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Text: The United States should engage in prior, binding consultation with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization over whether to \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. The United States should advocate the plan throughout the process of consultation and should enact the result of consultation.

Say yes – Europe is worried about American overstretch

De Nevers 7 (renee de nevers, 2007, International Security, Nato’s international security role in the terrorist era, pg. 59-60 TBC 6/21/10)

NATO’s members also differ on the means to respond to threats confronting the alliance. This was most apparent in the bitter dispute over the 2003 U.S. invasion of Iraq. The dispute illustrated three points of disagreement. First, it rejected different understandings of the nature of the terrorist threat and how to combat it. Second, it exposed deep differences about the appropriate use of force, and in particular about the U.S. policy of preventive war. Whereas the United States insisted that the urgency of the threat posed by Saddam Hussein’s supposed possession of WMD mandated immediate action, several European allies argued that Hussein was contained and could be deterred. Third, the dispute illustrated increasing European concern about U.S. unilateralism and the fear that NATO’s European members might be “entrapped” by their alliance commitments to support a reckless military operation. 92 As a result, both France and Germany balked at supporting the United States.93 Although the Bush administration sought to repair relations with key European allies and institutions after the 2004 presidential elections, the acrimony caused by this dispute has left a residue of ill will. The shifting alignments and attitudes toward threats confronting NATO have reduced the United States’ willingness to accept alliance constraints.94 Moreover, the United States’ strategic focus has changed, with greater attention being given to the Middle East, Central Asia, and East Asia. This is evident both in the changing base deployments in Europe and the State Department’s decision to shift at least 100 diplomatic positions from Europe to other regions, including Africa, South Asia, East Asia, and the Middle East.95 This move is a logical step and if anything overdue, given the end of the Cold War, but it is telling of shifts in U.S. policy priorities.

Net Benefit: Alliance DA

US – NATO relations high but remains vulnerable to US unilateralism

Slocombe 10 (WALTER B. SLOCOMBE June 2010 PERSPECTIVE Towards A New NATO Strategic Concept A View from the United States http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/id/ipa/07299.pdf)

Nonetheless, NATO remains for the US, as stated in the new national security strategy, »the pre-eminent securi-ty alliance in the world today«, both the »cornerstone for US engagement with the world and a catalyst for international action«. Most of the US’s other formal alliance relationships and all its less formal security partnerships are essentially one-way streets where the US commits itself to help partners in their own defense but without expecting much, if any, help from them outside the strict confines of the joint defense of the partner in question. NATO is – with the partial excepti-on of Australia and to a much lesser extent Japan – the only case where the US can realistically regard its part-ner as a potential source of assistance outside the con-text of the US guarantee. This broader relationship is not, however, without its problems simply because the US expects more of its NATO partners – so it is more likely that the partners will seem to fall short of what the US expects, and that the allies will believe the US is pres-sing them to act more in its interests than their own.

1NC Shell

Unilateral withdrawal from collective participation causes failure of the alliance

Hsiung 1 (James C. a professor of politics at New York University http://www.lewrockwell.com/orig/hsiung1.html TBC 6/21/10)

It may not be a coincidence that European resentment to U.S. unilateralism is at its post-Cold War peak following the change of guards at the White House since January 20. A number of foreign-policy decisions by the new Bush Administration, ranging from the announced unilateral U.S. withdrawal from Kosovo and, for that matter, reduced U.S. commitment to the NATO, to the unilateral withdrawal from the Kyoto Protocol of 1998 when global warming has since become a more pronounced threat to humanity, and to a nonetheless unilateral decision (despite perfunctory, cursory "consultations" with European leaders) to scrap the 1972 ABM treaty with Russia, clearing the way for an equally unilateral National Missile Defense (NMD) system. This scheme, furthermore, goes against a common chorus of opposition even among America’s close allies in Europe and in Asia (Japan and South Korea). The ground of their common opposition is that the NMD may elicit new rounds of destablizing arms race not seen since the Cold War. True, unilateralism is not a monopoly of any Administration, nor any particular session of Congress. In 1999, the U.S. Senate unilaterally rejected the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty (CNTBT), which the Clinton Administration had signed three years earlier along with 154 other countries. The United States, under Reagan, had unilaterally held out joining the 119 states that signed the epochal 1982 Law of the Sea Convention after seven years of diligent negotiations. The ostensible official reason was that the United States would have no part to legislating socialism by treaty. The real reason, however, was that Washington wanted to have a permanent seat on the governing council of the International Seabed Authority, an agency to be created under the United Nations with the authority to issue licenses to national mining companies bent on exploiting seabed resources. Having finally won such an exclusive concession following 12 more years of talks, the United States then signed the treaty in 1994. But, the truth is that unilateralism has only been carried to new heights unknown before under the Bush Administration. It has irked America’s allies. Hence, any sensible person can readily infer a correlation between this unprecedented pitch of unilateralism and America’s ouster from the Human Rights Commission after it lost the May 3 election. Unilateralism and After Unilateralism may take different forms. Withdrawal from collective action in producing collective goods (such as environmental control) takes the form of omission. It may, on the other hand, take the form of commission, such as in the U.S. invasion of Panama, in December 1989, under the senior Bush. In the latter event, the example thus set may have encouraged copy-catting, such as in Saddam Hussein’s invasion of Kuwait scarcely nine months later. A most common form of unilateralism is to set different rules for itself, as from those for others. In the EP-3E spy plane case, the United States asserted it had the right to spy on another coastal state from the airspace over the latter’s 200-mile exclusive economic zone (EEZ). When pressed, the Bush White House might claim, on the ground of non-ratification, that America was not bound by the 1982 treaty’s provisions establishing the rights of a foreign coastal state, thus freeing America from the duty to observe the "due regard" rule for the latter’s rights (including the right of privacy) while flying a spy plane over its EEZ. Nor, in this view, is the United States bound by the rule that the high seas are reserved for "peaceful purposes" only. We need not belabor the point that these rules are or have become customary rules in general international law binding on all nations. The fact is that the United States in 1983, under President Reagan, established a 200-mile EEZ of its own by [unilateral] proclamation. One wonders what would happen if any foreign nation should send spy planes, on routine missions, into the airspace over America’s EEZ so established. The consequences from such hegemonic unilateralism may vary. The recent troubles the Bush Administration has encountered in the four events above are but a reminder of what kinds of bitter fruits are likely to result from America’s unilateralist approach to foreign affairs. The twenty-first century is one characterized by the rise of what is known as "comprehensive security," comprising environmental security, economic security, and human security. Remedies require collective action, not unilateral self-help. The ultimate lesson from these recent events is that they are a wake-up call that the time has come for America to shift gears toward greater use of collective action, on security matters as in foreign relations in general – or else, be prepared to face rejection even by America’s own allies.
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NATO is the only institution that can solve existential threats from terrorism that can come immediately from anywhere

Robertson 3 (Speech by NATO Secretary General, Lord Robertson at the 9th Conference de Montreal May 6 http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2003/s030506a.htm TBC 6/22/10

The scale of threats has also increased. Today terrorism is more international, more apocalyptic in its vision, and far more lethal. And despite the best efforts of our diplomats and counter-proliferation experts, the spread of bio-chemical and nuclear weapons is already a defining security challenge of this new century. If not addressed, it will put more fingers on more triggers. And because not all of these fingers will belong to rational leaders, traditional deterrents will not always deter. All this adds up to a guaranteed supply chain of instability. It adds up to a security environment in which threats can strike at anytime, without warning, from anywhere and using any means, from a box-cutter to a chemical weapon to a missile. In the months leading to Prague, NATO’s 19 member countries demonstrated that they understood the nature of this challenge and were united in a common response to it. What this has meant in practice for the Alliance can be summarised under three headings: new roles, new relationships and new capabilities. NATO is worth retaining only if it is relevant. It evolved successfully in the 1990s to engage former adversaries across the old Soviet bloc and then to deal with instability and ethnic cleansing in the Balkans. Now NATO is radically changing again to play important new roles in the fight against terrorism and weapons of mass destruction. It already provides the common glue of military interoperability without which multinational operations of any kind would be impossible. Canada’s Joint Task Force 2 and Princess Patricia’s Canadian Light Infantry were able to operate effectively against the Taliban and Al Qaida in Afghanistan only because of decades of cooperation in NATO. After 9/11, NATO also played a supporting role in actions against Al Qaida. Most importantly, however, NATO at Prague became the focal point for planning the military contribution against terrorism, a major new role and one which no other organisation in the world could play. In doing so, we have put an end to decades of arid theological debate about whether the Alliance could operate outside Europe. NATO now has a mandate to deal with threats from wherever they may come.
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Terrorism will escalate into extinction

Morgan 9 (Dennis, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Yongin Campus - South Korea Futures, Volume 41, Issue 10, December 2009, Pages 683-693, World on Fire) LL

Moore points out what most terrorists obviously already know about the nuclear tensions between powerful countries. No doubt, they’ve figured out that the best way to escalate these tensions into nuclear war is to set off a nuclear exchange. As Moore points out, all that militant terrorists would have to do is get their hands on one small nuclear bomb and explode it on either Moscow or Israel. Because of the Russian “dead hand” system, “where regional nuclear commanders would be given full powers should Moscow be destroyed,” it is likely that any attack would be blamed on the United States” Israeli leaders and Zionist supporters have, likewise, stated for years that if Israel were to suffer a nuclear attack, whether from terrorists or a nation state, it would retaliate with the suicidal “Samson option” against all major Muslim cities in the Middle East. Furthermore, the Israeli Samson option would also include attacks on Russia and even “anti-Semitic” European cities In that case, of course, Russia would retaliate, and the U.S. would then retaliate against Russia. China would probably be involved as well, as thousands, if not tens of thousands, of nuclear warheads, many of them much more powerful than those used at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, would rain upon most of the major cities in the Northern Hemisphere. Afterwards, for years to come, massive radioactive clouds would drift throughout the Earth in the nuclear fallout, bringing death or else radiation disease that would be genetically transmitted to future generations in a nuclear winter that could last as long as a 100 years, taking a savage toll upon the environment and fragile ecosphere as well. And what many people fail to realize is what a precarious, hair-trigger basis the nuclear web rests on. Any accident, mistaken communication, false signal or “lone wolf’ act of sabotage or treason could, in a matter of a few minutes, unleash the use of nuclear weapons, and once a weapon is used, then the likelihood of a rapid escalation of nuclear attacks is quite high while the likelihood of a limited nuclear war is actually less probable since each country would act under the “use them or lose them” strategy and psychology; restraint by one power would be interpreted as a weakness by the other, which could be exploited as a window of opportunity to “win” the war. In other words, once Pandora's Box is opened, it will spread quickly, as it will be the signal for permission for anyone to use them. Moore compares swift nuclear escalation to a room full of people embarrassed to cough. Once one does, however, “everyone else feels free to do so. The bottom line is that as long as large nation states use internal and external war to keep their disparate factions glued together and to satisfy elites’ needs for power and plunder, these nations will attempt to obtain, keep, and inevitably use nuclear weapons. And as long as large nations oppress groups who seek self-determination, some of those groups will look for any means to fight their oppressors” In other words, as long as war and aggression are backed up by the implicit threat of nuclear arms, it is only a matter of time before the escalation of violent conflict leads to the actual use of nuclear weapons, and once even just one is used, it is very likely that many, if not all, will be used, leading to horrific scenarios of global death and the destruction of much of human civilization while condemning a mutant human remnant, if there is such a remnant, to a life of unimaginable misery and suffering in a nuclear winter.

\*Uniqueness\*

NATO Strong Now

Afghanistan has not weakened NATO

Lederman 10 (Josh, covers Community and Politics for Medill News Service at Northwestern University in Chicago, April 8, <http://news.medill.northwestern.edu/chicago/news.aspx?id=162809>) LL

The Secretary General of NATO pushed back Thursday against concerns that military resolve among allies in Afghanistan is weakening and stressed that 2010 will be a year of progress. “I do realize that 2009 was a very difficult year and we experienced many setbacks in Afghanistan,” Anders Rasmussen acknowledged. Yet he pointed to the addition of 40 thousand troops – most of them American - and the goal to train 300 thousand Afghan soldiers and police by October 2011 as reasons to be optimistic. Asked how NATO will maintain continuity if partners withdraw, Rasmussen admitted that the Netherlands and Canada are engaging in heated discussions about their role in the 8-year-old war. Yet he said that so far all 28 NATO allies have remained fully engaged. Non-U.S. troops make up 40 percent of NATO’s military presence, he noted. “It’s quite good I think, and a testimony of solidarity and strong commitment,” Rasmussen said. “So I’m not that worried.”

Obama has made efforts to strengthen relations with NATO

Radio Free Europe 9 (April 4, http://www.rferl.org/content/Obama\_Stresses\_NATO\_Cooperation\_Decries\_Drift\_In\_Afghanistan/1601882.html) LL

Between his meetings with Sarkozy in France and Merkel in Germany, Obama moved to a sports stadium in Strasbourg to make his first major public address to a European audience since taking office.  He stressed the importance of the U.S.-European trans-Atlantic alliance. "I've come to Europe this week to renew our partnership, one in which America listens and learns from our friends and allies, but where our friends and allies bear there share of the burden," Obama said. "Together, we must forge common solutions to our common problems." At the

NATO summit, which began with a dinner in the German town of Kehl and was continuing the next day in Strasbourg, the alliance will also discuss its strained relations with Russia following the August Russian-Georgian war. NATO Secretary General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer told a youth conference on April 2 in Strasbourg that the alliance favors dialogue with Moscow to settle differences such as those over Georgia. The opening of the summit has been filled with symbolism, beginning with Obama hopping across the French-German border to meet with the German chancellor before the official proceedings got under way. The gathering marks the 60th anniversary of the trans-Atlantic alliance, which was formed in 1949 as a counterweight to the Soviet Union and to create a new and more stable European security order following World War II.

NATO Strong Now

NATO is growing and stable despite some controversy surrounding Russia

Welle 9 (Deutsche, Center for Global Research, March 28, http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=12930) LL

US President Barack Obama said in a meeting with NATO's Secretary General that he wants to improve relations with Russia. Yet Obama said he also feels the alliance should not be afraid of expanding its borders. The future of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's relationship with Russia was a big topic as Obama met with NATO Secretary General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer on Wednesday, March 25. Obama said he wants to "reset" US-Russian relations, which have become increasingly strained. But Obama said that good relations with Moscow would not come at the expense of NATO expansion, something which Russia vehemently opposes. The United States has supported bringing countries such as Georgia and Ukraine into NATO, although Obama did not mention the countries by name. Obama said it was important to "send a clear signal throughout Europe that we are going to continue to abide by the central belief ... that countries who seek and aspire to join NATO are able to join NATO." Scheffer played down the alliance's disagreements with Russia after Wednesday's meeting. "We have many things on which we disagree, but NATO needs Russia and Russia needs NATO, so that's one of the things we agree on," he said after the meeting. But the alliance's top commander says NATO's relationship with Russia is more difficult than at any time since the end of the Cold War. General John Craddock pointed to Russia's war with Georgia in August of 2008 as well as disputes with Ukraine over gas supplies this year as contentious issues. He made the comments as part of written testimony before the US Senate Armed Services Committee. Russia is also unhappy with US plans to set up a missile defense system in Poland and the Czech Republic. "We are in a time of uncertainty in the US-Russian relationship brought about by disagreements over European security, Russia's role in what it regards as its neighborhood, and Russia's decision to send forces into Georgia and to recognize the breakaway regions of South Ossetia and Abkhazia," Craddock wrote. After the Cold War ended, many believed that Europe and Eurasia were no longer at threat of being invaded, an assumption which "has been now proven false," Craddock said, pointing to Russia's incursion into Georgia. Craddock also said he's like the United States to maintain the size of its military presence in Europe, despite plans to reduce the number of US soldiers stationed in countries such as Germany. NATO turning 60 While Russia was a main topic of discussion, Obama and Scheffer also discussed the alliance's stragegy in fighting militants in Afghanistan and plans for NATO's 60th anniversary summit. The meeting will be held in Germany and France on April 3-4. Obama said the 60th anniversary of the military alliance was "testimony to the effectiveness of NATO in creating stability and peace and prosperity, laying the groundwork for so much that has taken place over the last several years."

NATO Relevant Now

NATO is making efforts to adapt to current politics; the 2010 Strategic Concept proves

Atlantic Council 10 (April 27, <http://www.acus.org/publication/stratcon-2010-alliance-global-century>) LL

Strategic Concept 2010 must embody a set of principles that underpin the commitment to sustain political vision and military effectiveness and provide the narrative supporting modernization of NATO forces: 1. Restate the Alliance’s Political Mission. All members of the Atlantic Alliance retain a fundamental commitment to liberty, democracy, human rights and rule of law which underpin both the political mission and strategy of the Alliance. 2. Balance Solidarity, Strategy and Flexibility. In a fractured world, a complicated partnership is unlikely to generate unity of purpose and effort. Consensus, thus, will always be to an extent conditional with the need for flexibility paramount. To that end, a new contract is needed among and between all members of the Euro-Atlantic community that enshrines flexibility as the strategic method of the Alliance even as it spells out those core areas of defense where solidarity is both automatic and absolute. Only by balancing political and strategic realities will such a contract move NATO beyond a spurious rhetorical role to ensure each member gains security from all the rest in return for the equitable sharing of responsibilities. Such a goal will demand that NATO acts as the transatlantic security forum for political discussion given the challenges the allies face together. 3. Promote Political Flexibility. The world today is too complex for the Atlantic Alliance to manage critical security challenges alone. However, in such an environment, a strong Atlantic Alliance will be essential for the security and defense of the Euro-Atlantic area and beyond. Equally, there will be times when having a United Nations, European Union or OSCE flag on an operation, rather than a NATO flag, will afford a better chance of success. In such circumstances, NATO should be able and willing to play an enabling role. 4. Reestablish the Link between Strategy and Fighting Power. NATO is first and foremost a military security organization. Critical to both its purpose and role is the generation, organization and application of military effect. At the heart of Strategic Concept 2010 must be a commitment to enhance fighting power with capabilities and capacities designed to ensure the allies remain the world’s preeminent military group. Even the defense of members today requires advanced deployable armed forces with force modernization tailored to such an end. 5. Strike a Better Balance between Protection and Projection. For the Atlantic Alliance to play its wider military security role, the military stability and security of Europe (both members and partners) – and reassurance of all – remain central to NATO’s mission. Therefore, a better balance is required, based on assessed need, between protection of the home base against threats such as terrorism and the projection of stability. 6. Recommit to Success in Afghanistan. It is critical that NATO succeeds in the wars in which it engages. Therefore, the commitment to succeed in Afghanistan will need to be restated with conviction and demonstrated through action on the battlefield (in line with the Obama administration’s decision to push towards a stability breakthrough).

**NATO is making efforts to adapt to the contemporary world**

Kramer 10 (Franklin, Atlantic Council Vice Chair and member of the [Strategic Advisors Group](http://www.acus.org/../../../../../people/sag), The Atlantic Council, Apr 2, <http://www.acus.org/publication/nato-initiatives-era-global-competition>) LL

NATO is currently engaged in a philosophical review of its foundational principles as it undertakes to develop a new Strategic Concept to be adopted this November at the Lisbon Summit. The words of the concept will have little impact, however, unless they are implemented by a series of consequential initiatives that make NATO an effective organization in a new era of global competition. This issue brief recommends five such initiatives for NATO, which would be approved at Lisbon, designed to respond to global challenges, both immediate and longer term. The initiatives are: Enhancing NATO’s capacity for civil-military interaction, and specifically creating a civil-military plan for Afghanistan; Building effective defense with limited resources by creating focused multi-national formations that meet critical Alliance needs; Enhancing NATO’s ability both to respond to new challenges for allies and to utilize partner capacities by expanding training and education capabilities of Allied Command Transformation (ACT) on new requirements (e.g., counterinsurgency, cyber) and on partner needs; Establishing an arms control agenda for NATO, including tactical nuclear weapons; Making NATO an effective place to discuss security issues of consequence by establishing an “Enhanced North Atlantic Council (NAC) Forum” which could review issues beyond traditional defense (e.g., cyber, energy, Iran) and could add partners as appropriate (e.g., the European Union, Pakistan) to the topic for discussion.

Cooperation Now

Status quo cooperation exists between the US and NATO in Africa

Rozoff 10 (Rick, Global Research, Jan 10, http://www.infowars.com/u-s-nato-expand-afghan-war-to-horn-of-africa-and-indian-ocean/) LL

In parallel with the escalation of the war in South Asia – counterinsurgency operations in Afghanistan and drone missile attacks in Pakistan – the United States and its NATO allies have laid the groundwork for increased naval, air and ground operations in the Horn of Africa and the Gulf of Aden. During the past month the U.S. has carried out deadly military strikes in Yemen: Bombing raids in the north and cruise missile attacks in the south of the nation. Washington has been accused of killing scores of civilians in the attacks in both parts of the country, executed before the December 25 Northwest Airlines incident that has been used to justify the earlier U.S. actions ex post facto. And, ominously, that has been exploited to pound a steady drumbeat of demands for expanded and even more direct military intervention. The Pentagon’s publicly disclosed military and security program for Yemen grew from $4.6 million in 2006 to $67 million last year. “That figure does not include covert, classified assistance that the United States has provided.” [1] In addition, “Under a new classified cooperation agreement, the U.S. would be able to fly cruise missiles, fighter jets or unmanned armed drones against targets in the country, but would remain publicly silent on its role in the airstrikes.” [2] On January 1 General David Petraeus, the chief of the Pentagon’s Central Command, in charge of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq as well as operations in Yemen and Pakistan, was in the Iraqi capital of Baghdad and said of deepening military involvement in Yemen, “We have, it’s well known, about $70 million in security assistance last year. That will more than double this coming year.” [3] The following day Petraeus was in the capital of Yemen where he met with the country’s president, Ali Abdullah Saleh, to discuss “continued U.S. support in rooting out the terrorist cells.” [4] White House counterterrorism adviser (Assistant to the President for Homeland Security and Counterterrorism) John Brennan briefed President Barack Obama on Petraeus’ visit to Washington’s new war theater and afterward stated “We have made Yemen a priority over the course of this year, and this is the latest in that effort.” [5] The alleged terrorist cells in question are identified by U.S. and other Western governments as being affiliated with al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP). However, on January 4 CNN reported that “A senior U.S. official cited a rebellion by Huti [Houthi] tribes in the north, and secessionist activity in the southern tribal areas” as of concern to Washington. [6] The Houthis’ confessional background is Shi’a and not Sunni Islam and the opposition forces in the south are led by the Yemeni Socialist Party, so attempts to link either with al-Qaeda are inaccurate, self-serving and dishonest. In both the north and south the United States, its NATO allies – Britain and France closed their embassies in Yemen earlier this week in unison with the U.S. – and Saudi Arabia are working in tandem to support the Saleh government in what over the past month has become a state of warfare against opposition forces in the country. Saudi Arabia has launched regular bombing raids and infantry and armored attacks in the north of the country and, according to Houthi rebel sources, been aided by U.S. warplanes in deadly attacks on villages. Houthi spokesmen have accused Riyadh of firing over a thousand missiles inside Yemen, and in late December the Saudi Defense Ministry acknowledged that its military casualties over the preceding month included 73 dead, 26 missing and 470 wounded. In short, a cross-border war on the Arabian peninsula. The West, though, has even larger plans for Yemen, ones which include integrating military operations from Northeast Africa to the Chinese border. Typical of recent statements by U.S. officials and their Western allies, last weekend British Prime Minister Gordon Brown disingenuously claimed that “The weakness of al Qaeda in Pakistan has forced them out of Pakistan and into Yemen and Somalia.” [7] Brown told the BBC on January 3 “Yemen has been recognized, like Somalia, to be one of the areas we have got to not only keep an eye on, but we’ve got to do more. So it’s strengthening counter-terrorism cooperation, it’s working harder on intelligence efforts.” [8] It is up to Mr. Brown to explain why, if al-Qaeda has been “forced out” of Pakistan, he is adding soldiers to the U.S. and NATO surge that will soon bring combined Western troop numbers to over 150,000 in Afghanistan while intensifying deadly attacks inside Pakistan itself. The British prime minister has also called for an international meeting on Yemen for later this month and announced that “The UK and the US have agreed to fund a counter-terrorism police unit in Yemen….” [9] In Western news reports, or rather rumor peddling, Yemeni rebels are accused of supplying weapons to Somali opposite numbers and the second are reported to have offered fighters to the former. In short the officially discarded but in fact revived and expanded “global war on terrorism” is now to be fought in a single theater of war that extends from the Red Sea to Pakistan. A joint endeavor by the Pentagon’s Central and Africa Commands and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to build upon the consolidation of almost the entire European continent under NATO and Pentagon control and the ceding of the African continent to the new U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM). (Except for Egypt, an individual Pentagon asset and NATO Mediterranean Dialogue partner.)

Cooperation Now

The US and NATO act together in the Black Sea Region

Rozoff 10 (Rick, Global Research, European Dialogue, May 28, http://eurodialogue.org/osce/US-And-NATO-Accelerate-Military-Build-Up-In-Black-Sea-Region) LL

In the post-Cold War era and especially since 2001 the Pentagon has been steadily shifting emphasis, and moving troops and equipment, from bases in Germany and Italy to Eastern Europe in its drive to the east and the south. That process was preceded and augmented by the absorption of former Eastern Bloc nations into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization beginning in 1999. In one of the first nations in that category, Poland, the initial contingent of what will be over 100 U.S. troops arrived in the town of Morag this week, as near as 35 miles from Russian territory, as part of a Status of Forces Agreement between Washington and the host country ratified this February. Also in February, the governments of the Black Sea nations of Romania and Bulgaria confirmed plans for the U.S. to deploy a land-based version of Standard Missile-3 anti-ballistic interceptors on their territory. The U.S. Sixth Fleet, headquartered in Italy, has deployed warships to the Black Sea with an increased frequency over the past few years, visiting and conducting joint drills with the navies of Bulgaria, Romania and Georgia. Last autumn it was revealed that the Pentagon planned to spend $110 million dollars to upgrade and modernize a base in Bulgaria and another in Romania, two of seven such newly-acquired installations in the two nations. The air, naval and infantry bases in Bulgaria and Romania have been employed for the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq and, although not publicly acknowledged, doubtlessly for arming Georgia before, during and since its five-day war with Russia in August of 2008. The Pentagon’s Joint Task Force-East has all but officially been assigned to the Mihail Kogalniceanu Airfield in Romania and also makes regular use of the Romanian Army’s Babadag Training Area and the Novo Selo Training Range in Bulgaria, the latter near the strategic Bezmer Air Base and the Black Sea port city of Burgas (Bourgas). Last year Joint Task Force-East conducted a series of military trainings with Bulgarian and Romanian counterparts from August 7 to October 24. The immediate purpose of the combat drills was for “downrange” operations in Afghanistan, but the lengthy and extensive nature of the maneuvers demonstrated the longer-term and longer-range intents of the U.S. and its NATO allies. The latter also have free use of the Bulgarian and Romanian military bases. Two squadrons from the 2nd Stryker Cavalry Regiment were among the 2,000 American troops who participated in last year’s war games in the two nations. American Admiral James Stavridis, commander of U.S. European Command and NATO’s Supreme Allied Commander Europe, visited Romania on April 27 and 28, meeting with the country’s president and defense minister. The main topics of discussion were NATO’s new Strategic Concept and its war in Afghanistan, but the issue of stationing U.S. interceptor missiles was surely touched upon as well. NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen was in Romania on May 6 and 7 to meet with the president, defense minister, foreign minister and top military commander. The U.S.-NATO missile shield project and the war in Afghanistan were major subjects on the agenda. Five days after Rasmussen left the capital the Romanian Foreign Ministry announced that “A round of technical US-Romanian talks on Romania’s inclusion in the Phased Adaptive Approach of the European missile defense system took place in Bucharest” a day earlier, May 11. [HotNews.ro, May 12, 2010] The NATO chief arrived in neighboring Bulgaria on May 20 for similar discussions. The local press announced in advance that “The construction of a common missile defense system and Bulgaria’s accession into it, along with reforms in the Bulgarian army and NATO’s new strategic concept – these will be some of the issues that NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen is going to discuss with his Bulgarian partners during his two-day visit to Sofia beginning on Thursday, May 20.” [Standart News, May 16, 2010] In fact, while in the Bulgarian capital Rasmussen met with the nation’s prime minister, president and defense minister and, according to a Bulgarian news source, the top issue discussed was “the planned installation of an anti-missile defence system in the region, as Brussels plans to deploy anti-missile units in Bulgaria and negotiations are set to be launched following the Portugal Nato summit” in November. [Sofia Echo, May 20, 2010] Rasmussen reiterated the demand that all Balkans nations be incorporated into NATO, which would dictate the inclusion of Bosnia, Serbia, Macedonia, Montenegro and Kosovo. (As NATO recognizes the last-named as an independent state.) The host nation’s foreign minister, Nikolay Mladenov, spoke after the meeting with NATO’s secretary general and linked the North Atlantic bloc’s collective military assistance article with U.S.-led missile deployments and anti-Russian energy transit projects. He specifically highlighted “setting up the anti-missile defence shield as a part of Article 5 against new threats” and “the inclusion of energy security to key security issues.” [Focus News Agency, May 20, 2010]

Cooperation Now

The US and NATO act together in arms projects

Rozoff 10 (Rick, Global Research, European Dialogue, May 28, http://eurodialogue.org/osce/US-And-NATO-Accelerate-Military-Build-Up-In-Black-Sea-Region) LL

Even Ukraine under its new president Viktor Yanukovich remains within NATO’s Black Sea plans. The prohibition against the presence of foreign military forces for exercises in the nation, effected by the former opposition against Yanukovich’s pro-U.S. predecessor Viktor Yushchenko, has been reversed, and U.S. and fellow NATO states’ troops may resume Sea Breeze exercises on Ukraine’s Black Sea coast.

The establishment of U.S. and NATO naval, air and infantry bases and interceptor missile installations in Black Sea nations is the prototype for expansive and permanent military build-ups in Eastern Europe and into former Soviet space, which is being replicated in the Baltic Sea region. An imaginary Iranian threat is the subterfuge employed to justify the presence of U.S. and NATO warplanes, warships, troops, mechanized and airborne units, missile batteries, training centers and radar facilities in the Black Sea and Baltic Sea regions.

 Iran does not border either of the two seas and has neither the ability nor any reason to threaten nations that do.

Recent news reports from both sides of the Atlantic speak of a warming of relations between Russia and the United States, between Russia and NATO. If so, Russian political leaders won’t have to extend their hands far to clasp those of their alleged Western friends and allies. They need merely reach across their southwestern and northwestern borders on the Black and Baltic Seas.

NATO and the US are making efforts to cooperate on operations in Afghanistan and with Russia

Speedie 9 (David, Carnegie Council,bAug 17, http://www.cceia.org/resources/articles\_papers\_reports/0028.html) LL

We publish today the second set of papers under the U.S.-Russia strand of our U.S. Global Engagement Program.

These papers—two from Americans, two from Russians—embrace an ambitiously broad spectrum of issues, covering U.S./NATO-Russia cooperation on Afghanistan and Central Asia. Four major points may be seen to emerge from the spirited discussion in the papers:

1. The United States/NATO and Russia have clear and urgent common interests in promoting long-term stability in Afghanistan. These include containing and defeating "radical extremist" forces, reversing the noxious effects of the opium trade from that country, and preventing instability in Afghanistan from impacting an extended region. Despite these shared interests, cooperation between Russia and the West is "episodic," rather than strategic or systematic.

2. Afghanistan must be seen, not in isolation, but in a broader regional (Central Asian) context. This is true both in terms of the importance of the region (strategic location, energy resources) and of the formidable challenges (instability, economic reversals). Russia and the West both see advantages and interests to be protected (thus the recent competition for a military presence in the otherwise marginal Kyrgyzstan), but should avoid a new "Great Game" of promoting self-interest over shared concerns.

Cooperation Now

The US and NATO cooperate via multiple regional operations in the Middle East and Asia

Central Asia Caucus Institute 9 (Oct 2009, http://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&q=cache:cgbFLEELDNYJ:kms1.isn.ethz.ch/serviceengine/Files/ISN/110237/ichaptersection\_singledocument/0110b0e8-bef5-4fe7-a2a1-3002bd8b56fc/en/2.pdf+US-NATO+cooperat\*&hl=en&gl=us&pid=bl&srcid=ADGEESii-7ZlDW-pNjZK4QvUfhydAykAr8EXbLzfAUkXDi\_cR8sTDFk5zqOH6wiMHvhPvyDvPK\_Yw2-V5r-ZPUeZPUlj0ALDCaLZ5BaZu\_6zPjpmzFmhQv6acR63AYZLjpIEHjyzYAg3&sig=AHIEtbSapzsqH\_8F9BRHxc3s\_STJ\_7OBBg) LL

The primary regional objective for the U.S. and NATO is to contain and neutralize the Taliban insurgency in the arc of instability that stretches across Afghanistan’s western and southern borders. Along the south and eastern borders this has meant a practical extension of the theater of war into Pakistan as the country reels from terrorist strikes by such home grown militant organizations as the TTP (Tehreek-e-Taliban Pakistan). Whereas on the western borders, the regional strategy envisages a possible strategic re-engagement with Iran to neutralize the challenge of growing insurgency. At the same time there is a realization that bilateral channels alone are inadequate in addressing the whole spectrum of such issues with Pakistan, while with Iran no such bilateral channels exist. The second objective deals with the trilateral context where the concerns of Pakistan’s security establishment are addressed with reference to both India and Afghanistan. Lately there is a realization that any attempt to attach conditions that aim to change or restructure Pakistan’s security calculus without affecting a change in its security environment is bound to be resisted. The unmediated involvement of India in Afghanistan has added another dangerous dimension and increased Pakistan’s insecurities. The third objective is to launch a broad multilateral initiative where regional countries such as China, Iran, Russia, and the Central Asian states and Pakistan’s other strategic partners such as Saudi Arabia and the UAE are brought on board to stabilize Afghanistan and Pakistan. Within the regional scenario the potential role of China in stabilizing both Afghanistan and Pakistan is assuming greater prominence. China who is Pakistan’s largest investor is poised to become the largest investor in Afghanistan as well with a US$3.5 billion dollar stake in the Aynak copper mines south of Kabul. Creating space for multilateral cooperation over Afghanistan has also acquired greater significance, as there is a greater urgency in securing alternate transit routes for military and non-military supplies to U.S./NATO troops stationed in Afghanistan. Currently the two transit routes through Pakistan supply 40 per cent of the fuel and 80 per cent of non-fuel supplies for the war effort in Afghanistan. These routes are becoming more vulnerable to militant attacks.

NATO involved in cooperation with Pakistan

Benitez 10 (Jorge Benitez is the Director of NATOSource and a Nonresident Senior Fellow in the International Security program. Atlantic Council http://www.acus.org/natosource/high-level-consultations-between-nato-and-pakistan TBC 6/21/10)

From NATO: Deputy Assistant Secretary General Robert Simmons visited Islamabad on 19 and 20 May for an exchange of views with Pakistani authorities on a range of issues of common interest to NATO and Pakistan. Mr. Simmons met with Foreign Secretary Salman Bashir, Defence Secretary Syed Athar Ali and other high-ranking government officials. He commended Pakistan's efforts in the fight against extremism and thanked them for the good cooperation with regard to the Alliance's efforts in Afghanistan. Mr. Simmons and his interlocutors agreed to pursue similar high-level meetings in the future to deepen NATO-Pakistan relationship. The visit was an opportunity to take stock of the good practical cooperation between NATO and Pakistan with regard to military-to-military contacts and to discuss issues such as regional cooperation, arms control, defence against terrorism and also NATO's work on a new Strategic Concept, to be adopted later this year.

Consult Now

Consultation with NATO over military issues exists now

Burns 10 (Robert, AP National Security Writer, March 14, http://www.breitbart.com/article.php?id=D9EEHI101&show\_article=1) LL

[WASHINGTON](http://topics.breitbart.com/WASHINGTON/) (AP) - The U.S. is taking a go-slow approach on one of the touchiest and least discussed national [security issues:](http://topics.breitbart.com/security%2Bissues/) whether to remove the last remaining Cold War-era U.S. nuclear weapons in [Europe.](http://topics.breitbart.com/Europe/) Some officials in [Germany](http://topics.breitbart.com/Germany/) and other [U.S. allies](http://topics.breitbart.com/U.S.%2Ballies/) in [Europe](http://topics.breitbart.com/Europe/) are advocating a withdrawal, citing President [Barack Obama's](http://topics.breitbart.com/Barack%2BObama/) call last year for a nuclear-free world. But the U.S. is putting off an early decision, preferring to consult within [NATO,](http://topics.breitbart.com/NATO/) starting at a meeting of foreign ministers in April that Secretary of State [Hillary Rodham Clinton](http://topics.breitbart.com/Hillary%2BRodham%2BClinton/) plans to attend, according to several Obama administration officials. The officials discussed the matter on condition of anonymity because details are secret and the administration is in the midst of an internal review of the role and purpose of the U.S. nuclear arsenal. The estimated 200 weapons in [Europe](http://topics.breitbart.com/Europe/) are a fraction of that total. Results of the review, originally due to [Congress](http://topics.breitbart.com/Congress/) in December, have been delayed repeatedly and now aren't expected before April. The study, known as the [Nuclear Posture Review,](http://topics.breitbart.com/Nuclear%2BPosture%2BReview/) is expected to call for a reduced role for nuclear weapons in U.S. national security strategy, as reflected in the substantial reductions being negotiated with [Russia](http://topics.breitbart.com/Russia/) in a replacement for the 1991 [Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty,](http://topics.breitbart.com/Strategic%2BArms%2BReduction%2BTreaty/) or START. That negotiation does not apply to the U.S. nuclear weapons in [Europe,](http://topics.breitbart.com/Europe/) which are categorized as "nonstrategic" because they are short-range bombs designed to be launched by [fighter jets](http://topics.breitbart.com/fighter%2Bjets/) based in [Europe](http://topics.breitbart.com/Europe/)—including by [NATO](http://topics.breitbart.com/NATO/) members' jets. Ivo Daalder, the U.S. ambassador to [NATO,](http://topics.breitbart.com/NATO/) said on Feb. 23 that the review "will not make any decisions that preclude any option with respect to nuclear weapons and [NATO.](http://topics.breitbart.com/NATO/)" The START negotiations aim to reduce U.S. and Russian long-range nuclear weapons, such as intercontinental ballistic missiles carried on submarines. Talks have bogged down for months. The [White House](http://topics.breitbart.com/White%2BHouse/) said Obama on Saturday had an "encouraging" telephone conversation with Russian President [Dmitry Medvedev](http://topics.breitbart.com/Dmitry%2BMedvedev/) about prospects for an early end to the arms negotiations. The bombs in [Europe](http://topics.breitbart.com/Europe/) are a sensitive subject because they reflect a long-standing U.S. military and political commitment to the defense of its European allies, who have relied on the U.S. nuclear "umbrella" as an alternative to developing their own nuclear weapons. [Washington](http://topics.breitbart.com/WASHINGTON/) has a similar commitment to Asian allies, including [Japan](http://topics.breitbart.com/Japan/) and [South Korea,](http://topics.breitbart.com/South%2BKorea/) but it has maintained that role with U.S.-based long-range nuclear weapons. Asia-based U.S. nuclear arms were withdrawn in the early 1990s by President [George H.W. Bush.](http://topics.breitbart.com/George%2BH.W.%2BBush/) The [U.S. government](http://topics.breitbart.com/U.S.%2Bgovernment/) as a matter of policy will not confirm the location of U.S. nuclear weapons, but it is well known that the sites in [Europe](http://topics.breitbart.com/Europe/) are in [Belgium,](http://topics.breitbart.com/Belgium/) [the Netherlands,](http://topics.breitbart.com/the%2BNetherlands/) [Germany,](http://topics.breitbart.com/Germany/) [Italy](http://topics.breitbart.com/Italy/) and [Turkey.](http://topics.breitbart.com/Turkey/) The U.S. has had nuclear arms in [Europe](http://topics.breitbart.com/Europe/) since the 1950s. [Hans M. Kristensen,](http://topics.breitbart.com/Hans%2BM.%2BKristensen/) director of the [Nuclear Information Project](http://topics.breitbart.com/Nuclear%2BInformation%2BProject/) at the [Federation of American Scientists,](http://topics.breitbart.com/Federation%2Bof%2BAmerican%2BScientists/) which advocates nuclear [arms control,](http://topics.breitbart.com/arms%2Bcontrol/) believes the administration is inclined to remove the nuclear weapons from [Europe](http://topics.breitbart.com/Europe/) but wants to take a cautious approach. "The Obama administration came in with a strong pledge to mend ties with the allies, and so the last thing it wants to be seen to do is to make a decision over the heads of the allies," he said in an interview Sunday. "The U.S. would move these weapons tomorrow if this were just its own decision." One apparent impediment to an early withdrawal of the weapons is the view of newer members of [NATO](http://topics.breitbart.com/NATO/)—those closer to [Russia,](http://topics.breitbart.com/Russia/) such as the [Baltic states.](http://topics.breitbart.com/Baltic%2Bstates/) They see the [U.S. weapons](http://topics.breitbart.com/U.S.%2Bweapons/) as an important symbol of a [NATO](http://topics.breitbart.com/NATO/) guarantee of their territorial integrity. Older [NATO](http://topics.breitbart.com/NATO/) members see it differently. Five of them—[Belgium,](http://topics.breitbart.com/Belgium/) [Germany,](http://topics.breitbart.com/Germany/) [the Netherlands,](http://topics.breitbart.com/the%2BNetherlands/) Luxembourg and Norway—in February called for consultations on the question of a U.S. nuclear withdrawal, and [NATO](http://topics.breitbart.com/NATO/) Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen said this month that "a hot issue like our nuclear posture" will be on the agenda, beginning at the April foreign ministers meeting. The consultations are likely to last for months, possibly into 2011. Parliament members from several European [NATO](http://topics.breitbart.com/NATO/) countries are circulating a letter to be sent to Obama stating that the elimination of short-range nuclear weapons in [Europe](http://topics.breitbart.com/Europe/) is an urgent matter and should be addressed once the U.S. and [Russia](http://topics.breitbart.com/Russia/) complete their START treaty. "It is the sincere wish of the majority of people in [Europe](http://topics.breitbart.com/Europe/) that tactical nuclear weapons are withdrawn from [Europe](http://topics.breitbart.com/Europe/) and eliminated," the letter says, according to a copy published by the [Global Security Institute,](http://topics.breitbart.com/Global%2BSecurity%2BInstitute/) an international group that advocates nuclear disarmament.

Consult Now

Empirically, consultations have been vital to foreign politics

NATO 9 **(**March 10,http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/news\_51460.htm**) LL**

The Vice President of the United States, Joseph Biden, met today with the North Atlantic Council to discuss the main challenges ahead in Afghanistan and consult with NATO Allies on the ongoing US strategic policy review towards Afghanistan and Pakistan. Allies welcomed this consultation process and the recent decision by President Obama to send more forces to ISAF. They agreed that the international community cannot afford the cost of failure in Afghanistan and Pakistan. NATO Ambassadors highlighted the need to concentrate efforts on building a regional approach, engaging local Afghan communities at the district level, as well as on a stronger civilian effort and increased support for Afghan institution building, in particular the Afghan Army and Police. Allies also stressed the need to focus efforts on tackling the narcotics problem and reducing civilian casualties to an absolute minimum. Today's consultations were part of the discussions conducted by Allies in the run up to the 60th anniversary NATO Summit in Strasbourg / Kehl on April 3-4. NATO Allies agreed that these consultations are key as well as part of the development of a joint and agreed way forward for Afghanistan.

**NATO leaders and Obama work closely on Afghanistan strategy**

Montopoli 9 (Brian, CBS News, September 29, http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544\_162-5350551-503544.html) LL

President Obama and NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen stressed to reporters following their Oval Office meeting today that the war in Afghanistan is not only a concern of the United States.  "This is not an American battle, this is a NATO mission as well, and we are working actively and diligently to consult with NATO at every step of the way," Mr. Obama said.  Added Rasmussen: "Our operation in Afghanistan is not America's responsibility or burden alone. It is, and will remain, a team effort." Rasmussen said he agrees with the president's approach of devising the proper strategy before considering resources. "The first thing is not numbers," he said, stressing the importance of finding the right approach to the eight-year-old conflict. He said careful decision-making "should not be misinterpreted as lack of resolve." Rasmussen noted, however, that NATO countries are now looking at the report from Gen. Stanley McChrystal, the commander of U.S and NATO troops in Afghanistan, which calls for troop increases. And he said, "we will stay in Afghanistan as long as it takes to finish our job." The president, who lauded Rasmussen as "active and effective," said the two men had a "very fruitful" discussion in which they agreed that it is "absolutely critical that we are successful in dismantling, disrupting and destroying the al Qaeda network."  Mr. Obama is now considering whether to increase troop levels in Afghanistan or shift to a strategy more focused on disrupting al Qaeda in Pakistan, which would rely less on troops. The president and Rasmussen told reporters they also discussed missile defense and agreed that the new configuration is an improvement. The pair did not take questions or discuss Iran or the McChrystal request specifically. or discuss Iran or the McChrystal request specifically.

Consult Now

Cooperation and consultation are common in the status quo

Euronews 9 **(June** 10, http://www.euronews.net/2009/10/06/eu-and-us-at-odds-over-afghanistan**/) LL**

When it came the call was loud and clear. US General Stanley McChrystal, the top NATO commander in Afghanistan, wants a major shift in strategy to battle the Taliban and he needs 40,000 more troops and equipment to do it.

But where are they coming from? Its a dilemma for the Obama administration as the Europeans look to be stepping back from the fray as casualties mount, costs soar and public opinion begins to dip. The US president held talks with NATO head Anders Fogh Rasmussen and made a clear point. “This is not an American battle. This is a NATO mission as well. And we are working actively and diligently to consult with NATO every step of the way.” Europe’s defence ministers are meeting in Gothenburg and what to do in Afghanistan is high on the agenda. The blocs foreign policy chief, Javier Solana, indicated that the EU would wait for the results of the Afghan election before committing to any new Afghan plan. As it stands 68,000 US soldiers are in Afghanistan backed by 35,000 from other countries, mostly Europe. 40 percent of US generals back the call for a 40,000 troop surge. Europe wants 17,000 instructors to train 13,000 Afghan soldiers and 80,000 police. Caught in the middle is President Obama while his top brass want extra firepower his main allies lean toward a training strategy. General McChrystal gave his reasons for wanting a speedier end to a difficult conundrum. “We need to reverse the current trend and time does matter. Waiting does not prolong a favourable outcome. This effort will not remain winnable indefinitely, public support will not last indefinitely.” He is not alone in his thinking, General Henri Bentegeat, who heads the EU’s Military Committee, says its not a problem of troop shortages but a lack of political will that is keeping Europe from deploying more military in the country. EU Ministers are set to grasp this nettle again at a formal meeting in Brussels in November.

Consultation over a variety of strategic issues now

Kellerhals 10 (Merle, Bureau of International Information Programs, U.S. Department of State May 5, <http://www.america.gov/st/peacesec-english/2010/May/20100505145813dmslahrellek0.734112.html>) LL

Washington — Vice President Biden will conduct consultations with officials from NATO, the European Union and Spain during a three-day trip that will focus on critical strategic, security and economic issues, the White House says. The vice president is expected to make a major address to the European Parliament on U.S.-EU cooperation, especially in the areas of security and counterterrorism, the White House said in a statement May 5. Biden left for Brussels May 5 and will conduct meetings May 6 and May 7 there before traveling on to Madrid for meetings May 7 and May 8. “During these meetings, the vice president will discuss how the United States and the EU can improve cooperation in areas of mutual concern, including Afghanistan and Pakistan, Iran, counterterrorism, climate change and energy security, and the promotion of economic growth,” the White House statement said. While in Spain, Biden is expected to consult on shared issues and the Spanish presidency of the EU. The vice president is expected to address bank data-sharing between law enforcement authorities in the European Union and the United States that is intended to combat terrorism. A measure on this subject has met with some resistance in the 27-nation bloc. The EU had wanted to give U.S. counterterrorism agencies access to data collected by the Society for Worldwide Interbank Financial Telecommunication (SWIFT), which records and tracks all financial transactions among European banks, but that became controversial over privacy concerns. New negotiations are to be held between EU and U.S. Treasury officials to reach an agreement that sets more stringent requirements for obtaining financial data and also provides for privacy safeguards. NATO MEETINGS Biden is expected to hold talks with NATO Secretary-General Anders Fogh Rasmussen May 6 that will include the NATO-led security mission in Afghanistan, a limited missile defense system for Europe, NATO’s Strategic Concept, and its relations with Russia. NATO’s Strategic Concept contains the guiding principles used to address security threats and prepare the alliance for the challenges it will face in the 21st century. In an article in the online International Herald Tribune May 5, Biden said he will meet with NATO ambassadors to advance the ongoing dialogue among the United States and its closest allies on the future of European security. “I do so because the United States is firmly committed to the view that any decisions about Europe’s security must be made in close coordination with our European allies and partners. We will decide nothing about our European allies and partners without them,” Biden said in the newspaper commentary. Biden said the United States and NATO must seek to increase transparency about all of their military forces, including conventional and nuclear forces and other defensive assets in Europe, including missile defense.

Consult Now

US and NATO consult extensively on foreign affairs; Russia proves

Kellerhals, 9 (Merle, February 13, US Embassy, http://www.usembassy.org.uk/euro004.html) LL

Washington — The United States wants to consult with its NATO partners and with Russia to determine if a cooperative approach to missile defense in Europe can be developed, says Under Secretary of State William Burns. “We are also open to the possibility of cooperation with Russia, with our NATO partners on new missile defense configurations which can take advantage of assets that each of us has,” Burns said February 13 in an interview with the Interfax news agency in Moscow. The U.S. Embassy in Moscow confirmed the text of the interview, according to the Reuters news agency. Burns added that the United States will continue to consult with the Czech Republic and Poland on plans to locate a limited missile defense system in the two NATO-partner countries. The system would help protect U.S. allies from rogue nations that may develop intercontinental missile systems.

The US and NATO are working on joint projects; Russia proves

AFP 9 (Sep 9, http://www.france24.com/en/20090918-rasmussen-russia-us-nato-integrate-missile-systems-shield-europe) LL

**AFP** - The United States, NATO and Russia should consider integrating their missile defence systems, the Western alliance's secretary general said Friday.     In a major speech outlining his vision for enhanced ties with Moscow, NATO chief Anders Fogh Rasmussen issued his call 24 hours after US President Barack Obama's decision to scrap a plan to install an anti-missile shield and radar in eastern Europe.     "NATO wants Russia to be a real stakeholder in European and international security," Rasmussen said at the Western alliance's Brussels HQ. "We need Russia as a partner in resolving the great issues of our time.     "We should explore the potential for linking the US, NATO and Russia missile defence systems at an appropriate time," he underlined.     Offering to embrace Russian President Dmitry Medvedev's ideas for a joined-up security arrangement stretching from the Far East to the west coast of America, Rasmussen asked in return for Moscow to exert maximum pressure on Iran over its nuclear programme.     "I believe that a NATO-Russia dialogue could provide real added value. We must all aim for a Euro-Atlantic security architecture in which Russia sees herself reflected," the former Danish premier stressed.     Studying how to tackle the proliferation of ballistic missile technology is in "NATO and Russia's fundamental strategic interest, he added.     Calling for a joint review with Russia of global security challenges, he said: "I would like to see NATO and Russia agree to carry out a joint review of the new 21st century security challenges to serve as a firm basis for our future cooperation.     "I believe that NATO and Russia should immediately look to reinforce our practical cooperation in all the areas where we agree we face the same risks and threats to our security -- and there are many of those areas," Rasmussen added.     As Rasmussen was speaking, Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin praised as "correct and brave" Washington's decision to shelve former president George W. Bush's plans.     Seeking "practical cooperation" with Moscow on global defence issues, Rasmussen said he was aware that NATO-Russia relations "can quickly become hostage to domestic politics" and admitted that his proposals will require "considerable political will."     Rasmussen's olive branch comes at a time when Cold War-style Western reflexes have been on edge following Russia's short war with US ally Georgia.     Tense posturing over efforts to bring Ukraine into NATO's sphere of influence and fears over global energy security given Moscow's vast oil and gas reserves have further strained ties in recent years.     Poland and the Czech Republic -- where parts of the missile shield were to be based -- officially put a brave face on Obama's decision, saying it did not signal any deterioration in ties with Washington.     Ties between Moscow and the West have been slowly recovering since Obama took over at the White House, promising a "reset" in their relations.     Russian media also reacted warmly to the developments over missile defence plans, with the Kommersant daily saying Obama's decision removed "one of the main irritants" that lingered from predecessor George W. Bush's policies.     "This step can be considered the first real manifestation of Washington's widely proclaimed 'reset' and a decisive break with the policies of the previous administration," Kommersant wrote.

Consult Now

Consultation now

NATO 10 (4/7/10 http://www.nato.int/issues/cooperation\_partners/index.html TBC 6/21/10)

NATO and its Partner countries hold regular consultations on a wide range of issues. Their forces exercise together and serve alongside each other in NATO-led operations. And they are working together against terrorism. They also cooperate in areas such as defence reform, countering the proliferation of weapons, curbing the threat posed by landmines and stockpiled munitions, disaster preparedness, and scientific research. Consultations Through the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, NATO and Partner countries engage in regular consultations on a wide-rage of security and defence-related issues. These range from general political discussions, for example on crisis-response missions and regional issues and tensions, to more technical exchanges on issues such defence reform, budgeting and planning.

Credibility Now

NATO has growing cred now – France proves

Brzezinski 9 (Zbigniew September/October 2009 An Agenda for NATO Toward a Global Security Web Foreign Affairs TBC 6/21/10)

Even France's decision to return to full participation in NATO's integrated military structures -- after more than 40 years of abstention -- aroused relatively little positive commentary. Yet France's actions spoke louder than words. A state with a proud sense of its universal vocation sensed something about NATO -- not the NATO of the Cold War but the NATO of the twenty-first century -- that made it rejoin the world's most important military alliance at a time of far-reaching changes in the world's security dynamics. France's action underlined NATO's vital political role as a regional alliance with growing global potential.

NATO has a credible modern role now but needs better consultation

Albright et. al. 10 (Madeline, MAY 17, 2010 NATO 2020: ASSURED SECURITY; DYNAMIC ENGAGEMENT ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GROUP OF EXPERTS ON A NEW STRATEGIC CONCEPT FOR NATO http://www.msz.gov.pl/files/docs/DPB/polityka\_bezpieczenstwa/dokumenty\_i\_komunikaty/NATO%20GOE%20report%20May%202010-final.pdf TBC 6/22/10)

The turn of the century brought with it new and varied challenges for the Alliance. In earlier decades, NATO’s defence preparations emphasised the massing of troops to deter or repel a cross-border attack. Today, Alliance members remain concerned about the possibility that regional disputes or efforts at political intimidation could undermine security along its borders. However, NATO must also cope with hazards of a more volatile and less predictable nature -- including acts of terrorism, the proliferation of nuclear and other advanced weapons technologies, cyber attacks directed against modern communications systems, the sabotage of energy pipelines, and the disruption of critical maritime supply routes. Often, an effective defence against these unconventional security threats must begin well beyond the territory of the Alliance. Already, NATO has responded to this new reality by assisting the government of Afghanistan in its fight against violent extremism, combating piracy in the Gulf of Aden, contributing to seaborne security in the Mediterranean, training and equipping Iraqi defence forces, and helping to construct more stable societies in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo. As this list indicates, shifting defence imperatives bring with them new needs -- for a transformation in military capabilities, a more sophisticated approach to NATO partnerships, more extensive security consultations, and a more streamlined and efficient Alliance structure.

US-NATO Relations High

US – NATO relations high but remains vulnerable to US unilateralism

Slocombe 10 (WALTER B. SLOCOMBE June 2010 PERSPECTIVE Towards A New NATO Strategic Concept A View from the United States http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/id/ipa/07299.pdf)

Nonetheless, NATO remains for the US, as stated in the new national security strategy, »the pre-eminent securi-ty alliance in the world today«, both the »cornerstone for US engagement with the world and a catalyst for international action«. Most of the US’s other formal alliance relationships and all its less formal security partnerships are essentially one-way streets where the US commits itself to help partners in their own defense but without expecting much, if any, help from them outside the strict confines of the joint defense of the partner in question. NATO is – with the partial excepti-on of Australia and to a much lesser extent Japan – the only case where the US can realistically regard its part-ner as a potential source of assistance outside the con-text of the US guarantee. This broader relationship is not, however, without its problems simply because the US expects more of its NATO partners – so it is more likely that the partners will seem to fall short of what the US expects, and that the allies will believe the US is pres-sing them to act more in its interests than their own.

Now Key

Now is a key time – Failure now destroys NATO

Sloan 10 (Stanley R. Sloan | June 15, 2010 NATO a Permanent Alliance: Today's Challenges http://www.acus.org/new\_atlanticist/nato-permanent-alliance-todays-challenges TBC 6/21/10

The attitudes and capabilities the United States and Europe bring to the NATO table in the years immediately ahead will determine whether the alliance will become part of the answer to problems of global instability. If NATO—meaning, of course, the NATO nations—successfully manages the stabilization effort in Afghanistan, it will establish its credentials as a serious and constructive device for multilateral security cooperation for the international community. Of course, failure in any mission the members assign to the alliance could have disastrous consequences for NATO’s credibility and future utility.

\*Links\*

NATO Wants Consult – General

Eu wants genuine consultation -- they want to be able to change US policies

Schake 9 (Kori, Sr Research Fellow at the Hoover Institution, June 26, MANAGING AMERICAN HEGEMONY) LL

When Europeans complain about the declining legitimacy of U.S. international involvement, they mean either that we are not doing what they want us to do, or we are not doing it through the institutions they value. Consultations with Europeans are near constant and take up far and away the majority of U.S. diplomatic engagement: we consult with Europeans bilaterally, both in their capitals and in Washington, through NATO and the European Union, at the United

Nations. It cannot be that the quantity of consulting is insufficient; what Europeans are really complaining about is that U.S. policies are insufficiently malleable to their influence.

NATO Wants Consult – Military Presence

NATO wants consultation on issues of military presence

Alliance Strategic Concept 99 (24 Apr. Approved by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C. http://www.nato.int/cps/en/SID-A6D4AE9A-68A044DF/natolive/index.htm TBC 6/20/10)

The Alliance is committed to a broad approach to security, which recognises the importance of political, economic, social and environmental factors in addition to the indispensable defence dimension. This broad approach forms the basis for the Alliance to accomplish its fundamental security tasks effectively, and its increasing effort to develop effective cooperation with other European and Euro-Atlantic organisations as well as the United Nations. Our collective aim is to build a European security architecture in which the Alliance's contribution to the security and stability of the Euro-Atlantic area and the contribution of these other international organisations are complementary and mutually reinforcing, both in deepening relations among Euro-Atlantic countries and in managing crises. NATO remains the essential forum for consultation among the Allies and the forum for agreement on policies bearing on the security and defence commitments of its members under the Washington Treaty. The Alliance seeks to preserve peace and to reinforce Euro-Atlantic security and stability by: the preservation of the transatlantic link; the maintenance of effective military capabilities sufficient for deterrence and defense and to fulfill the full range of its missions; the development of the European Security and Defense Identity within the Alliance; an overall capability to manage crises successfully; its continued openness to new members; and the continued pursuit of partnership, cooperation, and dialogue with other nations as part of its co-operative approach to Euro-Atlantic security, including in the field of arms control and disarmament.

NATO Wants Consult – Troop Redeployments

Multilateral security influence key to solve troop redeployments in Japan and South Korea

China Daily 3 (7/18 http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/en/doc/2003-07/18/content\_246008.htm 6/20TBC)

With the United States stepping up its largest military strategic redeployment since World War II, the voices in that country backing the establishment of an Asian version of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) became recently particularly loud. Under the Pentagon's military programme, the United States is preparing major shifts in the deployment of its forces in the Asia-Pacific region, including the movement of US marines from bases on the Japanese island of Okinawa to Australia, and the use of new basing facilities in Singapore and the Philippines. Washington also plans to withdraw some US troops from the Demilitarized Zone within the Republic of Korea. The moves are aimed at calming down the public anger in the Republic of Korea and Japan at the US army bases in their countries and at forming a more mobile, smaller-scale chain of bases in the Asia-Pacific region. The United States is designing a NATO-like multilateral military mechanism for Asia to better serve its own strategic interests. Some US scholars hold that the absence of a multilateral security system in Asia has been one of Washington's major strategic mistakes. Saul Saunders, a US expert on Asian affairs, said one of the major errors of Washington's Asia policy since World War II has been the lack of a multilateral security system analogous to NATO in this region. The argument is by no means a new one in the United States. As early as the 1950s, John Foster Dulles, then US Secretary of State, advocated that the United States build a military alliance in Southeast Asia to deal with the former Soviet Union and the newly founded People's Republic of China -- two arch-enemies of the United States at that time.

NATO Wants Consult – Turkish Nukes

Consultation on Turkish Nukes is key to NATO cohesion and cooperation with disarm

BOLLFRASS 8 (Alex Bollfrass October 30 2008 http://www.stimson.org/pub.cfm?id=703 “The US-German Tactical Nuclear Weapons Dilemma” 6/20) TBC

A US administration advancing a nuclear weapons agenda that goes beyond traditional arms control and limitations measures will need to reassure Germany and similarly positioned states that such deliberations would not diminish US dedication to its security. Early consultations on how to transition from a nuclear extended deterrence to a conventional assurance must be a crucial part of any major new initiatives. It will also free allied governments to support a new administration’s plans for multilateral arsenal reductions politically and diplomatically. A failure to work with allies could yield a tepid public response and private resistance from governments in favor of nuclear disarmament. Extended deterrence in the Atlantic security environment lends itself to denuclearization. There are challenges, to be sure, but if it can work anywhere, it is there. As an adaptation by North Americans, Europeans, and Russians to the realities of the post-Cold War environment, it is worth pursuing alone. Beyond that, it would serve as a model for more thorny environments in which regional security problems are dominated by nuclear weapons and insecurities.

NATO members rely on US nukes in Europe – Consultation is key

Kristensen 9 (Hans, director of the Nuclear Information Project at the Federation of American Scientists, Jan. 14, http://www.fas.org/blog/ssp/2009/01/schlesingerreport.php TBC 6/21/10)

For example, in the opening paragraphs of the section called “The Special Case of NATO,” the report concludes: “As long as NATO members rely on U.S. nuclear weapons for deterrence, no action should be taken to remove them without a thorough and deliberate process of consultation.” Certainly NATO members should be consulted, but withdrawing “them” (which refers to the roughly 200 tactical nuclear bombs deployed in five European countries) hardly constitutes eliminating the entire U.S. nuclear weapons deterrent. A withdrawal from Europe would not be the end of the nuclear umbrella, as the Schlesinger report indicates, which could be continued by long-range forces just like it was in the Pacific after tactical nuclear weapons were withdrawn from South Korea in 1991.

NATO Wants Consult – Nukes

NATO wants consultation in changes in nuclear policy, unilateralism could ruin the alliance

Brooks, Halperin, and Perkovich, 9 (Linton, AMBASSADOR, Morton, CONGRESSIONAL COMMISSION ON THE STRATEGIC POSTURE OF THE UNITED STATES, George, APRIL 6TH CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE, http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/npc\_build\_or\_break.pdf 6/20) TBC

I agree with that. I think I’d have a slightly different view of what fails to square the circle. I think the first thing is we need to take this seriously. I’ve been surprised at how much allied governments care about nuclear weapons now. Their position is not, you know, we didn’t know you guys still had nuclear weapons. Just do whatever you want. They are concerned. They’re following it very closely. They care a lot about it. Some people in each of these countries are worried that we’re not doing enough to get rid of nuclear weapons. Some people in all of these countries are worried that we may do too much, although we’re not yet close to that line. I do not think the actual deployments make as much difference as the political relationship and the assurances that we should give. One thing we should learn to do is not make demands on other governments in this area which hurt them domestically in their own politics, and then we can’t deliver on. We’ve just done that again with the ballistic missile defense. We did that from the beginning of NATO with a series of demands which have undercut the domestic politics of countries for, my view, no good reason. I think the political relationships, the confidence that we give them, the consultation that we do. They should not read in the newspaper about any changes in the American nuclear posture. I hope even this speech was, in fact, discussed in advance, not only with our European allies, but with our Asian allies, as well, so that they know where we’re going. I also think the president went about as far as he should go on elimination of nuclear weapons. He laid it out there as an aspiration, as an objective, as something that will happen, he hopes, some time in the future, but I think the critical point is that the steps we take now have to be steps that enhance our security and that of our allies, whether or not we get to zero in any reasonable time, or whether or not we know how to go to zero. They need to be able to be supported and endorsed based on the notion that they improve our security even if zero never turns out to be a reasonable objective. MR. PERKOVICH: Thank you. Do you want to jump in on this or – Linton? AMB. BROOKS: We always talk about deterrence being a function of capability and will. Nothing we’re going to do in the next several years, as just a practical matter, is going to take away the capability to offer extended deterrence, even if the START follow-on goes quickly, and we immediately move to a much more dramatic level. So the question is how do we convince our allies that we still have the will? Things like weapons in Europe are symbols, but they’re not – they’re not the only way. I agree completely with the point about consultation, and I’d go further. We in the ’80s, when I was doing arms control, we would wind up Paul Nitze and Ed Rowney, and we would put them on planes, and they would go to every capital you’ve ever heard of. Transcript Not Checked Against Delivery And they would say, we’re here to consult; tomorrow we’re making an announcement, and here’s what it is. And so what our allies got was they weren’t surprised. They didn’t do what Mort said. They didn’t read our position in the paper, but they also didn’t influence our position. I think those days have to be over. I think that – and that’s going to be hard, because the new administration, like all new administrations, wants to do things quickly. And consultation with allies, as many in this room know, whatever else it is, is not a “quickly” kind of thing, but I think we are going to have to do more of it so that we do not have our allies misinterpret where the president is going. I don’t think there’s anything that risks the security of our allies in – at least in what the president has outlined so far, but I think it is entirely possible to do this wrong and leave that impression. And so I think we’re in the need to build in time for genuine consultation with allies, or we’re not going to like the way this works out. We’re going – we are going to trade one set of problems for another.

NATO Wants Consult – Nukes

Changes in nuke posture need consultation – They’d say yes

CSIS 9 (Center for Security and International Studies Issues and Insights 9 (12) http://csis.org/files/publication/issuesinsights\_v09n12.pdf)

That traditional division may be eroding. In campaign documents, candidate Obama set a goal of a world without nuclear weapons, and promised to pursue it. His platform called for substantial cuts in the U.S. nuclear arsenal, a verifiable global ban on the production of new nuclear weapons material, and a halt to the development of new nuclear weapons, among other measures. Japanese participants called those initiatives “encouraging,” and urged the U.S. to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) and conclude a Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty (FMCT). In the very next breath, however, those same speakers betrayed nervousness about the implications of such a policy, warning that the U.S. extended deterrent had to be strengthened at the same time those shifts and cuts were underway. There are fears that the U.S. could try to cut too deeply, too fast. Patience, planning, and consultation are essential.

NATO Wants Consult – Afghanistan

Empirically, the US has engaged in consultations with NATO over Afghanistan military policies

Wilson 9 (Chris, Reuters, March 3, http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSN03493980) LL

March 3 (Reuters) - Vice President Joe Biden will consult NATO allies in Brussels next week as part of a strategy review on Afghanistan and Pakistan ordered by President Barack Obama as he shifts the U.S. military focus away from the Iraq war. Biden will travel to Brussels to meet the North Atlantic Council, the 26-member alliance's main policy forum, and hold talks with NATO's secretary-general and senior European Union officials, his office said on Tuesday. Obama last month approved the deployment of 17,000 more troops to Afghanistan as Washington and other NATO nations try to stabilize the country, where insurgent violence is at its highest since U.S-led forces toppled the Taliban in late 2001. Other NATO countries are under pressure to boost troop commitments to the international operation in Afghanistan, though some are reluctant to do so. With a top-to-bottom Afghanistan-Pakistan policy review under way since he took office last month, Obama said he would make announcements before a NATO summit in France in April, about "the direction the United States would like to go." Biden's trip appeared aimed at laying groundwork for Obama's first European visit as president. "The purpose of his trip is to consult with allies on Afghanistan and Pakistan and to ensure that their views help inform the strategic review ordered by President Obama," Biden's office said. Obama is seeking to shift military focus from the unpopular war in Iraq, which the Bush administration considered the central battlefront against Islamic militants, to the Afghan conflict, which he sees as a more pressing concern. The United States makes up the bulk of a 70,000-strong international force, mostly from NATO countries, in Afghanistan.

Obama has empirically consulted NATO allies in Afghanistan operations.

Xinhua 9 (March 10, ChinaView.com, http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2009-03/10/content\_10986434.htm) LL

BRUSSELS, March 10 (Xinhua) -- U.S. Vice President Joe Biden on Tuesday consulted with representatives from NATO allies on a common strategy and approach in Afghanistan, and warned of new terror threats against NATO targets and allies being plotted by the al-Qaida network and Islamic extremists by using Afghanistan and Pakistan as staging areas. "It is from that area that al-Qaida and extremist allies are regenerating and conceiving new atrocities aimed at the people around the world," Biden told reporters following the meeting of the North Atlantic Council (NRC), NATO's decision-making body, in Brussels. Biden is in Brussels to exchange views with NATO allies on the situation in Afghanistan as the Barack Obama administration in undergoing "a strategic review" of the U.S. policies in Afghanistan and neighboring Pakistan. "I know people in America and Europe are tired of this war (in Afghanistan)," said Biden, who stressed that no threat is more serious than the one posed by Afghanistan. "None of us can deny the new threats in the 21st century must be dealt with. None of us can escape the responsibility to meet these threats. That's why President Obama ordered a full-scale strategic review of our policies in Afghanistan and Pakistan. He insisted we consult with our allies and partners so we can reach a common approach" said Biden. The U.S. administration is conducting a review of its policy in Afghanistan and Pakistan, shifting focus from Iraq to fighting Islamic militants in Afghanistan. Obama has approved plans to send an additional 17,000 U.S. troops to Afghanistan. Washington's NATO allies are under pressure to send more troops to Afghanistan, but the Europeans are reluctant to do so but are more enthusiastic to send more police trainers, judges and judicial experts to the central Asian nation which is to hold a crucial presidential election in August. Biden said Washington will build its European allies' ideas and concerns into its policy review, which he said would be ready before the end of this month in preparation for the April 3-4 NATO Summit.

NATO Wants Consult – Afghanistan

In relation to Afghanistan, the US has empirically relied on NATO consultations

Kruzel 9 *(*John J.,March 25, *American Forces Press Service,* <http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=53648>) LL

WASHINGTON, March 25, 2009 – The United States has been in close consultation with NATO allies as it completes an evaluation of the strategy in Afghanistan, President Barack Obama said today. After a meeting at the White House with NATO Secretary General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer, the president said the United States expects to share its analysis with alliance counterparts. A defense official this month said the review is likely to be distributed among allies ahead of the NATO summit in early April. “We believe that we are going to be able to ensure that the NATO members who've made so many sacrifices and have been working so hard already are reinvigorated, and that the coordination that's going to be taking place will make it even more effective for us as we complete a successful NATO mission,” Obama said of the Afghan strategy review. The summit, to take place April 3 and 4 in Strasbourg, France, and Kehl, Germany, also coincides with the alliance’s 60th anniversary, which Obama said is a testament to NATO’s quality. “It is a testimony to the strength of the trans-Atlantic alliance, a testimony to the effectiveness of NATO in creating stability and peace and prosperity, laying the groundwork for so much that has taken place over the last several years,” he said. Obama said he and de Hoop Scheffer are confident that the NATO summit could produce new processes to make the alliance stronger and more effectively coordinate efforts in Afghanistan. The summit’s agenda also could include issues beyond the scope of the NATO mission in Afghanistan. “We have a set of challenges that require NATO to shift from the 20th century to the 21st century; issues of terrorism, failed states, nuclear proliferation, a whole host of new challenges as well as the traditional role that NATO has played in preserving the territorial integrity of NATO members,” Obama said. In their meeting today, the president and the secretary general also discussed the role NATO plays regarding Russia, and how the Obama administration seeks to reset the relationship between Washington and Moscow. “My administration is seeking a reset of the relationship with Russia, but in a way that's consistent with NATO membership and consistent with the need to send a clear signal throughout Europe that we are going to continue to abide by the central belief that countries who seek and aspire to join NATO are able to join NATO,” Obama said. De Hoop Scheffer noted that the 60th anniversary is a time to reflect on past successes, but also to look ahead, especially concerning Afghanistan, which he called NATO’s most important operational priority.

NATO has rested its credibility on Afghanistan

Moran 6 (Michael Moran November 29, 2006 NATO Pins Future to Afghanistan CFR http://www.cfr.org/publication/12056/nato\_pins\_future\_to\_afghanistan.html TBC 6/22/10)

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) pinned its future credibility on its difficult mission in Afghanistan, declaring in a joint statement at its Riga summit that its peacekeepers must have the forces, resources, and flexibility needed "to ensure the mission's continued success" (WashPost). Yet they made only limited progress on lifting national restrictions on deployed forces which render many German, Spanish, Italian, and other troops of little use in combat zones (FT).

NATO cred is on the line in Afghanistan

Crossland 10 (David Foreign Correspondent February 21. 2010 Nato members face biggest Afghanistan battle at home http://www.thenational.ae/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20100222/FOREIGN/702219852/1013 TBC 6/21/10)

“Nato has had a relatively good week. This new campaign against a Taliban stronghold in the province of Helmand seems to have gone rather well and a couple of very important Taliban commanders have been captured,” said Constanze Stelzenmüller, an analyst at the German Marshall Fund in Berlin. “This was very necessary because Nato has otherwise been having a very bad one and a half years. “Much depends on whether the so-called surge in Afghanistan continues to go reasonably well, and there are lots of reasons why it could still go badly. The European governments have understood that their political credibility and Nato’s credibility is on the line here.”

NATO Wants Consult – Iraq

NATO has a strong involvement in Iraqi security and military operations

NATO 10 (June 10, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics\_51978.htm) LL

The Alliance is engaged in helping Iraq create effective armed forces and, ultimately, provide for its own security. In accordance with UN Security Council Resolution 1546, the NATO Training Mission-Iraq (NTM-I) was set up in 2004 at the request of the Iraqi Interim Government. The NTM-I is not a combat mission. Its operational emphasis is on training and mentoring, and equipment donation and coordination through the NATO Training and Equipment Co-ordination Group. The aim of NTM-I is to help Iraq develop a democratically-led and enduring security sector. To reinforce this initiative, NATO is working with the Iraqi government on a structured cooperation framework to develop the Alliance’s long-term relationship with Iraq. While NATO does not have a direct role in the international stabilization force that has been in Iraq since May 2003, it is helping the Iraqi government build the capability to ensure, by its own means, the security needs of the Iraqi people. Operationally, NTM-I has specialized at the strategic level with the training of mid- to senior-level officers. By providing mentoring, advice and instruction support though in- and out-of-country training and the coordination of deliveries of donated military equipment, NTM-I has made a tangible contribution to the rebuilding of military leadership in Iraq and the development of the Iraqi Ministry of Defence and the Iraqi Security Forces (ISF). In 2007, Allies decided to extend their training assistance to Iraq by including gendarmerie-type training of the federal police in order to bridge the gap between routine police work and military operations. In December 2008, on the request of Prime Minister Al-Maliki, NATO expanded the Mission to other areas including navy and air force leadership training, defence reform, defence institution building, and small arms and light weapons accountability. The NTM-I delivers its training, advice and mentoring support in a number of different settings. Twenty-three NATO member countries and one partner country are contributing to the training effort either in or outside Iraq, through financial contributions or donations of equipment.

NATO monitors Iraqi security and lends key international cooperation to Iraqi internal affairs

Capezza 8 (David, consultant to The Center for a New American Security , October 28, The Atlantic Council, <http://www.acus.org/new_atlanticist/iraq-training-mission-shows-natos-future>) LL

At the request of the provisional Iraqi government in 2004, NATO began providing training, assistance, and equipment to the Iraqi Security Forces to assist with the creation of a democratically led and enduring security sector.  This mission has grown from planning and training security forces to include advising and mentoring of security forces, both in and out of Iraq.  Today all twenty-six NATO members provide funding for NATO Training Mission-Iraq (NTM-I) and sixteen countries are providing staffing for the mission. Since its inception, this out-of-area mission has challenged the conventional wisdom about the future purpose of NATO, demonstrating that the alliance can remain a relevant actor in the European and international security environments.  NATO Training Mission-Iraq (NTM-I) represents a model for how NATO can help perform successful European Security and Defense Policy missions; modernize member state forces and work interoperably; support the United States; engage with the Russian Federation; and work in the absence of member-state consensus.  The leadership training that NTM-I is providing is sustainable, with the purpose of shifting responsibility to Iraqi control.  The mission in Iraq also provides NATO with a framework for future missions.  First, though the U.S.-led coalition in Iraq did not initially have the support of all alliance members, NTM-I provided organization with a structure that could allow for members to provide support the coalition’s efforts in various ways.  As Lt. General Dubik stated in a June 2008 interview, “I found that every nation could give a good contribution to the Mission.  The challenges…are to make sure that each nation contributes consistently with the Iraqi national interests.  And that’s always possible…every nation in NATO could give a good contribution.”  NATO’s training academies, non-commissioned officer (NCO) leadership training, and training of Iraqi National Police have contributed to and supported the great efforts of establishing a democratically-led and experienced ISF.  International involvement for a military mission is critical, as it provides a source of legitimacy, both diplomatically and militarily. The presence of the international community provides a venue for the international community to remain involved and interested. Support need not be provided solely in the form of troop contributions. Support can be monetary, training, or any other form of assistance.  NTM-I provides all of these forms of support and, therefore, provides the Iraq mission with a greater sense of legitimacy.

NATO Wants Consult – Iraq

NATO involvement in Iraq would be immensely beneficial in maintaining order and appeasing allies

Gordon 3 (Philip H., Senior Fellow for U.S. Foreign Policy, Brookings Institution, April 10, <http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2003/0410iraq_gordon.aspx>) LL

As we contemplate the tremendous challenges of maintaining order and beginning reconstruction in Iraq, it is worth thinking about how the United States can avoid the burdens and risks of what may come to be seen as unilateral occupation. Wouldn't it be nice, for example, if we had at our disposal a multilateral organization to which we could turn for help, a body more effective and efficient than the UN but that would still confer legitimacy on the operation and help spread some of the costs? Imagine, in fact, a grouping composed of over two dozen democracies, including our most prosperous European allies, that had interoperable military forces, experience with peacekeeping and disarmament tasks, an available pool of troops, and existing command arrangements. Imagine further, while we're really fantasizing, that this organization had close institutional links with several dozen partner countries and a proven track record of promoting defense reform and civil-military relations in former authoritarian states. If such an organization did not exist, we would certainly want to invent it.

Fortunately, such an organization does exist. NATO has all these attributes and there would be many advantages to giving it a key role in post-war Iraq. First, nowhere else is there a large group of available and experienced peacekeepers who could gradually replace the thousands of exhausted American and British soldiers currently deployed in Iraq. The United States should not wish to keep (or pay for) a substantial part of its army in Iraq for the foreseeable future, especially given other military challenges that could suddenly appear somewhere else around the world. And it is implausible that we will be able to quickly draw down our current force presence, given the political vacuum in Iraq and the potential for ethnic strife, retributions, looting, or outside meddling in the country. Fresh troops will have to come from somewhere, and no organization is better placed to provide them than NATO.

Involving NATO in post-war Iraq would also help to legitimize the reconstruction process in the eyes of many around the world—making a UN mandate more likely and clearing the way for EU reconstruction funds. Having launched the war without explicit UN authority and against the will of much of world opinion, there is already much skepticism about American motives and little trust that Washington will take any but its own interests into account. Putting the Pentagon in sole charge of maintaining security, hunting weapons of mass destruction, and reconstituting an Iraqi army would only heighten that global skepticism, no matter how much confidence Americans might have in their own judgment or fairness. Putting the UN directly in charge of security in Iraq might be reassuring around the world, but as it showed in the Balkans, the UN is ill-prepared to play an effective security role in a potentially hostile environment. Giving a role to NATO—some of whose members have recently proven their willingness to stand up to Washington—would prove that Iraq was not a mere American protectorate, while still giving us confidence that security would be ensured.

Finally, involving NATO in post-war Iraq's security arrangements would be a vital step toward giving our European allies—including Russia—a stake in the successful reconstruction of Iraq. One of the most negative consequences of having to fight this war without support from France, Germany, Russia and most of European public opinion was that those countries and many individuals overseas now see the creation of a democratic, stable and prosperous Iraq as our project, not theirs. Although they would never say so, they even have an almost subconscious stake in our failure, if only to prove the merit of their opposition to the war. To reverse that destructive dynamic, the United States has a strong interest in involving as many European allies as possible in the effort to make a new Iraq; a collective NATO commitment to that goal would be an important first step.

NATO Wants Consult – Iraq

NATO is committed to Iraq through the Long Term Agreement of 2009

Helmick and Spinelli 9 (Frank and Giuseppe, commander and deputy commander, respectively, of NATO Training Mission-Iraq, September 20, http://www.sundayszaman.com/sunday/detaylar.do?load=detay&link=187612) LL

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization has been a force for good for more than 60 years. Originating in the aftermath of World War II, NATO is one of several multi-national collaborative organizations that have successfully maintained peace and stability in Western Europe ever since those dark days of widespread conflict and human suffering. With the fall of the Iron Curtain in 1989, the contributions of NATO began to extend beyond the borders of Western Europe. In the 1990s, NATO successfully halted two genocides in the Balkans. Currently, NATO and many partners in the international community are helping the people of Afghanistan in their efforts to achieve peace, stability and the opportunity for a brighter and more prosperous future. Though NATO's efforts in Afghanistan tend to be higher profile and garner greater attention, less well known are the significant contributions NATO is making for the people of Iraq through an organization called NATO Training Mission-Iraq, or NTM-I. At the request of the government of Iraq, NTM-I has been involved since 2004 in helping Iraq develop security forces that are professional, operate in accordance with international standards and the rule of law and have respect for human rights. NTM-I's role in Iraq is not a combat role. NTM-I's sole purpose is to help equip, train and mentor Iraq's fledgling military and police forces. NTM-I is a small organization, but its work is significant. NTM-I consists of around 270 personnel from 13 NATO countries. NTM-I personnel are not involved in tactical operations. NTM-I's efforts focus on helping Iraq professionalize its military and police training academies and its military and police professional education systems. With the ongoing drawdown of US and Coalition military forces in Iraq, NATO's efforts take on even greater significance. Iraq's security forces are already responsible for security in Iraq's cities. As agreed to by Iraq and the United States, all US forces will withdraw from Iraq by the end of 2011. At this point, Iraq's security forces will be solely responsible for the safety and security of the nation and all of Iraq's citizens. Though Iraq's military and police forces are performing increasingly well, it can be seen from history and recent experience in places like the Balkans that the development of fully developed and professional security institutions takes time. The government of Iraq has recognized this fact and has therefore asked that NATO continue the NTM-I mission through a formal document known as the Iraq-NATO Long Term Agreement. Recently ratified by the NATO Council, the Long Term Agreement provides for the continuation of the NTM-I mission and lays the groundwork for future mutually beneficial professional development and exchange opportunities. It is important to clarify that the LTA is not a precursor to NATO membership nor does it commit NATO to any security responsibilities in Iraq. The LTA merely provides for continued NATO assistance in the training, development and readiness of Iraq's security forces. Stability in Iraq is in the best interests of the international community. It is also morally right that we help the people of Iraq in this small but meaningful way. NTM-I will continue to work at the direction of the NATO Council and in partnership with the government of Iraq to enhance the stability of Iraq and the safety of Iraq's citizens.

NATO Wants Consult – Kuwait

NATO has become increasingly involved in Kuwait’s military affairs.

Kuwait Times 10 (April 4, http://www.kuwaittimes.net/read\_news.php?newsid=MTM1NTA5NTc2Ng==) LL

ROME: The North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the State of Kuwait have reached an unprecedented agreement according to which the two sides would organize joint courses and Kuwaiti lecturers would educate NATO personnel on some regional issues. Lt Gen Wolf-Dieter Loeser, the head of the Nato Defense College (NDC), in a statement to Kuwait News Agency (KUNA) on Saturday, said NATO and a visiting Kuwaiti delegation, including heads of military academies chaired by Sheikh Thamer Al-Ali Sabah Al-Salem Al-Sabah, Deputy Chief of the Kuwaiti National Security Apparatus, agreed on organizing several joint activities very soon. NATO officials agreed with Sheikh Thamer that Kuwait would dispatch more cadets to take part in special courses on the Middle East. The academy would send its 80 enlistees of several member states of the western organization to the Gulf country for follow-up courses on regional issues. He also expressed readiness to host academic lecturers from Kuwait and indicated at preparations for a week-long course to be held at the NATO academy headquarters. Such an unprecedented integrated workshop would certainly be beneficial for the NATO, he said. Lt Gen Loeser indicated at the necessity for joint cooperation between the NATO and allied states for action against global challenges, namely terrorism, spread of weapons of mass destruction, threats caused by "rogue states," energy security and combating cyber attacks and crimes. In line with the approach to face such global threats, the NATO has been involved in the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative (ICI), with Kuwait, the UAE and Qatar, for cooperation on such issues, namely non-proliferation of nuclear arms, the Iranian nuclear file and the energy security, he said. The NATO official while emphasizing importance of cooperation at these levels, indicated at the need to reach mutual understanding regarding certain "political and cultural and religious conducts. He affirmed the vital role of the NATO academies for enhancing understanding and education about issues of the Middle East.

NATO and Kuwait operate under a binding security agreement.

Centre for Research on Globalization 6 (December 12,

http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=4138) LL

Kuwait on Tuesday signed a security agreement with Nato at the opening of an international conference to discuss boosting security links with Gulf Arab states. The Information Security Agreement, signed by Kuwaiti Foreign Minister Sheikh Mohammed Al Sabah and Nato Secretary General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer, will regulate the exchange of security information between the 26-member Nato and oil-rich Kuwait as part of the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative (ICI). The deputy head of Kuwait’s National Security Agency, Sheikh Thamer Ali Al Sabah, told reporters the agreement would allow the exchange of “classified” security and defence information between Nato and Kuwait. “The agreement will enhance the existing security cooperation between Nato and Kuwait ... It also involves exchange of information on countering terrorism,” he said. Kuwait is the only country of the ICI that has signed such an agreement, he said. Around 120 Nato delegates are attending the “International Conference of Nato and Gulf Countries: Facing Common Challenges through ICI.” A number of senior officials, including Bahrain’s crown prince, Sheikh Salman bin Hamad Al Khalifa, and military commanders are representing the six-nation Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) at the conference.

NATO Wants Consult – Kuwait

NATO has in interest in Kuwait because of the threat of Iran’s nuclear program

Al-Siyassa and Al-Jarida 10 (March 10, Middle East Media Research Institute Blog, <http://www.thememriblog.org/blog_personal/en/25699.htm>)

In a lecture at the Kuwait Diplomatic Institute, NATO Defense College commander Lt.-Gen. Wolf-Dieter Loeser called for closer relations between NATO and the Gulf countries, particularly Kuwait, and warned that Iran's nuclear program endangered the region as well as the entire world.Kuwait Diplomatic Institute director-general Abd Al-'Aziz Al-Sharekh said that Kuwait and NATO were working to increase cooperation between them, and to draw up an agreement enabling NATO to use Kuwaiti ports and airfields for activity in Iraq. Kuwaiti national security apparatus deputy director Sheikh Thamer Ali Al-Sabbah said that soon he would head a delegation that would visit the NATO Defense College.

NATO and Kuwait are connected by an intelligence sharing pact to counter terrorism in the Middle East

Reuters 6 (December 12, http://news.oneindia.in/2006/12/12/kuwait-nato-sign-intelligence-sharing-pact-1165936236.html) LL

KUWAIT, Dec 12 (Reuters) Kuwait today signed an agreement to share certain types of classified intelligence with NATO, the first such accord between the Western military organisation and a Gulf state. NATO already has similar pacts with partners in eastern Europe and West Asia states and is looking to extend them to the Gulf, which it sees as a strategically key region in the fight against terrorism. ''This is a security pact to maintain confidentiality in the exchange of information between NATO and Kuwait,'' Sheikh Thamer Ali al-Sabah, acting director of pro-Western Kuwait's National Security Agency, told reporters. ''It's basically for exchange of security information and maintaining its confidentiality,'' he said. The pact gives Kuwait access to classified NATO information on security, defence and counterterrorism, he added. The agreement was signed on the sidelines of a conference of Gulf Arab states and NATO. A NATO official said the intelligence it envisaged sharing was information needed to boost practical support by Kuwait for NATO missions, citing in particular the patrols by alliance ships in the Mediterranean aimed at deterring terrorist activity. ''It can go as far as both parties want it to go,'' the official said, adding that one aim was to ensure that NATO and Kuwaiti equipment was able to function together.

NATO Wants Consult – Japan and Korea

The war in Afghanistan means that NATO has shifted its interests eastward towards Japanese and Korean allies

CAEI 2 (Centro Argentino de Estudios Internacionales 6/20 http://www.caei.com.ar/es/programas/cei/P02.pdf) TBC

The vast gas and oil resources of the region as well as the global war against terrorism have brought new powers into the play – the United States, the European Union, Japan, South Korea, among others. Shortly after the 9/11 terrorist attacks on the United States, NATO member states invoked Article V, the alliance’ s collective defense clause, to come to the aid of the United States in the conflict against terrorism. At a NATO ministerial meeting in Reykjavik in May 2002, NATO members agreed that they must be able to carry out the full range of missions and to field forces wherever they are needed, sustain operations over distance and time, and achieve their objectives3. This was followed by an out-of-area action against terrorism – that in Afghanistan. The Alliance’ s involvement in Afghanistan is one of the most significant examples of the way NATO has evolved in the recent years. NATO has been leading the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) since August 2003, which aims at bringing peace and stability to Afghanistan and ensures that the country is never again used as a base for terrorists. The five Central Asian republics - neighboring Afghanistan, the Caucasus and the Middle East, have come to play an essential strategic role in Operation Enduring Freedom as well as in the implementation of NATO’ s mission. They have been important partners in ensuring the logistic supply of ISAF forces and in supporting the overall ISAF objectives. The new dynamics have caused significant changes in the geo-strategic situation and have radically altered the equations of power in the region4. Over the course of the antiterrorist campaign, the United States have gained foothold in Central Asia. Coalition forces set up bases in Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan to launch operations in neighboring Afghanistan. Thus, once being on the periphery of the Euro-Atlantic area, now the region has regained its strategic importance of the “geopolitical pivot” of Eurasia5 and has turned to be an important neighboring area of the Alliance – a staging post for combating extremist networks based in South Asia, as well. The expansion of NATO's missions to include the peace and stability operation inside Afghanistan must be seen as signifying a dramatic and even qualitative change in the Alliance that brings about long-term strategic consequences. One of the immediate results of extended U.S. and Western presence in wider Central Asia and the subsequent war in Iraq has been the intensification of the Russian government and military pressure upon Central Asian regimes to subordinate their armed forces to a Russian-led collective security treaty organization. The organization is supposed to act as a counterbalance to NATO in the area and as a place where Moscow would represent local governments while also effectively abridging their sovereign capabilities with regard to defense.

Japan and South Korea are new areas of interest for NATO

Davis 8 (Ian, March 19, 2008, contributor Foreign Policy In Focus a London consultant for BASIC http://www.fpif.org/articles/nato\_at\_a\_crossroads TBC 6/20)

The call for a “Global NATO” is partly based on concerns that the Alliance faces “perilous overstretch” — despite the fact that one member state, the United States, is responsible for about half of global military expenditure in 2007 and NATO collectively accounting for around two-thirds of the global total. The stretch has come from the existing missions in Iraq and Afghanistan, on top of the role the alliance is increasingly being asked to play in conflicts in parts of Africa and other potential trouble spots around the world. Those being touted as sharing NATO's values and many common interests include Australia, Brazil, Japan, India, New Zealand, South Africa, and South Korea. The argument that NATO should now be open to any state that qualifies for membership, and should not be restricted to North American and European countries, deserves further discussion. But the globalization of NATO should play second fiddle to securing European-U.S. agreement on future priorities.

NATO Wants Consult – Japan and Korea

NATO has shared interests with Japan and Korea in Asia

Armitage 3 (Mr. Richard L. Armitage - Deputy Secretary of State, United States of America Aug 12 http://www.asiasociety.org/policy-politics/international-relations/us-asia/keynote-address-asia-foreign-policy-update-luncheon-?page=0,1 6/20 TBC)

For China, Japan, the Republic of Korea, I believe that their behaviour as states with global economic reach has perhaps now outpaced their behaviour as states with global political reach. For all the Asian players, however, it is fair to say that this international system in which your fortunes are now so deeply vested is yours to protect and defend. Challenges such as terrorism, HIV/AIDS, trafficking in narcotics, trafficking in persons, and yes, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, these are challenges for us all. And this is the reality which Australia has long recognised. Now, there is no question that there will not be 100 percent overlap in interests between any collection of partners, of friends, or even allies, and that is quite understandable. We all want to do what is right in the world, but we all have to do right by our people, and that will always involve some selectivity. When it comes to terrorism, however, after September 11 and October 12, I think most of the international community saw a clear, self-interest in cooperation. After all, the terrorists espouse an ideology of destruction, and they aren’t particular about just whom they kill. It’s not just Americans and Australians who have been slaughtered by al Qaeda and affiliates, but hundreds of Filipinos, Kenyans, Moroccans, Saudis and Tanzanians. Citizens of more than 90 nations died in the World Trade Center alone. And, again, as we saw so horribly in downtown Jakarta last week, far too many Indonesians have lost their lives at the hands of extremists. But Indonesians have much more to lose in this battle, including their sense of security, their sense of confidence in the future. This is a time when the world community needs to help restore Indonesia’s faith in itself. Certainly by cooperating in counterterrorism and law enforcement efforts, but also by engaging across the board, in particular by helping this country along the road to economic and to political reform, and in so doing, to deny the terrorists the safe haven they often seek in misfortune and in turmoil. Without a doubt, it will be Australian leadership which will be essential in this regard. It’s a theme, isn’t it-- Australian leadership. Indeed, Australian leadership, both in terms of military contributions and reconstruction aid have been important to reversing the fortunes of Afghanistan and rescuing what was little more than a burnt out shell of a state from the thugs and the terrorists who held it hostage. Indeed, some 90 nations have offered direct contributions to military operations in Afghanistan. As we’ve recently read, NATO in fact has just taken command of the International Stability Force in Afghanistan. But a cross-section of Asian nations are also engaged. Japan has contributed military assets, as has the Republic of Korea, even though that nation is of course facing severe security concerns of her own at home. Singapore, Thailand and the Philippines have also offered military assistance, and China, for that matter, has not only provided reconstruction aid in Afghanistan, but has also proven to be a valuable partner in counterterrorism operations.

NATO Wants Consult – Japan

NATO holds a significant role in Asian security issues – Japan proves

Tsuruoka 9 (Michito Tsuruoka is a Research Fellow of the National Institute for Defense Studies (NIDS), Ministry of Defense, Japan NATO Review 6/20 http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2009/Asia/nato\_partner\_asia/EN/index.htm TBC)

NATO as a political partner To begin with, each country has a different set of motivations regarding its relationship with the Alliance. When Japan made an overture to NATO in 2006 and 2007, it was predominantly a diplomatic move. It is true that both Foreign Minister Taro Aso and Prime Minister Shinzo Abe mentioned the possibility of operational cooperation between Japan and NATO during their respective addresses to the NAC (North Atlantic Council). It should be remembered, however, that both men spent much time there explaining the Asian security situation, including China and North Korea. Abe even directly “requested” the Allies “to urge North Korea to take sincere steps towards the resolution” of the issue of abduction of Japanese citizens by the North Korean authorities. It is Japan’s intention to use NATO as an additional venue to raise international, particularly European, awareness of the Asian security situation. That is why Tokyo appreciated the NAC statements condemning the North Korean missile launch in July 2006 and the nuclear test in October the same year. Despite highly bellicose languages from Pyongyang, dealing with the country remains a diplomatic game, where international solidarity matters a lot. NATO may not be a political actor in its own right. But as the world’s biggest and most capable political-military alliance, it carries a certain—both intended and unintended—weight in international security affairs. This also explains why those who are sceptical about NATO, not least those who do not share values with NATO, fear the expansion of the Alliance’s area of activities and influence. NATO’s image in the outside world as an influential security actor is arguably stronger than NATO itself recognises. But precisely because of this, Japan sees NATO as an important new political partner. Other partners may follow suit.

Japan and NATO have similar interests

Hirose 10 (Yoshikazu, Professor of International Relations at the National Defense Academy, Japan. World Security Network,Jun 11, http://www.worldsecuritynetwork.com/showArticle3.cfm?article\_id=18313&topicID=59) LL

For Japan, there are at least two merits in enhancing cooperation with NATO. Firstly, NATO's comprehensive strategy fits Japan, which has refrained from making active military contributions under the pacifist Constitution, better than cooperation under the Japan-US alliance alone. Caught in a dilemma of "security" and "reconstruction," Japan has often been unable to come up with effective measures for international peacebuilding. Partnership with NATO may open up opportunities for Japan to play a more effective role. Financial assistance and the dispatch of civilians to the NATO/ISAF-assisted Provincial Reconstruction Teams are already such examples. Secondly, cooperation with NATO members, with which Japan shares such fundamental values as democracy, rule of law and human rights, will provide Japan with a valuable opportunity to learn about a multilateral security framework. Japan has little experience in institutionalized multilateral security cooperation other than with the United Nations. At a time when there is a greater need for cross-border cooperation to meet global challenges, enhancing cooperation with a coalition of democracies will offer Japan useful experience and lessons as it promotes multilateral cooperation in diverse Asia.

NATO Wants Consult – Korea

NATO interested in asian security and has a beneficial relationship with Korea

Rozoff 10 (Rick Manager of stop NATO international February 12th http://rickrozoff.wordpress.com/2010/02/12/nato-expansion-missile-deployments-and-russias-new-military-doctrine/ 6/20) TBC

Developments related to military and security matters in Europe and Asia have been numerous this month and condensed into less than a week of meetings, statements and initiatives on issues ranging from missile shield deployments to the unparalleled escalation of the world’s largest war and from a new security system for Europe to a new Russian military doctrine. A full generation after the end of the Cold War and almost that long since the breakup of the Soviet Union, the past week’s events are evocative of another decade and another century. Twenty or more years ago war in Afghanistan and controversial missile placements in Europe were current news in a bipolar world. Twenty years afterward, with no Soviet Union, no Warsaw Pact and a greatly diminished and truncated Russia, the United States and NATO have militarized Europe to an unprecedented degree – in fact subordinating almost the entire continent under a Washington-dominated military bloc – and have launched the most extensive combat offensive in South Asia in what is already the longest war in the world. Of 44 nations in Europe and the Caucasus (excluding microstates and the NATO pseudo-state of Kosovo), only six – Belarus, Cyprus, Malta, Moldova, Russia and Serbia – have escaped having their citizens conscripted by NATO for deployment to the Afghan war front. That number will soon shrink yet further. Of those 44 countries, only two – Cyprus and Russia – are not members of NATO or its Partnership for Peace transitional program and Cyprus is under intense pressure to join the second. On February 4 and 5 all 28 NATO defense chiefs met for two days of deliberations in Istanbul, Turkey which concentrated on the war in Afghanistan, the bloc’s military deployment in Kosovo and accelerated plans for expanding a world-wide interceptor missile system to Eastern Europe and the Middle East. That gathering followed by eight days a two-day meeting of the NATO Military Committee in Brussels which included 63 military chiefs from NATO nations and 35 Troop Contributing Nations, as the bloc designates them, including the top military commanders of Israel and Pakistan. That conference focused on the Afghan war and NATO’s new Strategic Concept to be officially formalized at an Alliance summit later this year. The commander of all 150,000 U.S. and NATO troops in Afghanistan, General Stanley McChrystal, attended both two-day meetings. Pentagon chief Robert Gates presided over the second and “Afghanistan and missile defense are examples of the new priorities that Gates wants NATO to focus on.” [1] As indicated by the number of Chiefs of Defense Staff in attendance at the Brussels meetings – 63 – NATO’s reach has been extended far beyond Europe and North America over the past decade. Troops serving under the bloc’s command in Afghanistan come from every inhabited continent, the Middle East and Oceania: Australia has the largest non-member contingent with over 1,500 soldiers, and other non-European nations like Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Colombia, Egypt, Georgia, New Zealand, Singapore, South Korea and the United Arab Emirates have troops in Afghanistan or on the way there.

NATO Wants Consult – New NATO – Asia

NATO sees itself as a forum for consultation for all problems worldwide even in Central Asian and the Pacific

Rozoff 10 (Rick Manager of stop NATO international February 10th 6/20 http://rickrozoff.wordpress.com/2010/02/10/natos-role-in-the-military-encirclement-of-iran/) TBC

The secretary general of the U.S.-led “world’s sole global military bloc” – Anders Fogh Rasmussen – spoke at the annual Munich Security Conference on February 7, delivering himself of a ponderous and grandiose screed entitled NATO in the 21st Century: Towards Global Connectivity, during which he touted the role of the military bloc in intruding itself into almost every interstice imaginable: The ever-expanding war in Afghanistan, terrorism, cyber attacks, energy cut-offs – the last two references to Russia if not formally acknowledged as such – nuclear non-proliferation, climate change, piracy, failed states, drugs, “humanitarian disasters, conflicts over arable land, and mounting competition for natural resources,” [4] North Korea and Iran. In repeating Alliance and other Western leaders’ demands that “NATO should become a forum for consultation on worldwide security issues,” Rasmussen stated that “to carry out NATO’s job effectively today, the Alliance should become the hub of a network of security partnerships and a centre for consultation on international security issues….And we don’t have to start from scratch. Already today, the Alliance has a vast network of security partnership[s], as far afield as Northern Africa, the Gulf, Central Asia, and the Pacific.” [5] Indeed NATO has a broad and expanding network of members and military partners throughout the world. It has one member, Turkey, the second largest contributor of troops to the bloc, which borders Iran, and a partnership ally, Azerbaijan, which does also.

The US, NATO, and Japan are interlinked in NATO’s new multilateral role

Tsuruoka 9 (Michito Tsuruoka is a Research Fellow of the National Institute for Defense Studies (NIDS), Ministry of Defense, Japan NATO Review 6/20 http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2009/Asia/nato\_partner\_asia/EN/index.htm TBC)

NATO as a means of cooperation with the US When countries such as Australia and New Zealand decided to send troops to Afghanistan, the partner they chose did not have to be NATO. In fact, when NZ deployed troops to Afghanistan for the first time, it was done under the framework of the Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) in close bilateral cooperation with the US. There was no secret that it was a decision to support specifically the US and to show solidarity with the country in the wake of the 9/11, which had nothing to with NZ-NATO cooperation at that time. As a result of the geographical expansion of the ISAF in late 2006, the NZ troops stationed in Bamyan province had to move from the OEF command to the ISAF. From NZ’s point of view, the resultant cooperation with NATO was largely an unintended by-product of what it had been doing regardless of the ISAF. This clearly shows another critical value that NATO has as a framework to cooperate in international peace operations and other areas. It is that NATO offers an additional route to cooperate with the US. Cooperation with NATO including troop contribution to NATO-led missions and operations can take place in the context of cooperation with the US. This should not be a surprising element given that even among the Allies, contribution to the ISAF and other NATO-led activities are often seen as a way to ensure positive relations with the US. “Partners across the globe” are not an exception here. It is certainly no coincidence that so far, most of the Alliance’s new partners beyond the Euro-Atlantic region are in fact US allies, such as Australia and Japan. Australia-NATO and Japan-NATO cooperation are new faces of these countries’ bilateral security relations with the US. A Joint Statement of the US-Japan 2+2 (Security Consultative Committee: SCC) of May 2007 placed Japan-NATO cooperation in the context of ‘common strategic objectives’ of the two allies.

NATO Wants Consult – New NATO

NATO is eager to have a broader consulting role about diverse worldwide problems

Brunnstrom and Trevelyan 10 (David and Mark, Reuters, Feb. 7 6/20 http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSLDE61607K TBC)

NATO should become the global forum with other nations on a host of security issues extending from terrorism, cyber attacks, nuclear proliferation, piracy, climate change and competition for natural resources as well as Afghanistan, he said. "NATO can be the place where views, concerns and best practices on security are shared by NATO's global partners. And where ... we might work out how to tackle global challenges together," he told a conference in Munich ahead of discussion of a new NATO Strategic Concept due to be approved in November. Rasmussen said NATO was already working with Pakistan, and other countries stood to gain from a stable Afghanistan. "India has a stake in Afghan stability. China too. And both could help further develop and rebuild Afghanistan. The same goes for Russia," he said. RUSSIAN SCEPTCISM A senior Russian politician reacted sceptically to the proposals, saying NATO first had to think globally, and complained that Russia had not been involved in the process. "I believe the problem of NATO today is that NATO develops in reverse order -- it tries to act globally more and more but continues to think locally," said Konstantin Kosachev, chairman of the Russian Duma's International Affairs Committee. "As soon as NATO starts to reach beyond its borders this is no longer just an internal matter for NATO," said Kosachev, who was also speaking the annual Munich Security Conference. Moscow still views NATO, its Cold War adversary, with deep suspicion. Ties were severely strained by the 2008 war between Russia and Georgia and by U.S.-backed plans to invite more former Soviet states to join the alliance. Kosachev accused the alliance of provoking the Georgia-Russia conflict by promising Tbilisi eventual membership and of failing to tackle the drugs problem in Afghanistan. He urged NATO to show it was serious by having proper discussions with Russia about Moscow's security concerns and proposals. Former U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, chair of a group of experts drawing up the Strategic Concept, and Canadian Defence Minister Peter MacKay backed Rasmussen's vision of NATO as the preeminent forum for global security discussion. "I think we are talking about how we can have some coordinating mechanism for all the various organisations that exist in the world," Albright said, adding that the question was "which organisation can make the biggest difference." "While I am a great admirer of the United Nations, I know what it can and cannot do," she said, noting that it was NATO cooperation that halted the killing in Kosovo in the 1990s. Rasmussen said he did not see the Western military alliance, which groups 26 European nations, Canada and the United States, becoming a competitor to the United Nations. "We are talking here about a group of nations consulting, formally or informally, on security. Nothing more. "In fact, I think it would actually benefit the UN. NATO is operating almost without exception in support of UN resolutions. Allies are all strong and active UN members," he said.

Link – Consultation k to Credibility

Consultation is key to a credible NATO

Anthony 8 (Dr. Ian 4 February 2008 The Future of Nuclear Weapons in NATO Research Coordinator, SIPRI pg. 25 TBC)

NATO has underscored that a credible Alliance nuclear posture and the demonstration of Alliance solidarity and common commitment to war prevention continue to require widespread participation by European Allies involved in collective defence planning in nuclear roles, in peacetime basing of nuclear forces on their territory and in command, control and consultation arrangements.22 However, while the residual nuclear missions of NATO are carried out under the auspices of a policy agreed within the Alliance as a whole, the associated military-technical questions inevitably affect countries differently depending on the particular role that they play within the overall framework.

Consultation on troop withdrawal is key to NATO credibility

Hunter and Gwertzman 9 (Robert E. Hunter, Senior Advisor, RAND Corporation Bernard Gwertzman, Consulting Editor, CFR.org December 9, 2009http://www.cfr.org/publication/20938/usnato.html?breadcrumb=/publication/publication\_list%3Ftype%3Ddaily\_analysis%26page%3D20 TBC 6/22/10)

What Obama said is a conditions-based withdrawal. It doesn't give any final dates for actually withdrawing. But that I think it also led to a good deal of confusion in Europe. In the first place, Europeans always complain about the nature of consultations. They always argue that there has never been enough, and that has been true in this case as well. The decision was an American one, which was then given to the Europeans, some of whom have had some role in it, but very few. Some people would argue that they would rather have a fait accompli by the American leadership, thereby relieving them of any responsibility; others would say, "once again the United States is dropping something on us, and expecting us to go along." How many troops are in Afghanistan now? What about after the new "surge"? There are two operations in Afghanistan: One is Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF), which is almost entirely United States now, and has thirty-six thousand U.S. troops. The other one is the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF)--which is the NATO-commanded operation, but U.S. Commander General Stanley McChrystal also commands these forces. ISAF now has about sixty-eight thousand forces from forty-two countries, and with the thirty thousand extra U.S. troops announced by Obama, plus the seven thousand promised by the Allies, there will then be nearly one hundred thousand-plus troops in ISAF, plus the Americans in OEF. In terms of motivation, very few European countries believe that winning in Afghanistan--that is, dismantling, defeating, and destroying al-Qaeda and Taliban--is necessary for their own security. A few believe that, but most do not. When they add forces, it is to protect the credibility of NATO now that it is there. NATO has never failed at anything it chose to do. Many of these governments wouldn't repeat what they did in 2003 when they sent troops, but that's water over the dam, and they don't want NATO to be damaged by a failure to persevere in Afghanistan. So what we're dealing with is a kind of implicit, unspoken bargain. Will the United States recommit in practical ways to being a European power, and at the same time, will the Europeans assist what they see to be primarily U.S. interests and U.S. motivations in regard to Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. Most of them are doing this ... to please the United States. There are two basic issues within NATO. One is the immediate issue of Afghanistan. The other is a difference of perspective about what challenges NATO faces. Most Europeans would argue that the work of wrapping up the Cold War is still not entirely finished. There are some minor issues and one huge, major issue. The minor issues are in places like the Balkans; the bigger issue is the future of Russia.

Link – Consultation k to Credibility

Consultation is key to a credible NATO

Anthony 8 (Dr. Ian 4 February 2008 The Future of Nuclear Weapons in NATO Research Coordinator, SIPRI pg. 25 TBC)

NATO has underscored that a credible Alliance nuclear posture and the demonstration of Alliance solidarity and common commitment to war prevention continue to require widespread participation by European Allies involved in collective defence planning in nuclear roles, in peacetime basing of nuclear forces on their territory and in command, control and consultation arrangements.22 However, while the residual nuclear missions of NATO are carried out under the auspices of a policy agreed within the Alliance as a whole, the associated military-technical questions inevitably affect countries differently depending on the particular role that they play within the overall framework.

Link – Consultation k to Alliance

This is a turning point for the alliance – renewed cooperation key to avoid collapse

Daalder 3 (Ivo H., Senior Fellow, Foreign Policy Studies, The Brookings Institution, “The End of Atlanticism,” SURVIVAL, Summer 2003, pp. 147-166. TBC 6/21/10)

There is nothing inevitable about this scenario. There is a more hopeful, and equally plausible scenario by which the deterioration of US– European relations will lead to a realisation on both sides of the Atlantic that a major readjustment is necessary to renew and update the partnership. Europe would invest in the resources necessary to complement its soft-power with real, hard-power capabilities. The United States would once again come to realise that allies and alliances are assets to harbour and strengthen rather than abandon or take for granted. A partnership of relative equals could emerge from this readjustment to deal with common challenges ranging from terrorism and weapons of mass destruction to energy security, climate change and infectious diseases – provided both sides decided this is what they wanted.49 What is no longer possible is for the relationship to continue to drift. There is too much resentment, and too many are becoming alienated, for the drifting apart to continue indefinitely. Relations between Europe and the United States have reached a turning point. Either their long marriage comes to an end, or it will be renewed. Which one of these futures comes true will depend especially on the United States, which, as the senior partner, has the greatest power to put the alliance back on track or to push it off the road completely.

Consultation on military posture key to solidify alliance

Cambell and Ward 3 (Kurt M. Campbell and Celeste Johnson Ward Foreign Affairs, Vol. 82, No. 5 (Sep. - Oct., 2003),Published by: Council on Foreign Relations Pg.101-102 TBC 6/21/10)

GIVEN THE SENSITIVITY of the issues involved, several steps should be taken before and during the rollout of any new military posture. The first is ensuring that everything about the move is vetted carefully by all major relevant actors. Attention to process will not solve every problem, but it will certainly affect the receptivity of other countries to any changes. How allies such as South Korea and Japan respond, for example, will depend not just on the substance of the modifications themselves, but also on how well the United States consults with their governments, takes their reservations into account, and allays their various anxieties. In fact, rather than being seen as a routine obligation or a nuisance, consultations over the posture changes should be seen as an important opportunity to solidify, strengthen, and redefine those alliances for the future. In Europe, similarly, countries are likely to be more receptive to changes if they take place in the context of a revitalized NATO and a reinvestment in the Atlantic alliance by the United States, rather than being seen as an expression of impatience or unconcern with "old Europe."

Link – Consultation k to Alliance

Consultation is key to the Alliance

De Nevers 7 (renee de nevers, 2007, International Security, Nato’s international security role in the terrorist era, pg. 57-58 TBC 6/21/10)

This examination of NATO’s participation in the U.S. war against terror yields three main insights. First, the chronic capabilities gap between the United States and its allies is growing, and increasingly may be limiting the alliance’s operational cooperation. Second, the gap between what the United States and European states are willing to do militarily is also growing. This rejects their disparate capabilities and the differences in operational planning that follow from them. Third, the United States’ commitment to working through the alliance is unclear. While NATO’s chief military officer stresses the value of NATO’s military mechanisms and political consultation, the U.S. government is often unwilling to rely on NATO in campaigns that relate directly to defending the United States. Not only do Pentagon leaders want to avoid the effort of working to build consensus within the alliance, but they see it as compromising the mission and the safety of U.S. forces. Moreover, some U.S. government offcials note that the Bush administration sees NATO as unreliable, because of the diffculty in gaining troop commitments from member states in recent years. This has fostered the view expressed by one State Department ofªcial, who noted, “We ‘ad hoc’ our way through coalitions of the willing. That’s the future.”86 NATO’s Limited Role in the U.S. War on Terror Three factors help to explain why NATO’s contribution to the U.S. war on terror has been relatively limited: shifting alignments and threat perceptions due to systemic changes, NATO’s chronic and growing capabilities gap, and the war against terror itself. alignments and threats after the cold war Two critical changes in the nature of the international system have infuenced NATO’s evolution since the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. First, the dis- NATO’s International Security Role 57 86. Guy Dinmore, “U.S. Sees Coalitions of the Willing as Best Ally,” Financial Times, January 4, 2006. Contribution of power in the international system is no longer bipolar. For all its tensions, the international system was relatively stable during the Cold War, with the two superpowers and their allies aligned in opposition. This made core alliance cohesion relatively easy to maintain. NATO’s European members were unlikely to defect from the U.S.-led alliance, and the United States was unlikely to abandon Europe, though fears to the contrary emerged periodically. Although scholars continue to debate whether the current international system is unipolar, multipolar, or something else, today U.S. military power dwarfs that of other powers in the international system. Second, a security community developed among the European powers, Japan, and the United States concurrently with the erosion and eventual collapse of Soviet power. As a result, the option of war between these powers has become virtually unthinkable. This is an equally momentous change in the international system, given that great power war has been a constant in history.87 NATO has denied realist predictions that it would not survive in the absence of the threat it was created to defend against: the Soviet Union. But the aforementioned systemic changes have led alliance members to perceive security threats differently. They have also renewed uncertainties about alliance stability and the U.S. commitment to NATO.

Using NATO as a forum for discussion is key to its survival

Goldgeier 10 (James M. Goldgeier is the Whitney Shepardson senior fellow for transatlantic relations at the Council on Foreign Relations March 2, 2010 http://www.cfr.org/publication/13272/to\_remain\_relevant\_nato\_must\_adapt\_to\_21st\_century\_threats\_concludes\_new\_cfr\_report.html TBC 6/22/10)

Potential U.S. disinterest is the greatest danger facing NATO going forward. To keep the United States engaged in the North Atlantic Alliance, the Europeans must signal that they understand the new threat environment and what it takes to meet that threat. It would be far better for both the United States and Europe if NATO succeeds. American reassurance is still valuable within Europe. A formal institution of leading democracies that provides a forum for discussion and a vehicle for action is a significant advantage for the United States as it seeks to promote international order.

Link – Consultation k to Alliance

Consultation key to cohesion

Mecum 7 (Mark M. Mecum June 2007 SOLVING ALLIANCE COHESION: NATO COHESION AFTER THE COLD WAR A thesis presented to the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences of Ohio University http://etd.ohiolink.edu/send-pdf.cgi/Mecum%20Mark%20M.pdf?ohiou1180549294 TBC 6/22/10)

Another concept that Liska identifies as playing an integral part to the cohesion of an alliance is consultation. Consultation by an alliance – or specifically by the core-member of an alliance – toward external actors and threats and toward internal member-states and threats is key to providing cohesion. If an alliance lacks a managing tool to quell disunity, then the whole internal aspect of cohesion is jeopardized. Regardless of the size of an alliance, every member wants to maximize its political influence and power over decision-making. Having multiple member states competing for the same thing can blur the purpose of the alliance to members and to the world. It can also block the idea of community and shared identity, concepts that sometimes are key to defining cohesion in alliances. Additionally, without a method to manage the internal dimension of an alliance, consensus-building and shared decision-making opportunities will be put at risk. Consultation is also important for external actors and threats to an alliance. If conflicts often arise to an alliance, then lacking a tool to manage those threats and perhaps preventing the potential activation of alliance stipulations is very important. While some alliances do serve as power maximizing tools, others serve as management, deterrence, or bandwagoning alliances. In these cases, it is even more crucial to be able to effectively manage the common foreign policies of the alliance.

Link – Consultation on Turkey k to Alliance

Consultation on Turkish Nukes is key to the Alliance

BASIC 10 (British American Security Information Council January 6/20 http://www.basicint.org/pubs/BASIC-MindtheGapNATOnuclear.pdf ) TBC

The Alliance is considering its response to the transformational vision expressed by a number of leaders in and out of government, most notably by President Barack Obama himself and expressed at the UN Security Council in resolution 1887. The new Strategic Concept will need to reflect this by unambiguously acknowledging the Alliance’s responsibility to play a leadership role in taking cooperative steps to create the conditions for moves towards a world free of nuclear weapons, and outlining a nuclear doctrine that is consistent with these moves, on the assumption that the Nuclear Posture Review will have done so, marrying continued deterrence and stronger non-proliferation measures with significant disarmament steps. However in the interests of Alliance cohesion, the forward-deployed nuclear weapons need not be addressed explicitly in the text of the new Strategic Concept. They have already been removed under bilateral agreements from the UK and Greece. The small number remaining in Germany, Belgium, Italy, Turkey and the Netherlands could be tackled in a similar way in consultation with Alliance partners. However, it would be better for cohesion if the Allies could agree amongst themselves that investment would be better placed in other capabilities.

Link – Consultation on Afghanistan k to Alliance

NATO consultation over Afghanistan reinvigorates the Alliance

Morgan 9 (David Reuters March 12 National Post http://www.nationalpost.com/Afghan+review+expected+early+next+week/1382231/story.html TBC 6/21/10)

The United States currently has 38,000 troops in Afghanistan as part of an overall Western military presence of nearly 70,000 troops from NATO and other countries. Obama has approved 17,000 extra U.S. troops for Afghanistan to tackle an intensifying Taliban insurgency. Vice President Joe Biden this week asked NATO allies for their input into the strategy review. “Every country that we talked to -- all 26 around the table -- were thinking: how can I contribute? Some will do that in terms of military units, some will do it in terms of trainers or people for (provincial reconstruction teams) or police mentors and some will do it financially,” the official said. The administration hopes to use such consultations to bind allies into a common approach and then ask them for more help. “The depth of the consultations I think are very good for the relationships but it also creates a foundation for being able to go back to the allies and say: OK, we agreed on the way forward together and so now we’re going to resource this new strategy together,” the defence official said.

Link – Consultation k to Relations

Consultation key to avoid relations problems

Cambell and Ward 3 (Kurt M. Campbell and Celeste Johnson Ward Foreign Affairs, Vol. 82, No. 5 (Sep. - Oct., 2003),Published by: Council on Foreign Relations Pg.102 TBC 6/21/10)

During the consultations, the United States should explain the pur pose and rationale behind its actions, making it clear that the changes are global and not driven by any particular regional dynamic. Because of the timing, international observers will be prone to view the changes in the context of recent events, particularly the lead-up to and conduct of the war in Iraq. Without guidance from the United States, they will put their own spin on what is happening, which will not necessarily be accurate and could adversely affect other U.S. interests. U.S. officials should also underscore repeatedly the fact that the United States has no intention of stepping back from its traditional security commitments. Getting the signals right will be critical to preempting unnecessary negative consequences. Despite much evidence to the contrary, some allies continue to worry about U.S. commitment and staying power and may read the new plans as an indicator of what the most powerful nation on earth thinks is important. They need to be assured that any moves are being driven by military concerns and do not reflect a significant change in diplomatic priorities. The changes, moreover, should not be rushed or hyped, and they should be explained as evolutionary movements rather than radical departures. Particularly in delicate situations such as on the Korean Peninsula, abruptness is unlikely to pay dividends. For that reason, in fact, the United States should consider delaying the movement of the Second Infantry Division out of the DMZ. It is true that there may never be an ideal time for such a change. But with the threat from North Korea unabated and perhaps even heightened recently, now would be an especially inopportune moment. However the move might increase the effectiveness of any military response to North Korean provocations, it would be a difficult sell in the region. Politics would inevitably over shadow strategic realities, and the result could be greater resentment of the United States in South Korea, greater concern in Japan, and greater anxiety throughout the region. When moves are ultimately made-as they should be-they should be done delicately and slowly, and with a close eye on regional perceptions and concerns.

Link – Unilateralism Kills the Alliance

Unilateral withdrawal from collective participation causes failure of the alliance

Hsiung 1 (James C. a professor of politics at New York University http://www.lewrockwell.com/orig/hsiung1.html TBC 6/21/10)

It may not be a coincidence that European resentment to U.S. unilateralism is at its post-Cold War peak following the change of guards at the White House since January 20. A number of foreign-policy decisions by the new Bush Administration, ranging from the announced unilateral U.S. withdrawal from Kosovo and, for that matter, reduced U.S. commitment to the NATO, to the unilateral withdrawal from the Kyoto Protocol of 1998 when global warming has since become a more pronounced threat to humanity, and to a nonetheless unilateral decision (despite perfunctory, cursory "consultations" with European leaders) to scrap the 1972 ABM treaty with Russia, clearing the way for an equally unilateral National Missile Defense (NMD) system. This scheme, furthermore, goes against a common chorus of opposition even among America’s close allies in Europe and in Asia (Japan and South Korea). The ground of their common opposition is that the NMD may elicit new rounds of destablizing arms race not seen since the Cold War. True, unilateralism is not a monopoly of any Administration, nor any particular session of Congress. In 1999, the U.S. Senate unilaterally rejected the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty (CNTBT), which the Clinton Administration had signed three years earlier along with 154 other countries. The United States, under Reagan, had unilaterally held out joining the 119 states that signed the epochal 1982 Law of the Sea Convention after seven years of diligent negotiations. The ostensible official reason was that the United States would have no part to legislating socialism by treaty. The real reason, however, was that Washington wanted to have a permanent seat on the governing council of the International Seabed Authority, an agency to be created under the United Nations with the authority to issue licenses to national mining companies bent on exploiting seabed resources. Having finally won such an exclusive concession following 12 more years of talks, the United States then signed the treaty in 1994. But, the truth is that unilateralism has only been carried to new heights unknown before under the Bush Administration. It has irked America’s allies. Hence, any sensible person can readily infer a correlation between this unprecedented pitch of unilateralism and America’s ouster from the Human Rights Commission after it lost the May 3 election. Unilateralism and After Unilateralism may take different forms. Withdrawal from collective action in producing collective goods (such as environmental control) takes the form of omission. It may, on the other hand, take the form of commission, such as in the U.S. invasion of Panama, in December 1989, under the senior Bush. In the latter event, the example thus set may have encouraged copy-catting, such as in Saddam Hussein’s invasion of Kuwait scarcely nine months later. A most common form of unilateralism is to set different rules for itself, as from those for others. In the EP-3E spy plane case, the United States asserted it had the right to spy on another coastal state from the airspace over the latter’s 200-mile exclusive economic zone (EEZ). When pressed, the Bush White House might claim, on the ground of non-ratification, that America was not bound by the 1982 treaty’s provisions establishing the rights of a foreign coastal state, thus freeing America from the duty to observe the "due regard" rule for the latter’s rights (including the right of privacy) while flying a spy plane over its EEZ. Nor, in this view, is the United States bound by the rule that the high seas are reserved for "peaceful purposes" only. We need not belabor the point that these rules are or have become customary rules in general international law binding on all nations. The fact is that the United States in 1983, under President Reagan, established a 200-mile EEZ of its own by [unilateral] proclamation. One wonders what would happen if any foreign nation should send spy planes, on routine missions, into the airspace over America’s EEZ so established. The consequences from such hegemonic unilateralism may vary. The recent troubles the Bush Administration has encountered in the four events above are but a reminder of what kinds of bitter fruits are likely to result from America’s unilateralist approach to foreign affairs. The twenty-first century is one characterized by the rise of what is known as "comprehensive security," comprising environmental security, economic security, and human security. Remedies require collective action, not unilateral self-help. The ultimate lesson from these recent events is that they are a wake-up call that the time has come for America to shift gears toward greater use of collective action, on security matters as in foreign relations in general – or else, be prepared to face rejection even by America’s own allies.

\*Internal Links\*

Internal Link – NATO key to Asian Influence

Expanding NATO influence and coordination of allies over Southeast Asia is key to US control of the region

Xuecheng 4 (Liu Xuecheng, a researcher with the China Institute of International Studies 6/20/10 http://english.peopledaily.com.cn/200406/03/eng20040603\_145233.html TBC)

In the Asia-Pacific region, the United States, to meet with new security concerns, has maintained and strengthened the arrangements forged during the Cold War period by adjusting trans-Pacific bilateral military alliances. During the eight years of former US President Bill Clinton's term, the United States confirmed Japan and Australia as its core allies in the Asia-Pacific region and respectively regarded the two countries as the northern and southern anchors of its East Asian security strategy. Through various military exercises and construction of a missile defence system, Washington subsequently succeeded in networking its bilateral military relations with Australia, Japan, the Republic of Korea (ROK), the Philippines, Thailand, and Singapore. Following the Kosovo War, the perception that Europe's security situation had been under control of NATO while Asia-Pacific security was being threatened by more uncertain and unpredictable factors prompted the United States to begin to shift its military strategy eastward. In 2001, an expert panel under the National Security Commission of the Bush administration published a report on the new US-Asian security strategy, which strongly advised the government to establish a co-ordinated and comprehensive Asian strategy. The report suggested the United States strengthen bilateral alliances with traditional allies, and especially, develop and strengthen political, economic and military ties with nations posing no threat to US national interests. It also said the United States should adopt the strategy of balancing influences among some emerging influential Asian nations such as China, India and Russia. The report further reminded the Bush administration of paying attention to the hotspot-filled unstable arc from Northeast Asia to the Malacca Straits, the Indian Ocean, the Persian Gulf, and Southern Caucasia at the northern corner of the Caspian Sea. In the wake of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, the Bush administration has put its priority on countering terrorism and preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Under those two banners, the United States has strengthened its strategic control of the V-shaped belt stretching from Northeast to Central Asia, to which China, Indian, Japan and Russia are closely adjacent. The US traditional energy transportation passage and nations Bush branded as part of the so-called "axis of evil" also overlap this long arc. While strengthening its strategic control of the outstretched chain, the United States has also actively worked to extend the network of Asia-Pacific security alliances under its domination to the Indian Ocean and even to the Persian Gulf to join the southward-extending NATO. To expedite implementation of this strategy, Washington has promoted active participation of its traditional allies in the anti-terror war, and prompted them to co-ordinate its anti-proliferation moves and support its ambitious missile defence system. To show its intimate ties with the key states and regions in this chain, Washington has also given them non-NATO ally status. Japan, ROK, the Philippines, Thailand, Pakistan, Kuwait, Singapore, and Taiwan now enjoy such treatment. US Secretary of State Colin Powell recently claimed India will soon gain similar status. By pursuing such a strategic and security configuration in Asia the US has essentially created a NATO-like military mechanism.

Internal Link – Alliance k to deter Russia

The Alliance is key to deter Russia

Perkovich 9 (George May 2009 George Perkovich is vice president for studies and director of the Nuclear Policy Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace http://www.icnnd.org/research/Perkovich\_Deterrence.pdf TBC 6/23/10)

The former Warsaw Pact and Soviet states now in NATO are more exposed to Russian coercion. Russia has conventional military superiority over these states which are located near it and Russia probably would be more willing to use hard power against them than it is against Western European states. NATO collectively has the military resources to deter and stymie potential Russian aggression against the new NATO states. The question, as discussed below, is under what circumstances NATO would have the political will to confront Russia on behalf of the new members. And would this resolve be greater or weaker in a world without nuclear weapons?

Internal Link – Alliance k to Prolif and Terror

NATO cohesion key to solve rising geopolitical challenges like proliferation and terrorism

Brzezinski 9 (Zbigniew Brzezinski, former U.S. National Security Adviser, Sept/Oct 2009, Foreign Affairs, 88.5 6/20) TBC

NATO's potential is not primarily military. Although NATO is a collective-security alliance, its actual military power comes predominantly from the United States, and that reality is not likely to change anytime soon. NATO's real power derives from the fact that it combines the United States' military capabilities and economic power with Europe's collective political and economic weight (and occasionally some limited European military forces). Together, that combination makes NATO globally significant. It must therefore remain sensitive to the importance of safeguarding the geopolitical bond between the United States and Europe as it addresses new tasks. The basic challenge that NATO now confronts is that there are historically unprecedented risks to global security. Today's world is threatened neither by the militant fanaticism of a territorially rapacious nationalist state nor by the coercive aspiration of a globally pretentious ideology embraced by an expansive imperial power. The paradox of our time is that the world, increasingly connected and economically interdependent for the first time in its entire history, is experiencing intensifying popular unrest made all the more menacing by the growing accessibility of weapons of mass destruction--not just to states but also, potentially, to extremist religious and political movements. Yet there is no effective global security mechanism for coping with the growing threat of violent political chaos stemming from humanity's recent political awakening. The three great political contests of the twentieth century (the two world wars and the Cold War) accelerated the political awakening of mankind, which was initially unleashed in Europe by the French Revolution. Within a century of that revolution, spontaneous populist political activism had spread from Europe to East Asia. On their return home after World Wars I and II, the South Asians and the North Africans who had been conscripted by the British and French imperial armies propagated a new awareness of anticolonial nationalist and religious political identity among hitherto passive and pliant populations. The spread of literacy during the twentieth century and the wide-ranging impact of radio, television, and the Internet accelerated and intensified this mass global political awakening. In its early stages, such new political awareness tends to be expressed as a fanatical embrace of the most extreme ethnic or fundamentalist religious passions, with beliefs and resentments universalized in Manichaean categories. Unfortunately, in significant parts of the developing world, bitter memories of European colonialism and of more recent U.S. intrusion have given such newly aroused passions a distinctively anti-Western cast. Today, the most acute example of this phenomenon is found in an area that stretches from Egypt to India. This area, inhabited by more than 500 million politically and religiously aroused peoples, is where NATO is becoming more deeply embroiled. Additionally complicating is the fact that the dramatic rise of China and India and the quick recovery of Japan within the last 50 years have signaled that the global center of political and economic gravity is shifting away from the North Atlantic toward Asia and the Pacific. And of the currently leading global powers--the United States, the EU, China, Japan, Russia, and India--at least two, or perhaps even three, are revisionist in their orientation. Whether they are "rising peacefully" (a self-confident China), truculently (an imperially nostalgic Russia) or boastfully (an assertive India, despite its internal multiethnic and religious vulnerabilities), they all desire a change in the global pecking order. The future conduct of and relationship among these three still relatively cautious revisionist powers will further intensify the strategic uncertainty. Visible on the horizon but not as powerful are the emerging regional rebels, with some of them defiantly reaching for nuclear weapons. North Korea has openly flouted the international community by producing (apparently successfully) its own nuclear weapons--and also by profiting from their dissemination. At some point, its unpredictability could precipitate the first use of nuclear weapons in anger since 1945. Iran, in contrast, has proclaimed that its nuclear program is entirely for peaceful purposes but so far has been unwilling to consider consensual arrangements with the international community that would provide credible assurances regarding these intentions. In nuclear-armed Pakistan, an extremist anti-Western religious movement is threatening the country's political stability. These changes together reflect the waning of the post-World War II global hierarchy and the simultaneous dispersal of global power. Unfortunately, U.S. leadership in recent years unintentionally, but most unwisely, contributed to the currently threatening state of affairs. The combination of Washington's arrogant unilateralism in Iraq and its demagogic Islamophobic sloganeering weakened the unity of NATO and focused aroused Muslim resentments on the United States and the West more generally.

\*\*Misc Impacts\*\*

**NATO k/ Europe**

**NATO involvement is key to US maintenance of influence in European affairs**

European allies are critical in the war on terror

Stull 5 (Alan, Lieutenant Colonel Alan M. Stull, UW Army War College, Mar 18, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ada431845&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf) LL

A major goal of the Bush NSS is to “strengthen alliances to defeat global terrorism and

work to prevent attacks against us and our friends.”9 The United States has already seen a

great divide between it and a few European Alliance partners on the strategy for fighting global terrorism. Though the NATO Secretary General implemented Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty immediately following the 11 September 2001 attacks on the United States and tooksignificant measures to assist the United States, lack of consensus in NATO diminished its

support to Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) and only 16 of 26 NATO countries are deployed with

the U.S. action there. Though the United States prefers building coalitions rather than acting

through NATO, NATO backing is still critical. Pulling back from Europe at this time, though not

tied to current tensions with Germany and France, can only weaken one of the greatest

alliances against global terrorism. NATO is the strongest U.S. long term alliance. It has one of

the best established military command and control structures and an established intelligence

sharing system which is vital to tracking terrorists that transit through Europe and neighboring countries. Europeans also have 30 years of experience in dealing with modern terrorism. Therestationing of 40,000 soldiers from USAREUR back to the United States may be sending the wrong message about the U.S. commitment to Europe and the NATO Alliance. The Germans,who will see almost all of these reductions, understand the United States’ rationale for a

restructuring and restationing in light of their commitments in Iraq and Afghanistan as well as

the threat reduction to Europe, but they may not understand the significant levels of these

reductions.10 The bottom line is they support the withdrawal but lament the economic

consequences.

As part of the United States restructuring and restationing plan there are proposals to

establish some bases in Eastern Europe and rotate forces to them from the United States. This

seems like a great plan for expeditionary engagement, but the United States will not have the

units to rotate into Europe with its commitments in Iraq and Afghanistan. This rotation plan

would, of course, have to be put on hold indefinitely due to operations in Iraq and Afghanistan

and so Europe will simply be left with whatever forces are permanently stationed there.

The United States has traditionally held influence in European affairs because of its

leadership in NATO as Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR) and possessing the

most powerful military force supporting NATO. However, if the United States reduces forces too

far in Europe it could lead to a loss of influence in Europe and even a call demanding that the

SACEUR be a European.11 Additionally if the United States withdrew from the integrated

command structure then all influence would be lost. To further compound this, as the European

Union (EU) gains strength, U.S. leadership within NATO may be the only way for the United

States to hold any sway within European leadership. The ultimate failure here would be for

NATO to dissolve and leave the EU wholly responsible for European security objectives with no U.S. connection. This would have deleterious implications for the alliance against the GWOT. NATO also brings a certain amount of legitimacy to any operation around the world.

NATO sanctioned operations are looked at in more legitimate terms than U.S. unilateral

operations. Because hegemonic United States is often viewed as the big bully, NATO gives it a

different face and significant international recognition. Even though the United States is often

the lead contributor of forces, NATO sanction provides significantly more international legitimacy and cooperation. This helps somewhat to excise the unilateral moniker from the United States.

**NATO k/ Regional Escalation**

US leadership in NATO is critical to checking escalation of regional power struggles

Stull 5 (Alan, Lieutenant Colonel Alan M. Stull, UW Army War College, Mar 18, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ada431845&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf) LL

Currently NATO and the EU are not capable of diffusing regional conflicts militarily without U.S. leadership and resources. The United States has been the leader within NATO since its inception in 1949. It appears that without the U.S. leadership and resources NATO could simply fade away or become irrelevant.13 The United States and the United Kingdom (UK) have traditionally been the only nations willing and/or capable of deploying and leading NATO missions. Though NATO and the EU are working toward sharing more of the security burden, both troop and monetary, they are a long way from a force viable of conducting expeditionary operations and quelling any regional conflicts within Europe, Eurasia or North Africa. The European Security Strategy states that the EU and the United States acting together are “a formidable force for good in the world” and this is reason for the EU to build up its capabilities further and increase its coherence.14 However, Article III-309 of the EU Constitution only gives the following missions to any EU defense and security forces: joint disarmament operations, humanitarian and rescue tasks, military advice and assistance tasks, conflict prevention and peace-keeping tasks, tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peace-making and post-conflict stabilization.15 Additionally, NATO countries are spending far too little on defense with most spending less than two percent of their GDPs for defense. Only France at 2.6 percent and the United Kingdom at 2.4 percent are anywhere close to the 3.3 percent the United States spends on defense.16 The EU draft Constitution directs the EU to “proceed more intensively to develop its defense capacities through the development of its national contributions and participation, where appropriate, in multinational forces,” and “have the capacity to supply by 2007 at the latest, either at national level or as a component of multinational force groups, targeted combat units for the missions planned, structured at a tactical level as a battle group, with support elements including transport and logistics, capable of carrying out the tasks referred to in Article III-309.”17 Though these provisions are spelled out in the new EU Constitution, it is unlikely that most member states will have the national will to meet this standard. Many EU countries have continued to exceed the European Economic and Monetary Union (EMU) mandated maximum three percent deficit ceiling with no penalties, so there is no reason to believe they will comply with this mandate when the constitution is ratified. Many current European governments understand they do not have the means to compete with many countries militarily so they are very content to rely on Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty for their security blanket. The European Security Strategy further adds to this as it states, “As a union of 25 members, spending more than 160 billion Euros on defense, we should be able to sustain several operations simultaneously.”18 The Balkans conflicts give proof of Europe’s poor record of conflict resolution without NATO/U.S. commitment. The Balkan conflict at the beginning of the decade revealed European military incapacity and political disarray; the Kosovo conflict at decade’s end exposed a transatlantic gap in military technology and the ability to wage modern warfare that would only widen in subsequent years. Outside of Europe, the disparity by the close of the 1990s was even more starkly apparent as it became clear that the ability of European powers, individually or collectively, to project decisive force into regions of conflict beyond the continent was negligible. Europeans could provide peacekeeping forces in the Balkans — indeed; they could and eventually did provide the vast bulk of those forces in Bosnia and Kosovo. But they lacked the wherewithal to introduce and sustain a fighting force in potentially hostile territory, even in Europe. Under the best of circumstances, the European role was limited to filling out peacekeeping forces after the United States had, largely on its own, carried out the decisive phases of a military mission and stabilized the situation. As some Europeans put it, the real division of labor consisted of the United States “making the dinner” and the Europeans “doing the dishes.”Without some U.S. leadership in European defense forces, regional conflicts could easily go unchecked and bring new instability to Europe and Eurasia. If NATO were to dissolve, the EU Rapid Reaction Force (RRF) could become Europe’s sole defense force with little or no United States involvement.

**NATO k/ Regional Escalation**

**NATO fosters cooperation and checks regional escalation**

Gordon 2(Philip H., Senior Fellow for U.S. Foreign Policy Foreign,

The Brookings Institution, Summer of 2002, <http://www.brookings.edu/articles/2002/summer_globalgovernance_gordon.aspx>) LL

Yet to conclude that NATO no longer has an important role to play because it was not used for a mission for which it was not designed would be perverse and mistaken. The alliance remains the primary vehicle for keeping the United States engaged in European security affairs. Through its enlargement process, NATO is playing a critical part in unifying a continent that had been divided for almost 50 years. It brought peace to the Balkans, where it continues to deploy tens of thousands of troops, without whom the region could easily revert to the horrible conflicts of the 1990s. Through its Partnership for Peace, the alliance has reached out to and promoted military cooperation with partners in Central Asia, some of which made essential contributions to the campaign in Afghanistan. NATO also continues to promote military interoperability among the allies, so that they can cooperate militarily with each other even when NATO itself is not involved—as they did during the 1990-91 Gulf War and in parts of the operation in and around Afghanistan. As the international community considers ways to stabilize Afghanistan in the wake of the war, NATO planning and command-and-control capabilities may well prove the best option for maintaining a long-term, Western-led security force.

NATO k/ Warming

NATO is uniquely equipped to respond to crises caused by global warming

Rider 9 (Jonathan Rider, 5th August 2009 The Henry Jackson Society http://www.henryjacksonsociety.org/stories.asp?id=1232 TBC 6/22/10)

Secondly, as the environment begins to respond to climatic change and global warming, there will be a greater demand for aid relief. This element is closely related to the third modus operandi in which NATO will begin to play an increasingly important role in reconstruction and development. In the nineties NATO was instrumental in paving the way for a new approach to reconstruction in the Balkans, arguing for a synthesised rebuilding of infrastructure as well as security. It was recognised very early on that a military presence alone was insufficient to maintain peace and promote long-term stability. Today, in Afghanistan where civilian and NGO support is limited, a similar approach is being taken and NATO troops are providing a broad spectrum of services from military training to engineering though provincial reconstruction initiatives. Military personnel can operate in areas of greater risk where civilians would fear to tread or politicians would fear to put them. NATO is uniquely equipped and uniquely placed to carry out these tasks because it can draw on a depth of resources, both financial and physical that single state actors do not have at their disposal. Moreover, action is sanctioned and legitimised through universal international consensus, further strengthening existing bonds between alliance members.

NATO k/ Iran

NATO key to check Iran

Streich 10 (Michael Streich Apr 22, 2010 Adjunct Professor of History http://weuropeanhistory.suite101.com/article.cfm/natos-changing-role-in-a-global-society TBC 6/22/10)

NATO’s “Strategic Concept” is rooted in global considerations. NATO Secretary General Anders Rasmussen, speaking in Washington, DC on February 23, 2010, referred to a “new division at NATO headquarters to deal with new threats and challenges.” Speaking at Georgetown University the day before, Rasmussen spoke of “deepening our partnerships with countries from across the globe.” Rick Rozoff (Global Research, February 14, 2010), commenting on the ambitious global goals of NATO, writes that the alliance, “has a broad and expanding network of members and military partners throughout the world.” Any potential military conflict with Iran will most likely include a NATO role. What began as an alliance centered on European collective security, may prove to be the guarantee of European Union survival in the face of global military and economic threats such as the alleged nuclear ambitions of Iran.

NATO k/ Iran and Russia

Alliance key to solve Iran and Russia

Weisser 10 (Ulrich Weisser 6 – 7, 2010 Chief Policy Planning in the German MOD Institute for Strategic, Political, Security and Economic Consultancy Berlin, Germany TBC 6/22/10)

NATO urgently needs to establish a new consensus. Otherwise we will neither come to terms with common challenges like how to cope with the Iranian nuclear issue or with the urging question how to deal with Russia. Right now Europe is divided on this issue. Most East European states define their security mostly in terms of protection against Russia and many of them even want NATO to draw up specific plans for defense against Russia. This attitude is in direct conflict with Germany´s interest of entangling Russia in partnership rather than confronting it. NATO needs a new political strategy in order to master the challenges of tomorrow. Globalization is not only an economic phenomenon but is also relevant for the global challenges to our security. This development can only be mastered by a concept of international burden sharing, in which specific capabilities for crisis management are tied to regional responsibilities. Afghanistan is the best example. Henry Kissinger has rightly pointed out, that the country has powerful neighbors or near neighbors – Pakistan, India, China, Russia, Iran. Each one has substantial capabilities to defend interests against threats emerging in Afghanistan. But they all have chosen to stand more or less aloof. This leads to the conclusion that international organizations have to coordinate their strategies. Russia, China and the countries in Central Asia do coordinate their policies on energy and counter-terrorism in the Shanghai Organization for Cooperation. They see the drug industry as the most important problem not only for Afghanistan but also for the region as a whole. We are well advised to share this view.

NATO k/ Power Balancing

NATO is key to balance the rise of growing powers

Kupchan 9 (Charles A. October 22, 2009 Professor of International Affairs at Georgetown University and Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations Before the Foreign Relations Committee United States Senate First Session, 111th Congress http://www.cfr.org/publication/20507/nato\_a\_strategic\_concept\_for\_transatlantic\_security.html TBC 6/22/10)

Anchoring the West. During its first forty years, NATO’s main purpose was to integrate and defend the West. During the past twenty years, it has focused primarily on expanding the West and, following the attacks of September 11, contributing to the mission in Afghanistan. Looking forward, NATO’s defining purpose should be to anchor the West while simultaneously serving to coordinate its political and military engagement within and beyond the Euro-Atlantic area. It is essential to view NATO as much more than a military tool-kit: it is perhaps the primary institution responsible for preserving the coherence and effectiveness of the West as a political community. That function, back-stopped by transatlantic cooperation in a multiplicity of other forms, will grow increasingly important over time as global power shifts away from the Atlantic democracies, and western-dominated bodies such as the G-8 turn into far more diverse bodies such as the G-20.

NATO k/ Russian Conflict (1/1)

The Alliance is key to deter Russia

Perkovich 9 (George May 2009 George Perkovich is vice president for studies and director of the Nuclear Policy Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace http://www.icnnd.org/research/Perkovich\_Deterrence.pdf TBC 6/23/10)

The former Warsaw Pact and Soviet states now in NATO are more exposed to Russian coercion. Russia has conventional military superiority over these states which are located near it and Russia probably would be more willing to use hard power against them than it is against Western European states. NATO collectively has the military resources to deter and stymie potential Russian aggression against the new NATO states. The question, as discussed below, is under what circumstances NATO would have the political will to confront Russia on behalf of the new members. And would this resolve be greater or weaker in a world without nuclear weapons?

War with Russia kills us all

Engdahl 7 (F. William Engdahl 2-18-07 (has written on issues of energy, politics and economics for more than 30 years, beginning with the first oil shock in the early 1970s and contributed regularly to a number of publications, http://www.engdahl.oilgeopolitics.net/Geopolitics\_\_\_Eurasia/Putin/putin.htm TBC 6/23/10)

A new Armageddon is in the making. The unilateral military agenda of Washington has predictably provoked a major effort by Russia to defend herself. The prospects of a global nuclear conflagration, by miscalculation, increase by the day. At what point might an American President, God forbid, decide to order a pre-emptive full-scale nuclear attack on Russia to prevent Russia from rebuilding a state of mutual deterrence? The new Armageddon is not exactly the Armageddon which George Bush’s Christian fanatics pray for as they dream of their Rapture. It is an Armageddon in which Russia and the United States would irradiate the planet and, perhaps, end human civilization in the process.

NATO k/ Russian Conflict – EXT

Perception of NATO weakness kills Russian relations

Chivvis 9 (Christopher S. Chivvis Christopher S. Chivvis is a political scientist with the RAND Corporation Considerations on NATO’s Future Direction politique étrangère 4:2009 TBC 6/23/10)

It is not the task of the Strategic Concept to determine the precise extent towhich NATO should reassure its new members about Russia – that is, to outline specific military measures required. Nevertheless, the Strategic Concept must reaffirm the willingness to use the allies’ unsurpassed collective military might to maintain the territorial integrity of its members.Not doing so would be counter-productive to both the credibility of the Alliance and the effort to improve NATO-Russia relations. Without security, NATO’s newmembers will continually sow the seeds of discord over allied strategy toward Russia. Reassuring them is, therefore, a prerequisite for an effective reset of NATO-Russia relations, especially in the aftermath of the Russia-Georgia war.

Genuine consultation is key to solve Russian domestic development and its international cooperation

Blank 8 (Stephen J. Blank Feb. 8 Research Professor of National Security Affairs *Strategic Studies Institute* TOWARDS A NEW RUSSIA POLICY Pg. 80-81 TBC 6/22/10)

Until and unless those and other such differences among policymakers are overcome, no coherent Russian policy is possible, let alone imaginable. But overcoming our own internal divisions on these issues is only the beginning of wisdom. For any approach to Russia to succeed, it must not be merely a unilateral one, but rather one shared by and with our European allies on the basis of genuine consultation and consensus. And it must be attuned to both Russia’s domestic and its foreign policy behavior which are mutually reinforcing. Despite unity with the EU on Iran to date, it is by no means clear if the Transatlantic Alliance has achieved a truly significant recovery since the invasion of Iraq in 2003 which shattered both the Transatlantic Alliance and any hope of a unified European common foreign and security policy. Thus after having edited another volume in the seemingly endless series of publications 81 examining the troubled Transatlantic Alliance, Marcin Zaborowski concludes that, It is clear that the greater congruence of policies between both sides of the Atlantic was not followed by the convergence of principles and ideologies. Most importantly, the EU and the United States continue to have fundamentally different views on the role and importance of international institutions and agreements. The legacy of this disagreement is not just ideological, but it affects transatlantic cooperation in some specific policy fields, most prominent in the Middle East.250 These same observations may be invoked concerning Western policy toward Russia for even where assessments of Russian developments converge, policy recommendations and outcomes currently diverge. Even if there is a unified American position, if it is not coordinated with and implemented by our European allies and Japan in the Far East, it will fail to register with full force in Moscow whether it is about human rights, the frozen conflicts in the CIS, Central Asia, or energy. So beyond the reestablishment of our own internal policy coherence, there must be close coordination and a united course of action with our allies regarding an agenda of East-West negotiation. As Lynch writes, Transatlantic coordination is crucial for ensuring that Russia remains a positive player on the world stage, an inclusive player in its neighborhood, and a state led by the rule of law. Whether the agenda is thick or thin, internal developments cannot be divorced for long from external behavior. What happens inside Russia impacts on the nature of Russia as a partner for the EU and the US. At a time when Europe and America have less leverage over Russia’s domestic development than they had, transatlantic cooperation becomes all the more vital. In 82 this the EU and US should build on areas of overlap in their agendas, such as regional security questions in the Balkans and the Middle East, ensuring positive momentum in the former Soviet Union, and raising concerns with domestic developments in Russia.251 This also means that on occasion Washington will have to defer to the collective wisdom of its partners and even to China and Russia’s arguments. But it also means that the United States needs to stimulate NATO and the EU to do better than they have in coming up with coherent policies towards Russia as regards Ukraine, Moldova, the Caucasus, energy issues, Central Asia, and democratization; for today the prevailing trend is towards incoherence and disunity within both organizations on these agenda issues.252

NATO K/ Turkey Arming (1/1)

If Turkey’s confidence in NATO’s guarantees were shaken, it could easily nuclearize

TERTRAIS 8 (Bruno, Senior Research Fellow at the Fondation pour la recherche stratégique (FRS), DECEMBER “The Middle East’s Next Nuclear State” Strategic Insights, Center for Contemporary Conflict, December 6/20 http://www.nps.edu/Academics/centers/ccc/publications/OnlineJournal/2008/Dec/tertraisDec08.pdf) TBC

Like most Arab countries, Turkey has announced its intention to restart its civilian nuclear program. It already has a very significant nuclear infrastructure. Its main research center (Cekmece Nuclear Research and Training Center) has two modern (1986) pilot installations for conversion and fuel fabrication.[51] The involvement of several Turkish firms in the AQ Khan network indicates that there is industrial know-how in the country which could be of use to a uranium enrichment program. However, Ankara claims to be uninterested by enrichment.[52] The country operates two research reactors: a light-water 5 MWth reactor;[53] and a small Triga Mark- II unit, which is being converted to operated on LEU.[54] It also has a small waste treatment facility (Radioactive Waste Processing and Storage Facility). Scientists have made computer simulations of reprocessing with the Purex process.[55] Generally speaking, nuclear science and technology is very active in the country. Also, Turkey is one of the only States in the region to have started setting up the regulatory mechanisms needed for larger-scale nuclear programs, under the aegis of the Turkish Atomic Energy Commission (TAEK). Turkey is moderately worried about the Iranian nuclear program. It has generally good relations with its neighbor. It is covered by a formal nuclear guarantee, backed by a multilateral alliance, and has nuclear weapons on its territory (including for use by Turkish aircraft). However, Ankara may be losing its sense of confidence about NATO. At two occasions—1991 and 2003—its allies were perceived as hesitant to fulfill their security commitments. The new generation of Turkish officers do not trust NATO as much as the previous one.[56] In addition, political relations with the West have become more difficult because of Iraq, controversy about the 1915 events, and a European reluctance to give a clear perspective for entry into the European Union. Turkish public opinion has an extremely negative view of the United States.[57] (It is also opposed to the continued stationing of U.S. nuclear weapons.)[58] Ankara’s perception of the Western security guarantee will be a key for its future nuclear choices.[59] The military option would be an extreme one: a choice in that direction would require a deepening of the crisis in confidence with both the United States and Europe. Additionally, domestic power games may come into play: a nuclear program might be a way to consolidate the place of the military in the political decision-making process. Defiance vis-à-vis Iran is stronger in the so-called “kemalist” circles

Turkey’s nuclearization would make Europe a powder keg for nuclear war and terrorism

SOKOLSKI 7 (JUNE 14TH The Nonproliferation Policy Education Center, http://www.npec-web.org/Presentations/20070616-Sokolski-Talk-AixEnProvence-Conference.pdf 6/20) TBC

One country that might disagree with this view, though, is Turkey. It is trying to figure out how to live with a nuclear weapons armed neighbor, Iran; is disappointed by its inability to be fully integrated into the EU; and is toying with getting its own nuclear capabilities. Whether or not Turkey does choose to go its own way and acquire a nuclear weapons-option of its own will depend on several factors, including Ankara’s relations with Washington, Brussels, and Tehran. To a very significant degree, though, it also will depend on whether or not the EU Members States are serious about letting Turkey join the EU. The dimmer these prospects look, the greater is the likelihood of that Turkey will chose to hedge its political, economic, and security bets by seeking a nuclear weapons-option of its own. This poses a difficult choice for the EU. Many key members are opposed to letting Turkey join the EU. There are arguments to favor this position. Yet, if Turkey should conclude that its interests are best served by pursuing such a nuclear weapons-option, it is almost certain to fortify the conviction of Egypt, Algeria, and Saudi Arabia to do the same. This will result in the building up a nuclear powder keg on Europe’s doorstep and significantly increase the prospect for nuclear terrorism and war.

NATO K/ Middle East Peace

Six reasons that NATO is key to the middle east peace process

Negm 5 (Heba Negm was a Visiting Fellow with the NDCAcademic Research Branch within the framework of the NATO Mediterranean Dialogue Fellowship Programme. Research Paper No. 20 - June 2005 NATO and the Middle East Peace Process: Scenarios of Possibilities and Risks TBC)

As mentioned before, NATO is viewed as a viable way forward for putting an end to the Middle East conflict. But can NATO really offer a viable solution? And how can NATO, through its Mediterranean Dialogue, its outreach into the Istanbul Initiative (ICI), or perhaps at a later stage in a more direct sense, be instrumental in playing a role in this region? Although many advocates have begun to emphasise that NATO can play an important role in the Middle East conflict, it is crucial to investigate NATO’s reluctance to become involved in the Middle East peace process despite the presence of six important facts: – The first one is that a framework already exists that might allow NATO to play a role in this conflict, i.e. the Med Dialogue and the Istanbul Initiative (ICI), which states in Article (2) that “Progress towards a just, lasting, and comprehensive settlement of the Israeli- Palestinian conflict should remain a priority for the countries of the region and the international community as a whole, and for the success of the security and stability objectives of this initiative. Full and speedy implementation of the Quartet Road Map is a key element in international efforts to promote a two state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in which Israel and Palestine live side by side in peace and security. The roadmap is a vital element of international efforts to promote a comprehensive peace on all tracks, including the Syrian-Israeli and Lebanese-Israeli tracks.” – The second is that NATO has a good track record in peacekeeping missions and has played an important role in conflicts which are relatively similar to the one in the Middle East, i.e. the Balkans. – The third fact is that there is a firm indicator of growing support among top NATO officials, including Americans and Europeans, both at the formal and the informal level (Istanbul Initiative, Madrid ministerial conference, Munich conference, Vilnius meeting, etc). For instance, NATO defence ministers recently discussed this proposal informally. Similarly, a number of US senators and officials, including some on the National Security Council, are known to support this idea.2 NATO Secretary General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer himself has stated bluntly that “we should not shy away from starting to think about a potential role for NATO in supporting a Middle East peace agreement….. There is a logic to support a role for NATO in fostering security and stability in the Middle East.”3 – The fourth is the fact that NATO provides a unique natural divide between Europe that tends to be more sympathetic to the Palestinians and the US which is more sympathetic to Israel. – The fifth is the current unprecedented attention given by NATO to the Middle East region as a whole and the myriad of plans presented to “remodel” the region, ranging from the efforts to implement regional reforms to a Greater Middle East initiative. – The final one is the inescapable fact that this conflict not only inhibits a firm regional security structure but also poses - both directly and indirectly - security threats to NATO’s members. Based on the above-mentioned facts and after having conducted a number of interviews at NATO HQ in Brussels, it can be argued that, notwithstanding growing support for increased NATO involvement in the region, the Middle East peace process is not at the top of NATO’s agenda at the moment, given the risks involved, the acute division over this issue and insufficient political will on the part of Alliance members to reach a consensus. Nevertheless, it is quite useful to understand the ongoing debate surrounding this issue and the arguments put forward by the two groups concerned, those who support NATO’s involvement in the conflict and those who are against it.

NATO K/ Middle East Peace

NATO surrounding Iran is key to prevent regional arms race

Rozoff 10 (Rick Rozoff Global Research February 11, 2010 http://www.infowars.com/nato%E2%80%99s-role-in-the-military-encirclement-of-iran/ TBC 6/22/10)

NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen told an Al Arabiya correspondent that “NATO considers the Gulf region a continuation of the Euro Atlantic security area,” and in reference to Iran – which of course was not invited to the conference – “we all are seriously concerned about nuclear ambitions and about the nuclear domino-effect they could cause in a region that is pivotal for global stability and security.” [16] In recent weeks the United States announced the sale of land-based interceptor missiles to Bahrain, Kuwait, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates. It has supplied both Patriot Advanced Capability-3 and Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) missile systems to GCC states and has deployed sea-based Standard Missile-3 interceptors in the Gulf on Aegis class warships. In early February the deputy secretary general of NATO, Claudio Bisogniero, was in Qatar and, “Lauding the support extended by Qatar to Nato since the Istanbul Initiative in 2004,” said “Qatar has become an active participant in most deliberations held under the aegis of Nato….” [17] GCC states being integrated into international NATO operations are being recruited for the war in Afghanistan. A U.S. armed forces publication disclosed in late January that 125 security personnel from Bahrain were guarding “the headquarters for U.S. military operations in volatile Helmand province, where more than 10,000 Marines are stationed and more are on the way.” [18] The U.S. and NATO are launching the biggest and bloodiest battle of the more than eight-year war in Afghanistan in Helmand. Troops from the UAE have been serving under NATO command in Afghanistan for years. The Kuwait News Agency wrote on January 28 that the chairman of NATO’s Military Committee, Admiral Giampaolo Di Paola, said “the Alliance is in discussion with a Gulf state to deploy AWACS planes for reconnaissance mission[s] over Afghanistan in support of its ISAF mission and also for anti-piracy off Somalia.” In addition, Di Paola was quoted saying “The Alliance is close to closing the basic issue with one of the Gulf countries” and “We are looking forward to be in a position to follow on the temporary deployment that we have today in Oman with a more permanent long-term deployment.” [19] Oman directly overlooks Iran on the Strait of Hormuz. The true military powerhouse in the Gulf region, Saudi Arabia – armed to the teeth with advanced U.S. weapons – has been engaged in its first-ever war since last November. Riyadh has launched regular attacks with infantry, armor and warplanes in the north of neighboring Yemen against Houthi rebels. Hundreds of Yemeni civilians have been reported killed in the assaults, which rebel spokesmen claim have been accompanied by U.S. air strikes. [20] 200,000 civilians have been uprooted and displaced by fighting in the north since 2004. The Saudi government acknowledges over 500 military casualties, both dead and wounded. The population of northern Yemen is Shia in terms of religious conviction, and the Saudi offensive is not only fraught with the danger of being converted into a war with Iran once removed but in fact can serve as a rehearsal – and training – for the genuine article. In other countries bordering Iran, last July NATO Deputy Secretary General Claudio Bisogniero signed an agreement with the Iraqi Minister of Defense to train the nation’s security forces. The NATO website reported: “This agreement represents a milestone in the cooperation between the Republic of Iraq and NATO and demonstrates the Alliance’s strong commitment….The agreement will provide the legal basis for NATO to continue with its mission to assist the Government of the Republic of Iraq in developing further the capabilities of the Iraqi Security Forces.” [21] Last month NATO started recruiting ethnic Kurds for Iraq’s national security force in the north of the country near the Iranian border. On Iran’s western border, during meetings of NATO defense ministers in Turkey late last week Pentagon chief Robert Gates met with Chief of Turkish General Staff General Ilker Basbug and Gates said that he had “discussed, with General Basbug, Turkey’s role in the missile defense system and relations between our armies.” [22] Former NATO secretary general George Robertson, arguing that U.S. nuclear warheads should be kept in Germany, recently divulged that there are between 40 and 90 American nuclear weapons stored at Turkey’s Incirlik Air Base under NATO arrangements. To Iran’s northwest, Azerbaijan is increasingly being developed as a NATO outpost in the South Caucasus and the Caspian Sea Basin. Early this month “A working group of the Azerbaijani Defense Ministry and the United States European Command (USEUCOM) held a meeting in Stuttgart, Germany….The meeting [was] held within the framework of the Azerbaijan-US action plan for military cooperation” and lasted five days. [23] The country has been granted a NATO Individual Partnership Action Plan as have other former Soviet states like Georgia, Ukraine and lately Moldova. In January Azerbaijan hosted a planning conference for the NATO Regional Response 2010 military exercise. Last year “the Regional Response 2009 military training was held within the NATO’s Partnership for Peace (PfP) programme in April 2009 in Baku. “Commander of US Land Forces in Europe Carter Ham participated in the training.” [24] Azerbaijan has doubled its troop strength in Afghanistan and will train Afghan National Army personnel at its military schools. The nation’s Foreign Ministry recently announced that Azerbaijan is interested in joining the NATO Response Force along with Ukraine, regarding which the Alliance provides this description: “The NATO Response Force (NRF) is a highly ready and technologically advanced force made up of land, air, sea and special forces components that the Alliance can deploy quickly wherever needed. “It is capable of performing missions worldwide across the whole spectrum of operations….” [25] In late January a former Azeri presidential adviser, Vafa Guluzade, spoke at a seminar called NATO-Azerbaijan Cooperation: A Civilian View and said, “The territory and people of Azerbaijan are ideal for military cooperation with NATO. The country has a favourable geostrategic location….Azerbaijan has military aerodromes suitable for NATO bases.” [26] To Iran’s east, the U.S. and NATO will soon have over 150,000 troops, and according to a recent study 400 bases, in Afghanistan and both Western belligerents are coordinating military actions with Pakistan, the Alliance through the Trilateral Afghanistan-Pakistan-NATO Military Commission. The chain is being tightened around Iran from every direction and NATO is forging several of the key links.

NATO K/ Middle East Peace

NATO is key to Peace process resolution

Scowcroft and Brzezinski 8 (Brent Scowcroft and Zbigniew Brzezinski Friday, November 21, 2008 president of the Forum for International Policy and trustee and counselor at the Center for Strategic and International Studies http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/11/20/AR2008112003008.html TBC)

The major elements of an agreement are well known. A key element in any new initiative would be for the U.S. president to declare publicly what, in the view of this country, the basic parameters of a fair and enduring peace ought to be. These should contain four principal elements: 1967 borders, with minor, reciprocal and agreed-upon modifications; compensation in lieu of the right of return for Palestinian refugees; Jerusalem as real home to two capitals; and a nonmilitarized Palestinian state. Something more might be needed to deal with Israeli security concerns about turning over territory to a Palestinian government incapable of securing Israel against terrorist activity. That could be dealt with by deploying an international peacekeeping force, such as one from NATO, which could not only replace Israeli security but train Palestinian troops to become effective.

Now is an essential opportunity for NATO to gain a role in the middle east peace process

Mansour 10 (Yasmine Abou Mansour 10/06/2010 a member of the British Council’s Transatlantic Network 2020 http://www.esharp.eu/Web-specials/NATO-s-Middle-Eastern-promise TBC 6/22/10)

As the most powerful political and military alliance in history, bringing together 28 diverse nations, NATO clearly has the potential to contribute to the stability of the Middle East. Ongoing discussions on its new strategic concept – the most ambitious policy-shaping exercise in a decade – should result in a vision of NATO as a security actor in the region. But for now, many tough questions remain unanswered. Will NATO involve its partners in its approach to new security challenges? Will the alliance consolidate its involvement in Iraq through the establishment of a long-term partnership? Will NATO’s partnerships seek to include, in the foreseeable future, significant regional players such as Saudi Arabia, Oman, Lebanon, Syria or Libya? Will it develop a policy towards Iran? Last but not least, will the Israeli-Palestinian conflict remain absent from NATO’s agenda – thus undermining its potential future role in the Middle East peace process? NATO has the potential to significantly contribute to the security and stability of the Middle East. It should use the current window of opportunity offered by its new leadership and the elaboration of a new strategic concept to engage in a genuine dialogue with its Middle Eastern partners. The Middle East is seeking a clear picture of the alliance’s level of ambition and its ability to respond adequately to the multifaceted security concerns of this volatile region.

NATO solves the middle east peace process

Mozgovaya 8 (Natasha 22:04 08.12.08 http://www.haaretz.com/news/zbigniew-brzezinski-israel-s-push-for-iran-strike-may-hurt-u-s-ties-1.259081 TBC 6/22/10)

Brezinski also says the two sides should consider an international peacekeeping force led by NATO to assuage security concerns. "The possible involvement of NATO is not a question of war on terror, but ensuring that the Palestinian state is not a military threat, but at the same time stable and secure, and NATO presence could bring this double benefit," he said. "Perhaps a NATO presence [could] ensure a peace agreement, or maybe even an American presence along the Jordan River, to give the Israelis sense of geographical security."

\*Terror Scenario\*

**NATO K/ Terrorism (1/1)”**

NATO is the only institution that can solve existential threats from terrorism that can come immediately from anywhere

Robertson 3 (Speech by NATO Secretary General, Lord Robertson at the 9th Conference de Montreal May 6 http://www.nato.int/docu/speech/2003/s030506a.htm TBC 6/22/10

The scale of threats has also increased. Today terrorism is more international, more apocalyptic in its vision, and far more lethal. And despite the best efforts of our diplomats and counter-proliferation experts, the spread of bio-chemical and nuclear weapons is already a defining security challenge of this new century. If not addressed, it will put more fingers on more triggers. And because not all of these fingers will belong to rational leaders, traditional deterrents will not always deter. All this adds up to a guaranteed supply chain of instability. It adds up to a security environment in which threats can strike at anytime, without warning, from anywhere and using any means, from a box-cutter to a chemical weapon to a missile. In the months leading to Prague, NATO’s 19 member countries demonstrated that they understood the nature of this challenge and were united in a common response to it. What this has meant in practice for the Alliance can be summarised under three headings: new roles, new relationships and new capabilities. NATO is worth retaining only if it is relevant. It evolved successfully in the 1990s to engage former adversaries across the old Soviet bloc and then to deal with instability and ethnic cleansing in the Balkans. Now NATO is radically changing again to play important new roles in the fight against terrorism and weapons of mass destruction. It already provides the common glue of military interoperability without which multinational operations of any kind would be impossible. Canada’s Joint Task Force 2 and Princess Patricia’s Canadian Light Infantry were able to operate effectively against the Taliban and Al Qaida in Afghanistan only because of decades of cooperation in NATO. After 9/11, NATO also played a supporting role in actions against Al Qaida. Most importantly, however, NATO at Prague became the focal point for planning the military contribution against terrorism, a major new role and one which no other organisation in the world could play. In doing so, we have put an end to decades of arid theological debate about whether the Alliance could operate outside Europe. NATO now has a mandate to deal with threats from wherever they may come.

**Terrorism leads to extinction**

Alexander 3 (Yonah professor and director of the Inter-University for Terrorism Studies in Israel and the United States, The Washington Times, Aug 25,  http://www.washingtontimes.com/commentary/20030827-084256-8999r.htm) LL

 Last week's brutal suicide bombings in Baghdad and Jerusalem have once again illustrated dramatically that the international community failed, thus far at least, to understand the magnitude and implications of the terrorist threats to the very survival of civilization itself. Even the United States and Israel have for decades tended to regard terrorism as a mere tactical nuisance or irritant rather than a critical strategic challenge to their national security concerns. It is not surprising, therefore, that on September 11, 2001, Americans were stunned by the unprecedented tragedy of 19 al Qaeda terrorists striking a devastating blow at the center of the nation's commercial and military powers. Likewise, Israel and its citizens, despite the collapse of the Oslo Agreements of 1993 and numerous acts of terrorism triggered by the second intifada that began almost three years ago, are still "shocked" by each suicide attack at a time of intensive diplomatic efforts to revive the moribund peace process through the now revoked cease-fire arrangements (hudna). Why are the United States and Israel, as well as scores of other countries affected by the universal nightmare of modern terrorism surprised by new terrorist "surprises"? There are many reasons, including misunderstanding of the manifold specific factors that contribute to terrorism's expansion, such as lack of a universal definition of terrorism, the religionization of politics, double standards of morality, weak punishment of terrorists, and the exploitation of the media by terrorist propaganda and psychological warfare. Unlike their historical counterparts, contemporary terrorists have introduced a new scale of violence in terms of conventional and unconventional threats and impact. The internationalization and brutalization of current and future terrorism make it clear we have entered an Age of Super Terrorism (e.g. biological, chemical, radiological, nuclear and cyber) with its serious implications concerning national, regional and global security concerns.

NATO K/ Terrorism

European allies are critical in the war on terror

Stull 5 (Alan, Lieutenant Colonel Alan M. Stull, UW Army War College, Mar 18, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ada431845&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf

) LL

As the United States fights the Global War on Terrorism (GWOT) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) wrestles with its post cold-war role, it is imperative that America stays deeply engaged in Europe. The United States must maintain relevance in Europe to continue cooperation with Europeans on security and economic policies. The United States has maintained its most influential position on the Continent through its ongoing NATO leadership. However, on 16 August 2004, President Bush announced significant troop reductions in both Europe and Asia as part of the major restructuring and restationing of U.S. forces. On the surface this does not conflict with the U.S. National Security Strategy (NSS) of September 2002, but as an overall U.S. position it may further divide the United States from its European allies, undermining NSS goals. The United States and Europe have always had a different view of the world. This view was muted during the Cold War when they were united against the USSR, but today with no common enemy the differences have come to the forefront. This divide can only deepen as the United States disengages from Europe. As their strategic visions diverge and the United States reduces its presence to just a few thousand forces spread among a handful of European countries, its influence may fade to the point where the United States is no longer a factor in European policymaking. Though not an immediate concern, it could easily become one over the next two decades as the United States concentrates on the GWOT and the European Union (EU) concentrates on strengthening its union politically, economically as well as militarily with ratification of its first constitution. A strong NATO will aid the United States in the GWOT, be the international force used to prevent regional conflicts within Europe’s influence and ensure the continued strong economic growth of Europe.

NATO K/ Terrorism

**Empirically, NATO has taken extreme measures to contain terrorism**

**United Nations 3** (July 29, http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:qVAz-6YKyfUJ:www.un.org/spanish/docs/comites/1373/nato\_contribution.doc+NATO+terrorism&cd=36&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us) LL

Since the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001, all 19 NATO Allies have shown a strong determination to play their part in the fight against terrorism. They have demonstrated political solidarity, made concrete military and other practical contributions, and engaged NATO's 27 EAPC Partner countries and 7 Mediterranean Dialogue countries. The successful removal of Afghanistan's Taliban regime, the effective campaign against the Al-Qaida terrorist network, and the generally improved security situation in Afghanistan, are all due in no small measure to this support. Continued success in the fight against terrorism will be possible only through a sustained, co-operative effort by the broader international community, in which NATO will continue to play an important role as a platform for political support and multinational military action. • Article 5: On 12 September 2001, less than 24 hours after the terrorist attacks, and for the first time in NATO's history, the Allies invoked Article 5 of the Washington Treaty declaring the attack against the United States as an attack against all 19 allies. Accordingly, each Ally committed itself to assisting the United States by taking such actions as each deemed necessary. • Initial Support: On 4 October 2001, in response to requests by the United States, the Allies agreed to take eight measures to expand the options available in the campaign against terrorism. These initial measures included enhanced intelligence sharing, blanket overflight rights and access to ports and airfields, assistance to states threatened as a result of their support for coalition efforts, as well as the deployment of NATO naval forces to the eastern Mediterranean and Airborne Early Warning aircraft to patrol US airspace. • "Active Endeavour": Under this continuing maritime operation, underway since 26 October 2001, elements of NATO's Standing Naval Forces patrol the eastern Mediterranean and monitor merchant shipping. To date, more than 25,000 ships have been monitored, and those that raised suspicion have been signalled, shadowed and documented. In February 2003, the NATO Allies decided to extend the operation to include the escort of civilian shipping through the Strait of Gibraltar and compliant boardings of suspicious vessels. • "Eagle Assist": From mid-October 2001 to mid-May 2002, NATO Airborne Warning and Control Systems aircraft (AWACS) helped protect the US homeland. 830 crewmembers from 13 NATO countries flew nearly 4300 hours and over 360 operational sorties. The operation was concluded by the North Atlantic Council on the basis of material improvements to the US air defence posture and enhanced cooperation between civil and military authorities, and following a US evaluation of homeland security requirements. • NATO's Partners: On 12 September 2001, all 27 of NATO's Partners in the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council condemned the attacks of 11 September, offered their support to the United States and "pledged to undertake all efforts to combat the scourge of terrorism". NATO continues to engage its EAPC Partners in its response to terrorism, and is working to enhance its dialogue with 7 southern Mediterranean nations. • NATO-Russia: 11 September and the common challenge of terrorism have led to a new quality in NATO-Russia cooperation. The NATO-Russia Council launched in May 2002 identifies terrorism as one of several areas for NATO-Russia consultation and practical cooperation, such as developing joint terrorist threat assessments and analysing proliferation risks and possible counter-measures. Important achievements include two high-level conferences on the role of the military in fighting terrorism, and a disaster response exercise with several Allies and Partners held in Noginsk, Russian Federation, in September 2002. • Balkan Terrorism: NATO member forces in the Balkans have acted against terrorist groups with links to the Al-Qaida network. They continue to contribute to the campaign against terrorism by focusing on the illegal movement of people, arms and drugs, and by working with the authorities throughout the region on border security issues.

NATO K/ Terrorism

US cannot overcome terrorism without NATO allies

Lugar 2 (Richard, senior senator from Indiana and is a member of the Foreign

Relations Committee and the Select Committee on Intelligence, *THE WASHINGTON QUARTERLY*, Summer 2002, http://www.twq.com/02summer/lugar.pdf) LL

To make a global CTR plan work, the United States will need the support of its allies. NATO should play the lead role in addressing the central security challenge of our time. The United States needs the Europeans—their political support; police; intelligence cooperation; economic assistance; and, not least of all, military might. Americans do not want to carry the burden of this war alone, nor should they. When the attack was on its homeland, the United States was prepared to respond immediately and do most of the work itself, but a broader campaign requires a bigger team. NATO must and will become an effective organization in the war on terrorism by addressing those countries directly involved and by isolating those who continue to proliferate WMD. Broadening NATO’s focus will require it to change significantly. The alliance has shown its capacity to adapt to new challenges, particularly when the United States offers leadership. In 1993, after the collapse of communism and the Soviet Union, I was among the first to call for the expansion of the organization. I often said that the task we faced was to reorganize the West to deal with the East. I used the phrase that NATO had to go “out of area or out of business” to capture this shift in alliance responsibility. Many on both sides of the Atlantic said it could not be done, but President Bill Clinton and European leaders set a new strategic direction for NATO. Today, Europe and NATO are stronger and better as a result. The time to take the next logical step is now. In a world in which terrorist attacks on our countries can be planned in Germany, financed in Asia, and carried out in the United States, old distinctions between “in” and “out of area” have become irrelevant. We have surpassed the old boundaries and other geographical distinctions that guided our thinking on NATO. If the United States and Europe—the most advanced Western democracies and the closest allies in the world—cannot organize ourselves to meet the new terrorist threat, we will have given the enemy a huge advantage. Those seeking to do us harm would like nothing more than to see the West divided over its own security. The tragic events of September 11 did bring the United States and Europe closer together, and our cooperation to win this war has been unprecedented. Many Europeans recognize that the threat is real and that Europe is a target. Although unpublicized for security reasons, European support in terms of police cooperation and intelligence sharing is unprecedented and has been essential to our progress. In the earliest stages of the fighting, more Europeans than Americans were on the ground in Afghanistan. As we move into the reconstruction stage, Europe has paid much of the bill for rebuilding the nation. Unfortunately, U.S. and European views diverge sharply on how to deal with Iraq and Iran. In part, Europeans are preoccupied with their efforts to come together within the EU in the midst of a recession. They worry about the United States going into unilateralist overdrive, citing Bush’s “axis of evil” comments in his State of the Union address as evidence. Some worry that the president went too far, but I would suggest that he did not go far enough. To continue the geometric metaphor, I believe we are facing a “vertex of evil”—an intersection of WMD and terrorism. The threat is greater and the response more sweeping than the debate surrounding the president’s phrase. The United States and our allies must prepare to keep the lines of terror away from nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, materials, and knowledge. We need partners for this effort, and there are no better candidates than our NATO allies.

NATO K/ Terrorism

NATO’s ability to manage multiple contingencies makes it indispensable in the war on terror

Feith 3 (Douglas, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, Committee on Armed Services, Mar 27, http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/congress/2003\_hr/feith1.pdf) LL

The Alliance has had to rethink its nature and role over the last dozen years or so, impelled most forcefully, first, by the end of the Cold War and then by the start of the global war on terrorism. The West’s victory in the Cold War, though largely to the credit of NATO, caused many people to question whether NATO had a continuing reason for being. The global war on terrorism, I believe, has rather clearly answered the question in the affirmative. The strategic essence of the war on terrorism is the danger to open societies posed by terrorist networks and their state sponsors around the globe. That danger is especially grave in light of the chemical, biological and nuclear weapons ambitions of leading state sponsors of terrorism. To counter that danger, the United States and our allies need an ability to manage multiple contingencies simultaneously in widely separated areas of the world. Success in dissuading, deterring and defeating our enemies in the war on terrorism requires strategies, capabilities and command structures that allow for flexibility and quick action. We need a set of diverse tools for the job. As for the military tools, we need rapidly usable, long-range and lethal strike capabilities in response to good intelligence about unexpected events. In the war on terrorism, it is useful for the United States to have allies. NATO has contributed valuably to the war effort. The September 11, 2001 attack on the United States resolved a debate within NATO as to whether regions beyond the North Atlantic arena are “out-of-area.” NATO member states now realize that responding to threats emanating from beyond Europe are part of NATO’s mission. The Alliance recently decided to support Germany and the Netherlands, for example, in their leadership in Afghanistan of the International Security Assistance Force – a mission that brings NATO well out of its traditional geographic domain. I consider “international community” a loose term because the world’s nations do not, alas, adhere in common to key philosophical principles. But NATO is accurately referred to as the Atlantic Community. The European and North American allies do, in fact, share a commitment to democracy and individual liberty. Furthermore, our economies are thoroughly intertwined. In bad times, the United States has stood with Europe. And, as demonstrated in the aftermath of 9-11, Europe has stood with the United States. We have our intra-community disagreements, as I’ll discuss further in my testimony, but the degree of harmony in the policies and interests of the NATO allies is rare among multinational organizations. The North Atlantic Treaty serves as a foundation for transatlantic military cooperation. Among its members, NATO promotes common defense policies, common military doctrine and integrated force postures. NATO’s success in military integration is found no where else in the world.

NATO K/ Terrorism

Unity fostered by NATO is key in the war on terror

Ellis 4 (Brent, , Norman Paterson School of International Affairs, Carleton University, *Journal of Military and Strategic Studies*, Fall 2004, Vol. 7, Issue 1 ©Centre for Military and Strategic Studies, http://www.jmss.org/jmss/index.php/jmss/article/viewFile/194/211) LL

NATO Contributions to the Campaign Against Terrorism: A Key Player

The nature of the campaign against terrorism itself facilitates a strong NATO role in that it puts a priority upon international cooperation in the realm of defence and security. If “organization, cooperation and coordination” are the keys to successfully dealing with terrorism NATO can provide all three.8 There are four main realms where NATO can make a significant contribution to the campaign: diplomacy, military, intelligence-sharing and defence cooperation, which suggests that NATO can make a significant contribution to a multi-dimensional campaign.

The Diplomatic Realm: A Forum for Discussion and Action

Strobe Talbot suggests that NATO’s “military and political functions have always been intertwined” and argues that “at its inception, NATO was about more than just banding together against a common enemy; it was also about creating, consolidating and expanding a zone of safety within which common values and cooperative institutions could prosper.”9 This fact opens room for a significant diplomatic role for NATO in fostering support for the campaign on terrorism which underpins the critical element of international cooperation - “NATO can contribute in a number of different ways. Its comparative advantage is centered on its military clout, but it is certainly not limited to it.”10 If maintaining coalition support and solidarity is a key element of the campaign against terrorism, then surely one role NATO can play is as a forum for the mobilization of such support and solidarity, especially noting the strong, shared values that unite the members of the alliance.

The role NATO can play in this area is highlighted by the invocation of article 5 of the Washington Treaty in the aftermath of the September 11 attacks. Gordon suggests that the “political solidarity” evoked by the NATO response to the attacks was highly significant even if the NATO allies were not very active in the military campaign in Afghanistan.11 Indeed NATO possesses assets beyond the North Atlantic Council in this diplomatic role. The Euro-Atlantic Partnership council is perhaps the just as important a forum as the NAC in that it includes a wider set of states including some, such as those in Central Asia, that are key to the war on terrorism. Indeed on September 12 the members of the “Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council” condemned the terrorist attacks on the US and “pledged to undertake all efforts to combat the scourge of terrorism.”12 The members of the EAPC have also signed a “Partnership Action Plan against Terrorism” which includes a variety of measures including commitments to sign the relevant UN conventions related to the campaign against terrorism, commitments to find ways of improving intelligence sharing and generally improve international cooperation in the campaign against terrorism. NATO also possesses key assets in the form of the Mediterranean Dialogue, an initiative developed in 1994 as a means of improving cooperation and political dialogue with countries in the Mediterranean region, and the NATO-Russia Council which was launched in May 2002.13

The importance of political solidarity in the campaign against terrorism is not just for its own sake; it underpins successful action in the military sphere. Discussing potential roles for the military in combating terrorism Lord Robertson has suggested that all potential roles have one thing in common: they require political support; “a broad base of support, political as well as practical.” He cites the experience of Afghanistan as an example: “The recent operations against Al-Quaida would not have been possible without the political and logistical support offered by a unique coalition – a coalition including Russia, many Central Asian countries, Pakistan and in the Gulf Region.”14 Thus, NATO contributions in the diplomatic realm facilitating international cooperation are interrelated with contributions in the military realm of the war on terror, the next subject to be discussed.

NATO K/ Terrorism

NATO effectively combats terrorism and ensures stability in areas of terrorist activity

Ellis 4 (Brent, , Norman Paterson School of International Affairs, Carleton University, *Journal of Military and Strategic Studies*, Fall 2004, Vol. 7, Issue 1 ©Centre for Military and Strategic Studies, http://www.jmss.org/jmss/index.php/jmss/article/viewFile/194/211) LL

The Military Dimension: NATO Operations or NATO Toolbox?

There are two primary roles NATO can play in terms of making a military contribution to the campaign against terrorism: NATO can take military action directly, conducting operations under the command and control of NATO itself, in the manner of the Kosovo campaign of 1999, or it can facilitate operations of “coalitions of the willing” by acting as a toolbox from which interoperable forces can be drawn in order to conduct military operations.15 There are also two types of military operations in which NATO military forces may make a contribution to the campaign against terrorism: the first is by conducting combat operations against terrorist groups or their supporters directly; the second is a military operation in the form of a peace support operation designed to ensure stability, either national or regional, in an area of terrorist activity. Based upon this analysis it is possible to categorize the possible NATO military contributions to the campaign against terrorism in a two by two matrix showing four possible types of military operations.16 Accordingly the American “Operation Enduring Freedom” can be categorized as a combat operation in a coalition of the willing operation facilitated by NATO,17 whereas the ISAF deployment is a PSO deployed under NATO command.18

While NATO has not yet conducted direct combat operations in a counterterrorism role within an operation under NATO command, NATO does seem to be putting the requisite pieces in place showing some potential to do so. NATO has developed a military concept for defence against terrorism and is currently developing an operational concept of operations to put it into effect. Critically the military concept against terrorism underlines the Alliance’s readiness to act against terrorist attacks or the threat of such attacks and to deploy forces “as and where required to carry out such missions.”19 As well NATO is developing the NATO Response Force (NRF), an elite force designed as a highly flexible, rapidly deployable, technologically advanced, elite force. This force is to be initially operationally capable by October 2004, is scheduled to reach its full operating capability by October 2006 and is reported to be well-suited to a counterterrorism role.20 If this is the case, NATO may have a sound option on the table for direct counterterrorism combat operations by 2006. Until then, one should not underestimate the significance of NATO’s role in conducting PSOs. Indeed, this is most likely the area where the United States needs more assistance,21 and an area of considerable NATO expertise where NATO can make a significant contribution to the campaign against terrorism.22

Terrorism Impacts

Terrorism will escalate into extinction

Morgan 9 (Dennis, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Yongin Campus - South Korea Futures, Volume 41, Issue 10, December 2009, Pages 683-693, World on Fire) LL

Moore points out what most terrorists obviously already know about the nuclear tensions between powerful countries. No doubt, they’ve figured out that the best way to escalate these tensions into nuclear war is to set off a nuclear exchange. As Moore points out, all that militant terrorists would have to do is get their hands on one small nuclear bomb and explode it on either Moscow or Israel. Because of the Russian “dead hand” system, “where regional nuclear commanders would be given full powers should Moscow be destroyed,” it is likely that any attack would be blamed on the United States” Israeli leaders and Zionist supporters have, likewise, stated for years that if Israel were to suffer a nuclear attack, whether from terrorists or a nation state, it would retaliate with the suicidal “Samson option” against all major Muslim cities in the Middle East. Furthermore, the Israeli Samson option would also include attacks on Russia and even “anti-Semitic” European cities In that case, of course, Russia would retaliate, and the U.S. would then retaliate against Russia. China would probably be involved as well, as thousands, if not tens of thousands, of nuclear warheads, many of them much more powerful than those used at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, would rain upon most of the major cities in the Northern Hemisphere. Afterwards, for years to come, massive radioactive clouds would drift throughout the Earth in the nuclear fallout, bringing death or else radiation disease that would be genetically transmitted to future generations in a nuclear winter that could last as long as a 100 years, taking a savage toll upon the environment and fragile ecosphere as well. And what many people fail to realize is what a precarious, hair-trigger basis the nuclear web rests on. Any accident, mistaken communication, false signal or “lone wolf’ act of sabotage or treason could, in a matter of a few minutes, unleash the use of nuclear weapons, and once a weapon is used, then the likelihood of a rapid escalation of nuclear attacks is quite high while the likelihood of a limited nuclear war is actually less probable since each country would act under the “use them or lose them” strategy and psychology; restraint by one power would be interpreted as a weakness by the other, which could be exploited as a window of opportunity to “win” the war. In other words, once Pandora's Box is opened, it will spread quickly, as it will be the signal for permission for anyone to use them. Moore compares swift nuclear escalation to a room full of people embarrassed to cough. Once one does, however, “everyone else feels free to do so. The bottom line is that as long as large nation states use internal and external war to keep their disparate factions glued together and to satisfy elites’ needs for power and plunder, these nations will attempt to obtain, keep, and inevitably use nuclear weapons. And as long as large nations oppress groups who seek self-determination, some of those groups will look for any means to fight their oppressors” In other words, as long as war and aggression are backed up by the implicit threat of nuclear arms, it is only a matter of time before the escalation of violent conflict leads to the actual use of nuclear weapons, and once even just one is used, it is very likely that many, if not all, will be used, leading to horrific scenarios of global death and the destruction of much of human civilization while condemning a mutant human remnant, if there is such a remnant, to a life of unimaginable misery and suffering in a nuclear winter.

Terrorism Impacts

Terrorism will go nuclear; it makes genocides, wars, oppression, and governmental domination inevitable

Sid-Ahmed 4 (Mohamed, political analyst, Managing Editor for Al-Ahali, Aug 26, http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2004/705/op5.htm) LL

A nuclear attack by terrorists will be much more critical than Hiroshima and Nagazaki, even if -- and this is far from certain – the weapons used are less harmful than those used then, Japan, at the time, with no knowledge of nuclear technology, had no choice but to capitulate. Today, the technology is a secret for nobody. So far, except for the two bombs dropped on Japan, nuclear weapons have been used only to threaten. Now we are at a stage where they can be detonated. This completely changes the rules of the game. We have reached a point where anticipatory measures can determine the course of events. Allegations of a terrorist connection can be used to justify anticipatory measures, including the invasion of a sovereign state like Iraq. As it turned out, these allegations, as well as the allegation that Saddam was harbouring WMD, proved to be unfounded. What would be the consequences of a nuclear attack by terrorists? Even if it fails, it would further exacerbate the negative features of the new and frightening world in which we are now living. Societies would close in on themselves, police measures would be stepped up at the expense of human rights, tensions between civilisations and religions would rise and ethnic conflicts would proliferate. It would also speed up the arms race and develop the awareness that a different type of world order is imperative if humankind is to survive. But the still more critical scenario is if the attack succeeds. This could lead to a third world war, from which no one will emerge victorious. Unlike a conventional war which ends when one side triumphs over another, this war will be without winners and losers. When nuclear pollution infects the whole planet, we will all be losers.

Terrorism Impacts

**Terrorism escalates into nuclear war**

Speice 6 (Patrick, JD Candidate @ College of William and Mary, February 2006, William & Mary Law Review, http://www.accessmylibrary.com/article-1G1-144666195/negligence-and-nuclear-nonproliferation.html) LL

Accordingly, there is a significant and ever-present risk that terrorists could acquire a nuclear device or fissile material from Russia as a result of the confluence of Russian economic decline and the end of stringent Soviet-era nuclear security measures. 39 Terrorist groups could acquire a nuclear weapon by a number of methods, including "steal[ing] one intact from the stockpile of a country possessing such weapons, or ... [being] sold or given one by [\*1438] such a country, or [buying or stealing] one from another subnational group that had obtained it in one of these ways." 40 Equally threatening, however, is the risk that terrorists will steal or purchase fissile material and construct a nuclear device on their own. Very little material is necessary to construct a highly destructive nuclear weapon. 41 Although nuclear devices are extraordinarily complex, the technical barriers to constructing a workable weapon are not significant. 42 Moreover, the sheer number of methods that could be used to deliver a nuclear device into the United States makes it incredibly likely that terrorists could successfully employ a nuclear weapon once it was built. 43 Accordingly, supply-side controls that are aimed at preventing terrorists from acquiring nuclear material in the first place are the most effective means of countering the risk of nuclear terrorism. 44 Moreover, the end of the Cold War eliminated the rationale for maintaining a large military-industrial complex in Russia, and the nuclear cities were closed. 45 This resulted in at least 35,000 nuclear scientists becoming unemployed in an economy that was collapsing. 46 Although the economy has stabilized somewhat, there [\*1439] are still at least 20,000 former scientists who are unemployed or underpaid and who are too young to retire, 47 raising the chilling prospect that these scientists will be tempted to sell their nuclear knowledge, or steal nuclear material to sell, to states or terrorist organizations with nuclear ambitions. 48 The potential consequences of the unchecked spread of nuclear knowledge and material to terrorist groups that seek to cause mass destruction in the United States are truly horrifying. A terrorist attack with a nuclear weapon would be devastating in terms of immediate human and economic losses. 49 Moreover, there would be immense political pressure in the United States to discover the perpetrators and retaliate with nuclear weapons, massively increasing the number of casualties and potentially triggering a full-scale nuclear conflict. 50 In addition to the threat posed by terrorists, leakage of nuclear knowledge and material from Russia will reduce the barriers that states with nuclear ambitions face and may trigger widespread proliferation of nuclear weapons. 51 This proliferation will increase the risk of nuclear attacks against the United States [\*1440] or its allies by hostile states, 52 as well as increase the likelihood that regional conflicts will draw in the United States and escalate to the use of nuclear weapons.

**Terrorism causes the U.S. to lash out, precipitating global war**

Schwartz-Morgan 1 Nicole Schwartz-Morgan, Assistant Professor of Politics and Economics at Royal Military College of Canada, 10/10/2001, “Wild Globalization and Terrorism,” http://www.wfs.org/mmmorgan.htm

The terrorist act can reactivate atavistic defense mechanisms which drive us to gather around clan chieftans. Nationalistic sentiment re-awakens, setting up an implacable frontier which divides "us" from "them," each group solidifying its cohesion in a rising hate/fear of the other group. (Remember Yugoslavia?) To be sure, the allies are trying for the moment to avoid the language of polarization, insisting that "this is not a war," that it is "not against Islam," "civilians will not be targeted." But the word "war" was pronounced, a word heavy with significance which forces the issue of partisanship. And it must be understood that the sentiment of partisanship, of belonging to the group, is one of the strongest of human emotions. Because the enemy has been named in the media (Islam), the situation has become emotionally volatile. Another spectacular attack, coming on top of an economic recession could easily radicalize the latent attitudes of the United States, and also of Europe, where racial prejudices are especially close to the surface and ask no more than a pretext to burst out. This is the Sarajevo syndrome: an isolated act of madness becomes the pretext for a war that is just as mad, made of ancestral rancor, measureless ambitions, and armies in search of a war. We should not be fooled by our expressions of good will and charity toward the innocent victims of this or other distant wars. It is our own comfortable circumstances which permit us these benevolent sentiments. If conditions change so that poverty and famine put the fear of starvation in our guts, the human beast will reappear. And if epidemic becomes a clear and present danger, fear will unleash hatred in the land of the free, flinging missiles indiscriminately toward any supposed havens of the unseen enemy. And on the other side, no matter how profoundly complex and differentiated Islamic nations and tribes may be, they will be forced to behave as one clan by those who see advantage in radicalizing the conflict, whether they be themselves merchants or terrorists.

Terrorism Turns Econ

Terrorism kills the global economy

Allison 8 (Graham, , director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government, is a former U.S. assistant secretary of defense, Mar 23, http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/publication/18230/nuclear\_attack\_a\_worstcase\_reality.html) LL

Homeland Security Undersecretary Charles Allen confirmed Mr. Tenet's view in his Senate testimony earlier this month. He told lawmakers: "Our post-9/11 successes against the Taliban in Afghanistan yielded volumes of information that completely changed our view of al Qaeda's nuclear program. We learned that al Qaeda wants a weapon to use, not a weapon to sustain and build a stockpile. ... A terrorist group needs only to produce a nuclear yield once to change history." Would a nuclear 9/11 be a game-changer? You bet. Consider the consequences of even a single nuclear bomb exploding in just one U.S. city. Researchers at the Rand Corp., a U.S. government-funded think tank, estimated that a nuclear explosion at the Port of Long Beach, Calif., would cause immediate indirect costs worldwide of more than $3 trillion and that shutting down U.S. ports would cut world trade by 10 percent. The negative economic repercussions would reverberate well beyond the developed world. As former U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan warned, "Were a nuclear terrorist attack to occur, it would cause not only widespread death and destruction, but would stagger the world economy and thrust tens of millions of people into dire poverty," creating "a second death toll throughout the developing world."

Academic studies prove terrorism hurts the economy

Abadie and Gardeazabal 7 (Alberto: professor of public policy @ Harvard, and Javier; Gareazabal: professor of economics @ the University of Baque Country, August 2007, http://ksghome.harvard.edu/~aabadie/twe.pdf) LL

It has been argued that terrorism should not have a large effect on economic activity, because terrorist attacks destroy only a small fraction of the stock of capital of a country (see, e.g., Becker and Murphy, 2001). In contrast, empirical estimates of the consequences of terrorism typically suggest large effects on economic outcomes (see, e.g., Abadie and Gardeazabal, 2003). The main theme of this article is that mobility of productive capital in an open economy may account for much of the difference between the direct and the equilibrium impact of terrorism. We use a simple economic model to show that terrorism may have a large impact on the allocation of productive capital across countries, even if it represents a small fraction of the overall economic risk. The model emphasizes that, in addition to increasing uncertainty, terrorism reduces the expected return to investment. As a result, changes in the intensity of terrorism may cause large movements of capital across countries if the world economy is sufficiently open, so international investors are able to diversify other types of country risks. Using a unique dataset on terrorism and other country risks, we find that, in accordance with the predictions of the model, higher levels of terrorist risks are associated with lower levels of net foreign direct investment positions, even after controlling for other types of country risks. On average, a standard deviation increase in the terrorist risk is associated with a fall in the net foreign direct investment position of about 5 percent of GDP. The magnitude of the estimated effect is large, which suggests that the “open-economy channel" impact of terrorism may be substantial.

This paper analyzes the effects of terrorism in an integrated world economy. From an economic standpoint, terrorism has been described to have four main effects (see, e.g., US Congress, Joint Economic Committee, 2002). First, the capital stock (human and physical) of a country is reduced as a result of terrorist attacks. Second, the terrorist threat induces higher levels of uncertainty. Third, terrorism promotes increases in counter-terrorism expenditures, drawing resources from productive sectors for use in security. Fourth, terrorism is known to affect negatively specific industries such as tourism.1 However, this classification does not include the potential effects of increased terrorist threats in an open economy. In this article, we use a stylized macroeconomic model of the world economy and inter- national data on terrorism and the stock of foreign direct investment (FDI) assets and liabilities to study the economic effects of terrorism in an integrated world economy

\*Say Yes\*

Say Yes – Military Presence

Say yes – Europe is worried about American overstretch

De Nevers 7 (renee de nevers, 2007, International Security, Nato’s international security role in the terrorist era, pg. 59-60 TBC 6/21/10)

NATO’s members also differ on the means to respond to threats confronting the alliance. This was most apparent in the bitter dispute over the 2003 U.S. invasion of Iraq. The dispute illustrated three points of disagreement. First, it rejected different understandings of the nature of the terrorist threat and how to combat it. Second, it exposed deep differences about the appropriate use of force, and in particular about the U.S. policy of preventive war. Whereas the United States insisted that the urgency of the threat posed by Saddam Hussein’s supposed possession of WMD mandated immediate action, several European allies argued that Hussein was contained and could be deterred. Third, the dispute illustrated increasing European concern about U.S. unilateralism and the fear that NATO’s European members might be “entrapped” by their alliance commitments to support a reckless military operation. 92 As a result, both France and Germany balked at supporting the United States.93 Although the Bush administration sought to repair relations with key European allies and institutions after the 2004 presidential elections, the acrimony caused by this dispute has left a residue of ill will. The shifting alignments and attitudes toward threats confronting NATO have reduced the United States’ willingness to accept alliance constraints.94 Moreover, the United States’ strategic focus has changed, with greater attention being given to the Middle East, Central Asia, and East Asia. This is evident both in the changing base deployments in Europe and the State Department’s decision to shift at least 100 diplomatic positions from Europe to other regions, including Africa, South Asia, East Asia, and the Middle East.95 This move is a logical step and if anything overdue, given the end of the Cold War, but it is telling of shifts in U.S. policy priorities.

Say yes – removing forward deployed forces allows the US to transfer forces to NATO missions

Shimkus 6 JOHN SHIMKUS (UNITED STATES) RAPPORTEUR NATO parliamentary assembly CHANGES IN US FORWARD DEPLOYMENT AND ITS EFFECTS ON EUROPE http://www.nato-pa.int/default.asp?SHORTCUT=999 TBC 6/21/10)

47. What should be clear from this report, however, are the needs and intentions of the United States as it undertakes this reorganization of its global military presence. The United States is adjusting many aspects of its military to improve its ability to respond to crises around the world. In many ways it is a process that parallels one being implemented to varying degrees by other NATO members as they adjust their militaries to the current global security environment. Across the Alliance members are taking steps to make their forces more flexible and deployable. For most members of the Alliance, much of that adjustment involves changing the type and amount of equipment they purchase. However, for the United States, a large part of that adjustment involves altering how and where it stations its military personnel outside of the United States. This should not be interpreted as a lessening of the American commitment to its European allies. If anything it should be seen as a facet of its enduring commitment to the Alliance. By reshaping how and where it stations its military forces, the United States will be able to play an even more substantial role in the range of missions NATO is likely to face in the coming decades.

Say Yes – Military Presence

Say yes – NATO recognizes that the Cold War has ended and forward deployment isn’t useful

Shimkus 6 JOHN SHIMKUS (UNITED STATES) RAPPORTEUR NATO parliamentary assembly CHANGES IN US FORWARD DEPLOYMENT AND ITS EFFECTS ON EUROPE http://www.nato-pa.int/default.asp?SHORTCUT=999 TBC 6/21/10)

8. Those forces were primarily designed to fight in place or close to their base. Troops in South Korea, for example, were there to deter aggression from North Korea and would have been the first in combat should North Korea have resumed hostilities with the South. US forces in Germany were oriented towards blunting a Warsaw Pact drive across Western Europe and were trained and equipped to fight in place or close to their home base. 9. Their presence was also a political guarantee of the United States' commitment to the defence of its allies in Europe and Asia. An attack on Germany or South Korea would have immediately engaged American troops, automatically ensuring that the full weight of the US military would be brought to bear against the aggressor. Thus, the presence of US military forces in those locations was an important part of maintaining international stability during the Cold War. 10. The end of the Cold War and the end of conventional military threats to the United States' Western European allies meant that the need for such large standing forces, designed to fight in place, was eliminated. As a consequence, the United States dramatically reduced its numbers of military personnel stationed abroad. Nearly 300,000 military personnel were returned to the United States, and the active duty military shrank to 1.4 million, about half of its size in 1990. 11. Yet, while the remaining overseas personnel in Europe no longer had to be prepared to fight a conventional war close to their base, they were increasingly called upon to participate in missions far from their bases in Germany or elsewhere in Europe. Increasingly they were called upon to undertake missions in the Balkans, and even further a field in the Persian Gulf region. Although bases in Europe are geographically closer to that region than the United States, heavy forces forward-deployed in Europe are not necessarily optimally deployed for operations in the Persian Gulf or regions even further east. Virtually all heavy military equipment must be transported by ship to those locations and the circuitous route from Germany through the North Sea, the Atlantic Ocean and around through the Mediterranean is not necessarily faster than sending forces from the eastern seaboard of the United States. Therefore, the US Department of Defense has concluded that most heavy forces should be based in the United States.

Say Yes – Turkish Nukes

NATO wants consultation on any removal of European Nukes – they’ll say yes

Burns 10 (Robert AP National Security Writer 14 Mar 2010 6/20 http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2010/03/15/us\_cautious\_on\_removing\_nuclear\_arms\_from\_europe/ TBC)

The U.S. government as a matter of policy will not confirm the location of U.S. nuclear weapons, but it is well known that the sites in Europe are in Belgium, the Netherlands, Germany, Italy and Turkey. The U.S. has had nuclear arms in Europe since the 1950s. Hans M. Kristensen, director of the Nuclear Information Project at the Federation of American Scientists, which advocates nuclear arms control, believes the administration is inclined to remove the nuclear weapons from Europe but wants to take a cautious approach. "The Obama administration came in with a strong pledge to mend ties with the allies, and so the last thing it wants to be seen to do is to make a decision over the heads of the allies," he said in an interview Sunday. "The U.S. would move these weapons tomorrow if this were just its own decision." One apparent impediment to an early withdrawal of the weapons is the view of newer members of NATO — those closer to Russia, such as the Baltic states. They see the U.S. weapons as an important symbol of a NATO guarantee of their territorial integrity. Older NATO members see it differently. Five of them — Belgium, Germany, the Netherlands, Luxembourg and Norway — in February called for consultations on the question of a U.S. nuclear withdrawal, and NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen said this month that "a hot issue like our nuclear posture" will be on the agenda, beginning at the April foreign ministers meeting. The consultations are likely to last for months, possibly into 2011. Parliament members from several European NATO countries are circulating a letter to be sent to Obama stating that the elimination of short-range nuclear weapons in Europe is an urgent matter and should be addressed once the U.S. and Russia complete their START treaty. "It is the sincere wish of the majority of people in Europe that tactical nuclear weapons are withdrawn from Europe and eliminated," the letter says, according to a copy published by the Global Security Institute, an international group that advocates nuclear disarmament.

There is a deep tradition of cooperation and consultation over NATO nukes and they’ll say yes

Larsen 6 (The Future of U.S. Non-Strategic Nuclear Weapons and Implications for NATO Drifting Toward the Foreseeable Future Jeffrey A. Larsen, Ph.D. 31 October 2006 Pg. 78-9 TBC)

Tactical nuclear weapons have served the Alliance well since their introduction in the early 1950s. Their credibility was based on solidarity, widespread participation, and proven capabilities. They have allowed NATO to meet its military requirements at less cost and greater likelihood of success; they have provided reassurance to European allies of American commitment to their defense; they have provided that essential “Atlantic link” between North America and Europe; and they have provided a venue for cooperation and cohesion through the Nuclear Planning Group and nuclear mission sharing through programs of cooperation and dual-key arrangements. As Martin Smith has written, the legacy of the Cold War years to NATO was… the permanent and institutionalized framework for multilateral consultations amongst NATO members on issues relating to prospective use policy, modernization programs, and arms control decisions.173 In general, however, Europeans and Americans see the world through different lenses. The United States has a global perspective, and often sees solutions that emphasize military means. Europeans, on the other hand, see alternatives in more diplomatic ways, including the use of treaties, agreements, and multilateral approaches. Regardless of one’s starting perspective, however, all agree that today the rationales offered above for nonstrategic weapons are fading in a post-Cold War world. The proximate threat that justified these weapons in the first place has disappeared (at least for the time being); many of the member states are weary of the burdens of defense in general, and nuclear matters in particular; and in some ways the European members seem to be shifting politically away from the United States on foreign policy matters. This is especially important with regard to the major partner states. As a study on European nuclear roles recently concluded, “The trend seems clear: nuclear burden-sharing in NATO, in as far as host country nuclear strike missions are concerned, is on a slow but steady decline toward ending altogether. The only question seems to be when and whether it will be constrained defense budgets and force structure reorganization or a political decision that will end it.”174

Say Yes – Turkish Nukes

Say Yes – NATO loves disarm

Dutch Press Agency 10 (Feb 26, 2010 Five NATO members call for review of NATO nuclear policy http://www.monstersandcritics.com/news/europe/news/article\_1536986.php/Five-NATO-members-call-for-review-of-NATO-nuclear-p TBC 6/21/10)

Five members of NATO, including Germany and Norway, Friday called for a review of the defence alliance's nuclear policy at an upcoming summit in April. The proposal was expressed in a joint letter to NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen released by the Norwegian Foreign Ministry. The foreign ministers of Germany, Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and Norway said they welcomed US President Barack Obama's initiatives 'to strive towards substantial reductions in strategic armaments, and to move towards reducing the role of nuclear weapons.' NATO 'should discuss what we can do to move closer to this overall objective,' the five foreign ministers said. The April summit in the Estonian capital Tallinn offered a chance for a 'comprehensive discussion,' the five said, noting that it was to be followed by a conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Norwegian Foreign Minister Jonas Gahr Store said the letter 'was in line with the government's disarmament strategy.'

Europe loves the plan, but wants consultation

AFP 10 (Feb. 19 http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\_20100219\_2293.php TBC 6/21/10)

NATO members Belgium, Germany, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and Norway are expected to make the request "in the coming weeks" that "nuclear arms on European soil belonging to other NATO member states are removed," according to a spokesman for Belgian Prime Minister Yves Leterme. "It's a question of launching the debate at the heart of NATO," Dominique Dehaene said. Belgium, Germany and the Netherlands are believed to hold some of the roughly 200 U.S. tactical nuclear weapons that remain in Europe, though most are estimated to be in Italy and Turkey. At the height of tensions with the then-Soviet Union, the United States reportedly fielded thousands of such armaments on the continent. The request would not address the nuclear arsenals of France and the United Kingdom, AFP reported. "Belgium is in favor of a world without nuclear weapons and advocates this position at the heart of NATO," ahead of the May review conference for the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, Leterme said in a prepared statement (Agence France-Presse I/Spacewar.com, Feb. 19). The former head of NATO joined three other Belgian statesmen today in similarly calling for the withdrawal of the European-based U.S. deterrent, according to AFP. "The Cold War is over. It's time to adapt our nuclear policy to the new circumstances," according to a statement signed by former NATO chief Willy Claes, former Belgian Prime Ministers Jean-Luc Dehaene and Guy Verhofstadt and former Foreign Minister Louis Michel. "The U.S. tactical nuclear weapons in Europe have lost all military importance," adds the statement, which was published in a number of Belgian newspapers. "We call on our (Belgian) government to follow the example of the German government and to call in NATO for a rapid withdrawal of the nuclear arms," the authors wrote (see GSN, Oct. 30, 2009). Present NATO chief Anders Fogh Rasmussen has cautioned any nation against rushing to divest itself of the U.S. weapons, AFP reported. "I hope that any step will take place in the alliance in a multilateral framework and that no unilateral step be taken," Rasmussen said last fall. "This is a question which concerns all allies. It's a question of overall security and defense"

Say Yes – Afghanistan

NATO empirically defer to American policy on Afghanistan

ERLANGER 9 (STEVEN, New York Times, August 4 http://www.nytimes.com/2009/08/05/world/05nato.html TBC 6/21/10)

NATO approved a reorganization of its command structure in Afghanistan on Tuesday to better coordinate the war there against Al Qaeda and the Taliban. The Obama administration, which has moved to sharply increase the American military presence in Afghanistan, wanted the change to improve command efficiency over the NATO forces there, known as the International Security Assistance Force. NATO agreed to establish a new Intermediate Joint Headquarters in Kabul under an American, Lt. Gen. David M. Rodriguez, to manage the day-to-day war. General Rodriguez will continue to report to the top American military commander in Afghanistan, Gen. Stanley A. McChrystal. The decision was made at the first meeting of the North Atlantic Council, NATO’s governing body, presided over by NATO’s new secretary general, Anders Fogh Rasmussen, the former Danish prime minister who started work on Monday.

Say yes – European countries don’t believe in the mission

AP 9 (April 4th, http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2009/04/04/world/main4918872.shtml TBC 6/21/10)

NATO's ability to succeed in Afghanistan is seen as a crucial test of the power and relevance of the alliance founded to counterbalance the Soviet Union and now fighting a rising insurgency far beyond its borders. European leaders and voters remain deeply skeptical about whether more troops can stabilize a country devastated by decades of war.

Say yes – European publics dislike the war

DeYoung 10 (Karen Washington Post Staff Writer Tuesday, January 26, 2010 http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/01/25/AR2010012503761.html TBC 6/21/10)

The administration is looking to the one-day conference for policy commitments in support of Obama's new strategy -- including his deployment of more than 30,000 additional U.S. troops -- from governments whose backing has often been tentative in the face of widespread opposition from their publics. Although several other nations, including Britain, have promised to send more forces, early commitments of up to 7,000 troops include some who had been previously scheduled to be rotated into Afghanistan. Both Germany and France have resisted calls to send more troops, and Canada and the Netherlands have set dates for the withdrawal of their combat forces.

NATO already plans to exit Afghanistan

BBC 10 (April 23, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south\_asia/8639029.stm) LL

Nato is preparing to hand control of parts of Afghanistan to the Afghan people this year, Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen has said. Nato foreign ministers, and their partners in the international coalition in Afghanistan, have been meeting in the Estonian capital Tallinn. They endorsed a plan to gradually transfer security and governance powers to Afghan authorities. The US and Nato have 126,000 troops there, rising to 150,000 by August. US President Barack Obama has said that the US aims to begin pulling troops out of Afghanistan in 2011. But at the heart of Nato's strategy is creating the right conditions to allow the Afghan government to take full control. "As of today, we have a road map which will lead towards transition to Afghan lead [control], starting this year," Mr Rasmussen said. "We agreed the approach we will take to transition. We set out a process, the conditions that will have to be met, and what we will do to make those conditions happen." Mr Rasmussen said that the transition must not only be "sustainable but irreversible".

Say Yes – Afghanistan

NATO seeks to lessen control over Afghanistan

Nagara 10 (Bunn, Centre for Research on Globalization, April 25, http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=18853) LL

TWO days ago, Nato came to an inevitable conclusion: start handing control of Afghanistan back to the Afghan people later this year. That was the thrust of the Nato meeting in Tallinn, Estonia, during the week. The eventual pullout might not have been part of the original plan when US forces invaded and ejected the Taliban regime in 2001. After all, Afghans live in a strategic region with layers of intrigue overlaid with oil pipelines in or around Central Asia, the Caspian, and certain transnational corporations running through some nations while bypassing others. Oil as a geopolitical factor has been as influential as it has been invisible, and the Bush administration that invaded Iraq and Afghanistan has been the most informed by oil interests yet. Besides, like Saddam Hussein’s Iraq, Taliban Afghanistan had posed as such a convenient and tempting target when they refused to “cooperate” quietly. Nonetheless, a projected winding down of US-led occupation forces later this year accords with US President Barack Obama’s plan to withdraw US troops from July 2011. Officially, this would first need to be approved by the Afghan government this July. However, the proposed schedules are still very tentative when seen from either the Nato or the US standpoint. Realities on the ground indicate that various militant groups in Afghanistan or in neighbouring Pakistan are regrouping, and raring to “test” local government strength once the occupying forces withdraw. Equally, the presence of foreign forces does not discourage militant attacks on them or on local villagers in the way. The status of foreign troops as occupiers only affirms their role as legitimate targets, for nationalistic, religious, local political or some self-interested purposes. Then when the occupation forces retaliate against suspected insurgent hideouts, innocent bystanders often get maimed or killed as well. Militant groups and local communities have different reasons for ridding their country of foreign occupiers, that being a hallmark of Afghan history.

Poland is leveraging for US-NATO withdrawal from Afghanistan

The Armchair Generalist 10 (June 15, http://armchairgeneralist.typepad.com/my\_weblog /2010/06/poland -presses-for-nato-withdrawal-from-afghanistan-1.html) LL

Matt Yglesias notes the [Polish prime minister's call to withdraw NATO forces from Afghanistan and says that it's telling](http://yglesias.thinkprogress.org/2010/06/polish-pm-pressing-for-end-to-afghanistan-mission/). From the Reuters article: Poland has 2,600 soldiers in Afghanistan as part of a U.S.-led NATO mission that is about to peak at 150,000. Public support for the deployment has eroded because of the deaths of Polish soldiers and a resurgence of the Taliban. “Poland will push its NATO allies at a meeting in Lisbon to jointly come up with a relatively quick and precise plan for ending this intervention (in Afghanistan),” said Tusk. “Poland is not in a position to break NATO solidarity … but we are sufficiently involved in Afghanistan to take advantage of the right to discuss ending this mission as soon as possible,” he said.

**Poland is pushing for US-NATO withdrawal from Afghanistan**

Borowski 10 (Chris, Reuters, June 12, http://af.reuters.com/article/worldNews/idAFLDE65B0DU20100612) LL

WARSAW (Reuters) - Poland will press its NATO allies to draw up plans to end their mission in Afghanistan as soon as possible, Prime Minister Donald Tusk said on Saturday after the country's seventeenth soldier died there. Poland has 2,600 soldiers in Afghanistan as part of a U.S.-led NATO mission that is about to peak at 150,000. Public support for the deployment has eroded because of the deaths of Polish soldiers and a resurgence of the Taliban. "Poland will push its NATO allies at a meeting in Lisbon to jointly come up with a relatively quick and precise plan for ending this intervention (in Afghanistan)," said Tusk. "Poland is not in a position to break NATO solidarity ... but we are sufficiently involved in Afghanistan to take advantage of the right to discuss ending this mission as soon as possible," he said. NATO's next summit will take place in Lisbon in November. Poland's defence ministry said earlier on Saturday that one soldier died and eight others were wounded when a roadside bomb exploded near their armoured vehicle 12 km from their base in Ghazni, in southwestern Afghanistan. Acting President Bronislaw Komorowski, a party ally of Tusk who is favoured to win a June 20 presidential election, said he had discussed the plans to push for an end to the Afghanistan mission with Tusk before the latest death on Saturday morning. U.S. President Barack Obama announced in December that he would send 30,000 additional troops to Afghanistan, but also set a goal of starting a gradual withdrawal in July 2011.

Say Yes – Afghanistan

**US troops have been pulling out without NATO objection**

International Business Times 10 (April 14, http://www.ibtimes.com/articles/19663/20100414/nato-troops-withdraw-from-remote-eastern-afghanistan-valleys.htm) LL

U.S. General Stanley McChrystal last year said he would take a hard look at the valley as part of a strategy review to ensure his troops were focused on securing key population centres rather than remote areas where insurgents hide out. "The question in the Korengal is: How many of those fighters, if left alone, would ever come out of there to fight?" McChrystal told the Washington Post at the time. "I can't answer it. But I do sense that you create a lot of opposition through operations." U.S. commanders had been debating whether to increase U.S. forces in the valley to root out the insurgents, keep forces level or leave the area, the Post had reported. In a statement on Wednesday, NATO forces said troops had begun leaving the Korengal valley in March but they could still respond to crises in the area if needed. "The area was once very operationally important, but appropriate to the new strategy, we are focusing our efforts on population centres," U.S. Army Colonel Randy George said in the statement. U.S. forces have been pulling out of other remote outposts in eastern [Afghanistan](http://www.ibtimes.com/topics/detail/231/afghanistan/), where troops trying to control passes used by Taliban fighters have suffered heavy casualties at the hands of insurgents more familiar with the treacherous terrain.

**NATO intends to initiate a gradual withdraw process in the status quo**

Burlinova 10 (Natalya, Afghanista.ru, May 17, http://en.afghanistan.ru/doc/182.html) LL

The April meeting of the NATO foreign Ministers in the Estonian capital has reconfirmed that the alliance is determined to pursue a policy of Afghanization of the country’s security, the gradual handing over of the responsibility for guaranteeing security to the Afghan army, police and special services. This will be done gradually. The possibility of handing over responsibility in each province will be decided individually. To this end, International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan will focus on training Afghan national security forces, army and police, which will ultimately take the responsibility for security in the country into their hands. However, handing over the responsibility to Afghans doesn’t mean that NATO will leave Afghanistan immediately, although the alliance, according to its Secretary General, has no plans to stay in the country forever. Really, NATO has no alternative either in short-term or long-term perspective. None of the international or regional organizations is ready to assume a key role since they have no greater functional and military potential than NATO. However, logically, the alliance will have to leave Afghanistan sooner or later. NATO Secretary General, for one, refuses to fix a date when this will happen and insists that in this case, much depend on the developments rather than a timetable. NATO will leave the country when it is hundred percent sure that the Afghan army and the police are ready to maintain law and order in the country.

Say Yes – Afghanistan

Afghan war is badly perceived by NATO countries and NATO admits that the war is not America’s responsibility

Cowell 9 (Alan, The New York Times, December 2, http://www.nytimes.com/2009/12/03/world/03reax.html?\_r=1) LL

PARIS — As political and military leaders across the globe pondered [President Obama](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/o/barack_obama/index.html?inline=nyt-per)’s announcement of his Afghan strategy, European allies offered a mixed response on Wednesday, with some of the biggest contributors to the [NATO](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/n/north_atlantic_treaty_organization/index.html?inline=nyt-org) coalition withholding promises of immediate troop reinforcements. The NATO secretary general, [Anders Fogh Rasmussen](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/r/anders_fogh_rasmussen/index.html?inline=nyt-per), said he believed other members of the alliance would contribute 5,000 soldiers — and possibly more — to make a “substantial” increase to the 42,000 NATO troops already ranged against the [Taliban](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/t/taliban/index.html?inline=nyt-org). “This is not just America’s war,” he said at the alliance’s headquarters in Brussels. But the president’s entreaties drew an ambivalent response in some European nations where the war is broadly unpopular among voters who question why it is being fought and whether it can be won. [France](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/france/index.html?inline=nyt-geo) and [Germany](http://www.nytimes.com/info/germany?inline=nyt-geo) ruled out an immediate commitment, saying they were awaiting an Afghanistan conference in London in late January. Other nations offered only limited numbers of soldiers. Álvaro de Vasconcelos, director of the [European Union](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/e/european_union/index.html?inline=nyt-org) Institute for Security Studies in Paris, said the war was “badly perceived in Europe, contaminated by the Iraq war, the killing of civilians, the collateral damage, all of which has contributed to a widespread opposition to the Afghan war among Europeans.” “If the civilian side is as important as the military one — training the Afghan police, judiciary and doing development, which Europeans know very well how to do and consider their main expertise — it will make it easier for European leaders to get support.’” “More troops for a very unpopular war, without knowing where we’re going, doesn’t work — you can’t sell it to Europeans,” Mr. de Vasconcelos said. “But you can sell the transition from war to crisis management.” Mr. Obama’s plan to send around 30,000 more American soldiers was closely watched in Pakistan, gripped by a Taliban insurgency intertwined with Afghanistan’s. There, distrust of American intentions runs deep, partly because the United States is seen as having abandoned the region after the Soviet Union’s withdrawal from Afghanistan in 1989, and there is widespread fear in the security establishment of a repetition of those events.

Say Yes – Afghanistan

Non-US troop increases ease NATO’s need for troops

 Cowell 9 (Alan, The New York Times, December 2, http://www.nytimes.com/2009/12/03/world/03reax.html?\_r=1) LL

In Europe, some analysts also said Mr. Obama’s speech had fallen short of expectations. “This is one of Obama’s most important foreign policy decisions,” said Ayesha Khan, an analyst with Chatham House, a policy institute in London. “It comes after months of deliberation and a painstaking consultative process, but the outcome to this much-anticipated and long-awaited announcement has been an anticlimax for those who expected a paradigm shift.” Mr. Rasmussen, the NATO secretary general, did not say where he expected additional coalition forces to come from. [Britain](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/unitedkingdom/index.html?inline=nyt-geo), the second-largest contributor after the United States, has promised to add 500 to its 9,000-strong Afghan deployment, and Prime Minister [Gordon Brown](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/b/gordon_brown/index.html?inline=nyt-per) said Wednesday that Britain would “continue to play its full part in persuading other countries to offer troops to the Afghanistan campaign.” [Poland](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/poland/index.html?inline=nyt-geo)’s defense minister said the country would [increase its contingent by 600](http://www.nytimes.com/aponline/2009/12/02/world/AP-EU-Poland-Afghanistan.html) from its current level of 2,000, to serve in combat, reconnaissance and training missions, The Associated Press reported, but the decision awaits governmental approval. A Spanish newspaper said Spain might increase its deployment by 200 soldiers to 1,200. Britain pledged to press other allies to boost their contingents, and [Italy](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/italy/index.html?inline=nyt-geo) hinted at an unspecified increase beyond its current 2,800 soldiers in the [patchwork of foreign troops](http://www.isaf.nato.int/) in Afghanistan, known as the International Security Assistance Force. With more than 2,800 soldiers on the ground — and a relatively high casualty rate among them — [Canada](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/canada/index.html?inline=nyt-geo) welcomed Mr. Obama’s decision, with Foreign Minister Lawrence Cannon saying the “additional U.S. resources will help to provide a more secure environment for the Afghan people.” The French president, [Nicolas Sarkozy](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/s/nicolas_sarkozy/index.html?inline=nyt-per), called Mr. Obama’s speech on Tuesday night “courageous, determined and lucid, giving new impetus to the international commitment” but he did not commit to adding to France’s nearly 3,750 troops now in the war zone. “France expects clear commitments from Afghan authorities, in answer to the strong commitments of the international community, on policy, economic and social development and on fighting drug trafficking,” he said. The foreign minister, [Bernard Kouchner](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/k/bernard_kouchner/index.html?inline=nyt-per), said in a [radio interview](http://www.france-info.com/chroniques-l-invite-du-matin-2009-12-02-bernard-kouchner-pour-le-moment-aucune-necessite-a-augmenter-nos-375874-81-188.html) that France had increased its force levels in September and, in its area of operations, “our zone doesn’t need a troop increase. Our area is well taken care of.” But he did not rule out further adjustment, referring to the international conference on Afghanistan in London in late January. “We will see how to adjust things then.” Germany, too, is awaiting the gathering in London to decide whether to increase the size of its contingent. “We hear the wishes of the United States, but we will not decide in the coming days. We will decide only after the Afghanistan conference,” Chancellor [Angela Merkel](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/m/angela_merkel/index.html?inline=nyt-per) said. Several German newspapers have reported that Washington is pressing for up to 2,500 more German soldiers. As the third-largest contributor in the alliance with 4,300 troops on the ground, Germany is currently debating a one-year renewal of a parliamentary mandate for the deployment which sets a maximum level of 4,500 troops.

Say Yes – Afghanistan

The Afghanistan war is unpopular among NATO members, and some members want US to consult more about key military issues

Tetrais 9 (Bruno, Sr Research Fellow at the Foundation for Strategic Research in Paris, European Institute, Winter/Spring 2009, <http://www.europeaninstitute.org/Winter/Spring-2009/nato-at-60-not-yet-retirement-age.html>) LL

NATO itself is not exempt from tensions. The challenge of winning of the Afghan war is a source of heated transatlantic debates. The NATO operation there is increasingly unpopular in Europe, and Obama’s call for reinforcements has so far been met with strong reluctance among the European allies. Nor is there any end in sight for another bone of contention – the numerous “caveats” that many allied nations have included in the rules of engagement for their military forces in NATO operations in Afghanistan. The question of how to deal with Russia and Iran, which loom as the most important potential military threats for NATO in the coming decade, is a dual source of divergences in the alliance. Diverging views about Russia and Iran seem bound to exacerbate tensions about missile defense and the new sites for the U.S. system: already, the debate has moved from being a bilateral issue to a NATO one since some member states now would like to see Europe benefit from it. A consensus on the next steps for NATO enlargement seems elusive at best. Finally, the continued deployment of U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe is criticized in some NATO countries – notably Germany and Belgium, where many politicians argue that the alliance’s reliance on nuclear weapons will jeopardize the outlook for the Non-proliferation Treaty Review Conference in 2010. The long-overdue revision of NATO’s 1999 Strategic Concept, which will be announced at the Strasbourg-Kehl summit, will not be easy. To ensure NATO’s safe passage into its next decade, there are some recommendations to be borne in mind. The incoming U.S. administration should refrain from dramatic initiatives without prior consultation of its European allies on major issues such as Iran, Russia, nuclear weapons or missile defense. Europeans, for their part, should accept that the U.S. military predominance legitimizes a greater say for Washington than for other alliance capitals in the management of common security issues. If European governments find themselves unable to increase the strength of their forces in Afghanistan (because of economic or military constraints), they should at least reduce their “caveats” curtailing the use of their national contingents and also increase their contribution to non-military assistance to the Afghan

Say Yes – Iraq

Troop withdrawn from Iraq would be directed to a NATO led mission in Afghanistan

The Nation 9 (October 1, <http://www.nation.com.pk/pakistan-news-newspaper-daily-english-online/International/01-Oct-2009/US-speeds-up-troop-withdrawal-from-Iraq/>) LL

WASHINGTON (Reuters/AFP) - The US military has accelerated the withdrawal of troops from Iraq and freed up resources for the Nato-led mission in Afghanistan, the US commander in Iraq told Congress on Wednesday. Speeding the drawdown of forces in Iraq could help pave the way for sending additional troops to Afghanistan, where the top US commander has asked for tens of thousands of reinforcements. General Ray Odierno, who leads the US military mission in Iraq, told a congressional hearing that the 124,000-strong US force would be reduced ahead of schedule to 120,000 by mid-October. He said the withdrawal could facilitate a US build-up in Afghanistan. “That’s a bit faster than we originally planned,” Odierno told the House Armed Services Committee. General Ray Odierno pointed to plans to withdraw some 4,000 troops from Iraq by the end of October as evidence of this flexibility on timing, saying “that’s a bit faster than we originally planned.” “I work very carefully ... to identify any capabilities that we have and that we no longer need that can be used in Afghanistan,” Odierno said. “Within our plan, I have flexibility to speed up (the pullout), if I think the situation on the ground allows it.” There are approximately 124,000 US troops in Iraq compared with about 66,000 in Afghanistan, where the top military commander wants US President Barack Obama to deploy more forces to turn around the flagging, 8-year-old war. Obama, who is reviewing Afghan strategy in the face of rising casualties and souring public support for the conflict, plans to end the US combat mission in Iraq on Aug 31, 2010.

Iraq war unpopular among NATO member nations - US withdrawal would be accepted

BBC 5 (December 28, <http://www.turkishweekly.net/news/24217/poland-postpones-iraq-withdrawal.html>) LL

Poland's government says it has taken the "very difficult decision" to extend its military deployment in Iraq until the end of 2006.  The new conservative government's decision reverses the previous leftist administration's plan to pull troops out in early 2006.  Poland, a staunch ally of the US, has about 1,500 troops stationed in Iraq.  It is the fifth biggest foreign contingent in Iraq, after the US, Britain, South Korea and Italy.  Among other US European allies, Bulgaria, Hungary and Ukraine have already opted to withdraw their forces.  The last Ukrainian forces serving in Iraq left on Tuesday, the defence ministry said.  Their withdrawal coincided with that of the remaining 130 Bulgarian troops.  Polish Prime Minister Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz, elected in October's parliamentary elections, has asked the Polish president to keep his country's forces there for another year. "This is a very difficult decision, but we take into consideration the fact that the mandate of UN stabilisation forces has been extended to the whole of 2006 and, secondly, strong requests of Iraqi authorities that we stay there," he said.  The force would be cut to 900 in March and its focus shifted to training Iraqi troops, Polish Deputy Defence Minister Stanislaw Koziej said. In September 2003, after the March invasion, the US put Poland in charge of an international force in south-central Iraq, including the Poles.  Opinion polls show the deployment is unpopular at home, with a majority of Poles wanting the soldiers to pull out.  The violence in Iraq has killed 17 Polish soldiers, the Associated Press reports.  The BBC's Adam Easton in Warsaw says many Poles feel the country has got very little in return for its commitment.  But most Polish politicians believe the country has won prestige by commanding a multinational force in Iraq, he says.  During Mr Marcinkiewicz's visit to Iraq last week, he estimated it would take another 12 months before Iraqi forces could take over the Polish zone.  The decision to stay has to be ratified by the new Polish president, Lech Kaczynski. He is a close political ally of the government, so that looks set to be a formality, our correspondent says.  Earlier this week Ukraine's President Viktor Yushchenko paid a surprise visit to Iraq and inspected the last Ukrainian unit to be withdrawn.  Ukraine had contributed 1,650 troops to the US-led coalition - the largest non-Nato contingent there.  The Ukrainian defence ministry has said 50 military instructors will stay in Iraq to train local forces.

Say Yes – Iraq

Iraq troops have been reduced and redirected to Afghanistan, where NATO’s need is more urgent

AFP 9 (September 30, http://www.iol.co.za/index.php?sf=2813&art\_id=nw20090930224201378C376580&click\_id=2813&set\_id=1) LL

Washington - The United States military has accelerated the withdrawal of troops from Iraq and freed up equipment for the Nato-led mission in Afghanistan, the US commander in Iraq told Congress on Wednesday. A faster draw-down of forces in Iraq could help pave the way for sending additional troops to Afghanistan, where the top US commander has asked for tens of thousands of reinforcements. General Ray Odierno, who leads the US military mission in Iraq, told a congressional hearing that the 124 000-strong US force would be reduced ahead of schedule to 120 000 by mid-October. "That's a bit faster than we originally planned," Odierno told the House Armed Services Committee. He said improved conditions in the Anbar province meant only one brigade was needed there instead of two US brigades. Odierno said "as we go forward we will thin our lines across Iraq" to meet an August 2010 deadline to withdraw all US combat forces from Iraq and reduce troop levels to 50 000. In an interview with the New York Times published Wednesday, he said the target of 50 000 could be reached sooner if elections due in January go smoothly. With the Afghan war receiving a higher priority, the stretched US military is under pressure to scale back the American presence in Iraq at a faster pace. Odierno said he had agreed with the head of US Central Command, General David Petraeus, on shifting some resources to Afghanistan as the equipment was no longer required in Iraq. "We identify those key pieces (of equipment) that are no longer needed in Iraq, that are needed in Afghanistan. And those are moved very quickly," he said, citing "engineering and aviation" assets. Commanders in Afghanistan have appealed for more surveillance drones and transport aircraft to help them fight an increasingly violent insurgency. The general's comments came as the White House convened senior military officers and civilian officials to weigh war strategy in Afghanistan, with President Barack Obama due to join the deliberations on Wednesday. Looming over the strategy session is a request for up to 40 000 troops from the commander in Afghanistan, General Stanley McChrystal, who has warned that without more forces the mission could face defeat at the hands of Taliban insurgents. Odierno said the slightly faster draw-down in Iraq was possible because the country's security forces were operating effectively with US troops now playing a supporting role. The US military had cut back the number of bases for its mission by more than 200, combined headquarters and reduced the number of contractors in Iraq from 149 000 at the start of the year to about 115 000, he said. "We have already begun deliberately drawing down our forces without sacrificing security," he said. Violence had declined dramatically, with the number of attacks down by 85 percent over the past two years, from 4 064 incidents in August 2007 to 594 in August of this year, the general said. He acknowledged that "there was a clear security lapse" on August 19 when two devastating truck bombings struck Iraqi government ministries, killing 95 people. But he said it did not represent a systematic failure by Iraqi forces, as overall security conditions had improved. He repeated warnings that Arab-Kurd tensions posed the most serious threat to Iraq's stability and described elections due in January as crucial to the country's future and to US draw-down plans. He also said Iran's role in Iraq remained a source of concern but its training activity of "surrogate elements" had declined somewhat. - AFP

Say Yes – Korea

Say yes – Korean troops would be relocated to NATO interests in the middle east

Nam 6 (Chang-hee Associate Professor of Political Science at Inha Uni- versity, Incheon, South Korea Relocating the U.S. Forces in South Korea: Strained Alliance, Emerging Partnership in the Changing Defense Posture Source: Asian Survey, Vol. 46, No. 4 (Jul. - Aug., 2006), pp. 630-631 TBC 6/21/10)

As analyzed above, the realignment of the USFK is related to internal changes in Korean society on the one hand and the U.S. strategy to realign its troops on a global scale on the other. Anti-U.S. sentiment that has gathered momentum since the 2002 presidential election, as well as an increasing number of com- plaints about U.S. bases, are both strengthening the argument for relocation of the 2nd ID faster than most Koreans would have predicted. From a long-term perspective, should the relocation of Yongsan Garrison and the 2nd ID proceed smoothly, a new bilateral partnership could emerge to share responsibility in America's war on terrorism. As a leading Asian economy, South Korea has a common stake with the U.S. in reducing the spreading danger of terrorism. About 3,500 ROK troops have already been deployed for reconstruction mis- sions in Iraq. This has consolidated trust among top policymakers in Washing- ton for Seoul's commitment to the alliance. By supporting the U.S. efforts to transform its own armed forces via the relocation project, Koreans should benefit from a stable global trade and investment environment.

Say Yes – Structure

NATO’s structure and attitudes about cooperation make them say yes

Douglas 3 (Douglas Feith, Undersecretary of Defense for Policy, 3-27-2003 [FNS], http://armed-services.senate.gov/statemnt/2003/March/Feith.pdf TBC 6/21/10 )

I wish to make two points to launch our discussion here of this issue. First, the consensus rule has proven valuable in certain important ways. It has been a means to force nations to make decisions. And it has tended to create pressure for unified positions, rather than encourage divisiveness and obstructionism. Second, the absence of consensus does not (and should not) stop NATO members from acting militarily outside of NATO as their own interests may require. When NATO 4 members so act, they can benefit from the Alliance by cooperating with allies whose military capabilities are available or usable because of the interoperability, combined training, combined doctrine and the like attributable to Alliance activities. The Role of France: Now, as to the recent problem of France’s regrettable conduct within NATO. French efforts to block steps to enhance Turkey’s security against possible chemical, biological or other attacks by Saddam Hussein reflected a deliberate decision to block initiatives important to the Alliance. It raised questions not only about NATO’s decision-making, but its ability to make good on its obligations to member states. Fortunately, the majority of current Allies value NATO for the links it provides between Europe and North America. NATO enlargement and EU enlargement promise to reinforce in those institutions the ranks of those seeking close partnership with the United States. On issues of transatlantic concern, divisions appear more frequently within Europe than across the Atlantic.

NATO’s culture hates saying no – structure means approval

Wallander 3 (Celleste Wallander a senior fellow at the Center for Strategic and International Studies and the director of its Russia and Eurasia Program pg. 724-5 http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=164731 TBC 6/21/10)

When asked why its members were able to turn to NATO at that point, officials answer that it is because NATO is a consensus-building institution that had developed norms and procedures for making and implementing decisions.72 This is true of many international organizations: what made NATO’s assets for consultation and decision making different? NATO’s political procedures and practices were unmatched among security institutions in their design for intensive consultation, commitment to consensus, aversion to the appearance of disarray, and concrete capacity for implementation. As important as the abstract commitments to consensus, officials explain, were the day-to-day procedures and practices that made consensus possible: bureaucratic tricks that made the alliance work. A good example is the ‘‘silence procedure.’’ When the office of the secretary-general seeks to get agreement on a decision, it drafts a memo to the permanent representatives of all the member countries. The memo takes the form ‘‘I propose decision X, and unless I hear no from you, I will go ahead.’’ Over the years, NATO’s norms have developed such that countries do not want to ‘‘break silence,’’ so these decisions tend to get passed.73 In other words, NATO could adapt to post–Cold War security in part because it is mundane: it is an organization of hundreds of daily interactions and procedures. NATO functions on a permanent basis and has bureaucracies with practices and procedures staffed by civilians from many countries who work together.74 ‘‘NATO’s institutions gave us a base for finding cooperation. . . . The institution has nooks and crannies which are very helpful for getting cooperation going. . . . [It] is a processoriented organization: we do not want to spend time talking about structure, but just do it.’’75 The alliance’s structures and practices, especially its elaborate committee system, allow countries to focus on specifics and practical matters; it is not an enormous, cumbersome forum for discussing big issues. Furthermore, NATO’s structure ensures that progress becoming stalled in one area will not prevent progress in another. The patterns and methods of working that evolved during the Cold War have been extended to new post–ColdWar security problems.

Say Yes – New NATO Nations

Say Yes – New NATO nations are pro American

Coskun 6 (June 2006 Bezen Balamir Coskun Old Europe, New Europe and the European Union’s Middle East Policy between Old and New Europe CEEISA Conference 25 –27 PhD Candidate Loughborough University / UK Department of Politics, International Relations and European Studies TBC 6/21/10)

During Iraqi crisis in the behaviour of the prospective members confirmed old Europe’s prejudices that new comers will be pro-American. Most of the CEE states responded the US call for the enforcement of UN Security Council Resolution 1441. The Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland together with Denmark, Italy, Portugal, Spain and the UK signed the ‘Letter of Eight’ to call European unity in the Security Council on enforcement of 1441. This was kind of reaffirmation of Donald Rumsfeld’s assumption about Old Europe - New Europe divide. Interestingly new Europe’s response to the US’ call coincided with the ratification of the second enlargement of NATO which included most of CEE states. In spite of public opinion that is overwhelmingly against the war both Poland and Czech Republic eagerly took their place in Iraq. The Czech Republic established itself firmly as “New Europe” when it joined the coalition in Iraq. Today about 100 Czech military police are training the Iraqi police against huge odds. They will remain in Iraq as long as they are needed. (Winkler 2006) CEE states’ position in Iraqi case can be explained in different ways. From the political strategic perspective for the CEEs playing NATO card is a way to balance ‘Franco-German’ wing of the Union. According to Heather Grabbe (2004, 64) CEE, particularly newly independent ones, has suffered from decisions made by great powers outside the region.

Say Yes – Psychology

Psychology proves that involving other actors can get them to accept outcomes that are not in their best interests

Freeman 00 (Jody Professor of Law at UCLA – JD Harvard University, June, 2000 (75 N.Y.U.L. Rev 543) 6/20 TBC)

Perhaps this form of public/private interdependence might increase the willingness of regulated entities to submit to the regulation, even when the outcome does not favor them. Social psychology teaches us that parties are more likely to view outcomes as legitimate when they play a meaningful role in the process. n474 Parties may derive satisfaction not solely from getting what they want in a bargaining process, but from being included in the enterprise, taken seriously, and offered explanations for decisions. n475 Evidence from the most recent study of regulatory negotiation supports such claims. n476 Although speculative, it is reasonable to believe that a direct role in [\*657] rulemaking will facilitate policy implementation or improve relationships among repeat players, producing payoffs down the line. Without more information about the nature of the public/private interaction, however, it proves difficult to assess its implications for accountability. Neither economists nor political scientists have sufficiently explored the deliberative dimension of public/private interaction, and how it might alter parties' preferences, for example. n477 Traditionally, economists have modeled behavior assuming fixed preferences, n478 but preferences form through the confluence of culture, environment, and experience. Conceivably, they shift as a function of both time and context. n479 Recent research in cognitive psychology suggests, in fact, that preferences are not as fixed as traditional economics assumes. n480 Perhaps deliberative processes present opportunities not only to readjust one's own preferences, but also to influence those of others.

Say Yes – Relations

Say yes – Europe wants to maintain US relations

Schmidt 7 (John R., the senior analyst for Europe in the Bureau of Intelligence and Research at the Department of State and former director of the NATO office at the State Department and as director for NATO affairs at the National Security Council, “Last Alliance Standing? NATO after 9/11” Washington Quarterly - PROVOCATIONS; Vol. 30, No. 1; Pg. 93. Winter, TBC 6/21/10)

Although France is not without allies, most EU-member NATO allies seek a middle road. They favor a strong and autonomous ESDP and would probably be prepared to go further in this direction than the United States would like, but they are generally not prepared to cross the U.S. redlines discussed above. This reflects an enduring commitment to maintain close relations with the United States despite the absence of any palpable military threat to their security. Yet, just as they are unwilling to go as far as the French would like in pushing ESDP independence from NATO, they are similarly disinclined to go as far as the United States would like in finding new roles and missions for the alliance, particularly if they conflict with perceived EU prerogatives, or in funding the NRF.

\*A2\*

A2: Perm

Genuine consultation is key to the alliance

Haass, 4 (Richard N. President of the Council on Foreign Relations, 6/1/04, “The United States and Europe: Adjusting to the Global Era”, Council on Foreign Relations, http://www.cfr.org/publication/7069/united\_states\_and\_europe.html TBC 6/21/10)

Genuine consultation is a must. Consultation cannot consist of simply informing others of what has already been decided or going through the motions and not adapting policies yet still expecting support. Nor can consultations wait until a crisis is upon us; talks should be held in advance on how to deal with the central challenges of this era. This promises to be the best and most likely only way of forging a policy framework relevant to the challenges central to this era of international relations. Both Europeans and Americans have reason to maintain and where possible expand their cooperation. As has already been alluded to, this is the optimal way to deal with those regional and global challenges that affect both but which neither alone can manage. Such challenges (and opportunities) go beyond the full gamut of transnational issues. Let me single out two. The first is to promote political, economic, educational, and social reform throughout the Arab and Muslim worlds. It is essential that young men and women in these societies see a reason to live. This will require meaningful reform resulting in meaningful political participation, economic opportunity, and access to an education that will provide the tools basic to this global era. Making progress here will require the wisdom and resources of both Europe and the United States.

NATO knows the perm isn’t genuine – leaks are inevitable

Shafer 04 (Jack, Slate's editor at large, “J. William Leonard frets about the breakdown of the classification system” Slate 6-23 http://www.slate.com/id/2102855/)

Don't mistake Leonard for an ACLU firebrand: As Steven Aftergood of the Federation of American Scientists (whose excellent listserv alerted me to the speech) puts it, Leonard "is not an 'openness' advocate or a free-lance critic of government secrecy." He's a career security professional who deplores the leaks of classified material to the press. Leonard attributes what he calls an "epidemic" of leaks to the press to the dysfunctional classification system, which has recently taken to using the war as an "excuse to disregard the basics of the security classification system." Leaks are coming out of the "highest levels of our government" (the Valerie Plame affair); a former Cabinet secretary is alleged to have handed off classified material to a book author for publication, and the classification machine is operating so poorly down at Guantanamo Bay that a chaplain was publicly charged with pilfering secrets on his computer and then released. "The problem [Leonard] has identified is that the currency of classification is being devalued by questionable, sometimes suspiciously self-serving secrecy actions," writes Aftergood in e-mail. "This produces an erosion of security discipline, which in turn fosters an environment in which leaks are more likely to come about. The net result is bad security policy and bad public policy."

A2: Perm

**Non-binding consultation will provoke a backlash even though NATO supports the plan**

Sloan 97 (Stanley R. Sloan, senior specialist in international security policy with the Congressional Research Service, July 25, 1997 http://www.slate.com/id/2102855 TBC 6/22/10)

Self-confident US behavior has rubbed many Europeans the wrong way. When the Clinton administration revealed its choice of three candidates - Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary - to participate in the first wave of NATO enlargement, many allies privately applauded. Even France, which is a strong proponent of including Romania and Slovenia, was not surprised that the United States and several other allies would only support a smaller group. But the fact that the United States appeared to have abandoned the process of NATO consultations in making its choice clear, and then said its decision was non-negotiable, troubled even our closest allies. It strengthened the hand of those in Europe who claim that the United States is acting like a "hegemonic" power, using its impressive position of strength to have its way with weaker European allies. One official of a pro-American northern European country that supports the package of three told me, "We liked the present but were troubled by the way it was wrapped." US officials say that they wanted to keep the issue within alliance consultations but that their position was being leaked to the press by other allies. They decided to put an end to "lobbying" for other outcomes. Their choice to go strong and to go public may be understandable and even defensible. However, the acknowledged leader of a coalition of democratic states probably needs to set the very best example in the consultative process if it wants other sovereign states to follow. Perhaps it is just hard being No. 1. US officials have noted that the United States is "damned if it does, and damned if it does not" provide strong leadership. Perhaps the style of the NATO decision simply reflects a Washington culture in which the bright and brash more often than not move ahead in the circles of power. But the style does not work well in an alliance of democracies. Whatever the explanation, US-European relations would have been better served by a US approach that allowed the outcome to emerge more naturally from the consultative, behind-the-scenes consensus-forming process. The final result would have been the same, and the appearance of a United States diktat to the allies would have been avoided.

A2: Perm

Genuine consultation with Nato is key to its survival

Kissinger 02 (Henry A., national security adviser and later secretary of state under Presidents Nixon and Ford, advisor to Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon, 12-1- 2002 San Diego Union-Tribune, “NATO at the crossroads; NATO'S uncertain future in a troubled alliance,” http://www.icai-online.org/69477,46136.html TBC 6/22/10)

Why NATO is still important As the alliance shifts its emphasis from the military to the political arena, from defending a geopolitical dividing line to what in NATO parlance used to be called "out of area" conflicts, both sides of the Atlantic need to define for themselves why NATO is still important. The United States must resist the siren song of basing foreign policy on hegemonic power. Many of the problems affecting world order are not susceptible to solution by military means. History shows that, sooner or later, every powerful country calls into being countervailing forces. And at that point -- and I would insist even now -- the United States will not be able to sort out every international problem alone without exhausting itself physically and psychologically. We will need allies, and the countries that most share our values and history are the NATO countries. And however much conventional wisdom balks at the concept of a clash of civilizations, that is what Western societies face together from the radical crusading version of Islam. The ultimate challenge for American foreign policy is to turn dominant power into a sense of shared responsibility; it is to conduct policy, as the Australian scholar Coral Bell has written, as if the international order were composed of many centers of power, even while we are aware of our strategic preeminence. It implies the need for a style of consultation less focused on selling immediate policy prescriptions than on achieving a common definition of threats and long-range purposes. By the same token, Europe must resist the temptation of "distinctiveness" for its own sake. Criticism of American culture and policy has been a staple of European opponents of NATO for 50 years. What is unusual now is that the governments in key countries are making no efforts to stem the tide and occasionally even stir it up. The alliance needs a clearer declaration of what is intended by a "European" foreign policy and one less geared to pacifying domestic pressure groups. Europe must be allowed scope for disagreeing with its partner. But if distinctiveness is defined by disagreement for its own sake, Western civilization is on the road to destroying its substance as it did in the first half of the 20th century. Europe must take seriously that America's attempt to shape a world order reflects a sense of global responsibility and not the psychological orientation of particular leaders. In this context, the debate between multilateralism and unilateralism assumes a different dimension. Abstract multilateralism is as incompatible with a new Atlantic relationship as abstract unilateralism. The former absorbs purpose in a quest for a general global consensus, the latter in overemphasis on a special national character. But NATO, to be meaningful, needs to have a special character between these two extremes. It must be able to define common purposes more precise than the attainable international consensus and more embracing than the national interest of an individual partner, however powerful. Is this possible? Or are we condemned to drift apart? We cannot know the answer today, but the future of our civilization requires that we make the effort to find it.

**AT: Consult Bad**

Counter interpretation – the neg can only consult through formal mechanisms

**KANG AND TAE-HYO**, 20**01**

Choi, Kim, Future ROK-U.S. Security Cooperation: Comprehensive Security Alliance, <http://nari.re.kr/tt/board/ttboard.cgi?act=download&db=newasia_1&aidx=169&fidx=1>

Instead of having a fully integrated cooperation structure, it would be desirable to have the parallel consultative structure that can be found in NATO and the U.S.-Japan security alliance. This does not mean two totally independent forces in parallel. Rather, the strategic consultative mechanisms will be strengthened, while intelligence and information-sharing will be enhanced. In brief, while there are two groups of muscle, brain and nerves, the two respective countries are connected closely. The two forces are not integrated, but they are linked with one another through a close consultative mechanism.

**Consult CPs are Good:**

1. **TOPIC SPECIFIC EDUCATION – DEBATE BETWEEN UNILATERAL AND MULTILATERAL ACTION CORE QUESTION OF THE TOPIC. COMPARATIVE 1NC EVIDENCE PROVES.**
2. **NEGATIVE STRATEGY – KEY TO TEST DEFENSE OF UNILATERAL ACTION AND INTERNAL LINK TO INTERNATIONAL CREDIBILITY ADVANTAGES.**
3. **C. ALTERNATIVE IS CONDITION OR INTERNATIONAL FIAT CPS WHICH ARE WORSE**

**(A.) NO PREDICTABLE MECHANISM OR ACTOR – ALLOWS THE NEG TO CHANGE THE COUNTRY OR ISSUE CONDITIONED ON EVERY ROUND KILLING INDEPTH DEBATE.**

**(B.) OBJECT FIAT – LEADS TO CP LIKE ‘ISRAEL SHOULDN’T STRIKE IRAN’ THAT FIAT EXTREMELY IMPROBABLE ACTION THAT HAS NO COMPARATIVE EVIDENCE.**

AT: Textual Competition Good

**Textual competition is good –**

 **(a.) KEY TO TOPIC FOCUS – cuts down on meaningless word pics and critical net benifits, we only force you to defend words that have meaning.**

**(b.) REWARDS GOOD DEBATE – ALLOWS THE TEAM WHO DID THE MOST IN-DEPTH RESEARCH TO DETERMINE WHAT’S ACCEPTABLE GROUND.**

**(c.) ELIMINATES UNIQUENESS CPS – INCREASING RELIANCE ON THE NUCLEAR ARSENAL ISN’T COMPETITIVE.**

**(2.) Counterplan competes textually – it doesn’t include the entirety of the text and tests resolved and timing.**

\*Aff Stuff\*

Lie Perm Card

(**\_\_) NO LEAKS.**

LOVEN, NOVEMBER 5TH 2008

Jennifer, Great expectations: Obama will have to deliver, Associated Press, <http://www.cleveland.com/nation/index.ssf/2008/11/great_expectations_obama_will.html>

He also showed himself to be a highly disciplined, CEO-style manager. **The leak-proof, tightly managed and orderly Obama operation mimics the Bush White House, and flows from "No Drama Obama" himself** -- a man so focused that he didn't give himself a day off from working out, even the morning after winning the presidency.

Consult Bad Theory

**A) Conditional solvency – the plan becomes contingent on a yes. Its not reciprocal, allowing them to spike out of arguments**

**B) Artificially competitive Textual competition is best – it’s the least arbitrary, guarantees good counterplan competition and causes careful plan writing. Artificial competition makes permutations impossible and justifies intrinsic permutations like plan plus consult on another china policy. We can go for it.**

**C) There’s an infinite number - can consult countries, alliances, groups of countries, infinitely regresses to consulting individuals and NGO’s. Makes it impossible to predict**

NATO Weak Now

NATO is becoming increasing weak and ineffective in the 21st century

Sieff 9 (Martin, UPI Sr News Analyst, April 17, http://www.upi.com/Business\_News/Security-Industry/2009/04/17/21st-century-NATO-a-weak-hollow-giant/UPI-99071239994461/) LL

[WASHINGTON](http://www.upi.com/Business_News/Security-Industry/2009/04/17/21st-century-NATO-a-weak-hollow-giant/UPI-99071239994461/##), April 17 (UPI) -- The NATO alliance that confronted the collapse of the Soviet Union from 1989-91 really had teeth. Today, a far larger but also far weaker NATO resembles a 1930s airship -- huge, slow, unwieldy, vulnerable and filled with nothing more than hot gas. Many military analysts believed that as late as the early 1980s, the Soviet Union and its satellite allies in the Warsaw Pact still had an overwhelming superiority in conventional forces, particularly in artillery and main battle tanks, over the assembled forces of NATO, especially on the expected main battlefield area between them of the North European plain. However, the decision of NATO leaders to push ahead with the deployment of their small, highly mobile, nuclear-armed U.S.-built Pershing II intermediate-range ballistic missiles changed the strategic equation. The Pershings gave deployed NATO forces in Western Europe a far more lethal and credible deterrent than anything they had previously fielded. Even at its time of greatest relative weakness in the face of the Red Army and its Soviet allies, there was no question during the Cold War that NATO was first and foremost a defensive military alliance. Its member states agreed that the military forces they put under the command of NATO at alliance headquarters outside Brussels were meant to defend their territories, not to project power outside them, however worthy the cause was. Therefore, the U.S. commitment in the 1950-53 Korean War, with allies such as Britain and Turkey sending military contingents to fight alongside U.S. forces, was never a NATO operation. Neither was the long U.S. military commitment in Vietnam. Nor was the 1991 Gulf War to liberate Kuwait from Iraq, although NATO allies, primarily Britain and France, sent significant forces to fight alongside U.S. troops. However, in the years following the collapse of communism and the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the nature of the alliance gradually changed. It eventually grew to its present size of 28 member states -- one more in number than the 27-nation European Union. All the former member states of the Warsaw Pact eventually joined NATO. So did even three former Soviet republics, the small Baltic nations of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia that had been swallowed by the Soviet Union against their will in 1940. Successive U.S. presidents, both Republican and Democratic, enthusiastically backed by [British governments](http://www.upi.com/Business_News/Security-Industry/2009/04/17/21st-century-NATO-a-weak-hollow-giant/UPI-99071239994461/##), welcomed the new NATO member states one and all. There was a happy, almost universally shared agreement across the political spectrum in Washington that expanding the alliance was a good thing that would spread peace and security, as well as democracy and free markets, throughout Central and [Eastern Europe](http://www.upi.com/Business_News/Security-Industry/2009/04/17/21st-century-NATO-a-weak-hollow-giant/UPI-99071239994461/##). However, all the new member states were net consumers of NATO and U.S. security; they could not add to it themselves. This was dramatically demonstrated after the al-Qaida terrorist attacks on the United States of Sept. 11, 2001, that killed 3,000 Americans. To the astonishment of U.S. and European leaders alike, the first time the Article 5 clause for mutual defense in the alliance's founding 1949 North Atlantic Treaty, also known as the Treaty of Washington, was ever activated, it was for the Europeans to help America rather than the other way around. But this support, while emotionally important and welcome, was symbolic rather than practical. In the 21st century, the United States remained the single military giant on whom the defense of an ever-increasing number of much smaller and weaker NATO member states rested.

NATO Weak Now

**Structural weaknesses prevent NATO from acting effectively**

Afghan Voice Agency 10 (February 24, http://www.avapress.com/vdcfxmdy.w6dvja7riw.txt?PHPSESSID=5092ea07059843556defb256f9b88html&PHPSESSID=8abbe5a888a8ab4a9e42bb4c3a3ddhtml&PHPSESSID=457ca2dbdd0cbc9f55b7aab2310292b0) LL

With the war in Afghanistan as his guide, Defense Secretary Robert Gates on Tuesday called for sweeping changes in the way NATO prepares for and fights nontraditional conflicts. (AP)\_ Citing a "crisis" in the alliance, Gates said Afghanistan has exposed fundamental NATO weaknesses — shortcomings that he said can undermine the viability of NATO as it faces future security threats. He cited a money shortage within NATO — a perennial problem that successive American administrations have tried and failed to fix. That, in turn, is a "symptom of deeper problems with the way NATO perceives threats," assesses its defense needs and sets spending priorities, Gates said. Gates tempered his stern message with words of praise for NATO allies, saying they had demonstrated in just the last three months an "unparalleled level of commitment" to the war effort by increasing their troop contributions from 30,000 last summer to 50,000 this year. "By any measure that is an extraordinary feat," he said. He did not mention, however, that even NATO members who have shared the combat burden in Afghanistan are finding it hard to sustain. In the Netherlands, for example, the coalition government collapsed this month over the issue of troop contributions; the 2,000-strong Dutch troop contingent is to begin withdrawing in August. Another stalwart, Canada, plans to remove 2,800 troops by next year, even as some other nations send more. NATO's budget squeeze reflects a larger cultural and political trend within an alliance, Gates said. After decades of success in preventing a catastrophic eruption of conflict on the European continent, NATO member countries have failed to modernize their militaries — instead relying on superior U.S. firepower. Afghanistan, however, has shown that a superpower cannot succeed alone in a conflict that requires not just traditional military strength but also civilian expertise and the clout of international support. "The demilitarization of Europe — where large swaths of the general public and political class are averse to military force and the risks that go with it — has gone from a blessing in the 20th century to an impediment to achieving real security and lasting peace in the 21st," he told a National Defense University audience filled with uniformed military officers from many of NATO's 28 member countries. The danger, he added, is that potential future adversaries may view NATO as a paper tiger. "Not only can real or perceived weakness be a temptation to miscalculation and aggression, but, on a more basic level, the resulting funding and capability shortfalls make it difficult to operate and fight together to confront shared threats," Gates told a forum on rewriting the basic mission plan of the NATO alliance. "All of this should be a wake-up call that NATO needs serious, far-reaching and immediate reforms to address a crisis that has been years in the making," Gates said. If NATO simply rewrites its basic agenda — officially known as its "strategic concept" — without changing the practices and the mindset of alliance members, the result "will not be worth the paper it is printed on," he added.

NATO Weak Now

**The US doesn’t need NATO**

Bandow 9 (Doug, The American Spectator, February 6, http://spectator.org/archives/2009/02/06/completely-useless) LL

Three of Great Britain's retired top military officers have [declared](http://news.yahoo.com/s/afp/20090116/wl_uk_afp/britainpoliticsnucleardefence_20090116005401) their country's nuclear deterrent to be "completely useless." They suggest dropping the British submarine-based missiles, relying instead on the U.S. Such a step would effectively complete Europe's status as America's biggest military dependent.

NATO was created during the midst of the Cold War to prevent Soviet domination of Eurasia. Europe was a notorious freeloader on the U.S. even then, but the conventional wisdom was that Washington had to defend the Europeans even if they weren't terribly interested in defending themselves. Both Great Britain and France created independent nuclear forces, but these arsenals were viewed as adjuncts to America's nuclear umbrella.

Europe's dependence on the U.S. makes no sense today. The Cold War is over, and with it Moscow's potential for dominating the continent. Even before the economic crisis Russia's global pretensions exceeded its capabilities. The victory over tiny Georgia demonstrated that Moscow could defeat a small neighbor, not conquer any of the populous and prosperous countries in Old Europe, the traditional center of America's defense efforts. The Russian economy has since taken a huge hit and political protests are increasing. Georgia might turn out to be Moscow's high water mark before its own social problems force Russians to turn inward.

Even if the Europeans face a serious security threat, they do not need America's help. The European Union has a larger population and GDP than does America; the EU also has begun forging a continental perspective on foreign policy issues. Yet the Europeans have proved to be the worst sort of military deadbeats, with neither the will nor the ability to project much force anywhere. This isn't just an American judgment. British Defense Secretary John Hutton declared in mid-January: "Free-loading on the back of U.S. military security is not an option if we wish to be equal partners in this trans-Atlantic alliance."

He pointed to Afghanistan as emblematic of Europe's defense failure, demonstrating "a legacy of underinvestment by some European member states in their armed forces, significant variance in political commitment to the campaign, and underneath it all a continued overreliance on the U.S. to do the heavy lifting." If a more centralized European Union does anything on defense, it should be to develop a continent-wide force capable of combat and backed by sufficient lift to get it where needed.

As part of that process, Europe needs to consider the question of nuclear weapons. For 60 years the Europeans have relied on the U.S., yet why should Washington risk nuclear war to protect them from a sharply diminished threat? A week before the statement by the three British military officers, a Pentagon panel recommended keeping U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe and possibly modernizing the arsenal.

NATO Weak Now

**Doesn’t matter if relations with NATO are strained; NATO’s only a burden**

Bacevich 9 (Andrew, professor of history and international relations at Boston University, April 2, http://articles.latimes.com/2009/apr/02/opinion/oe-bacevich2/2) LL

The alliance has lost its sense of purpose. The way to get it back is for the U.S. to withdraw and let Europe be responsible for its own defense. When he visits Strasbourg, France, this week to participate in festivities marking NATO's 60th anniversary, President Obama should deliver a valedictory address, announcing his intention to withdraw the United States from the alliance. The U.S. has done its job. It's time for Europe to assume full responsibility for its own security, freeing the U.S. to attend to more urgent priorities. The creation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in 1949 remains a singular example of enlightened statecraft. With Europe's democracies still suffering from the ravages of World War II, and fearing the threat posed by Stalinist Russia, the U.S. abandoned its aversion to "entangling alliances" and committed itself to Europe's defense. Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower came out of retirement to serve as NATO's first military chief. As U.S. forces arrived to take up their stations, the alliance soon found its footing. In its heyday, NATO possessed formidable capabilities and real (if never fully tested) cohesion. Its safety ensured, Western Europe prospered and remained at peace. Over time, the Soviet threat diminished and eventually disappeared. Since then, however, an alliance once regarded as the most successful in all of history has lost its way. When the end of the Cold War left Russia temporarily weakened, the United States and its allies wasted no time in exploiting that weakness. NATO pressed eastward, incorporating into its ranks nations that had previously formed part of the Soviet empire and of the Soviet Union itself. American policymakers urged the alliance to expand its reach, abandoning its defensive posture to become an instrument of intervention. According to the conventional wisdom of the 1990s, NATO needed to go "out of area" or it would surely go "out of business." This program of enlarging both NATO's territorial expanse and its ambitions has now reached an impasse. Through its military punishment of Georgia last year, Russia has signaled it will not tolerate further encroachments into what the Kremlin sees as its legitimate sphere of influence. Meanwhile, through its ineffective performance in Afghanistan -- NATO's most ambitious "out of area" contingency -- the alliance has revealed the extent to which its capabilities and its cohesion have eroded. Present-day NATO is a shadow of what it once was. Calling it a successful alliance today is the equivalent of calling General Motors a successful car company -- it privileges nostalgia over self-awareness. As with GM, so too with NATO: Fixing past mistakes will require painful changes. Continuing along the existing trajectory is not an option. If the alliance pursues any further eastward expansion (incorporating Ukraine into its ranks, as some in Washington have advocated), it will implode. If it persists in attempting to pacify Afghanistan (vainly trying to prod the Germans and other reluctant allies into deploying more troops with fewer strings attached), it will only further expose its internal weakness. NATO won't survive by compounding its own recent errors. Salvation requires taking a different course. However counterintuitive, the best prospect for restoring NATO's sense of purpose and direction lies in having the U.S. announce its intention to exit the alliance. Salvaging NATO requires reorienting the alliance back to its founding purpose: the defense of Europe. This remains a worthy mission. Although Vladimir Putin's Russia hardly compares with Josef Stalin's Soviet Union, and although current Russian military capabilities pale in comparison with those of the old Red Army, the fact is that Europe today does face a security threat to its east. Having been subjected (in its own eyes at least) to two decades of Western humiliation, authoritarian Russia is by no means committed to the status quo. Given the opportunity, the Kremlin could well give in to the temptation to do mischief. NATO's priority must be to ensure that no such opportunity presents itself, which means demonstrating an unquestioned capacity for self-defense. The difference between 1949 and 2009 is that present-day Europe is more than capable of addressing today's threat, without American assistance or supervision. Collectively, the Europeans don't need U.S. troops or dollars, both of which are in short supply anyway and needed elsewhere. Yet as long as the United States sustains the pretense that Europe cannot manage its own affairs, the Europeans will endorse that proposition, letting Americans foot most of the bill. Only if Washington makes it clear that the era of free-riding has ended will Europe grow up. NATO's anniversary bash promises to be an historic event. As part of his promise to promote change, Obama should make it a farewell party.

Say No – Afghanistan

**McChrystal’s plans for an offensive in Kandahar means that NATO will be reluctant to allow US troop withdrawal from Afghanistan.**

Rozoff 10 (Rick, researcher for Centre for Research on Globalization, Stop NATO, June 9, http://rickrozoff.wordpress.com/2010/06/09/military-watershed-longest-war-in-u-s-and-afghan-history/) LL

Ahead of what has been planned as the largest military offensive of the nearly nine-year war, the assault against the southern province of Kandahar and in particular the city of the same name which is its capital, the initiative does not appear to be with the U.S. and NATO. The campaign was scheduled to begin this month and culminate in August when combined U.S. and NATO troop strength in Afghanistan will reach 150,000. On the morning of June 9 fifty NATO tankers transporting oil and other supplies were attacked only fifty kilometers south of the Pakistani capital of Islamabad. According to earlier reports, top U.S. and NATO commander Stanley McChrystal is amassing over 25,000 troops – American, NATO and Afghan government – for the offensive in the city of Kandahar. The Daily Telegraph recently reported that “British military intelligence estimates there are between 500 and 1,000 insurgents who operate regularly in the area,” [2] which would mean as high as a 50-1 ratio of U.S.-led troops to Afghan insurgents, comparable to February’s attack on the town of Marjah in neighboring Helmand Province where 15,000 U.S.- and NATO-led forces faced as few as 400 armed fighters. [3] The Kandahar operation is still scheduled to commence this month and “will focus on Kandahar city and the farmland around it, and could take from four to six months. While Nato commanders are promising a low-key, Afghan-led approach to Kandahar city itself, international troops are preparing for combat operations in some of the areas around the city.” [4]

Withdrawal is unpopular with NATO; NATO commander General MacCrystal believes it will bring instability

The Voice of Russia 10 (May 31, http://english.ruvr.ru/2010/05/31/8797239.html) LL

The Commander of the US and NATO forces in Afghanistan, General Stanley MacCrystal has said that it will be  wrong to believe  that stability will  return to that  country after the pull out of American troops. US President, Barack Obama has promised to begin withdrawing American soldiers from Afghanistan in July of 2011, but  all those who believe that the presence of foreign troops in Afghanistan is the cause of the country’s instability will be  disappointed, declared Mac Crystal.

Afghan nationals do not trust the local authorities that are unable to provide security for the nation unaided at the present time. It is a no win situation: withdrawing  U.S troops is bad and leaving them in Afghanistan will bring neither peace nor stability; 9 years of the  so-called anti-terrorism operation have not produced the desired results, but the  task of bringing peace and stability to Afghanistan should  not be left  to the  US  alone, said  Professor Sergei Druzhilovsky of the Moscow Institute of International Affairs.

Say No – Afghanistan

NATO will say no; NATO is already expecting increased American troops in Afghanistan

CNN 9 (December 2, http://edition.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/12/01/obama.world.reax/index.html) LL

(CNN) -- The non-U.S. members of NATO intend to commit at least 5,000 more troops to Afghanistan along with the American buildup just announced, the alliance's top civilian leader said Wednesday. NATO Secretary-General Anders Fogh Rasmussen said the 5,000 figure is "based on what we know now," adding, "I would expect a few thousand on top of that." "Based on my talks with a big number of political leaders, I feel confident that we will see significant increases in the troop contributions," Rasmussen said on CNN's "Amanpour" program. The additional units would bring NATO's contribution to the Afghan war to about 47,000 troops. That figure comes on top of the nearly 100,000 Americans expected to be in the fight once the additional deployments U.S. President Barack Obama announced Tuesday night are in place. "The important thing here is that allies and partners have responded very positively to the speech made by President [Obama](http://topics.edition.cnn.com/topics/Barack_Obama)," Rasmussen said. He said the first pledges could be announced at a conference of NATO foreign ministers Thursday and Friday in Brussels, Belgium, the seat of the alliance. "There is a broad consensus in the alliance that we must stand together," Rasmussen said. "We are in this together. We will support the United States. It is an alliance mission." Obama announced Tuesday night that he will send an additional 30,000 U.S. troops to Afghanistan while setting a goal of starting to bring forces home by the summer of 2011. The new strategy is designed to eliminate al Qaeda in Afghanistan and help the Afghan government defeat the Taliban insurgency, while bolstering neighboring Pakistan's anti-terrorism efforts. n addition to the 28 NATO allies, 15 non-NATO members have contributed troops to the U.S.-led coalition. The largest contribution from those countries is from Australia, with 1,200 troops. Rasmussen said the allies will stay in Afghanistan "as long as it takes to finish our job -- but, obviously, it's not forever." "The way forward is to hand over responsibility to the Afghans, province by province, as their own capacity develops," he said. The additional troops being dispatched "will build the bridge to the transition," he added. In his speech, Obama emphasized that the U.S. troop commitment in Afghanistan was not open-ended, saying, "the nation that I am most interested in building is our own."

Say no – NATO is rededicated to the war

Reuters 9 (Dec. 22, NATO says no deadline for Afghan troop withdrawal http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE5BL2H220091222 TBC 6/21/10)

NATO Secretary-General Anders Fogh Rasmussen was visiting Afghanistan for the first time since U.S. President Barack Obama announced plans this month to send 30,000 extra troops to Afghanistan to try and tame mounting violence. NATO allies have also promised to send around 7,000 more. But Washington's plan also calls for U.S. troop levels to be scaled down from 2011 as Afghan security forces gradually take over responsibility, sparking concerns among Afghan civilians. Unrest has reached its worst levels in the eight-year war, and many fear that bombings and attacks may rise if their police and troops have not been well-enough prepared for their new responsibilities. There are currently around 110,000 international troops in Afghanistan, including 68,000 Americans. "My first message is to the Afghan people: I know that some are wondering how long international forces will stay, more specifically, they are worried we will leave too soon," Rasmussen told reporters alongside the Afghan president in Kabul. "Let there be no doubt, the international community will stand with you, will protect you, and help rebuild your country until you are ready to stand on your own," he said. Rasmussen said there would be a "new momentum" in 2010 as NATO ramped up its mission in Afghanistan but that its main focus would be to protect the population and train more Afghan forces.

Say No – Kuwait

Say No – NATO has been increasing cooperation with Kuwait and sees it as its future in the middle east

Rozoff 9 (ROZOFF February, 2009 Eurasia Critic NATO In The Persian Gulf Rick http://www.eurasiacritic.com/articles/nato-persian-gulf TBC 6/21/10)

With this unprecedented move, both countries being part of the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative, one observer opined that "we can assume that a military base in Abu Dhabi would contribute to a better NATO-GCC understanding. " (Gulf News [Saudi Arabia], January 27, 2008) "For France, the military base certainly improves its status within NATO as well as with the US as it would become the only NATO member other than the US that is stationed in the Gulf." (Ibid) A couple of days before NATO's Secretary General Scheffer signaled his approval of the initiative in advance by visiting the UAE, when it was noted "that his first ever official visit to this region showcases the strengthening pace of cooperation between NATO and the countries of this region." On that occasion Scheffer emoted that "Even before the launch of the ICI, the UAE displayed strong cooperation with NATO in the Balkans during the 1990s" and threatened that "The issue of nuclear proliferation has again taken center stage owing to the ambitions of Iran and North Korea...." (Dubai City Guide, January 24, 2008) And it was added, not that it needed to be, "The United Arab Emirates and Nato mull the establishment of cooperation in line with the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative (ICI), said the secretary-general of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (Nato), Jaap de Hoop Scheffer." (Khaleej Times [United Arab Emirates], January 27, 2008] On January 29 NATO Assistant Secretary Jean-Francois was in Qatar where he told the local press corps: "Our practical cooperation has intensified as well, especially at the military-to- military level. There has been a growing number of participants from Qatar in NATO courses and seminars. Besides, Qatar was the first ICI country to appoint a Liaison Officer to NATO in Brussels, in order to facilitate our cooperation, " after which the press reported that "A NATO team recently visited Doha to discuss...the possibility of elaborating an Individual Cooperation Programme with the Alliance.... " (The Peninsula [Qatar], January 29, 2008) Not to be left out, the Pentagon announced the following month that it was establishing a permanent Army command in Kuwait. Its commander described it as "a permanent platform for 'full spectrum operations in 27 countries around southwest Asia and the Middle East" and added, ""That's full spectrum operations. We're able to adapt better ... and go from high-intensity to regular warfare...." (Stars and Stripes, February 19, 2008)

Link Turn – Rising Expectations

Genuine consultation with Europe causes rising expectations which hurt the alliance -

Mead 4 (Walter Russell, MEAD, Senior Fellow @ The CFR, 2004 Power, Terror, Peace, and War, pg. 130-134)

Partly because it needed European cooperation in the Balkans, partly because ideologically many Clinton era officials agreed with European positions on issues like Kyoto and the ICC, and partly out of habits of consultation and deference that grew up during the cold war, the Clinton administration never quite made clear to Europeans just how unreasonable their hopes were. At the same time, most American diplomats and the broader "interlocutor class" of experts who specialize in transatlantic relations are generally more sympathetic to the ; European approach than they are to the red state, red meat approach of the American Jacksonians and the Revival Wilsonians who, since September 11th, have figured so prominently in the politics of American foreign policy. The Bush administration made the strategic decision that it no longer made sense to encourage Europe in illusions about the direction of American policy. Whether Europe liked that policy or disliked it was less important than that Europe understood it. Moreover, stroking Europe only seemed to increase Europe's already inflated sense of its importance in the world of American foreign policy. This transition was a necessary and normal one, I and it ultimately does offer the prospect of a more realistic but still very close relationship among the Cold War allies. If the Clinton administration and the broader American foreign policy establishment had done a better job of communicating the changing American approach in earlier years, the transition might not have been so painful—but it is also true that the Bush administration could and should have done more to cushion the shock for what, after all, are some of our closest and most important allies in a dangerous world. The bitterness of the controversy was regrettable, and hasty remarks by Bush officials exacerbated it, but it was probably on balance a good thing to remind Europeans in general and Germans in particular that transatlantic crises have a way of turning into European crises. With Germany, France, and Russia locked in an anti-American alliance, Poland understandably becomes nervous, and rightly so. When Russia and Germany get close, Poland has a way of getting smaller. A good German relationship with the United States remains the best basis for continuing progress toward European integration.

Link Defense – No Spillover

NATO consultation fails – one single issue will not spillover.

Kissinger 4 (Henry, former secretary of state, NEWSWEEK, November 08, page lexis)

Across the Atlantic, leaders have been concentrating on transferring national sovereignty to new European institutions. This involves a host of technicalities and legal issues which are both arcane and elusive for most Americans. More fundamentally, the United States conducts its policies as the sovereign states of Europe did in the 19th and first half of the 20th centuries. The European nations having invented the concept of the nation-state are now in the process of seeking to abandon their sovereignty to a European Union not yet possessing the traditional attributes of the state. They find themselves in a halfway house between their history and a future still in the process of evolving.
All this has generated a witches' brew of mutual misunderstandings. In America, critics describe European attitudes as fainthearted, querulous and, on occasion, duplicitous. In Europe the media (and too many political figures) revel in descriptions of America's racial tension, the death penalty, differences over the environment and mistreatment of prisoners as if aberrations reflected the ultimate meaning of the United States. Shifting their priority from the Atlantic alliance to the U.N. Security Council, Europeans feel no special obligation to support U.S. policy, on occasion actively opposing it.
These conditions cannot be removed by consultation on any one individual issue, and require a fundamental change of attitude on both sides of the Atlantic. The nations bordering the North Atlantic need to ask themselves the fundamental question that has always underpinned the alliance--that is, what will the allies do for the relationship beyond the international consensus reflected at the United Nations? Much of European debate today implies that the answer is "very little." To subject common military action to prior approval of the Security Council is incompatible with the very concept of alliance, which implies a special set of obligations. It spells the ultimate disintegration of a world order with the Atlantic partnership as its centerpiece. The Atlantic relationship, to be meaningful, needs to have a special character. The United States and Europe should be prepared to do things for each other in the sphere beyond the immediate dictates of national interest and without insisting on universal consensus.

Solvency Deficit – Delay

CP delays solvency –huge beauracracy, large numbers of new nations, and consensus based decision making mean that consultation takes forever

REUTERS 4 ( 3/31, Taipei Times, <http://www.taipeitimes.com/News/world/archives/2004/03/31/2003108563>

**Forty percent of NATO will now be former communist states**, and Washington has welcomed them as a counterweight to the "old Europe" of France and Germany, who opposed the Iraq war.

A Russian parliamentary deputy dismissed the Washington ceremony as a "show."

Konstantin Kosachev, representative of a Russian parliamentary committee on international affairs, said a NATO plan to patrol Baltic airspace was an "unfriendly" move. Estonia and Latvia border Russia, while Lithuania has a frontier with Moscow's Kaliningrad enclave.

"It can not be ruled out that Russia ought to look at the possibility of taking corresponding measures," he sai Russian Foreign Ministry spokesman Alexander Yakovenko said, **"**The main thing that could improve the state of European security is a fundamental change in the very nature of NATO ... including a joint fight against new and real threats and challenges." Monday's expansion has brought NATO nearer to the Balkans, the south Caucasus, the Middle East and Central Asia, all potential breeding grounds for the West's post-Sept. 11 enemies: terrorism and the spread of weapons of mass destruction. But the expansion could hinder NATO's ability to respond quickly to such threats because of its consensus decision-making.

Consultation Non-Unique

Lack of consultation has been a problem since NATO formation

Slocombe 10 (WALTER B. SLOCOMBE June 2010 PERSPECTIVE Towards A New NATO Strategic Concept A View from the United States http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/id/ipa/07299.pdf)

NATO remained at the center of American foreign and security policy throughout the Cold War. The transat-lantic relationship was not – despite a good deal of recent misplaced nostalgia – always an easy one. US and European views diverged on relations with the Soviet Union, on Ostpolitik and arms control, on the relative role of nuclear and conventional weapons in alliance strategy, and on »burden sharing«. The allies resisted American proposals to extend NATO’s scope beyond geographically defined defense of alliance territory, and complained of American domination of NATO decision-making and lack of consultation on matters, such as arms control, where essentially unilat-eral US actions affected their interests. For all these differences – which still persist in new guises – the Alliance retained broad support in the US. That continues to be the case, with opinion polls consis-tently showing more support for US security relation-ships with NATO and its members than with other partners.

**NATO Weak on Terrorism**

**Empirically, NATO is useless in efforts to combat terrorism**

Gordon 2(Philip H., Senior Fellow for U.S. Foreign Policy Foreign,

The Brookings Institution, Summer of 2002, http://www.brookings.edu/articles/2002/summer\_globalgovernance\_gordon.aspx) LL

SUMMER 2002 — Less than 24 hours after the September 11 terrorist attacks on the United States, America's allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization came together to invoke the alliance's Article 5 defense guarantee—this "attack on one" was to be considered an "attack on all." When it came time to implement that guarantee, however, in the form of the American-led military campaign in Afghanistan, NATO remained on the sidelines—by U.S. choice. The Americans decided not to ask for a NATO operation for both military and political reasons—only the United States had the right sort of equipment to project military forces halfway around the world, and Washington did not want political interference from 18 allies in the campaign. In light of these decisions, some observers have begun to wonder whether NATO has any enduring role at all. And there are, in fact, serious reasons for concern about the future of the alliance if leaders on both sides of the Atlantic do not take the steps necessary to adapt it to changing circumstances. The Afghanistan campaign revealed large gaps between the war-fighting capabilities of the United States and its allies and reinforced the perception in some quarters in Washington that it is easier to conduct operations alone than with allies who have little to offer militarily and who might hamper efficient decisionmaking. Moreover, the U.S. decision to increase its defense budget by some $48 billion for 2003—an increase larger than any single European country's entire defense budget—will only make this capabilities gap worse. To the extent that the war on terrorism leads the United States to undertake military operations in other distant theaters, and to the extent that the Europeans are unwilling or unable to come along, NATO's centrality will be further diminished.

**NATO lacks the infrastructure to effectively participate in the war on terror**

De Nevers 7 (Renee, President and Fellows of Harvard College and MIT, *International Security*, 2007, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international\_security/v031/31.4denevers.html) LL

 Moreover, several of NATO's current activities, such as its missions in Afghanistan and the Mediterranean, are closely linked to the war on terror, with other NATO missions also contributing to this fight. These activities have led NATO's secretary-general, Jaap de Hoop Scheffer, to declare that "more than ever, NATO is in demand, and NATO is delivering."1 This apparent vibrancy, however, may not accurately reflect NATO's true condition. Although its missions have expanded dramatically since the end of the Cold War and alliance members agree on the threat posed by terrorism, NATO's actual role in the multifaceted struggle against terrorists is minor. This could have long-term implications for alliance unity. This article investigates how the United States has worked with NATO in prosecuting the war on terror. The U.S. government conceives of this struggle broadly, with counterinsurgency and efforts to constrain the spread of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) as essential elements. NATO is the United States' premier alliance, and most of Washington's closest allies are members. But how does NATO contribute to this war on terror? To be sure, NATO is not simply a "tool" of U.S. policy. The war on terror is a U.S. creation, however, and NATO has been forced to adjust to this fact. The United States perceives [End Page 34] terrorism as the key national security threat it will face in the coming years. Just as the United States is working to transform its strategies in response to this threat, we would expect it to evaluate key alliances and security relationships with this measure. I argue that NATO is playing a largely supportive role in U.S. efforts to combat terrorism. The focus of both the European "fight against terrorism" and the U.S. "war on terror" lies elsewhere, leaving NATO's contribution to efforts to quell terrorism somewhat tangential. NATO is conducting a defensive mission in the Mediterranean in response to the terrorist threat, and it has adopted strategies ranging from new technology development to consequence management to prevent or mitigate terrorist attacks. In Afghanistan the alliance has assumed a frontline role in seeking to deny terrorist groups a foothold there, making this NATO's first de facto combat operation ever. But many of the essential elements of the fight against terrorism, such as intelligence sharing, occur outside NATO. Afghanistan aside, NATO members participate in offensive efforts to respond to terrorism outside NATO through bilateral activities or loose coalitions of the willing. There are three main reasons for NATO's limited role: shifts in alignments and threat perceptions caused by systemic changes, NATO's limited military capabilities, and the nature of the fight against terror.

**NATO Weak on Terrorism**

**US does not need NATO support in the war on terror**

De Nevers 7 (Renee, President and Fellows of Harvard College and MIT, *International Security*, 2007, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international\_security/v031/31.4denevers.html) LL

NATO's military guidelines are more defensive and reactive than those of the United States. NATO places greater emphasis on reducing vulnerabilities and enhancing capabilities to respond quickly to potential attacks. In contrast, the United States seeks to keep terrorists from striking the homeland or U.S. interests abroad. And, whereas NATO's military guidelines suggest that its forces could play either lead or supportive roles in offensive operations against terrorists, more planning is recommended before NATO-led offensive operations are undertaken, while the recommendations for support missions are more practical. This indicates the alliance's greater comfort and experience with its support role.

The goals of NATO and the United States as outlined in these strategies do overlap in important ways. For example, each recognizes the usefulness of multilateral actions and seeks to prevent attacks before they occur. In addition, NATO's counterterrorism strategy shares with U.S. policy the recognition that [End Page 38] preventing attacks may require offensive action against terrorists or states that support them. As NATO's Military Concept for Defense against Terrorism states, "Allied nations agree that terrorists should not be allowed to base, train, plan, stage, and execute terrorist actions, and the threat may be severe enough to justify acting against these terrorists and those who harbor them."14

The overlap notwithstanding, U.S. strategy documents suggest that NATO's deeply institutionalized, consensus-based model is not the United States' preferred approach for multilateral cooperation in the war on terror. Moreover, NATO appears to be less central to U.S. policy and planning. Both the 2002 and 2006 NSS documents promote the formation of coalitions, both within and outside NATO, to address a range of threats.15 More critically, the 2006 NSS makes explicit the U.S. preference for a looser form of cooperation, citing as a model the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI), an activity designed by the George W. Bush administration to constrain the spread of WMD-related technology. The 2006 NSS states as a goal "[the] establish[ment of] results-oriented partnerships on the model of the PSI to meet new challenges and opportunities. These partnerships emphasize international cooperation, not international bureaucracy. They rely on voluntary adherence rather than binding treaties. They are oriented towards action and results rather than legislation or rule- making."16 The 2006 NSS also states that "existing international institutions have a role to play, but in many cases coalitions of the willing may be able to respond more quickly and creatively, at least in the short term."17 Similarly, the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) highlights the distinction between "static alliances versus dynamic partnerships" and the Pentagon's preference for the latter.18 Some Pentagon officials insist that the apparent disdain for existing alliances is aimed not at NATO, but at bodies such as the Organization for American States, which, for example, has resisted U.S. efforts to revise its charter in an attempt to isolate Venezuela's president, Hugo Chavez, to punish his anti-U.S. stance. Although NATO's European members are less concerned now that the United States would use NATO as a "toolbox" than they were immediately after the U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003,19 they may not be reassured that the United States strongly supports the alliance. [End Page 39]

**NATO Weak on Terrorism**

**The US could check terrorism more efficiently without NATO**

De Nevers 7 (Renee, President and Fellows of Harvard College and MIT, *International Security*, 2007, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international\_security/v031/31.4denevers.html) LL

Second, the United States and its European allies have diverging views about the role of military intelligence. From the U.S. perspective, military intelligence [End Page 42] is an increasingly important component on the battlefield. The Department of Defense emphasizes that military intelligence is no longer just a staff function, but rather a war-fighting function that soldiers on the battlefield will be actively engaged in at all times. In addition, as part of its broader interest in network-centric warfare, the Defense Department is pushing to establish a fully "networked battlespace," with the goal of "information dominance" in any conflict.30 NATO's European members do not place the same degree of emphasis on real-time military intelligence.

Third, the capabilities gap that has presented a chronic problem for NATO is increasing in the intelligence area, which suggests growing problems for interoperability. Already in the 1990s, the U.S. military had to maintain "legacy" communications systems to enable it to operate with other NATO members, and allied forces depended heavily on U.S. communications and intelligence during the 1999 Kosovo bombing campaign.31 One reason the United States rejected some European offers of military assistance in its intervention in Afghanistan in 2001 was the difficulties presented by different levels of technological sophistication. The United States spends far more on research and development than its allies; the Defense Department's budget request for research and development for FY 2007 is $57.9 billion. In contrast, the entire defense budget for the United Kingdom, NATO's next largest spender, was $50.2 billion in FY 2006.32 The United States also has a more robust domestic high-technology industry than does any of its European allies.

To be sure, alliance members agree on the need for improvements in intelligence capabilities and interoperability. NATO adopted an initiative on developing new capabilities, particularly in areas such as intelligence and surveillance, in November 2002. In addition, some alliance members are working to improve their information warfare capabilities.33 That better intelligence [End Page 43] capabilities continue to be problematic is evident in repeated references to the need for improved intelligence sharing both among national agencies and internationally.34

The problem, however, is deeper than merely the need for better intelligence capabilities; NATO's members have developed diverging operational concepts because their military capabilities differ. Differences in their views on the role of information in war fighting are one example of this divergence. The United States approaches the use of force differently than do most European militaries, which means that cooperation on the battlefield could be increasingly difficult.35 Although joint exercises may highlight these differences, they do not necessarily resolve them.

**NATO Weak on Terrorism**

NATO is not effective in counter terrorism; internal disagreements and ability gaps prove

De Nevers 7 (Renee, President and Fellows of Harvard College and MIT, *International Security*, 2007, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international\_security/v031/31.4denevers.html) LL

Three factors explain Washington's circumvention of the alliance in prosecuting the war on terror. First, two critical changes in the international system, U.S. hegemony and the emergence of a security community, particularly among European states, have led NATO's members both to differ among themselves on a broad range of global issues and to perceive security threats differently. They also differ on the appropriate means for responding to perceived threats, as was most evident in the dispute over the U.S. invasion of Iraq. These shifting alignments and attitudes have reduced U.S. willingness to accept alliance constraints.

Second, U.S. military capabilities are greater and more sophisticated than those of its allies, which makes it difficult for even close U.S. allies to coordinate with U.S. forces in frontline military activities. Some U.S. officers point out that one goal of NATO training exercises is to illuminate these differences, as a way to spur allies to improve their capabilities.104 But NATO's expansion has eroded its military capabilities further. Combined with the increasing use of national caveats, which constrain what individual military forces can do in NATO operations, the alliance's ability to work with the United States in confronting immediate military threats appears limited, at best. [End Page 64]

Third, the nature of the war on terror itself constrains NATO's contribution to U.S. strategy. Iraq and Afghanistan notwithstanding, terrorism is fought primarily by nonmilitary means, such as law enforcement and intelligence gathering. Moreover, NATO's members face different threats.

**NATO Weak in Afghanistan**

**NATO suffers from insufficient troops, national caveats, and weak political will**

De Nevers 7 (Renee, President and Fellows of Harvard College and MIT, *International Security*, 2007, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international\_security/v031/31.4denevers.html) LL

ISAF was initially established with UN Security Council authorization under British command in October 2001, after the United States overthrew Afghanistan's Taliban government. NATO assumed control of ISAF in August 2003.53 Initially ISAF's mission was limited to patrolling Kabul, but since 2004, ISAF has undertaken a four-stage expansion of its mission into the northern and western provinces of Afghanistan, and later to the south and east. It has also deployed several provincial reconstruction teams, which are based on a [End Page 49] model developed by the U.S. military that combines security and reconstruction functions in an effort to help stabilize the countryside.54 ISAF assumed responsibility for security throughout Afghanistan in October 2006. At that point, it was NATO's largest operation, involving about 31,000 troops, including roughly 12,000 U.S. troops under ISAF command.

ISAF represents a valuable contribution to the U.S. goal of denying terrorists sanctuary or allies, given al-Qaida's close ties with the previous Taliban regime and ongoing efforts to pursue al-Qaida members in the border region between Afghanistan and Pakistan. All twenty-six NATO members participate in ISAF, as do ten non-NATO partner countries.

At the same time, ISAF has suffered from three significant problems. First, since 2003 the alliance has been unable to secure sufficient troop commitments to meet the target force size. When NATO took control of the southern and eastern regions of Afghanistan in August 2006, its 31,000-strong force represented about 85 percent of the troops and equipment that NATO commanders had requested for the mission. Since July 2006, NATO troops have confronted far more intense fighting than expected.55 The alliance appealed for more troops in September 2006, but only one member country, Poland, offered to send additional troops.56 At the November 2006 summit meeting in Riga, Latvia, new pledges from member states raised the troop and equipment totals to 90 percent of requirements.57 ISAF's commander at that time, Lt. Gen. David Richards, said that it can manage with the current troop strength, but additional troops would allow it to conduct major operations more rapidly and with less risk to NATO soldiers.58 [End Page 50]

Second, many troops in Afghanistan operate under "national caveats," whereby governments place limits on what military activities their troops are allowed to do or where they are allowed to go in carrying out their missions. These caveats are problematic for two reasons: they hurt operational effectiveness; and alliance members do not share risks equally, which can cause friction.59 Germany's troops can be deployed only near Kabul, for example, and in 2006 Poland resisted sending additional troops to southern Afghanistan, where they are needed the most. Only six NATO members operate without caveats. The problem is not unique to ISAF; national caveats caused headaches during NATO's peacekeeping mission in Bosnia as well, and they have long been a problem in UN peacekeeping missions.60 Recognition of the operational problems such caveats pose has led to a marked decline in their use, but they have made both multinational cooperation and operations in general more difficult in Afghanistan.61 Caveats tend to creep back in, moreover, as is evident in repeated efforts to eliminate them. NATO leaders agreed to reduce caveats at the 2006 Riga summit, for example, with the result that 26,000 troops of the increased force of 32,000 had broader freedom to act.62

Third, the Afghan leadership fears that the United States will abandon it, and it is unsure what NATO's authority over both the security and counterterrorism mission will mean in the long run. Concern has also been raised about whether NATO has the political will and capabilities to fight a sustained counterinsurgency campaign.63 Since NATO forces assumed responsibility for security in southern Afghanistan, the frequency and intensity of Taliban attacks have increased.64 This renewed fighting forced the United States to reverse plans to reduce [End Page 51] its military commitment in Afghanistan and led the British to expand their troop contribution to ISAF.65 The United States decided in January 2007 to extend the tours of 3,200 troops in Afghanistan, and further troop increases were under consideration.66 Notably, U.S. forces, ISAF's largest contingent, will continue to conduct the bulk of counterterrorism activities aimed at al-Qaida. The U.S. military also retains 11,000 troops outside ISAF's command to sustain a separate counterinsurgency function in addition to peacekeeping.67

**NATO Weak in Iraq**

National caveats, lack of funding, and lack of consensus have prevented effective NATO handling of Iraq

De Nevers 7 (Renee, President and Fellows of Harvard College and MIT, *International Security*, 2007, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/international\_security/v031/31.4denevers.html) LL

In 2004, at U.S. urging, NATO agreed to play a central role in training Iraqi security forces. NATO's training effort has several elements: mentoring of Iraqi military officers by NATO personnel; creation of an officer training facility in Iraq; and training of Iraqi officers in NATO facilities. NATO's target is to train 1,000 officers inside Iraq annually, and 500 outside the state; by September [End Page 52] 2006, NATO had trained 650 Iraqi officers in European facilities and roughly 2,000 officers overall.71 NATO has also donated military equipment to Iraq's security forces. This equipment comes primarily from former Warsaw Pact countries that have become NATO members, and it is compatible with Iraq's Soviet-supplied military hardware.

NATO's training mission has faced significant difficulties, however. First, the need to gain consensus on all decisions hamstrung efforts to get the mission up and running and greatly slowed the process; residual bitterness over the U.S. decision to invade Iraq contributed to this problem. Some members objected to the precedent set by taking on the training mission, which also slowed decisionmaking.72 Second, as in Afghanistan, some troop contributions have operated under national caveats, which has hindered commanders' efforts to coordinate NATO's activities. Third, funding for the mission has been a serious problem. Countries contributing troops are expected to cover their own costs. NATO set up a "trust fund" to pay for the establishment of a defense university in Iraq, but contributions to the fund have thus far been insufficient. As a result, although the Iraqi government has stressed its preference for in-country training to help gain popular trust and support for the new security forces, more officers have been trained outside Iraq.73

NATO Peacekeeping in the West Bank fails – Caveats

Diker et. al 10 (Dan Senior Foreign Policy Analyst, Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs; Adjunct

Fellow, Hudson Institute *Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs* ISRAEL’S CRITICAL SECURITY NEEDS FOR A VIABLE PEACE http://www.jcpa.org/text/security/fullstudy.pdf

Even in a robust NATO deployment in Afghanistan, which is not a peacekeeping mission, European states have insisted on “caveats” for the employment of their forces, restricting their use for only the safest missions. There were national caveats banning nighttime operations and restricting the geographic deployment of forces to specific areas which were known to be more secure. Some caveats required consultations between commanders in the field and national capitals in Europe before tactical decisions could be taken. Most importantly, there were national caveats that excluded the use of certain forces that were part of the NATO alliance in counterterrorism operations.1 General John Craddock, the former Supreme Allied Commander of NATO, admitted in 2009 that NATO forces were burdened with 83 national caveats, which were reduced to about 70.2 NATO remains a cumbersome organization. Given its track record in Afghanistan, it is difficult to imagine the efficacy of similar forces in the West Bank. NATO remains a cumbersome organization, especially when it comes to decisionmaking and processing urgent operational requirements from commanders. In counterterrorism operations, it is precisely the ability to act quickly and decisively that keeps the peace and prevents attacks. Given the track record of NATO in Afghanistan, it is difficult to imagine the efficacy of similar forces in the West Bank

NATO Fails – Generic

NATO lacks cohesion and organization

Rupp 4 (Richard, International Studies Association, Mar 17, fromhttp://www.allacademic.com/meta/p73714\_index.html) LL

Despite substantial internal reform, collaborative missions, membership enlargement, and consistent public pronouncements of allied unity, NATO’s days as a coherent, effectively functioning, military alliance are drawing to a close. The states that established the Alliance in 1949 confronted a common threat to their survival. Though NATO’s member-states have made considerable efforts to identify new threats and missions since 1991, no unifying set of priorities has surfaced. Though many dangers to Western security have emerged in the post-Cold War period--the rise of the Al-Qaeda arguably the most significant--these issues have not unified the NATO members in significant common purpose. In the absence of a menace to their vital interests, and with fundamental political, economic, and environmental differences dividing the United States from Canada and Europe since the early 1990s, NATO will prove less and less valuable to its members with each passing year. This assertion is certainly provocative in light of the reforms and military operations that NATO has undertaken since the collapse of the Soviet Union. From the adoption of the Alliance’s 1991 Strategic Concept, to the design of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC), the Combined Joint Task Forces (CJTF), Partnership for Peace (PFP), membership enlargement, and military operations in Bosnia, Kosovo, and Afghanistan, NATO has consistently endeavored to adapt to the changing security and political terrain of the post-Cold War era. Scholars and policy makers who endorse NATO’s value and utility, acknowledge the array of challenges continuing to confront the Alliance. However, NATO advocates argue that those challenges are manageable and with the right set of reforms and policy initiatives, the Alliance will function effectively well into the future.

NATO Fails at Peacekeeping

NATO fails at peacekeeping

Davis 9 (Dr. Ian Davis is the founding director of NATO Watch and an independent human security and arms control consultant, writer and activist 31 March - 1 April 2009The Shadow NATO Summit: Options for NATO - pressing the reset button on the strategic concept 31 March - 1 April 2009, Brussels http://www.basicint.org/pubs/natoshadow.pdf)

 In summary, NATO is not ideally suited to peacekeeping operations. If this is to become a core goal of the Alliance, it would need to adapt its doctrines to clearly separate peacekeeping from war-fighting. It also needs to adjust its approach to planning. Rather than seeking to make NATO operations ‘comprehensive’ by bringing a greater range of actors into its planning process, it needs to orient its planning towards implementation of core military peacekeeping tasks, as defined in a peace agreement or a commonly agreed peacebuilding/recovery strategy. While it must evidently strive to be networked with other civilian actors – and well informed of its operational context –it must relinquish its ambition to direct the entire international reconstruction effort. This is not only politically unrealistic, but is arguably unhelpful in so far as it limits the diversity and innovation in support of complex political stabilization or peacebuilding processes, and reduces the space for local leadership in the peacebuilding effort.

NATO Bad – Hegemony

NATO Requires overstretch that collapses hegemony

Merry 3 ( E. Wayne, Therapy’s End: Thinking Beyond NATO, The National Interest, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m2751/is\_74/ai\_112411717/pg\_8/?tag=content;col1

For better or worse, the United States has global responsibilities and unique global capabilities. At the same time, **Washington's** diplomatic and political **capacities are already overburdened**. While U.S. operational and logistical capabilities are today supreme, America's overall force structure is little more than half the size it was a generation ago, and its reserves are seriously overcommitted. The best forces can cover only limited tasks, especially for a democratic nation that employs only volunteers. Stated plainly, **NATO is a luxury the United States can no longer justify. This vast subsidy for Europe is in direct conflict with the procurement and development budgets required to maintain the American technological lead in an ever-competitive world. Today's precision weapons will be commonplace tomorrow, and even the Pentagon's immense budget cannot always keep up**.

NATO Bad – China

The CP causes NATO overreach which causes conflict with China – other issues stabilize the alliance.

Heisbourg 6 ( Special adviser at the Fondation pour la Recherche Strategique, 2006

Francois, Paris, “Why Nato needs to be less ambitious,” Financial Times, 11/22/06, lexis

Yet it is as clear that Nato is no longer a pivot of US strategy, as demonstrated by its marginal treatment in America's latest quadriennal defence review. Indeed, the word "Nato" is all too often, in American political and media parlance, a euphemism for the phrase "the European allies" - which is not saying quite the same thing. Nato's expansion may be reaching the limits beyond which it would become a force of regional instability rather than one of stabilisation: Ukraine is literally split down the middle over the issue of entry to the Nato alliance. Going "out of area", as in Afghanistan, has helped keep Nato in business but in the process the alliance has become an a la carte multilateral institution. The Atlantic alliance has also ceased to be the principal point of US-European consultation on the key strategic issues of our times: the rise of China, the nuclear ambitions of Iran and North Korea and the fate of the crisis-ridden Middle East are dealt with mainly outside the Nato framework. In itself, this reduction of Nato's place in the overall scheme of strategic affairs should not be a big concern for those who live and work beyond the confines of the Nato bureaucracy. After all, Nato is immensely and uniquely useful in fostering interoperability between the military forces of its members, which is key to forming effective coalitions of forces. In a world in which the mission determines the coalition, this ability is more important than ever. Similarly, Nato remains key in ensuring that the partner states of eastern Europe press on with reform of their security sectors. Unfortunately, Nato is not sticking to its core competencies. In a quest to carve a greater role for itself and demonstrate global relevance, the alliance is running the risk of overreaching itself in strategic and political terms, with potentially dangerous consequences. In the run-up to Riga, there has been much talk of a "Nato-bis", or second version, of a privileged partnership between Nato and hopefully like-minded states in the Asia-Pacific region such as Japan and Australia. The wisdom of this is questionable, to put it mildly, given its potential for needless friction with a rising China. The push for a Nato-bis is probably not intended to foster a "west against the rest" alignment in east Asia; but that could be its inadvertent effect. Nato should not be acting like a solution in search of a problem.

The impact is nuclear war

Johnson 1 (Charles Former Professor of Poly Sci @ Berkeley, Former Chairman of the Department and Chair of the Center for Chinese Studies, 5-14-01,

Chalmers, *The Nation*, n19v272 p. 20, L/N)

China is another matter. No sane figure in the Pentagon wants a war with China, and all serious US militarists know that China's minuscule nuclear capacity is not offensive but a deterrent against the overwhelming US power arrayed against it (twenty archaic Chinese warheads versus more than 7,000 US warheads). Taiwan, whose status constitutes the still incomplete last act of the Chinese civil war, remains the most dangerous place on earth. Much as the 1914 assassination of the Austrian crown prince in Sarajevo led to a war that no one wanted, a misstep in Taiwan by any side could bring the United States and China into a conflict that neither wants. Such a war would bankrupt the United States, deeply divide Japan and probably end in a Chinese victory, given that China is the world's most populous country and would be defending itself against a foreign aggressor. More seriously, it could easily escalate into a nuclear holocaust. However, given the nationalistic challenge to China's sovereignty of any Taiwanese attempt to declare its independence formally, forward-deployed US forces on China's borders have virtually no deterrent effect.

NATO Bad – Arms Sales

**NATO arms sales contribute to regional instability**

Rozoff 9 (Rick, Global Research, Sep 22, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=15339>) LL

The vast preponderance of American and other NATO states' arms are sold to nations neither in North America and Europe nor on their peripheries. They are sold to nations like Saudi Arabia, India, Israel, the United Arab Emirates, Australia, Egypt, Taiwan, South Korea, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Colombia, Kuwait, the Philippines, Morocco and other Western client states and military outposts far removed from the much-vaunted Euro-Atlantic space. The weapons along with the military technicians, trainers and advisers that inevitably accompany them are spread throughout nations in geostrategically vital areas of the world, near large oil and natural gas reserves and astride key shipping lanes and choke points. In many instances Western-fueled arms buildups are accelerating in nations bordering Russia, China, Iran and Venezuela. Geopolitics in its most transparent, cynical and brutal manifestation. The growing sales of Western arms in the Persian Gulf, the South Caucasus, South America (Chile and Colombia most pronouncedly), Africa, Far East Asia and the South Pacific (Australia in the first instance) are an integral element of American and general Western plans to gain access to and domination over world energy resources. The campaign is not limited to efforts to muscle into nations and regions rich in oil and natural gas (and uranium), nor to employing fair means or foul, peaceful or otherwise, to seize the commanding heights of the international energy market. The overarching objective is to control the ownership, transport and consumption of energy worldwide. To determine who receives oil and natural gas, through which routes and at which prices. And to dictate what the political and military quid pro quo will be for being invited to join a U.S.-dominated international energy transportation and accessibility network. Those who are allowed to exploit, sell and transit hydrocarbons to the Western and ultimately world market are levied for a handsome share of their energy-derived revenues for unprecedented acquisition of arms and for the stationing of U.S. and other NATO states' military forces on their soil. Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, the United Arab Emirates, Azerbaijan and Georgia are salient examples. The last two-named nations have increased their military budgets by well over 1,000 percent in the first case and by over 3,000 percent in the second in the span of a few years. A United Press International report of August 25, 2009 estimated that Middle Eastern nations would purchase $100 billion worth of arms over the next five years, with the lion's share going to the oil-rich Western client states of Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates and Iraq. There are six major areas in the world that the United States and its allies have targeted in history's largest scramble for hydrocarbons and, it's important to remember, against a recent backdrop of diminishing energy consumption, plunging prices and both the discovery and presumption of oil and natural gas reserves hitherto unexploited.