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# **EU Counterplan Shell**

## Text: The European Union should \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[insert plan mandates]

## Observation 1: Not topical—not the US and the counterplan tests the US federal government in the resolution.

## Observation 2: Competition—doesn’t link to US based disads.

## Observation 3: Net Benefit—EU leadership--

## **European leadership in space is key to developing a European leadership role on Earth:**

European Commission, 1/20/2011 “Bringing space down to earth”

<http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/space/index_en.htm>

Europe needs an effective space policy that will allow the EU to take the global lead in selected strategic policy areas. Space can provide the tools to address many of the global challenges that face society in the twenty-first century: challenges that Europe must take a leading role in addressing. Space systems and space-based technologies are a critical part of the daily life of all European citizens and businesses. From telecommunications to television, weather forecasting to global financial systems, most of the key services that we all take for granted in the modern world depend on space in order to function properly. Research and development activities are coordinated within the framework of the overall European Space Policy, complementing the efforts of member countries and of other key players, including the European Space Agency. In the future space will become even more important and offer new opportunities for business as well as services for citizens. Improved positioning and timing systems along with global environmental monitoring will provide areas for innovative companies to flourish by providing new services. Space is also critical in terms of environmental, security and climate change considerations. Europe is home to a large, hi-tech aerospace industry that supplies a significant part of the world's commercial requirements for satellite manufacture, launch and services. The European industry has proved highly competitive in a difficult marketplace. Space systems are clearly strategic assets that demonstrate independence and the ability to assume global responsibilities. To maximise the benefits and opportunities that they can provide to Europe now and in the future, it is important to have an active, co-ordinated strategy and a comprehensive European Space Policy.

## Strong EU solves multiple scenarios of extinction.

Bruton 2001 (John, Former Irish Prime Minister, Report before the Joint Committee on European Affairs, Parliament of Ireland, October, http://www.irlgov.ie/committees-02/c-europeanaffairs/future/page1.htm)

2.5 As the Laeken Declaration put it, "Europe needs to shoulder its responsibilities in the governance of globalisation" adding that Europe must exercise its power in order "to set globalisation within a moral framework, in other words to anchor it in solidarity and sustainable development". 2.6 Only a strong European Union is big enough to create a space, and a stable set of rules, within which all Europeans can live securely, move freely, and provide for themselves, for their families and for their old age. Individual states are too small to do that on their own. Only a strong European Union is big enough to deal with the globalized **human diseases**, such as AIDS and tuberculosis. Only a strong European Union is big enough to deal with **globalized criminal conspiracies**, like the Mafia, that threaten the security of all Europeans. Only a strong European Union is big enough to deal with globalized **environmental threats**, such as global warming, which threaten our continent and generations of its future inhabitants. Only a strong European Union is big enough to deal with globalized **economic forces**, which could spread recession from one country to another and destroy millions of jobs. Only a strong European Union is big enough to regulate, in the interests of society as a whole, the activities of profit seeking private corporations, some of which now have more spending power than many individual states. 2.7 These tasks are too large for individual states. 2.8 Only by coming together in the European Union can we ensure that **humanity**, and the values which make us, as individuals, truly human, prevail over blind global forces that will otherwise overwhelm us.

# International FIAT Good

## 1) Tests the agent in the resolution: the United States federal government—the counterplan de-justifies the agent in the plan and the resolution.

## 2) Increases education about the world—learn about EU policy and how it interacts with space.

## 3) Key to neg flexibility—can’t win asteroids striking the Earth are good so the NEG needs international counterplans.

## 4) Turn: checks ethnocentrism—avoids the belief that the US is the key to the world.

## 5) Lit checks abuse—we read evidence specific to the EU role in space.

## 6) Predictable—they should research answers against the European role in space.

## 7) Topic is AFF biased—topic is huge—basically any use of space is allowed—NEG needs options to check back a near infinite range of affirmatives.

# **Permutation Answers**

## (--) Permutation still links to the net benefits: all our US bad disads are net benefits to the counterplan.

## (--) The permutation still makes the EU dependent on the United States—extend our European

## Commission Evidence that the EU needs to develop independence in the space arena to be perceived as a global leader on other issues.

## **(--) Space is crucial to developing European independence—the permutation merely continues European dependence on the US:**

European Commission, 4/8/2011 (“European space policy,” <http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/space/esp/index_en.htm>)

Space systems are strategic assets demonstrating Europe's independence and readiness to assume global responsibilities. The strategic mission of the European Space Policy, jointly developed by the European Commission and the ESA, is based on the peaceful exploitation of outer space.

## (--) Establishing space policy at a European level demonstrates European ability to take a leadership role in the world:

European Commission, 4/8/2011 (“European space policy,” <http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/space/esp/index_en.htm>)

The establishment of a space policy at European level demonstrates the ability of the EU to take a positive lead in areas of vital strategic importance that link a wide variety of policy areas - from telecommunications to humanitarian aid - and involve a complex interaction of players at regional, national and international levels.

# EU Counterplan Impact Overview—Bruton evidence extension

## Extend our Bruton evidence—the EU solves disease, warming, and global economic recessions—these are all terminal for civilization while outweighing and turning the AFF.

## And…Diseases risk extinction:

The Scotsman, 9/11/1995 (“The mega death,” Lexis)

Bullets and bombs may be the weapons of the present, but plagues, viruses and killer microbes are the arsenal of the future. Together with the sarin gas which it released on the Tokyo underground in April, the Japanese Ohm cult had stockpiled a lethal bacterium which it chose not to unleash. Crippling continents by using killer infectious diseases is no far- fetched idea of sci-fi novels. But the scientists' inability to distinguish between naturally emerging and synthetic disease outbreaks means whole areas could be laid waste before anyone realised what was happening, warns Laurie Garrett, author of a ground-breaking book on the burgeoning of infectious disease. All this on top of the fact that new diseases are emerging naturally at an alarming rate - representing a real threat to the survival of the human species - says The Coming Plague. Meticulously researched over the past decade, Garrett's book charts the history of our age-old battle against the microbes, and concludes that we are beginning to cede the advantage to the disease-carriers. The optimism born out of defeating smallpox in the Sixties was dangerously premature. Everything from overuse of antibiotics to increased promiscuity have helped smooth the path for the microbes ever since. "The survival of the human species is not a pre- ordained evolutionary programme," warns Nobel Laureate Joshua Lederberg in The Coming Plague.

# EU Counterplan: Libya Impact Module

## (--) European unity needed to push Gadhafi out of power in Libya and stabilize the region:

Mimosa Spencer, 3/2/2011 (staff writer, “EU Unity Needed To Push Gadhafi Out Of Libya”

<http://online.wsj.com/article/BT-CO-20110302-703547.html>**)**

European Union countries need to work together to push Libyan head of state Col. Moammar Gadhafi out of power, said France's European Affairs Minister Laurent Wauquiez on the French radio channel France Info. He was talking about a meeting scheduled between European Union leaders to discuss developments in Libya on March 11. The "total determination of all European countries" is needed to "push Gadhafi out and make sure that a blood bath doesn't ensue," Wauquiez said. He also called for European unity to devise a type of Marshall Plan for the Mediterranean region that would also involve the U.S. and Asian countries: "We need a Marshall plan, European on the one hand but also involving America and Asian countries to stabilize the situation in the Mediterranean, complete unity on this matter," he said.

## (--) Failure in Libya undermines world democratic movements, risks terrorism, a war in Korea, a Chinese-Taiwanese war, and Japanese rearmament:

Christian Science Monitor 3/2/2011 (3/2/11, " No fly zone over Libya? Obama must take a stand soon. ", http://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/the-monitors-view/2011/0302/No-fly-zone-over-Libya-Obama-must-take-a-stand-soon)

As in Tunisia and Egypt, the best outcome would be for Libyans themselves to oust their dictator, Muammar Qaddafi, without military help from outside powers like the United States. Events are moving fast, and it’s difficult to know which way this budding revolution will go. The rebels in Libya’s east are debating whether to ask for outside help. Still, the potential repercussions of not acting militarily need to be seriously weighed – and not just in the Oval Office, Pentagon, and State Department. What if this North African country of 6 million people becomes another Rwanda or Kosovo, with genocidal violence? Mr. Qaddafi is a ruthless dictator with a record of vengeance against opponents – as seen in recent days as he has become more isolated. The morality of letting him commit mass killing needs to be debated widely now – and not after the fact, as was the case with Rwanda’s genocide. It was the West’s mistake not to intervene in that 1994 African massacre that helped persuade NATO in 1999 to save Kosovo from Serbian atrocities. In 2000, Britain’s military intervention in Sierra Leone was also done to prevent a slaughter. Obama would be wise to engage China and Russia, as key United Nations Security Council members, on their degree of support for humanitarian intervention in Libya. And what if Qaddafi is able to crush this uprising for democracy, which could then dampen the Arab awakening in other countries? A historic moment might be lost to transform the terror-exporting Middle East. Not to save a popular and large democratic movement would send a signal to at least one key American ally. If the US won’t help Libya on its verge of freedom, would it also not defend South Korea against a North Korean invasion? Taiwan, too, may decide that the US won’t come to its aid in another showdown of force with mainland China. Japan may muscle up its military, assuming Americans have now turned inward.

## (--) Democracy promotion key to preventing inevitable extinction

**Diamond**, senior research fellow at Hoover Institution, **95**

(Larry, *Promoting Democracy in the 1990s: Actors and Instruments, Issues and Imperatives,* A Report to the Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict, December 1995, p. 6)

This hardly exhausts the lists of threats to our security and well-being in the coming years and decades. In the former Yugoslavia nationalist aggression tears at the stability of Europe and could easily spread. The flow of illegal drugs intensifies through increasingly powerful international crime syndicates that have made common cause with authoritarian regimes and have utterly corrupted the institutions of tenuous, democratic ones. Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons continue to proliferate. The very source of life on Earth, the global ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered. Most of these new and unconventional threats to security are associated with or aggravated by the weakness or absence of democracy, with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty, and openness.

## (--) Terrorists will use nuclear weapons triggering global nuclear war and extinction

Mohamed **Sid-Ahmed, 2004** ([**http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2004/705/op5.htm**](http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2004/705/op5.htm), 26 August - 1 September 2004)

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.**

# EU Counterplan: EU Unity Key to Solve Libya

## (--) EU unity key to ending the Libyan crisis:

Shada Islam , 3/10/2011 (“EU unity needed on Libya”

<http://www.friendsofeurope.org/Contentnavigation/Library/Libraryoverview/tabid/1186/articleType/ArticleView/articleId/2235/EU-unity-needed-on-Libya.aspx>)

European Union governments must not break ranks over how to end the prolonged crisis in Libya. They must also urgently agree on a new blueprint for stronger engagement with Egypt and Tunisia. Discord at the EU summit on March 11 or other meetings in the coming weeks will send a message of weakness and lack of resolve to Colonel Gaddafi, emboldening his supporters as they step up the offensive against rebels seeking his removal. Given the difficulties in getting a complete picture of the quickly changing situation in Libya – and different national concerns of the 27 EU states – Europe is not alone in struggling to find a coherent policy on Libya. The US is similarly divided on how best to tackle a very complex situation. European governments have imposed sanctions on Gaddafi and his family and sent millions of euros in humanitarian aid to refugees seeking to leave Libya. They remain rightfully wary of direct intervention, fearing entanglement in another prolonged war in the Middle East.

## (--) Important for the EU to not send mixed signals to Gadhafi:

Shada Islam , 3/10/2011 (“EU unity needed on Libya”

<http://www.friendsofeurope.org/Contentnavigation/Library/Libraryoverview/tabid/1186/articleType/ArticleView/articleId/2235/EU-unity-needed-on-Libya.aspx>)

EU governments clearly need time to assess, reflect and consult on the right actions to take on Libya. But while they do so, they should avoid sending mixed signals to Gaddafi and his supporters.

# EU Counterplan Impacts—Libya--Module Extensions--Terrorism

## (--) Protracted Libyan civil war risks conflicts throughout Africa and widespread terrorism:

James Phillips and James Carafano, 3/4/2011 (Senior Research Fellow for Middle Eastern Affairs @ Heritage, Deputy Director of the Davis Institute @ Heritage Foundation, “Time for a Long-Term Strategy for Libya” <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2011/03/Time-for-a-Long-Term-Strategy-for-Libya>)

The Obama Administration must avoid wishful thinking about an “easy button” policy for liberating Libya from the oppressive and murderous Qadhafi dictatorship. The hope that a quick Western intervention through imposing a no-fly zone would ensure the toppling of the regime, reassert American leadership in the “fight for freedom,” or stem a serious humanitarian crisis is not realistic. Even if he is deprived of airpower, Colonel Muammar Qadhafi has mustered sufficient military force to make a stand, and it is unlikely that a mere show of force by Western powers would precipitate the collapse of his entrenched regime. That said, the U.S. has significant interests in the outcome of the current conflict. Qadhafi has committed crimes against Americans, and it is in the national interest to bring him to justice. Moreover, a protracted civil war in Libya risks spreading instability throughout the region, exacerbating a humanitarian crisis that could spill over to NATO’s front door, and creating a failed state that could become a sanctuary for transnational terrorist groups like al-Qaeda.

## (--) African conflict escalates to global nuclear war

Jeffrey Deutsch, Rabid Tiger Project founder, professor of political science at New World University, November 18, 2002, The Rabid Tiger Newsletter, Vol. II, No. 9, http://www.rabidtigers.com/rtn/newsletterv2n9.html

The Rabid Tiger Project believes that a nuclear war is most likely to start in Africa. Civil wars in the Congo (the country formerly known as Zaire), Rwanda, Somalia and Sierra Leone, and domestic instability in Zimbabwe, Sudan and other countries, as well as occasional brushfire and other wars (thanks in part to “national” borders that cut across tribal ones) turn into a really nasty stew. We’ve got all too many rabid tigers and potential rabid tigers, who are willing to push the button rather than risk being seen as wishy-washy in the face of a mortal threat and overthrown. Geopolitically speaking, Africa is open range. Very few countries in Africa are beholden to any particular power. South Africa is a major exception in this respect - not to mention in that she also probably already has the Bomb. Thus, outside powers can more easily find client states there than, say, in Europe where the political lines have long since been drawn, or Asia where many of the countries (China, India, Japan) are powers unto themselves and don’t need any “help,” thank you. Thus, an African war can attract outside involvement very quickly. Of course, a proxy war alone may not induce the Great Powers to fight each other. But an African nuclear strike can ignite a much broader conflagration, if the other powers are interested in a fight. Certainly, such a strike would in the first place have been facilitated by outside help - financial, scientific, engineering, etc. Africa is an ocean of troubled waters, and some people love to go fishing.

# EU Counterplan Impacts—Libya--Module Extensions to Other Moduled Impacts

## (--) China-Taiwan war causes massive worldwide nuclear conflict:

STRAITS TIMES, June 25, 2000; Lexis

THE high-intensity scenario postulates a cross-strait war escalating into a full-scale war between the US and China. If Washington were to conclude that splitting China would better serve its national interests, then a full-scale war becomes unavoidable. Conflict on such a scale would embroil other countries far and near and -- horror of horrors -- **raise the possibility of a nuclear war**. Beijing has already told the US and Japan privately that it considers any country providing bases and logistics support to any US forces attacking China as belligerent parties open to its retaliation. In the region, this means South Korea, Japan, the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Singapore. If China were to retaliate, **east Asia will be set on fire**. And the conflagration may not end there as opportunistic powers elsewhere may try to overturn the existing world order. With the US distracted, Russia may seek to redefine Europe's political landscape. The balance of power in the Middle East may be similarly upset by the likes of Iraq. In south Asia, hostilities between India and Pakistan, each armed with its own nuclear arsenal, could enter a new and dangerous phase. Will a full-scale Sino-US war lead to a nuclear war? According to General Matthew Ridgeway, commander of the US Eighth Army which fought against the Chinese in the Korean War, the US had at the time thought of using nuclear weapons against China to save the US from military defeat. In his book The Korean War, a personal account of the military and political aspects of the conflict and its implications on future US foreign policy, Gen Ridgeway said that US was confronted with two choices in Korea -- truce or a broadened war, which could have led to the use of nuclear weapons. If the US had to resort to nuclear weaponry to defeat China long before the latter acquired a similar capability, there is little hope of winning a war against China 50 years later, short of using nuclear weapons. The US estimates that China possesses about 20 nuclear warheads that can destroy major American cities. Beijing also seems prepared to go for the nuclear option. A Chinese military officer disclosed recently that Beijing was considering a review of its "non first use" principle regarding nuclear weapons. Major-General Pan Zhangqiang, president of the military-funded Institute for Strategic Studies, told a gathering at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars in Washington that although the government still abided by that principle, there were strong pressures from the military to drop it. He said military leaders considered the use of nuclear weapons mandatory if the country risked dismemberment as a result of foreign intervention. Gen Ridgeway said that should that come to pass, we would see the destruction of civilisation. There would be no victors in such a war. While the prospect of **a nuclear Armaggedon over Taiwan** might seem inconceivable, it cannot be ruled out entirely, for China puts sovereignty above everything else. Gen Ridgeway recalled that the biggest mistake the US made during the Korean War was to assess Chinese actions according to the American way of thinking. "Just when everyone believed that no sensible commander would march south of the Yalu, the Chinese troops suddenly appeared," he recalled. (The Yalu is the river which borders China and North Korea, and the crossing of the river marked China's entry into the war against the Americans). "I feel uneasy if now somebody were to tell me that they bet China would not do this or that," he said in a recent interview given to the Chinese press.

## (--) Japanese rearm causes a revival of Japanese empire and war with the US and China.

Purrington, RAND, 95 EAST ASIAS POTENTIAL FOR INSTABILITY AND CONFLICT p. 217

## Japan has both the technological capabilities and nuclear material necessary to rapidly emerge as a major nuclear power. Domestic and regional aversion to any revision of Japan’s three non-nuclear principles, however would make such a choice difficult. A “great power” Japan would create regional insecurity and would jeopardize Japan’s trade relations with its neighbors. It would therefore likely necessitate a path of formal empire in order to guarantee Japan’s access to regional markets and raw resources. But such a step would be even more dangerous since it would also be certain to cause severe conflict with other major powers, especially China and the United States.

# EU Counterplan Impacts--Russian Aggression Module

## A) Strong EU checks Russian aggression—the US will fail:

Denis Corboy, 2008 (director of the Caucasus Policy Institute at King's College, Christian Science Monitor, 11/7/2008, “Europe, not the US, can get Russia to behave,” Lexis)

When war erupted in August between Russia and Georgia, it was the European Union (EU) president who achieved a cease-fire agreement. Was this just a lucky break for the EU, or a sign of Europe's strength? The answer is one that Europe needs to take full advantage of: Nicolas Sarkozy achieved the cease-fire not because the EU has more military divisions than Stalin's heirs. His personal energy and France's weight may have helped, but Europe's real clout is its pull on Russia and its people. As the tone of Russian President Dimitry Medvedev's state-of-the-union address indicated this week, big challenges remain. On top of strong language for Washington, Russia has military predominance on Georgia's doorstep and no Western counterweight is in sight. Moscow's recognition of the "independence" of the Georgian separatist areas of Abkhazia and South Ossetia - despite international condemnation - seems intended to signal that Moscow will not retreat. Europe, not America is now best able to get Moscow to behave. Europe is a neighbor and huge market for Russian energy and minerals. The EU accounted for just over half of Russia's foreign trade in 2007. Russians see Europe as appealing - a rich and stable region where the state plays a large role and citizens enjoy generous social benefits. And Russian elites have long aspired to European ways. Underlining Europe's pull, President Medvedev recently called the EU a "strategic partner" and waxed that Europe and Russia were "united by history, by common borders, and most important, I hope, we are united by the vision of a new greater Europe." In the wake of the Georgian war, however, Europeans have reason to harbor increased doubt that Russia is a strategic partner. Moscow is going out of its way to signal that Ukraine is the next target. Russian leaders have publicly vilified President Yushchenko, challenged the logic of Crimea's status in Ukraine, and insisted on retaining the Russian naval base at Sevastopol after the lease expires in 2017. Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin even alleged that Ukraine had dispatched soldiers to fight alongside Georgian troops in the August war. Just as incredulously, this week Medvedev charged that the war was "among other things, the result of the arrogant course of the US administration." It is unlikely that rants such as these are what Europe expects of a partner. Still, the EU has notable advantages over the US and NATO in influencing Russia to behave more responsibly. Distant from Russia, the US is a military rival and not a major economic partner. Many Russians are suspicious of the US and NATO. The EU should develop more traction with Russia so as to capitalize fully on its advantage. The EU should devise ways for Georgia and Ukraine to participate in an association with step-by-step integration, free trade arrangements, and a road map for eventual EU membership. The road map should be accompanied by an intensified EU-Russian dialogue that would underscore the benefits of cooperation for all parties. If Russia treats its neighbors and economic partners fairly, an enhanced EU-Russia partnership should be on the table. Incentives work best when combined with clear expectations. Mistreating energy investors, such as BP, or undermining the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe should have well- understood consequences. These steps would better anchor Russia and its interested neighbors in Europe's architecture, enhance democratic gains and political stability, and build a stronger foundation for prosperity. Then, further democratic and economic reforms would make those countries more attractive partners to the EU. Closer linkages with the EU would also discourage Russia from picking fights with neighbors for fear of diminishing its own European relations. The West should adopt a long-haul strategy with South Ossetia and Abkhazia akin to nonrecognition of the forcible incorporation of the Baltic countries into the USSR in 1940. This policy allowed the West to pursue high priorities with Moscow, such as nuclear arms control. Likewise, today a formula needs to be found which will permit negotiations for a new EU-Russia partnership agreement. In addressing the UN General Assembly this fall, French President Sarkozy suggested a good way forward, "Why not build across the whole Continent a common economic space which would unite Russia and Europe?" He is on the mark. Isolating Russia or keeping it permanently at arm's length would be a historic error. Eventually, Russia will awake from its tragic history of authoritarianism and imperialism. Europe and the EU can hasten this by offering the prospect of closer integration if Russia respects the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of its neighbors. When president, Obama can reinforce this course, but America cannot substitute for Europe.

## B) Russian aggression against Europe risks nuclear escalation:

Rick Rozoff, 2009 (“Baltic Sea: Flash Point For NATO-Russia Conflict,” <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/stopnato/message/37592>)

In such an environment of international lawlessness and heightened alarm over military threats, otherwise minor contretemps and even fears of a neighbor's and potential adversary's intents can spark a conflict - and a conflagration. The world has been on edge for a decade now and a form of numbing has set in with many of its inhabitants; a permanent condition of war apprehension and alert has settled over others, particularly those in areas likely to be directly affected. Over the past six years the worst and most immediate fears have centered on the prospects of three major regional conflicts, all of which are fraught with the danger of eventual escalation into nuclear exchanges. The three are a renewed and intensified Indian-Pakistani conflict, an outbreak of hostilities on the Korean Peninsula and an attack by the US, Israel or both in unison against Iran. The first would affect neighbors both in possession of nuclear weapons and a combined population of 1,320,000,000. The second could set Northeast Asia afire with China and Russia, both having borders with North Korea, inevitably being pulled into the vortex. The last could lead to an explosion in the Persian Gulf and throughout the Middle East, with the potential of spilling over into the Caspian Sea Basin, Central and South Asia, the Caucasus and even the Balkans, as the US and NATO have strategic air bases in Bulgaria, Romania, Turkey, Iraq, Afghanistan and, at least for the time being, Kyrgyzstan that would be employed in any major assault on Iran and the latter would retaliate against both land- and sea-based threats as best it could. In the event that any of the three scenarios reached the level of what in a humane and sensible world would be considered the unthinkable - the use of nuclear weapons - the cataclysmic consequences both for the respective regions involved and for the world would be incalculable. Theoretically, though, all three nightmare models could be geographically contained. There is a fourth spot on the map, however, where most any spark could ignite a powder keg that would draw in and pit against each other the world's two major nuclear powers and immediately and ipso facto develop into a world conflict. That area is the Baltic Sea region. In 2003, months before NATO would grant full membership to the Baltic nations of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, the Russian Defense Minister at the time, Sergei Ivanov, warned that such a development would entail the deployment of NATO, including US, warplanes "a three-minute flight away from St. Petersburg," Russia's second largest city. And just that occurred. NATO air patrols began in 2004 on a three month rotational basis and US warplanes just completed their second deployment on January 4 of this year. Had history occurred otherwise and Soviet warplanes alternated with those of fellow Warsaw Pact nations in patrolling over, say, the St. Lawrence Seaway or the Atlantic Coast off Nova Scotia, official Washington's response wouldn't be hard to imagine or long in coming. A 2005 report by the Natural Resources Defense Council confirmed that the US maintained 480 nuclear bombs in Europe, hosted by six NATO allies, Belgium, Britain, Germany, Italy, Netherlands and Turkey. More recent estimates indicate that over 350 American nuclear weapons remain in Europe to the present time. If the six above-mentioned nations continue to host nuclear arms, what would new NATO members Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania - the first and third currently governed by former US citizens, president Toomas Hendrik Ilves and Valdas Adamkus, respectively - deny the Pentagon? In the interim between the accession of the three Baltic states and former Soviet republics into NATO and now, the Alliance as a whole and the US in particular have expanded their permanent military presence within all three nations: Estonia and Latvia which both border the main body of Russia and Lithuania which abuts the Russian enclave of Kaliningrad.

# EU Counterplan Impacts: Russian Aggression Module

## Geopolitical incentives will create tension over the Baltics in the next decade --- risks major conflict.

George Friedman, 2009 (Founder and Chief Executive Officer of STRATFOR, “The Coming Conflict With Russia,” Journal of International Security Affairs, <http://www.securityaffairs.org/issues/2009/17/friedman.php>)

The reabsorption of Belarus and Ukraine into the Russian sphere of influence is more or less a given in the next five years. When that happens, Russia will have roughly returned to its borders with Europe between the two world wars. It will be anchored in the Caucasus in the south, with Ukraine protected, and in the north its borders on the northern European plain will abut Poland and the Baltic countries. That will pose the questions of which the most powerful country in the north is and where the precise frontiers will be. The real flash point will be the Baltics. The traditional path to invade Russia is a three-hundred-mile gap between the northern Carpathians and the Baltic Sea. This is flat, easily traversed country with few river barriers. This northern European plain is a smooth ride for invaders. A European invader can move due east to Moscow or to St. Petersburg in the northwest. During the Cold War, the distance from St. Petersburg to NATO’s front line was also more than a thousand miles. Today the distance is about seventy miles. This explains the strategic nightmare Russia faces in the Baltics—and what it will need to do to fix the problem. The three Baltic countries were once part of the Soviet Union. Each became independent after the Soviet collapse. And then, in that narrow window, each became part of NATO. As we have seen, the Europeans are most likely too far into their decadent cycle to have the energy to take advantage of the situation. The Russians are not going to risk their national security on that assumption, however. They saw Germany go from being a cripple in 1932 to being at the gates of Moscow in 1941. The inclusion of the Baltic countries along with Poland in NATO has moved NATO’s frontier extraordinarily close to the Russian heartland. For a country that was invaded three times in the last two hundred years, the comfortable assumption that NATO and its members are no threat is not something it can risk. From the Russian point of view, the major invasion route into their country is not only wide open but also in the hands of countries with a pronounced hostility toward Russia. The Baltic countries have never forgiven the Russians for their occupation. The Poles are equally bitter and deeply distrustful of Russian intentions. Now that they are part of NATO, these countries form the front line. Behind them is Germany, a country as distrusted by Russia as Russia is by the Poles and Balts. The Russians are certainly paranoid—but that doesn’t mean they don’t have enemies or that they are crazy. This would be the point of any confrontation. The Russians can live with a neutral Baltic region. Living with a Baltic region that is part of NATO and close to the Americans, however, is a much more difficult pill to swallow. On the other hand, the Americans, having backed down in Central Asia, and being cautious in the Caucasus, can’t retreat from the Baltics. Any compromise over the three NATO members would send Eastern Europe into a panic. Eastern Europe’s behavior would become unpredictable, and the possibility of Russian influence spreading westward would increase. Russia has the greater interest, but the Americans could bring substantial power to bear if they chose.

## EU unity key to checking Russian influence in Eastern Europe:

Economist, 2/26/2009 (“The bill that could break up Europe,” http://www.economist.com/node/13184655?%29)

The political consequences of letting eastern Europe go could be graver still. One of Europe’s greatest feats in the past 20 years was peacefully to reunify the continent after the end of the Soviet empire. Russia is itself in serious economic trouble, but its leaders remain keen to exploit any chance to reassert their influence in the region. Moreover, if the people of eastern Europe felt they had been cut adrift by western Europe, they could fall for populists or nationalists of a kind who have come to power far too often in Europe’s history.

# **EU Counterplan Impacts: India Economy**

## **EU economic turmoil undermines India’s economy:**

World Market Pulse, 2010 (7/9/2010, “Cracks Appearing In EU Unity?”

<http://seekingalpha.com/instablog/613865-world-market-pulse/80867-cracks-appearing-in-eu-unity>)

On May 10 when the European Union and the IMF stitched together a $1 trillion rescue package for Greece, the world felt relieved. Stock markets gave a big thumbs-up to it. The Indian BSE Sensex zoomed by 560 points. However, by the weekend Europe was back in turmoil. President Sarkozy of France threatened to pull out of the euro if Germany backed out of the bailout. Adding fuel to the fire, Deutsche Bank chief executive Josef Ackermann said in an interview that Greece might not ever pay back its debts. This sent alarm bells ringing beyond Europe. Asian stock markets were shaken. What began as a sub-prime crisis in the US in 2008, resulting in bank defaults and the collapse of Lehman Brothers, has reached a stage where heavily indebted countries are crying for bailouts. The trouble is not just limited to Greece. Portugal, Ireland, Italy and Spain too face the heat. In anger, they blaming “a wolf pack of currency speculators” who have brought down the euro. Equally hated are the credit rating agencies, which are re-rating national debts to junk levels and drying up borrowing sources and raising costs of capital. Even the fate of the EU as a single political and economic entity is threatened. Bickering is out in the open. No one wants to pay for another nation’s follies. The eurozone citizens will have to bear the burden of their leaders’ blunders. The global recovery stands jeopardised. India’s exports to Europe, particularly by IT companies, will be hit. Global capital is shifting to safer havens like India and other emerging markets. In the turbulent times gold stands out as a safe investment. Hence, a steep rise in its prices. Europe will have to stand as one in this hour of crisis and help the European Central Bank and the IMF to sort outs its debt issues. This will take time and require patience and cooperation of the EU members.

## Indian Economic Strength Solves Indo-Pak War

Garten, 1995 former undersecretary of Commerce for International Trade, 1995 (Federal Document Clearing House Congressional Testimony, March 7, 1995, Lexis)

Paramount among those interests are the commercial opportunities that are increasingly at the heart of the Clinton Administration's foreign policy. But it is impossible to separate those commercial interests from our broader interests. Economic reforms enable our companies to take advantage of the opportunities within the Indian market and enable Indian companies to better enter the global marketplace. Economic growth in India is **a powerful stabilizing force** in a region of the world where stability is of supreme.importance. Stability and growth in India are of enormous importance through southern Asia, from the Middle East to Indochina**. Peace and prosperity in that part of the world are essential to the peace** and prosperity of the world. The survival of Indian democracy is an important message to those who doubt the value of democracy, particularly in large, complex, emerging societies. India is a regional powerhouse. Home of the world's fourth largest navy. Home of a burgeoning space program. It would be hard to describe a nation that could be more central to our interests in the century ahead -- or one with whom the promise of cooperation and friendship is greater.

## Indo-Pak war risks nuclear war and extinction of all life on the planet:

Jeff Duffy last modified 9/22/2004 (accessed at: HYPERLINK "http://www.ccds.charlotte.nc.us/History/India/03/duffy/duffy.htm" http://www.ccds.charlotte.nc.us/History/India/03/duffy/duffy.htm)

All of this strife could be multiplied tremendously with the introduction of nuclear weapons. Such weapons would drastically multiply the damage India and Pakistan could cause, and could even affect the whole world. Nuclear weapons not only kill huge masses of people in the direct area where the bombs are dropped but also pose danger to surrounding areas. From the bombs come radioactive pollution of the air and the chance of radioactive particles on the earth surface. It has been proven that even low concentrations of radioactivity endanger humans and can harm people throughout the whole world. Modern nuclear weapons can create unimaginable devastation **and could even destroy all life on earth**. One possible outcome is **nuclear winter** which is caused when multiple bombs are set off **resulting in killing all life on earth**. Since these two countries are in possession of nuclear weapons **there is a great chance that they will use them.** Unfortunately, India and Pakistan both have developed nuclear weapons.

# EU Couternplan Impacts: AT: Turn--US Economic Collapse Tanks European Economy

## (--) European economy is largely decoupled from the US economy:

Dr. Bill Conerly, 2008 (Ph.D. in economics from Duke University, “Has Europe's Economy Decoupled from the U.S.?”

<http://seekingalpha.com/article/60914-has-europe-s-economy-decoupled-from-the-u-s>)

Will the United States' economic slowdown pull Europe down enough that we in the States will have an additional problem from them? Or from a European perspective, has their economy decoupled from the U.S. to the extent that they'll be immune from our problems? In theory, the knee bone is connected to the thigh bone. However, the magnitude of the connection can vary from country to country, and from time to time. The Euro area's GDP in 2007 will be about $11.9 trillion this year (according to IMF estimates). U.S. imports from the Euro area have totaled $245 billion in 2007 through November; let's say $267 billion for the full year. So Euro area's exports to the U.S. account for just two and a quarter percent of its GDP. How much of a drop in our imports (Europe's exports) might we have in a U.S. recession? Last recession our imports fell by 5.5 percent. Let's say that with the fall of the dollar, our imports really drop, by say ten percent. That would cut 0.2 percent off of Europe's growth rate, plus multiplier effects if any. That does not send Europe into recession. As for the echo effect, U.S. exports to the Euro area amount to about 1.3 percent of our GDP. You take 1.3 percent of a 0.2 percent drop and you get a trivially small number, less than three thousandths of one percent. So forget an echo recession, unless . . . The direct effect of a U.S. slowdown on Europe will be small, but it's possible that the same factors which are weakening our economy are also at work over there. In that case, Europe could sink into recession for the same reasons we do, but not because we do. But it turns out that the housing cycle is much milder in Europe than in the U.S. Take a look at the OECD's chart, which includes their estimates for 2007 and a forecast for 2008: The bottom line is that I do not expect Europe's economy to slow down very much, certainly not enough to slow down the U.S. economy.

## (--) And declining European economy could tank the US economy—meaning the DA turns the case:

Rachel Beck, 6/2/2008 (staff writer, “Slowing European economy could dent U.S. corporate profits”

<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/06/02/business/worldbusiness/02iht-euecon.4.13403659.html?_r=3>)

U.S. corporate profits fueled by international sales could quickly disappear if the European economy begins to falter, stripping many multinational companies of a huge source of earnings growth. Europe accounts for almost half of U.S. companies' foreign sales, according to Citigroup. "Investors tend to think of China and India when they hear about international sales," said Tobias Levkovich, chief U.S. equity strategist for Citigroup. "They don't recognize how much comes from Europe."

# \*\*\*\*\*EU Counterplan AFF Answers\*\*\*\*\*

## (--) Doesn’t solve the case: Extend our Dinerman evidence—the US is key and international institutions like the EU will get bogged down in bureaucratic paralysis preventing action. Any risk of this is a reason to vote AFF—extend the impact calculus that even the tiniest risk of an asteroid hitting the Earth is an extinction level threat that must be avoided at all costs.

## (--) Permute: Do both: Allows for best collaborative approach between the US & EU:

Wall Street Journal, 2011 (JUNE 23, 2011, “Europe Ends Independent Pursuit of Manned Space Travel” http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304569504576403810498723484.html?mod=googlenews\_wsj)

The agency's chief also said that by failing in the past to set up robust international space-transportation partnerships, Europe and the U.S. "made a collective mistake." As a result, Mr. Dordain said, "we now face the not very comfortable situation" of being totally dependent, at least for the next few years, on Russian technology to reach the international space station.

## (--)US leadership on asteroid deflection is key to motivating other actors to act—solving the case the best--

Lt Col Martin E. B. **France, 2000** (Air & Space Power Journal, Planetary Defense:

Eliminating the Giggle Factor, <http://www.airpower.maxwell.af.mil/airchronicles/cc/france2.html>)

A key component of the Shoemaker Report, as in the earlier Spaceguard Survey, was its international character. However, it seems that most nations interested in the NEO threat are **still awaiting America’s lead.** Russia, for example, has the technology and interest (Tunguska) among its astronomy and military communities to play a significant role in the Spaceguard Survey, but economic circumstances have precluded them from taking the initiative. Australia has recently backed away from its fledgling telescope program, which played a critical role in confirming NEOs first seen by other telescopes from its unique location in the southern hemisphere, and international attempts to encourage the Australian government to bring its program back into operation have failed.23 The United Kingdom, home of some of the most enthusiastic NEO watchers, formed a "Task Force on NEOs" led by Dr. Harry Atkinson. This group of four scientists has limited funding and is only tasked with making recommendation to Her Majesty’s Government by mid-2000 on how the UK should best contribute to the international effort on NEOs.24 Additionally, Spaceguard is a loose, voluntary consortium of international observatories and interested parties that serves to relay NEO identification to concerned groups and fellow participants.

## (--) International FIAT is a voting issue:

## A) No rational policy actor can choose between the US and the EU—making the counterplan an illogical option for the judge.

## B) Infinitely regressive—allows any country or agency around the world to be the agent—making the AFF research burden infinite and destroying AFF ground.

## C) Steals all the AFF—makes it impossible to be Affirmative.

## (--) Non-Unique: EU unity unraveling now over Libya—they don’t solve.

Shada Islam , 3/10/2011 (“EU unity needed on Libya”

<http://www.friendsofeurope.org/Contentnavigation/Library/Libraryoverview/tabid/1186/articleType/ArticleView/articleId/2235/EU-unity-needed-on-Libya.aspx>)

In recent days, however, EU unity appears to be unravelling as member states set off in different directions. France has recognised the Libyan rebels as the country’s rightful representatives. The European Parliament says other European governments should do the same. Portugal, however, has held talks with an envoy despatched by Gaddafi, prompting Britain and German to insist that EU governments show pledge not to work or co-operate with Gaddafi. There is no EU agreement on setting up a no-fly zone although the UK and France are most clearly in favour of such a move.

## **Spending constraints and political uncertainty undermine European space efforts--**

Wall Street Journal, 2011 (JUNE 23, 2011, “Europe Ends Independent Pursuit of Manned Space Travel” http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304569504576403810498723484.html?mod=googlenews\_wsj)

Both NASA and ESA, its European counterpart, face severe spending constraints and political uncertainty over their future. On both sides of the Atlantic, there are plans to build powerful new rockets with enhanced capabilities, including heavy-lift versions to explore deeper into space. But their problems also are similar. There are debates in Europe and the U.S. about safeguarding the existing industrial base tied to solid rocket motors. At the same time, experts in both cases are advocating new liquid-fueled rocket engines as less costly and easier to operate.

# EU Counterplan AFF Answers

## Turn: US space leadership key to solve multiple scenarios for war--

Vorenberg 2008 (2/12/08, Sue, Sante Fe New Mexican, “Scientists: U.S. power at stake in space race:

Nation's success in moon project could prevent wars, earn right to lucrative helium mining”, http://

www.santafenewmexican.com/Local%20News/Space-Technology-and-Applications-International-Forum-

Scientist)

The underlying political message of space exploration and development is that our nation is powerful and strong, scientists at a space conference here said Tuesday. Presidential candidates seem focused on using NASA's budget for things other than space exploration, but that would send the wrong message to growing nations like China, said two speakers at the Space Technology and Applications International Forum. The U.S. remains the only country that has landed on the moon. But under NASA's current budget, China is likely to get there before the U.S. returns. "We must beat the People's Republic of China to the moon," said John Brandenburg, a senior propulsion scientist at Orbital Technologies Inc. in Wisconsin and a former scientist at Sandia National Laboratories. "A race to the moon is not a land war in Asia. And a race to the moon is one we can win." Beating China to the moon might actually stop that country from invading Taiwan, he said, because it will make the U.S. look stronger to the international community. "We can't win a land war in Asia," Brandenburg added. And while the idea of increasing NASA's budget might not be popular, using NASA to send that sort of message to other countries is something the current crop of political candidates needs to consider, said Tom Taylor, vice president of Lunar Transportation Systems Inc. in Las Cruces. "I worry about some of the politics we see in this election year, and that politicians are looking at NASA's budget as a way to educate the masses rather than to push forward with space exploration," he said. Deterring wars is often more psychological than reality-based, Brandenburg said, and a U.S. presence on the moon sends a strong signal that our nation is still a technological powerhouse. "Our efforts in space are an indication of our wealth," Brandenburg said. "If we don't progress in space, people see us as a paper tiger. When we're in space, we're seen as a titanium tiger." Skylab's premature descent through the atmosphere in July 1979 might have encouraged Iranian militants in November 1979 to take over the U.S. embassy in Tehran and capture hostages, he said, because it appeared that U.S. power was fading. "If we look weak in space, bad things tend to happen on Earth," Brandenburg said. One of the biggest concerns is that the space shuttle program will stop in 2010, and the U.S. will have no way to get to the international space station -- other than hitching a ride with the Russians -- for at least four years as the next generation of U.S. space vehicles comes online, he said. If we're not first to go back to the moon, other countries will get there first in the not-so-distant future, perhaps in the next 20 years or so, Taylor said. And those countries could grab up access to helium 3 -- a source of clean, powerful fusion energy that could replace the entire power generation structure on Earth. "While it's a little early to speculate, helium 3 is worth about $12 billion per 2,000 pounds -- if we could mine it on the moon, it would change our entire nuclear industry," Taylor said. "If other countries get there first, I fear that our nation will drop into some lesser status." From a pure resource perspective, mining helium 3 could turn the U.S. into the top power producer in the world, Brandenburg said. "Once you get helium 3 on the moon, the moon becomes the new Persian Gulf," he said. "It's worth about 5,000 Saudi Arabias." And while in the end, everything comes down to tight budgets in Washington, the two scientists say they still hope politicians will keep the bigger picture in mind and consider the next round of the space race is not something we want to lose. "Resources are always tight in any society," Brandenburg said. "But you have to remember that exploration almost always leads to greater wealth."

## China-Taiwan war causes massive worldwide nuclear conflict:

STRAITS TIMES, June 25, 2000; Lexis

THE high-intensity scenario postulates a cross-strait war escalating into a full-scale war between the US and China. If Washington were to conclude that splitting China would better serve its national interests, then a full-scale war becomes unavoidable. Conflict on such a scale would embroil other countries far and near and -- horror of horrors -- **raise the possibility of a nuclear war**. Beijing has already told the US and Japan privately that it considers any country providing bases and logistics support to any US forces attacking China as belligerent parties open to its retaliation. In the region, this means South Korea, Japan, the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Singapore. If China were to retaliate, **east Asia will be set on fire**. And the conflagration may not end there as opportunistic powers elsewhere may try to overturn the existing world order. With the US distracted, Russia may seek to redefine Europe's political landscape. The balance of power in the Middle East may be similarly upset by the likes of Iraq. In south Asia, hostilities between India and Pakistan, each armed with its own nuclear arsenal, could enter a new and dangerous phase. Will a full-scale Sino-US war lead to a nuclear war? According to General Matthew Ridgeway, commander of the US Eighth Army which fought against the Chinese in the Korean War, the US had at the time thought of using nuclear weapons against China to save the US from military defeat. In his book The Korean War, a personal account of the military and political aspects of the conflict and its implications on future US foreign policy, Gen Ridgeway said that US was confronted with two choices in Korea -- truce or a broadened war, which could have led to the use of nuclear weapons. If the US had to resort to nuclear weaponry to defeat China long before the latter acquired a similar capability, there is little hope of winning a war against China 50 years later, short of using nuclear weapons. The US estimates that China possesses about 20 nuclear warheads that can destroy major American cities. Beijing also seems prepared to go for the nuclear option. A Chinese military officer disclosed recently that Beijing was considering a review of its "non first use" principle regarding nuclear weapons. Major-General Pan Zhangqiang, president of the military-funded Institute for Strategic Studies, told a gathering at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars in Washington that although the government still abided by that principle, there were strong pressures from the military to drop it. He said military leaders considered the use of nuclear weapons mandatory if the country risked dismemberment as a result of foreign intervention. Gen Ridgeway said that should that come to pass, we would see the destruction of civilisation. There would be no victors in such a war. While the prospect of **a nuclear Armaggedon over Taiwan** might seem inconceivable, it cannot be ruled out entirely, for China puts sovereignty above everything else. Gen Ridgeway recalled that the biggest mistake the US made during the Korean War was to assess Chinese actions according to the American way of thinking. "Just when everyone believed that no sensible commander would march south of the Yalu, the Chinese troops suddenly appeared," he recalled. (The Yalu is the river which borders China and North Korea, and the crossing of the river marked China's entry into the war against the Americans). "I feel uneasy if now somebody were to tell me that they bet China would not do this or that," he said in a recent interview given to the Chinese press.