



IMPERIALISM DA - DUDL - FROM THE NAUDL CORE FILES

(INCLUDES AFF ANSWERS)



IMPERIALISM DA – NEG

Argument Glossary	3
Summary	4
1 NC – NATO imperialism bad	5
1 NC - LINK	6
1 NC - IMPACT	7
2 NC/1NR Link extension – Conflict with Russia	8
2 NC/1NR Link extension – Continued exploitation	9
2 NC/1 NR Impact extension – Million deaths	10
2 NC/1NR Impact Extension – Russian cyberattack	11
2 NC/1NR Impact extension – Russian Nuclear War	12
2 NC/1NR Impact turn answer – U.S. censorship, freedom decline	13
2 NC/1NR – Imperialism bad	14
2 NC/1NR Link extensions - Imperialist expansion bad	17
2 NC/1NR Impact extensions – NATO expansion bad for economy	19
2 NC/1NR Impact extension – Nato expansion creates instability	21
2 AC – NATO imperialism inevitable	23
2 AC No link – military race inevitable	24
2 AC Impact turn – Tech Collaboration	25
2 AC Impact turn – U.S. cyber freedom	26
2 AC No impact – No nuclear war	27
2 AC Answers to – Economic impact	28
2 AC Answers to - Cyber attack	29



NATO (noun) – NATO is an international organization which consists of the U.S., Canada, Britain, and other European countries, all of whom have agreed to support one another if they are attacked. NATO is an abbreviation for 'North Atlantic Treaty Organization'

Hegemony (noun) – preponderant influence or authority over others: DOMINATION

Imperialism (noun) – the policy, practice, or advocacy of extending the power and dominion of a nation especially by direct territorial acquisitions or by gaining indirect control over the political or economic life of other areas

Structural Violence (noun) – “Structural violence” refers to the multiple ways in which social, economic, and political systems expose particular populations to risks and vulnerabilities leading to increased morbidity and mortality

Deterrence (noun) – May prevent actions based on fear of consequences

Foreign policy (noun) – foreign policy, general objectives that guide the activities and relationships of one state in its interactions with other states

Neoliberalism (noun) – neoliberalism, ideology and policy model that emphasizes the value of free market competition

Western civilization (noun) - Western civilization refers to the art, literature, culture, and enduring ideas that emerged from the eastern Mediterranean basin in the centuries before the common era, that developed in myriad forms through the Middle Ages, and that ultimately took modern shape after the Renaissance. A branch of technology that uses radiation energy

Capitalism (noun) – Capitalism is an economic system in which private individuals or businesses own capital goods. The production of goods and services is based on supply and demand in the general market—known as a market economy—rather than through central planning—known as a planned economy or command economy.

Colonialism (noun) – domination of a people or area by a foreign state or nation: the practice of extending and maintaining a nation's political and economic control over another people or area

Militaristic (adjective) – supporting the idea of having powerful armed forces in a country

Communism (noun) – a system in which goods are owned in common and are available to all as needed

Demilitarization (noun)- to prohibit (something, such as a zone or frontier area) from being used for military purposes



The goal of the Neg is to prove that the plan presented by the affirmative team is a bad idea. The more you focus on the plan and why it is a bad idea, the more often you'll win debates. This imperialism DA is one way you can prove the affirmative is a bad idea. It argues that even if the plan has some good effects it starts a chain reaction that spreads more imperialist ideals. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was established in 1949, post WWII for the Western bloc to prevent the spread of Soviet communism. This is a linear disadvantage meaning uniqueness is not up for contestation, the imperialist history of NATO is undeniable.

The first card of the 1NC contextualizes the exploitation NATO has inflicted on the global South and why NATO as an organization is flawed. The following link card explains why the affirmatives reaffirms imperialism. There are more link cards in the Neg extras section of this file, choose links accordingly in respond to the case ran by the AFF. The last part of this DA is the impact, divided into three big categories, stealing tech from developing regions, threat to human survival, and lastly attacks from Russia. Rule of thumb for the link also applies here, choose the impact appropriate for the case run by the affirmative. All additional neg cards are included at the end of the file.

The strategy for the AFF is to select your response cards accordingly. If the card read by the NEG has a no link or no impact answer read it for your 2AC. The impact turn is critical to winning the DA. You must establish why NATO imperialism is inevitable, it is happening regardless of what the AFF plan is calling for. Next you need to do analysis work on why American hold of the cyberspace is still comparatively better than Russian or Chinese control. The key idea for the impact turn is that the AFF is necessary, United States intervention is providing more access to the internet allowing suppressed groups to use it to gain freedom.

NOTE: Unlike the other disadvantages in this set the Imperialism disadvantage is what we refer to as a "linear DA" that means imperialism exists now (ie, is non-unique) but the negative will make the argument that it is so bad we should not just throw up our hands and accept it, we should instead reject instances that will make it worse.



NATO WAS CREATED TO PROTECT WESTERN CIVILIZATION PERPETUATING IMPERIALIST EXPLOITATION OF AFRICA IN THE NAME OF SECURITIZATION.

Sobukwe, 2022. (Djibo, Former Central Committee member of the All African People's Revolutionary Party, February 23.) NATO and Africa: A Relationship of Colonial Violence and Structural White Supremacy. Black Agenda Report. <http://blackagendareport.com/nato-and-africa-relationship-colonial-violence-and-structural-white-supremacy>

Considering the public media attention and concern about possible expansion of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), it is worth reminding people about NATO's bloody history in Africa. NATO was founded in 1949 after WWII at a time when African countries were still under the yoke of colonialism. In fact most of the original founders of NATO had been Africa's principal colonizers such as UK, France, Portugal, Belgium, Italy and the USA as lead NATO organizer and dominant partner. The organization was established as a collective defense against the Soviet Union with the requirement (Article 5) that any attack on one was considered an attack on all and therefore requiring a collective response.

Since NATO was founded with the purported purpose of halting possible Soviet aggression and stopping the spread of Communism it would seem to follow that after the collapse of the USSR in 1991 there would no longer be a need for NATO. Since then however, NATO has expanded from the founding twelve to at present thirty member states many of whom are eastern European countries, formerly Soviet republics and Warsaw Pact allies. Today, NATO has become a huge axel in the wheel of the military industrial complex controlled by U.S. empire for the purpose of full spectrum dominance, driven by the ferocious appetites of corporate capital.

Walter Rodney accurately describes the early foundation of colonial Africa's relationship with NATO which continues today as he described in How Europe Underdeveloped Africa:

Needless to say, in the 1950's when most Africans were still colonial subjects, they had absolutely no control over the utilization of their soil for militaristic ends. Virtually the whole of North Africa was turned into a sphere of operations for NATO, with bases aimed at the Soviet Union. There could have easily developed a nuclear war without African peoples having any knowledge of the matter. The colonial powers actually held military conferences in African cities like Dakar and Nairobi in the early 1950's, inviting the whites of South Africa and Rhodesia and the government of the USA. Time and time again, the evidence points to this cynical use of Africa to buttress capitalism economically and militarily, and therefore in effect forcing Africa to contribute to its own exploitation. [emphasis added]¹

Kwame Nkrumah had already warned in his 1967 Challenge of the Congo that there were at least seventeen air bases, nine foreign naval bases, three rocket sites and an atomic testing range operated by NATO in in North Africa, in addition to military missions in about a dozen other African countries, not to mention the exploitation of raw materials for the production of nuclear weapons occurring in the mines of Congo, Angola, South Africa and Rhodesia.² Nkrumah called for the urgent need to counter the challenge of NATO in the strategy he outlined in his Handbook of Revolutionary Warfare which included the call for a military high command and an All African People's Revolutionary Army (AAPRA).³



THE EXTENSION OF NATO MEMBERSHIP TO THE BALTIC REGION FURTHERS IMPERIALIST AMERICAN SECURITY RHETORIC IN THE CYBER-SPHERE.

Micko & Plichta, 2019. (Branislav, PhD candidate in political science at Charles University. Marcel, an independent analyst in Washington, DC. April 5). *The Case for NATO: Why the Alliance's Post-Cold War Expansion is Vital to European Security and American Interests*. Modern War Institute.

<https://mwi.usma.edu/case-nato-alliances-post-cold-war-expansion-vital-european-security-american-interests/>

At a time when NATO is tested by competition with a revanchist Russia, critiques of its approach to membership have just as frequently been from inside the alliance as out. Arguments from scholars and commentators bemoan NATO's post-1991 expansion and advocate a halt to welcoming new members altogether. Among reasons cited to freeze membership are the inclusion of "vulnerable" countries, such as the Baltic nations who allegedly do not bring enough to the table, a supposedly deteriorating US domestic commitment to the alliance, and the potential to provoke the Russians. These critiques are not new—they have appeared regularly throughout the alliance's history in one form or another—nor do they convincingly demonstrate the need to freeze membership in NATO. On the contrary: the alliance is best served by continuing to consider new members.

First of all, there is the question of capabilities. The idea that the smaller countries of central, eastern, and southern Europe do not bring any relevant capabilities to the table made an appearance during the initial debates about their inclusion. While it is obviously true that smaller countries with smaller budgets cannot build military forces that would be able to face Russia in conventional warfare, proponents of this argument either forget about or ignore the major qualitative contributions these countries make. Every nation that has joined the alliance has brought something new and important to the table—be it mountain operations specialization from Slovenia, CBRN defense from the Czech Republic, or experience in countering cyber warfare from Estonia. Four of NATO's newest member states—Estonia, Slovakia, Lithuania, and the Czech Republic—ranked in top ten countries in cybersecurity globally, according to National Cyber Security Index 2018, far above both Russia and the United States. Given the importance of understanding cyber and hybrid warfare, the alliance would be weaker without the expertise and capabilities of its new members.



NATO IS A TOOL FOR THE WESTERN WAR WAGING, ITS IMPERIALIST EXPANSION AGENDA IS A THREAT TO HUMANITY.

Lendman, 2020 (Stephen, a 2008 Project Censored winner and 2011 Mexican Journalists Club international journalism award recipient, June 9.) NATO's Diabolical 2030 Agenda.

<https://stephenlendman.org/2020/06/09/natos-diabolical-2030-agenda/>

From inception, US-dominated **NATO has always been and continues to be an instrument for advancing its imperial agenda by brute force** — endless wars its favored strategy along with other hostile actions.

Alliance secretaries general operate as US puppets, serving its imperial interests, Jens Stoltenberg the latest in a long line of subservient NATO heads.

On Monday, he addressed the Washington-based Atlantic Council (AC), a neocon infested think tank involved in weaponizing hysteria against nations on the US target list for regime change — notably China, Russia and Iran.

AC's board of director and so-called "experts" include a rogue's gallery of hawkish extremists who never met a sovereign independent country they didn't want transformed into a US vassal state by brute force or other hostile means.

NATO's longterm vision is all about pursuing Washington's imperial agenda globally. Stoltenberg's mandate is furthering its diabolical aims.

Its 2030 agenda includes expanding the alliance worldwide, greater military spending, and more preemptive wars on humanity than already — a scourge essential to challenge.

At a time when the only threats face by the US and other Western countries are invented, not real, Stoltenberg pretends otherwise in deference to his master in Washington.

He lied saying "Russia continues its military activities unabated."

Russian forces are in Syria by invitation of its legitimate government — involved in aiding its military combat US-supported ISIS and likeminded jihadists.

Stoltenberg: "ISIL and other terrorist groups are emboldened" — instead of explaining they're US proxies in Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, Yemen, Libya and elsewhere, used by the Pentagon and CIA.



SUPPORT FOR NATO EXPANSION TO SWEDEN AND FINLAND CREATES TENSION WITH RUSSIA.

Cato Institute, 2022. (April 22) Nine Reasons Why NATO Should Close the Door to Sweden and Finland.

<https://www.cato.org/commentary/nine-reasons-why-nato-should-close-door-sweden-finland>

Almost eight decades have passed since the end of World War II and Europe remains helplessly dependent on America. Yet U.S. officials are celebrating the expected application by Finland and Sweden to join NATO.

The Washington Blob doesn't seem likely to be satisfied until every country on earth relies on the U.S. for its defense.

In truth, NATO expansion has never been about American security. Rather, it was meant to expand Washington's defense dole in the name of promoting regional stability.

So why should Americans increase their defense load now? The U.S. should stop adding new members to the transatlantic alliance and instead prepare to turn Europe's defense over to Europe.

The allies did not invite Ukraine into NATO because they didn't want to risk war. The same rationale applies to these two countries.

Neither Finland nor Sweden is under threat. Both are well-armed and friendly with the West; neither has major disputes with Moscow. Indeed, Helsinki maintained its independence as a neutral against the Soviet Union. Even the most Russophobic analysts offer no evidence that Russian President Vladimir Putin plans to conquer the two states and add them to an expanded U.S.S.R. And if he attempted to do so, Ukraine's experience suggests that the two would exact a terrible price.

Since including the two states would address no Russian threat to existing members, doing so would be seen as threatening by Moscow. Indeed, Finland provides another route to St. Petersburg, with the Finnish border little more than 100 miles away. Warned long-time Putin ally Dmitry Medvedev: "If Sweden and Finland join NATO, the length of the land borders of the alliance with the Russian Federation will more than double. Naturally, these boundaries will have to be strengthened." Meaning that Moscow likely would rely on America's Cold War policy of "massive retaliation," using nuclear weapons to cover conventional weakness.

Although further expanding NATO might appear to be an appropriate riposte to Moscow's invasion of Ukraine, doing so would reinforce the security fears which animated Russia's aggressive policy against both Georgia and Ukraine. Despite the Washington Blob's blithe denial that U.S. policy had anything to do with Russia's actions, the allies recklessly violated their assurances that NATO would not expand, conducted aggressive military operations undermining Russian interests, and promoted regime change against Russo-friendly governments. Had Moscow acted similarly in Latin America the U.S. would have threatened war. Further deepening Europe's division with Finland's and Sweden's inclusion would exacerbate already deepening hostilities.



FURTHER COLLABORATIONS WITH NATO WILL ALLOW MEMBERS TO MAINTAIN THEIR HOLD OF COLONIES IN THE GLOBAL SOUTH CONTINUING EXPLOITATION OF PEOPLE AND DEVELOPING TECHNOLOGIES.

Barker & Madsen, 2018. (Pam. Wayne, American Journalist and former consultant of the National Security Agency, May 9.) NATO: a Promoter of Colonialism in the 21st Century. Europe Reloaded.

<https://www.europereloaded.com/nato-promoter-colonialism-21st-century/>

Five NATO members continue to possess colonies. These NATO states have no intention of granting their territories independence any time soon. Not only does France, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Denmark, and the United States insist on maintaining vestiges of their colonial pasts, but their colonies have been interwoven into NATO's military infrastructure.

The continued presence of French, British, Dutch, Danish, and American colonies around the world extends what is officially called the "North Atlantic Treaty Organization" to the South Atlantic, the Caribbean Sea, the Pacific Ocean, and the Indian Ocean. If there was ever an organization guilty of blatantly deceptive advertising practices, it is NATO.

Recent attempts to secure more political autonomy in the French Caribbean territories of Guadeloupe, Martinique, and French Guiana, the latter the home of a French space launch facility having strategic importance, have been met with everything from indifference in Paris or extreme hostility. A January 26, 1968 SECRET Central Intelligence Agency report warned against Soviet recent attempts to establish space tracking facilities in French Guiana. That same year, the Guiana Space Center (pictured) was established at Korou in the French colony. NATO ordered the suppression of independence moves by the people of Guiana to keep the center solely in the hands of France and the European Space Agency. In March and April 2017, populist tempers flared when Guianese protesters took over the Korou space facility over charges that France was ignoring the people of the colony. Youth unemployment, for example, is at a staggering 55 percent.

NATO, while still using the "North Atlantic" designator, does not want to lose its colonial footprints around the world, from Mayotte in the Indian Ocean and Wallis and Futuna in the South Pacific to St. Helena in the South Atlantic and Guam in the West Pacific. NATO has long been accused of waging neo-colonial wars in Africa, the Middle East, and Asia. However, when it comes to basic garden-variety colonialism, NATO is intent on maintaining control over of its member states' territorial toeholds in the seven seas.



NATO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR MILLIONS OF INNOCENT DEATHS AROUND THE GLOBE.

Lendman, 2020 (Stephen, a 2008 Project Censored winner and 2011 Mexican Journalists Club international journalism award recipient, June 9.) NATO's Diabolical 2030 Agenda.

<https://stephenlendman.org/2020/06/09/natos-diabolical-2030-agenda/>

NATO's existence hasn't "kept us safe for 70 years." Its existence is responsible for countless millions of deaths, vast destruction, and human misery wherever its forces show up.

As long as the alliance exists, world peace and stability will remain unattainable.

The risk of global war with nuclear weapons will haunt humanity.

Washington wants NATO used as a global military to force its will on other nations belligerently, to crush democratic freedoms where they exist, to bludgeon or bully countries worldwide to bend to its will.

NATO 2030 is a scheme for expanding NATO worldwide more than already, for greater military spending, for crushing opposition to Washington's imperial aims.

It's an agenda that risks global war with nukes, Stoltenberg serving as a mouthpiece for diabolical US aims.

Taking orders from a higher authority in Washington, he's charged with saluting and obeying.

Claiming China is a threat to US hegemonic aims, he said the following:

Its ruling authorities "are investing heavily in modern military capabilities, including missiles that can reach all NATO countries."

NATO is all about militarization and warmaking, unrelating to "protecting each other" — despite no foreign threats to any alliance member states.

Disbanding NATO would be one of the most important ways to advance world peace and stability over endless wars US-led member states wage.

The alliance has always been all about offense, not defense, notably since the Soviet Union dissolved nearly 30 years ago.

US-controlled NATO is a killing machine, an aggressor alliance, an enemy of world peace and stability.

The kind of world it pursues is unsafe and unfit to live in.

As long as the alliance exists, so will a permanent state of war on humanity along with it.



IF THE U.S. CONTINUES TO PUSH NATO EXPANSION, IT WILL TRIGGER CYBERSECURITY ATTACKS FROM RUSSIA.

O'Connor & Jamali, 2022. (Tom an award-winning senior writer of foreign policy at Newsweek, Naveed a Newsweek editor and former FBI double agent, January 24). Russia Could Launch Cyber Attacks Against U.S. if Biden Sends Wrong Signals, Intel Warns. Newsweek.

<https://www.newsweek.com/russia-could-launch-cyber-attacks-against-us-if-biden-sends-wrong-signals-intel-warns-1672280>

In a new memo obtained by Newsweek, the Department of Homeland Security has warned of Russia's potential to launch cyberattacks against the United States in response to a possible escalation of the crisis unfolding at the border with Ukraine.

"We assess that Russia would consider initiating a cyber attack against the Homeland if it perceived a US or NATO response to a possible Russian invasion of Ukraine threatened its long-term national security," the memo, dated January 23 and attributed to the Office of Intelligence and Analysis, reads in bold text.

The warning came as President Joe Biden sent additional weapons to Ukrainian forces and reportedly weighed the option of sending thousands of U.S. troops to the Baltic states bordering Russia over concerns that Moscow was planning imminent military action against Ukraine.

Kyiv has defied the Kremlin's protests by seeking membership in the NATO Western military alliance, something that Russian officials have said threatened their country's national security. The bloc has expanded eastward since the fall of the Soviet Union three decades ago and has refused to rule out including Ukraine as well.

The memo detailed a range of ways in which Russia may choose to unleash its cyber arsenal in the event of a flare-up while noting such an action would be unprecedented.

"Russia maintains a range of offensive cyber tools that it could employ against US networks — from low-level denials-of-service to destructive attacks targeting critical infrastructure," the memo read. "However, we assess that Russia's threshold for conducting disruptive or destructive cyber attacks in the Homeland probably remains very high and we have not observed Moscow directly employ these types of cyber attacks against US critical infrastructure — notwithstanding cyber espionage and potential prepositioning operations in the past."

Reached for comment, a spokesperson for the Department of Homeland Security told Newsweek said it "regularly shares information with federal, state, local, tribal, and territorial officials and the private sector to ensure the safety and security of all communities across the country."

"We have increased operational partnerships between private sector companies and the federal government to strengthen our nation's cyber defenses, including through CISA's newly established Joint Cyber Defense Collaborative (JCDC)," the spokesperson said. "The JCDC brings these partners together to help us understand the full threat landscape and enable real-time collaboration to empower our private sector partners to gain information and take action against the most significant threats to the nation."



TENSION BETWEEN NATO AND RUSSIA IS ESCALATING, CONFLICT CAN GO NUCLEAR.

O'Connor & Jamali, 2022. (Tom an award-winning senior writer of foreign policy at Newsweek, Naveed a Newsweek editor and former FBI double agent, January 24). Russia Could Launch Cyber Attacks Against U.S. if Biden Sends Wrong Signals, Intel Warns. Newsweek.

<https://www.newsweek.com/russia-could-launch-cyber-attacks-against-us-if-biden-sends-wrong-signals-intel-warns-1672280>

The memo, which was first reported on by CNN, has already generated reactions from experts and former officials, some of whom expressed concern that a wider conflagration could erupt.

Alexander Vindman, a retired U.S. Army lieutenant colonel who served as director for European Affairs at the National Security Council under former President Donald Trump, said the Biden administration has tried to "keep the U.S. out of bilateral confrontation" with Russia, and "that's why they kind of took this approach limited to diplomacy" as the U.S. leader ruled out the deployment of U.S. soldiers to Ukraine itself.

"Already we see that's eroding," Vindman, who was reassigned from his position in early 2020 following his testimony to lawmakers regarding a controversial call between Trump and Ukrainian counterpart Volodymyr Zelensky, told Newsweek. "Already we see the risks in a full-spectrum type of scenario, starting out kind of low-end with regards to cyber operations, those risks are increasing."

And if these risks turn kinetic, he warned such an escalation could pass the point of no return.

"Once the shots are fired, there is no putting the genie back in the bottle," Vindman said.

One former U.S. intelligence analyst said Russian President Vladimir Putin was likely calculating these risks as he planned his next moves vis-à-vis the situation in Ukraine and deterring U.S. actions.

"Russia certainly has the ability to carry out cyber attacks against U.S. systems, but also very much wants to avoid direct confrontation with the United States through deliberate acts that might result in their loss of 'escalation control,'" the former intelligence analyst told Newsweek. "Attacks targeting U.S. critical infrastructure systems would almost certainly prompt more serious reprisals from the Biden administration, something Putin wants to avoid, as he'll likely seek to keep conflict confined to Ukraine."



THE USFG IS PASSING NEW LEGISLATION LEADING TO A CONTINUOUS DECLINE IN CYBER FREEDOM, GLOBAL DECLINE IN INTERNET FREEDOM HINDERS SOCIAL MOVEMENT.

Paul, 2021. (Kari September 22.) Internet freedom on the decline in US and globally, study finds. The Guardian. <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2021/sep/21/internet-freedom-decline-free-speech-study>

Online freedom is continuing to decline globally, according to a new study, with governments increasingly cracking down on user speech and misinformation on the rise.

The report from Freedom House, a Washington DC-based democracy advocacy group, found internet freedom declined for the fifth year in a row in the US and the 11th year internationally – for two distinct reasons.

Domestically, the lack of regulation in the tech industry has allowed companies to grow beyond reproach and misinformation to flourish online. Abroad, authoritarian governments have harnessed their tight control of the internet to subdue free expression.

Freedom House cited a growing lack of diversity among sources of online information in the US that allowed conspiracies and misinformation to rise, an issue that was gravely underscored during the 2020 elections and the 2021 insurrection at the US Capitol.

Meanwhile, global internet freedom declined for the 11th consecutive year, with more governments arresting users for nonviolent political, social, or religious speech than ever before. Officials in at least 20 countries suspended internet access, and 20 regimes blocked access to social media platforms, the report said.

The biggest declines were seen in Myanmar, Belarus, and Uganda. In Uganda, internet freedom fell by seven points after pro-government social media accounts flooded the online environment with manipulated information preceding the January 2021 elections. In August 2020 in Belarus, government forces cracked down on election unrest by restricting access to the internet and surveilling activists online.

The report called the Chinese government “the world’s worst abuser of internet freedom”, citing new legislation criminalizing certain expressions online and draconian prison terms issued to activists for online dissent - including an 18-year sentence against one activist for distributing a paper criticizing the government’s handling of the Covid-19 pandemic.



THE NATO ALLIANCE WAS CREATED TO PROTECT THE WHITE WESTERN CIVILIZATION.

Hor, 2022. (Amoz JY, a PhD candidate in residence at the Institute for Security and Conflict Studies at the George Washington University, April 12.) NATO was founded to protect ‘civilized’ people. That means White. (n.d.). The Washington Post. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/04/11/nato-ukraine-refugees-whiteness/>

“Western civilization” is a term that posits liberal ideals as the unique heritage of White people. For example, in 1949, one senator justified the creation of NATO by saying:

There is not a member of the Senate who does not stem from one of [the North Atlantic] countries. His forebears came from Europe. ... We are the result. ... [T]his is our hour not to fail civilization. Three hundred million persons ... believe in the great common principles which the race has developed and inherited through generation after generation.” (Note: Emphasis is the author’s)

This was not an isolated sentiment. Fifty years before Samuel Huntington’s book “Clash of Civilizations,” the term “Western civilization” was the title of history courses. The most famous was Arnold Toynbee’s bestseller “A Study of History,” in which he represents “Western Civilization” as the only civilization exclusively made up of the three White “races” — Nordic, Alpine and Mediterranean. (By contrast, he states that Black “races” have not contributed to any civilization).

Because “Western Civilization” was (or is) understood to be exclusively made up White “races,” the term could function as a surrogate term for “Whiteness,” including in the preamble of the North Atlantic Treaty: “The Parties to this Treaty ... are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples.” (Note: Emphasis is the author’s)

As one senator elaborated in 1949 hearings, this proposal to “defend our so-called western tradition” meant “the culmination of a thousand years [of] the Anglo-Saxon [i.e. White] people.” Unsurprisingly, what makes Ukrainians’ plight so shocking is that “they seem so like us,” so “civilized.”



THE U.S. SUPPORTED EUROPEAN COLONIZATION POST WWII TO PREVENT THE SPREAD OF COMMUNISM.

Hor, 2022. (Amoz JY, a PhD candidate in residence at the Institute for Security and Conflict Studies at the George Washington University, April 12.) NATO was founded to protect 'civilized' people. That means White. (n.d.). The Washington Post. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/04/11/nato-ukraine-refugees-whiteness/>

The invasion of Ukraine has been horrifying to witness.

Early on, some observers repeatedly expressed the idea that the invasion of Ukraine is especially horrifying because, as CBS reporter Charlie D'Agata, who was in Kyiv, put it, "This isn't a place, with all due respect, like Iraq or Afghanistan, that has seen conflict raging for decades. This is a relatively civilized, relatively European — I have to choose those words carefully too — city." (D'Agata later issued an apology.)

People of color are not surprised. A large body of research finds that Whiteness informs who is deemed deserving of welfare, protectionism, property, security, freedom, humanitarianism and more. NATO's very inception — too — was birthed through appeals to Whiteness.

To understand the selective empathy toward Ukraine, here are four historical examples that illustrate how race has always mattered when it comes to NATO and the concept of Western civilization, drawn from a large body of scholarship as well as my own dissertation research.

NATO was born out of a fear of White slavery. American commitments to NATO were born out of the fear that communism would spread in Europe. However, communism was seen to pose a threat not just to "freedom" — but specifically to White freedom, as historian Tyler Stovall and others have shown.

In the U.S. South, communism was seen as synonymous with desegregation. Looking abroad, arch-segregationist Sen. James Eastland (D-Miss.) in 1947 explained his support for U.S. commitments to Europe: ... there is more slavery on the earth today than at any previous time in the world's history ... communism is the greatest of all enslavers [because] Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia are the first nations in modern history which have recognized and practiced the doctrine of human slavery as applied to the white race. (Note: Emphasis is the author's.)

Defending European democracy meant reinforcing colonization elsewhere. NATO was born as an alliance that protected — and even funded — European colonization. As explicated during the 1948 congressional hearings on the Marshall Plan, the United States believed that Europe's postwar economic recovery was crucial to resisting communism. Britain, for instance, was to recover through recolonizing Malaya and its strategic resources — rubber and tin. British-controlled Malaya was the second-highest exporter to the United States before Japan's takeover in World War II. Reestablishing this "triangular trade" was so important that the United States indirectly assisted the suppression of independence movements in colonial Southeast Asia, culminating in the Vietnam War.



NATO's WESTERN ALLIES DIVIDED AND CONQUERED AFRICA BY RECRUITING AND INFILTRATING GOVERNMENT LEADERSHIP.

Sobukwe, 2022. (Djibo, Former Central Committee member of the All African People's Revolutionary Party, February 23.)
NATO and Africa: A Relationship of Colonial Violence and Structural White Supremacy. Black Agenda Report.
<http://blackagendareport.com/nato-and-africa-relationship-colonial-violence-and-structural-white-supremacy>

Imperialism has always used its strategy of divide and rule. To enable the acceptance of the idea of a 'benevolent' NATO, the colonial powers knew that they had to convince and recruit a neo-colonial class of indigenous Africans who would do their bidding. This divide played itself out in the national liberation movements between those who were friendly to imperialist forces and those who wanted a real break from colonialism. Nkrumah explains in Neo-colonialism, The Last Stage of Imperialism, the wide array of methods employed by neocolonialism, ranging from economic, political, religious, ideological and cultural spheres. To do this, NATO works hand in hand with other mechanisms of imperialism like the CIA 7 which was instrumental in the coup against the Nkrumah government and the murder of Patrice Lumumba.

The settler colony of Azania/South Africa would be another example of a NATO outpost. From the beginning it was obviously on the side of the Western/ NATO powers since it was essentially a colony of Britain and therefore was a NATO surrogate. In 1955 South Africa and Britain formulated the Simonstown agreements which contained provision for the naval surveillance and defense of the African continent from Cape to Cairo. In spite of a purported arms embargo, NATO countries and Israel also provided South Africa with the necessary technology to develop nuclear weapons.



NATO IS USING MILITARY AND TECHNOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT TO SUPPRESS GROWTH OF CHINESE AND RUSSIAN POWER.

Shea, 2020. (Raner, September 21.) NATO 2030: a Desperate Plan to Try to Preserve US Imperialist Hegemony. Orinoco Tribune - News and Opinion Pieces about Venezuela and Beyond.

<https://orinocotribune.com/nato-2030-a-desperate-plan-to-try-to-preserve-us-imperialist-hegemony/>

The technocrats of the NATO empire have frantically been trying to reverse the damage, to patch up the strained imperial alliances and restore the paradigm of 20th century liberal hegemony. When Henry Kissinger talks about how important it is to “safeguard the principles of the liberal world order,” he’s talking about stopping the imperialist contradiction which Stalin described from incurably destabilizing the U.S.-centered corporatocracy.

And NATO encapsulates this desire for retaining imperial unity and control. Strategic thinkers within the global imperialist elite believe that the imperialist powers will need to cooperate in order to have a better chance of subduing the rising anti-imperialist powers. It’s why Andrés Oppenheimer, the editor of the empire-loving Miami Herald, agrees with Stoltenberg in that Trump’s ultra-nationalist strategy harms U.S. foreign policy goals. Oppenheimer and the rest of the anti-Trump neoconservative intelligentsia have thus been hoping for a Biden victory, believing Biden’s approach of international cooperation would make Washington better able to achieve regime change in Venezuela and to counter the rise of Russia and China.

But the power of Republican voter suppression, as well as the largely reactionary nature of the U.S. voting population, make me highly doubtful that they’ll succeed in ousting Trump. The capitalist contradictions of the U.S. will continue to translate into an increasingly fractured world order. The reactionary nationalism of countries like Britain will continue to result in deteriorating proletarian conditions throughout the neoliberal world, especially within the core imperialist countries. Expanding NATO to the U.S. loyalist states within the Pacific hemisphere isn’t going to undo these processes within the collapse of global capitalism, any more than it’s going to stop the trend towards a multi-polar world where China is the strongest power.

This is why the NATO technocrats aim to continue intensifying anti-Chinese and anti-Russian propaganda, tightening censorship, and making the countries they control more militarized; the heightening of the capitalist and imperialist contradictions result in a greater potential for proletarian uprising.



GROWTH IN NATO INFLUENCE WILL ALLOW LEADERS TO TIGHTEN GRASP OF GLOBAL SECURITY PREVENTING OTHER NATIONS FROM SURPASSING THEIR POLITICAL INFLUENCE.

Hassan, 2008. (Ghali, an independent political analyst living in Australia. August 25.) NATO: A Tool Of U.S. Imperialism. Countercurrents.Org. Retrieved June 9, 2022, from <https://countercurrents.org/hassan250808.htm>

The U.S.-controlled North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) has lost its purpose to continue as a defence alliance. However, its aggressive expansion is endangering world peace and the survival of the planet.

Despite its irrelevant role, NATO has become part of the U.S. military. Instead of dismantling the once defence alliance, the U.S. pushed to enlarge NATO and expand its boundaries. The U.S. has lured most European nations, including former Warsaw Pact members, the so-called “New Europe”, to join its military. Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic joined in 1999; Bulgaria, Latvia, Lithuanian, Estonia, Slovakia and Romania in 2004, others are waiting in line. Becoming a NATO member proves to be a profit bonanza for U.S.-Israeli weapon industries and arm dealers. All new recruits into NATO are obliged to increase their “defence” budgets to modernise and enlarge their military arsenals at the expense of vital public services.

Engineering and using crisis in Europe and elsewhere, the U.S. cancelled the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABM) in order to locate ABMs and to lure more nations to sign up for the system, including Australia, South Korea and Japan. Under the fraudulent pretext of defence against “rogue” states, the U.S. has just signed a “deal” with Poland to station on Polish soil U.S. “interceptor missiles”. The provocative deal is seen by Russians as a dangerous opportunity for the U.S. to expand its military presence and threat across the world. Poland hailed the deal as a counter to Russian “threat”. Of course Poland is fully aware that the missiles are against Russia not Iran, as the U.S. continues to mislead the public. After Poland, the U.S. is planning to build a twin anti-missile radar system in the Czech Republic. Many Poles as well as Czechs are against the deals and rightly believe their countries are becoming vassal states of a dangerous U.S. militarism.

Since the end of the so-called “Cold War”, the U.S. aim has always been a quest for imperialist domination of the globe through U.S. militarism, including the establishment of U.S. military bases in strategic areas of the world. The U.S. policy of destabilising Russia and undermining Russia’s integration with Europe is aimed at controlling Eurasia’s natural resources. The events of 9/11 provided the U.S. with a pretext to justify the U.S. war on Islam and a global imperialist expansion.

World peace is greatly served by multilateralism and international institutions without an aggressive U.S. military expansion. The transformation of NATO into a tool of U.S. imperialism is endangering the survival of the planet.



CONTINUED SUPPORT FOR THE NATO ALLIANCE WILL FORCE MEMBERS INTO DIFFICULT POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC POSITIONS.

Dr. Roberts, 2020. (Peter, professor at Emory University's Goizueta Business School NATO 2030: Difficult Times Ahead. (n.d.). Rusi.Org. <https://rusi.org/explore-our-research/publications/commentary/nato-2030-difficult-times-ahead>

Amidst the national angst around the coronavirus pandemic response, the speech by NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg on 8 June 2020 did not make headlines – perhaps it should have done.

In outlining his vision for NATO in 2030, Stoltenberg focused on increasing the political and economic unity and impact of the Alliance, and doing so globally, rather than simply in a European or North Atlantic context. Such language is exactly what the US was lobbying for at the leaders' meeting in London in December 2019: a refocusing and appreciation of the role China has been playing in global security challenges. This is a bold plan in the face of various European economic tie-ins with China. It also comes at an opportune moment, as President Donald Trump has ordered the withdrawal of more US troops from European soil, a move which has been met with unusual criticism from European politicians and former US military staff.

Whilst Stoltenberg focused on political unity and the potential economic levers of a united Alliance, there are a number of military changes that are being developed and reviewed over this summer. The new NATO military strategy achieved approval in May 2019 and SACEUR (NATO's senior warfighting commander) is drafting a new Operational Concept of Deterrence and Defence and a new NATO Warfighting Capability Concept is also in the works.

These plans are perhaps an attempt to shift the Alliance's military planning from one that is capability-based (a concept that tries to have a smattering of every military capability available, including some new ones), to one that is threat-based (a concept that looks specifically at competitors and builds/develops capabilities designed to counteract any weaknesses and build on opportunities for advantage).

Currently, NATO is driven by the equipment states have determined they need (or wish to retain), and will make available to NATO. The new concept would prioritise and presumably encourage states to change their priorities in favour of those the Alliance determines as important. What is difficult to imagine is how SACEUR will reconcile the ability to generate these forces with national prioritisation and deployment of forces by individual states: this is a fundamental dilemma that will need to be overcome if the concepts are to be useful.

The Trade-offs for Member States

For individual member states, this will lead to some tough choices, and questions over the prioritisation of investment decisions. If, for example, the UK decided – in its paused Integrated Review – to move away from heavy-armour formations in favour of lighter and more manoeuvrable forces, this impacts on any NATO plan for a heavy deterrence capability to match that of Russia. The implication is that decisions will need to determine whether NATO is actually important enough to skew internal, sovereign policy decisions, or whether a balance can be struck.



NATO's EUROPEAN EXPANSION EXACERBATES REGIONAL INSTABILITY WHILE CREATING A FINANCIAL BURDEN FOR THE U.S.

Hassan, 2008. (Ghali, an independent political analyst living in Australia. August 25.) NATO: A Tool Of U.S. Imperialism. Countercurrents.Org. Retrieved June 9, 2022, from <https://countercurrents.org/hassan250808.htm>

The costs to the region are not simply monetary. By admitting certain countries before others, NATO would sharpen already existing divisions in the region—between the more prosperous North and the less prosperous South, between Eastern Europe and the struggling countries of the former Soviet Union. This division in particular threatens Ukraine, whose eastern half contains a large ethnic Russian population. Russia simply cannot countenance the absorption of Ukraine into a Western security alliance. Ukraine itself suspects that it will be allowed to slip into the Russian sphere of influence in exchange for Russia's approval of Visegrad Four membership in NATO. The Clinton administration's preference for limited expansion—a “two-community solution”—would draw new lines of demarcation through an already conflicted region.

Should NATO pursue membership for the region as a whole, a new set of problems arise. For instance, how would NATO handle already existing conflicts—between Hungary and Romania, Hungary and Slovakia, Romania and Ukraine, Ukraine and Russia, Estonia and Russia? To date, only Greece and Turkey maintain a substantial rift within the alliance. Could the alliance survive a new set of fault lines? Finally there are the costs to the U.S. of NATO expansion. According to the CBO, incorporation of just the Visegrad Four would cost an additional \$60 to \$125 billion over 15 years. The bill for the U.S. would be \$5 to \$19 billion—but only if the Visegrad Four covered a substantial portion of the upgrade, an implausible scenario.

The countries of East-Central Europe largely favor joining NATO. The region has been promised a great deal in terms of European integration and Western aid, but integration remains in limbo, and Western aid has not been forthcoming in large quantities. Sadly, NATO expansion has become a substitute for more substantial political and economic integration into the West, which is what East-Central Europe really desires.

Lost in the discussion of NATO expansion is the obvious question: is the alliance still necessary after the end of the cold war? The risks outlined above seem to outweigh any possible benefits for postcommunist Europe.



NATO's 2030 AGENDA FURTHERS IMPERIALIST EXPANSION INTO THE INDO-PACIFIC CAUSING REGIONAL INSTABILITY.

Shea, 2020. (Raner, September 21.) NATO 2030: a Desperate Plan to Try to Preserve US Imperialist Hegemony. Orinoco Tribune - News and Opinion Pieces about Venezuela and Beyond.

<https://orinocotribune.com/nato-2030-a-desperate-plan-to-try-to-preserve-us-imperialist-hegemony/>

But to further secure their interests going into the unstable geopolitical period of the 2020s, the imperialists need to ensure that they'll hold thorough control over the countries within perhaps the most geopolitically important region of the current era: the Indo-Pacific. This is where NATO 2030 comes in.

In an event from this June that was sponsored by the neoconservative think tank the Atlantic Council, NATO's General Secretary Jens Stoltenberg announced a reform project called NATO 2030. It's a plan to absorb Australia, New Zealand, Japan, and south Korea into NATO, as well as to expand NATO's influence beyond a mere military role and also make it a tool for influencing the wider political spheres of the countries under its jurisdiction. Stoltenberg's explanation for this project's existence was perfectly reflective of the recent liberal push against Trumpian nationalist isolationism: "we must resist the temptation of national solutions and we must live up to our values: freedom, democracy and the rule of law. To do this, we must stay strong militarily, be more united politically and take a broader approach globally."

This plan isn't just about securing imperial cooperation within the region where the U.S. is expanding its military buildup against China. It's about trying to bypass one of the great contradictions of imperialism, which is the tendency of the imperialist powers to fight among themselves amid their quests for domination. In *The Foundations of Leninism*, Stalin described this dynamic as:

The contradiction among the various financial groups and imperialist Powers in their struggle for sources of raw materials, for foreign territory. Imperialism is the export of capital to the sources of raw materials, the frenzied struggle for monopolist possession of these sources, the struggle for a re-division of the already divided world, a struggle waged with particular fury by new financial groups and Powers seeking a "place in the sun" against the old groups and Powers, which cling tenaciously to what they have seized. This frenzied struggle among the various groups of capitalists is notable in that it includes as an inevitable element imperialist wars, wars for the annexation of foreign territory. This circumstance, in its turn, is notable in that it leads to the mutual weakening of the imperialists, to the weakening of the position of capitalism in general, to the acceleration of the advent of the proletarian revolution and to the practical necessity of this revolution.



THE CONTINUATION OF NATO EXPANSION DISRUPTS GLOBAL DEMILITARIZATION EFFORTS.

Feffer, 1996. (John, director of Foreign Policy in Focus at the Institute for Policy Studies, November 1.) The Costs and Dangers of NATO Expansion. Institute for Policy Studies.

https://ips-dc.org/the_costs_and_dangers_of_nato_expansion/

Although a member of PFP, **Russia has** steadfastly **opposed NATO expansion**. Virtually all political forces within the country view this policy as an encirclement, a containment that will lead to greater isolation. **Thus, Russia is particularly sensitive about the inclusion of bordering countries—the Baltics, Ukraine, Moldova. Should the Baltic countries join NATO, Russian officials hinted that they would counter with troop concentrations or tactical nuclear weapons on the border, thus decreasing, not increasing, security in the region.** The Yeltsin government also threatened to scuttle key arms control agreements such as START II, CFE, and INF. Since Russia poses a considerably diminished security threat to Europe (see In Focus: U.S.-Russian Relations), **expansion is an aggressive act that threatens to undo decades of security cooperation** and tilt Russia closer toward considering an anti-Western alliance with China or pariah states such as Iraq.

Even if Russia should suddenly change its mind, **NATO expansion** still **represents a step backward for Eastern and Central Europe**. On the heels of Soviet withdrawal, expansion **would reverse the trend toward demilitarization in the region**. New NATO members would have to devote enormous funds to buy the weapons and communication systems necessary to mesh with the Western command structure—an increase by one estimate of at least 60 percent and possibly 80 percent over current military expenditures. These defense budget hikes would put enormous pressure on strained budgets and divert money from the reform of productive sectors at a time when the region is cutting its military spending (Hungary has pared its defense spending by 60 percent since 1988, Poland by 44 percent). **Expansion will also undo the steps**, however tentative, that these countries have **taken toward military conversion.**

NATO has promised to pick up some of the bill, but this aid would be earmarked for military expenditures rather than critical economic or civic reform. U.S. policy is driven in part by domestic considerations: new NATO members would be prime markets for U.S. arms exports (F-16 and F-18 fighter aircraft and Cobra attack helicopters have already been offered to the region). Yet, even with NATO subsidies and weapons giveaways from the Pentagon, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates that the Visegrad Four would still be unable to afford the necessary modernization.



NATO IMPERIALISM INEVITABLE, U.S. CONTROLLED CYBERSPACE IS STILL COMPARATIVELY BETTER THAN EASTERN IRON FIST.

Business Insider, 2016. (July 14). America's internet is incredibly free compared to most countries. Business Insider.
<https://www.businessinsider.com/americas-internet-is-incredibly-free-compared-to-most-countries-2016-7>

One fact that surprised us — given how much Americans talk about censorship — is how relatively little internet censorship there is in the US. As in zero censorship of the important topics tracked by the free expression watchdog.

Now not everyone has such a rosy assesment of US censorship.

Reporters Without Borders called the US an Enemy of the Internet in 2014, saying "US surveillance practices and decryption activities are a direct threat to investigative journalists, especially those who work with sensitive sources for whom confidentiality is paramount and who are already under pressure."

Freedom House's 2015 report, released in October last year, noted some concerns about the US, like increasing pressure on private companies to install backdoors and arrests for some people who filmed police actions.

Still, the US looks better than most of the world, ranking sixth out of 65 countries, with China coming in dead last.



THE COLD WAR ERA CAME TO AN END IN THE LATE 1990S BUT RUSSIAN MILITARISTIC GROWTH CONTINUES, RACE TO THE TOP PERSISTS REGARDLESS TO ACTION OF THE AFF.

Josh Holder, Scott Reinhard, and Michael Schwartz, 2022. (Jan, 27.) 2022.)

<https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2022/01/27/world/europe/russia-forces.html>

A build-up of Russian forces near the border with Ukraine has raised concerns among Western and Ukrainian officials that the Kremlin might be preparing for significant military action, possibly an invasion. This map, compiled by The New York Times, shows troops, tanks and heavy artillery moving into positions that threaten to widen the conflict in Ukraine's east and potentially open a new front on Ukraine's northern border, closer to the capital, Kyiv. From there, they can also menace the countries on NATO's eastern flank.

Russia currently has about 130,000 troops on the Ukraine border, according to Ukraine's military. U.S. intelligence agencies have assessed that the Kremlin has drawn up plans for a military operation involving up to 175,000 troops that could begin in the coming weeks. While it is not clear whether President Vladimir V. Putin of Russia has decided to launch an attack — and Moscow has said repeatedly in recent weeks that it has no plans to do so — analysts say the country is well on its way toward constructing the architecture needed for a significant military intervention in Ukraine.

Much of the buildup so far, according to officials and military analysts, has involved troops and equipment that take time to deploy, including tanks and heavy armor, some of which have traveled by train from bases as far away as Siberia.

Before launching a significant military operation, Russia needs to deploy reserve soldiers and logistical infrastructure, like field hospitals, that until recently appeared to be missing from positions near Ukraine, analysts say. But these elements along with additional troops have been moving into some areas of Russian deployment, Ukrainian and western officials say.

Much of the attention so far has been directed at the buildup of forces near two breakaway provinces in eastern Ukraine, Donetsk and Luhansk, where the Ukrainian military has been at war with Russian-backed separatists since 2014. The separatist forces, which include Russian troops and Ukrainian fighters opposed to Kyiv's rule, number about 30,000, according to an assessment by the Ukrainian military.

Since the start of 2021, Russia has moved an additional five battalion tactical groups into the border area near Luhansk and Donetsk, including about 5,000 soldiers sent to reinforce the 12,000 or so stationed there permanently, according to Ukrainian authorities.

Just as significant, according to officials and military analysts, are the forces massing north of Ukraine in areas such as Klintsy, at the point where the Ukrainian, Russian and Belarusian borders meet. Russia has also begun ferrying troops, armor, fighter jets and advanced anti-aircraft systems into Belarus, a Russian ally and Ukraine's northern neighbor, putting a growing force within range of Kyiv. Russia's Defense Ministry says the buildup in Belarus is purely for military exercises scheduled to begin Feb. 10. But, American officials and NATO say these exercises could be a pretext for deploying troops meant to threaten Ukraine and put NATO allies on edge.



NATO MEMBERS ARE WORK COLLABORATIVELY TO INVENT NEW TECHNOLOGY AND METHODS TO STRENGTHEN CYBERSECURITY ON A UNITED FRONT. NATO, 2022. (Last updated March, 23.) NATO Cyber defense https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_78170.htm

Cyber threats to the security of the Alliance are complex, destructive and coercive, and are becoming ever more frequent. NATO will continue to adapt to the evolving cyber threat landscape. NATO and its Allies rely on strong and resilient cyber defences to fulfil the Alliance's core tasks of collective defence, crisis management and cooperative security. The Alliance needs to be prepared to defend its networks and operations against the growing sophistication of the cyber threats it faces.

Cyber defence is part of NATO's core task of collective defence.

NATO Allies have affirmed that international law applies in cyberspace.

NATO's main focus in cyber defence is to protect its own networks, operate in cyberspace (including through the Alliance's operations and missions), help Allies to enhance their national resilience and provide a platform for political consultation and collective action.

In July 2016, Allies reaffirmed NATO's defensive mandate and recognised cyberspace as a domain of operations in which NATO must defend itself as effectively as it does in the air, on land and at sea.

Allies also made a Cyber Defence Pledge in July 2016 to enhance their cyber defences, and have continued to bolster their national resilience as a matter of priority.

NATO reinforces its cyber capabilities, including through education, training and exercises.

Allies are committed to enhancing information-sharing and mutual assistance in preventing, mitigating and recovering from cyber attacks.

NATO Cyber Rapid Reaction teams are on standby 24 hours a day to assist Allies, if requested and approved.

In February 2019, Allies endorsed a NATO guide that sets out a number of tools to further strengthen NATO's ability to respond to significant malicious cumulative cyber activities.

NATO is intensifying its cooperation with industry through the NATO Industry Cyber Partnership.

At the 2021 NATO Summit in Brussels, Allies endorsed a new Comprehensive Cyber Defence Policy, which supports NATO's core tasks and overall deterrence and defence posture to enhance further the Alliance's resilience.

Allies are promoting a free, open, peaceful and secure cyberspace, and pursuing efforts to enhance stability and reduce the risk of conflict by supporting international law and voluntary norms of responsible state behaviour in cyberspace.



AMERICANS ARE ABLE TO ROAM THE CYBERSPACE FREELY, THE U.S. IS DETERMINED TO PROVIDE THE SAME ACCESS TO THE REST OF THE WORLD ALLOWING SUPPRESSED GROUPS TO FIGHT FOR THEIR FREEDOM.

The United States Agency for Global Media Retrieved June 16, 2022, from <https://www.usagm.gov/office-internet-freedom/>

Since 2002, USAGM has been involved in activities to circumvent internet censorship by foreign governments in order to distribute news content and better provide a forum for free expression in closed societies. This portfolio has since grown to be an increasingly critical component of the agency's ability to fulfill its mission to "inform, engage, and connect people around the world in support of freedom and democracy."

USAGM has supported internet freedom projects through the Office of Internet Freedom (formerly the Internet Anti-Censorship Division) and the Open Technology Fund (OTF), USAGM's newest non-profit grantee. The USAGM's internet freedom program supports, per congressional appropriations guidance, global internet freedom for the expansion of unrestricted access to information on the internet. Over the past seven years, USAGM has invested more than \$100 million in projects to promote internet freedom in the world's most restricted environments. Together, these programs have supported the tools and systems necessary for USAGM networks to report and disseminate content in information-restrictive markets, and for USAGM audiences to receive and share content safely online.

While previously OIF directly supported certain circumvention at-scale projects, OTF now supports all the agency's internet freedom needs. OIF's role is to maintain a strong partnership with OTF, to provide oversight to ensure continued OTF compliance with relevant rules and regulations in the execution of congressionally mandated use of internet freedom funds for technology projects, ensure uninterrupted circumvention services for USAGM entities and their training needs, provide critical field-driven feedback loop, and manage the assessment of particular OTF projects to inform USAGM strategy and oversight.



2 AC NO IMPACT – NO NUCLEAR WAR

NUCLEAR WAR UNLIKELY, EVEN RUSSIA UNDERSTANDS THIS IS THE LAST RESORT.

Valenti, 2022. (Maggie, April 14). How Likely Is A Nuclear War In Europe? Russian Officials Make Threats Amid Risk Of NATO Expansion. International Business Times.

<https://www.ibtimes.com/how-likely-nuclear-war-europe-russian-officials-make-threats-amid-risk-nato-expansion-3474683>

Russian officials have taken a step towards threatening nuclear war, warning that if Sweden and Finland join NATO, Russia will place nuclear weapons in the Baltic region.

Russian officials have previously stated that if Russia's existence or territory is threatened, nuclear weapons are an option.

Keeping nuclear weapons in the Baltic — specifically in Russian-controlled Kaliningrad, which sits between Poland and Lithuania — as Russian officials have recently threatened, would make it easier for Russia to target Western countries.

However, threats like these are not uncommon from Russia and nuclear weapons have previously been in the region.

Sweden and Finland are near Baltic countries and have held onto neutrality for a long time, but since have reconsidered their positions after Russia invaded Ukraine. Finland also shares an 830-mile border with Russia and currently around half of the world's nuclear weapons are owned by Russia.

Despite the threats of nuclear war, events like the Cuban Missile crisis, North Korean aggression, and Russian threats, governments have not used nuclear weapons during a war since World War II. IN 1945, the U.S. dropped bombs on two Japanese cities, Hiroshima and Nagasaki, in the first and only time these weapons were used during a war.

Even with the recent heightening of Russian aggression, multiple people have been quick to say that Russian President Vladimir Putin is bluffing, that nuclear war is not in his best interest.

"This threat of escalation . . . is cheap talk. Putin is bluffing. He is deliberately allowing the U.S. intelligence community to discover data about escalation in order to scare us away from helping Ukrainians win," Michael McFaul wrote in an opinion column for the Washington Post.

McFaul argues that the U.S. and Western allies are not doing more to help Ukraine, including providing certain weapons out of fear of Russian escalation. He believes they should be doing more to ensure Ukraine's victory and should ignore Putin's threats.

"Putin is angry and unhinged, but not suicidal," he added.

NATO Secretary-General has called Putin's threats of escalation "nuclear saber-rattling."

"Nuclear war can not be won and it could never be fought," he said.



EUROPEAN COUNTRIES ARE HESITANT TO INCREASE MILITARY SPENDING TO SUPPORT NATO'S EXPANSION AGENDA.

Dr. Roberts, 2020. (Peter, professor at Emory University's Goizueta Business School NATO 2030: Difficult Times Ahead. (n.d.). Rusi.Org. <https://rusi.org/explore-our-research/publications/commentary/nato-2030-difficult-times-ahead>

Across the Alliance, striking that balance is a dilemma that can become divisive, as some members step up to the fighting part of the requirement, whilst others focus on the high-tech (but much safer) part. The relative investments might be equal in national treasure, but the difference in risk to personnel will be significant.

Should the UK make unilateral decisions (for example on potentially scrapping the Army's heavy-armoured capability), it will be tempting for the government to argue that the additional capabilities of British Carrier Strike capability, or large numbers of F35s, drones, or new surveillance capabilities, along with a healthy research and development financial allocation, outweigh the potential drawbacks from the removal of tanks from its commitment to NATO's Order of Battle. The reality, however, is that those new capabilities will not buy out that commitment of a heavy armour formation in the land domain, specifically aimed at countering Russian armoured strength. A NATO threat-based model of force design and employment is realistic and desirable in the current competition against Russia, but cannot be achieved unless member states also adopt the same concept. A divergence in the philosophy of force designs between member states and NATO will mean that the Alliance can generate neither a capability-based force, nor one that matches the threat, leaving the organisation in a worse position than it is already.

If Stoltenberg is serious about making these military changes, as well as the political and economic ones, he will need to make a more convincing argument to major contributors (the US, France, the UK, and Germany) that their defence budgets and procurement plans need to be NATO-centric, and not merely where national defence plans conveniently coincide with NATO's. The speed of development of these states is much faster than many other Alliance member states can afford, or have planned for. Yet more transformation might be needed, and there is the risk of developing a three-speed NATO, with the staggering pace of US military development, the slower pace of similar trends in the UK, France and potentially Germany, and the more measured speed of other Allies, which will be largely determined by broad national economic trends and budget allocations.



THE U.S. IS PREPARED FOR RUSSIAN CYBER ATTACKS.

Blinken, 2022. (Antony J. Secretary of State, May 10.) Attribution of Russia's Malicious Cyber Activity Against Ukraine. United States Department of State.

<https://www.state.gov/attribution-of-russias-malicious-cyber-activity-against-ukraine/>

The United States is joining with allies and partners to condemn Russia's destructive cyber activities against Ukraine. In the months leading up to and after Russia's illegal further invasion began, Ukraine experienced a series of disruptive cyber operations, including website defacements, distributed denial-of-service (DDoS) attacks, and cyber attacks to delete data from computers belonging to government and private entities – all part of the Russian playbook. For example, the United States has assessed that Russian military cyber operators have deployed multiple families of destructive wiper malware, including WhisperGate, on Ukrainian Government and private sector networks. These disruptive cyber operations began in January 2022, prior to Russia's illegal further invasion of Ukraine and have continued throughout the war.

Today, in support of the European Union and other partners, the United States is sharing publicly its assessment that Russia launched cyber attacks in late February against commercial satellite communications networks to disrupt Ukrainian command and control during the invasion, and those actions had spillover impacts into other European countries. The activity disabled very small aperture terminals in Ukraine and across Europe. This includes tens of thousands of terminals outside of Ukraine that, among other things, support wind turbines and provide Internet services to private citizens.

As nations committed to upholding the rules-based international order in cyberspace, the United States and its allies and partners are taking steps to defend against Russia's irresponsible actions. The U.S. Government has developed new mechanisms to help Ukraine identify cyber threats and recover from cyber incidents. We have also enhanced our support for Ukraine's digital connectivity, including by providing satellite phones and data terminals to Ukrainian government officials, essential service providers, and critical infrastructure operators. We praise Ukraine's efforts—both in and outside of government—to defend against and recover from such activity, even as its country is under physical attack.