Negative: NASAMS Air Defense

By “Coach Vance” Trefethen

AFF plan deploys NASAMS - National Advanced Surface to Air Missile System - air defense systems at US military bases in Poland and Germany. It's basically a ground based launcher that shoots down incoming enemy planes, cruise missiles and drones.

Negative: NASAMS Air Defense 2

HARMS / SIGNIFICANCE 2

1. Russia is no threat 2

Ukraine war proves how weak Russia is. We shouldn’t be wasting resources on such a weak “threat” 2

Ukraine proves weakness of Russian military. No way they can threaten the rest of Europe 2

Ukraine war is a humanitarian crisis, not a military threat: Don’t over-react 2

2. No US obligation 3

Russia isn’t much of a threat. Whatever problem it may be, it should be managed by Europe, not us 3

US national security is best served by NOT confronting Russia and letting Europe deal with it 3

INHERENCY - Status Quo solves better than AFF Plan 3

1. Poland 3

Poland is installing Patriot anti-aircraft defense system 3

Patriot is better than NASAMS 4

2. Germany 4

Germany has IRIS-T and Patriot, providing short, medium and long range air defense 4

SOLEVENCY 4

1. Insufficient Affirmative Plan 4

You can't just pick one thing and say "This solves for air defense." It requires multiple layers that haven't been discussed nor thought through by the Affirmative team 4

DISADVANTAGES 5

1. European defense capabilities weakened 5

Link: Germany is building its own European air defense system 5

Link: Bringing in outside systems will jeopardise the development of future European capabilities 5

Impact: Turns AFF goal of security in Europe. East European security against Russia would be better with increased European capabilities 5

2. European defense mind-set weakened 5

Link: Europeans, including Poland, won't fight for each other because they believe America will rescue them 5

Brink: Europe on the brink of slipping back to their old ways of refusing to spend on defense and letting the US pay for it - and it's unsustainable because we can no longer pay for it 6

Link: Only way Europe will increase its defense capabilities is if the US stops defending them 6

Impact: Weaker European security. They're less secure when they rely on the US and we can't defend them in a crisis 6

3. Hyping the threat 7

Link: Inflating the evil Russian threat makes things worse: Hardens Putin, increases risk of retaliation 7

Impact: World War 3 7

Negative: NASAMS Air Defense

HARMS / SIGNIFICANCE

1. Russia is no threat

Ukraine war proves how weak Russia is. We shouldn’t be wasting resources on such a weak “threat”

Prof. Anatol Lieven 2022 (Professor at Georgetown University School of Foreign Service, Qatar, visiting professor in the War Studies Dept of King’s College London, senior fellow of the New America Foundation ) 14 July 2022 “Just How Much Bigger Is the US-NATO Military Force Than Russia's?” <https://www.commondreams.org/views/2022/07/14/just-how-much-bigger-us-nato-military-force-russias> (accessed 26 July 2022)

The Russian invasion of Ukraine, and the atrocities that have accompanied it, have naturally caused deep anxiety throughout Europe. NATO's new Strategic Concept for the next decade calls Russia "the most significant and direct threat to Allies' security and to peace and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area." But before devoting huge additional resources to confront Russia, it would be a good idea to take a level-headed look at Russian military resources and the nature and extent of the Russian military threat to NATO. We should not forget how, after the USSR's collapse, Western intelligence agencies concluded that their Cold War estimates of Soviet military power were greatly[exaggerated](https://www.csmonitor.com/1995/1024/24191.html) (just as, it's worth noting, were Western[predictions](https://www.rferl.org/a/russia-ukraine-invasion-scenarios/31614428.html) of an easy Russian[victory](https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_reports/RR2500/RR2563/RAND_RR2563.pdf) over Ukraine this year). After all, U.S. and Western resources are not unlimited, and devoting them to defend against Russia means limiting them elsewhere.

Ukraine proves weakness of Russian military. No way they can threaten the rest of Europe

Doug Bandow 2022 (JD; senior fellow at the Cato Institute; former special assistant to Pres. Reagan) 28 Mar 2022 “With Russia’s Weakness on Full Display: Hawks Now Want America to Fight Russia and China” <https://www.cato.org/commentary/russias-weakness-full-display-hawks-now-want-america-fight-russia-china> (accessed 29 July 2022)

Putin also inadvertently showcased the limits of the Russian armed services. They have significant firepower but suffer from important weaknesses. While raw numbers of troops and tanks would suggest that Moscow could defeat any European nation, poor logistics, maintenance, morale, and training make Russia look substantially less threatening. No doubt, Moscow will learn from its mistakes and address its military’s shortcomings, though it might be short of money to refurbish its force. Nor should Russians be underestimated if defending their country from attack. However, looking ever less plausible are scare stories of a revived Red Army driving across Europe to the Atlantic.

Ukraine war is a humanitarian crisis, not a military threat: Don’t over-react

Doug Bandow 2022 (JD; senior fellow at the Cato Institute; former special assistant to Pres. Reagan) What Now for Russia? 3 March 2022 <https://www.cato.org/commentary/what-now-russia> (accessed 29 July 2022)

Third, Washington should treat Russia’s invasion primarily as a humanitarian crisis, not a military threat. Russian President Vladimir Putin is a bad guy, but he has never demonstrated the slightest interest in war against America, which would be beyond foolish. Thus, the Biden administration should not overreact. Its principal obligation is to ensure that the Russian invasion does not turn into a security crisis for the U.S.

2. No US obligation

Russia isn’t much of a threat. Whatever problem it may be, it should be managed by Europe, not us

Doug Bandow 2022 (JD; senior fellow at the Cato Institute; former special assistant to Pres. Reagan) 28 Mar 2022 “With Russia’s Weakness on Full Display: Hawks Now Want America to Fight Russia and China” <https://www.cato.org/commentary/russias-weakness-full-display-hawks-now-want-america-fight-russia-china> (accessed 29 July 2022)

After World War II, many democratic and friendly states were vulnerable to Soviet subversion and assault. Hence Washington’s policy of containment. Thankfully, the justification for this policy disappeared: the USSR collapsed, the Warsaw Pact dissolved, Eastern European nations raced westward. Had Washington and its allies behaved differently, not treating Moscow as a defeated nation through NATO expansion and more, Russia likely would not have reemerged as a threat. But Putin has helpfully demonstrated that Moscow, though certainly not a paper tiger, nevertheless is not equipped for continent‐​wide aggression. Russia remains a problem, but one that could and should be managed by Europeans, not Americans.

US national security is best served by NOT confronting Russia and letting Europe deal with it

Doug Bandow 2022 (JD; senior fellow at the Cato Institute; former special assistant to Pres. Reagan) 28 Mar 2022 “With Russia’s Weakness on Full Display: Hawks Now Want America to Fight Russia and China” <https://www.cato.org/commentary/russias-weakness-full-display-hawks-now-want-america-fight-russia-china> (accessed 29 July 2022)

Ultimately, Russia’s criminal aggression against Ukraine offers a reminder why US security is best served by remaining outside of unnecessary conflicts, not making other nations’ wars America’s own. It is well past time for Washington’s allies and friends to take over their own security and confront whatever threats exist. The American people defended much of the world over the last eight decades. Now it is time for them to retire.

INHERENCY - Status Quo solves better than AFF Plan

1. Poland

Poland is installing Patriot anti-aircraft defense system

NEWSWEEK 2022 (journalist Zoe Strozewski) 21 Nov 2022 " 'Patriot' Missiles, Which Poland Wants on Its Border, Compared to NASAMS" (accessed 21 Mar 2023) https://www.newsweek.com/poland-patriot-missiles-comparison-nasams-1761128

After a believed Ukrainian missile struck inside Poland's border last week and killed two people, Germany offered to provide additional "Patriot" missile launchers to fellow [NATO](https://www.newsweek.com/topic/nato) member Poland amid fears of a dangerous escalation in Russia's war. Polish Defense Minister Mariusz Blaszczak announced on [Twitter](https://twitter.com/mblaszczak/status/1594601239320223744?s=20&t=-VJn1R4M70NO9q567DxRGw) Monday that he had accepted this offer and planned to propose that the launchers should be stationed at Poland's shared border with Ukraine.

Patriot is better than NASAMS

NEWSWEEK 2022 (journalist Zoe Strozewski) 21 Nov 2022 " 'Patriot' Missiles, Which Poland Wants on Its Border, Compared to NASAMS" (accessed 21 Mar 2023) https://www.newsweek.com/poland-patriot-missiles-comparison-nasams-1761128

The Patriot is a surface-to-air missile system [used by the U.S. and its allies](https://www.newsweek.com/us-made-weapons-might-not-protect-ukraine-nuclear-strike-putin-1749546), but it bears some key similarities and differences to another type of air defense system that has become a subject of discussion in the war. [National Advanced Surface-to-Air Missile Systems (NASAMS)](https://www.newsweek.com/russia-ukraine-war-nasams-1746237) were developed by the American manufacturer Raytheon and the Norway-headquartered Kongsberg Defence & Aerospace. The Patriot is also produced by Raytheon, according to Army-technology.com. Newer variants of the Patriot systems, which more than a dozen countries currently operate, can engage ballistic and cruise missiles, loitering munitions, and aircraft, according to the Center for Strategic and International Studies' Missile Threat site. Sean Spoonts, a U.S. Navy veteran and editor-in-chief of Special Operations Forces Report (SOFREP), told Newsweek that the Patriot is "the gold standard in terms of anti-missile systems." In comparison to the medium-range NASAMS, the Patriot system can shoot at short, medium and long ranges, Spoonts said.

2. Germany

Germany has IRIS-T and Patriot, providing short, medium and long range air defense

[Sven Arnold](https://www.swp-berlin.org/wissenschaftler-in/sven-arnold) and [Torben Arnold](https://www.swp-berlin.org/wissenschaftler-in/torben-arnold) 2023 (Visiting Fellows in the International Security Research Division, Foundation for Science & Politics, in Germany) 2 Feb 2023 "Germany’s Fragile Leadership Role in European Air Defence" (accessed 21 Mar 2023) https://www.swp-berlin.org/10.18449/2023C06/

The IRIS-T SLM (Infra-Red Imaging System-Tail/Surface Launched Medium Range) system, devel­oped and produced in Germany, covers short to medium ranges. Germany recently delivered several of these to Ukraine. There are different guided missiles for IRIS-T, namely the variants SLS for short ranges and SLM for medium ranges. For long ranges, the SLX variant is to be developed. Poland has ordered the British Common Anti-air Modular Missile (CAMM) system, in which Italy would also be interested. CAMM has comparable characteristics to IRIS-T SLS. As far as long ranges above 35 km are concerned, six other European allies besides Germany use the Patriot system.

SOLEVENCY

1. Insufficient Affirmative Plan

You can't just pick one thing and say "This solves for air defense." It requires multiple layers that haven't been discussed nor thought through by the Affirmative team

[Sven Arnold](https://www.swp-berlin.org/wissenschaftler-in/sven-arnold) and [Torben Arnold](https://www.swp-berlin.org/wissenschaftler-in/torben-arnold) 2023 (Visiting Fellows in the International Security Research Division, Foundation for Science & Politics, in Germany) 2 Feb 2023 "Germany’s Fragile Leadership Role in European Air Defence" (accessed 21 Mar 2023) https://www.swp-berlin.org/10.18449/2023C06/

Air defence must be thought of holistically. It is technically very demanding because there are many interconnecting factors. In order to minimise dangers, the entire pro­cess must therefore be perfectly linked, from the reconnaissance of a threat with radar or satellites via a C2 structure to the combat units. This process must be efficient and fast, because in missile defence some­times only minutes pass between the launch and the target being reached. The Russian Iskander missiles stationed in Kaliningrad are just one example. It would only take them a few minutes to reach Berlin. Integrated air defence means that all military dimensions are taken into account: land, air, sea, cyberspace, and space. Dif­fer­ent systems are deployed: fighter jets, unmanned systems, ground systems, air defence frigates, IT systems, and satellites. All these systems are set up in such a way as to create mutually overlapping layers and domains. This is to make it as difficult as possible for the enemy to overcome the defences. In order to be able to react im­mediately to a threat, air defence must be prepared around the clock to repel enemy aircraft, drones, or missiles at vary­ing ranges and altitudes.

DISADVANTAGES

1. European defense capabilities weakened

Link: Germany is building its own European air defense system

[Sven Arnold](https://www.swp-berlin.org/wissenschaftler-in/sven-arnold) and [Torben Arnold](https://www.swp-berlin.org/wissenschaftler-in/torben-arnold) 2023 (Visiting Fellows in the International Security Research Division, Foundation for Science & Politics, in Germany) 2 Feb 2023 " Germany’s Fragile Leadership Role in European Air Defence" (accessed 21 Mar 2023) https://www.swp-berlin.org/10.18449/2023C06/

In his Prague speech on 29 August 2022, Chancellor Olaf Scholz stated that Germany intends to invest heavily in its air defence capabilities. He sees Germany as taking a leading role. All European partners are invited to get involved as well. Six weeks later, on the fringes of the NATO meeting in Brussels, the former Defence Minister Christine Lambrecht concretised this leader­ship role and signed a declaration of intent with 14 partners entitled the [European Sky Shield Initiative](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_208103.htm). The goal is to better pro­tect Europe against threats from the air.

Link: Bringing in outside systems will jeopardise the development of future European capabilities

[Sven Arnold](https://www.swp-berlin.org/wissenschaftler-in/sven-arnold) and [Torben Arnold](https://www.swp-berlin.org/wissenschaftler-in/torben-arnold) 2023 (Visiting Fellows in the International Security Research Division, Foundation for Science & Politics, in Germany) 2 Feb 2023 " Germany’s Fragile Leadership Role in European Air Defence" (accessed 21 Mar 2023) https://www.swp-berlin.org/10.18449/2023C06/

Care must be taken, however, not to jeopardise the development of future Euro­pean capabilities. Short-term purchasing decisions will have long-term consequences for in-house product development, because money spent on the procurement of non-European weapon systems is not being spent on European research and development.

Impact: Turns AFF goal of security in Europe. East European security against Russia would be better with increased European capabilities

Giovanna De Maio 2021 (nonresident fellow in the Center on the United States and Europe at Brookings Institution) "OPPORTUNITIES TO DEEPEN NATO-EU COOPERATION" Dec 2021 (accessed 3 July 2022) https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/FP\_20211203\_nato\_eu\_cooperation\_demaio.pdf

Similarly, a scenario analysis by the International Institute for Strategic Studies argued that without the help of the United States, conventional forces from European NATO countries would not be able to push back against the hypothetical conquest of Lithuania and part of Poland by the Russian Federation. To ensure that they can successfully respond to a land attack from Russia, or a coordinated Russia-China operation, Europeans need to increase the quality and readiness of their defense apparatus. All these analyses indicate that expanded capabilities on the European side are crucial for a stronger NATO posture.

2. European defense mind-set weakened

Link: Europeans, including Poland, won't fight for each other because they believe America will rescue them

Doug Bandow 2022 (JD from Stanford; senior fellow at the Cato Institute; worked as special assistant to President Ronald Reagan) 13 July 2022 "Europe Is Rich. So Why Does It Need America’s Help against Russia?" <https://www.cato.org/commentary/europe-rich-so-why-does-it-need-americas-help-against-russia> (accessed 27 Aug 2022)

This persistent reliance on America should come as no surprise. [A 2020 Pew Research Center poll](https://www.pewresearch.org/global/2020/02/09/nato-seen-favorably-across-member-states/) found little enthusiasm among Europeans to assist one another. The overall median result was 50‐​to‐​38 percent against. Of the 13 European nations polled, majorities in only three – Lithuania, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom – favored fighting for fellow NATO members. That number hit 40 percent in only three other nations – France, Poland, and Spain. Only 34 percent in Germany did so. In every case more people believed that America would defend them. Of course.

Brink: Europe on the brink of slipping back to their old ways of refusing to spend on defense and letting the US pay for it - and it's unsustainable because we can no longer pay for it

Doug Bandow 2022 (JD from Stanford; senior fellow at the Cato Institute; worked as special assistant to President Ronald Reagan ) 27 July 2022 "So If Europe Wants to Escalate against Russia Who Foots the Bill?" https://www.cato.org/commentary/so-europe-wants-escalate-against-russia-who-foots-bill (accessed 27 Aug 2022)

If finally forced to choose between social services at home and military subsidies abroad, America’s aging population is likely to join its European cousins in choosing the former. Then the latter will have to decide whether they believe their countries are worth defending. Russia’s criminal invasion of Ukraine was a great wrong that seemed to wake a militarily somnolent continent. Now the Europeans show signs of slipping back into their previous defense stupor, but the old way of doing things is no longer sustainable.

Link: Only way Europe will increase its defense capabilities is if the US stops defending them

Doug Bandow 2022 (JD from Stanford; senior fellow at the Cato Institute; worked as special assistant to President Ronald Reagan) 13 July 2022 "Europe Is Rich. So Why Does It Need America’s Help against Russia?" <https://www.cato.org/commentary/europe-rich-so-why-does-it-need-americas-help-against-russia> (accessed 27 Aug 2022)

A succession of presidents, secretaries of defense, and secretaries of state have asked, pleaded, insisted, whined, begged, and abased themselves in pressing the Europeans to do at least as much for themselves as the U.S. did. But continental governments took America’s measure, recognized that its foreign policy elite was determined to run the world irrespective of the cost to the American people, and would continue protecting Europe even if the Europeans disarmed completely. If so, Biden and company would express their disappointment … and then send more troops to cover the European shortfall! So the U.S. continues to provide defense welfare to its populous, prosperous “allies.” Instead of adding forces to Europe, Washington should be bringing American personnel home. Europe needs to decide if it believes Russia poses an existential threat and if so, take effective action accordingly. The only way that will happen is if Uncle Sam does less. Starting now.

Impact: Weaker European security. They're less secure when they rely on the US and we can't defend them in a crisis

Hans Binnendikj, Daniel Hamilton and Alexander Vershbow 2022. (Binnendiki - Distinguished Fellow at The Atlantic Council. Hamilton - Non-Resident Senior Fellow, Brookings Institution. Vershbow - Distinguished Fellow - The Atlantic Council. Former NATO Deputy Secretary General; former Assistant Secretary of Defense and former US Ambassador to NATO, Russia and S.Korea) Strategic responsibility: Rebalancing European and trans-Atlantic defense 24 June 2022 https://www.brookings.edu/articles/strategic-responsibility-rebalancing-european-and-trans-atlantic-defense/

China’s aggressive territorial claims in the South and East China Seas, and its threats to the integrity of Taiwan, present a real risk of conflict in the Indo-Pacific, including direct confrontation between China and the United States. In such a situation, critical sea lanes of communication, maritime shipping, and European commercial interactions with China, and with Asia more broadly, would be disrupted. The interests of various European allies in the Indo-Pacific would be at risk. Opportunities would also be created for Russia. U.S. forces might not be available to adequately reinforce European allies against a simultaneous Russian military challenge. The Europeans would need to quickly fill those gaps. They need to plan now how they would do so.

3. Hyping the threat

Link: Inflating the evil Russian threat makes things worse: Hardens Putin, increases risk of retaliation

Doug Bandow 2022 (JD; senior fellow at the Cato Institute; former special assistant to Pres. Reagan) 23 May 2022 “The Washington Blob: Its Blind Arrogance May Lead to War with Russia” <https://www.cato.org/commentary/washington-blob-its-blind-arrogance-may-lead-war-russia> (accessed 29 July 2022)

Worse, administration officials are not just pursuing inflated war aims, but promoting them publicly, expressing desire for regime change, war crimes trials, and a weakened Russia. This ostentatious challenge raises the stakes for the Putin government, increasing pressure on it to respond. Public discussions of America’s role in combat operations, including targeting Russian generals and ships, also highlights Washington’s status as a cobelligerent and tempts Moscow to retaliate.

Impact: World War 3

Doug Bandow 2022 (JD; senior fellow at the Cato Institute; former special assistant to Pres. Reagan) 23 May 2022 “The Washington Blob: Its Blind Arrogance May Lead to War with Russia” <https://www.cato.org/commentary/washington-blob-its-blind-arrogance-may-lead-war-russia> (accessed 29 July 2022)

Escalation could be [striking Western aid shipments](https://www.thenationalnews.com/world/europe/2022/04/11/poland-risks-russian-agression-as-it-becomes-key-weapons-route-for-ukraine/) before they reach Ukraine, perhaps in Poland; encouraging attacks by Russian or proxy forces on US garrisons elsewhere, such as in Syria or Iraq; augmenting the military capabilities of American adversaries, most dangerously Iran or North Korea; employing more [destructive weapons and firepower](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-60664169), including nuclear weapons; and [declaring full mobilization](https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2022/05/19/russians-criticize-military-war-ukraine/), thereby committing the Russian people to a modified version of total war. All of these would set up a potentially dangerous confrontation with Washington. It would be madness for the US to match or trump Moscow, given the stakes. However, backing down, seemingly abandoning Ukraine, would sacrifice US credibility. This is how World War III could start.