

Speech, Home School Debate 12/1.

1. Heart of the topic: **Grand Strategy** – role of the U.S. in a broader global context.
 - a. **Carnegie Mellon’s Center for International Relations and Politics** defines it as: Grand strategy may be defined as the combination of diplomatic, economic, military, and political factors used by leaders to defend their respective nation-states.
 - b. The U.S. is a wealthy and relatively very influential nation, so its actions toward the UN or with intervention in conflict have greater repercussions.
2. **Isolationism.**
 - a. Popularized recently by libertarians, bolstered by public combat fatigue.
 - b. Advocates withdrawal from global affairs.
 - i. Pro’s
 1. Wars are costly.
 - a. Monetary cost – immoral and coercive to spend tax dollars on wars people may not agree with?
 - b. Human cost – immoral to fight others battles? To risk the lives of U.S. personnel?
 - c. Troop overstretch is bad.
 2. Interventions pick winners and losers, causing anti-American sentiment.
 - a. Also allows balancing – nations looking to take American hegemony by force.
 3. May make realities on the ground worse.
 - a. Can cause corruption, trafficking, supply of guns, etc. to opposition, fueling a conflict longer.
 - b. Very difficult to beat an insurgency.
 4. Regional frameworks may be better suited to the unique needs of their area.
 - a. African Union in Africa.
 - b. Turkey in Syria
 - c. European Union in Europe.
 - ii. Cons
 1. U.S. self-interest can’t exist in a vacuum in a globalized society.
 - a. Economic interests (trade).
 - b. Global security threats.
 - i. Critical to forward basing and deterrence/rapid response -- the old Roman maxim: “To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of promoting peace.” (Matthew Spalding, Heritage Foundation, “The Ideology of Isolationism,” <http://blog.heritage.org/2012/01/21/the-ideology-of-isolationism/>)
 - ii. Deterrence/challengers.

Bradley A. Thayer (Associate Professor in the Dept. of Defense and Strategic Studies at Missouri State University) 2007 American Empire: A Debate, "Reply to Christopher Layne" p 109 (NOT the full card.)

"If the United States adopted offshore balancing, many of those allies would terminate their relationship with the United States. They would be forced to increase their own armaments, acquire nuclear weapons, and perhaps ally against the United States, even aiming their nuclear weapons at the United States. In those circumstances, the United States would be far less secure and much worse off than it is now. That might be the future if the United States changed its grand strategy. To be sure, at present the United States is a great ally."

2. Immoral to allow atrocities to happen if we are in a position to prevent.
 - a. Rwanda.
 - b. Kosovo.
 - c. Syria?
3. Unilateralism. Defined, Symeon C. Symeonides, Dean and Professor of Law at Willamette University, ""unilateralism" is defined as "[t]he doctrine that nations should conduct their foreign affairs individualistically without the advice or involvement of other nations."
 - a. Pro's.
 - i. Allows the U.S. to pursue policies without giving other nations a say.
 1. Removed inefficiencies.
 2. Doesn't subordinate our objectives to the whims of other potentially hostile nations.
 - a. Syria
 - b. China (Sudan)
 - c. Iran (Russia/China trying to dilute sanctions)
 - ii. The U.S. is powerful and so will often lose out in negotiations.
 1. Kyoto, etc.
 2. Can't proceed with critical ops such as targeted killings. International outcry prevents.
 - iii. Countries that see the success of these efforts are likely to join a coalition eventually.
 1. Was the rationale behind Iraq – countries willingly joining a coalition.
 2. Worked in many instances.
 3. Michla Pomerance, Michla **Pomerance**, "U.S. Multilateralism, Left and Right," Professor of International Law at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, (NOT the full card).

“Utilizing multilateral mechanisms in the service of the "national interest" is a legitimate enterprise, but the world and the United States cannot afford to allow that "interest" to be narrowly defined. The term should (and usually does) encompass the promotion of milieu goals, such as world order based on minimal standards of civilization and decency. Multilateral cooperation will continue to depend (perhaps more than ever) on resolute unilateralism and readiness to go-it-alone, if necessary. Only such an attitude furnishes the "cement" to hold coalitions together. What was true before September 11 remains true today: in the long run, a self-abasing, obsessive multilateralism serves the interest of neither the United States nor the enlightened world.”

- b. Cons
 - i. Can cause severe resentment internationally.
 - ii. Forces the U.S. to shoulder the full cost of an operation (including the full cost of failure).
 - iii. Weakens international institutions by destroying their credibility.
 - iv. Creates outcomes in which no one on the ground is invested.
- 4. Multilateralism. Defined as nations working together to achieve a common objective.
 - a. Pros.
 - i. Gives greater legitimacy to an initiative.

Warren Christopher, Secretary of Defense, Foreign Policy, Spring, 1995 (NOT the full card).

“American leadership also requires that we galvanize the support of allies, friends, and international institutions in achieving common objectives--as we did with Iraq, Haiti, and North Korea. Lately it has become fashionable to argue that we should simply go it alone. That view is naive: It limits our flexibility, weakens our influence, and harms our interests. That would be tantamount to unilateral disarmament against some of the world's most pressing threats. Many of our most important objectives cannot be achieved without the cooperation of others. We did not win the Cold War by facing down the Soviet Union alone. We will not win the global fight against proliferation, terrorism, crime, or threats to the environment without cooperation from friends and allies. At this time of great opportunity, we cannot build a more secure and prosperous world by ourselves.”
 - ii. More pragmatic way to address global issues, cost-wise (unilateralism is expensive.)
 - 1. Credibility of international organizations is key to environment, pandemics, other global issues.
 - iii. More respectful to alliances.
 - 1. Key to intelligence cooperation and military support.
 - b. Cons.
 - i. Allows free-riding.

1. Robert Kagan, Senior Associate at Carnegie, (NOT the full card).
“of these nations are giving themselves a “free ride” on the back of American power, benefiting from the international order that American hegemony undergirds, while at the same time puncturing little holes in it for short-term advantage. The more serious danger is that this behavior will gradually, or perhaps not so gradually, erode the sum total of power that can be applied to protecting the international order altogether. The false multipolarity sought by France, Russia, and others would reduce America’s ability to defend common interests without increasing anyone else’s ability to do so.”
- ii. Bolsters inefficient institutions.