Negative Brief: Bosnia US Troop Deployment

By “Coach Vance” Trefethen

***Resolved: The United States Federal Government should substantially reform its policy towards one or more countries in Europe***

The AFF plan puts US troops in Bosnia to try to hold that country together, as it is torn by ethnic divisions left over from the civil war 30 years ago. The nation of "Bosnia & Herzegovina" (sometimes abbreviated to just "Bosnia") has three competing ethnic groups: Croats, Serbs and Muslims (who are sometimes referred to as Bosniaks). These groups fought a big civil war 30 years ago and a fragile peace was settled with US intervention. However, the three groups still hate each other. Two of them (Croats and Serbs) have nearby contiguous countries made of their own people (Croatia and Serbia) to which they would like to be joined instead of being forcibly held as part of Bosnia. The Bosnian government, led by Bosniaks, wouldn't like that to happen and instead wants US troops deployed to help prevent the breakup of their nation. NEG position - let it happen. A breakup would be better than forcing these groups to get along against their will.
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Negative: Bosnia - US Troops

SOURCE INDICTMENT

Samantha Powers

Dr Ted G. Carpenter 2020 (PhD in U.S. diplomatic history; Senior Fellow for defense & policy studies at Cato Institute) 1 Jan 2020 " Samantha Power in Bosnia: A Poster Child for Toxic Advocacy Journalism" (accessed 11 Sept 2022) https://www.cato.org/commentary/samantha-power-bosnia-poster-child-toxic-advocacy-journalism

As Power relates in her [2019 memoir](https://www.amazon.com/Education-Idealist-Memoir-Samantha-Power/dp/0062820699/ref%3Dsr_1_2?crid=M487CY0K3C49&keywords=samantha+power+the+education+of+an+idealist&qid=1577727232&s=books&sprefix=Samantha+%2Cstripbooks%2C177&sr=1-2), The Education of an Idealist, she was merely an intern at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace who lacked press credentials from the organization’s flagship publication, Foreign Policy, or any other recognized news organization. She describes how she solved that problem. “I waited until the Foreign Policy editorial staff had headed home and the cleaners had completed their nighttime rounds on the floor. Once the suite was completely deserted, I walked into the office of Charles William Maynes, the journal’s editor, picked up several sheets of his stationery and then hurried back to my desk. Hands shaking, I began typing a letter impersonating the unwitting Maynes.” Then “determined to get to Bosnia, I went ahead and wrote to the head of the UN Press Office, asking that the UN provide Samantha Power, Foreign Policy’s ‘Balkan correspondent,’ with ‘all necessary access.’” Such conduct said volumes about her obsession to cover the Bosnian war–and about her ethics. Her overwhelming bias about the Bosnia conflict also was evident, and she remains surprisingly candid about it.

**END QUOTE. HE GOES ON TO CONCLUDE LATER IN THE ARTICLE QUOTE:**

Samantha Power’s performance regarding the Bosnian war was a textbook example of especially toxic advocacy journalism in international affairs. That type of coverage not only is a disgrace to ethical journalism, it has helped foment disastrous, destabilizing Western military interventions in multiple countries.

HARMS / SIGNIFICANCE

1. A/T "Possible breakup of Bosnia"

So what? Best policy would be to let it happen. No reason to force ethnic groups to stay against their will

Doug Bandow 2021 (Senior Fellow at Cato Institute; JD from Stanford Univ.; former special assistant to Pres. Reagan) 26 Nov 2021 "The Allied Project in Bosnia Might Implode" (accessed 11 Sept 2022) https://www.cato.org/commentary/allied-project-bosnia-might-implode

Dodik made clear he doesn’t want conflict and intends to attack no one. Whatever his private fantasies, doing so would be suicidal. In practice, the ethnic Serbs simply want to be left alone, without colonial oversight from Washington and Brussels. Why should Croats, who long wanted to join the Croatian state, and Bosniaks, go to war to compel the Serbs to stay? If the Bosniaks had a right to leave Yugoslavia, why not wave a pleasant goodbye to the Serbs if they leave Bosnia?

Breakup of Bosnia would be better than any alternative involving intervention. We should leave them alone

Doug Bandow 2021 (Senior Fellow at Cato Institute; JD from Stanford Univ.; former special assistant to Pres. Reagan) 26 Nov 2021 "The Allied Project in Bosnia Might Implode" (accessed 11 Sept 2022) https://www.cato.org/commentary/allied-project-bosnia-might-implode

The answer to the latest Balkans contretemps is simple: Washington should shut up and the E.U. should bring home its “high representative.” Encouraging peace is a worthwhile goal. Micromanaging other peoples’ lives is not. The U.S. and Europe should allow Bosnia to sort out its own problems, even if that results in a break‐​up. As my colleague Ted Galen Carpenter [pointed out](https://www.19fortyfive.com/2021/11/when-will-america-realize-bosnia-is-a-zombie-state/), “Bosnia is a political and economic zombie, and no amount of Western effort can truly give it life.” It is time to stop trying. After decades of outside rule, allow the Bosnians and [other residents of the Balkans](https://responsiblestatecraft.org/2021/05/14/memo-to-the-west-let-balkans-draw-their-own-lines/) to decide how and with whom they want to live.

No problem in the Balkans justifies US intervention to forcibly maintain multi-ethnic states

Doug Bandow 2021 (Senior Fellow at Cato Institute; JD from Stanford Univ.; former special assistant to Pres. Reagan) 14 May 2021 " Memo to the West: Let Balkan countries draw their own lines" (accessed 11 Sept 2022) https://responsiblestatecraft.org/2021/05/14/memo-to-the-west-let-balkans-draw-their-own-lines/

Most important, America and Europe have bungled attempts to play global social engineers. They believe that states should be ever bigger and more diverse. People in the Balkans evidently do not. Even if multi-ethnic federalism is seen as the liberal ideal, it obviously isn’t the practical and peaceful solution in this case. It is time to allow locals to attempt to settle their disputes. The U.S. and EU have obvious interests in preserving the peace. They do not have a similar interest in attempting to force others to live by arbitrary rules concocted in Washington and Brussels. After spending decades bungling attempts to remake the Mideast, Central Asia, and the Balkans, Washington should have learned this lesson by now.

2. Bosnia isn't worth saving

Bosnia is a failed country that doesn't work

Dr. Ted G. Carpenter 2021 (PhD in U.S. diplomatic history; Senior Fellow for defense & policy studies at Cato Institute) 22 Nov 2021 " When Will America Realize Bosnia Is A Zombie State?" (accessed 11 Sept 2022) https://www.cato.org/commentary/when-will-america-realize-bosnia-zombie-state

The current High Representative, Christian Schmidt, seems to be having [even more trouble](https://www.eurasiareview.com/17112021-the-problem-with-bosnias-last-high-representative-oped/) than most of his predecessors with the recalcitrant domestic factions. In October, Serb leader Milorad Dodik announced a new effort to dissolve Bosnia and enable the predominantly Serb region to become fully independent as the Republika Srpska. He [stated bluntly](https://www.msn.com/en-us/news/world/bosnia-s-serb-leader-dodik-unveils-plans-to-dismantle-failed-country/ar-AAPOK0m) that Bosnia was a “failed country” and Western “experiment” that “does not work.” Given the facts on the ground, it is hard to argue against Dodik’s conclusion.

3. A/T "Another Bosnian Civil War!!"

Last Bosnian war didn't justify US intervention - harms were exaggerated by the media

Dr Ted G. Carpenter 2011. (PhD in U.S. diplomatic history; Senior Fellow for defense & policy studies at Cato Institute) 2 June 2011 (accessed 11 Sept 2022) "Mladic’s Arrest and Corrosive Bosnian Myths" https://www.cato.org/commentary/mladics-arrest-corrosive-bosnian-myths

Even as Western pundits and human rights activists were repeatedly venting their outrage about the suffering of innocent civilians in Bosnia, far worse bloodletting was taking place in Sierra Leone and other locales. If we are to learn anything worthwhile about the Bosnian civil war, it is important to move beyond the self‐​serving myths about genocide that were primarily used to justify an interventionist policy by the United States and its NATO allies.

SOLVENCY

1. Bosnia can't be saved nor fixed

Can't resuscitate a zombie: No amount of outside intervention can fix Bosnia. Just accept it and give up

Dr. Ted G. Carpenter 2021 (PhD in U.S. diplomatic history; Senior Fellow for defense & policy studies at Cato Institute) 22 Nov 2021 " When Will America Realize Bosnia Is A Zombie State?" (accessed 11 Sept 2022) https://www.cato.org/commentary/when-will-america-realize-bosnia-zombie-state

U.S. and other Western leaders refuse to face the overwhelming evidence that their nation‐​building venture in Bosnia has failed. Trying to insist on national unity there, when three decades of painful experience confirm that there is no semblance of national unity, constitutes foreign policy malpractice. Bosnia remains intact only at the insistence of arrogant U.S. and European officials who refuse to admit that their approach was fatally flawed from the outset. Bosnia is a political and economic zombie, and no amount of Western effort can truly give it life. It is well past time to accept that reality.

The Dayton Agreement in the 1990s tried to make Bosnia work by establishing its current government. But Bosnia as a nation will never work and it's time to give up

Prof. Timothy Waters 2021 (prof. of law at Indiana Univ.) 9 Dec 2021 (accessed 12 Sept 2022) "**Bosnia’s endless crisis could be solved by letting it break apart peacefully**" https://theconversation.com/bosnias-endless-crisis-could-be-solved-by-letting-it-break-apart-peacefully-173051

Since Dayton, there’s been peace, but little else: [a moribund economy](https://www.economy.com/bosnia-and-herzegovina/indicators), [failed reconciliation](https://theconversation.com/bosnias-25-year-struggle-with-transitional-justice-75517), a country thrice-cleaved. Dayton is often blamed for Bosnia’s dysfunction, but that’s a half-truth: “Dayton Bosnia” is dysfunctional – but which part is failing? Not Dayton: It’s designed to prevent effective governance and to ensure that no one of Bosnia’s three groups might dominate the others. Dayton’s compromises were the logical culmination of Bosnia’s war – the tribute reason paid to power. No, the dysfunction is Bosnia – the idea that this territory, whose [three peoples lack shared identity](https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/mladic-verdict-reveals-bosnias-divisions-lack-reconciliation-2021-06-08/), is a sensible unit. A quarter-century on life support suggests it isn’t.

US intervention can't "fix" Bosnia because Bosnia can't be fixed

Prof. Timothy Waters 2021 (prof. of law at Indiana Univ.) 9 Dec 2021 (accessed 12 Sept 2022) "**Bosnia’s endless crisis could be solved by letting it break apart peacefully**" https://theconversation.com/bosnias-endless-crisis-could-be-solved-by-letting-it-break-apart-peacefully-173051

Policymakers interpret the current crisis as a [test of Western resolve](https://www.csis.org/analysis/bosnia-test-western-resolve): Increase the pressure again, add new sanctions or deploy more troops. But to what end? America keeps trying to fix Dayton but treats Bosnia as a given, and then wonders why the treatment doesn’t take. There’s no exit strategy: Just stabilize the patient, again.

The US could keep intervening "forever" and it would never fix the fundamental problems in Bosnia

Prof. Timothy Waters 2021 (prof. of law at Indiana Univ.) 9 Dec 2021 (accessed 12 Sept 2022) "**Bosnia’s endless crisis could be solved by letting it break apart peacefully**" https://theconversation.com/bosnias-endless-crisis-could-be-solved-by-letting-it-break-apart-peacefully-173051 (Republika Srpska is the Serbian part of Bosnia, which wants to drop out/secede from Bosnia)

The U.S. has been engineering Bosnia since 1995. Reengaging now, [including proposals to dissolve Republika Srpska](https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/new-atlanticist/bosnias-power-sharing-deal-is-coming-undone-heres-how-to-fix-it/) – as if that wouldn’t risk war – means more engineering. The question is, for what purpose? If the reason is to avoid secession, ask why. If the answer is “to avoid war,” ask where our present policy is headed, and how many troops are needed. And when the present crisis passes, let’s have the courage to ask whether insisting on Bosnia makes sense. How long will America keep Bosnia in crisis? Until it works? Until its people stop wanting something else? Right now, those sound like euphemisms. Right now, the answer to our unasked question is “forever.”

Preserving Bosnia means preserving failure: The country is in terrible condition

Dr. David Harland 2017 (Executive Director of the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue. He served as a witness for the Prosecution at the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia) "Never again: International intervention in Bosnia and Herzegovina" July 2017 (accessed 12 Sept 2022) https://www.hdcentre.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/Never-again-International-intervention-in-Bosnia-and-Herzegovina.pdf

More than two decades after the deal, there have been no further outbreaks of fighting. The ceasefire that UNPROFOR oversaw prior to Dayton is still in effect and has never been violated. However, essential flaws in this elite bargain mean that Bosnia remains a dysfunctional state trapped in the provisions of that agreement. It is one of the poorest countries in Europe; the machinery of government established at Dayton is cumbersome and remains unreformed and financed by unsustainable levels of debt; school curriculum and the media reinforce grievances and fears among communities; rates of divorce and depression are high; and the rate of recruitment to jihadi organisations is the highest in the world. There might not have been a return to war, but there has been minimal progressive change.

Lesson learned from the 1990's: Most likely result of intervention in Bosnia is failure

Dr. David Harland 2017 (Executive Director of the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue. He served as a witness for the Prosecution at the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia) "Never again: International intervention in Bosnia and Herzegovina" July 2017 (accessed 12 Sept 2022) https://www.hdcentre.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/Never-again-International-intervention-in-Bosnia-and-Herzegovina.pdf

The lesson from this is not that the military intervention in 1995 was wrong, nor that it would have been better not to attempt to broker a deal. On the contrary, the intervention was the right thing to do – it just was not as decisive as later accounts suggest; and the deal that emerged from the end of the war was not as positive. The lesson, therefore, is primarily one of humility: those who intervene anywhere need to know that the cost is usually high, the results are often bad, and the most likely result is failure. Instead of humility, however, the story of Bosnia has been one of an over-simplified and over-sold narrative that has subsequently informed multiple other interventions that have done more harm than good.

DISADVANTAGES

1. Oppression

Bosnian government requests US help so they can oppress the Serb minority

Doug Bandow 2022 (JD from Stanford; senior fellow at the Cato Institute; worked as special assistant to President Ronald Reagan) 5 July 2022 " Great Power Folly? NATO’s Ill‐​Timed Turn to China" https://www.cato.org/commentary/great-power-folly-natos-ill-timed-turn-china (accessed 27 Aug 2022)

Unfortunately, the Bosniaks want to keep their recalcitrant citizens, just like the Kosovars oppose releasing ethnic Serbs from Kosovo. To prevent the captives from going free, Bosnian Muslims [harken back to the civil war](https://www.france24.com/en/live-news/20211022-bosnia-s-serb-leader-dodik-unveils-plans-to-dismantle-failed-country), which, they contend, could have been stopped by timely outside intervention. So naturally, they believe, Washington should intervene now and…do something. Without specifying what.

US intervention in Bosnia will make us complicit in oppressing the Serb minority

Doug Bandow 2022 (JD from Stanford; senior fellow at the Cato Institute; worked as special assistant to President Ronald Reagan) 5 July 2022 " Great Power Folly? NATO’s Ill‐​Timed Turn to China" https://www.cato.org/commentary/great-power-folly-natos-ill-timed-turn-china (accessed 27 Aug 2022) (brackets added)

What kind of a democracy forces other people to live in arrangements they did not voluntarily agree to? America does! The all‐​seeing, all‐​knowing social engineers in Washington will prescribe the way of life for ethnic Serbs in Bosnia. Explained [State Department Counselor Derek] Chollet: “The United States is committed to do whatever we can to try to prevent the worst from happening and, more than that, try to achieve an even better outcome” by ensuring Bosnia’s subservience to the West, or putting it “back on its path towards its Euro‐​Atlantic destination,” as [Chollet more politely](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/envoy-us-ready-to-confront-attempts-to-tear-bosnia-apart/2021/11/16/828d89aa-46ff-11ec-beca-3cc7103bd814_story.html) allowed.

2. Already Tried & Failed - US intervention makes things worse

US intervention is the problem, not the solution: It's what created the failed state of Bosnia in the first place

Dr Ted G. Carpenter 2017 (PhD in U.S. diplomatic history; Senior Fellow for defense & policy studies at Cato Institute) "How U.S. Meddling in the Bosnia Conflict Changed the Face of NATO" 9 May 2017 (accessed 11 Sept 2022) https://www.cato.org/commentary/how-us-meddling-bosnia-conflict-changed-face-nato

The Clinton administration not only took the policy lead, it soon dominated the process. Washington insisted that Bosnia remain intact, and U.S. policy focused on suppressing the Croat and Serb secessionist campaigns. Clinton administration officials were especially determined to thwart the bid for independence by the Republika Srpska, the Serb entity that had gained control of nearly half of Bosnia’s territory and whose forces besieged the Muslim‐​controlled nominal national capital, Sarajevo. Washington prodded its allies to adopt stronger anti‐​Serb measures, and that led eventually to the first use of military force in NATO’s history with the launching of air strikes against Bosnian Serb forces. That action produced a largely dictated peace agreement, the Dayton Accords, negotiated by U.S. Assistant Secretary of State [Richard Holbrooke](http://amzn.to/2qWfnv7) in November 1995. Although the agreement ended the bloodshed, it did not make Bosnia anything more than a pretend country ruled by a succession of international viceroys ruling primarily through [arbitrary edicts](http://amzn.to/2q0myoQ). Bosnia was, and is, an [economic basket case](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/future-development/2015/11/05/three-reasons-why-the-economy-of-bosnia-and-herzegovina-is-off-balance/) heavily dependent on international financial inputs. Worse, the deep ethnic divisions [continued unabated](https://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/15/world/europe/bosnian-elections-reinforce-longstanding-ethnic-divisions.html?_r=0), making effective political cooperation nearly impossible. Two decades after the civil war, Bosnia remains a [dysfunctional, poverty‐​stricken ward](https://www.theguardian.com/global/2015/nov/10/bosnia-bitter-flawed-peace-deal-dayton-agreement-20-years-on) of the international community.

3. Weakens European Allies

Link: US intervention in Bosnia usurps responsibilities of European allies. Result: They over-rely and free-load on the US

Ted G. Carpenter 2017 (PhD in U.S. diplomatic history; Senior Fellow for defense & policy studies at Cato Institute) 9 May 2017 (accessed 11 Sept 2022) "How U.S. Meddling in the Bosnia Conflict Changed the Face of NATO" https://www.cato.org/commentary/how-us-meddling-bosnia-conflict-changed-face-nato

The Bosnia conflict was a huge missed opportunity for the United States to set new, more rational, priorities for itself in the post–Cold War world. A far better policy would have been to inform the Europeans that a petty conflict in the Balkans did not reach the threshold of a serious security threat to the transatlantic community warranting direct U.S. involvement, much less requiring Washington’s leadership. NATO’s European members had no more right to expect a dominant U.S. role in dampening a Bosnian civil war than Americans would have had the right to expect European countries to take the lead in addressing a similar conflict in the Caribbean or Central America. By usurping the leadership role, Washington perpetuated an unhealthy European dependence—and sometimes outright free riding—on U.S. security exertions.

Link: Must have strong European allies to share burdens for defending against China

Hans Binnendijk & Alexander Vershbow 2021. (Binnendijk and Vershbow are both Distinguished Fellows at the Atlantic Council. Binnendijk is a former National Security Coucil Senior Director for Defense Policy. Vershbow is a former NATO Deputy Secretary General and US Assistant Secretary of Defense ) Needed: A trans-Atlantic agreement on European strategic autonomy 10 Oct 2021 <https://www.defensenews.com/global/europe/2021/10/10/needed-a-transatlantic-agreement-on-european-strategic-autonomy/> (accessed 3 July 2022)

Europeans feel a greater need for strategic autonomy because of doubts about American reliability prompted by former President Trump’s disdain for NATO, as well as recent flawed consultations relating to troop withdrawal from Afghanistan and the Australian submarine deal. The United States is calculating the increased military capabilities it needs to deter an aggressive China in Asia and requires a stronger European partner to share the burdens.

Link: China threatens US hegemony

Ashley Tellis 2020 (Tata Chair for Strategic Affairs and a senior fellow at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He is also a counselor at the National Bureau of Asian Research and the research director of the Strategic Asia Program) 4 May 2020 "COVID-19 Knocks on American Hegemony" <https://carnegieendowment.org/2020/05/04/covid-19-knocks-on-american-hegemony-pub-81719> (accessed 8 June 2021)

After almost two decades of conflicted hesitancy, the United States finally acknowledged that it is involved in a long-term strategic competition with China. This rivalry, almost by definition, is not merely a wrangle between two major states. Rather, it involves a struggle for dominance in the international system, even if China as the rising power disavows any such ambition. China’s very ascendancy—if sustained—could over time threaten the U.S. hegemony that has been in place since the end of World War II.

Impact: World peace & prosperity. US hegemony is key to global peace & prosperity

Capt. M. V. Prato 2009 (United States Marine Corps,Command and Staff College, Marine Corps Combat Development Command,Marine Corps University) “The Need for American Hegemony” <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/citations/ADA508040> (accessed 3 June 2021)

The world witnessed a vast shift in the polarity of geopolitics after the Cold War. The United States became the world’s greatest hegemon with an unequalled ability to globally project cultural, political, economic, and military power in a manner not seen since the days of the Roman Empire. **[END QUOTE]** Coined the “unipolar moment” by syndicated columnist Charles Krauthammer, the disparity of power between the U.S. and all other nations allows the U.S. to influence the world for the mutual benefit of all responsible states. Unfortunately, the United States is increasingly forced to act unilaterally as a result of both foreign and domestic resentment to U.S. dominance and the rise of liberal internationalism. [**He goes on to conclude later in the same context QUOTE**:] The United States must exercise benevolent global hegemony, unilaterally if necessary, to ensure its security and maintain global peace and prosperity.

4. Preserving a bad system

Link: AFF's goal is to preserve Bosnia as-is and prevent breakup by deploying US troops

That's what they think should happen and that's their goal. But that's bad because…

Impact: Worse outcome. Preserving the Dayton arrangement (Bosnia's government since the end of the civil war) entrenches failure and discrimination and blocks any future successful resolution

Dr. David Harland 2017 (Executive Director of the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue. He served as a witness for the Prosecution at the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia) "Never again: International intervention in Bosnia and Herzegovina" July 2017 (accessed 12 Sept 2022) https://www.hdcentre.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/Never-again-International-intervention-in-Bosnia-and-Herzegovina.pdf

The political deal that ended the war in Bosnia had been in preparation since before the fighting began, and evolved slowly over the three-and-a-half years. The Dayton agreement was the fifth iteration of this deal. The main features of the Dayton agreement had been elaborated in the four earlier plans. What was distinctive about the Dayton deal was that it took on many of the worst features of the earlier plans and discarded some of the best. The Dayton agreement was an elite deal between the same three ethno-national elites that had started the war in the first place, and was brokered by the US without the endorsement of the people whose fate it determined. It cemented a ceasefire that had already been put in place by the UN before the negotiations began, and confirmed the results of ethnic cleansing, mainly to the benefit of the Serbs. Quite unnecessarily, it created enduring constitutional arrangements which were both unworkable and discriminatory, and which have prevented the emergence of moderate and pragmatic political forces.

5. National sovereignty

No one gave America the right to intervene in Bosnia

Bosnian Serb President Milorad Dodik 2022. (quoted by NPR journalist Frank Langfitt) 2 Feb 2022 (accessed 11 Sept 2022) pr.org/2022/02/02/1077710119/the-multi-ethnic-state-of-bosnia-is-once-again-in-crisis

Who invited and who gave the right to America to interfere in these issues here in Bosnia and Herzegovina. This is becoming a serious issue of interference in domestic affairs.

Can’t justify overriding the national sovereignty of internal affairs of other countries

The Lawyers and Jurists 2010 (ethical disclosure: article is undated but references events in 2010) (The Lawyers & Jurists” is a non-profit organization of attorneys) “THE US INTERVENE IN OTHER COUNTRIES” [THE US INTERVENE IN OTHER COUNTRIES | The Lawyers & Jurists (lawyersnjurists.com)](https://www.lawyersnjurists.com/article/the-us-intervene-in-other-countries/) (accessed 9 Sept 2022)

“Lately, there have been several interventions into the other countries policies by USA. Several countries have shown their protest against these measures taken by the United States. These countries are China, Russia, Lebanon, Iran, etc. The politics and diplomats of these countries have expressed their opinion and the opinion of the majority considering the intentions of the United States to make advices and control the situation. Although the human rights violations are an important issue that has to be taken into consideration by each country, each country itself is able to control the situation and use their resources to solve the problem. As a fact, from the USA can be expected the offer of help in solving some inner problems within the country, but not the intervention in any country.”

(Unlike human rights…) National sovereignty is the only universally accepted global norm among nations

Prof. Stephen M. Walt 2020 (professor of international relations at Harvard Univ.) “Countries Should Mind Their Own Business” July 17, 2020 ​​<https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/07/17/sovereignty-exceptionalism-countries-should-mind-their-own-business/> (accessed 7 Sept 2022)

Thus far, the only political form that has commanded nearly universal global acceptance is the territorial state itself, along with the closely related idea of nationalism. As Hendrik Spruyt, Stephen Krasner, Dan Nexon, and others have explored, the territorial state was only one of several political forms coexisting in early modern Europe, and its eventual emergence as the dominant political form was a contentious process that might have turned out differently. Many factors contributed to its ultimate success, and one of them was the idea of sovereignty: the principle that every government got to run its own affairs as its rulers (or, eventually, its citizens) saw fit. And once that principle took firm hold, individual local variations were reinforced and entrenched.

Impact: Risk of war. Stronger views against intervention would make international conflict less likely

 Prof. Stephen M. Walt 2020 (professor of international relations at Harvard Univ.) “Countries Should Mind Their Own Business” July 17, 2020 ​​<https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/07/17/sovereignty-exceptionalism-countries-should-mind-their-own-business/> Accessed: September 7, 2022.

“Although there are clearly areas where our future depends on states agreeing to limit their own freedom of action and conform to global norms and institutions, greater respect for sovereignty and national autonomy has some obvious benefits. First, states that interfere in foreign countries rarely understand what they are doing, and even well-intentioned efforts often fail due to ignorance, unintended consequences, or local resentment and resistance. A stronger norm of noninterference could make some protracted conflicts less likely or prolonged.”

Impact: Increased risk of war and conflict. Backlash against national sovereignty violation increases war conflict

Prof. Stephen M. Walt 2020 (professor of international relations at Harvard Univ.) “Countries Should Mind Their Own Business” July 17, 2020 ​​<https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/07/17/sovereignty-exceptionalism-countries-should-mind-their-own-business/> Accessed: September 7, 2022.

 “Second, trying to impose a single model on other countries inevitably raises threat perceptions and increases the risk of serious great-power conflict. The Westphalian idea of sovereignty was created in part to address this problem: Instead of continuing to fight over which version of Christianity would hold sway in different countries (one of the key drivers of the wars that preceded the Westphalian peace), European states agreed to let each ruler determine the religious orientation of their realm. Similarly, a powerful state’s efforts to shape the domestic arrangements of another country will inevitably be seen as threatening by the target: Just look at how Americans now react to the possibility of Russian interference in our political system.”