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Negative: Poland - US Troops

TOPICALITY

1. Nothing reformed

Permanent stationing of US troops in Poland is already US policy. Fifth Army Corps is being stationed there under Biden policy

Ellen Mitchell 2022 (journalist) 29 June 2022 THE HILL " Defense & National Security — US troops in Poland to become permanent" (accessed 3 Jan 2023) https://thehill.com/policy/defense/overnights/3542091-defense-national-security-us-troops-in-poland-to-become-permanent/ ("V Corps" = "Fifth Corps")

Biden vowed to increase the number of troops stationed in Europe on the second day of a NATO summit in Madrid during a meeting with NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg. What’s going where: Specifically, the president announced plans to permanently headquarter U.S. Army V Corps in Poland, add a rotational brigade in Europe stationed in Romania and increase rotational deployments to the Baltic states — moves that will bolster forces on NATO’s eastern flank.

Violation: Affirming Status Quo policy defeats the goal of debate

Affirmatives are supposed to advocate significant reform, not simply affirm that the Status Quo. We can't debate if both sides are advocating Status Quo.

Impact: Negative ballot

If no one affirms the resolution then there's effectively no Affirmative team in the round. No matter who wins you should write Negative on the ballot.

INHERENCY

1. Already there

10,500 US troops already stationed in Poland

Zachary Basu 2022 (journalist) 18 Mar 2022 "Where 100,000 U.S. troops are stationed in Europe" (accessed 15 Jan 2023) https://www.axios.com/2022/03/23/where-100000-us-troops-are-stationed-europe

President Biden will meet Friday with U.S. troops stationed in Poland, a key NATO ally currently housing 10,500 of the 100,000 American service members now deployed across Europe. **Why it matters:** Russia invaded Ukraine with a force estimated at 190,000. The last time the U.S. had 100,000 troops deployed in Europe was 2005, during the early years of the Global War on Terror, according to a [history of U.S. force posture](https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/21474071-eucom) provided by U.S. European Command.

US Air Force is in Poland too

NEW YORK TIMES February 2022 (journalist Eric Schmitt) published 21 Feb 2022 updated 23 Feb 2022 "U.S. Troops in Poland Brace for Possible Ukrainian Evacuees" (accessed 3 Jan 2023) https://www.nytimes.com/2022/02/21/us/politics/ukraine-military-poland-refugees.html

The Pentagon in recent days has also dispatched aerial reinforcements to Britain, Germany and Eastern Europe. The Air Force said F-35 fighters from Hill Air Force Base, Utah, deployed to Germany days after B-52 bombers from Minot Air Force Base, N.D., were sent to Britain in a previously planned mission. Eight F-15s from Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, N.C., have flown to Lask Air Base in Poland to augment the eight American F-15s there that are usually stationed in Britain. “The deployment of U.S. F-15s to Poland elevates the collective defense capabilities on NATO’s Eastern flank and the enhanced air policing mission,” Gen. Jeffrey Harrigian, the head of U.S. Air Forces in Europe and Africa, [said in a statement](https://www.usafe.af.mil/News/Press-Releases/Article/2929924/us-aircraft-heading-to-poland-to-enhance-nato-collective-defense/).

HARMS / SIGNIFICANCE

1. No threat to Poland

Poland and the Baltic's actions (minimal defense spending) prove they don't really think there's much of a threat from Russia

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)

According to the latest figures, only [one alliance member](https://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/2022/3/pdf/220331-def-exp-2021-en.pdf) spent a greater share of its GDP on the military than did Washington — Greece, which is more concerned about fellow NATO member Turkey than Russia. Just seven other European [governments met](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_67655.htm) the two percent guideline, which was agreed to 16 years ago. Anyway, given the ferocity of combat in Ukraine, a couple pennies on the dollar seems inadequate for countries, such as Poland and the Baltic States, which claim to fear a Russian Armageddon and constantly lobby for their own US garrisons.

Poland's actions prove they don't perceive a threat from Russia: They spend only 2.05% of GDP on defense

Doug Bandow 2019 (Senior Fellow, Cato Institute) 21 Mar 2019 " ‘Fort Trump’ in Poland: Why These Colors Won’t Fly" (accessed 15 Jan 2023) https://www.cato.org/commentary/fort-trump-poland-why-these-colors-wont-fly

Outlays by the five most economically significant European countries barely qualify as mediocre. The United Kingdom is slightly above 2 percent (through a bit of statistical legerdemain) and France is a little below. Germany spends an embarrassing 1.23 percent—its official commitment to essentially double spending over the next five years is a mix of both fantasy and lie. Italy barely breaks 1 percent and Spain doesn’t even hit that pitiful level. However, perhaps most shameful of all is Poland, which last year devoted only 2.05 percent of its GDP to defense. Surely the independence from Russia that it claims to cherish is worth more than two cents on the dollar.

No chance of Russia invading Poland and they wouldn't succeed if they tried

Doug Bandow 2019 (Senior Fellow, Cato Institute) 21 Mar 2019 "‘Fort Trump’ in Poland: Why These Colors Won’t Fly" (accessed 15 Jan 2023) https://www.cato.org/commentary/fort-trump-poland-why-these-colors-wont-fly

Today the European states collectively enjoy a 10‐​to‐​one economic and three‐​to‐​one population advantage over Russia. And they are backed by Washington. Even Trump could not easily ignore NATO’s explicit defense commitment. Nor is Putin likely to risk a catastrophic war for the dubious privilege of ruling over an antagonistic Polish population that has never taken foreign occupation well. Such a conflict would destroy his rule.

Turn: There's no threat, but putting troops in Poland may create one

Michael Kofman 2018 (*Senior Research Scientist at CNA Corporation and a Fellow at the Wilson Center’s Kennan Institute. Previously he served as program manager at National Defense University*) 12 Oct 2018 "PERMANENTLY STATIONING U.S. FORCES IN POLAND IS A BAD IDEA, BUT ONE WORTH DEBATING" WAR ON THE ROCKS (accessed 3 Jan 2023) https://warontherocks.com/2018/10/permanently-stationing-u-s-forces-in-poland-is-a-bad-idea-but-one-worth-debating/

Unlike the Cold War, when the Soviet Union had a discernible strategic objective, and its general staff had known military objectives, there is a general inability of these proposals to explain how they intend to deter Russian plans. Soviet forces were massed across from NATO, such that their path of attack was well established. Reasonable arguments could be made on structuring forces to deter by denial where possible, punishment where not, and presenting the risk of unacceptable nuclear escalation. Today there are no such forces massed against Poland (at least not yet, wait until they get a U.S. divisional headquarters), and there is no discernible strategic goal for a Russian invasion of either Poland or the Baltics, which is arguably why it has not happened.

2. A/T "Missile hitting Poland"

Missile was from Ukraine, not Russia and hit Poland by mistake

Alex Ward 2022 (national security reporter ; former White House and national security reporter at Vox. He was also an associate director in the Atlantic Council's Brent Scowcroft Center on International Security) (accessed 3 Jan 2023) https://www.politico.com/newsletters/national-security-daily/2022/11/16/remain-calm-after-poland-missile-hit-u-s-army-chief-00067482



3. Russian threat exaggerated

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 ) 14July 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(just as, it's worth noting, were Western predictions of an easy Russian victory 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 Mar2022 “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.

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 Mar2022 “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.

4. A/T "Germany is an unworthy ally"

(Jan. 2023) Germany is massively helping Ukraine with military equipment and money

Official web page of the German Federal Government 2023. (Note: in this evidence "Federal Government" refers to the German Federal Government, not the US) 13 Jan 2023 "Military support for Ukraine" (accessed 15 Jan 2023) https://www.bundesregierung.de/breg-en/news/military-support-ukraine-2054992

Germany provides support for Ukraine by supplying equipment and weapons, these come from supplies of the Federal Arms Forces and from deliveries from industry financed from the Federal Government’s funds for security capacity building. An overview. The Federal Government supports the Ukrainian military in close coordination with its partners and allies. This list provides an overview of lethal and non-lethal German military support for Ukraine. It includes deliveries from the Federal Armed Forces, as well as supplies from German industry financed from the Federal Government’s funds for so-called security capacity building. Funding for the security capacity building initiative amounts to a total of 2.2 billion Euros for the year 2023 (after 2 billion Euros for 2022). The funds are to be used primarily to support Ukraine. At the same time, they will be used to finance Germany’s increased mandatory contributions to the European Peace Facility (EPF), which in turn goes towards reimbursing EU member states for costs incurred to them in providing support for Ukraine.

(Nov. 2022) Germany is ramping up defense spending and military aid to Ukraine

Dimitar Bechev 2022 (Visiting Scholar at Carnegie Europe) 22 Nov 2022 "Is Germany changing tack on Ukraine?" (accessed 15 Jan 2023) <https://www.aljazeera.com/opinions/2022/11/22/is-germany-changing-tack-on-ukraine> (brackets added)

Germany’s longer-term strategy also reflects strong support for an anti-Russia front. Berlin has unveiled an ambitious programme to ramp up defence spending and overhaul foreign and security policy. With the German government [setting up](https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2022/5/30/german-parties-reach-deal-on-107bn-defence-spending-boost) a 100bn-euro ($102bn [billion dollar]) fund to modernise the military, Russia is facing a much more potent EU west of its border. And as weapons deliveries to Ukraine show, some of the new kit Berlin acquires could well end up on the battlefront in the Donbas or Zaporizhia regions.

(Nov. 2022) Germany supports sanctions on Russia, canceled Nord Stream gas pipeline, and supplied weapons to Ukraine

Dimitar Bechev 2022 (Visiting Scholar at Carnegie Europe) 22 Nov 2022 "Is Germany changing tack on Ukraine?" (accessed 15 Jan 2023) <https://www.aljazeera.com/opinions/2022/11/22/is-germany-changing-tack-on-ukraine>

To be fair, Berlin has sent some weapons, including self-propelled howitzers and multiple rocket launchers, which have proven their worth in fighting against Russian forces. And the German government has been quite forthcoming on sanctions against Russia. It [halted](https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2022/2/22/germany-pauses-nord-stream-2-certification-process-over-ukraine) the lucrative Nord Stream 2 pipeline project, supplying Russian gas to the country, even before the Russian invasion started.

5. No Baltic threat

US troops in Poland wouldn't help the Baltics. 1) there's no threat. 2) they'd need to be located elsewhere to actually deter an invasion

Michael Kofman 2018 (*Senior Research Scientist at CNA Corporation and a Fellow at the Wilson Center’s Kennan Institute. Previously he served as program manager at National Defense University*) 12 Oct 2018 "PERMANENTLY STATIONING U.S. FORCES IN POLAND IS A BAD IDEA, BUT ONE WORTH DEBATING" WAR ON THE ROCKS (accessed 3 Jan 2023) https://warontherocks.com/2018/10/permanently-stationing-u-s-forces-in-poland-is-a-bad-idea-but-one-worth-debating/

The U.S. military would be best off establishing forces that are resilient in theater, but that are out of range of Russian forces, thus making their posture a credible deterrent. The idea — thinking strategically — is to position for the initial period of war, not a specific battle over the Suwalki Gap. In any case, this entire doomsday scenario is unlikely, given that Russia seems to not have much interest in the Baltic and would also have to borrow a few hundred thousand troops from a third country for the occupation (i.e. there’s no operational reserve in Russia to occupy and hold large tracts of terrain). Beyond the absence of reserves, one could also point to major deficits in Russian air lift, as another fact that does not comport well with the theory that Moscow is hungrily eyeing the prospect of a surprise attack and/or occupation of the Baltics.

Invasion of Ukraine doesn't threaten the Baltics, and even if it did, it doesn't justify increased US military commitment

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)

Despite Russia’s invasion of Ukraine, Moscow has shown no similar interest in any other state, including the Baltics, the conquest of which would gain little while ensuring enduring hostility. However in taking this perspective, the Europeans should not expect continued coddling, subsidizing, and protecting from the U.S. Surely nearly eight decades after the end of World War II Washington should end the continent’s cheap ride on Americans.

If the Baltics "really" were afraid of the "Russian threat," they'd already be spending more on defense

Doug Bandow 2022. (J.D.; senior fellow at the Cato Institute, specializing in foreign policy and civil liberties. He worked as special assistant to President Ronald Reagan ) 22 Apr 2022 "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(accessed 16 June 2022)

Both Finland and Sweden have capable militaries that would promote an independent European defense system. However, further expanding America’s European defense dole would discourage defense efforts by them and others. Today19 NATO members (including Canada) devote less than two percent of GDP to their armed forces. Among the largest European countries, Germany, Italy, and Spain most dramatically leave the spending and fighting to others. Even the Baltics and Poland, so vocal about their fears of Russian aggression, spend little more than two percent of GDP on their defense, a pittance if their independence is truly at risk.

SOLVENCY

1. No military benefit

No value to US troops in Poland because they don't deal with any realistic Russia scenario

Michael Kofman 2018 (*Senior Research Scientist at CNA Corporation and a Fellow at the Wilson Center’s Kennan Institute. Previously he served as program manager at National Defense University*) 12 Oct 2018 "PERMANENTLY STATIONING U.S. FORCES IN POLAND IS A BAD IDEA, BUT ONE WORTH DEBATING" WAR ON THE ROCKS (accessed 3 Jan 2023) https://warontherocks.com/2018/10/permanently-stationing-u-s-forces-in-poland-is-a-bad-idea-but-one-worth-debating/

Proposals for permanent bases in Poland reflect broader conversations in NATO on deterrence, which are struggling to link forces and capabilities available to the Russia problem set in a meaningful way. Most policy suggestions come down to sticking brigades or divisions somewhere in the hope that they have a deterring effect. Hunzeker and Lanoszka agree that a division in Poland makes no sense, and suggest that instead of a divisional headquarters, these forces are best spread as tripwire outposts in the path of a Russian attack. These are well-intentioned ideas, but what Russian objective are they meant to deter — another partition of Poland?

2. No deterrence

Putting US troops in Poland doesn't deter. It just shows misunderstanding of Russian military

Michael Kofman 2018 (*Senior Research Scientist at CNA Corporation and a Fellow at the Wilson Center’s Kennan Institute. Previously he served as program manager at National Defense University*) 12 Oct 2018 "PERMANENTLY STATIONING U.S. FORCES IN POLAND IS A BAD IDEA, BUT ONE WORTH DEBATING" WAR ON THE ROCKS (accessed 3 Jan 2023) https://warontherocks.com/2018/10/permanently-stationing-u-s-forces-in-poland-is-a-bad-idea-but-one-worth-debating/

If you want a good conventional deterrent by denial, then one of the most important factors is the adversary’s perception that aggression would result in a costly war of attrition, and that their aims could not be easily achieved. There are always those who believe that when it comes to deterrence, more is more, and simply stacking units somewhere near an adversary’s borders equals more deterrence. That’s not how it works. The forces have to be relevant to the adversary’s capabilities, demonstrate the ability to hold at risk what the adversary values, and be resilient against a surprise attack. Placing a division in Poland accomplishes little. On the contrary, it signals misunderstanding of Russian military doctrine and military thought.

US base in Poland gives no deterrence and negative net benefits

Michael Kofman 2018 (*Senior Research Scientist at CNA Corporation and a Fellow at the Wilson Center’s Kennan Institute. Previously he served as program manager at National Defense University*) 12 Oct 2018 "PERMANENTLY STATIONING U.S. FORCES IN POLAND IS A BAD IDEA, BUT ONE WORTH DEBATING" WAR ON THE ROCKS (accessed 3 Jan 2023) https://warontherocks.com/2018/10/permanently-stationing-u-s-forces-in-poland-is-a-bad-idea-but-one-worth-debating/

A permanent U.S. base in Poland will not deter Russia any better, and it will probably do more harm to NATO than good. From the standpoint of deterrence and alliance politics, it’s a foolish and detrimental idea. The United States does need more forces in Europe with capabilities relevant to deterring Russia, but an armored division in Poland is not the right answer.

3. No cost savings

Troops stationed in Poland would cost the US more than if stationed elsewhere

Doug Bandow 2018 (senior fellow at the Cato Institute, specializing in foreign policy and civil liberties. He worked as special assistant to President Ronald Reagan; JD from Stanford Univ) 30 Oct 2018 "America Doesn’t Need a ‘Fort Trump’ in Poland" (accessed 15 Jan 2023) https://www.cato.org/commentary/america-doesnt-need-fort-trump-poland

Stationing troops overseas isn’t cheap. The Pentagon operates multiple bases in different lands, cultures, and economies. It established commissaries, base exchanges, movie theaters, gyms, infirmaries, and schools. It transports and stores military equipment. I’m a military brat. The Air Force sent my family back and forth, along with our housing goods. We enjoyed gasoline at American, not local, prices. Foreign contributions—the so‐​called host nation support—typically lessens these costs, but Poland’s annual contribution is unlikely to match those of wealthier U.S. allies.

4. No US national security benefit

Poland does not defend America, and neither does Europe

Doug Bandow 2018 (senior fellow at the Cato Institute, specializing in foreign policy and civil liberties. He worked as special assistant to President Ronald Reagan; JD from Stanford Univ) 30 Oct 2018 "America Doesn’t Need a ‘Fort Trump’ in Poland" (accessed 15 Jan 2023) <https://www.cato.org/commentary/america-doesnt-need-fort-trump-poland> ("Fort Trump" was a proposal to station a permanent deployment in Poland and name the military base after then-President Trump)

Overseas commitments and facilities made some sense during the Cold War. However, today’s Fort Trump would serve no useful military purpose. Poland does not defend America. Even Europe does not protect the United States. Instead, NATO is defense welfare for Europe.

DISADVANTAGES

1. Provoking Russia

Link: Eastward expansion of NATO power is what causes Russian insecurity and creates the threats. Doing more of the same just makes it worse

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)

Although unjustified, Vladimir Putin’s “special military operation” should have come as no surprise. NATO ostentatiously flouted Russia’s oft‐​stated security concerns and violated a gaggle of allied assurances by extending the alliance ever eastward. Then its members refused to negotiate over Putin’s demand that they go no further. No one believed he would follow up with a broad invasion of Ukraine. When he did, the Europeans engaged in much wailing and gnashing of teeth while turning to Washington.

Brink: US and Russia are on the brink of nuclear escalation. NATO had better not push any further

Dr. Nikolai Sokov 2022 (*Senior Fellow at the Vienna Center for Disarmament and Nonproliferation. Previously he worked at the Center for Nonproliferation Studies in Monterey and in 1987-92 was an arms control negotiator for Soviet and then Russian Foreign Ministry* ) 30 May 2022 " Risks of Nuclear Escalation after the End of War in Ukraine" https://gjia.georgetown.edu/2022/05/30/risks-of-nuclear-escalation-after-the-end-of-war-in-ukraine/ (accessed 27 Aug 2022)

It would still be wrong to completely disregard the risk of escalation. As NATO continues to test the limits of what is permissible, it may inadvertently cross a Russian red line. In mid-April, Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov pointedly [noted](https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/5316680?from=top_main_6) that Russia did not intend to use nuclear weapons “at this stage” of the war, reiterating the nuclear threat after almost a month of silence. The longer the war continues, the closer NATO and Russia will approach the threshold of tolerance.

Impact: Nuclear annihilation

Amy Goodman 2022 (journalist) Warnings Grow over Nuclear Annihilation as Tensions Escalate Between U.S., Russia & China 4 Aug 2022 https://www.democracynow.org/2022/8/4/united\_nations\_nuclear\_annihilation\_united\_states (accessed 27 Aug 2022)

The United Nations Secretary-General António Guterres warned this week humanity is, quote, “one miscalculation away from nuclear annihilation.” He made the comments at the opening of a major U.N. gathering here in New York to review the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. The meeting comes at a time when tensions are escalating between the United States and two other nuclear powers, Russia and China.

2. Harms US best interest, weakens US global hegemony

Link: AFF says we have to do their plan because Poland wants it

That's what they claim. Their 1AC doesn't even discuss why the US would benefit.

Link: Poland's opinions on US defense policy are not in America's best interest

Doug Bandow and Adriel Kasonta 2022 (Bandow - Senior Fellow, Cato Institute. Kasonta - Consultant and Lawyer) 24 Feb 2022 "The United States’ Poland Problem" (accessed 15 Jan 2023) https://www.cato.org/commentary/united-states-poland-problem

On the other hand, the American people are not so enthused about the prospect of confronting Russia. Although only seven percent of Americans [surveyed](https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2022/01/26/republicans-and-democrats-alike-view-russia-more-as-a-competitor-than-an-enemy-of-the-u-s/?utm_source=AdaptiveMailer&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=22-01-26%20Russia/Ukraine%20SR%20Heads-up&org=982&lvl=100&it) last month believed that Russia was a partner, half viewed Moscow as more of a competitor than an enemy—a view that stands in stark contrast to the attitude of the hawks in Warsaw. While acting as Europe’s defender, Washington should remember to protect its own interests first. None of it allies will do so, as Poland has helpfully reminded the American people.

Link: US national interests - duty to its own citizens - take priority over other foreign policy goals

Doug Bandow 2021 (senior fellow at the Cato Institute, specializing in foreign policy and civil liberties. He worked as special assistant to President Ronald Reagan; JD from Stanford Univ.) “Eight Ways We Can Serve US Interests and Pursue Human Rights Too” 28 May 2021 (accessed 7 Sept 2022) <https://www.cato.org/commentary/eight-ways-we-can-serve-us-interests-pursue-human-rights-too>

“The central purpose of Washington’s international strategy should be to advance the interests of the American people. That means protecting them along with their territory, constitutional system, liberties, and prosperity. These objectives transcend the many other goals routinely set by governments.”

Link: Weakens US dominant global role by strengthening Putin, justifying his aggressive posture, and moving Russia closer to China

Doug Bandow 2018 (senior fellow at the Cato Institute, specializing in foreign policy and civil liberties. He worked as special assistant to President Ronald Reagan; JD from Stanford Univ) 30 Oct 2018 "America Doesn’t Need a ‘Fort Trump’ in Poland" (accessed 15 Jan 2023) https://www.cato.org/commentary/america-doesnt-need-fort-trump-poland

Putin is doing badly at home. But a clear, unprovoked, aggressive U.S. military advance would help stoke nationalism to his benefit. It would reinforce his argument that Moscow needs strong leadership. A Polish‐​American base would push his government ever closer to China, even though the two nations have little in common other than antagonism toward America’s dominant global role. Indeed, Washington’s unintended reversal of Richard Nixon’s successful effort to widen the split between Russia and China may be the greatest failure of U.S. foreign policy in recent years.

Impact: World peace & prosperity at risk without US influence. 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.

3. Weaker long-term European security

Link: Establishing a Poland base would discourage Europeans from doing more to defend themselves

Doug Bandow 2019 (Senior Fellow, Cato Institute) 21 Mar 2019 " ‘Fort Trump’ in Poland: Why These Colors Won’t Fly" (accessed 15 Jan 2023) https://www.cato.org/commentary/fort-trump-poland-why-these-colors-wont-fly

Establishing a Polish base would also discourage America’s European defense dependents from doing more. Poland, certainly, and surrounding nations, probably, would do even less. Germany would see little reason to up its paltry financial commitment to its military. So too other leading European nations, which already prefer not to burden their populations amid economic difficulties.

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.

Link: US troop deployments will give Poland an excuse and motive to cut their defense spending

Doug Bandow 2019 (Senior Fellow, Cato Institute) 21 Mar 2019 " ‘Fort Trump’ in Poland: Why These Colors Won’t Fly" (accessed 15 Jan 2023) https://www.cato.org/commentary/fort-trump-poland-why-these-colors-wont-fly

The Poles would build a base—contributing a couple billion dollars or so—with the expectation that the Americans would come man it. Poland would gain a de facto direct U.S. security guarantee against Russia. And with U.S. troops on station, it could then cut back on military spending. As an added bonus, Americans would contribute generously to the local economy. All in all, it would be a sweet deal for Poland.

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.