

Between Intervention (All-In) and Isolation (All-Out)

Henry R. Nau
George Washington University

Canon Institute for Global Studies, Tokyo, Japan,
January 22, 2016

America's Foreign Policy Dilemma

- Afghanistan and Iraq War 2001-2009 – “ALL IN” Approach (W. Bush)
 - Military Intervention
 - Arms Without Diplomacy
 - Democracy Promotion
- Iran and Syria 2009-2016 – “ALL OUT” Approach (Obama)
 - No Boots on the Ground
 - Diplomacy Without Arms
 - Dial Back Democracy

Presidential Candidates on Foreign Policy

All-Out With an Open Hand (Obama) – Rand Paul and Bernie Sanders

All Out with a Fist – Donald Trump

All Out with a Moral Message – Ted Cruz

All Out with a Pragmatic Message – Chris Christie

Still Mostly Out But Emphasize Strategy/Leadership – Jeb Bush, Ben Carson, and John Kasich

More All In But With Diplomacy Not Military – Hillary Clinton

All In Approach – Marco Rubio, Carly Fiorina (Lindsey Graham)

STAY THE COURSE: Three Steps

- Improve Security Environment of World Not Just Security of Nation
- Build up Military to Negotiate and Compromise Toward Freedom
Not Win Militarily
- Be Patient and Rely on Economic Revitalization and Growth

Improve Security Environment Not Just Security

- World is Better Place in 2016 than 1916
- Culture and Civilization Divide
- Democracy Unites – Democratic Peace
 - Opposing Parties Rotating Peacefully in Power
 - Military Under Control of Elected Government
 - Civil Liberties (Individual Rights to Own Property, Assemble, Free Speech, Impartial Courts and Vote)
- But Democracy is Difficult
 - Can't Promote It Everywhere at Once
 - Set Priorities

Setting Priorities

- Prioritize freedom on the borders of existing free countries
 - Border between free countries and Russia in Europe
 - Border between free countries and China in Asia
- Address threat AND pursue freedom in border countries – Ukraine, Turkey, Korean peninsula.
- Address threat BUT get out quickly in remote regions – Vietnam, Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria.
- In last decade, United States has done just the opposite – pushed freedom in remote regions at expense of freedom on borders of freedom

Use Military Force to Negotiate and Compromise Not to Win

- Military force and diplomacy go together, not either/or
- Objective is not military victory in conventional sense but negotiated outcome that weakens despots and moves needle toward freedom
- In priority regions, use military alliances to open regional societies and markets – US-J-SK alliances and TPP to Include China; NATO and TTIP to Include Russia
- In remote regions, use military leverage to provide Off-Ramp – Iran and Syria

Off Ramps In Iran and Syria

- Iran: Negotiation not the problem
 - Expectation that nuclear agreement will contain Iran is problem. Only military strength on ground can do that.
 - Should have maintained sanctions and bargained for more than just postponing nuclear program
- Syria
 - Objective is ISIS not regime change
 - Arm moderate rebels to balance forces on the ground
 - Negotiate with but weaken Assad by openness – for example, UN safe zones and role in ceasefire
 - Give Egypt and Israel priority for stability in region (Egypt-Israeli peace agreement)
 - Prioritize Turkey for democracy in region

Patience and Economic Dynamism

- Economic Growth Is Bedrock of Democratic Foreign Policy – No Emphasis by Presidential Candidates?
- Authoritarian States Can't Keep Up
- Bottom Up Initiatives (TPP and TTIP) at Regional Level
- Light Regulation of Trade and Finance at Global Level
- Possible Only through Structural Reforms at Domestic Level

Summary

- Not All in or All Out but STAY THE COURSE!
- Grow US and Global Free Market Economy
- Stand for Democracy but with Priorities and Patience
- Arm Diplomacy to Bargain Effectively with Non-Democracies
- Compromise When Military Leverage at Peak
- Stop Cycling, Find Middle Ground Between Isolation and Intervention