

Cosmo and Not the Fairy AC

Resolved: The United States is justified in intervening in the internal political processes of other countries to attempt to stop human rights abuses.

Definitions:

**Justified**: **to prove or show to be just, right, or valid**

(Mariam-Webster Dictionary 2013, Justified, http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/justify)

**Human Rights are inalienable fundamental rights to which a person is inherently entitled simply because she or he is a human being**

(Sepúlveda, Magdalena; van Banning, Theo; Gudmundsdóttir, Gudrún; Chamoun, Christine; van Genugten, Willem J.M. (2004). Human rights reference handbook (3rd ed. rev. ed.). Ciudad Colon, Costa Rica: University of Peace. ISBN 9977-925-18-6)

**Chantel Oudraat maps out intervening in Internal Political Processes as:**

(Chantal de Jonge Oudraat, Associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2000, “Intervention in Internal Conflicts: Legal and Political Conundrums”, http://carnegieendowment.org/files/15oudraat.pdf)

Under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, the UN Security Council **imposing coercive measures** and disregard the general principle of non-intervention **in the domestic affairs of states if it determines that a particular problem poses a “threat to international peace and security.**

Observation #1: Notions of Sovereignty are derived from respecting Human Rights

**Anne Peters Explains**

(Anne Peters, Prof. Dr. iur., LL.M (Harvard), European Journal of International Law Vol. 20, 2009, pg. 513-544, http://ejil.oxfordjournals.org/content/20/3/513.full)

This article argues that the international legal system has since 1999 moved much further in the direction of an individual-centred, humanized system – on a track that had of course already been laid with the codification of international human rights after the Holocaust and World War II. A big step was the endorsement of the responsibility to protect (R2P), which definitely ousted the principle of sovereignty from its position as a Letztbegründung (first principle) of international law. **It has become clear that the normative status of sovereignty is derived from humanity, understood as the legal principle that human rights, interests, needs, and security must be respected and promoted, and that this humanistic principle is also the telos of the international legal system. Humanity is the A and Ω of sovereignty. State sovereignty remains foundational only in a historical or ontological sense, to the extent that the states’ mutual respect for each other's sovereignty constitutes the legal system of juxtaposed actors and governs law-making. State sovereignty is not only** – as in the meanwhile canonical view **– limited by human rights, but is from the outset determined and qualified by humanity, and has a legal value only to the extent that it respects human rights, interests, and needs. It has thus been humanized. Consequently, conflicts between state sovereignty and human rights should not be approached in a balancing process in which the former is played off against the latter on an equal footing, but should be tackled on the basis of a presumption in favour of humanity.**

Observation #2: The Resolution does not note that the United States is acting unilaterally in the resolution; therefore the United States can act through International Organizations like the UN. The resolution clearly hinges on the notion of protecting human rights not unilateral vs. multilateral intervention; trying to make such a distinction would be trying to create a false dichotomy.

Observation #3: Inaction still prescribes the action of no action; ergo, the Negative cannot just bring up systematic flaws in humanity because inaction caused by listening to such moral qualms can lead to physical impacts. Ex. In 1994 issues over sovereignty caused inaction in the International Community on what to do with Rwanda which prevented intervention that could have helped the Tutsi people. The negative still is bound to the harms of not acting. This also means the Negative is bound to being competitive with the Affirmative impacts and real world will always trump “a priori” because the “a priori” still leads to physical impacts.

Observation #4: The resolution only requires the Affirmative to justify humanitarian intervention, not prove that it is a perfectly efficient model. The Affirmative has full rights in the 1AR to Perm the NC if they do not directly clash, proving another model for stopping human rights as “more just” does not prove mine as “unjust”.

Value: Justice

The value of this round will be justice, defined as fairness. Justice is blind in respect to the

(John Rawls, Political Liberalism, Former Professor at Harvard University, 1993, http://books.google.com/books/about/Political\_liberalism.html?id=roHeAMi8W14C)

Specific position of the individual. Instead, justice deserves a universal stand point which is to value all members of humanity. By advocating the allocation of justice to all members of humanity, one is also advocating an egalitarian ideology of justice which respects all people equally.

Value Criterion: Cosmopolitanism

In order to strive for this equality oriented justice, the value criterion will be Cosmopolitanism

**Kok-Chor Tan explains that**

(Kok-Chor Tan, Source: Ethical Theory and Moral Practice, Vol. 5, No. 4 (Dec., 2002), pp. 431-461)

Many liberals have argued that a sincere commitment to the liberal ideals of individuality and equality commits one also to a cosmopolitan conception of global distributive justice (e.g., Shue, 1980; Pogge, 1989; Nussbaum, 1996,2000; Beitz, 1999a; Jones, 1999a; Moellendorf, 2002).1 **Cosmopolitanism takes the individual to be the ultimate unit of moral worth and to be entitled to equal consideration regardless of her culture, nationality or citizenship, besides other morally arbitrary facts about her. As Martha Nussbaum has put it, the cosmopolitan view holds that, wherever she is, "each human being is human and counts as the moral equal of every other"** (Nussbaum, 1996, p. 133). **A cosmopolitan conception of distributive justice would thus hold that distributive principles ought to apply among individuals across national boundaries, and not be limited within or constrained by these boundaries. Extending John Rawls's difference principle to the global context, for example, cosmopolitan liberals would argue that a just global distributive scheme is one that would most benefit the worst-off representative individual of the world's population taken as a whole** (Pogge, 1989, p. 247; Beitz, 1999a, p. 152). Indeed, the cosmopolitan idea was thought to follow logically from the avowed universalism of liberalism, and it was for some time widely-believed that a proposed liberal theory of justice is a *reductio ad absurdum* if it cannot be universalized to support a theory of cosmopolitan justice

**Violations of cosmopolitanism have impacts that are both philosophical and physical, thus we must weigh both existential impacts as dehumanization concurrently with philosophical notions of otherization.**

Contention #1: The United States is justified in intervening in the Internal Political Processes of other countries to protect rights of Women

Sub Point A: Internal Intervention is the only way to secure Women’s rights

**Louise Hancock Explains**

(Louise Hancock, MSc in Human Rights from the London School of Economics, Oxfam International October 2011, “A Place at the Table: Safeguarding Women’s Rights in Afghanistan”, http://www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/bp153-womens-rights-afghanistan-03102011-en.pdf)

**Much more needs to be done if women are to participate meaningfully in public life from the community level to the provincial and national level. They need to be educated, particularly at the community level, about their rights, including the legal right to vote; they need the opportunity to gain the necessary skills to reach political decision making positions at all levels of government; and they need the barriers stopping them from exercising their rights, whether cultural, religious, or economic, to be addressed.** As discussed, religious leaders have a vital role to play in breaking down some of these barriers, particularly at the community level. Those who threaten or abuse women in public life must be prosecuted.

**External intervention fails to break down these internal barriers, therefore the United States needs to intervene internally so that we can help break down political and cultural barriers that prevent women obtaining their human rights, which can only be changed from the inside.**

Sub Point B: Protecting Women’s Rights is key for sustainable development and preventing future Humanitarian Rights Violations

**Donna Goodman explains**

**(Donna Goodman, Senior Analysis @ United Nations Development Program, 2012, “Adolescent Girls at the Tipping Point for Sustainable development”, http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/gender/Gender%20and%20Environment/Powerful-Synergies.pdf)**

**It is universally recognized that poverty is a major cause of human rights violations and a barrier to sustainable development. The importance of a healthy and safe environment to gender equality—and the right to it—must be considered within the scope of an intergenerational approach to poverty eradication.** As the gender dimensions of climate change and ecosystem degradation are gaining a greater profile in the global debate, the cross-cutting ‘double jeopardy’ brought by gender and adolescence has largely been ignored (Plan International 2011)

**Goodman 2 furthers that**

**(Donna Goodman, Senior Analysis @ United Nations Development Program, 2012, “Adolescent Girls at the Tipping Point for Sustainable development”, http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/gender/Gender%20and%20Environment/Powerful-Synergies.pdf)**

Moreover, **the rights of adolescent girls** and, more broadly, all children, **impact the multidimensional poverty index, as set forth in the UNDP’s Human Development Report 2011, substantiating the call for long-range planning for investment in quality, equitable primary schooling, which enables girls and women to participate in postprimary education and income-generating activities** (UNGEI 2012). **An educated girl is more likely to delay marriage, have fewer, healthier and better-educated children, and enjoy greater income and quality of life. According to the World Bank, investments in girls’ education may go further than any other spending in global development** (UNESCO 2006b, World Bank 2012b).

The United States is justified in intervening in the internal political processes to help secure the rights of women insofar as it is the key to preventing human rights violations in the future. The United States should take every step that it can to help promote the rights of women whether that is creating women quotas for Parliament like in Iraq or allocating other state’s funds to school houses to promote gender equality. Such action would help prevent further need to intervene in the future. Therefore, harms of the NC are minimized insofar if we intervene now it takes away the need to intervene in the future thus any impact they bring up is very short term

Contention #1: The United States has an obligation to take action against human rights abuses even in the face of Sovereignty issues

Subpoint A: Sovereignty should never be used as a shield for Human Rights Violations

**Nsongurua Udombana explains**

(Nsongurua J. Udombana is Associate Professor & Director of the Human Rights Center,

Central European University, Budapest, Human Rights Quarterly, 2005, “Why Neutrality is sin: The Darfur Crisis and the Crisis of Humanitarian Intervention, http://depot.gdnet.org/newkb/submissions/1164057311\_Udombana\_(HRQ,\_Darfur).pdf)

**The inaction of the international community during the 1994 Rwanda genocide has shown nonintervention in the so-called internal affairs of states to be a questionable principle, particularly in times of grave crisis. The Darfur crisis further shows that this principle can no longer be taken as an article of blind faith, and the international community must come to terms with these global realities. As Ocran rightly concluded, “no state should, under the cover of the principle of nonintervention in domestic affairs, commit acts contrary to the peremptory rules of international law.” Even advocates of sovereignty seem to agree that the interpretations** of the UN Charter “**do not reflect a conclusion that the ‘sovereignty’ of the target state stands higher in the scale of values of contemporary international society than the human rights of its inhabitants to be protected from genocide and massive crimes against humanity”**

Subpoint B: We as U.S. citizens have a moral obligation to do everything we can to support efforts to prevent genocide. It is an immeasurable tragedy worse than physical death.

**Claudia Card explains**

(Claudia Card, Philosophy Prof @ U of Wisconsin-Madison. "Genocide and Social Death," Hypatia, Vol.18, Iss. 1 2003)

**“When a group with its own cultural identity is destroyed, its survivors lose their cultural heritage and may even lose their intergenerational connections.** To use Orlando Patterson's terminology**, in that event, they** may **become "socially dead" and their descendants "natally alienated," no longer able to pass along and build upon the traditions, cultural developments** (including languages**), and projects of earlier generations** (1982, 5-9). **The harm of** **social death is not** **necessarily less extreme than that of physical death. Social death can even aggravate physical death by making it indecent, removing all respectful and caring ritual, social connections, and social contexts that are capable of making dying bearable and even of making one's death meaningful.** In my view, **the special evil of genocide lies in its infliction of not just physical death** (when it does that) **but social death, producing a consequent meaninglessness of one's life and even of its termination.** “This view, however, is controversial.

Claudia Card, Philosophy Prof @ U of Wisconsin-Madison. "Genocide and Social Death," Hypatia, Vol.18, Iss. 1 2003

The United States must protect human rights and international justice by doing everything in its power to stop genocide, because social death is not just, and the U.S. is justified in attempting to stop social death perpetrated by the leaders of nations that commit gross human rights abuses.

Genocide is an existential impact and has weight that will always outweigh a moral qualm about intervention because the negative is still bound to the impact of genocide. The negative has to be competitive with this contention because anything that doesn’t directly engage with this is the reason that genocides are allowed to occur in this world. We try to find excuses to prevent any kind of intervention that is the only way to help prevent this existential impact. Always vote genocide first and gut check real world.

Thus I affirm