A2 Realism

On the Realism

Realism falls because

1: Realism doesn’t account for changes in the International Community

**Mohammed Ayoob** explains

(Mohammed Ayoob, “Subaltern Realism: International Relations Theory Meets the Third World” New York: St.Martin’s Press, 1998, pp.31-54)

**In their pursuit of “scientism”, realism and neoliberalism**, and the neosynthesis that captures the increasingly expanding common ground between them, **have lost substantially the sense of both geography** **(limited as their universe is in terms of geographic locale)** **and history (including the history of the geographic area from which they draw much of their data). This shortcoming deprives much of the theorizing done under the rubric of the two paradigms of historical depth and geographic comprehensiveness**. In other words**, it restricts their potential to accommodate and explain change in the international system, for we can explain change only if we have a vision of historical continuity** (including the discontinuities embedded in the historical record) **and spatial inclusiveness.**

2: It assumes the United States will remain the economic hegemon. This is largely proven false as **China’s rising economy will eclipse ours by at least 2030** and their economic hegemony is

(Ian Talley, Wall Street Journal, Dec 10 2012, “Report Predicts China will have largest economy”, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323339704578171114155456982.html)

Already being exercised in regions from Africa and the Middle East. The United States was able to adapt a realistic framework in the Cold War insofar as we stood alone as the World’s predominant super power after World War II but this is no longer the case

3: The United States can’t always act in its self-interest because it would lose credibility in the International community which would harm its economic interests. So because the United States is no longer in the economic hegemon it’s in a double bind where it can’t act unilaterally or else it risks its ability to act unilaterally in the future.

Realism Topicality Shell

A: Interpretation

The Affirmative has to defend the resolution’s contextual claim that the United States will “intervene in the internal political processes of another country to attempt to stop human right abuses”. The Affirmative is bound to the justification for intervention being “stopping human right abuses”.

B: Violation

The run Realism, which denies the importance of ethical norms between states like HR

**Julian Korab explains**

(Korab-Karpowicz, W. Julian, "Political Realism in International Relations", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Winter 2011 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2011/entries/realism-intl-relations/>.)

In the discipline of international relations there are contending general theories or theoretical perspectives. **Realism**, also known as political realism**, is a view of international politics that stresses its competitive and conflictual side**. It is usually contrasted with idealism or liberalism, which tends to emphasize cooperation. **Realists consider the principal actors in the international arena to be states, which are concerned with their own security, act in pursuit of their own national interests, and struggle for power**. The negative side of **the realists' emphasis on power and self-interest is their skepticism regarding the relevance of ethical norms to relations among states.** National politics is the realm of authority and law, whereas international politics, they sometimes claim, is a sphere without justice, characterized by active or potential conflict among states.

Intervening for Human Rights is inherently antithetical to Realism. A realistic framework is never topical on the AC because Realists would only endorse “Intervening in the internal processes of other countries to further US Interests”. Any realistic case will result in that conclusion thus making it not topical.

C: Standards

Ground: This case is obviously constructed to usurp all negative ground. The resolution is clearly hinged on “stopping human right abuses”, so key negative ground is supposed to be any replacement to this. In pretty much all of the topic literature realism is contextualized for the negative position and acts as a key voice against humanitarian intervention in the International community. A realist framework would for instance be against intervention in countries lacking resources because it wouldn’t give any benefit of the United States, so if you grant this ground to the affirmative you essentially allow them to kick out of protecting human rights even in many instances where it won’t economically benefit the United States. This obviously violates negative ground and is a reason why I can’t link my case to this Aff. When I go for case debate the only thing I can do is dump on Realism and this allows me for no interaction.

Anti-Resolutional:

Debaters try this shit all of the time. They try to find a way to flip the resolution so they can negate on the affirmative in order to frame out any negative position or use the NC to just super-charge the AC in the 1AR. This inherently is just a strategic ploy that will always create a race to the bottom on definitions and shitty debate.

D: Voters

Better Debate: If you vote up Realist AC’s you’re only going to give them incentive to continue to run the case unaltered. This forces every Neg to choose either to race to the bottom on the definitions debate or run topicality because they can’t run their positions. The only way to incentivize debaters to write better cases that don’t cause bad debates in the future is to vote them down because debate is inherently a competitive event so people will correct bad habits if they are harmed from them, but they will continue them if they are rewarded

Fairness: Without rules to the game no one plays them. Plus the judge just ethically should prefer a fair round to an unfair round, unless you know you’re like a proctor of a Presidential Debate.

A2 Cosmopolitanism

Now on to Cosmopolitanism

Cosmo falls because

**1: Cosmopolitan politics always create a double bind: either you exterminate political opposition or you don’t solve**

**Maselink Stanislav explains**

(Stanislav, 12/02/09 “Cosmopolitan Democracy and Its Failure in Providing a Political Identity” http://faustianeurope.wordpress.com/2009/02/12/cosmopolitan-democracy-and-its-failure-in-providing-a-political-identity/)

It was argued that **no political organization can be ‘universal’ or cosmopolitan in the sense of equal treatment of all human beings according to some moral norms. So long as the political opposition will entail the political opposition between human beings any pretention to cosmopolitanism or universal political membership is false or worse, consciously hypocritical.** We therefore did not question cosmopolitanism on its normative grounds but merely on the basis of its own internal aspiration in providing the universal political membership for all human beings. **The answer is therefore not that politics require a national or ethnic identity for its function** (although perhaps some communitarians would claim otherwise), **but that it always requires a political one.** As a political identity always means the adoption of a certain set of norms and things we consider worthy in our political community to be – of the political - **a political identity in turn always entails the willingness to protect that political community against those who might threaten it. Cosmopolitan democracy, as based on the argument that it provides the political identity of a human being, equally to everyone just because of their humanity, must therefore necessarily fail in its effort.**

2:

**The UN will not intervene anymore after Libya because China and Russia will always Veto any UNSC Resolution to do so**

**Joshua Foust** **explains**

(Joshua Foust, Political Analyst for the New York Times, PBS, March 26, 2012, “When Intervention Fails”, http://www.pbs.org/wnet/need-to-know/opinion/when-intervention-fails/13446/)

These **interventions have political and diplomatic consequences as well. The transformation of the Libyan campaign from a humanitarian mission to regime change has had serious political and diplomatic blowback.** A recent study by the British think tank RUSI notes that**:[T]he manner in which the initial Security Council resolution was contorted out of all recognition from the protection of civilians to, in effect, outright regime change has left a sour taste in the mouths of powers like China, Russia and India who still hold an absolute conception of state sovereignty. The result,** the report argues, is that **Russia and China will presume future humanitarian interventions are really cover for regime change and will veto any UNSC support.**

**This only proves that cosmopolitanism doesn’t actually function in the International community. Human Rights Interventions are not a common ground that every country can agree upon, and if their evidence is not before 2012 and the blowblack of Libyan Intervention, their evidence is outdated.**

A2 Democracy

Now onto their Criterion/Contention of Democracy

Democracy fails in this respect because

1: Intervention doesn’t create democracy, it unravels it

**George Downs explains**

(Bruce Bueno de Mesquita and George W. Downs, professors at NYU, Summer 2006

“Intervention and Democracy,” International Organization, Volume 60, No. 3, pp. 627-649, http://www.jstor.org/stable/3877822)

It is also worth noting that **ten years after an intervention, the degree of democracy in states that were U.S. intervention targets and in states that were the targets of intervention by some other democracy (or democracies) are statistically the same**. […] **That is, all democratic interveners, as expected, tend to restrict the extent of democratic freedoms for their targets to comparable levels of symbolism without democratic substance.** The absolute scores of democratic target states are also revealing. **The standard cutpoint in the literature for defining democracies based on the Polity index is equivalent to a score of 0.80**. Contrast this with the **mean democracy scores ten years after a democratic intervention which are only 0.538** (U.S.) and 0.554 (other democracies), well below the standard threshold and roughly equivalent to between 0 and +1 on the Polity -10 to +10 scale; that is, the scores for such countries as Zambia and Liberia in the late 1990s. The same is true for the other two dependent variables, highlighting the fact that **neither the United States nor other democratic interveners create democratic polities**.

2: If we usurp a political government from the inside that doesn’t guarantee that the next government in power will be any better after our presence leaves. Cross Apply my Sub point B of Contention 1 and you realize because these countries will only be economically worse off they will turn to totalitarian leaders for immediate economic stability. History proves this.

3: In order for democracies thrive it needs to be instilled by the people not by a secondary government. Democracies thrive because they have a foundational base of willing participants who chose democracy and fought for it. This loyalty prevents negative regime changes, however, when a secondary government overthrows the former government it fails to instill this political loyalty.

A2 Responsibility to Protect

Now let’s go to their Responsibility to Protect

1: R2P Might have been affirmed by the International Community in 2005, but real world application of it has turned major powers in the United Nations against the concept and anyone who has paid attention to International affairs in the last 2 years understands this change.

**Gareth Evans 2012 explains**

(Gareth Evans, Australia’s foreign minister for eight years and President Emeritus of the International Crisis Group, “Responsibility While Protecting”, Jan 27. 2012, http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/responsibility-while-protecting)

But there is more to it than that. **Security Council consensus** about when and how to apply **R2P**, so evident in February and March 2011, **has evaporated in a welter of recrimination about how the NATO-led implementation of the Council’s Libya mandate “to protect civilians and civilian populated areas under threat of attack” was carried out.**

**Leading the critical charge have been the “BRICS” (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa). Their complaints are not about the initial military response – destroying the Libyan air force’s infrastructure**, **and air attacks on ground forces advancing on Benghazi. Rather, they object to what came after, when it rapidly became apparent that the three permanent Security Council’s members driving the intervention** (the United States, the United Kingdom, and France) **would settle for nothing less than regime change, and do whatever it took to achieve it.**

China and Russia’s permanent membership on the Security Council is enough veto any resolution for R2P and they have made it clear in Syria that they are going to reject any Resolution on R2P because of their ideological opposition to it. After Libya R2P no longer exists as a justification to Humanitarian Intervention.

2: Cross Apply Noam Chomsky from my sub point A. Responsibility to Protect has general restrictions that are given by the International Community and one of those is against the internal intervention of individual states so the Affirmative even fails to uphold the tenants of R2P.