

Vote or Die NC

I Negate

Definitions:

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

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

**Eliav Lieblich explains that intervening in the internal political processes of a country**

(Eliav Lieblich, Visiting Scholar, Cegla Center for Interdisciplinary Research of the Law, Tel

Aviv University Faculty of Law, Boston University International Law Journal, Vol.29:337, 2010, “Intervention and Consent: Consensual forcible interventions in internal armed conflicts as international agreements”, http://www.bu.edu/law/central/jd/organizations/journals/international/volume29n2/documents/Lieblich-finalpdf.pdf)

Intervention in the physical (or descriptive) sense **takes place whenever Party C engages in a conflict between opposing parties A and B. Thus, whenever a state engages parties to an internal armed conflict—using forcible or non-forcible measures, legally or illegally—it intervenes physically in the conflict. However, the term intervention encompasses an additional, separate meaning connoting the unlawful, coercive interference or encroachment upon the territorial integrity or internal political affairs of another state**

**James Nickel notes that**

(Nickel, James, "Human Rights", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2013 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), forthcoming URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2013/entries/rights-human/>.)

**Human rights are international norms that help to protect all people everywhere from severe political, legal, and social abuses.**

Observation #1: The Affirmative makes a false dichotomy between action and inaction

**Anne Orford explains**

(Anne Orford, Professor @ University of Melbourne, 2003, Cambridge University Press, “Reading Humanitarian Intervention: Human Rights and the Use of Force in International Law”, http://bilder.buecher.de/zusatz/21/21785/21785632\_lese\_1.pdf)

Her question is a compelling one. **It raises a central theme underlying the debate about the legitimacy of humanitarian intervention**—**the idea that the choice of facing the international community in** security or **humanitarian crises is one between action and inaction. Despite the power of this argument, the assumption that the international community faces a choice between intervention and inaction limits the capacity of international law to develop adequate responses to post-Cold War** security and **humanitarian crises.** In Chapter 3, I suggest a way forward for the debate that may enable international lawyers to move beyond the perceived opposition between action and inaction. To do so, I examine the ways in which international law and international institutions have been present and active in places such as former Yugoslavia, Rwanda, and East Timor prior to, and during, the humanitarian crises that arose there. The international community had already intervened on a large scale in each of the above cases before the security crises erupted, particularly through the activities of international economic institutions. **Inactivity, in other words, is not the alternative to intervention. The international community is already profoundly engaged in shaping the structure of political, social, economic, and cultural life in many states through the activities of, inter alia, international economic institutions.**

**The negative is not simply just bound to idly watching Humanitarian rights violations occur, I can advocate that the United States is only justified in acting externally with the other country. Sanction, treaties, etc. are all examples of how the United States can choose to act externally with respect to the other nation’s sovereignty and are key negative ground. Also this means if the Affirmative does not prove why “Internal Intervention” uniquely solves for Human Rights abuses, their impacts are non-unique.**

Observation #2: In 2007 another LD resolution was constructed with almost exact same wording with one exception, it used the actor of the United Nations instead of the United States. The wording committee who created this resolution clearly understood the implications of replacing that actor with the United States. The Resolution, thus, begs the question of whether the United States can act unilaterally to stop human rights abuses by intervening in the internal political processes of another country

Value: International Justice

The value of this round will be International justice, defined as fairness to all states. 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 state. 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: Respecting the Sovereignty and Self Determinism of Other Nations

**Anne Orford 2 explains**

(Anne Orford, Professor @ University of Melbourne, 2003, Cambridge University Press, “Reading Humanitarian Intervention: Human Rights and the Use of Force in International Law”, http://bilder.buecher.de/zusatz/21/21785/21785632\_lese\_1.pdf)

**According to the UN Charter, self-determination of people’s is a principle to be respected as a basis for the development of peaceful and friendly relations among nations. Self-determination was raised to the status of a right of peoples in the common Articles 1 of the two major human rights covenants, which provided that all peoples have the right freely to determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development. The idea that states were committed to respecting, protecting, and promoting self-determination was a central component of the promise that the creation of the UN would usher in an age of decolonialisation.** In the post-Cold War era, some international lawyers came to argue international law guaranteed peoples not only the right to choose a form of political, economic, and social organization, but also the right to democratic governance as the ideal form of political organization. The concept that under international law all peoples have a right to self-determination reflects most perfectly law’s self-image as a guarantor of peace human rights and democracy.

Often not really talked about is the fact that Self-Determinism in and out of itself is a human right. A basic right of countries is protection from other nations intervening in their internal political processes.

My Sole Contention is thus that the United States is not justified violating the sovereignty of other nations.

Sub point A: The United Nations has explicitly rejected the United States Right of Intervention even for Humanitarian purposes

**Noam Chomsky 2008 explains**

(Noam Chomsky, Professor @ MIT, Monthly Review, “Humanitarian Imperialism: The New Doctrine of Imperial Right”, September 2008, http://www.chomsky.info/articles/200809--.htm)

Again, there is a slight problem: those annoying facts. **The UN World Summit of September 2005 explicitly rejected the claim of the NATO powers that they have the right to use force in alleged protection of human rights. Quite the contrary, the Summit reaffirmed “that the relevant provisions of the Charter [which explicitly bar the NATO actions] are sufficient to address the full range of threats to international peace and security.”** The Summit also reaffirmed “the authority of the Security Council to mandate coercive action to maintain and restore international peace and security...acting in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter,” and the role of the General Assembly in this regard “in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter.” Without Security Council authorization, then, **NATO has no more right to bomb Serbia than Saddam Hussein had to “liberate” Kuwait. The Summit granted no** new **“right of intervention” to individual states or regional alliances, whether under humanitarian or other professed grounds.**

The United Nations clearly has laid out that every nation has a right to sovereignty that other nations can not violate even in the face of human rights violations. This means that the United States needs to act with respect to this declaration when preventing human rights violations. External Action, through treaties or sanctions, is the only kind of action that is justified in the international community.

Sub Point B: Humanitarian Intervention gives far too much of an incentive for the intervening nation to restructure the other’s political system in a way most beneficial to them, not for the other country.

**Anne Orford 3 explains**

(Anne Orford, Professor @ University of Melbourne, 2003, Cambridge University Press, “Reading Humanitarian Intervention: Human Rights and the Use of Force in International Law”, http://bilder.buecher.de/zusatz/21/21785/21785632\_lese\_1.pdf)

**Indeed intervention in the name of humanitarianism too readily provides an alibi for the continued involvement of those interested in exploiting and controlling the resources and people of target states.** The ‘myopia’ of international lawyers about the effects of the new interventionism means that, in general, **international legal debate fails to address the ways in which the destructive consequences of coercive economic restructuring contributes to instability, leads to further violence and denials of human rights.**

**This is more than proven by our current restructuring of the Iraqi government. Continued involvement has only helped destroy their infrastructure because of the radical changes that we made to it. This is why sovereignty is so important, because it is the last safeguard of other nations to be protected from larger powers. Also this operates as a turn on their case because it proves that internal intervention will only contribute to more instability and human rights abuses in the long run.**