I affirm: Economic sanctions ought not be used to achieve foreign policy objectives

Adam Winkler defines economic sanctions,

Winkler, Adam (holds a B.S.F.S. from Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service and a J.D. from New York University School of Law) “Just Sanctions” The Johns Hopkins University Press. Human Rights Quarterly 21.1 (1999) 133-155

**Economic sanctions are limitations on trade or access to markets enacted to encourage a target nation to behave in a way preferred by the sanctioning nations**. Economic sanctions cover four types of trade limitations: "(a) restrictions on the flow of goods, (b) restrictions on the flow of services, (c) restrictions on the flow of money, and (d) control of markets themselves in order to reduce or nullify the target's chance of gaining access to them." [18](http://208.34.222.250/bin/rdas.dll/RDAS_SVR=muse.jhu.edu/journals/human_rights_quarterly/v021/21.1winkler.html" \l "FOOT18) Some examples include trade embargoes, restrictions on the importation of metals, petroleum, or other goods and commodities, and freezing foreign assets, lines of credit, or development aid. **A definitive characteristic of economic sanctions is that they are specifically intended to cause economic harm to another state. The basic idea is that "the burden of economic hardship imposed by sanctions will become intolerable"** **[19](http://208.34.222.250/bin/rdas.dll/RDAS_SVR=muse.jhu.edu/journals/human_rights_quarterly/v021/21.1winkler.html" \l "FOOT19) to the citizens of the target state, who in turn will pressure their leaders to change undesirable policies**. [20](http://208.34.222.250/bin/rdas.dll/RDAS_SVR=muse.jhu.edu/journals/human_rights_quarterly/v021/21.1winkler.html" \l "FOOT20) Unlike domestic economic policies, which may have unintentional economic effects abroad, sanctions are adopted specifically to harm the economy in a target country. In this way, **sanctions** are similar to war; both **are used to inflict harm intentionally upon a target nation in order to alter its policies or conduct.**

Ought is defined as a moral obligation (OED).Per ought, I value Morality. There is a moral obligation to solve poverty because it is the single most destructive phenomenon plaguing humanity. Al Khalifa,

Sheikha Haya Rashed Al Khalifa (Bahrain), President of the General Assembly 8 December 2006 http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2006/gasm380.doc.htm

When poverty is so immediate and the suffering so intense, the world has a moral and strategic obligation to fight poverty and to address the human rights concerns of the most vulnerable. The poorest are more likely to experience human rights violations, discrimination or other forms of persecution.  Being poor makes it harder to find a job and get access to basic services, such as health care, education and housing.  Poverty is above all about having no power and no voice. History is littered with well-meaning, but failed solutions.  If we are to eradicate poverty and promote human rights, we need to take action to empower the poor and address the root causes of poverty, such as discrimination and social exclusion.  It is because human rights, poverty reduction and the empowerment of the poor go hand in hand that we all have a moral duty to take action.

Further, poverty kills at least 18 million people per year and is a form of structural violence. Gilligan,

Gilligan professor of Psychiatry at the Harvard Medical School 96 [James, , Director of the Center for the Study of Violence, and a member of the Academic Advisory Council of the National Campaign Against Youth Violence, Violence: Our Deadly Epidemic and its Causes, p 191-196]

**The deadliest form of violence is poverty.** You cannot work for one day with the violent people who fill our prisons and mental hospitals for the criminally insane without being forcible and constantly reminded of the extreme poverty and discrimination that characterizes their lives. Hearing about their lives, and about their families and friends, you are forced to recognize the truth in Gandhi’s observation that the deadliest form of violence is poverty. Not a day goes by without realizing that trying to understand them and their violent behavior in purely individual terms is impossible and wrong-headed. Any theory of violence, especially a psychological theory, that evolves from the experience of men in maximum security prisons and hospitals for the criminally insane must begin with the recognition that these institutions are only microcosms. They are not where the major violence in our society takes place, and the perpetrators who fill them are far from being the main causes of most violent deaths. Any approach to a theory of violence needs to begin with a look at the structural violence in this country. Focusing merely on those relatively few men who commit what we define as murder could distract us from examining and learning from those structural causes of violent death that are far more significant from a numerical or public health, or human, standpoint. By “structural violence” I mean the increased rates of death, and disability suffered by those who occupy the bottom rungs of society, as contrasted with the relatively lower death rates experienced by those who are above them. Those excess deaths (or at least a demonstrably large proportion of them) are a function of class structure; and that structure is itself a product of society’s collective human choices, concerning how to distribute the collective wealth of the society. These are not acts of God. I am contrasting “structural” with “behavioral violence,” by which I mean the non-natural deaths and injuries that are caused by specific behavioral actions of individuals against individuals, such as the deaths we attribute to homicide, suicide, soldiers in warfare, capital punishment, and so on. Structural violence differs from behavioral violence in at least three major respects. \***The lethal effects of structural violence operate continuously, rather than sporadically, whereas** murders, suicides, executions, **wars, and other forms of behavioral violence occur one at a time.** \*Structural violence operates more or less independently of individual acts; independent of individuals and groups (politicians, political parties, voters) whose decisions may nevertheless have lethal consequences for others. \***Structural violence is normally invisible, because it may appear to have had other (natural or violent) causes. The finding that structural violence causes far more deaths than behavioral violence does is not limited to this country.** Kohler and Alcock attempted to arrive at the number of excess deaths caused by socioeconomic inequities on a worldwide basis. Sweden was their model of the nation that had come closes to eliminating structural violence. It had the least inequity in income and living standards, and the lowest discrepancies in death rates and life expectancy; and the highest overall life expectancy in the world. When they compared the life expectancies of those living in the other socioeconomic systems against Sweden, they found that **18 million deaths a year could be attributed to** the **“structural violence”** to which the citizens of all the other nations were being subjected. During the past decade, the discrepancies between the rich and poor nations have increased dramatically and alarmingly. **The 14 to 18 million deaths a year caused by structural violence compare with about 100,000 deaths per year from armed conflict. Comparing this frequency of deaths from structural violence to the frequency of those caused by major military** and political **violence**, such as World War II (an estimated 49 million military and civilian deaths, including those by genocide—or about eight million per year, 1939-1945), the Indonesian massacre of 1965-66 (perhaps 575,000) deaths), the Vietnam war (possibly two million, 1954-1973), and **even a hypothetical nuclear exchange** between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. (232 million), **it was clear that even war cannot begin to compare with structural violence, which continues year after year.** In other words, every fifteen years, on the average, as many people die because of relative poverty as would be killed by the Nazi genocide of the Jews over a six-year period. **This is**, in effect, **the equivalent of an ongoing, unending, in fact accelerating, thermonuclear war**, or genocide, **perpetrated on the weak and poor every year of every decade, throughout the world. Structural violence is also the main cause of behavioral violence** on a socially and epidemiologically significant scale (from homicide and suicide to war and genocide). **The question as to which of the two forms of violence—structural or behavioral—is more important, dangerous, or lethal is moot, for they are inextricably related to each other, as cause to effect.**

Thus the standard is decreasing global poverty.

My thesis is that economic sanctions create and contribute to poverty and ought not be used to achieve foreign policy objectives.

First, the logic of sanctions is to choke economies. Rarick explains:

Rarick, Charles A. (Professor of International Business in the School of Management at Purdue University-Calumet, Indiana, USA) and Martine Duchatelet (Dean of the School of Management and Professor of Finance and Economics at Purdue University-Calumet,

Indiana, USA), “An Ethical Assessment of the Use of Economic Sanctions as a Tool of Foreign Policy.” *IEA Economic Affiars*, June 2008.

**Sanctions are a means to an end. The theory operating behind sanctions is to cause as much pain as possible to the people of the receiving country in order for pressure to be brought on the government. The citizens of the sanctioned country are used as a means to achieve the foreign policy objectives of the sanctioning country.**

This means that poverty is increased as a result of sanctions, because innocent civilians, who are often struggling to survive, are the targets. Winkler provides the empirical warrants,

Winkler, Adam (holds a B.S.F.S. from Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service and a J.D. from New York University School of Law) “Just Sanctions” The Johns Hopkins University Press. Human Rights Quarterly 21.1 (1999) 133-155  
Such **effects from sanctions are predictable**. Similar to the Iraqi situation**, the embargo against Haiti** also **had a profound impact on ordinary citizens.** According to official US estimates, **240,000 manufacturing and associated industry jobs were lost** in 1991 **due to sanctions imposed by the Organization of American States**. Likewise, **an analysis of the sanctions against Serbia-Montenegro** reported in the *British Journal of Medicine* **details the devastating impact of sanctions on the health care of ordinary Serbs. Indeed, this is the very premise of sanctions: to inflict such harm upon the economy, and consequently on the target population, that leaders will be forced to alter undesirable policies.** Nevertheless, it may be that some of these numbers are exaggerated. However, **even if, for example, only one percent of the estimated 500,000 Iraqi children died due to sanctions, moral consideration of this deadly instrument of foreign policy is warranted.** In this task, the principles underlying the laws of just war provide a place to begin.

Second, even smart sanctions exacerbate civilian poverty. Drenzer,

Drenzer, Daniel W. (Dept of Political Science, University of Chicago) “Review: How Smart Are Smart Sanctions?” *Blackwell Publishing on behalf of The International Studies Association* 2009 pp 1-5

Unfortunately**, even if the implementers of smart sanctions become more sophisticated, smart sanctions are still likely to be a noble failure**. The contributors to Smart Sanctions acknowledge some of the reasons for this, but not all. For example**, the case studies show that smart sanctions still impose significant costs on a target state's populace**. Michael **Brzoska notes that an arms embargo increases the costs of weapons procurement, leading "to a major shift in government spending priorities and a consequent reduction in the economic well-being of the general population in the targeted state"** (p. 126). **De Vries acknowledges that "financial sanctions probably caused the greatest negative impact on non-targeted sectors of Serbian society," with the sanctions triggering severe stagflation in the Yugoslav economy** (p. 102). **The flight ban also imposed greater costs on the Yugoslav opposition than on the Milosevic regime,** leading the European Union to reverse course. **Moreover, travel sanctions can disrupt the shipment of food and cold-storage medicine to war-torn societies. In short, all sanctions impose costs on innocents.**

Therefore, smart sanctions increase poverty by 1) shifting government spending, 2) causing stagflation and 3) disrupting food and medicine shipment

Terrorism Advantage:

Link: Rejecting sanctions decreases poverty. Fandl 1,

Kevin J. Fandl. "Kevin Fandl, Trade, Development and Terrorism: Winning the War on Terror Without the War" American University International Law Review 19 (2004): 587.

**Economic sanctions have a significant impact on the economy of a developing country**.75 However, **the negative effects of increased unemployment, a constrained ability to export goods, and the inability to receive significant international development aid are most often felt by the populace** rather than the intended governmental targets. **The result is a population left struggling to make a suitable living under the regime of a bitter and powerless government. These regimes are often supported by the funding of extremist groups.**76 As such, **there is no motivation to discourage the teachings of** Islamic **fundamentalists nor to prevent them from recruiting vulnerable members into their cadres.**

Eradicating poverty solves for terrorism. Fandl 2,

Kevin J. Fandl. "Kevin Fandl, Trade, Development and Terrorism: Winning the War on Terror Without the War" American University International Law Review 19 (2004): 587.

**Eradicating poverty is the single most potent solution to the problem of terrorism**.100 **Reducing poverty improves health, and thus the sanctity of life; it permits access to education, and thus the ability to learn new skills and about the co-existence of cultures; it generates freedom; it spurs democracy; and it creates new opportunities for growth.**101 **A reduction in poverty levels allows for stable democratic regimes to emerge, leading in time to the implementation of the rule of law and the growth of a viable justice system.**102 Aid agencies recognize the need to bring about economic growth and stability to impoverished regions of the world in order to pave the way for development policies that teach sustainability.

Poverty is a root cause of terrorism. Khan,

[Ahmed Khan (of the human development foundation). **Poverty and Terrorism** 9/9/2002 <http://www.yespakistan.com/terrorism/poverty.asp>]

**Terrorism is a disease that has afflicted all nations, and civilized nations have done their best to eradicate it.** **However, there are factors that promote terrorism, and the desperation that begets terrorism-- poverty, suffering, and lack of fundamental services. The linkage of poverty with terrorism and violence seems to exist in all places, whether developed or under-developed, and it is easy to see why: people who might not have too much to live for are more willing to take up arms and fight for causes that seem unjust to many, than those of us who live comfortable lives** with access to basic services such as healthcare, housing, and steady supply of food and clean water. In addition, **some of those in lower socio-economic positions might also feel more committed to fundamental ideologies fostered by lack of education; and more willing to hold on to the ideologies which provide an enemy to target, rather than learn about the teachings of tolerance and peace**

Impact: Terrorism

Terrorist attacks already kill masses and harm the economy. Kittrie,

Kittrie, Orde F. (Associate Professor of Law, Sandra Day O'Connor College of Law, Arizona State University) “Averting Catastrophe: Why the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty is Losing its Deterrence Capacity and how to Restore it.” Michigan Journal of International Law, Winter 2007

**Armed only with boxcutters, the nineteen al Qaeda hijackers on September 11,** 2001, **killed almost 3,000 people and caused tens of billions of dollars in damage to New York City, the Pentagon, and the global economy. n1 This toll would be dwarfed by a "nuclear 9/11" - a nuclear attack launched by a terrorist state or group. Detonation of a small, crude nuclear weapon in a major city could kill more than 500,000 people and cause over one trillion dollars in damage**.

And, terrorism risks extinction. Yonah,

Alexander, Yonah (professor and director of the Inter-University for Terrorism Studies) “Terrorism Myths and Realities.” Washington Times, 8/28/1003

Last week's brutal suicide bombings in Baghdad and Jerusalem have once again illustrated dramatically that **the international community failed,** thus far at least, **to understand the magnitude and implications of** the **terrorist threats to the very survival of civilization itself.** Even the United States and Israel have for decades tended to regard terrorism as a mere tactical nuisance or irritant rather than a critical strategic challenge to their national security concerns. It is not surprising, therefore, that on September 11, 2001, Americans were stunned by the unprecedented tragedy of 19 al Qaeda terrorists striking a devastating blow at the center of the nation's commercial and military powers. Likewise, Israel and its citizens, despite the collapse of the Oslo Agreements of 1993 and numerous acts of terrorism triggered by the second intifada that began almost three years ago, are still "shocked" by each suicide attack at a time of intensive diplomatic efforts to revive the moribund peace process through the now revoked cease-fire arrangements [hudna]. Why are the United States and Israel, as well as scores of other countries affected by the universal nightmare of modern terrorism surprised by new terrorist "surprises"? There are many reasons, including misunderstanding of the manifold specific factors that contribute to terrorism's expansion, such as lack of a universal definition of terrorism, the religionization of politics, double standards of morality, weak punishment of terrorists, and the exploitation of the media by terrorist propaganda and psychological warfare. Unlike their historical counterparts, **contemporary terrorists have introduced a new scale of violence in terms of conventional and unconventional threats and impact. The internationalization and brutalization of current and future terrorism make it clear we have entered an Age of Super Terrorism** [e.g. **biological, chemical, radiological, nuclear and cyber] with its serious implications concerning national, regional and global security** concerns.