# DA – Human Rights Credibility

## Neg

### 1NC---General

Sanctions now, are key to global human rights credibility.

USDOT 12-8-2023, "Treasury Designates Perpetrators of Human Rights Abuse and Commemorates the 75th Anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights", https://home.treasury.gov/news/press-releases/jy1972 TDI

WASHINGTON — December 10, 2023 marks the 75th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), the landmark document enshrining human rights and fundamental freedoms for all individuals. Ahead of this historic anniversary and Human Rights Day, the Department of the Treasury (Treasury) reaffirms its steadfast commitment to promoting respect for human rights and accountability for perpetrators of human rights abuse.

“Our commitment to upholding and defending human rights is sacrosanct,” said Secretary of the Treasury Janet L. Yellen. “Abuses of human rights and fundamental freedoms—wherever they occur in the world—strike at the heart of our shared humanity and our collective conscience. Treasury’s targeted sanctions announced today and over the past year underscore the seriousness of our commitment to promoting accountability for human rights abuse and safeguarding the U.S. financial system from those who commit these egregious acts.”

Over the past year, including the actions taken today, Treasury has designated more than 150 individuals and entities across a dozen countries for issues relating to human rights abuse. These designations have leveraged numerous sanctions authorities and have targeted a range of activities that violate or abuse human rights and betray the vision laid out in the UDHR. Treasury designations also targeted instances of human rights abuse linked to terrorist organizations, criminal activity, repression of LGBTQI+ persons, transnational repression, and environmental crime and degradation. Treasury will continue to leverage all relevant sanctions authorities to promote respect for human rights and accountability for human rights violations and abuses. These include violations and abuses involving the repression of members of civil society, protesters, and journalists; violence against civilians; arbitrary detention and kidnapping; and gender-based violence, including conflict-related sexual violence (CRSV) which the President has identified as a priority through issuing the Presidential Memorandum on Promoting Accountability for CRSV.

Promoting accountability for conflict-related sexual violence is a top priority for President Biden, who last year signed a Presidential Memorandum directing the U.S. government to strengthen our exercise of financial, diplomatic, and legal tools against this scourge—leading to the first-ever imposition of sanctions resulting from a dedicated focus on conflict-related sexual violence. Today’s sanctions include 13 targets that have been identified for designation by the United States, and several in coordination with allies and partners on the United Nations Security Council, for their role in perpetrating or condoning the perpetration of rape and other forms of sexual violence, further implementing the Presidential Memorandum and underscoring the Administration’s commitment to recognizing this abhorrent abuse and promoting accountability.

Today, the Department of the Treasury’s Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) sanctioned 20 individuals for their connection to human rights abuse in nine countries. An additional two individuals were sanctioned under the Department of State’s counterterrorism authority. Furthermore, the Department of State likewise designated individuals in Russia, Indonesia, and the People’s Republic of China (PRC) for visa restrictions pursuant to Section 7031(c) of the Annual Appropriations Act. These actions are taken in concert with measures imposed by partners in the United Kingdom and Canada, which have similarly utilized economic measures to deter human rights abuse globally. We stand with our partners in upholding international ideals.

#### Eliminating sanctions on human rights violators decks HR credibility—sanctions safeguard the international system through proportional enforcement.

D’Amato ’10 – Anthony D’Amato, Northwestern Law, "The Moral and Legal Basis for Sanctions" (2010). Faculty Working Papers. Paper 95. <http://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/facultyworkingpapers/95>] TDI

In the early days of the formation of rules of international law,FN12 compliance with the rules was voluntary. The need to avoid friction—to avoid unnecessarily antagonizing one's neighbor-was usually enough to induce a state to obey the rules. This, coupled with the perception that most of the rules were in a particular state's self-interest anyway, meant that the seeds of international law were planted on fertile soil. But soon a state a particular rule to be against its perceived interests-perhaps its interests had changed so that a formerly welcome rule now seemed to have outlived its usefulness. Like the driver who decides this time to run the red light, a state might have simply flouted the rule, thus disadvantaging its neighboring states. If the early international system was to avoid descending rapidly into disequilibrium, it needed a sanctioning procedure to safeguard its rules. But there was no central enforcement authority—no World Government. Hence the states had no alternative but to enforce the rules themselves.

Therefore international law developed, simultaneously, a set of primary rules governing the conduct of states, and a set of secondary rules governing the enforcement of the primary rules. The secondary rules, which are far less detailed than the primary rules, can be summarized by the term "proportionality." Systemic equilibrium is best maintained if enforcement measures are proportional to the severity of the violation of the primary rules. If enforcement measures go too far—if they amount to "excessive force"—then they tip the scale in the other direction and invite retaliatory force. Since states know too well that force-and-retaliation can escalate rapidly into war, and since war is the most destabilizing force in the international system, enforcement measures have been elegantly gradated from the beginning of recorded history. Diplomatic "threats" and "gestures" have been carefully refined through time.

#### Human rights credibility is necessary for conflict resolution. Otherwise, future global conflicts & escalation are inevitable.

Fuentes-Julio & Ibrahim ’19 [Claudia; Assistant Professor in Peace Studies, Wilkinson College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences. Raslan; Assistant Professor & Coordinator of the International Relations, SUNY. “A Human Rights Approach to Conflict Resolution.” Ethics & International Affairs, Volume 33, Issue 3.] TDI

The traditional conflict resolution model carried out by government elites and high-ranking military officials has more recently been challenged with calls for a more plural and participatory process both during and after an agreement has been reached. Different bodies of research have shown how including civil society and women’s groups in peace initiatives can mitigate the risks of conflict and instability and increase the effectiveness of peacebuilding. Participation and inclusion, however, remains an elusive goal. For example, women accounted for only 2 percent of mediators and 5 percent of witnesses and signatories in peace processes that took place between 1990 and 2017. For the same period, only 5 percent of peace agreements contained references to gender-related violence, despite its well-documented prevalence in armed conflict.

A human rights–based approach can enhance calls for inclusion not only through the use of legal instruments but also through the work of extensive advocacy networks at the international and local levels. From participating in nonviolent resistance to transforming social relations through negotiation and reconciliation (including violence de-escalation and the creation of structural capacity for peace), human rights actors are usually engaged in an extensive scope of activities for peacebuilding. These actors also often play a key role in educating marginalized groups about their rights, diffusing a culture of peace and equality, and strengthening human rights principles from the bottom up.

Accountability and Redress

From a human rights perspective, guaranteeing that conflict resolution processes include accountability and redress for victims of abuse is fundamental. Otherwise, impunity will prevail, making it increasingly difficult to restore the rule of law and strengthen domestic institutions. Accountability can also help victims and conflict-affected communities to heal from a violent past and might deter future human rights violations. As Ellen Lutz has noted, “If rights abuses are not addressed in the context of the resolution of the current conflict, they set the stage for future conflicts because unaddressed past grievances are so easy to manipulate.”Footnote23 In 2004, UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan took a stand on this matter by issuing the first UN report on transitional justice in conflict and post-conflict societies, which proscribed the endorsement of blanket and unconditional amnesty in cases of genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes.

#### Each hotspot draws in great powers and causes nuclear escalation.

Muraviev ’24 [Alexey; Ph.D., Associate Professor, National Security & Strategic Studies, Curtin University. "Risk of Nuclear Escalation in Ukraine, Regional War Between Arab Nations and Israel Are The Two Most Immediate Strategic Challenges for The West In 2024.” https://www.skynews.com.au/insights-and-analysis/risk-of-nuclear-escalation-in-ukraine-regional-war-between-arab-nations-and-israel-are-the-two-most-immediate-strategic-challenges-for-the-west-in-2024/news-story/943e3113ffc7f56179f7a9bf8599cc12] TDI

The year 2023 finished with a series of spectacular and dramatic bangs as the West’s war with Russia over Ukraine escalated again.

Following Ukraine’s mostly failed strategic counteroffensive, the Russian forces began their own advance - gaining more ground albeit at a slow pace.

That change of fortunes coincided with Ukraine, and the notion that the US and its allies should continue to support it, becoming a point of political contention among western ruling elites.

Meanwhile, Israel’s counter-terrorism operation against Hamas in the Gaza strip has turned into a bloody, protracted campaign that is causing even greater divide in the west than the war in eastern Europe.

The ashes of the fighting in Gaza have spread across the Middle East, igniting further tensions in neighboring Lebanon and Syria, Iraq, and Yemen.

The latter has over the New Year become the factor of global attention because of the Houthi maritime terrorist attacks against international shipping in the strategically important Strait of Bab al-Mandab.

Finally, North Korea’s Kim Jon Un ordered his troops to maintain an “overwhelming war response capability” in preparation for “an inevitable war on the Korean peninsula” that could “breakout at any time”.

So, what does this all mean for the year ahead?

Major considerations

In my assessment, there are a series of key influences that are continuing to shape international security and will have significant impacts on national security of many nations, including Australia.

Firstly, there is the global effort to prevent existing conflicts from escalating into major regional wars, combined with attempts to find diplomatic back doors out of these wars.

In the first instance, that applies to Ukraine and the Middle East.

Secondly, there is the need to contain geopolitical and military-strategic tensions that have not yet spilled over into armed conflict, but could soon do so (see North Korea, Taiwan, Venezuela).

Adding to that, renewed nuclear-missile rivalry between the US and Russia and ongoing risks the further proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Thirdly, all nations want regime stability and survival, as well as regional security.

That applies to case studies across all continents except for Australia and includes milestone political events such as elections (with the US and Russia being focal points).

And don’t forget the terrorism-related risks as they recently manifested in Ecuador, the government of which struggles to contain the eruption of one of the most violent forms of criminal terrorism the world has seen in years.

Fourth are ongoing problems with environmental change, including that caused by the detrimental effects of current wars, problems with fresh water and sufficient food supply of the ever-growing world population as well as uncontrolled cross-border migration.

Finally, but not least, the growing values-driven divide between the west and the global south risks the emergence of the post-rules-based order world.

Avoiding a nuclear escalation

Of all the challenges above, the most immediate concern this year is the risk of ongoing wars in Ukraine and Gaza spreading beyond their current battle zones, dragging in more actors, and rising nuclear escalations.

In Ukraine, the prevailing fear is of Russia’s strategic offensive, which may see further losses to the besieged country’s territories.

That may force Volodymyr Zelensky’s government to enter into difficult political negotiations with Vladimir Putin, an option that is still being rejected by both sides.

The alternative is Ukraine’s political and military defeat in the longer run, unless NATO is willing to intervene militarily by sending its own forces to defend central and western parts of the country.

That in turn would seriously escalate the chances of a conventional conflict transitioning into a nuclear phase.

In the Middle East, there is the ongoing risk of a war between Hamas and Israel broadening to Lebanon and beyond, eventually drawing in more players from the region.

In a worst-case scenario, Israel’s war against Palestinian based terrorist and extremist groups could transition into yet another Arab-Israeli war, eventually culminating into a war between Israel and the Muslim world.

That scenario too carries risks of a nuclear escalation.

### Uniqueness---Extra

#### US credibility exists but it’s wavering – strong allyship and renewed commitment to human rights would provide a huge boost

**Dorsey 2023** [(James, senior fellow at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies at Nanyang Technological University in Singapore) “The US Lacks Credibility, but All Is Not Lost,” Fair Observer, https://www.fairobserver.com/world-news/us-news/the-us-lacks-credibility-but-all-is-not-lost/#, June 29, 2023] TDI

A recent poll of Arab public opinion suggests US credibility has taken a hit, but all is not lost—that is, if the United States realizes that Middle Easterners judge the US on glaring inconsistencies in its domestic and foreign policies rather than on its cultural, technological and economic attributes. Hypocrisy weighs on the US’s global reputation The discrepancy between US policies and professed values has always existed. However, it’s become more evident and relevant, and more of a liability, in the past 22 years as a result of the War on Terror, rising Islamophobia, the war in Iraq, US reluctance to confront Israel head-on and, most recently, the war in Ukraine. In addition, China did not loom so large in the past in the competition for influence in the Middle East. Arab nations were on the defensive in the years after the 9/11 al-Qaeda attacks on New York and Washington. The United States’ credibility problem is compounded by what Dino Patti Djalal, former Indonesian ambassador to Washington, and Michael Sheldrick, co-founder of Global Witness, see as more broad resentment in the Global South against the West. In an op-ed, Mr. Djalal and Mr. Sheldrick noted that The West is perceived to perpetuate double standards on issues ranging from climate action and responsibility to trade and accountability for human rights violations … They called for global solidarity during the pandemic while instead often pursuing vaccine nationalism. Western nations preach free trade but increasingly engage in protectionism. … While Westerners may see public criticism as a regular diplomatic practice, it is seen by many (in the Global South) as false righteousness, devoid of genuine partnership. Against that backdrop, the latest Arab Youth Survey conducted by public relations agency Asda’a BCW indicates the credibility problem the Biden administration needs to address to narrow the gap. A healthy 72% of the survey’s respondents identified the United States as an ally. Even so, the US ranked seventh as an ally behind Turkey, China, Britain, Germany, France and India. That does not mean that the US is perceived to have lost influence in the region. 33% named the US as the most influential power in the Arab world, followed in second place by 11% pointing to the United Arab Emirates. It does not mean that most youths want the US to retain its influence, either. 61% of respondents said they would support US disengagement, even if more than 60% believe the US will be a more important ally than Russia or China in the next five years. Likewise, the US at 19% ranks second, behind the UAE’s 24%, as the country Arab youth prefer to live in. The same is true for which country youth would like their country to emulate. In other words, its often unexplained contradictions in policy are catching up with the United States, but it retains sufficient ground to bridge the gap if officials recognize that credibility has become far more critical in a world of competing powers. “Perceptions of Western hypocrisy in the Global South, compounded by bitter memories of past interventions, have made our divided world even more polarized and have pushed old friends and partners to turn to new sources of development finance that come with less baggage and fewer strings attached, at least in theory,” Djalal and Sheldrick said. Moreover, the lack of credibility turns public criticism of human rights abuse and other illiberal and autocratic policies and actions into a liability rather than an effective policy tool. The US must begin to practice what it preaches Ideally, the United States and other Western nations would align their policies with their professed values. Of course, that would require an ideal world. The demands of realpolitik and increasingly polarised domestic politics ensure it is, at best, wishful thinking. But there are things the United States and others can do, at home and abroad, some of which are low-hanging fruit. The Biden administration could take heed of this week’s United Nations recommendations to end in Guantanamo Bay prison “cruel, inhuman, and degrading” violations of detainees’ fundamental rights and freedoms, including constant surveillance, grueling isolation, and limited family access. Guantanamo, home to the last 30 men detained as military combatants in the War on Terror since the 2001 al-Qaeda attacks, long symbolized to many the perceived hypocrisy of US advocacy for adherence to human rights. Fionnuala Ní Aoláin, the UN’s special rapporteur on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms while Countering Terrorism, made her recommendations following the first visit to the prison by UN experts in more than two decades. In addition, the United States, together with its Western allies, could enhance its credibility by living up to promises like the pledge to provide $100 billion in climate financing to developing nations and to ensure that countries from the Global South have a seat at the table. Western leaders have begun to acknowledge that the ball is in their court. In February, French President Emmanuel Macron told the Munich Security Conference that he was “shocked by how much credibility we are losing in the Global South.” Josep Borrell, the European Union’s foreign policy chief, echoed Mr. Macron at the same event. “We cannot think about European security without looking at the global scene and engaging with other partners. I see how powerful the Russian narrative is, its accusations of double standards. We have to dismantle that narrative, cooperate with other countries, accept that the UN structure must be adapted,” Mr. Borrel said, referring to demands that the Global South has a permanent seat on the United Nations Security Council. The United States’ key allies, the EU and Japan, appear to have taken the lead in attempting to regain credibility and trust. So far, they have taken small steps, but, by and large, they have yet to put their money where their mouth is. For the effort to gain momentum and for the United States to benefit, it needs not only to get on board with what Djalal and Sheldrick describe as “a thousand-mile journey,” but to get in the driver’s seat. It takes only a glance at the Arab Youth Survey to conclude that the stakes are high in the Middle East and across the globe. Credibility matters, perhaps more than ever since World War Two.

#### Biden’s recommitted foreign policy to promoting rights and freedoms but continued success is key.

Carothers and Brown 24 [(Thomas and Frances, Thomas Carothers is director of Carnegie’s Democracy, Conflict, and Governance Program.), "Democracy Policy Under Biden: Confronting a Changed World", https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2024/02/democracy-policy-under-biden-confronting-a-changed-world?lang=en, Carnegie Endowment, 2-6-2024] TDI

Summary In response to an international context U.S. President Joe Biden has described as an overarching struggle between democracy and autocracy, his administration has set out to support democracy globally as a major foreign policy priority. This effort has entailed gsrappling with three daunting challenges: a global democratic recession involving dozens of cases of democratic backsliding or collapse; the rising assertiveness of China, Russia, and other autocratic powers; and the troubled status of the United States as a model of well-functioning democracy. Although the Biden administration has not articulated a formal global democracy strategy, an examination of its efforts to date reveals six main elements of prodemocracy policy, each rooted in a particular theory of change. Countering autocratic challengers: taking diplomatic, economic, and security-related measures to limit the transnational reach and influence of China and Russia, based on the ideas that those countries are the central axis of expansive authoritarianism and that curbing their aggressive ambitions will bolster a rules-based order in which states and peoples are free to chart their own political courses and democracy can flourish. Engaging multilaterally on democracy: pursuing high-visibility multilateral and multistakeholder engagement on democracy, in the hope that by standing up together on democracy, the United States and other democracies can bolster global democratic solidarity, reverse the narrative of authoritarianism on the rise, and galvanize practical initiatives to support or defend democracy. Responding to democratic backsliding: exerting diplomatic and economic pressure to slow, reverse, or head off democratic backsliding in countries where it is occurring, reflecting the view that it is crucial to respond to democratic slippage before new autocratic regimes harden and that doing so will send a signal to other would-be backsliders that they will pay a price for moving down that road. Helping democracy deliver: mobilizing resources and other support for countries that have experienced promising democratic openings, to help reformist leaders succeed and, in so doing, challenge the pervasive global narrative of democratic failure. Upgrading democracy aid: increasing the scale of democracy assistance, enhancing programming in certain pivotal areas, and bolstering the position of democracy programming within the aid bureaucracy, reflecting the idea that countering the democratic recession requires a strong, focused aid response. Reforming U.S. democracy: pursuing efforts to strengthen U.S. democracy, not just from the desire to put U.S. democracy on a better path but from the conviction that the credibility of America’s support for democracy abroad depends upon its ability to improve its own democratic functioning. Taken together, these six policy elements represent a serious response to democracy’s troubled global situation and a significant recovery from the damage inflicted to U.S. democracy support by Donald Trump during his presidency. At the same time, each element embodies a complex mix of positive potential and nagging dilemmas and constraints. For example, defending democracy by countering autocratic powers faces the dilemma that the very effort to limit China’s and Russia’s geostrategic reach pushes the United States to seek closer ties with some backsliding or undemocratic governments. Meanwhile, the Biden administration’s big bet on prodemocracy multilateral diplomacy—the Summit for Democracy process—produced some payoffs but also generated downsides, including occupying considerable bureaucratic bandwidth that might have been focused on addressing pivotal democracy challenges around the world. Steps to counteract specific cases of backsliding have notched some notable successes. Yet they have also sometimes yielded limited impact due to countervailing interests that constrain U.S. actions and due to asymmetries of will between backsliding leaders and U.S. policymakers. Supporting democratic openings holds promise, but success will depend on whether adequate resources can be mobilized and whether better delivery of socioeconomic results on the part of reformist leaders will solidify these nascent openings. In addition, ambitions to reform U.S. democracy have often run aground on the shoals of political polarization and limits to the executive branch’s purview, highlighting the perniciousness of the problem more than alleviating it. The lasting impact of Biden’s democracy policy will only emerge over time, and it will ultimately hinge on the answers to three open questions: Can the administration’s promising thematic democracy initiatives be more fully integrated into U.S. bilateral country policies? Can these initiatives be brought together to ensure they add up to more than the sum of their parts? And can the inherently long-term nature of the bets that the administration is making be underpinned by successful efforts to institutionalize and sustain these policies beyond 2024? Introduction When President Joe Biden and his foreign policy team took office in early 2021, they set about to reestablish the United States as a global force for democracy. They defined this goal as an integral part of their efforts to rebuild America’s international standing and encased the push in expansive prodemocracy rhetoric. Biden spoke forcefully in February 2021 of the world being at an “inflection point” in a clash between democracy and autocracy, and he asserted that advancing democracy’s global fortunes was his “galvanizing mission.”1 Secretary of State Antony Blinken reiterated the same month that the administration’s foreign policy would be “centered on the defense of democracy and the protection of human rights.”2

### Link---North Korea

#### Lifting sanctions shreds human rights credibility. Kim’s regime is a totalitarian outlier.

Kelly ’22 – [Robert Kelly is a professor of international relations in the Political Science and Diplomacy Department of Pusan National University in South Korea. "In Defense of North Korea Sanctions." Korea Observer 53, no. 2 (2022)] TDI \*\*bracketed for language

A. Ethical: Expressing the International Community's Moral Displeasure with Orwellianism

North Korea is arguably the most repressive regime on the planet. The UN Commission of Inquiry on Human Rights in the DPRK (COI) has issued the most definitive report to date on human rights in the North (Commission of Inquiry 2014), and it is devastating. KINU's annual reviews of human rights in that country suggest no improvement since the COI (Lee 2020a). The Kim family regime's casual, wide-ranging brutality, coupled to its theocratic personality cult (Shin 2007), raise obvious concerns about such a country possessing such dangerous weapons. Even Pakistani nuclear weapons do not provoke similar anxiety.

Even without its WMD programs though, the ethical argument to cordon North Korea off from the world economy in order to pressure it to change is strong. Human rights is now a substantial, well-theorized, heavily-documented part of global governance, complete with UN agencies and NGOs dedicated to it; reports and observation from democratic governments' foreign ministries; regular news coverage; an embryonic world court - the International Criminal Court; and a congealing norm that states have a responsibility to at least minimally protect their own people (R2P). To treat North Korea - arguably the worst human rights abuser in the world - as inappropriately sanctioned would call into question the entire human rights edifice developed over decades. If there is one country in the world which has 'earned' sanction and isolation for its human rights repression, it is the DPRK.

Realist and dovish proponents of sanctions rollback argue that to hold North Korea to these standards puts unnecessary obstacles in the path of diplomacy. But North Korea is such a totalitarian outlier that treating the DRPK like a normal state raises persistent ethical issues. WMD are just technologies. What matters is who has them, and Michael Kirby, the lead investigator of the COI, analogized North Korea to Nazi Germany and its camps to Soviet gulags. As Kirby said (in NBC News 2014), "the gravity, scale and nature of these violations reveal a state that does not have any parallel in the contemporary world." If anti-sanctions analysis can question the ethics of sanctions (for their humanitarian impact), then it is logically permissible to also debate the ethics of engaging the world's worst human rights and R2P violator.

### Link---Iran

#### Lifting sanctions on Iran reverse progress on human rights leadership, empowers hardliners, and sends a message of impunity to authoritarian states.

Kittrie ’22 – Orde Kittrie is a professor of law at Arizona State University and senior fellow at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies. Gregory D. Koblentz is a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations and an associate professor at George Mason University. “Lifting Human Rights Sanctions on Iran Would Be a Mistake” The National Interest, <https://nationalinterest.org/feature/lifting-human-rights-sanctions-iran-would-be-mistake-201157>, March 14, 2022] TDI

Lifting sanctions on these Iranian human rights abusers will also empower these hardliners in the broader Iranian political arena. Islamic Republic officials who violate Iran’s legally binding obligations on human rights—including those under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, to which Iran is a party—are among those most likely to violate Iran's nuclear commitments. The United States should isolate and sanction them, not relieve them of sanctions pressure or otherwise rehabilitate them.

A decision to lift human rights and terrorism sanctions on these Iranian officials would be inconsistent with the previously expressed policies of the Biden and Obama administrations. For example, during his confirmation hearing, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy Colin Kahl said that Washington “should not be loosening sanctions on terrorism or human rights or anything else that checks back Iran’s destabilizing activities.”

The Biden administration is reportedly poised to lift all sanctions on many of Iran’s worst human rights abusers and terrorism sponsors in exchange for remarkably weak nuclear concessions from Iran. History has shown that sacrificing human rights concerns to achieve arms control objectives is both unnecessary and counterproductive.

Both Presidents Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan, due in part to the insistence of Congress, maintained strong human rights pressure on the Soviet Union while successfully negotiating major arms control agreements. The current Congress should step in to ensure that the administration’s eagerness for a deal with Iran does not undermine accountability for Iran’s egregious human rights abuses and sponsorship of terrorism.

The Iranians who will reportedly be freed from all sanctions under the nuclear deal include Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei, President Ebrahim Raisi, Vice President Mohsen Rezaei, and Hossein Dehghan, a former brigadier general in the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC). Each has a horrific record of personal responsibility for human rights abuses and terrorism.

Khamenei was Iran's president from 1981 until 1989 and has been its supreme leader since then. As such, Khamenei is ultimately responsible for four decades of Iranian human rights abuses and support for terrorism. A U.S. federal court held Khamenei personally responsible for the deaths of nineteen U.S. servicemembers in the bombing of the Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia. Federal courts have also held Khamenei personally responsible for the deaths of U.S. civilians in three terrorist bombings in Israel—two on public buses and one at an outdoor market in Jerusalem.

Raisi is responsible for the execution of thousands of political prisoners and the unlawful torture and execution of hundreds of peaceful protesters. All sanctions will likewise reportedly be lifted on Rezaei, a former IRGC commander in chief who is wanted by Argentina for organizing a 1994 attack on a Jewish community center that killed eighty-five people. Dehghan is responsible for mass executions as commander of the IRGC’s Tehran branch. He also commanded the IRGC in Lebanon when Iran ordered the Beirut barracks bombing, which killed 241 U.S. Marines.

The nuclear deal is reportedly also poised to lift all sanctions on the IRGC, which is responsible for the deaths of hundreds of Americans and has carried out terrorist activities that have violated human rights around the world for decades. This sends a particularly counterproductive message in the wake of recent reports that the IRGC is actively working to assassinate former U.S. government officials, including former U.S. national security advisor John Bolton.

Lifting sanctions on these Iranian human rights abusers and terrorism sponsors would send a dangerous message of impunity to Vladimir Putin and his henchmen at a time when they are committing war crimes in Ukraine and human rights abuses in Russia. Such a decision is contrary to America’s values, would wrongly abandon the Islamic Republic’s many victims—including hundreds of current political prisoners and detainees—and would also weaken deterrence against future abuses in Iran and make it harder for the Iranian people to liberate themselves from the Iranian regime. Iran saw mass uprisings in 2018, 2019, and 2020; the regime reportedly killed 1,500 demonstrators in November 2019 alone. The regime’s repression is likely to cause even more mass uprisings in the future. If Washington lifts these sanctions, Iranian officials will have even fewer worries about the personal price they might pay for crushing new uprisings.

Lifting sanctions on these Iranian human rights abusers will also empower these hardliners in the broader Iranian political arena. Islamic Republic officials who violate Iran’s legally binding obligations on human rights—including those under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, to which Iran is a party—are among those most likely to violate Iran's nuclear commitments. The United States should isolate and sanction them, not relieve them of sanctions pressure or otherwise rehabilitate them.

A decision to lift human rights and terrorism sanctions on these Iranian officials would be inconsistent with the previously expressed policies of the Biden and Obama administrations. For example, during his confirmation hearing, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy Colin Kahl said that Washington “should not be loosening sanctions on terrorism or human rights or anything else that checks back Iran’s destabilizing activities.”

In 2015, while discussing the very deal that Biden officials say they seek to resurrect, then-Secretary of State John Kerry told the Senate that the United States would not be violating the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) if Washington used “our authorities to impose sanctions on Iran for terrorism, human rights, missiles, or any other nonnuclear reason.” Kerry also said that “the JCPOA does not provide Iran any relief from United States sanctions under any of those authorities.”

The United States’ experience negotiating with the Soviet Union, which had a much more advanced nuclear program and military than Iran does today, demonstrates that lifting pressure on human rights abusers is not necessary to negotiate and implement verifiable arms control agreements. In fact, past efforts have shown that it is counterproductive.

Neither Carter, while negotiating the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT II), nor Reagan, while negotiating the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, made concessions on human rights in order to achieve progress on arms control. Instead, both Carter and Reagan made clear to the Soviets that progress on human rights was key to increasing trust on arms control.

In a June 1978 speech at the U.S. Naval Academy, Carter both discussed the importance of the ongoing SALT II negotiations and sharply criticized Soviet human rights violations, saying, “The abuse of basic human rights in their own country … has earned them the condemnation of people everywhere who love freedom.” Even at the height of the SALT II negotiations, Carter publicly “condemned” and “deplored” a Soviet sentence on dissident Anatoly Sharansky.

Both Carter and his secretary of state, Cyrus Vance, used public and private forums to impress upon Soviet leaders that continued human rights abuses would anger the American public and hinder the possibility of the Senate ratifying the completed SALT II treaty. Carter and Soviet chairman Leonid Brezhnev signed the SALT II treaty in June 1979. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan eventually derailed Senate ratification, but both the United States and the Soviet Union announced they would nevertheless abide by its provisions.

Reagan also negotiated and signed a major arms control agreement—the INF treaty—while strongly pressuring the Soviets on human rights. Reagan publicly called the Soviet Union an “evil empire.” He and his administration pressured the Soviets by raising human rights in meetings with them, highlighting human rights in presidential speeches, and openly discussing the issue with members of Congress, human rights activists, and Soviet dissidents.

After a summit with the Soviets, Reagan publicly declared that “we didn’t limit ourselves to just arms reductions.” Rather, he also discussed the Soviets’ “violation of human rights,” noting that “a government that will break faith with its own people cannot be trusted to keep faith with foreign powers.”

Reagan, like Carter, found it helpful to portray Congress as a “bad cop” on human rights issues. He emphasized to the Soviets that progress on other bilateral issues, given the human rights concerns of both his administration and congress, would be easier if Moscow would improve its human rights record.

Congressional action underscored this point to Moscow. The House and Senate passed numerous resolutions condemning Soviet human rights violations, while individual lawmakers criticized the administration when it even vaguely appeared to subordinate human rights to arms control.

Kenneth Adelman, Reagan’s top arms control adviser at the time, eloquently described the interplay between human rights and arms control in a January 1987 speech. He argued that human rights advocacy is not a hindrance, but rather a contributor, to effective arms control agreements.

It is no surprise, said Adelman, that “a nation that makes no effort to abide by its human rights agreement commitments also violates its arms control agreements.” It also comes as no surprise, he added, when a nation “that systematically lies to its own people fails to comply fully with an arms agreement it signs with us.” Adelman concluded that “openness and arms control go together.”

Thus, lifting human rights and counterterrorism sanctions would actually decrease the prospects for Iran’s lasting and verifiable abandonment of its nuclear weapons ambitions. It would also weaken deterrence against further abuses, abandon victims, empower Iranian hardliners, and send a dangerous message to Putin and his henchmen.

Much as it did with Carter and Reagan, Congress should act to ensure that the United States continues to pursue an end not only to Iran’s nuclear program but also to its egregious human rights abuses and state sponsorship of terrorism.

### Impact---Laundry List

**US human rights leadership solves war and pandemics, and spills over globally.**

**Koh ’20** — Harold; Sterling Professor of International Law at Yale Law School. He is the State Department’s Legal Adviser and Assistant Secretary of State for the Bureau of Democracy. June 2020; “Why U.S. Leadership Matters for the Global Defense, Protection and Promotion of Human Rights”; *American Foreign Service Association*; https://www.afsa.org/why-us-leadership-matters-global-defense-protection-and-promotion-human-rights; //Cyang

A Global System to Promote Human Rights

Remarkably, after World War II, the **U**nited **S**tates helped to erect a version of the global system that Kant envisioned. Through the Marshall Plan, the United States supported the revival of an economically united Europe, led by the European Union and protected by NATO, that became our indispensable global partner in promoting human rights. This approach to **global governance** formed the **basis** for the United Nations—**our system** to **end war** and promote human rights—and associated international institutions to govern international monetary flows, trade and development. The **U**nited **S**tates became the **indispensable** balance **wheel** of a **values-driven system** of global governance that empowered like-minded nations to organize ambitious multilateral attacks on **all** manner of **world problems**.

The last few years have offered **instead** a **disturbing counter-vision**—hauntingly evocative of the “spheres of influence” painted by George Orwell’s 1984—of a system where global megapowers are increasingly **indistinguishable** from one another in their **authoritarianism** and **commitment** to **disinformation**. These great powers ignore the violation of human rights and the rule of law in other spheres and violate them within their own, forging cynical alliances and manipulating public opinion to make today’s adversaries tomorrow’s allies. Physical and economic barriers are going up everywhere; European unity is **cracking**; and the **global commitment** to **h**uman **r**ights and the **r**ule **o**f **l**aw seems to be **eroding**. Without consistent U.S. leadership, we risk returning to the **balkanized world** that helped bring about the **devastations** of the **last century**.

As a nation, we must ask: Are we really ready to follow this dead end? If we downgrade human rights in favor of a more “pragmatic” foreign policy, what makes us different from any other country? After all, advancing human rights is our founding national credo. Abandoning America’s leadership role is both contrary to our interests and risks further global destabilization.

It is a false dichotomy to claim that a pragmatic foreign policy must “balance” the pursuit of our national interests with the preservation of our fundamental values, including the defense and protection of human rights. Paramount among our **national interests** must always be the **preservation** of our **fundamental values**. For ours is not a country built on a common race, ethnicity or religion. Instead, America is an idea: “we hold these truths to be self-evident.” If we do not consistently defend, protect and promote human rights at home and abroad, we will lose our distinctive national identity.

Particularly in a time of **COVID-19**, **climate change** and **refugee** outpouring**s**, U.S. leadership **matters** in the **global defense**, protection and promotion of human rights. The coronavirus pandemic has unveiled the close global intertwining of environment, health, economy and human rights. Climate-caused injury destroys animal habitats, triggering zoonotic (animal-to-human) diseases, causing pandemics that shatter lives, exacerbating income inequality and spurring the rise of authoritarian governments that perpetuate climate injury. Unless we break this vicious cycle, more **pandemics** will **surely come**.

This **unsettling moment** of **instability** and **uncertainty** makes it all the **more urgent** that we get back to first principles, both at home and abroad. There is still time to **return** our human rights policy to simple values: telling the truth, **setting** an **example**, and pursuing a consistent vision of human rights protection for the past, present and future.

### Impact---Liberal Democracy

#### Liberal democracy solves every impact but American credibility is vital.

Kasparov 17 — Garry Kasparov, Chairman of the Human Rights Foundation, former World Chess Champion, 2017 (“Democracy and Human Rights: The Case for U.S. Leadership,” Testimony Before The Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Transnational Crime, Civilian Security, Democracy, Human Rights, and Global Women's Issues of the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, February 16th, Available Online at https://www.foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/021617\_Kasparov\_%20Testimony.pdf, Accessed 07-13-2017)

As one of the countless millions of people who were freed or protected from totalitarianism by the United States of America, it is easy for me to talk about the past. To talk about the belief of the American people and their leaders that this country was exceptional, and had special responsibilities to match its tremendous power. That a nation founded on freedom was bound to defend freedom everywhere. I could talk about the bipartisan legacy of this most American principle, from the Founding Fathers, to Democrats like Harry Truman, to Republicans like Ronald Reagan. I could talk about how the American people used to care deeply about human rights and dissidents in far-off places, and how this is what made America a beacon of hope, a shining city on a hill. America led by example and set a high standard, a standard that exposed the hypocrisy and cruelty of dictatorships around the world. But there is no time for nostalgia. Since the fall of the Berlin Wall, the collapse of the Soviet Union, and the end of the Cold War, Americans, and America, have retreated from those principles, and the world has become much worse off as a result. American skepticism about America’s role in the world deepened in the long, painful wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and their aftermaths. Instead of applying the lessons learned about how to do better, lessons about faulty intelligence and working with native populations, the main outcome was to stop trying. This result has been a tragedy for the billions of people still living under authoritarian regimes around the world, and it is based on faulty analysis. You can never guarantee a positive outcome— not in chess, not in war, and certainly not in politics. The best you can do is to do what you know is right and to try your best. I speak from experience when I say that the citizens of unfree states do not expect guarantees. They want a reason to hope and a fighting chance. People living under dictatorships want the opportunity for freedom, the opportunity to live in peace and to follow their dreams. From the Iraq War to the Arab Spring to the current battles for liberty from Venezuela to Eastern Ukraine, people are fighting for that opportunity, giving up their lives for freedom. The United States must not abandon them. The United States and the rest of the free world has an unprecedented advantage in economic and military strength today. What is lacking is the will. The will to make the case to the American people, the will to take risks and invest in the long-term security of the country, and the world. This will require investments in aid, in education, in security that allow countries to attain the stability their people so badly need. Such investment is far more moral and far cheaper than the cycle of terror, war, refugees, and military intervention that results when America leaves a vacuum of power. The best way to help refugees is to prevent them from becoming refugees in the first place. The Soviet Union was an existential threat, and this focused the attention of the world, and the American people. There existential threat today is not found on a map, but it is very real. The forces of the past are making steady progress against the modern world order. Terrorist movements in the Middle East, extremist parties across Europe, a paranoid tyrant in North Korea threatening nuclear blackmail, and, at the center of the web, an aggressive KGB dictator in Russia. They all want to turn the world back to a dark past because their survival is threatened by the values of the free world, epitomized by the United States. And they are thriving as the U.S. has retreated. The global freedom index has declined for ten consecutive years. No one like to talk about the United States as a global policeman, but this is what happens when there is no cop on the beat. American leadership begins at home, right here. America cannot lead the world on democracy and human rights if there is no unity on the meaning and importance of these things. Leadership is required to make that case clearly and powerfully. Right now, Americans are engaged in politics at a level not seen in decades. It is an opportunity for them to rediscover that making America great begins with believing America can be great. The Cold War was won on American values that were shared by both parties and nearly every American. Institutions that were created by a Democrat, Truman, were triumphant forty years later thanks to the courage of a Republican, Reagan. This bipartisan consistency created the decades of strategic stability that is the great strength of democracies. Strong institutions that outlast politicians allow for long-range planning. In contrast, dictators can operate only tactically, not strategically, because they are not constrained by the balance of powers, but cannot afford to think beyond their own survival. This is why a dictator like Putin has an advantage in chaos, the ability to move quickly. This can only be met by strategy, by long-term goals that are based on shared values, not on polls and cable news. The fear of making things worse has paralyzed the United States from trying to make things better. There will always be setbacks, but the United States cannot quit. The spread of democracy is the only proven remedy for nearly every crisis that plagues the world today. War, famine, poverty, terrorism–all are generated and exacerbated by authoritarian regimes. A policy of America First inevitably puts American security last. American leadership is required because there is no one else, and because it is good for America. There is no weapon or wall that is more powerful for security than America being envied, imitated, and admired around the world. Admired not for being perfect, but for having the exceptional courage to always try to be better. Thank you.

## Aff

### 1AR---Uniqueness

#### **Human rights credibility is ‘obviously’ dead.**

Serhan ’24 [Yasmeen; Staff writer, TIME. “How Israel and Its Allies Lost Global Credibility.” https://time.com/6963032/israel-netanyahu-allies-global-standing/] TDI

There were signs. The chasm between Israel’s western allies and the rest of the world became apparent in the early months of the war, during which time Israel’s net favorability in places such as Brazil, China, Mexico, and South Africa flipped from positive to negative, according to survey data by the decision intelligence company Morning Consult. In countries that already held net negative views of Israel, such as Japan, South Korea, and the U.K., perceptions declined even further. By December, the U.S. was the only major developed market in which public sentiment toward Israel remained solidly positive.

This chasm has been perhaps most apparent at the U.N., where multiple ceasefire resolutions put forward by Brazil, the United Arab Emirates, and Algeria and backed by most other permanent members of the U.N. Security Council (barring the U.K., which mostly abstained) were repeatedly quashed by the U.S., citing insufficient language condemning Hamas or demanding the simultaneous release of Israeli hostages. When the U.S. put forward its own ceasefire resolution last month, Russia and China were the ones to veto it, along with Algeria. A breakthrough finally came on Mar. 25, when a resolution calling for an immediate ceasefire and the unconditional release of all hostages was passed with a sole U.S. abstention. While U.N. Security Council resolutions are legally binding (Washington claims otherwise in this case), it has yet to be enforced.

But as the war has ground on, and as increasingly dire reports of death, destruction, and man-made famine have made their way out of the Strip, even countries where support for Israel’s military offensive has been highest now appears to be diminishing. According to a March survey by the pollster Gallup, American support for Israel’s war in Gaza has flipped from a narrow majority in favor (50% approved and 45% disapproved in November) to a majority against (36% approve and 55% disapprove in March). While disapproval is highest among Democrats, Republicans and Independents also saw declines in support.

Sen. Chris Van Hollen, a leading Democratic lawmaker on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, tells TIME that Washington’s steadfast support for Israel amid allegations of possible war crimes has invited widespread criticism that the U.S. only selectively chooses to defend the international rules-based order — in Ukraine, for example, but not in Gaza. “We know that countries around the world, especially in the Global South, believe that the United States is applying a double standard here, and that is obviously having an impact on our own standing in the world,” he says.

#### Human rights credibility is low. New UN report.

**Dakwar ‘23** [(Jamil, Director, ACLU Human Rights Program.) “The U.S. Touts Itself as a Global Leader in Human Rights. A New U.N. Report Says Otherwise,” ACLU, https://www.aclu.org/news/human-rights/the-u-s-touts-itself-as-a-global-leader-in-human-rights-a-new-u-n-report-says-otherwise, November 15, 2023] TDI

Earlier this month, the United Nations Human Rights Committee delivered a searing report highlighting the U.S. government’s failure to meet its human rights obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). This international treaty, ratified by the U.S. in 1992, is one of only three key human rights treaties that the U.S. has ratified.

The U.N. committee’s concluding observations echo many of the concerns and recommendations raised by civil society groups last month during the U.S. review, where they sounded the alarm on violations of various human rights issues including Indigenous rights, voting rights, freedom of expression and assembly, gender equality and reproductive rights, criminal legal reform, immigrants’ rights, and more. Here are three key takeaways from the committee’s report.

1. Establishing a national human rights institution is a critical first step to advancing national progress on human rights.

Among their concluding observations, the committee stressed the lack of progress in establishing a national human rights institution (NHRI). An NHRI would play a crucial role in monitoring and ensuring that international human rights standards are being upheld at the national level.

While the Biden administration has called for continued dialogue around an NHRI in the U.S., concrete actions have yet to materialize. The committee’s urgent recommendations corroborate the longstanding demand from civil society groups to establish a presidential commission to explore options for creating an NHRI. Already, this call to action has been backed by several members of Congress and the International Association of Official Human Rights Agencies.

2. The U.S. should ensure that family separations never happen again.

The committee urged the U.S. to “redouble its efforts to ensure the reunification of all separated children with their families, guarantee that such family separations are prohibited in the future, and ensure that victims have access to effective remedies and receive full reparation, including adequate compensation and appropriate support services.” These recommendations align with those in the ACLU’s shadow report on family separation, and coincided with the ACLU’s announcement of a major settlement in Ms. L. v. ICE, which established that the U.S. government must continue to identify families that were separated by Trump’s zero-tolerance policy and provide a pathway for them to seek asylum in the U.S. The committee also raised concerns regarding racial discrimination and due process violations in the U.S. child welfare system, including the disproportionate number of Black and Indigenous children separated from their families.

3. The U.S. should adopt critical criminal legal system reforms, including abolishing the death penalty and placing a moratorium on life sentences without parole.

The committee concretely addresses a wide range of human rights violations in the U.S. criminal legal system, including extreme sentencing, which the ACLU has raised in our joint report with the Princeton Advocacy Policy Clinic. Most notably, the committee called on the U.S. to “establish a moratorium on the imposition of sentences to life imprisonment without parole.” This was a result of powerful testimonies and advocacy by various groups, including the Abolitionist Law Center and the Center for Constitutional Rights, which raised the torturous practice of death by incarceration to the committee.

The committee also urged the U.S. to establish a federal moratorium of the death penalty, abolish life without parole sentences for children, as well as the mandatory and non-homicide-related sentence of life imprisonment without parole, and make parole more accessible to all prisoners, including those sentenced to life imprisonment. For the first time, the committee called on the U.S. to expand parole eligibility for all incarcerated individuals, irrespective of age or the crime committed. These recommendations were also echoed in the recent report by the U.N. Expert Mechanism to Advance Racial Justice and Equality in Law Enforcement, which visited the U.S. last spring.

The time to act is now.

The U.S. touts itself as a global leader of universal human rights. Yet the committee’s report memorializes the immense gap between U.S. laws and policies and international human rights norms — even in the area in which the U.S. has heralded itself as a leader for decades: civil and political rights. And while the Biden administration has prioritized human rights in some ways, it has failed to pursue bold actions to demonstrate that it is leading by the power of example.

While the responsibility to implement the committee’s concluding observations lies with federal, state, and local governments, the Biden administration should immediately devote the necessary attention and resources to realizing these recommendations.

#### US human rights credibility down now.

Afia Ibnat, 2024, "3-28-24 Consistently inconsistent: The US’ credibility hangs in the balance", Daily Star, https://www.thedailystar.net/opinion/views/news/consistently-inconsistent-the-us-credibility-hangs-the-balance-3576721 Accessed 7-6-2024 TDI

The US, despite its arsenal of analysts, strategists, and policymakers, frequently has to reverse its foreign policy decisions. Time and again we have observed this phenomenon, with the US having to enforce the Reverse Course policy on its Cold War ally Japan in the late 1940s, pulling out of Afghanistan after 20 years of warfare with little to show for it, and imposing US visa sanctions on those "undermining democracy" prior to the January 7 Bangladesh election. Now, we're seeing the same in the US' paradoxical handling of Palestine. There seems to be a trend. Washington touts human rights, democracy, and peace, but only if achieving these doesn't clash with its main priorities: economics and security. In the case of Bangladesh, the country is used to the US being vocal about human rights and democratic norms, alongside the occasional chastisement regarding labour laws and unfair elections. However, the recent political climate shows that the US, despite not being happy with the way elections were conducted, remains persistent in pursuing deeper ties with Bangladesh on the economic, geostrategic, and development fronts. The US Press Spokesperson Matthew Miller, despite stating that the January 7 election lacked fairness, emphasised the US' dedication to collaborating with Bangladesh in advancing a joint vision for a free and open Indo-Pacific, supporting human rights and civil society in Bangladesh, and strengthening economic connections. On top of that, US President Joe Biden sent a letter to Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina on February 6 expressing his administration's desire to work with her on numerous fronts, including "​​global security, economic development, climate change and energy, global health, humanitarian support." The unseasoned eye would suffer from whiplash from the rate at which the US went from an attempt to strong-arm the Bangladeshi government to abide by the US rulebook for elections, to sweeping it all under the rug afterwards. Still, if we look at the US' track record, we can see that its behaviour remains consistently inconsistent and is thus somewhat predictable. In the past, the US sermonising about human rights was rarely digestible. But these days, it is met with waves of incredulity and ridicule in Dhaka and abroad in light of its actions in the Middle East. Washington claims itself as the champion of human rights and democracy globally, but there is growing apprehension that its reputation may have suffered irreparable damage this time around. The US' actions, including repeatedly vetoing ceasefire resolutions for Gaza in the UN Security Council, leading coalition attacks against the Houthi in the Red Sea, rejecting the South African case at the ICJ accusing Israel of genocide, and maintaining unwavering strategic, financial, military, and diplomatic support for Israel, collectively undermine its calls for upholding human rights, international law, and democratic principles in Bangladesh and beyond. The US has sold weapons worth more than $573.5 million to Israel since October 7, and this is just the amount that was made public. And now, Washington is busy reversing its approach to Gaza, with Biden shoddily airdropping aid and creating a makeshift emergency port to deliver humanitarian assistance in a crisis he continues to fund. Unfortunately, these efforts cannot undo the deaths of thousands of Palestinians and they certainly cannot undo the damage the US' image suffered as a result of supporting Netanyahu's repressive Israel in committing genocide against the Palestinians. Simply reversing its strategy at the last minute, before the elections, does not give the US a free pass to support criminals such as Netanyahu and continue business as usual. Even in South Asia, the US is inconsistent in its advocacy of democracy, particularly in India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh. In the case of India, Washington often overlooks evident instances of Hindu nationalism and related human rights violations, prioritising the US-India geostrategic partnership aimed at containing China's influence in the region. Conversely, in Pakistan, while the US calls for the restoration of democracy, it maintains a relatively soft and accommodating stance, favouring cooperation with military dictatorships rather than elected officials who may want to exit the US orbit. This approach sharply contrasts with the specific actions taken by Washington to support democracy in Bangladesh, which included visa sanctions imposed on individuals undermining the organising of free and fair elections. Despite this attempt at pressuring the ruling party in Bangladesh, the US shifted gears post-election so as not to disturb New Delhi's strategic ally and perturb the geopolitical waters to the point that Dhaka tilts too much towards Beijing or Moscow during turbulent times. These cases exemplify that US foreign policy remains inconsistent in pushing for democratic norms, but it does remain consistent in prioritising strategic interests above all. If the US continues to engage in actions which destabilise and undermine the international rules-based order by supporting the egregious crimes of Israel, while at the same time preaching about human rights and noble ideals like fairness, freedom, and inclusivity in Bangladesh and elsewhere, not only is the US shooting itself in the foot by eroding its own credibility, but it also faces the risk of increased isolation on the world stage. This, in the long run, will subsequently encourage other states to challenge US hegemony. Washington must draw practical red lines with Israel instead of throwing around tepid criticisms laced with double standards. The world is watching closely and the time for lip service is over. For the sake of its own national interests, the US must now do its part, as a great power, to reverse the damage it has done in clear, concrete, and consistent terms.

### 1AR---Link Turn

#### Sanctions empirically fail at their objectives and cause massive humanitarian suffering. Turns US credibility.

Drezner ‘21 [DANIEL W. DREZNER, Professor of International Politics at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University., (2021, September-October). The United States of Sanctions: The Use and Abuse of Economic Coercion. Foreign Affairs, 100(5), 142+. https://link-gale-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/apps/doc/A673449391/BIC?u=umuser&sid=summon&xid=d660ab25]

Yet for every success, there were more failures. The United States has imposed decades-long sanctions on Belarus, Cuba, Russia, Syria, and Zimbabwe with little to show in the way of tangible results. The Trump administration ratcheted up U.S. economic pressure against Iran, North Korea, and Venezuela as part of its "maximum pressure" campaigns to block even minor evasions of economic restrictions. The efforts also relied on what are known as "secondary sanctions," whereby third-party countries and companies are threatened with economic coercion if they do not agree to participate in sanctioning the initial target. In every case, the target suffered severe economic costs yet made no concessions. Not even Venezuela, a bankrupt socialist state experiencing hyperinflation in the United States' backyard, acquiesced.

SANCTIONS SETBACK

There are multiple problems with the way the United States currently employs economic sanctions. The biggest is the most banal: with maximum pressure has come maximum demands. The United States wants North Korea to denuclearize, Iran to denuclearize and then some, and Venezuela to accept the end of Bolivarian rule. To the rulers of these countries, these demands are tantamount to regime change. It should come as no surprise that they have opted to endure economic pain in lieu of making such massive concessions.

The Iran episode highlights an additional problem: the increasingly unilateral nature of U.S. economic pressure. Until recently, the United States had usually been able to impose financial sanctions with the explicit or implicit cooperation of allies. When the Trump administration decided to reimpose financial sanctions on Iran, however, it did so over the objections of European allies. The administration succeeded in ratcheting up the economic pressure on Iran by threatening secondary sanctions on other countries. The countries complied, and the gambit increased the costs to Iran, but success came at the price of straining long-standing ties.

At the same time, Washington has grown more comfortable sanctioning other great powers. What works with Mexico, however, does not work with China or Russia. Bigger targets have more resources to use to resist. The sanctions placed on Russia after its invasion of Ukraine might have deterred Moscow from more aggressive actions on its periphery, but that is a low bar for success. By any reasonable standard, the sanctions have failed to achieve their objective, since Russia has continued to violate international norms. Similarly, the myriad tariffs and other restrictive measures that the Trump administration imposed on China in 2018 failed to generate any concessions of substance. A trade war launched to transform China's economy from state capitalism to a more market-friendly model wound up yielding something much less exciting: a quantitative purchasing agreement for U.S. agricultural goods that China has failed to honor. If anything, the sanctions backfired, harming the United States' agricultural and high-tech sectors. According to Moody's Investors Service, just eight percent of the added costs of the tariffs were borne by China; 93 percent were paid for by U.S. importers and ultimately passed on to consumers in the form of higher prices.

A related problem is the ratchet effect. Presidents are always eager to impose sanctions but wary of removing them, because it exposes leaders to the charge of being weak on foreign policy. This makes it difficult for the United States to credibly commit to ending sanctions. When Biden considered lifting a few sanctions on Iran, for example, Republican lawmakers criticized him as a naive appeaser. Furthermore, many U.S. sanctions--such as those against Cuba and Russia--are mandated by law, which means that only Congress can permanently revoke them. And given the polarization and obstructionism now defining Capitol Hill, it is unlikely that sufficient numbers of lawmakers would support any presidential initiative to warm ties with a long-standing adversary. Even when political problems can be overcome, the legal thicket of sanctions can be difficult to navigate. Some countries are subject to so many overlapping sanctions that they find themselves trapped in a Kafka esque situation, unsure if there is anything they can do to comply. The difficulty of removing sanctions from some countries complicates the United States' efforts to bargain with all countries. If targets do not believe that Washington can lift its coercive measures, they have no incentive to bother with negotiations. What's the point of complying with U.S. demands if there will be no reward? That was one reason Saddam refused to negotiate with the United States in the 1990s and one reason Iran refused to negotiate with the Trump administration.

Sanctions also exact a humanitarian toll. Targeted financial sanctions were supposed to reduce the suffering associated with comprehensive trade embargoes, on the theory that going after banking systems and assets held by bad actors would spare the general population. In practice, most financial measures have been larded on top of trade sanctions, damaging the overall economies of targeted countries even more. International relations scholars do not agree on a lot, but the literature on sanctions is unanimous on the harm these measures inflict on populations in targeted countries. Even financial sanctions are likely to trigger repression, corruption, and backsliding on human development indicators.

Finally, targets have learned to adapt to life under sanctions. In the case of great powers such as China and Russia, this means finding alternative trading partners; Beijing lowered tariffs to European countries at the same time as it retaliated against the United States in their trade war. Russia countersanctioned European food imports to stimulate domestic production. Targets also respond with retaliatory sanctions, leading to a tit-for-tat escalation that imposes costs on U.S. producers and consumers. This tendency will only increase as other major economies view U.S. sanctions ostensibly imposed for national security reasons as a stalking-horse for trade protectionism. When the chief financial officer of the Chinese company Huawei was arrested in Canada and charged by the U.S. Department of Justice with trying to evade U.S. sanctions against Iran, China saw the move as part of the larger trade war; Trump did not help matters when he casually suggested that the executive could be released in return for trade concessions.

The greater long-term concern is that financial sanctions could undercut the U.S. dollar's standing as the world's primary reserve currency. It is the preeminent role of the dollar, along with the centrality of U.S. capital markets, that enabled the boom in financial sanctions in the first place. After a generation of these sanctions, however, targets are searching for alternatives to the dollar to protect themselves from coercion. Digital currencies offer one way out. The People's Bank of China has rolled out a digital yuan that will enable those who use it to bypass the U.S. dollar entirely. Even U.S. allies in Europe developed the Instrument in Support of Trade Exchanges (INSTEX), a means through which they could circumvent the dollar and trade with Iran. Little wonder, then, that the U.S. dollar's share of global foreign exchange reserves fell to a 25-year low at the end of 2020. For now, the dollar remains the primary global reserve currency. But if its use declines further, so will the power of American financial statecraft.

U.S. sanctions have notched a few significant accomplishments. But they have also alienated allies, impoverished populations, and encouraged diversification away from the dollar, all while failing to generate much in the way of tangible concessions. Policymakers seem to have confused the potency of sanctions with effectiveness. Much as generals erroneously relied on body counts as their metric of success in prosecuting the Vietnam War, policymakers are now using the pain inflicted by sanctions as a metric of success. In November 2020, for example, U.S. Secretary of State Mike Pompeo called the maximum-pressure campaign against Iran "extraordinarily effective." As evidence, he pointed out that "Iran's economy faces a currency crisis, mounting public debt, and rising inflation." Left unsaid by Pompeo was that despite all the economic pain, Iran was in fact accelerating its enrichment of uranium.

### 1AR---Impact---HR Cred

#### No impact and Trump thumps.

Posner 17 (Michael H. Posner - Jerome Kohlberg Professor of Ethics and Finance and a Professor of Business and Society at NYU's Stern School of Business, where he is working to launch the first-ever center on business and human rights at a business school. Prior to joining NYU Stern, Posner served from 2009 to 2013 in the Obama Administration as Assistant Secretary of State for the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor at the State Department. From 1978 to 2009, he led Human Rights First, a New York-based human rights advocacy organization – “Trump Abandons the Human-Rights Agenda” – 5/26/17 - http://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/trump-abandons-the-human-rights-agenda)

In his first four months in office, President Donald Trump has shaken America’s democratic foundations at home and abandoned a powerful bipartisan commitment to human rights. Seemingly forgotten is the legacy of Ronald Reagan, who, in his first Inaugural Address, pledged that America would “be the exemplar of freedom and a beacon of hope” for oppressed populations around the world.¶ Trump seems indifferent to, and at times disdainful of, this deeply rooted global commitment. He begs off mentioning human rights publicly, as he did on Sunday, in Riyadh, where he spoke to Arab and Muslim leaders from around the world. “We are not here to lecture,” he said. “We are not here to tell other people how to live, what to do, who to be, or how to worship. Instead, we are here to offer partnership—based on shared interests and values—to pursue a better future for us all.”¶ But Trump has developed a habit of embracing those whose values are antithetical to our own. He repeatedly expresses admiration for the Russian President, Vladimir Putin. “I do respect him,” Trump told Bill O’Reilly, in February. “But he’s a killer,” O’Reilly said. “There are a lot of killers,” Trump replied. “We’ve got a lot of killers. What, do you think our country’s so innocent?”¶ In early April, Trump welcomed to the White House the Egyptian President, Abdel Fattah El-Sisi, a leader who has locked up tens of thousands of his political opponents, decimated the human-rights community, and severely undermined Egypt’s democratic institutions. In their Oval Office meeting, Trump enthusiastically embraced Sisi, calling him “somebody that’s been very close to me from the first time I met him.”¶ In late April, Trump reached out to Rodrigo Duterte, the mercurial leader of the Philippines, who has invoked Hitler’s mass extermination of Jews as a model for how he would like to dispose of drug dealers and addicts. In what White House aides called a “very friendly conversation,” Trump congratulated Duterte for doing “ an unbelievable job on the drug problem,” and invited him to visit.¶ And, last month, Trump called President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, of Turkey, to congratulate him for winning a much-disputed referendum that will solidify his autocratic rule and further erode the country’s democratic institutions. Since a failed coup attempt last July, Erdoğan has sacked academics and thousands of judges and other public officials. Earlier this month, Trump welcomed Erdoğan to the White House—a visit that was marred by an attack on peaceful demonstrators outside the Turkish Embassy by his security agents.¶ In keeping with this pattern, Trump delivered his first major foreign-policy address to government leaders from the Arab and Muslim world, calling for a “principled realism, rooted in common values, shared interests, and common sense.” It makes sense for the President to talk about shared interests in regional security, in fighting terrorism, and in challenging Iran’s misadventures in Syria and Iraq and its support for Hezbollah. But shared values? According to Freedom House, Saudi Arabia is the eleventh least-free nation on earth: a place where free speech, assembly, and association are a distant dream; religious tolerance is nonexistent; and gender discrimination is pervasive.¶ Much of Trump’s speech was a call to isolate and weaken isis and other violent extremist groups by denying them financial support. “We must strip them of their access to funds,” he urged, failing to acknowledge, even implicitly, that the Saudis have doled out tens of billions of dollars in recent years to support the spread of Wahhabism, a puritanical strain of Islam, underwriting thousands of religious schools and mosques throughout the Arab and greater Islamic world. A number of these institutions have served as recruiting havens for violent extremists.¶ Perhaps most distressing is the President’s seeming lack of understanding of the root causes of the violent extremism that has plagued the Middle East and South Asia for decades, much less a willingness to confront them. As Ban Ki-moon, the United Nations Secretary-General at the time, wrote last year, “Violent extremism tends to thrive in an environment characterized by poor governance, democracy deficits, corruption and a culture of impunity for unlawful behavior engaged in by the State or its agents.” Elliott Abrams, a senior official in the George W. Bush Administration, addressed this point in reaction to Trump’s speech in Saudi Arabia, saying that “the President’s approach would work if terrorists were coming from outer space and our task was solely to organize against them militarily. That’s no doubt part of the task—but that’s not all of it, because they are coming from within the societies whose leaders he was addressing. He offered no explanation of what was producing this phenomenon.”¶ Trump assumes that foreign policy boils down to national-security and economic interests and that everything else, especially attention to human rights and democracy, is a distraction. Earlier this month, Secretary of State Rex Tillerson told State Department employees that pursuing such issues “really creates obstacles” in achieving what is best for America. That two-dimensional world view was on clear display in Riyadh, as Trump declined, even by inference, to challenge the Muslim leaders on their own bleak human-rights records, or to point out the link between their failures and the pervasive violent extremism in the region. Trump is right to recognize that America’s strategic and economic interests are vital, and oftentimes primary, and that the government often does need to engage with autocratic states to protect them, yet, in ignoring human rights, his Administration misses a valuable opportunity to advance these very interests.

#### Human rights promotion has zero positive effect on governance.

Thanassis Cambanis 8-17-2021, senior fellow and director of Century International, The Century Foundation's international research and policy center. "No Strings Attached: Why Aid Conditionality Just Doesn’t Work." DAWN. https://dawnmena.org/no-strings-attached-why-aid-conditionality-just-doesnt-work/. DL

The longer answer about aid conditionality is that it would not compel recipient governments to change their policies, even if the U.S. pursued a reform agenda that integrated its diplomatic, military and aid strategies. The history of U.S. aid as a lever for reform is littered with failures. Long-term aid recipients like Egypt, Jordan, the Palestinian Authority and Lebanon have never once undertaken a reform requested by Washington in exchange for copious aid.

Israel only once, and for a brief time, froze settlement activity under U.S. pressure—and that was nearly three decades ago. Since then, American support has consistently increased, indifferent to whether the particular administration in Washington supports or opposes Israel's continued settlement expansion and ongoing occupation of Palestinian territory. Even in conflict zones and weak states, such as Iraq, where enormous U.S. aid expenditures have sometimes been undertaken in conjunction with large-scale military and political assistance, they have had little to no effect when it comes to encouraging or incentivizing reforms.

Why don't these approaches work? The big three of Egypt, Israel and Jordan have all correctly calculated that the real decision-makers in the U.S. government don't really care about the human rights conditions supposedly attached to aid—or, at least, they can't be bothered to deal with the political blowback in Washington if they were to cut aid. In Iraq, governments sympathetic to a reform agenda—like those of Haider al-Abadi and Mustafa al-Kadhimi—are no more able to alter corrupt, power-sharing mechanisms than governments hostile to American requests—like those of Nouri al-Maliki and Adel Abdul Mahdi. Good governance is out of reach for reasons that U.S. aid cannot change. The threat to withhold aid, or even cancel it, cannot change the existential calculus of political actors whose survival and power depends on a corrupt and violent system. Such notions are based on a fantasy of American leverage that simply does not exist.

#### There’s also no impact. HR abuses don’t spillover or cause conflict.

Fareed Zakaria 20, host of Fareed Zakaria GPS on CNN, January/February 2020, “The New China Scare: Why America Shouldn’t Panic About Its Latest Challenger,” Foreign Affairs, https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/2019-12-06/new-china-scare

The rise of a one-party state that continues to reject core concepts of human rights presents a challenge. In certain areas, Beijing’s repressive policies do threaten elements of the liberal international order, such as its efforts to water down global human rights standards and its behavior in the South China Sea and other parts of its “near abroad.” Those cases need to be examined honestly. In the former, little can be said to mitigate the charge. China is keen on defining away its egregious human rights abuses, and that agenda should be exposed and resisted. (The Trump administration’s decision to withdraw from the UN Human Rights Council achieved the exact opposite by ceding the field to Beijing.)

But the liberal international order has been able to accommodate itself to a variety of regimes—from Nigeria to Saudi Arabia to Vietnam—and still provide a rules-based framework that encourages greater peace, stability, and civilized conduct among states. China’s size and policies present a new challenge to the expansion of human rights that has largely taken place since 1990. But that one area of potential regression should not be viewed as a mortal threat to the much larger project of a rules-based, open, free-trading international system.