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HUMAN RIGHTS CRITERION - Not needed/ Won’t work

COUNTER CRITERION: Central purpose of foreign policy is to maximize our nation’s security and well-being

Prof. Stephen M. Walt 2012. ( professor of international affairs at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government) 31 Aug 2012 On "Leading from the Front" FOREIGN POLICY [http://foreignpolicy.com/2012/08/31/on-leading-from-the-front/](http://www.google.com/url?q=http%3A%2F%2Fforeignpolicy.com%2F2012%2F08%2F31%2Fon-leading-from-the-front%2F&sa=D&sntz=1&usg=AFQjCNEmJg9FKf_qRm9xIBxevREnoh2Qew" \t "_blank)

In fact, the idea that the United States should always try to "lead" is completely bone-headed."Exerting leadership" is not the central objective of foreign policy; it is a means to an end but not an end in itself. The central purpose of foreign policy is to maximize the nation's security and well-being. If exerting "leadership" contributes to these ends, fine, but there will be many occasions when the smart strategy is to hold back and pass the buck to someone else. Blindly declaring that the United States must always go to enormous lengths to lead, and must constantly strive to reassure allies who need us far more than we need them, is mere jingoistic hubris. It's an applause line, but not a strategy.

CRITERION CRITIQUE: Human rights cannot be the sole criterion of foreign policy, we have to consider other factors

Dr. Uche Ofodile 2009. (Associate Professor, University of Arkansas School of Law. S.J.D., Harvard Law School; LL.M.. Harvard Law School; LL.M. (International Business Law), University College London. Fellow, Carnegie Council on Ethics and International Affairs) “Trade, Aid and Human Rights: China’s Africa Policy in Perspective” JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL COMMERCIAL LAW & TECHNOLOGY Vol. 4 Issue 2   
[www.jiclt.com/index.php/jiclt/article/download/73/72](http://www.jiclt.com/index.php/jiclt/article/download/73/72)

Indeed, when confronted with the issue of a U.S. human rights policy, Kissinger, at his confirmation as the Secretary of State, stated: “I believe it is dangerous for us to make the domestic policy of countries around the world a direct objective of U.S. foreign policy.” In a 1977 article, Kissinger argued that one of the basic challenges of foreign policy was “the perennial tension between morality and pragmatism.” Although admitting that human rights “must be an essential component” of U.S. foreign policy, he argued that to pursue it effectively, the U.S. “must take the measure of the dangers and dilemmas along the way.” Kissinger cautioned that because human rights advocacy is a powerful political weapon, the U.S. must be careful that in its application, all moral dividing lines are not eroded.

No universally agreed standards of human rights, and debate about them can even lead to conflict and war

Dr. Benjamin Rivlin & Peter J. Hoffman 2008. (Rivlin - PhD Harvard, international relations & government Director Emeritus of the Ralph Bunche Institute on United Nations and Professor Emeritus of Political Science, City University of New York Graduate School & University Center. Hoffman - Research Associate, Ralph Bunche Institute for International Studies, City Univ of New York) “The United Nations Human Rights Council (2008): A U.S. Foreign Policy Dilemma” 28 May 2008  
<http://www.ncafp.org/articles/08%20UN%20Human%20Rights%20COuncil.pdf>

The declaration, also referred to as the International Bill of Human Rights, affirmed the  
commitments of member states to respect a wide range of rights. However, in trying to specify and  
operationalize those norms, disputes appeared. Those divisions are exemplified by two international  
agreements: the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant  
on Social, Economic, and Cultural Rights. Accordingly, although there is one Universal Declaration,  
there are two covenants; that is, when rival frameworks could not be reconciled into one document,  
the deadlock was acknowledged by issuing separate agreements for different categories of rights. In  
short, during the cold war, human rights became a weapon. Instead of being based on the universal  
application of consensus-derived principles, human rights were used to embarrass or otherwise  
undermine political opponents. In addition to differences rooted in the ideological conflict of the cold war, an overarching fracture that fueled contestations over the meaning of human rights resurfaced in international politics in the 1990s in a slightly altered guise, the so-called clash of civilizations. This perspective argues that contrasts in  
cultural identities invariably lead to conflict and war. The divide between civil/political rights and  
social/economic/cultural rights became a prominent symptom of political dissension.

Just saying “human rights” doesn’t justify US intervention: There are thousands of human rights abuses happening today - you have to justify this particular intervention by showing how it affects the national interest and the world community.

Prof. Stephen Bronner 2011. (Professor of Political Science and Director of Civic Diplomacy and Human Rights at the Institute for World Challenges: Rutgers University) “On Judging American Foreign Policy: Human Rights, Political Realism, and the Arrogance of Power” LOGOS A Journal of Modern Society & Culture, <http://logosjournal.com/2011/summer_bronner/>

There are policymakers who never encountered a crisis for which American intervention wasn’t a remedy: Richard Barnett called them “white collar militarists.” But, then, hundreds of wars, thousands of human rights abuses are taking place as these words are being read. It is always legitimate to ask how egregious is *this* particular breach of human rights? Why is *this* particular nation the target? How does *this* crisis affect the national interest and the world community? One size does not fit all when it comes to foreign policy and the pursuit of human rights. This only makes the justification for any particular action in any particular instance more important.

Although she advocates increased attention to human rights in our foreign policy, Roberta Cohen in 2008 nevertheless admits that such concerns do not need to be “front & center” in every situation:

Roberta Cohen 2008. (MA with distinction from the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies; former Deputy Assistant Secretary for Human Rights at the State Department and Senior Adviser to the US Delegation to the U.N., is Senior Associate at the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University) INTEGRATING HUMAN RIGHTS IN US FOREIGN POLICY: THE HISTORY, THE CHALLENGES, AND THE CRITERIA FOR AN EFFECTIVE POLICY , Statement at the Foreigin Service Institute, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/speeches/2008/4/human%20rights%20cohen/04_human_rights_cohen.pdf>

This is not to suggest that human rights concerns must be front and center in every situation. There may be sound political and strategic reasons for placing human rights in a secondary position. In the case of China, for example, in 1979, normalizing relations with its government based on national security objectives like containing Soviet power and gaining influence in Asia understandably moved human rights concerns aside. Today, in the case of North Korea, reaching a nuclear agreement obviously has to take priority over introducing human rights concerns into the six-party talks. However, it is always important to distinguish between genuine strategic or political interests that may have to move human rights to the side, and shortsightedness, ignorance about the importance of including such concerns or simply not wanting to complicate cozy relationships with governments or warlords.

SOLVENCY

Roberta Cohen, who advocates increased attention to human rights in our foreign policy, in 2008 listed 10 criteria for application of human rights standards to be effective. Some of these criteria are listed below. The impact to these cards is that if the Affirmative claims “human rights” as an advantage, justification or criterion for their plan, they will fail to achieve it if their plan does not implement all of the policies and practices listed below. Just taking one small gesture toward human rights is not the same as actually achieving an effective human rights foreign policy.

1. Lack of Credibility

Link: Affirmative plan contains no mandates to correct these abuses that wreck our credibility (and if they did, we would argue they are extra-topical)

Impact: We can’t have an effective human rights policy without correcting our own abuses and getting international credibility

Roberta Cohen 2008. (MA with distinction from the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies; former Deputy Assistant Secretary for Human Rights at the State Department and Senior Adviser to the US Delegation to the U.N., is Senior Associate at the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University) INTEGRATING HUMAN RIGHTS IN US FOREIGN POLICY: THE HISTORY, THE CHALLENGES, AND THE CRITERIA FOR AN EFFECTIVE POLICY , Statement at the Foreigin Service Institute, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/speeches/2008/4/human%20rights%20cohen/04_human_rights_cohen.pdf>

What is necessary for an effective human rights policy? Here are ten suggested criteria. The first is credibility. A government cannot effectively promote human rights abroad if it is not observing them at home. If a government considers that habeas corpus and guarantees against torture are at variance with its national security, then it will not be able to urge other governments to respect these rights.

The U.S. has no international credibility on human rights because of our abusive practices

Prof. Manfred Nowak 2008. (Prof. Dr. Manfred Nowak, Professor for International Human Rights Protection, University of Vienna; United Nations Special Rapporteur on Torture) CIA- »EXTRAORDINARY RENDITION« FLIGHTS,TORTURE AND ACCOUNTABILITY –A EUROPEAN APPROACH; EDITED BY: EUROPEAN CENTER FOR CONSTITUTIONAL AND HUMAN RIGHTS E.V. (ECCHR), SECOND EDITION, [http://www.academia.edu/2092801/Pending\_Investigations\_and\_Court\_Cases\_with\_Denise\_Bentele\_und\_Georgios\_Sotiriadis\_](http://www.google.com/url?q=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.academia.edu%2F2092801%2FPending_Investigations_and_Court_Cases_with_Denise_Bentele_und_Georgios_Sotiriadis_&sa=D&sntz=1&usg=AFQjCNEPhjGRhodSrlh7BM3IEET_KOFOMQ" \t "_blank)

The United States and Europe, once at the forefront of human rights protection worldwide, have lost much of their credibility as global human rights defenders in the “War on Terror.” In addition, by compromising their principles of combating global terrorism within the boundaries of international human rights law and the rule of law, Western government have in fact played into the hands of terrorists who aim to reveal and criticize the hypocrisy of Western human rights policies.Furthermore, the systematic practice of rendition, torture and disappearance by the United States and its allies has provided an extremely negative example to other states with disastrous consequences. Time and again, I was confronted with one simple question by governments in all regions of the world that I visited in my function as UN Special Rapporteur on Torture: “Why do you criticize us for torture if even the United States of America is officially using this practice? Is torture not legitimate in our common fight against the evil of global terrorism?”

2. Realism - trying to do too much + Cooperation with other actors. Cohen’s 4th criterion for effective human rights policy is that if we try to do too much, we will simply have to step back later, and that we have to engage other actors besides the US government to be effective.

Roberta Cohen 2008. (MA with distinction from the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies; former Deputy Assistant Secretary for Human Rights at the State Department and Senior Adviser to the US Delegation to the U.N., is Senior Associate at the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University) INTEGRATING HUMAN RIGHTS IN US FOREIGN POLICY: THE HISTORY, THE CHALLENGES, AND THE CRITERIA FOR AN EFFECTIVE POLICY , Statement at the Foreigin Service Institute, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/speeches/2008/4/human%20rights%20cohen/04_human_rights_cohen.pdf>

Fourth, the policy must be realistic. It cannot overestimate US power to reform countries or democratize them or make them into miniature Americas. When policies become too strident or overblown, the Administration invariably has to retreat. Jimmy Carter had to step back after affirming in his inaugural address that the US commitment to human rights would be “absolute.” President Bush has had to backtrack on his overblown goal of bringing democracy to the Arab Middle East not to speak of his inaugural pledge to end tyranny in the entire world. A realistic policy will also not rely solely on American power and actions but encourage a broad range of actors to become involved -- other governments, in particular a coalition of democracies, multilateral and regional organizations, NGOs, and corporations.

3. Democracy doesn’t necessarily uphold human rights.

Roberta Cohen 2008. (MA with distinction from the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies; former Deputy Assistant Secretary for Human Rights at the State Department and Senior Adviser to the US Delegation to the U.N., is Senior Associate at the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University) INTEGRATING HUMAN RIGHTS IN US FOREIGN POLICY: THE HISTORY, THE CHALLENGES, AND THE CRITERIA FOR AN EFFECTIVE POLICY , Statement at the Foreigin Service Institute, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/speeches/2008/4/human%20rights%20cohen/04_human_rights_cohen.pdf>

Fifth, an effective human rights policy must seek to reconcile human rights and democracy goals. An exaggerated faith in elections can be misguided without simultaneous support for the institutions that make democracy work – an independent media, the rule of law, and a vibrant and involved civil society. President Bush’s insistence upon elections in the Palestinian territories led to the unexpected triumph of Hamas -- hardly a human rights victory. In Rwanda, the US provided democracy assistance prior to the genocide but failed to pay attention to human rights violations – the discriminatory actions being taken against the Tutsi minority.