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1. TOWER OF BABEL: THE CASE FOR ABOLISHING THE UN

**(Jonathan Edelblut researched most of the evidence in this case)**

In the Bible story of the Tower of Babel, all the people of the earth spoke one language, and decided to unite together on a big project to make a name for themselves. They began construction of a massive tower that would reach all the way up to the heavens. The project failed when God confused their languages and scattered them abroad into different groups. This story repeats itself today at the United Nations, where national governments trying to unite into a global project have instead lost what they shared in common, and the project has failed.  That’s why we’re here today affirming: that the United Nations should be significantly reformed or abolished.

OBSERVATION I: We’ll use the following DEFINITIONS

**United Nations** - “The United Nations is an international organization founded in 1945 after the Second World War by 51 countries committed to maintaining international peace and security, developing friendly relations among nations and promoting social progress, better living standards and human rights.” *(UN official website copyright 2012. “UN At A Glance,”* [*http://www.un.org/en/aboutun/index.shtml*](http://www.un.org/en/aboutun/index.shtml)*)*

**Abolish:** “Formally put an end to (a system, practice, or institution).”  (Oxford Dictionaries, Oxford University Press, 2012: http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/abolish) (JE)

OBSERVATION 2. INHERENCY, or the background and current status of the present system.  We see this in 2 key Facts.

FACT 1.  Unity Lost.  Like the Tower of Babel, the diversity of new members removed all clarity and unity from the UN

Ambassador Dore Gold, 2004. (Former Israeli Ambassador to the United Nations; Ph.D., B.A., and M.A. in Political Science from Columbia University; President of the Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs) “Tower of Babel: How the United Nations has Fueled Global Chaos” 9  Nov  2004 Inc.: <http://books.google.com/books?id=JdDoMm8qPUoC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false> (Accessed via Google Books) (JE)

“That would all change, however. In the biblical story of the Tower of Babel, the nations of the world initially spoke one language but lost their unity of purpose when this changed. In the case of the UN, member states all spoke the same political language at the beginning, but as new members flooded into the organization, they brought with them their own political languages—that is, completely different values and concepts of international morality. Soon UN member states were talking past one another. The clarity of 1945 was quickly lost. As early as 1946, Winston Churchill recognized that to be effective, the UN had to preserve its unity of purpose and its ability to act decisively.”

FACT 2.  Irrelevance.  Even Obama’s State Department admits the UN is not important, and is shifting focus to Non-Governmental Organizations, or “NGOs.”

Prof. Mark Mazower 2009.  ( Professor of History and World Order Studies at Columbia University) “No Enchanted Palace: The End of Empire and the Ideological Origins of the United Nations“ <http://press.princeton.edu/chapters/i8974.pdf>

But revealingly from our perspective, while designed to show American policymakers and  other readers why international institutions offer “real” benefits, such scholarship has little to say about the UN specifically. It simply does not regard it as a body of great importance. The political scientist recently appointed director of policy planning in the Obama administration State Department has suggested that transnational contacts across governments and NGOs — not the UN — constitute the real “new world order,” and she even looks forward to a “global rule of law without centralized global institutions.”

OBSERVATION 3.  We have a simple PLAN, to be carried out by UN member governments the day after an Affirmative ballot:

Mandate – Abolish the United Nations.

Agency and Enforcement will be through the United Nations member governments and ambassadors.  UN collectively owned property will be auctioned off and proceeds returned proportionally to member governments.

No funding will be necessary, and the Affirmative reserves the right to clarify this plan in future speeches.

OBSERVATION 4. The JUSTIFICATIONS, or reasons why you should vote for this Plan.

JUSTIFICATION 1.  Anti-Semitism.   Lack of moral clarity makes Anti-Semitism institutionalized at the UN

Dr. Salim Mansur  2009. (PhD in Political Science from Toronto Univ; Prof of political science at Univ of Western Ontario) “Shamelessness at the UN” TORONTO SUN  Sept 2009 <http://www.torontosun.com/comment/columnists/salim_mansur/2009/09/26/11128121-sun.html> (JE)

“Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu asked the assembled representatives of the UN member states in New York this week, "Have you no shame? No decency?" The answer is no. For in inviting once again holocaust-denier and Iran's President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad to address the General Assembly, the majority of member states confirmed how greatly anti-Semitism is now institutionalized at the UN. Only a few representatives led by Canadian delegates walked out on Ahmadinejad's speech and, thereby, "stood up for moral clarity" in Netanyahu's words. But finding moral clarity in the UN, as surely Netanyahu and his people know, would be as rare as stumbling upon a virgin in a brothel.”

JUSTIFICATION 2.  Undermining World Order.

Ambassador Dore Gold, 2004. (Former Israeli Ambassador to the United Nations; Ph.D., B.A., and M.A. in Political Science from Columbia University; President of the Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs) “Tower of Babel: How the United Nations has Fueled Global Chaos” 9  Nov  2004 Inc.: <http://books.google.com/books?id=JdDoMm8qPUoC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false> (Accessed via Google Books) (JE)

“Vicira de Mello was overoptimistic. Those perpetrating the new global chaos actually speak in the name of the UN’s norms. In the half century since the UN’s birth, the high standards and hopes that the UN set for itself have been systematically eroded. That erosion is at the heart of the global disorder we know today. The UN, supposedly the protector of international peace and security, has actually undermined the world order. As this book will demonstrate, to consider the UN the “source of international legitimacy” is absurd. Only by examining the UN’s record—not just its ideals, but its actual performance—can one understand how it has actually helped the world descend into such disorder. And understanding the source of today’s global crises is the only way to begin to remedy the situation. One thing is clear: the United Nations is not the answer. But before any alternatives can be considered, it is necessary to understand where this noble ideal went wrong.”

JUSTIFICATION 3.  Perverse Neutrality.   We see this in 3 sub-points. First...

Link:  The UN lacks the moral clarity to choose between good and evil, and remains neutral when it should not.

Ambassador Dore Gold, 2004. (Former Israeli Ambassador to the United Nations; Ph.D., B.A., and M.A. in Political Science from Columbia University; President of the Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs) “Tower of Babel: How the United Nations has Fueled Global Chaos” 9  Nov  2004 Inc.: <http://books.google.com/books?id=JdDoMm8qPUoC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false> (Accessed via Google Books) (JE)

“In the 1920s, Winston Churchill declared that he refused to remain impartial when it came to deciding between the firefighter and the fire. The UN has ostensibly adopted a different logic: it refuses to abandon impartiality. But a UN that perpetuates judgments based on moral equivalence only tilts world order in favor of the fire, and the politicization of the UN ends up placing it far too often squarely on the side of the fire.”

Next: The First Impact is that the UN turns a blind eye toward tragedies

Kelly Dawn Askin 2006.  (Senior Legal Officer of International Justice at the Open Society Justice Initiative; Fellow, Yale Law School and 2004-05 Fulbright New Century Scholar on the Global Empowerment of Women)““NEVER AGAIN” PROMISE BROKEN AGAIN. AGAIN. AND AGAIN.” Published by the Cardozo Law Review in 2006: <http://www.cardozolawreview.com/content/27-4/ASKIN.WEBSITE.pdf> (JE)

“In countries throughout the world—from Guatemala to Somalia, Bangladesh to Iraq, Argentina to Haiti—ruthless dictators and internal armed conflicts inflicted murder, mass rapes, sexual slavery, torture, forced disappearances, forced displacement, slave labor, and numerous other abuses on millions upon millions of innocent men, women, and children. With very few exceptions, these crimes were matched by resounding silence or an ineffective and inadequate response from the UN and the international community. The crimes were committed with impunity, as world leaders refused to intervene to prevent, halt, or punish the crimes, many of which were committed with the complicity or acquiescence of other countries, including their allies.”

Third: The Second Impact is that the UN undermines serious efforts against terrorism

Ambassador Dore Gold, 2004. (Former Israeli Ambassador to the United Nations; Ph.D., B.A., and M.A. in Political Science from Columbia University; President of the Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs) “Tower of Babel: How the United Nations has Fueled Global Chaos” 9  Nov  2004 Inc.: <http://books.google.com/books?id=JdDoMm8qPUoC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false> (Accessed via Google Books) (JE)

“For counterterrorism to succeed globally, moral clarity must be preserved. But the UN specializes in moral obfuscation. Thus Kofi Annan refused to condemn a Palestinian suicide bombing in the heart of Jerusalem on January 29, 2004, that killed eleven Israelis and wounded close to fifty. Instead he directed his press statement to both sides: “Once against I appeal, to Israelis and Palestinians alike, to rise above feelings of anger and vengeance, however natural, and to devote all their energies to negotiating a true and lasting peace.” Compare that “impartial” statement to the unequivocal response to the attacks from the U.S. secretary of state, Colin Powell: “Once again, terrorists have killed innocent people.” The U.S. government understood what the UN did not: that the only way to deal with the worst threats to international security is to confront them directly.”

JUSTIFICATION 4.  False Hope.  People in troubled areas who rely on the UN for protection end up dead.

Maggie Farley 2004.  (journalist) SEATTLE TIMES “U.N. peacekeeping failures chronicled in book”  <http://seattletimes.nwsource.com/html/nationworld/2002069794_unbook22.html> (brackets added;  SREBRENICA is pronounced “shreb-reh-NEET-sah)

But it's not the descriptions of sex that have dismayed U.N. officials. It is the trio's portrayal of the failures of peacekeeping and the betrayal of trust by an organization dedicated to saving lives. [UN staff worker Doctor Andrew] Thomson, who spent two years pulling bodies out of mass graves in Rwanda and the Bosnian town of Srebrenica — corpses of people who had sought safety with the United Nations — concludes: "If blue-helmeted U.N. peacekeepers show up in your town or village and offer to protect you, run. Or else get weapons. Your lives are worth so much less than theirs."

2. THE KIDS ARE ALL RIGHT: THE CASE FOR ABOLISHING U.N. FAMILY PLANNING (UNFPA)

Our topic today is a sensitive one that we’re going to deal with in a mature way and without getting into graphic details.  We’re here today to tell you about the United Nations’ misguided zeal for combatting the imaginary problem of overpopulation by promoting family planning methods of preventing the conception of children in poor countries worldwide.  At their best, these programs are useless.  If they actually do have effects, they’re harmful.  And at their worst extreme, they’re an abuse of human rights.  Those 3 key points:  Useless, harmful and abusive, are why my partner and I are affirming: That the United Nations should be significantly reformed or abolished.

We’re not going to ask you to judge the merits of large families or the moral values of limiting family size.  Our focus today is not about anyone’s personal beliefs in those areas, but about the role of the UN in trying to influence or even coerce those choices for poor people in Third World countries.  And while the subject of abortion is often connected with today’s topic, we’re not going to raise that issue nor expect the Negative team to debate it, so don’t worry.   With that, let’s look at...

OBSERVATION 1.  Our DEFINITIONS

**United Nations** - “political organization established 1945; headquarters in New York City in E *cen* Manhattan overlooking East River — see TURTLE BAY” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/united%20nations*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/united%20nations)*)*

**Significant:  “**2a**:** having or likely to have influence or effect **:** important <a significant piece of legislation>; also**:** of a noticeably or measurably large amount”  *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/significant*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/significant)*)*

**Reform:  “**1*a***:** to put or change into an improved form or condition *b***:** to amend or improve by change of form or removal of faults or abuses” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform)

**UNFPA -**  refers to the United Nations Population Fund, which used to be known as the United Nations Fund for Population Activities and still uses the old acronym.

OBSERVATION 2.  INHERENCY, or important FACTS about the conditions of the Status Quo.

FACT 1.  UNFPA’s goal.  UNFPA’s goal is reduced population growth through family planning in the developing world

UNFPA Executive Director Babatunde Osotimehin 2011.  “STATE OF WORLD POPULATION 2011”, published by UN Population Fund, <http://foweb.unfpa.org/SWP2011/reports/EN-SWOP2011-FINAL.pdf>

In many parts of the developing world, where population growth is outpacing economic growth, the need for reproductive health services, especially family planning, remains great.  The attainment of a stable population is a sine qua non for accelerated, planned economic growth and development.  Governments that are serious about eradicating poverty should also be serious about providing the services, supplies, information that women need to exercise their reproductive rights.

FACT 2.  UNFPA’s budget.  UNFPA’s budget is $292 million

United Nations UNFPA institutional budget for 2012-2013, published in February 2012.  “First regular session 2012. 1 to 3 February 2012, New York.  Item 5 of the provisional agenda.  UNFPA – Financial, budgetary and administrative matters.  UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND.  Institutional budget estimates for 2012-2013. <http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=3&ved=0CFsQFjAC&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.unfpa.org%2Fwebdav%2Fsite%2Fglobal%2Fshared%2Fexecutive-board%2F2012%2FFINAL%2520UN%2520VERSION%2520of%2520edited%2520UNFPA%2520institutional%2520budget%2C%25202012-2013%2C%2520single-spaced.doc&ei=ZRAmUIf1M8Go0AW8vYCoCg&usg=AFQjCNHNCr678NdwWvlDSfJbkRSM-_o6Ww&sig2=FhTdJHfcH8vxrtrwsLYosA>

The Executive Director, UNFPA, is pleased to submit the estimates for the institutional budget, 2012-2013, in the amount of $292.2 million (gross) and $245.0 million (net). The budget for development effectiveness, United Nations development coordination, management and special purpose cost categories is referred to as the institutional budget. The Executive Board, in decision 2010/32, approved the cost-classification categories, which form the basis for developing the 2012-2013 institutional budget estimates.

FACT 3.  UNFPA’s nonsense.  UNFPA makes hysterical and false claims about over-population

Dr. Nicholas Eberstadt 2009. (PhD in political economy & government, Harvard Univ. holds the Henry Wendt Chair in Political Economy at the American Enterprise Institute; has consulted for governmental and international organizations, the U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. State Department, USAID, and World Bank, and has testified before Congress)  “Curb the Population Myth” 1 Aug 2009 <http://www.policynetwork.net/environment/media/curb-population-myth>

'Continued rapid population growth poses a bigger threat to poverty reduction in most countries than HIV/AIDS,' the UNFPA said in an hysterical statement on World Population Day, last July. This is plain wrong: it is not human numbers that cause poverty, but bad economic policies, laws and institutions. The densely-populated Netherlands and Japan are prosperous but poor in resources, while much of impoverished Africa is thinly populated but rich in resources.

OBSERVATION 3.  UN member states should direct the UN to carry out the following PLAN:

1.  The UNFPA is abolished. Funding for UNFPA and all other UN family planning programs is cancelled.

2.  Any pure health-related non-family-planning programs formerly run by UNFPA are transferred to the World Health Organization (WHO) along with their funding.

3.  Enforcement through UN member governments through normal means

4.  Plan takes effect the day after an Affirmative ballot.

5.  Affirmative speeches may clarify the plan.

Now let’s turn to the 3 key issues that justify this plan:  UN family planning programs are Useless, Harmful and Abusive.  Let’s start with...

JUSTIFICATION 1.  Useless.  These programs are useless because even in poor countries, families can and do make their own decisions about family size, which means there’s no link between family planning programs and changes in birth rates.  Dr. Nicholas Eberstadt explains in 2009:

Dr. Nicholas Eberstadt 2009. (PhD in political economy & government, Harvard Univ. holds the Henry Wendt Chair in Political Economy at the American Enterprise Institute;  has consulted for governmental and international organizations, the U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. State Department, USAID, and World Bank, and has testified before Congress)  “Curb the Population Myth” 1 Aug 2009 <http://www.policynetwork.net/environment/media/curb-population-myth>

Health, literacy and voluntary contraception are meritorious objectives in their own right, irrespective of any influence on population growth. But it is misleading to claim they predictably reduce birth rates. Take literacy. The adult literacy rate in 2006 was about a third higher in Malawi than Morocco (54 percent vs. 40 percent), yet fertility levels in Malawi were double. Family planning campaigns are similarly unpredictable: in 1974 Mexico started a vigorous campaign to cut population growth and got fertility levels down by 56 percent but Brazil's fertility level fell by 54 percent with no campaign at all, in the same quarter century. These are not cherry-picked examples: there is simply no way of knowing in advance the impact of family-planning programmes on birth rates. It turns out that the single best international predictor of fertility levels is the number of children that women say they would like.

JUSTIFICATION 2.  Harmful.  Even if these programs really did reduce birth rates, that would be a bad thing, not a good thing.  We see this in 2 sub-points:

A.  Demographic Catastrophe.   We need to increase, not decrease, population growth to avoid worldwide catastrophe, and we need to repudiate the mindset of family planning

Dr. Brian Clowes 2011. (graduate of West Point, a former A-Team leader for the Army Special Forces;  PhD in Civil Engineering and Systems Science; Human Life  International's Director of Research and Training worldwide;  author of nine books, over 90 scholarly and popular articles; authored the report which helped sway legislators in the 2001 defunding of the UNFPA by the Bush administration) Exposing the Global Population Control Agenda, Fall 2011 <http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/clo/clo_12nssm-200.html>

From the very beginning, the concept of a "population explosion" was an ideologically motivated false alarm specifically designed to allow rich nations to pillage the resources of the poorer nations. The resulting push for population control in LDCs [Less Developed Countries] has borne absolutely no positive fruit in its decades of implementation. In fact, population control ideologies and programs make it even more difficult to respond to the impending grave crisis looming in the form of a disastrous worldwide "population implosion." It is time to begin urging families to have more children, not less, if we are to avoid a worldwide demographic catastrophe. The first step in such a massive change in policy is, of course, to change our vision and our values. In order to do this, we must repudiate old ways of thinking and outmoded ways of accomplishing our objectives.

B.  Economic impacts.   Poor countries - “Developing nations” - will never become rich if they reduce birth rates

Dr. Brian Clowes 2011. (graduate of West Point, a former A-Team leader for the Army Special Forces;  PhD in Civil Engineering and Systems Science; Human Life  International's Director of Research and Training worldwide;  author of nine books, over 90 scholarly and popular articles; authored the report which helped sway legislators in the 2001 defunding of the UNFPA by the Bush administration) Exposing the Global Population Control Agenda, Fall 2011 <http://www.lifeissues.net/writers/clo/clo_12nssm-200.html> (NSSM-200 was a US government strategy in the 1970s to promote reduced population growth in 3rd World countries)

NSSM-200 predicted that the population of the world would stabilize at about 10 to 13 billion, with some demographers predicting that the world population would balloon to as high as 22 billion people. Now we know that the population of the world will reach about eight billion, and then will begin to decline. The worldwide application of the strategies recommended in NSSM-200 has resulted in regional population growth rates decelerating so fast that they are already causing severe economic and social problems in Europe, the former Soviet Union, Japan, Singapore and Hong Kong. Many developing nations are now aging even more rapidly than the developed world, which foretells of even more severe problems for their relatively underdeveloped economies. The developed nations had the opportunity to become rich before they became old; if a nation becomes old first, it will never become rich.

JUSTIFICATION 3.  Abusive.  This links back to our Justification 1 about how the programs are useless.  If they’re useless, they deserve to be abolished.  But when they fail to work, governments are tempted to try to make them work by using coercion to force families to reduce their birth rates.  Such coercion is abusive to human rights and also justifies abolishing these programs.  We see this in 2 sub-points:

A.  When programs fail, coercion is the only recourse.

Dr. Nicholas Eberstadt 2007. (PhD in political economy & government, Harvard Univ. holds the Henry Wendt Chair in Political Economy at the American Enterprise Institute;  has consulted for governmental and international organizations, the U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. State Department, USAID, and World Bank, and has testified before Congress)   “Too Many People?”   July 2007   <http://www.aei.org/files/2007/07/11/20070712_Too_Many_People.pdf>

Whether they recognise it or not, every advocate of antinatal population programs must make a fateful choice. They must either opt for voluntarism, in which case their population targets will be meaningless. Or else they must opt for attempting to meet their population targets – in which case they must embrace coercive measures. There is no third way.

B.  The UNFPA promotes coercion and should be disbanded

Steven W. Mosher 2009. (completed all the requirements for his doctorate in Cultural Anthropology from Stanford University, which was denied him after the Chinese government complained about his research and publications. He holds two Masters Degrees from Stanford Univ in Cultural Anthropology and East Asian Studies, and Bachelors and Masters degrees in Biological Oceanography from the Univ of Washington) President's Page: Does the World Need A Global Population Control Agency?   PRI REVIEW Jan/Feb 2009 <http://www.pop.org/content/presidents-page-does-the-world-need-a-global-population-control-agency-919>

The idea of controlling human fertility "for the good of the state and its people," as Beijing is fond of saying, is a 20th century anachronism. It deserves to be as thoroughly discredited as Marxist-Leninism, and for the same reason: It is at heart a philosophy of state coercion. In its more extreme manifestations in China and elsewhere, it has given rise to terror campaigns. But even in its mildest guises, it encourages a technocratic paternalism that effectively subjugates individual and familial fertility desires to the wishes of the state. The U.S. should not only continue to avoid funding the U.N. Population Fund, it should withdraw entirely from the organization. The UNFPA, the creation of Rockefeller and his cronies, should simply be disbanded. Whatever legitimate health functions it performs can be transferred to the World Health Organization, UNICEF, or other international organizations.

3. OUR DAILY BREAD: THE CASE FOR A FOOD RESERVE PROGRAM

A generation ago the world was worried that we wouldn’t have enough food to feed today’s large global population. Those fears were wrong; there’s enough food today for everyone in the world. But yet millions still go hungry. It’s not because the food doesn’t exist - it’s because millions of the world’s poor simply can’t afford it when food prices unexpectedly spike. The UN can take action to reduce the tragedy of world hunger if we affirm: That the United Nations should be significantly reformed or abolished.

OBSERVATION 1. We will use the following DEFINITIONS

**United Nations** - “The United Nations is an international organization founded in 1945 after the Second World War by 51 countries committed to maintaining international peace and security, developing friendly relations among nations and promoting social progress, better living standards and human rights.” (UN official website copyright 2012. “UN At A Glance,” <http://www.un.org/en/aboutun/index.shtml>

**Significant: “**2a**:** having or likely to have influence or effect **:** important <a significant piece of legislation>; also**:** of a noticeably or measurably large amount” (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012. <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/significant>)

**Reform: “**1a**:** to put or change into an improved form or condition“ (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012. <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform>

World Food Program (WFP):

WFP official website 2012. <http://www.wfp.org/about/corporate-information>

WFP is governed by the WFP Executive Board, which consists of 36 Member States. The organization is headed by an Executive Director, who is appointed jointly by the UN Secretary General and the Director-General of FAO (UN Food and Agriculture Organization).

OBSERVATION 2. INHERENCY, or two key facts that describe the current policies of the Status Quo with regard to world food prices and food availability.

FACT 1. Current system inadequate. Price spikes and dangerous trends prove Status Quo global food system policies are deeply flawed

Timothy Wise & Sophia Murphy 2012. (Wise - Director of the Research and Policy Program at the Global Development and Environment Institute at Tufts University. Murphy - senior advisor to Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy’s Trade and Global Governance program) Resolving the Food Crisis: Assessing Global Policy Reforms Since 2007, Jan 2012, <http://www.ase.tufts.edu/gdae/Pubs/rp/ResolvingFoodCrisis.pdf?utm_source=SRFood+Newsletter&utm_campaign=e512da1b14-2012-0206_Taking_back_globalization_in_Davos&utm_medium=email>

The recent spikes in global food-prices in 2007-08 served as a wake-up call to the global community on the inadequacies of our global food system. Commodity prices doubled, the estimated number of hungry people topped one billion and food riots spread through the developing world. A second price spike in 2010-11, which is expected to drive the global food import bill for 2011 to an astonishing $1.3 trillion, only deepened the sense that the policies and principles guiding agricultural development and food security were deeply flawed. There is now widespread agreement that international agricultural prices will remain significantly higher than pre-crisis levels for at least the next decade, with many warning that demand will outstrip supply by 2050 unless concerted action is taken to address the underlying problems with our food system.

FACT 2. Reserves blocked. International food reserves could moderate price volatility and should be established, but they’re being blocked.

Timothy Wise & Sophia Murphy 2012. (Wise - Director of the Research and Policy Program at the Global Development and Environment Institute at Tufts University. Murphy - senior advisor to Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy’s Trade and Global Governance program) Resolving the Food Crisis: Assessing Global Policy Reforms Since 2007, Jan 2012, (brackets added) <http://www.ase.tufts.edu/gdae/Pubs/rp/ResolvingFoodCrisis.pdf?utm_source=SRFood+Newsletter&utm_campaign=e512da1b14-2012-0206_Taking_back_globalization_in_Davos&utm_medium=email>

IFPRI [International Food Policy Research Institute] has been clear in its calls for food reserves (von Braun and Torero 2009). The World Bank and the G-20 reject the use of reserves to moderate volatility. The G-20 will consider more limited humanitarian reserves, and they approved a pilot project under WFP auspices to experiment with a reserve for emergency food in West Africa. In October 2011, the CFS called for a review of the uses and effects of reserves. There is still little acknowledgement from the international system that many countries actively maintain food reserves, and some are cooperating in developing more substantial regional programs, such as the ASEAN+3 rice reserve. The international community needs to build on these efforts rather than constrain the use of reserves.

OBSERVATION 3. THE HARM. Volatility of global food prices is causing massive human suffering. We see this in 3 subpoints:

A. Food price sensitivity. Poor countries are far more sensitive to changes in food prices than rich countries, because they spend a higher percentage of their income on food. When food prices spike, they have no choice but to respond by eating less.

Benoit Daviron & the UN High Level Panel of Experts 2011. (lead author; team leader, High level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition (HLPE), Project Team, UN Committee on World Food Security. The other members of the project team were: Niama Nango Dembele, Sophia Murphy and Shahidur Rashid) “Price Volatility and Food Security” - A report by the High Level Panel of Experts On Food Security and Nutrition, July 2011 <http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/hlpe/hlpe_documents/HLPE-price-volatility-and-food-security-report-July-2011.pdf>

To illustrate, the budget share of food expenditure is about 70 percent in Tanzania and 45 percent in Pakistan against an average of 10 percent in the United States. This makes poorer countries much more responsive to changes in food prices than are wealthier ones (Regmi et al. 2001). Figure 4 presents price elasticity for cereals and vegetable oils calculated for 114 countries ranked in relation to their 1996 per capita GDP. It clearly shows the inverse relation that exists at the world level between income and food price elasticity. For the poorest countries, price elasticity for cereals and oil/fat demand is equal to -0.5. For the richest, it is almost zero. When prices rise, populations in poor countries eat less food.

B. Food price volatility hurts millions

Benoit Daviron & the UN High Level Panel of Experts 2011. (lead author; team leader, High level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition (HLPE), Project Team, UN Committee on World Food Security. The other members of the project team were: Niama Nango Dembele, Sophia Murphy and Shahidur Rashid) “Price Volatility and Food Security” - A report by the High Level Panel of Experts On Food Security and Nutrition, July 2011 <http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/hlpe/hlpe_documents/HLPE-price-volatility-and-food-security-report-July-2011.pdf>

Food price volatility over the last four years has hurt millions of people, undermining nutritional status and food security. The level of price volatility in commodity markets has also undermined the prospects of developing countries for economic growth and poverty reduction. After staying at historic lows for decades, food prices have become significantly higher and more volatile since 2007. A first price spike occurred across almost all commodities in 2007/2008. After a drop in 2009/10, prices are now climbing again and volatility remains high. Periods of high or low prices are not new. In fact, price variability is at the core of the very existence of markets. Since 2007, however, the degree of price volatility and the number of countries affected have been very high. This is why food price volatility in the context of higher food prices has generated considerable anxiety and caused real problems in many countries.

C. People starve. Food price volatility means people in poor countries starve

Dr. Homi Kharas 2011. (PhD Harvard; Senior Fellow and Deputy Director, Global Economy and Development, Development Assistance and Governance Initiative; former chief economist in the East Asia and Pacific Region of the World Bank) 3 Mar 2011 “Making Sense of Food Price Volatility” <http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2011/03/03-food-prices-kharas>

Politicians in developing countries care more about volatile food prices than those in developed countries because their citizens are more directly affected by the ups-and-downs of food prices. Just a few years ago, the main social issue in India was farmer suicides because of low agricultural prices. Today, it is the lack of affordability of food for the poor. In some sub-Saharan African countries, the poor might spend 70 percent of their income on food. If food prices double, these households literally become faced with the prospect of starvation.

OBSERVATION 4. The PLAN. UN member states will direct the UN to adopt the following plan through the agency of the UN World Food Program and supported by countries with large economies and major grain exporters. The PLAN has 3 mandates:

1. A decentralized 500,000 metric ton emergency grain reserve located in developing nations.

2. An international coordinated global grain reserve, maintained locally in grain exporting countries, under the management of the WFP, to be used for intervention in spot markets at times of price spikes.

3. A virtual reserve and intervention mechanism with an initial $20 billion fund, which will buy and sell grain contracts during times of market volatility to move grain prices opposite to market trends.

Funding through donations from UN member governments, percentages proportional to GDP.

Enforcement by UN member governments through normal means.

Plan takes effect 30 days after an Affirmative ballot.

All Affirmative speeches may clarify the plan as needed.

OBSERVATION 5. The Plan SOLVES for food volatility.

A. WFP grain reserves provide an emergency response

Dr. Joachim von Braun 2009. (PhD in agricultural economics from University of Göttingen, Germany; Director General of the International Food Policy Research Institute) Eliminating Drastic Food Price Spikes 11 Mar 2009 <http://www.ifpri.org/publication/eliminating-drastic-food-price-spikes>

The independent emergency reserve. A modest emergency reserve of around 300,000–500,000 metric tons of basic grains—about 5 percent of the current food aid flows of 6.7 million wheat-equivalent metric tons—would be supplied by the main grain-producing countries and funded by a group of countries participating in the scheme (The Club). This decentralized reserve would be located at strategic points near or in major developing-country regions, using existing national storage facilities. The reserve, to be used exclusively for emergency response and humanitarian assistance, would be managed by the World Food Programme (WFP). The WFP would have access to the grain at pre-crisis market prices to reduce the need for short-term ad hoc fundraising. To cover the cost of restoring the reserve to its initial level (that is, the difference between the post-crisis price and the pre-crisis price times the quantity of reserves used by WFP), an emergency fund should be created and its level maintained by the participating countries. The fund should be accompanied by a financing facility that the WFP could draw upon as needed to cope with potentially increased transport costs, as experienced in the 2008 crisis.

B. The 3 recommendations taken together will prevent food price spikes

Dr. Joachim von Braun 2009. (PhD in agricultural economics from University of Göttingen, Germany; Director General of the International Food Policy Research Institute) Eliminating Drastic Food Price Spikes 11 Mar 2009 <http://www.ifpri.org/publication/eliminating-drastic-food-price-spikes>

Price instability is a general feature of agricultural markets. The proposals made here are designed not to stabilize prices generally, but to prevent damaging price spikes and the collapse of confidence in the international grain market. The proposed actions will entail costs, but the modest costs of the required organizational elements must be balanced against the benefits of more effective international financial architecture. These benefits will include prevention of economic hardship, improved market efficiency, stronger incentives for long-term investment in agriculture, and prevention of political instability.  
The Proposed Global actions  
The three global collective actions we propose—a small, independent physical emergency reserve, a international coordinated global grain reserve and a virtual reserve and intervention mechanism backed up by a financial fund—would avoid the collapse of confidence in the international grain market, with many countries now trying to achieve grain self-sufficiency and rebuild their own public reserves while ensuring that the world can respond to emergency needs for food and prevent extreme price spikes.

4. NO GREATER CAUSE: THE CASE FOR REFORMING THE HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

In 2005, then-UN-Secretary General Kofi Annan urgently advocated reform of the UN Human Rights Commission, saying QUOTE: “We have reached a point at which the Commission’s declining credibility has cast a shadow on the reputation of the United Nations system as a whole, and where piecemeal reforms will not be enough,”# UNQUOTE.  The UN responded by creating a new UN Human Rights Council with, you guessed it, only piecemeal reforms.  Today my partner and I will show you how we can do a better job upholding human rights globally if we affirm: That the United Nations should be significantly reformed or abolished.

OBSERVATION 1.  We will use the following DEFINITIONS

**United Nations** - “The United Nations is an international organization founded in 1945 after the Second World War by 51 countries committed to maintaining international peace and security, developing friendly relations among nations and promoting social progress, better living standards and human rights.” (UN official website copyright 2012. “UN At A Glance,” <http://www.un.org/en/aboutun/index.shtml>

**Significant:  “**2a**:** having or likely to have influence or effect **:** important <a significant piece of legislation>; also**:** of a noticeably or measurably large amount”  (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012. <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/significant>)

**Reform:  “**1a**:** to put or change into an improved form or condition“ (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012. <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform>

**UNHRC, the United Nations Human Rights Council:**  “The Human Rights Council is an inter-governmental body within the United Nations system made up of 47 States responsible for the promotion and protection of all human rights around the globe.”  (UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights 2012. <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/HRC/Pages/HRCIndex.aspx>)

**OBSERVATION 2.  The UN Human Rights Council has critical FAILURES.**

FAILURE 1.  No membership criteria.   You’d think that a Human Rights Council would be made up of countries that actually respect human rights.   But you’d be wrong.   Former US State Department official Stewart Patrick said in 2012 QUOTE:

Stewart Patrick 2012.  (Senior Fellow and Director, Program on International Institutions and Global Governance at Council on Foreign Relations; former member of the US State Dept’s policy planning staff) The Human Rights Council: Give Credit Where Credit Is Due ,  1 June 2012 <http://blogs.cfr.org/patrick/2012/06/01/the-human-rights-council-give-credit-where-credit-is-due/>

To be sure, the HRC remains a flawed instrument for advancing human rights. Among the biggest limitations is its lack of clear membership criteria. Although the United States has kept some egregious human rights violators off of the Council–thwarting Iran’s 2010 bid, for example—persistent patterns of regional bloc voting make it too easy for rights violators, like Pakistan or China, to secure membership. As Nossel notes, raising the bar to HRC membership remains a pressing priority.

UNQUOTE.

FAILURE 2.  Endless Israel Bashing.  41% of the Council’s resolutions condemn Israel.  It’s hard to imagine how Israel could be responsible for 41% of the human rights violations in the world, but listen to former Canadian UN human rights representative Anne Bayefsky in 2012:

Anne Bayefsky 2012.  (B.A., M.A. and LL.B. from the University of Toronto and an M.Litt. from Oxford Univ.; served as the director of York's Centre for Refugee Studies, project director for the university's Human Rights Treaty Study;  served as a member of Canadian delegations to the UN Human Rights Commission, the UN General Assembly, and the Vienna World Conference on Human Rights)  26 June 2012 “A Hamas Victory at the UN Human Rights Council” <http://www.algemeiner.com/2012/06/26/a-hamas-victory-at-the-un-human-rights-council/>

The raft of anti-Israel informal meetings during Human Rights Council sessions which have been approved, and the nonstop Israel-bashing emanating from the Council itself, are not mere ships passing in the night. Forty-one percent of all the resolutions and decisions of the Council condemning a specific state have been directed at just one country among all 193 UN members, namely, Israel.

OBSERVATION 3.  We have a reform PLAN, to be implemented by UN member governments and the UN Security Council through any necessary legal means.

**Mandate 1.  Drop Israel Agenda.**  The Human Rights Council will be required to discontinue consideration of Israeli human rights violations until and unless a comprehensive peace settlement is reached between Israel and its neighbors.

**Mandate 2.  Membership Criteria.**   We establish 3 membership criteria:

1) Membership in the UNHRC will be decided by a two-thirds majority of the UN General Assembly members present and voting.

2) No country that is under UN Security Council sanctions for human rights issues shall be eligible for membership.  3) All countries submitting themselves as candidates for election to the Council will have an independent assessment of their human rights record from Freedom House submitted along with their request for membership.

**Mandate 3.  Reduced size.**The Council will be reduced from 47 members to 30.  Existing members will serve out their terms and future membership will be reduced proportionally based on existing geographical allocation quotas.

Enforcement and funding through UN member governments.

Funding for any activity not in compliance will be denied.

Plan takes effect January 1 of the year following an Affirmative ballot.

All Affirmative speeches may clarify the plan as needed.

OBSERVATION 4.  The Plan Achieves Comparative ADVANTAGES

ADVANTAGE 1.  Better hope for peace.  Ending the Israel bashing would improve efforts to resolve peace in the Middle East

David Matas 2009. (attorney; Senior Legal Counsel, B’nai Brith Canada)  Reforming the “Reformed” United Nations Human Rights Council, May 2009, Institute for International Affairs of B’nai Brith Canada, a Jewish human rights advocacy group, <http://www.bnaibrith.ca/files/11052009.pdf>

As I have indicated, the anti-Zionist invectives of the Human Rights Council make peace harder to achieve. The Security Council could easily and justifiably pass a resolution under its Charter authority over war and peace asking the Human Rights Council to defer all consideration of Israeli violation of human rights until there was a peace agreement between Israel and its neighbours. We should be asking the Security Council to do that. That sort of resolution would not only benefit efforts to achieve peace; it would confer an enormous benefit on the Human Rights Council, taking the anti-Zionist monkey off its back.

ADVANTAGE 2.  Better hope for human rights.  Ending Israel-bashing allows the Council to focus on real

abuse victims worldwide, offering hope for human rights reforms

David Matas 2009. (attorney; Senior Legal Counsel, B’nai Brith Canada)  Reforming the “Reformed” United Nations Human Rights Council, May 2009, Institute for International Affairs of B’nai Brith Canada, a Jewish human rights advocacy group, <http://www.bnaibrith.ca/files/11052009.pdf>

Expressions of concern about human rights violations, though they may not move the perpetrators to change their behaviour, surely move the victims to help them cope with their suffering. Crimes against humanity are crimes against us all. By showing solidarity with the victims, we acknowledge that we too are victims of these crimes. When the UN silences real victims and instead absorbs its time with Israel-bashing, we must say that this muzzling is wrong. By urging reform of the UN Human Rights Council, we join common cause with human rights victims everywhere. Providing examples of gross violations about which the UN has remained silent accomplishes the dual purpose of giving voice to the victims and presenting a powerful argument on the need for reform. Even should the reform effort go nowhere, the value of giving voice to the victims remains.

ADVANTAGE 3.   Membership Credibility.  Improving membership criteria makes the HRC more effective

A.  The Advocacy: We need two-thirds voting, Sanctions disqualification, independent assessments, and reduced membership to improve the composition of the Council.

Brett D. Schaefer 2009. (Jay Kingham Fellow in Inter­national Regulatory Affairs in the Margaret Thatcher Center for Freedom, a division of the Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for International Studies, at The Heritage Foundation; worked at the Pentagon as an assistant for international criminal court policy from March 2003 to March 2004; master's degree in international development from the School of International Service at American Univ)  2 Apr 2009 U.N. Human Rights Council Whitewash Argues Against U.S. Participation <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2009/04/un-human-rights-council-whitewash-argues-against-us-participation>

Improving the council's composition will require raising the threshold for election from a sim­ple majority to at least two-thirds of the General Assembly, barring governments under U.N. Secu­rity Council sanction for human rights abuses from council membership, and pressing for an independent assessment of candidate states' adherence to human rights. Independent assessments should replace the often sadly comical "pledges" that states submit to justify their candidacies in order for other nations to consider their "contribution...to the promotion and protection of human rights and their voluntary pledges and commitments made thereto" when voting for prospective members of the HRC. The annual Freedom House report, for example, could serve as one objective assessment. Increasing competition for seats by reducing the size of the council from 47 countries to a maximum of 30 countries would also help to improve the composition of the council.

B.  The Benefit: Effectiveness of the Council depends on its members upholding human rights

Amnesty International 2008.  (respected international non-governmental organization advocating for human rights around the world) “Pressure is on to elect strong and effective Human Rights Council” 30 Apr 2008  <http://www.amnesty.org/en/appeals-for-action/pressure-elect-strong-and-effective-human-rights-council>

All members of the United Nations have a duty to ensure that the Human Rights Council is a strong and effective body for the protection and promotion of all human rights in all countries. To achieve this, it is crucial that all states elected to the Council demonstrate commitment to the highest human rights standards.

C. The Impact:  Strengthening global protection of human rights.

Former UN Secretary General Kofi Annan 2011.  “Despite flaws, UN Human Rights Council can bring progress” 8 Dec 2011  CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, <http://theelders.org/article/despite-flaws-un-human-rights-council-can-bring-progress>

Human rights are at the core of the United Nations’ identity and enshrined in the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. People everywhere still look to the United Nations to uphold respect for universal and indivisible rights. If we let the UN Human Rights Council fail, which will surely happen if democratic states weaken their commitment and engagement with it, we leave the field free to tyrants to call the shots. That would be a betrayal of those who are, or might one day be, the target of oppression and violence. These people rely on the protection the UN might offer, however imperfect, and even more rely on those committed to human rights to work within the UN to strengthen that protection and make it truly universal. This is still a work in progress, but there is no greater cause.

5. YOU’RE NO HELP: THE CASE FOR ABOLISHING THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND (IMF)

The International Monetary Fund was established to help stabilize world currency trading in the aftermath of World War 2.  When that mission ended in 1971, instead of going out of existence, the IMF instead began loaning money to countries that couldn’t afford to pay it back, and dispensing advice that helped make their situations worse.  Bad advice and more debt are the last things we need in these perilous economic times, and that’s why we’re here today affirming: That the United Nations should be significantly reformed or abolished.

OBSERVATION 1.  We will use the following DEFINITIONS

**United Nations** - “The United Nations is an international organization founded in 1945 after the Second World War by 51 countries committed to maintaining international peace and security, developing friendly relations among nations and promoting social progress, better living standards and human rights.” *(UN official website copyright 2012. “UN At A Glance,”* [*http://www.un.org/en/aboutun/index.shtml*](http://www.un.org/en/aboutun/index.shtml)

**Significant:  “**2a**:** having or likely to have influence or effect **:** important <a significant piece of legislation>; also**:** of a noticeably or measurably large amount”  *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/significant*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/significant)*)*

**Reform:  “**1*a***:** to put or change into an improved form or condition*“ (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform)

International Monetary Fund or IMF:  First, its connection to the UN

International Monetary Fund 2005.  “Running the IMF”  IMF IN FOCUS,  1 Sept 2005 <http://www.imf.md/running%20imf.html>

Although the IMF is a specialized agency of the United Nations and participates in the Economic and Social Council of the UN, it operates independently and has its own charter, governing structure, rules, and finances.

Second, a description of what it does:

International Monetary Fund 2005.  “Running the IMF”  IMF IN FOCUS,  1 Sept 2005 <http://www.imf.md/running%20imf.html>

The IMF is a financial cooperative, in some ways like a credit union. On joining, each member country pays in a subscrip­tion, called its "quota." A country's quota is broadly deter­mined by its economic position relative to other members and takes into account the size of members' GDP, current ac­count transactions, and official reserves. Quotas determine members' capital subscriptions to the IMF and the limits on how much they can borrow. Quotas also help determine members' voting power. The combined capital subscriptions of the IMF's members form a pool of resources, which the IMF uses to provide tem­porary help to countries experiencing financial difficulties. These resources allow the IMF to provide balance of payments financing to support members implementing economic adjustment and reform programs.

OBSERVATION 2.  The CRITERION.  Today’s debate will center around one key issue: Does the IMF produce better results than free markets would otherwise produce?  At the end of this round, if you believe the IMF fails compared to free markets, you should vote Affirmative.  Patrick Welter explains in 2007 why this should be the voting criterion:

Patrick Welter 2007. (economics editor of the German daily, the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung. A graduate in economics;  has worked and conducted research at the Univ of Cologne, Germany, and George Mason Univ in Fairfax, Virginia) Less is more! Future prospects for the International Monetary Fund, <http://www.fnf.org.ph/downloadables/Less%20is%20More.pdf>

To justify the IMF’s existence, one needs convincing arguments to prove that it provides public goods and resolves problems that the market cannot. This is not an easy venture, as the IMF raises problems which, at least to some extent, make a desired public good seem like a public evil. There are arguments to suggest that the IMF is itself part of the problem that it seeks to resolve, explaining why a substantial number of critics of the Bretton Woods institutions call for its abolition.

OBSERVATION 3. FAILURES.  The IMF fails to promote better outcomes than free markets.

FAILURE 1.  No development.  IMF policies promote dictators and dependency, not development

Dr. Don Boudreaux 2011. (PhD economics, Auburn Univ. Prof of economics at George Mason Univ) 19 May 2011 “Abolish the IMF”  <http://cafehayek.com/2011/05/abolish-the-imf.html>

The IMF’s original purpose was to help cash-strapped governments maintain their currencies’ fixed exchange rates as directed by the 1944 Bretton Wood system. But that system gasped its dying breath in the summer of 1971, when – with Pres. Nixon’s closing of Uncle Sam’s gold window – all pretense of an international system of fixed exchange rates was abandoned. Undeterred by the total disappearance of its purpose, the IMF – flush with continuing streams of subsidies, especially from American taxpayers – morphed into a “development” agency. The quotation marks around “development” are no mistake. There’s no evidence that the IMF’s efforts as a development agency have had any positive effects, unless by “positive effects” you include creating among many poor countries a culture of dependency upon foreign “aid,” along with propping up authoritarian regimes.

FAILURE 2.  Unwise bailouts.  IMF bailouts remove incentives for caution among bankers by encouraging risky lending and bigger debt.  The best policy would be to simply let them default.

Doug Bandow 2011.  ( J.D., Stanford Univ; senior fellow at the Cato Institute, specializing in foreign policy and civil liberties;  worked as special assistant to President Reagan ) “Shut Down the Wasteful IMF” 27 June 2011 <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/shut-down-wasteful-imf>

The prospect of an IMF bailout leaves private lenders less reason to assess risks and exercise restraint. Columbia's Charles Calomiris argued that "instead of repaying the domestic oligarchs and the foreign banks, we should penalize them." Precedent matters. Observed economist Allan Meltzer, "Had it not been for the Mexican bailout, banks would have been much more cautious in Asia." The IMF helped create what George Shultz called a "bailout mentality." That appears to be what is happening in Greece. The Fund has been encouraging more lending and another, bigger bailout, to the consternation of Germany, which is picking up much of the European bill. Although the condition for more aid is supposed to be additional reform, the program is seen in Athens as a foreign imposition. Default and lack of access to international credit would be a more effective disciplining mechanism.

FAILURE 3.  Slowing needed reform.  Cheap IMF loans reduce incentives for good behavior because they allow countries to postpone needed reforms by covering their debts short-term with IMF money.

Doug Bandow 2011.  ( J.D., Stanford Univ; senior fellow at the Cato Institute, specializing in foreign policy and civil liberties;  worked as special assistant to President Reagan ) “Shut Down the Wasteful IMF” 27 June 2011 <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/shut-down-wasteful-imf>

There is an even more insidious problem with IMF lending. Many countries have moved unsteadily towards more market-oriented policies because they have suffered the consequences of disastrous economic failure. The day of reckoning finally came. Naturally, the IMF claims credit for today's reforms. But the organization likely has retarded the process. The Fund's financial assistance alone is unlikely to persuade governments otherwise lacking the will to reform. Loans can, however, undermine that commitment by reducing the financial pain caused by politically popular but economically harmful policies. Indeed, argued economist Roland Vaubel, "the prospect of cheap IMF lending is likely to generate a moral hazard by reducing the incentive to stay solvent. It would pay a potential borrower to pass the international means test." While governments rarely desire to wreck their economies, they do choose to take greater risks. In 1998 a report by the Joint Economic Committee noted: "Recent IMF lending and prospects for future lending not only reinforce existing risk-promoting incentives in emerging economies but also create incentives for additional risky lending by international financial institutions."

FAILURE 4.  Harms democracy and civil rights.  The IMF imposes conditions on its loans, and then governments have to enact those policies.  The results are bad, as we see from:

Dr. Elaine Byrne 2010.  (teaches Comparative Political Reform and has also taught Irish Politics as an adjunct lecturer at the Department of Political Science in Trinity College Dublin; PhD from the University of Limerick, Ireland)  11 May 2010 IRISH TIMES, “Global financial crisis undermining our democracy” <http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=FULL&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&expNewLead=id%3D%22expandedNewLead%22&fpSetup=0&brand=&_m=8afb92d29bb78fe5189e776cf6907041&searchType=&docnum=11&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=11&wchp=dGLzVzV-zSkAl&_md5=a4f3b9fad7f9cb86c9d9843d5e94b660&focBudTerms=&focBudSel=all>

Greek instability has warranted the unprecedented intervention by the International Monetary Fund to a member of the EU. A necessary evil of IMF intervention in domestic policy-making is the introduction of conditionality to every aspect of internal decision-making. The economic effects of conditional lending are now being felt on the streets of Greece. The political consequences of conditional lending, however, are not always immediately obvious. IMF policies have in the past been accused of being insensitive to their social impact. When the burden of structural readjustment falls disproportionately to those who depend on social and public services, the upshot is civil unrest. Like what is happening in Greece, governments feel that they have no other option but to limit civil liberties in the attempt to subdue social unrest that results from the stark structural adjustment prescribed by the IMF. The reality of IMF participation in a country’s domestic affairs is potentially the decline of democratic practices. The concept of democracy, which comes from ancient Greek words for people (demos) and rule (cracy), hence democracy rule by the people is categorically undermined when the policy straitjacket of conditionality is worn. The chance to participate in sovereign decision-making is made redundant.

OBSERVATION 4.  We have a PLAN, to be implemented by IMF member governments.

Mandate 1:  The IMF will be terminated, with its assets liquidated and returned to member countries proportional to their contributions and share of participation.

Mandate 2:  Minimal staff will be maintained to process incoming payments for any loans outstanding at the time of IMF termination.  When no further existing loans are outstanding, the IMF will go out of existence.

Enforcement through IMF member countries through denial of funding for any activities not in compliance.

Funding through liquidation of IMF assets.

Plan takes effect 30 days after an Affirmative ballot.

Affirmative speeches may clarify the plan as needed.

OBSERVATION 5.  The ADVANTAGES.  Markets are better than the IMF.

ADVANTAGE 1.  Incentives for better governance

Dr. Marian Tupy 2003.  (Ph.D. in international relations from the Univ of St. Andrews,  Great Britain.; policy analyst with the Center for Global Liberty and Prosperity specializing in the study of the political economy of Europe and sub-Saharan Africa) 22 Jan 2003, “Time to Reassess the Role of the IMF in the U.S. Foreign Policy” <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=2962>

At the root of the problem is the fact that far from being a capitalist tool, the IMF is not a market organization. It often serves as a benefactor to corrupt and inept regimes, which engage in gross macroeconomic mismanagement. Were it not for the IMF, economically incompetent governments would be forced to seek loans under normal free market conditions. Lenders would lend to governments at rates reflecting the risk involved. In other words, the more incompetent governments would be forced to borrow at higher interest and vice-versa. Higher interest rates would thus stimulate governmental circumspection in borrowing and expenditure.

ADVANTAGE 2.  Better path to reform and development

Ian Vasquez 2009. (director of the Cato Institute's Center for Global Liberty and Prosperity. He is a member of the Mont Pelerin Society and has been a term member of the Council on Foreign Relations; master’s degree from the School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins University)  Quoted in interview with Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, “Does Economic Downturn Mean New Role, Or No Role, For IMF? (brackets in original) <http://www.rferl.org/content/Does_Economic_Downturn_Mean_New_Role_Or_No_Role_For_IMF/1566497.html>

It has been increasingly clear that the IMF has been irrelevant in a globalized economy. And that is because it doesn't have enough resources -- nor will it ever have enough resources -- to do what it claims it would like to do.  Its approach to development and reform, which is a top-down approach, is contrary to the way that countries actually do develop, and its interventions create all sorts of counterproductive incentives, including the creation of moral hazard -- pushing individual actors and governments to behave more recklessly than they otherwise would on the notion that they'll always be rescued.  It is not the right policy to be rescuing countries like Argentina or Ukraine that have created messes of their own. The best way to deal with that [is] for countries to start addressing their own policy flaws and introducing reforms in their own countries. And this is not going to be resolved until they fix their own problems at home. And for that, you don't need the IMF.

6. COOL IT:  THE CASE FOR ABOLISHING THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE

The United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, also known as IPCC, is a scientific panel in name only.  Because of its habit of reaching its conclusions first and then trying to find or invent data that will fit, Australian climate researcher John McLean concluded in 2010 :  QUOTE "The IPCC has been a disgrace to science."# UNQUOTE  Today we'll show you why we should end this international disgrace as we affirm: That the United Nations should be significantly reformed or abolished.

OBSERVATION 1.  We will use the following DEFINITIONS

**United Nations** - “The United Nations is an international organization founded in 1945 after the Second World War by 51 countries committed to maintaining international peace and security, developing friendly relations among nations and promoting social progress, better living standards and human rights.” (UN official website copyright 2012. “UN At A Glance,” [*http://www.un.org/en/aboutun/index.shtml*](http://www.un.org/en/aboutun/index.shtml)

**Significant:  “**2a**:** having or likely to have influence or effect **:** important <a significant piece of legislation>; also**:** of a noticeably or measurably large amount”  (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012. [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/significant*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/significant))

**Reform:  “**1a**:** to put or change into an improved form or condition“ (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012. [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform)

**UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change** defines itself in

2012 SPECIAL REPORT OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE - MANAGING THE RISKS OF EXTREME EVENTS AND DISASTERS TO ADVANCE CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION, http://www.ipcc-wg2.gov/SREX/images/uploads/SREX-All\_FINAL.pdf) as QUOTE:

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is the leading international body for the assessment of climate change, including the physical science of climate; impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability; and mitigation of climate change. The IPCC was established by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) to provide the world with a comprehensive assessment of the current state of knowledge of climate change and its potential environmental and socioeconomic impacts.

OBSERVATION 2.  INHERENCY, a quick description of Status Quo policies.  One simple fact:  The IPCC promotes Greenhouse Gas controls as the international response to climate change.

Lee Lane 2011. (visiting scholar at Hudson Institute; former Co-Director of the Geoengineering Project at the American Enterprise Institute; former Executive Director of the Climate Policy Center, Vice President for Research at CSX Corporation ; selected by  NASA as lead author of a report on geoengineering as a tool of climate policy; has testified before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Science and Technology) 5 Apr 2011  “UN IPCC: Climate Change Analyst or Advocate?” REAL CLEAR SCIENCE <http://www.realclearscience.com/articles/2011/04/05/un_ipcc_climate_change_analyst_or_advocate_106235.html>

Much of the coming battle will rage around climate science; yet, the crux of the dispute actually lies elsewhere. It centers on the IPCC’s relentless campaign to push greenhouse gas (GHG) control as the main response to climate change. The part of the IPCC that handles economics and politics, the so-called Working Group 3 (WG-3) spearheads this campaign. Surprisingly this part of the IPCC has so far largely escaped controversy. WG-3 has insisted, with ever increasing dogmatism, that GHG controls, which must be global to be effective, will be both cheap and agreeable to all states. Thus, in its 2007 report, WG-3 writes warmly about the virtues of international agreements on climate. It goes on to catalogue many technologies that supposedly, were controls adopted by all states, might lower emissions at relatively modest cost. The problem is that the conditions needed for the world to adopt such measures, let alone for them to be cheap, simply do not exist.

OBSERVATION 3.  Our simple PLAN, to be implemented by UN member governments

1.  The UN IPCC is abolished.

2.  Plan takes effect the day after an Affirmative ballot.

3.  Enforcement through UN member governments through denial of funding to any activities not in compliance.

4.  Affirmative speeches may clarify as needed.

Now let’s look at the reasons for doing this Plan, or

OBSERVATION 4.  The JUSTIFICATIONS.

JUSTIFICATION 1.  Incompetence.  IPCC should be closed down because of its incompetence

Prof. Robert Carter 2009.  (Research Professor at James Cook University (Queensland) and the University of Adelaide (South Australia); marine geologist and environmental scientist with more than thirty years professional experience, and holds degrees from the University of Otago (New Zealand) and the University of Cambridge (England); former Director of Australia's Secretariat for the Ocean Drilling Program  )   8 Dec 2009 "Kill the IPCC"  THE DRUM, <http://www.abc.net.au/unleashed/27600.html>

The Climategate files have demonstrated the scientific malfeasance of an influential and internationally well networked segment of the climate research community. A small group of scientists and computer modellers - with the aid of an enormous supporting cast of environmental activists and organisations, self-interested business groups, and crusading journalists - have managed to turn the global warming issue (which in 1990 was an entirely sensible matter to have raised) into the scientific scam of the century, if not the biggest ever. Since the original leak in mid-November, which was not covered by the mainstream press, Climategate has surpassed 30 million hits on a Google search   The IPCC is the official UN body that has presided over this fiasco. It is an organisation that was specifically set up to provide advice to national governments (including Australia's) for their use in setting climate policy. The IPCC's incompetence is manifest in its failure to detect the corrupt science that has for so long permeated the activities of the international jetsetters of the climate science power group. The organisation should be closed down (without tears), and the Copenhagen COP-15 meeting would be a good place to start this process happening.

JUSTIFICATION 2.  Corruption.  IPCC’s scientific methods are so bad, and resistance to reform so entrenched, that the only solution is to abolish the Panel.

Dr. Vincent Gray, in an article last updated March 2008. ( Ph.D. in physical chemistry from Cambridge University; member of UN IPCC Expert Reviewers Panel)  SUPPORT FOR CALL FOR REVIEW OF UN IPCC <http://nzclimatescience.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=155&Itemid=1>

Over the years, as I have learned more about the data and procedures of the IPCC I have found increasing opposition by them to providing explanations, until I have been forced to the conclusion that for significant parts of the work of the IPCC, the data collection and scientific methods employed are unsound. Resistance to all efforts to try and discuss or rectify these problems has convinced me that normal scientific procedures are not only rejected by the IPCC, but that this practice is endemic, and was part of the organisation from the very beginning. I therefore consider that the IPCC is fundamentally corrupt. The only "reform" I could envisage, would be its abolition.

JUSTIFICATION 3.  Flawed policy influence.  If IPCC issued erroneous reports and nobody read them, it might not matter.  But erroneous IPCC recommendations have influence on public policy.  We see this in 2 sub-points:

A.  The Link:  US Court Decisions.  We offer as an example of IPCC influence the fact that its reports have influenced key environmental policy court decisions in the United States,  despite the fact that the science behind them was flawed or even fraudulent.

Kathleen Hartnett White 2012.  (director of the Armstrong Center for Energy and Environment at the Texas Public Policy Foundation; former chairman of the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality) 29 June 2012  Inglorious Mess: Federal Court Upholds EPA’s Greenhouse-Gas Authority <http://www.nationalreview.com/planet-gore/304425/inglorious-mess-federal-court-upholds-epa-s-greenhouse-gas-authority-kathleen-har>

The D.C. Circuit’s ruling relies heavily on the policy-laden, now-outdated high court decision *Massachusetts v. EPA,* from 2007. In that ruling, a 5–4 majority swallowed the scientific conclusion of the United Nations’ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) that man-made global warming is indeed occurring and presents a danger here and now. Noting supposed evidence of global warming all around them, the five-justice majority all but made the Endangerment Finding for the EPA. The D.C. Circuit had no alternative but to uphold the Supreme Court’s ruling unless it was willing to review the considerable weakness, bias, and conflicting evidence that have since clouded the original IPCC assessments on which EPA relied. Instead, the court expressed “extreme deference” to the EPA, also known as “give ’em a pass!” The court entirely glossed over the science driving the Endangerment Finding, which allowed it to reach the pathetically irrelevant conclusion: “EPA is not required to re-prove the existence of the atom every time it approaches a scientific question.” Two years after *Massachusetts v. EPA,* and in between the EPA’s proposed and final Endangerment Finding in late 2009, came the many disclosures known as Climategate, which unearthed significant error and fraud in the IPCC’s pivotal Fourth Assessment Report. Among the multiple revelations in the trove of leaked e-mails was that the lead authors hid data that would have undermined the report’s key claim of unprecedented, nonstop warming concurrent with the last century of fossil-fuel-driven industrialization. The responsible climate scientists later admitted that greater warming had occurred during a medieval warming period and that data gathered over the last two decades shows slightly *declining* rather than warming global mean temperatures. In other words, many of the IPCC’s key predictions have failed to occur.

B.  The Impact:  Severe economic damage.  As governments follow IPCC’s flawed science, they will implement flawed policies that will cause severe economic damage.

Dr. Vincent Gray, in an article last updated March 2008. ( Ph.D. in physical chemistry from Cambridge University; member of UN IPCC Expert Reviewers Panel)  SUPPORT FOR CALL FOR REVIEW OF UN IPCC <http://nzclimatescience.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=155&Itemid=1>

The disappearance of the IPCC in disgrace is not only desirable but inevitable. The reason is, that the world will slowly realise that the "predictions" emanating from the IPCC will not happen. The absence of any "global warming" for the past eight years is just the beginning. Sooner or later all of us will come to realise that this organisation, and the thinking behind it, is phony.  Unfortunately severe economic damage is likely to be done by its influence before that happens.

JUSTIFICATION 4.  Hidden Agenda.  IPCC has a dangerous hidden agenda. We see this in 2 sub-points:

A.  The Link:  Redistribution of Wealth.  The co-chairman of a key IPCC committee makes the stunning admission that his “climate policy” is not really about saving the environment, but instead it’s about international redistribution of wealth.

Dr. Ottmar Edenhofer 2010. (PhD economics; co-chairman of  Working Group 3 of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change; deputy director and chief economist at the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research) 14 Nov 2010    Interview originally in German with German news agency NZZ AM SONTAG at this site: <http://newsbusters.org/blogs/noel-sheppard/2010/11/18/un-ipcc-official-we-redistribute-worlds-wealth-climate-policy>.  English translation published by journalist Noel Sheppard in "UN IPCC Official Admits 'We Redistribute World's Wealth By Climate Policy' " on 18 Nov 2010 at <http://newsbusters.org/blogs/noel-sheppard/2010/11/18/un-ipcc-official-we-redistribute-worlds-wealth-climate-policy>

(EDENHOFER): First of all, developed countries have basically expropriated the atmosphere of the world community. But one must say clearly that we redistribute de facto the world’s wealth by climate policy. Obviously, the owners of coal and oil will not be enthusiastic about this. One has to free oneself from the illusion that international climate policy is environmental policy. This has almost nothing to do with the environmental policy anymore, with problems such as deforestation or the ozone hole.|

B.  The Impact:  Human rights.  Redistribution of wealth violates human rights.

Dr. José Azel 2012. (Ph.D. in International Affairs from Univ of Miami; Senior Scholar at the Institute for Cuban and Cuban-American Studies, Univ of Miami)  16 Apr 2012 “Taxes, the problem with redistrubution of wealth” MIAMI HERALD, <http://www.miamiherald.com/2012/04/16/2747072/taxes-the-problem-with-redistribution.html>

Imagine a person who works extra hours to earn cash in order to pursue happiness in some activity that requires cash (e.g., going to the theater). Imagine another person who elects to use the extra time on leisure activities that do not require cash (e.g., watching the sunset).  What is the difference between seizing the second person’s leisure and requiring some uncompensated social work, which would clearly be forced labor, and taking the first person’s income? Appropriating the results of someone’s labor is equivalent to seizing hours from that person. It gives others a fractional property right in the person, i.e., servitude. Redistribution can only be accomplished by violating individual rights and cannot be maintained without interference with our liberties.

7. TWO OLIVE BRANCHES: THE CASE FOR ADMITTING PALESTINE TO THE U.N.

In 1974, Palestine Liberation Organization Chairman Yasser Arafat gave a famous speech at the UN General Assembly wearing a gun holster.  He said QUOTE: "I have come bearing an olive branch and a freedom fighter's gun. Do not let the olive branch fall from my hand."# UNQUOTE.  Today the Palestinians have come to the UN with a different approach, as non-violent Palestinian democracy movement leader and Nobel prize nominee Dr. Mustafa Barghouthi  said in 2012 QUOTE:  “One time a Palestinian leader came to the United Nations with a gun and an olive branch. Today we are coming to the United Nations with two olive branches. Don't let us drop them.”# UNQUOTE.

The long Arab-Israeli conflict is probably too big for anyone to solve easily.  But there are reforms the UN can make here and now that will create comparative advantages over the Status Quo if we affirm: That the United Nations should be significantly reformed or abolished.

OBSERVATION 1.  We will use the following DEFINITIONS

**United Nations** - “The United Nations is an international organization founded in 1945 after the Second World War by 51 countries committed to maintaining international peace and security, developing friendly relations among nations and promoting social progress, better living standards and human rights.” (UN official website copyright 2012. “UN At A Glance,” <http://www.un.org/en/aboutun/index.shtml>

**Significant:  “**2a**:** having or likely to have influence or effect **:** important <a significant piece of legislation>; also**:** of a noticeably or measurably large amount”  (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012. <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/significant>)

**Reform:  “**1a**:** to put or change into an improved form or condition“ (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012. <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform>

OBSERVATION 2.  INHERENCY, some basic facts about Status Quo policies.

The situation is simple:  The Palestinians requested full membership in the UN, but they were denied.

BBC News 2012.  (British Broadcasting Corporation) 8 June 2012 “Palestinian President Abbas 'would accept' UN upgrade” <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-18372114>

Last September the Palestinian bid for full member status fell apart when the United States said it would veto it. Security Council backing is required for bids for full UN membership.

OBSERVATION 3.  We have a PLAN, to be implemented by UN member states through the Security Council and General Assembly:

1.  The Security Council reverses its rejection of full Palestinian UN membership.

2.  The General Assembly accepts Palestine as a full member of the UN.

3.   Funding through existing UN budgets, no increase needed.

4.  Enforcement through UN member governments, who will require their UN ambassadors to comply with the mandates.

5.  Plan takes effect the day after an Affirmative ballot.

6.  All Affirmative speeches may clarify the plan as needed.

OBSERVATION 4.  The Plan produces comparative ADVANTAGES over the Status Quo

ADVANTAGE 1.  Violence-reducing hope.  Admitting Palestine to the UN would give Palestinians hope and encourage non-violent solutions.

Dr. Mustafa Barghouthi 2012. (Secretary General of the Palestinian National Initiative, the president of The Palestinian Medical Relief Society, a member of the Palestinian Legislative Council, and a non-violence democracy leader based in Ramallah; nominee for Nobel peace prize)  Jan 2012, “Intelligence Squared U.S.” debate on the subject: “The U.N. should admit Palestine as a full member state”   <http://intelligencesquaredus.org/images/debates/past/transcripts/palestine.pdf>

My last point is that we know that admitting Palestine to the United Nations would not immediately create a change on the ground. We understand, but it will achieve three goals. First, it will give us hope. It will give Palestinians hope. Hope is what we need today to sustain a nonviolent approach to our resistance and struggle. Desperation and lack of hope as is advocated on the other side will only bring violence and dangerous things.

ADVANTAGE 2.   More tools against violence.   When violence does occur, we provide more ways for the international community to respond to it on both sides of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and we offer better hope for peace

Prof. Paul Parker 2012. (Chairperson and a Professor of Religious Studies at Elmhurst College) 17 Apr 2012  FOREIGN POLICY JOURNAL “U.N. Membership Would Unshackle Israel and Palestine”  <http://www.foreignpolicyjournal.com/2012/04/17/u-n-membership-would-unshackle-israel-and-palestine/>

When Palestine becomes a Member of the UN, Qassam rocket launches and drone missile attacks can be answered with the tools of international law, not retributive violence; home demolitions and land confiscation can be addressed in the international courts not the streets; cross-border kidnappings, shootings, and assassinations can be treated as criminal acts not terrorism or military exercises. And Palestine’s UN membership paves the way for both states to come to terms with the Arab Peace Initiative which promises to integrate Israel into its Arab ‘neighborhood’ which Israel has long described as hostile to its existence. Peace is possible.

ADVANTAGE 3.  We stop blocking democracy.  Palestinian democratic self-determination is blocked as long as we block UN membership.

Prof. Henry Siegman 2011. (President of the U.S./Middle East Project; non-resident research professor at the Sir Joseph Hotung Middle East Program, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London) 11 Aug 2011 Challenging the Insupportable Arguments Against Palestinian Statehood  <http://hrjpalestine.org/081111-news/>

We have put forward our democracy as a model for the rest of the world to follow. But in seeking to bludgeon Mahmoud Abbas into foregoing the United Nations and returning to predictably futile negotiations with Benjamin Netanyahu, the United States is placing its diplomatic leverage at the service of Israeli policies aimed at preventing Palestinian democratic self-determination. That is how the world will see it, no matter how this administration will try to rationalize its actions at the UN in September.

ADVANTAGE 4.  Uphold human rights.

Dr. Mustafa Barghouthi 2012. (Secretary General of the Palestinian National Initiative, the president of The Palestinian Medical Relief Society, a member of the Palestinian Legislative Council, and a non-violence democracy leader based in Ramallah; nominee for Nobel peace prize)  Jan 2012, “Intelligence Squared U.S.” debate on the subject: “The U.N. should admit Palestine as a full member state”   <http://intelligencesquaredus.org/images/debates/past/transcripts/palestine.pdf>

My third point is that, supposing our right to be admitted to the United Nations will be sending the right message, the message of respect to human rights, the message of respect to people's right for self-determination, the message of respect of the right of people to be sovereign. If we speak about the right of people in South Sudan and in Kosovo and in Libya and in Syria to be free and to have self-determination, then why not Palestine? And why continue to use the double standard, especially that admitting Palestine in the UN would be about correcting a historical mistake that was made. Since 1947 resolution the United States spoke about two states, Israel was established. Palestine was not.

ADVANTAGE 5.  Improved security for Israel.  Palestine’s UN status is key to Israel’s security

Prof. Paul Parker 2012. (Chairperson and a Professor of Religious Studies at Elmhurst College) 17 Apr 2012  FOREIGN POLICY JOURNAL “U.N. Membership Would Unshackle Israel and Palestine”  <http://www.foreignpolicyjournal.com/2012/04/17/u-n-membership-would-unshackle-israel-and-palestine/>

Palestine’s status in the UN is the key to Israel’s security and international support—and to Palestinian freedom, equal rights, and a just resolution of the refugees’ right of return. The UN is the world’s most inclusive institution devoted to peace. It is not perfect, but it is better than unending war. By hindering Palestine’s entrance to the UN, America has left Israelis and Palestinians with the limited options of capitulation to the other’s most recent demands or violence—and neither state is ready to capitulate.

ADVANTAGE 6. Better U.S.-Arab cooperation.

A.  The Link:  US opposition to Palestinian membership isolates us from the Arab world

Prof. Richard Falk 2012. (professor emeritus of international law at Princeton University; has been appointed to two United Nations positions on the Palestinian territories; currently Special Rapporteur for the United Nations Human Rights Council)  6 Jan 2012 UN Special Rapporteur, Richard Falk Talks About Palestine's Bid for Statehood (Part 1) HUFFINGTON POST  <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/kathleen-wells/un-special-rapporteur-ric_b_1187643.html>

So for the US and Israel to continue to call for direct negotiations is not only a prescription for a path of failure, it's also a way of allowing Israel to take advantage of delay to improve their relative claims on portions of the occupied territory -- what they call Creating Facts on the Ground. It's a very significant development in this way and if the United States in the end has to cast its veto to block membership by Palestine or even if it has to mobilize these nine states to abstain or withhold their votes, that too will isolate the United States even more in relation to the Arab world and more generally to the international community.

B.  The Impact:  America needs friends in the Arab world to promote peace and stability in the region

Prof. Richard Falk 2012. (professor emeritus of international law at Princeton University; has been appointed to two United Nations positions on the Palestinian territories; currently Special Rapporteur for the United Nations Human Rights Council)  6 Jan 2012 UN Special Rapporteur, Richard Falk Talks About Palestine's Bid for Statehood (Part 1) HUFFINGTON POST  <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/kathleen-wells/un-special-rapporteur-ric_b_1187643.html>

Well, I think an increasing number of informed observers of American foreign policy feel that it isn't in the interest of America and that we need to be friends with the Arab world in general. It's very important for energy, it's very important for nuclear non-proliferation, it's important for peace and stability in the region.

8. GO DIRECTLY TO JAIL: THE CASE FOR PEACEKEEPER ACCOUNTABILITY

Our topic today is a sensitive one that we’re going to deal with in a mature way and without getting into graphic details.  The details would shock and horrify you, but we trust you to understand the seriousness of sexual violence and exploitation without going into the details.  Let’s summarize it this way:  UN personnel are committing serious abuses.  Current legal structures aren’t dealing with it.  And we have a plan that will.  That’s why my partner and I are affirming: That the United Nations should be significantly reformed or abolished.

OBSERVATION 1.  We will use the following DEFINITIONS

**United Nations** - “political organization established 1945; headquarters in New York City in E *cen* Manhattan overlooking East River — see TURTLE BAY” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/united%20nations*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/united%20nations)*)*

**Significant:  “**2a**:** having or likely to have influence or effect **:** important <a significant piece of legislation>; also**:** of a noticeably or measurably large amount”  *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012. http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/significant)*

**Reform:  “**1*a***:** to put or change into an improved form or condition *b***:** to amend or improve by change of form or removal of faults or abuses” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform)

The International Criminal Court or ICC:

Osamu Shimizu and Yoshinobu Onuki 2009. (Shimizu - President of Research & Training Institute at Japan’s national Ministry of Justice.  Onuki - was President of Research &Training Institute at Japan’s national Ministry of Justice then promoted to Superintending Prosecutor of the Nagoya High Public Prosecutors Office while the paper was being written ) “White paper on crime 2009” <http://hakusyo1.moj.go.jp/en/58/nfm/n_58_2_2_6_1_8.html>

In 2003 the International Criminal Court was established in the Netherlands in accordance with the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court that came into effect in 2002 after being adopted at a diplomatic conference hosted by the U.N. The Court is a permanent international criminal court that can prosecute and punish anyone who has committed the crime of genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, and the crime of aggression (undefined) in accordance with international laws, and where investigation and prosecution is only implemented when the country with jurisdiction over the subject crime has no intention or ability to investigate and prosecute them.

OBSERVATION 2.  The GOAL:  UN Peacekeepers should be held accountable if they commit human rights abuses.  The UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations itself set this goal in 2008 when they said:

UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations 2008.  United Nations Secretariat, Peacekeeping Best Practices Section, UN Dept of Peacekeeping Operations, Division of Policy, Evaluation and Training, Jan 2008, “United Nations Peacekeeping Operations Principles and Guidelines” <http://pbpu.unlb.org/pbps/library/Capstone_Doctrine_ENG.pdf>

International human rights law is an integral part of the normative framework for United Nations peacekeeping operations. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which sets the cornerstone of international human rights standards, emphasizes that human rights and fundamental freedoms are universal and guaranteed to everybody. United Nations peacekeeping operations should be conducted in full respect of human rights and should seek to advance human rights through the implementation of their mandates (See Chapter 2). United Nations peacekeeping personnel – whether military, police or civilian – should act in accordance with international human rights law and understand how the implementation of their tasks intersects with human rights. Peacekeeping personnel should strive to ensure that they do not become perpetrators of human rights abuses. They must be able to recognize human rights violations or abuse, and be prepared to respond appropriately within the limits of their mandate and their competence. United Nations peacekeeping personnel should respect human rights in their dealings with colleagues and with local people, both in their public and in their private lives. Where they commit abuses, they should be held accountable.

OBSERVATION 3.  FAILURES.   Current policies fail to meet the goal.  We see this in 2 subpoints:

FAILURE 1.  Widespread abuse.  UN peacekeeper abuse is notorious.

Melanie O’Brien 2009. ( B.A./LL.B. (University of Newcastle, Australia), GDLP (University of Technology Sydney, Australia), LL.M.(Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law, University of Lund, Sweden), Doctoral Candidate at University of Nottingham, UK )  “ISSUES OF THE DRAFT CONVENTION ON THE CRIMINAL ACCOUNTABILITY OF UNITED NATIONS OFFICIALS AND EXPERTS ON MISSION”  <http://griffith.academia.edu/MelanieOBrien/Papers/850019/Issues_of_the_Draft_Convention_on_the_Criminal_Accountability_of_United_Nations_Officials_and_Experts_on_Mission>

Peacekeepers are traditionally seen as the bastions of the international community, protecting civilians during armed conflict or post-conflict situations. They are even accorded special status that renders attacks on peacekeepers a specific category of crime. However, in recent years, peace support operations (PSOs) have become notorious, owing to publicity surrounding a considerable number of instances of sexual exploitation and abuse committed by mission personnel. Accusations and reports have emerged about the commission of sexual exploitation by peacekeepers, both military and civilian, in missions in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Burundi, Côte d’Ivoire, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Haiti, East Timor and Cambodia.

FAILURE 2.  No accountability.   Current rules fail to hold abusive peacekeepers accountable

Prof. Elizabeth Defeis 2011. (Professor of Law and former Dean of Seton Hall University School of Law)  “THE UNITED NATIONS AND WOMEN—A CRITIQUE” WILLIAM & MARY JOURNAL OF WOMEN AND THE LAW, Volume 17 (ellipses in original)  <http://scholarship.law.wm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1312&context=wmjowl>

Under the Status of Forces Agreement negotiated between the U.N. and the troop contributing country (TCC), all such troops are subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the troop contributing state. This immunity cannot be waived by the Secretary-General since jurisdiction is exclusive to the TCC.  TCCs are united in their insistence that military personnel should not be subject to disciplinary action by the U.N. or by any other state, including the host state. Unfortunately, however, troop contributors have a poor record of holding their personnel accountable for such violations. Often the perpetrators are sent home with no further action taken by the home country, and it is impossible for victims to determine what, if any, disciplinary action has been taken.

OBSERVATION 4.  The HARMS, or the bad things that result from these failures.

HARM 1.  Justice denied.  UN peacekeeping offenders often go unpunished, leaving justice denied for victims

Renee A. Vezina 2012. (JD candidate, Ave Maria School of Law)  “COMBATING IMPUNITY IN HAITI: WHY THE ICC SHOULD PROSECUTE SEXUAL ABUSE BY UN PEACEKEEPERS,” Spring 2012, AVE MARIA INTERNATIONAL LAW JOURNAL <http://legacy.avemarialaw.edu/ILJ/assets/articles//vol1_num2/Vezina.pdf>

Furthermore, according to the Status-of-Forces Agreements, States have the duty of prosecuting their citizens for offenses committed while serving with the UN peacekeeping missions;  however, the accused offenders often go without punishment or diminished sentences and the penalties vary between the States.  Child victims continue to endure the effects of the abuse and lack the closure of justice being served because their abusers are not held accountable for their depraved acts.

HARM 2.  Shattered lives.  Abuse ruins victims’ lives.  Leaving out the worst graphic details, we quote from Dr. Carol Allais in 2011 as she comments in the context of an article about abuses committed by UN personnel:

Dr. Carol Allais 2011. (PhD Sociology, Univ of Port Elizabeth, S.Africa; professor and chairman of Department of Sociology at Univ of South Africa) SEXUAL EXPLOITATION AND ABUSE BY UN PEACEKEEPERS: THE PSYCHOSOCIAL CONTEXT OF BEHAVIOUR CHANGE  <http://www.ajol.info/index.php/smsajms/article/viewFile/70511/59115>

Sexual violence and abuse constitute atrocious violations of the human rights of the victims of the abuse. Regardless of the degree of overt physical force, there are severe physical and psychological consequences for the victims. Direct injuries include chronic pain, infection and infertility. Brutal rape can result in traumatic gynaecological fistula. Rape may also lead to abortion, which carries its own risk. The psychological implications are equally serious. Survivors often experience severe trauma and depression, sometimes leading to suicide.

HARM 3.  Weakened peacekeeping.  UN peacekeeping missions are jeopardized by the misconduct of their personnel

Dr. Carol Allais 2011. (PhD Sociology, Univ of Port Elizabeth, S.Africa; professor and chairman of Department of Sociology at Univ of South Africa) SEXUAL EXPLOITATION AND ABUSE BY UN PEACEKEEPERS: THE PSYCHOSOCIAL CONTEXT OF BEHAVIOUR CHANGE  <http://www.ajol.info/index.php/smsajms/article/viewFile/70511/59115>

The violation of codes of conduct may damage the impartiality of missions in the eyes of the local population, which, in turn, may impede the implementation of its mandate. The ill discipline engendered by SEA also degrades the effectiveness of the peacekeeping operation, especially in times of crisis. Instances of sexual exploitation and abuse may also constitute violations of international humanitarian law, international human rights law, or both. A peacekeeping operation cannot legitimately advise any government on adherence to international human rights standards and legal and judicial reform if its own peacekeeping personnel are engaging in acts of sexual exploitation and abuse, including such crimes as rape.  Sexual misconduct by peacekeeping personnel can also expose both themselves and the mission to blackmail and violent retaliation, especially during times of breakdown in law and order in the country.

OBSERVATION 5.  We have a PLAN, to be implemented by UN member states:

1.  UN peacekeeping mission members, both military and civilian, will be put under the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court for any cases of human rights abuses committed while serving on a UN mission.

2.  Funding through UN member governments through normal budgets and UN donation of funding to the ICC.

3.  Enforcement through UN member governments and the UN Secretary General through normal means.

4.  Plan takes effect the day after an Affirmative ballot.

5.  All Affirmative speeches may clarify the plan.

OBSERVATION 6.  SOLVENCY.  We see this in 2 subpoints.

A.  ICC jurisdiction prevents abuse and brings justice.

Renee A. Vezina 2012. (JD candidate, Ave Maria School of Law)  “COMBATING IMPUNITY IN HAITI: WHY THE ICC SHOULD PROSECUTE SEXUAL ABUSE BY UN PEACEKEEPERS,” Spring 2012, AVE MARIA INTERNATIONAL LAW JOURNAL (brackets added) <http://legacy.avemarialaw.edu/ILJ/assets/articles//vol1_num2/Vezina.pdf>

The SOFAs [Status Of Forces Agreements] provide that if a UN peacekeeper commits a crime in the host country, the CPIUN [Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations] applies and the offender is subject to the jurisdiction of their home country.  However, if the crime violates international human rights and UN Conventions, such as the CRC and the UNDHR, it is arguable that the offender should be subject to the same tribunals and punishment as other violators of human rights, and thus subject to the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court. In past cases where UN peacekeepers have been accused of sexual violence, very few cases have been resolved and only two peacekeepers have been imprisoned.  If the sexual violence against children is to be deterred and prevented, then the UN and the international community must show that such acts are not tolerated and ensure that justice prevails for the victim.

9. MORE EQUAL THAN OTHERS: THE CASE FOR SECURITY COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP & VETO REFORM

**by Robert Parks**

The United Nations started with the idea that world peace can be achieved by bringing the mightiest nations on earth to the same table.  At its birth in 1945, that meant only a handful of nations. The world has changed a great deal since then, but the UN has not.  Reforming the Security Council would create comparative advantages as we move closer to achieving  the UN’s lofty premise. That’s why my partner and I are affirming: That the United Nations should be significantly reformed or abolished.

OBSERVATION 1. We will use the following DEFINITIONS

**United Nations** - “political organization established 1945; headquarters in New York City in E *cen* Manhattan overlooking East River — see TURTLE BAY” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/united%20nations*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/united%20nations)*)*

**Significant: “**2a**:** having or likely to have influence or effect **:** important <a significant piece of legislation>; also**:** of a noticeably or measurably large amount” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/significant*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/significant)*)*

**Reform: “**1*a***:** to put or change into an improved form or condition *b***:** to amend or improve by change of form or removal of faults or abuses” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform)

OBSERVATION 2.   FAILURES.  The current structure of the Security Council is severely flawed.

FAILURE 1.  Veto Abuse.  Abuse of the veto by Permanent Members means the Council fails to deal with threats to peace and security.

Ambassador Richard Butler 2012. (Penn State University’s Distinguished Scholar of International Peace and Security; has held numerous senior Australian posts, including Deputy Representative at the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the OECD; Ambassador for Disarmament (Geneva); Australian Ambassador to Thailand and Cambodia; Australian Ambassador and Permanent Representative to the United Nations) Penn State Journal of Law & International Affairs, Apr 2012 Reform of the United Nations Security Council, <http://elibrary.law.psu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1001&context=jlia>

When one moves from the agenda to the track record of the Security Council in taking decisions, we are confronted with what has possibly been its greatest failure. The Council has had successes, but its record is more distinguished by its repeated failure to reach agreement on how to adequately deal with threats to peace and security. A principal reason for this has been the refusal of one or another of the Permanent Members to set aside their own interests.  Vetoing U.N. action against a state that is clearly in violation of international law and practice because that state is an ally should not be acceptable. This practice was never intended in San Francisco and it should not be acceptable in practical, political reality. Yet, this position has been accepted repeatedly. Using votes as favors is possibly the most significant instance of abuse of permanent privilege.

FAILURE 2.  Unrepresentative.  The Security Council is not representative of today’s world population.

C. Eduardo Vargas Toro 2008,  (project manager for refugee and conflict issues and political advocacy at Intersections International. Previously, he worked with the UN Office of Caritas Internationalis on a variety of refugee issues with UN Security Council member states and UN Economic and Social Council NGOs. He holds a MA from the John C. Whitehead School of Diplomacy and International Relations at Seton Hall University) “UN Security Council Reform:  Unrealistic Proposals and Viable Reform Options”  American Diplomacy, November 2008, <http://www.unc.edu/depts/diplomat/item/2008/1012/comm/vargas_un.html>

It is evident that the Security Council is not representative of today’s world. It lacks adequate representation of the developing nations that account for far more than half of the world’s population. This non-proportional representation of the non-P-5 member states in the Security Council gives them less ownership “in the maintenance of peace and international security” as stipulated in the Charter. Furthermore, the permanence and privileges in the Security Council of the countries that won World War II is no longer justified, for only the United States can still claim such great power status. In addition, the inability of the Security Council to act effectively in the face of violent situations such as Rwanda, Bosnia-Srebrenica, Somalia, and Sudan-Darfur makes it clear that reform needs to take place.

This leads to FAILURE 3.  Questionable Legitimacy.  The workability of the Security Council depends on it being perceived as legitimate worldwide, but that’s starting to fail as nations realize that it is unrepresentative.

Dr. Jean Krasno 2006. (PhD from  City University of New York Graduate Center;  Fellow in International Security Studies and Associate Research Scholar in Political  Science at Yale Univ) “Legitimacy, Representation, and Accountability: A Proposal for UN Security Council Reform“  YALE JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS,  Winter/Spring 2006 <http://yalejournal.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/061208krasno.pdf>

Once sidelined by Cold War rivalries, the United Nations now has the opportunity to meet the challenges of a complex world by bringing together the ideas and resources of its nearly universal membership to act in the name of peace and security. Yet the Security Council seems out of step, and its legitimacy is in question. In the General Assembly, each government is represented equally: one country, one vote. But the UN Charter created the Security Council as a much smaller body of eleven members that today includes ﬁfteen states, ﬁve permanent veto-bearing members, and ten states elected by the General Assembly for two-year terms. The Security Council was designed to be small enough to meet quickly in an emergency and decide on issues in a timely manner.  While General Assembly resolutions are considered recommendations, Security Council decisions are intended to be binding—a tough mandate when the UN has no enforcement capability of its own. Therefore, it is particularly important that the member states, which ultimately must enforce a Security Council mandate, believe that the council legitimately represents their interests. The UN ambassadors that make up the working group on Security Council reform have stated that the Security Council needs to be more representative, while several recent reports have made other suggestions for reforming the Security Council, including proposals to add additional seats and limit the veto power of the permanent members.

OBSERVATION 3. The PLAN.   We offer the following PLAN, to be implemented by UN member states

Mandates.

**1. New Permanent Members.**  The UN Security council will be expanded from 5 permanent members to 10 by adding Germany, Japan, India, Brazil, and South Africa.  All 10 will have veto power.  The non-permanent security council seats vacated by Germany, India and South Africa with be backfilled according to UN rules in the usual manner.

**2. Veto Reform.**   Henceforth  a Permanent Member veto of any Security Council measure will  require at least TWO permanent members supporting it to be effective.

Funding through UN member governments through normal budgets.

Enforcement through UN member governments through normal means.

Plan takes effect the day after an Affirmative ballot.

All Affirmative speeches may clarify the plan.

These reforms will improve the UN Security Council as we see in...

OBSERVATION 4.  FAILURES OVERCOME

SOLUTION  1. Our reforms make the Council more representative  and restore the power structure

Lionel Beehner 2012, (fellow at the Truman National Security Project, former senior writer at the Council on Foreign Relations, and PhD student in political science at Yale University), The World Policy Journal, “The UN's Fossilized Security Council”, June 6, 2012, <http://www.worldpolicy.org/blog/2012/06/06/uns-fossilized-security-council>

The Obama administration should back a simple and equitable plan to reform the Security Council: Add five more permanent members and supply them with veto powers—presumably Germany, Japan, India, Brazil, and South Africa—*but* require that a resolution can only be blocked by two vetoes rather than one. This plan, which Yale historian Paul Kennedy describes as “desperate but ingenious” in his recent book, *The Parliament of Man*, would make membership more representative of today’s global power structure rather than that of postwar 1945, while not making the voting procedures too unwieldy or cumbersome.

SOLUTION 2.  Veto reform restores legitimacy

C. Eduardo Vargas Toro 2008,  (project manager for refugee and conflict issues and political advocacy at Intersections International. Previously, he worked with the UN Office of Caritas Internationalis on a variety of refugee issues with UN Security Council member states and UN Economic and Social Council NGOs. He holds a MA from the John C. Whitehead School of Diplomacy and International Relations at Seton Hall University) “UN Security Council Reform:  Unrealistic Proposals and Viable Reform Options”  American Diplomacy, November 2008, <http://www.unc.edu/depts/diplomat/item/2008/1012/comm/vargas_un.html>

Another proposal is that no single P-5 member could veto a decision backed by others. This seems logical in that it would prevent unilateral action by a P-5 member against the will of the greater international community. Had this proposal been instituted in 1945, it would have prevented 195 unilateral vetoes used against the will of the remaining member states. The concept of having two P-5 members vote down a resolution creates a “greater legitimacy” in the Security Council, preventing the will of one country from trumping the rest.

OBSERVATION 5.  The ADVANTAGE  Better crisis resolution.  We see this in 2 sub-points

A.  The Link:   The Council becomes more effective at resolving big world problems

Brian Cox 2009 (Student Works Editor, S.C. JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW & BUSINESS) “United Nations Security Council Reform:Collected Proposals and Possible Consequences,” South Carolina Journal of International Law and Business, published by Univ. of S. Carolina School of Law, Vol. 6, Issue 1, Article 4 1-1-2009, <http://scholarcommons.sc.edu/scjilb/vol6/iss1/4>

No modem African state has achieved great power status, and difficult to support is that adding a developing state to the Council would contribute to the Council's core of protective power. However, many proposals argue that a more geographically representative Council would, by virtue of diversity, increase legitimacy, thereby making the Council more effective. "Effective" here can be interpreted to imply different problems. The reference could be to the  council's failure to effectively resolve situations like those in Rwanda, Bosnia, Somalia, Darfur and the Congo.  However, "effective" could also refer to the need to recapture the Council's image as a united body pursuing a *collective* security purpose. Including different viewpoints on the Council would undercut the world impression of the Council as a "self-appointed oligarchy” or a tool for the advancement of Western interests.

B.  The Impact:  Lives are at stake.  Lionel Beehner, who we quoted earlier as an advocate of our reforms, explains the urgency of these reforms in the same context in 2012.  He said QUOTE:

Lionel Beehner 2012, (fellow at the Truman National Security Project, former senior writer at the Council on Foreign Relations, and PhD student in political science at Yale Univ), The World Policy Journal, “The UN's Fossilized Security Council”, June 6, 2012 <http://www.worldpolicy.org/blog/2012/06/06/uns-fossilized-security-council>

The vote on Syria only underscores the need for change. In the past, the body was unable to intervene in Bosnia to avert the July 1995 Srebrenica massacre, and it was similarly impotent to prevent the genocide in Rwanda. If the Security Council cannot intervene to stop mass killings, then its entire raison d’etre is called into question. Unless the Council’s membership more fairly reflects the global realities of today without sacrificing its ability or willingness to act, it will lose its legitimacy—as issues of international import shift to other institutional forums and regional frameworks. In short, the Council risks becoming “neutered,” as Secretary of State Hillary Clinton aptly put it in February.

UNQUOTE.  With legitimacy and effectiveness improved for the UN Security Council, the world’s foremost force for peaceful coexistence could move into an unprecedented, brave new world of international diplomacy, with an Affirmative ballot in today’s debate.

10. JUST SAY NO:  THE CASE FOR ABOLISHING THE SECURITY COUNCIL VETO

When the UN was established, it created the Security Council to manage serious issues of war and peace and provide a mechanism for intervention to solve world crises.  At the time it seemed like a good idea to give each of the 5 major victorious World War 2 allies an absolute veto over Security Council decisions.    Today,  based on experience, we know better.  Please join us as we affirm: That the United Nations should be significantly reformed or abolished.

OBSERVATION 1. We will use the following DEFINITIONS

**United Nations** - “The United Nations is an international organization founded in 1945 after the Second World War by 51 countries committed to maintaining international peace and security, developing friendly relations among nations and promoting social progress, better living standards and human rights.” *(UN official website copyright 2012. “UN At A Glance,”* [*http://www.un.org/en/aboutun/index.shtml*](http://www.un.org/en/aboutun/index.shtml)

**Significant: “**2a**:** having or likely to have influence or effect **:** important <a significant piece of legislation>; also**:** of a noticeably or measurably large amount” *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/significant*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/significant)*)*

**Reform: “**1*a***:** to put or change into an improved form or condition*“ (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform)

Security Council:

Encyclopedia Britannica online, copyright 2012.  “United Nations Security Council”  (brackets in original) <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/532070/United-Nations-Security-Council>

United Nations Security Council, United Nations (UN) organ whose primary responsibility is the maintenance of international peace and security. The Security Council originally consisted of 11 members—five permanent members (the Republic of China [Taiwan], France, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States) and six nonpermanent members elected by the UN General Assembly for two-year terms. An amendment to the UN Charter in 1965 increased council membership to 15, including the original five permanent members and 10 nonpermanent members. Among the permanent members, the People’s Republic of China replaced the Republic of China in 1971, and the Russian Federation succeeded the Soviet Union in 1991. The nonpermanent members are generally chosen to achieve equitable representation among geographic regions, with five members coming from Africa or Asia, one from eastern Europe, two from Latin America, and two from western Europe or other areas. Five of the 10 nonpermanent members are elected each year by the General Assembly for two-year terms, and five retire each year.

OBSERVATION 2.  INHERENCY, or the conditions of the Status Quo.  One important FACT: Permanent members of the Security Council have a veto

Ambassador Richard Butler 2012. (Penn State University’s Distinguished Scholar of International Peace and Security; former Australian Deputy Representative at the International Atomic Energy Agency, Ambassador for Disarmament (Geneva); Australian Ambassador to Thailand and Cambodia; Australian Ambassador and Permanent Representative to the UN) PENN STATE JOURNAL OF LAW & INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS,, Apr 2012 Reform of the United Nations Security Council, <http://elibrary.law.psu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1001&context=jlia>

A crucial aspect of the privileged and responsible position assigned, in the Charter, to the Permanent Members of the Security Council, is the veto power. Each of them has the power to block any substantive decision of the Council.

OBSERVATION 3.  We have a PLAN, to be implemented by UN member states and the UN Security Council.

1.  The UN abolishes the veto power for permanent members of the Security Council.

2.  Plan takes effect the day after an Affirmative ballot.

3.  All Affirmative speeches may clarify the plan as needed.

OBSERVATION 4.  The JUSTIFICATIONS for why this plan should be adopted.

JUSTIFICATION 1.  Humanitarian crisis response.  Many UN member states advocate abolishing the veto because it blocks effective response to humanitarian crises like Rwanda and Darfur.

Jan Wouters & Tom Ruys 2005. (Wouters - Professor of International Law and the Law of International Organizations, Director of the Institute for International Law, Leuven University, Belgium.  Ruys - Research assistant, Institute of International Law, Leuven University) Security Council Reform: A New Veto for a New Century?  Aug 2005  <http://www.egmontinstitute.be/paperegm/ep9.pdf>

One of the traditional stumbling blocks has been the existence of the veto power of the Council’s permanent members, which enables any one of the so-called P-5 (France, the United Kingdom, the United States, China and Russia) to block any resolution that is not merely procedural in nature. The veto is considered fundamentally unjust by a majority of States and is thought to be the main reason why the Council failed to respond adequately to humanitarian crises such as in Rwanda (1994) and Darfur (2004). It is thus not surprising that most States wish to abolish or restrain the veto.

JUSTIFICATION 2.  Deterring genocide.  The Security Council would gain greater effectiveness in deterring future genocide

Ariela Blatter 2010. (Policy Director for Citizens for Global Solutions; worked at Amnesty International USA as the Senior Director for International Programs; international human rights lawyer ; served as a permanent representative to the UN on the establishment of the International Criminal Court, overseeing a team of NGO's lobbyists and policy staff; served on the U.S. Genocide Prevention Task Force; currently an adjunct faculty at American University’s School of International Service) The Responsibility Not To Veto: A Way Forward   (brackets added) <http://globalsolutions.org/files/public/documents/RN2V_White_Paper_CGS.pdf>

The Security Council is crucial and its response to genocide and mass atrocities must be made more effective. In the definition of the R2P principle set out in the World Summit outcome document and the UN Secretary-General’s report, *Implementing the Responsibility to Protect*, the Security Council is clearly *the* crucial body for implementing several aspects of the agenda, particularly in relation to pillars 2 and 3. The Council will not have legitimacy if it does not respond to cases of mass atrocities effectively. This is not a minor issue because the Council’s authority increasingly depends on its legitimacy within world politics.  As the ICISS Report correctly noted, if the P5 ‘fail to make the Council relevant to the critical issues of the day then they can only expect that the Council will diminish in significance, stature and authority.’  The prevention of genocide and mass atrocities remains one of ‘the critical issues of the day’ and that it will have a particularly acute impact upon the Council’s legitimacy.  An agreement by the P5 on RN2V [responsibility not to veto] will aid the Council and the issue. Moreover, if the P5 really were widely perceived to be serious about responding effectively to mass atrocities through the Council, this could, in turn, act as a deterrent for would-be perpetrators.

JUSTIFICATION 3.  Stop abuse.  Vetoes protect and enable human rights abusers

Jan Wouters & Tom Ruys 2005. (Wouters - Professor of International Law and the Law of International Organizations, Director of the Institute for International Law, Leuven University, Belgium.  Ruys - Research assistant, Institute of International Law, Leuven University) Security Council Reform: A New Veto for a New Century? <http://www.egmontinstitute.be/paperegm/ep9.pdf>

One of the main reasons why many States abhor the veto power is the fact that permanent members sometimes use the privilege to shield friendly States with whom they maintain close economic and diplomatic relations from condemnation or the imposition of economic sanctions. This sends out the manifestly wrong signal that States that stand close to one of the P-5 can get away with recurrent human rights violations and/or unlawful military incursions into neighbouring States. Regrettably, examples of this type are rife. In 1964 for example, Malaysia complained to the Council of aggression by Indonesia, as the latter country had dropped armed paratroopers on its territory.

JUSTIFICATION 4.   Legitimacy.  When the P5 use their veto to protect their friends from criticism, the Council loses legitimacy, reducing its effectiveness for solving world problems.

Lionel Beehner 2012.  (fellow at the Truman National Security Project, former senior writer at the Council on Foreign Relations; PhD candidate in political science at Yale Univ) “The UN's Fossilized Security Council” 6 June 2012 <http://www.worldpolicy.org/blog/2012/06/06/uns-fossilized-security-council>

Several foreign policy analysts complain that the Council has been hijacked by Great Powers politics to protect their client states. Russia’s refusal to sanction Syria, which enjoys strong ties and a lucrative arms trade with Moscow, provides a case in point. The United States has used its veto over 40 times to protect resolutions condemning Israeli actions. France has similarly blocked resolutions against Morocco for occupying parts of Western Sahara. According to Middle East Professor Stephen Zunes of the University of San Francisco, “The shameless protection by P5 countries of client states from international censure did not end with the Cold War.” Indeed, without meaningful reform, the body will be seen as neither legitimate nor effective in enforcing international law. Legitimacy is a subjective thing, of course, requiring actors to perceive of the council’s actions as holding legal and moral authority. The implication is that actors obey these rules less out of self-interest or fear of sanction—Security Council resolutions are often never enforced—than out of international norms and because they believe the institution to be the only legitimate and deliberative body representative of the international community. This is why so many of the world’s thorniest disputes of international justice end up at its doorstep. Imagine the legitimacy or legal authority the Supreme Court would wield if its justices were only property-owning white males. Yet, that is how much of the world eyes the permanent five members of the Council.

JUSTIFICATION 5.  Weapons of Mass Destruction.  We see this in 3 sub-points:

A. The Link:   Vetoes block action on enforcing Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) treaties

Ambassador Richard Butler 2012. (Penn State University’s Distinguished Scholar of International Peace and Security; has held numerous senior Australian posts, including Deputy Representative at the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the OECD; Ambassador for Disarmament (Geneva); Australian Ambassador to Thailand and Cambodia; Australian Ambassador and Permanent Representative to the United Nations) Penn State Journal of Law & International Affairs, Apr 2012 Reform of the United Nations Security Council, <http://elibrary.law.psu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1001&context=jlia>

Currently, there are questions of Iran and North Korea in the area of their nuclear programs. There have rarely been straight out vetoes, but vetoes have been threatened with respect to various proposals to remedy these situations. There is very great concern in the international community that the responsibility the Security Council holds for enforcing the weapons of mass destruction (WMD) treaties are incompatible with the idea that any of the Permanent Five could block such enforcement action.

B.  The Benefit:  The Security Council could play an important role in enforcing limits on nuclear proliferation

Prof. Ian Johnstone 2009. (Professor of International Law, Tufts University; Senior Visiting Fellow, Center on International Cooperation, New York University) July 10, 2009 “Non-proliferation enforcement: North Korea and the UN Security Council”  (brackets added)  [www.cic.nyu.edu/wmd/docs/archive/2009/johnstone\_n\_korea.pdf](http://www.cic.nyu.edu/wmd/docs/archive/2009/johnstone_n_korea.pdf)

Security Council action on North Korea is a good illustration of how the Security Council can move in the direction of authorizing coercive action, incrementally and not necessarily according to any design on the part of a particular SC member. As I noted in the introduction, it occurs piecemeal, in reaction to crises as they erupt and as a function of the political dynamics within the Security Council at a given moment. Arguably, China is now closer to accepting coercive interdiction of suspicious North Korean vessels than it was five years ago. The larger point is that effective diplomacy can be used to create precedents, build coalitions and push the Council in a direction that serves US interests, incrementally and over time. In the particular case of North Korea, high level diplomacy combined with arms and economic sanctions remain the best option by far, but diplomacy backed by the implicit threat of limited force – from the SC [Security Council] – may well pay dividends in the ongoing effort to contain NK [North Korea].

C. The Impact:   North Korean nuclear proliferation is an urgent threat

Council on Foreign Relations, Independent Task Force 2010.  (Charles L. Pritchard and John H. Tilelli Jr., Chairmen; Scott A. Snyder, Project Director;  CFR is an independent, nonpartisan membership organization, think tank, and publisher.  Pritchard - former aide to Pres. Bush in negotiations with N. Korea;  former US Representative to Korean Peninsula Energy Development Org. Tilelli - retired US Army 4-star general, former commander of US forces in Korea) “U.S. Policy Toward the Korean Peninsula”  June 2010 <http://iis-db.stanford.edu/pubs/22935/Korean_PeninsulaTFR64-1.pdf>

The urgency of the threat is undeniable. North Korea possesses nuclear-weapon and missile capabilities, has threatened its neighbors, and has been willing to sell nuclear materials and technology to the highest bidder. Its reclusive leadership is unpredictable, something yet again underscored by the unprovoked destruction of the Cheonan, a South Korean naval vessel, by a North Korean torpedo in late March 2010.

11. BE PREPARED: THE CASE FOR UNEPS U.N. EMERGENCY PEACE SERVICE (STANDING ARMY)

The sad fact of the human condition on planet Earth is that conflicts, violence and even genocide break out from time to time.  We don’t know in advance where or when it will happen, and no one can solve for every incident everywhere.  But being prepared for the inevitable is a better policy than being surprised by it.  And in those crisis situations, every day we wait to respond can make the difference between life and death for thousands of innocent people.  That’s why we come to you today affirming: That the United Nations should be significantly reformed or abolished.

OBSERVATION 1.  We will use the following DEFINITIONS

**United Nations** - “The United Nations is an international organization founded in 1945 after the Second World War by 51 countries committed to maintaining international peace and security, developing friendly relations among nations and promoting social progress, better living standards and human rights.” *(UN official website copyright 2012. “UN At A Glance,”* [*http://www.un.org/en/aboutun/index.shtml*](http://www.un.org/en/aboutun/index.shtml)

**Significant:  “**2a**:** having or likely to have influence or effect **:** important <a significant piece of legislation>; also**:** of a noticeably or measurably large amount”  *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/significant*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/significant)*)*

**Reform:  “**1*a***:** to put or change into an improved form or condition*“ (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform)

UNEPS - United Nations Emergency Peace Service

Dr. David Krieger, Prof. Saul Mendlovitz, William Pace 2006. (Krieger - J.D., PhD in political science; founder and president,  Nuclear Age Peace Foundation. Mendlovitz - emeritus Professor of Peace and World Order Studies, Rutgers Univ.  Pace - Executive Director of the World Federalist Movement-Institute for Global Policy)  “A UNITED NATIONS EMERGENCY PEACE SERVICE TO PREVENT GENOCIDE AND CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY”  <http://www.globalactionpw.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/uneps_publication.pdf>

Although these accomplishments and subsequent UN efforts to improve its rapid reaction capability have been important measures, they have not been sufficient. To stop genocide and crimes against humanity, the next logical and essential step is the creation of a United Nations Emergency Peace Service (UNEPS), a small, highly mobile standing United Nations rapid deployment capability that could be the first responder to potential cases of genocide and crimes against humanity.

OBSERVATION 2.  INHERENCY, or facts about the Status Quo.  We present 1 simple fact:  The UN has no standing army

Prof. Muna Ndulo 2011.  (Professor of Law, Cornell University Law School, and Director, Cornell University’s Institute for African Development)  “UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS AND SECURITY AND RECONSTRUCTION”   Cornell Law Faculty Publications. Paper 188. <http://scholarship.law.cornell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1187&context=facpub>

For example, in East Timor and Haiti, the United Nations allowed the Australian government and the United States government, respectively, to deploy troops before the UN deployed.  Such an approach is more time efficient, given that the United Nations does not have a standing army, and it therefore always takes a while before it can assemble and deploy a peacekeeping force. Notably, the speed at which deployment proceeds depends entirely on troop contributions from member states and the timely availability of resources to finance the mission.

OBSERVATION 3.  FAILURES.  The lack of a UN standing army creates failures that reduce the effectiveness of UN peacekeeping missions.  We see this in 3 subpoints:

A.  Deployment Delays

Kavitha Suthanthiraraj, Mariah Quinn & Juan Méndez 2009. ( Suthanthiraraj - Masters Degree in Development Studies (with a focus on Peace and Conflict Studies) from Univ of Sydney. Quinn - Research assistant with Global Action to Prevent War.  Mendez - Former U.N. Special Advisor on the Prevention of Genocide)  STANDING FOR CHANGE IN PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS,  May 2009 <http://www.globalactionpw.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/standing-for-change-final-may-09.pdf>

The delay between Security Council authorization and the actual deployment of troops and other peacekeeping capacities can seriously impede any mission’s ability to restore security and provide humanitarian protection and assistance. Respondents further observed that failing to establish a set timetable for peacekeeping operations and the tendency to extend mission mandates can cause discouragement on the ground and offers little incentive for parties to the conflict to broker a peace agreement.

B.  Troop recruitment and quality

Kavitha Suthanthiraraj, Mariah Quinn & Juan Méndez 2009. ( Suthanthiraraj - Masters Degree in Development Studies (with a focus on Peace and Conflict Studies) from Univ of Sydney. Quinn - Research assistant with Global Action to Prevent War.  Mendez - Former U.N. Special Advisor on the Prevention of Genocide)  STANDING FOR CHANGE IN PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS,  May 2009 <http://www.globalactionpw.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/standing-for-change-final-may-09.pdf>

The Department of Peacekeeping Operations must ensure that sufficient troops and equipment are committed to fulfill any mission mandate. In the current peacekeeping framework, these resources are contributed by Member States on a voluntary basis. This often proves problematic given that such commitment is uneven and is especially weak among the most powerful states. As a consequence of this arrangement, the capacity of DPKO is largely determined by the will of Troop Contributing Countries (TCCs) and those Member States, especially in the Security Council, that exert undue influence over the process. Further, this dependency on often reluctant Member States to contribute troops and supply machinery and logistical support impairs the timely deployment of peacekeepers. This process often undermines the overall efficacy of a mission: the ad hoc approach to deployment reflects a willingness to accept troops merely on the basis of availability, without giving due consideration to whether or not those troops possess the necessary training and skill sets to adequately manage an unfolding crisis.

C. The Impact:  Devastating human cost.  When forces arrive late or untrained, millions die

Sir Brian Urquhart 2006. (former Undersecretary-General of the UN; member of the British diplomatic team that helped establish the UN in 1945)  “A UNITED NATIONS EMERGENCY PEACE SERVICE TO PREVENT GENOCIDE AND CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY”  <http://www.globalactionpw.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/uneps_publication.pdf>

The failure to deploy forces in emergency situations can start a chain reaction of disaster, loss of life, and misery. However, late deployment of a mission with forces untrained for the tasks at hand can create an equally devastating humanitarian situation. In her recent, remarkable book, The Turbulent Decade, Sadako Ogata, the High Commissioner for Refugees in the 1990s, describes vividly what the absence of trained forces can mean for a large refugee population in whose camps there is no one to keep order or stop factional abuse. The post- Rwandan- genocide refugee crisis in the Great Lakes Region led to homicidal chaos that has so far cost over four million lives as well as many millions of dollars in relief aid and general economic loss.

OBSERVATION 4.  We offer the following PLAN to be implemented by UN member governments:

1.  Establish a 15,000 member UN Emergency Peace Service standing rapid reaction force, including any necessary training and equipment.

2.  Deployment of UNEPS will be authorized by vote of the UN Security Council.

3.  Funding from UN member governments donating 0.2% of national defense budgets.

4.  Plan takes effect 30 days after an Affirmative ballot.

5.  Enforcement through UN member governments through normal means.

6.  Affirmative speeches may clarify the plan as needed.

OBSERVATION 5. THE COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGES.

ADVANTAGE 1.  Failures corrected.  UNEPS corrects the issues of slow response time, recruitment and training

Dr. H. Peter Langille 2012. (directs global Common Security i3;  served on the working group of the Canadian study, Towards A Rapid Reaction Capability For The United Nations, (Ottawa: 1995), which was presented to the UN General Assembly;  supervised officers in the Canadian Forces College and taught in McMaster University’s Peace Studies program.)  “A UN emergency peace service?“ 14 May 2012 <http://www.opendemocracy.net/opensecurity/h-peter-langille/un-emergency-peace-service>

Governments, rather than relying on members of their own national services, could deploy UNEPS composed of dedicated individuals who volunteered to serve and work directly for the UN. People would be recruited globally to provide gender balance and universal representation. By drawing on the very best of professionals worldwide, the UN could screen, select and train participants to high common standards, ensuring higher sophistication and readiness for various assignments. The benefits of such a service have been understood for a long time. As Canada’s 1995 study on the subject noted, “UN volunteers offer the best prospect of a completely reliable, well-trained rapid reaction capability. Without the need to consult national authorities, the UN could cut responses times significantly, and volunteers could be deployed within hours of a Security Council decision“.

ADVANTAGE 2.  Lives saved.  UNEPS would save millions of lives and billions of dollars

Dr. Robert C. Johansen 2006. (PhD from Columbia Univ. Professor Emeritus of Political Science and Peace Studies, Notre Dame Univ.)   “A UNITED NATIONS EMERGENCY PEACE SERVICE TO PREVENT GENOCIDE AND CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY”  <http://www.globalactionpw.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/uneps_publication.pdf>

Despite the need at times to move quickly to prevent genocide, “ethnic cleansing,” and crimes against humanity, the United Nations has no reliable capacity to move promptly, even if halting a catastrophe could save hundreds of thousands of lives. Genocide in Rwanda illustrates this incapacity, as do the massive killings of innocent people in Cambodia, the former Yugoslavia, East Timor, Sierra Leone, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Liberia, the Sudan, and elsewhere. The time has come to create a permanent UN Emergency Peace Service to ensure that the next preventable humanitarian disaster will not occur. If such a service had been established earlier, it could have prevented many of the atrocities that have killed millions of civilians, wounded millions more, forced tens of millions from their homes, destroyed entire economies, and wasted hundreds of billions of dollars.

ADVANTAGE 3.  Deterrence and cost savings.

Dr. H. Peter Langille 2012. (directs global Common Security i3;  served on the working group of the Canadian study, Towards A Rapid Reaction Capability For The United Nations, (Ottawa: 1995), which was presented to the UN General Assembly;  supervised officers in the Canadian Forces College and taught in McMaster University’s Peace Studies program.)  “A UN emergency peace service?“ 14 May 2012 <http://www.opendemocracy.net/opensecurity/h-peter-langille/un-emergency-peace-service>

Of course, UNEPS would incur costs, as well as benefits. As proposed, it entails a start-up cost of approximately $2 billion and annual recurring costs of about $1 billion, to be shared by 192 member states. That’s clearly an enormous amount of money, which demands serious justification and context. However, this year, the UN Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations heard that the 15 largest countries had spent $1.6 trillion on armaments in 2010, while total expenditure on peacekeeping operations from 1948 to 2010 amounted to $69 billion. By contrast,UNEPS would require a relatively small investment. Given UNEPS’ potential to prevent and deter, it should help to reduce the number of operations required. With the potential to respond rapidly and reliably, it might also stem the need for later, larger and more expensive operations. In return, the cost savings should be substantive.

12. DON’T HAVE TO LIVE LIKE A REFUGEE:  THE CASE FOR ENDING UNRWA

Imagine 60 years from now in the future.  A government agency that was set up to temporarily assist resettlement of citizens displaced by Hurricane Katrina is still in business.  They issue a press release in which they announce how proud they are that the number of refugees they are serving has grown dramatically over the decades and how they look forward to many more years of growth! That’s crazy, but it’s Status Quo UN policy in the Middle East, and that’s why you need to join us as we affirm: That the United Nations should be significantly reformed or abolished.

OBSERVATION 1.  We will use the following DEFINITIONS

**United Nations** - “political organization established 1945; headquarters in New York City in E cen Manhattan overlooking East River — see TURTLE BAY” (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012. [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/united%20nations*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/united%20nations)*)*

**Significant:  “**2a**:** having or likely to have influence or effect **:** important <a significant piece of legislation>; also**:** of a noticeably or measurably large amount”  (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012. <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/significant>)

**Reform:  “**1a**:** to put or change into an improved form or condition b**:** to amend or improve by change of form or removal of faults or abuses” (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012. <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform>

**U-N-R-W-A:**The “United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees.”  For easier speaking in this debate round, we’ll be pronouncing it as “Un-raw.”

OBSERVATION 2.  INHERENCY, or facts that describe the Status Quo.  Australian Parliament representative Michael Danby gives a brief summary of the Status Quo in 2012:

Michael Danby 2012. (member of Australian Parliament) UNRWA Funding: Money well spent? May 2012 (the “US” in the dollar figure at the end refers to the measure of currency as United States dollars. It does not reference how much the US government is contributing, but rather is the total UNRWA budget) <http://www.danbymp.com/published-articles/1743-unrwa-funding-money-well-spent.html>

UNRWA was established to help the refugees who fled Israel as a result of the 1948 Arab-Israeli war, in which Arab countries attacked the newly declared Jewish State. The UNHCR services the rest of the world’s refugees but the structural and operational differences between the two UN organisations are stark. The UNHCR has a staff of some 7,600 people working in more than 125 countries to assist over 33 million.  Its budget for 2012 is US$3.59 billion.  UNRWA, on the other hand, provides assistance to only five million persons registered as Palestinian refugees in the areas of Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, Gaza, and the West Bank (including East Jerusalem).  It nevertheless employs over 29,000 staff, and its 2011 budget was US$1.23 billion.

OBSERVATION 3.  HARMS.   While the goal of UNRWA should have been to resettle and reintegrate displaced Palestinians as quickly as possible, their continued maintenance as refugees over 60 years later is causing big problems.  We see this in 3 HARMS:

HARM 1.  Blocking Peace.   UNRWA is the principal obstacle to peace in the Middle East.

Michael Bernstam 2011.  (a research fellow at the Hoover Institution, Stanford University; former visiting professor of economics at Monash University, Australia; former adjunct professor in Stanford University's Overseas Studies Program; former economic adviser to the Russian Parliament and the Central Bank of Russia) 7 Jan 2011 UNRWA: Five Letters That Spell Middle Eastern Misery, <http://www.cija.ca/middle-east/unrwa-five-letters-that-spell-middle-eastern-misery/>

Though pundits and foreign-policy experts focus on the question of settlements or the current temperature of negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians, UNRWA’s institutionalization of refugee-cum-military camps is, in my view, the principal obstacle to peace in the Middle East. The chances of achieving peace and security in the Middle East will continue to be remote as long as UNRWA is, in effect, underwriting a self-destructive Palestinian cycle of violence, internecine bloodshed and a perpetual war against Israel.

HARM 2.  Blocking economic development.  UNRWA blocks Palestinians from achieving self-reliance, economic development and productivity.

Prof. Nitza Nachmias 2009. (Senior Research Fellow at The Jewish-Arab Center, University of Haifa and a Visiting Professor at the Department of Political Science, Towson University, Maryland. 12 Oct 2009 “UNRWA at 60: Are There Better Alternatives?“ <http://www.meforum.org/2481/unrwa-at-60-better-alternatives> (brackets added)

We argue that UNRWA's inflated bureaucracy and the unrestrained scope of its non-emergency services hinder rather than induce Palestinian self-reliance. UNRWA's operations have been particularly damaging to the fledgling PA [Palestinian Authority] that has to accept the existence of a competing United Nations governing authority within its boundaries . The World Bank recently reported that the PA [Palestinian Authority] is "developing strategies that encourage productivity and growth in the industrial, agricultural, housing, and tourism sectors and allow the Palestinian economy to develop a diversified export portfolio" UNRWA's operations have the reverse effect of nurturing and advancing dependence.

HARM 3.  Promoting Terrorism.  UNRWA is funding Hamas, a terrorist movement whose goal is eliminating Israel

Rhonda Spivak  2012. (journalist, quoting retired Lieutenant Colonel, Israeli military; senior researcher of the Middle East and radical Islam at the Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs; former advisor to the Policy Planning Division of the Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs)  Expert Briefs Canadian Parliamentarians: In Gaza, UNWRA and Hamas are Bedfellows, 2 Apr 2012, <http://www.winnipegjewishreview.com/article_detail.cfm?id=2324&sec=2>

In an interview following the event, Jonathan D. Halevi, a Senior researcher of the Middle East and radical Islam at the Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs headed by former Israeli Ambassador to the UN, Dr. Dore Gold, said that "UNWRA in Gaza is just a tool in the hands of Hamas." He added that "Money provided by Western countries to UNWRA in Gaza is being used to fund a Hamas agenda- one of terrorism with the goal of eliminating Israel."

OBSERVATION 4.  We have a PLAN, to be implemented by UN member states through their representatives at UN headquarters.

1.  UNRWA structure and organization is phased out over the next 5 years.  UNRWA schools, medical facilities, financial institutions and social services in the Palestinian territories are transferred to the Palestinian Authority.

2.  UNRWA funding is given as subsidies to nations accepting integration of existing Palestinian refugees, including the Palestinian Authority.

3.  Reintegration subsidies are phased out as existing refugees’ lifetimes end, and no subsidies will attach to any new descendants.

4.  Plan takes effect 30 days after an Affirmative ballot.

5.  Funding through existing UNRWA budget.

6.  Enforcement through UN member states through normal means and withholding of funding for any activities not in compliance with the Plan.

7.  Affirmative speeches may clarify the plan as needed.

OBSERVATION 5.  The plan SOLVES for reintegrating and resettling Palestinian refugees.

Michael Bernstam 2011.  (a research fellow at the Hoover Institution, Stanford University; former visiting professor of economics at Monash University, Australia; former adjunct professor in Stanford University's Overseas Studies Program; former economic adviser to the Russian Parliament and the Central Bank of Russia) 7 Jan 2011 UNRWA: Five Letters That Spell Middle Eastern Misery, <http://www.cija.ca/middle-east/unrwa-five-letters-that-spell-middle-eastern-misery/>

Another option is for UNRWA funding to be converted into international subsidies earmarked exclusively for resettlement, integration and naturalization. The funds could be applied in the countries of current residence (reimbursing, too, those countries’ expenses), in Palestinian jurisdictions, or in whatever country would admit refugees on an individual basis. Israel is obviously unsuitable as a country of resettlement because integration there is not feasible and such a plan would defeat the whole purpose of the scheme. Most important, the transfer of UNRWA funding to the Palestinian Authority and local authorities would dispose of the very institution of refugee camps. They would become regular neighbourhoods and dwellings once their refugee status is removed. Integration would also become easier once the refugee stigma is removed from these neighbourhoods. UNRWA schools, medical facilities, financial institutions and all social services could be given outright to the Palestinian Authority, which would enhance its status, scope and power as the sovereign government of a new nation-state. In fact, the dismantling of UNRWA would, by itself, facilitate and accelerate the task of resettlement, integration and naturalization. This process has been forestalled in many places by the very existence of UNRWA and its refugee designation of the Palestinians.

OBSERVATION 6.  The Plan produces ADVANTAGES

ADVANTAGE 1.  Hope for peace.  Ending UNRWA would instantly create the conditions needed for a viable peace process in the Middle East

Michael Bernstam 2011.  (a research fellow at the Hoover Institution, Stanford University; former visiting professor of economics at Monash University, Australia; former adjunct professor in Stanford University's Overseas Studies Program; former economic adviser to the Russian Parliament and the Central Bank of Russia) 7 Jan 2011 UNRWA: Five Letters That Spell Middle Eastern Misery, <http://www.cija.ca/middle-east/unrwa-five-letters-that-spell-middle-eastern-misery/>

The phasing out of UNRWA is not only the Palestinians’ sole hope of finding a viable future, it also fits well with Palestinian Prime Minister Salam Fayyad’s hope of creating a viable independent state. Though supporters of the Palestinians and even some friends of Israel have come to believe that UNRWA is indispensable, nation-building from within is the only viable form of nation-building. Instead of perpetuating the dead end that the international welfare state for the Palestinians represents, ending UNRWA’s horrific six-decade reign would instantly create the conditions for an honest, meaningful and viable peace process to begin in the Middle East.

ADVANTAGE 2.  Better lives for Palestinians.  We help the Palestinian people improve their lives by ending welfare dependency

Michael Bernstam 2011.  (a research fellow at the Hoover Institution, Stanford University; former visiting professor of economics at Monash University, Australia; former adjunct professor in Stanford University's Overseas Studies Program; former economic adviser to the Russian Parliament and the Central Bank of Russia) 7 Jan 2011 UNRWA: Five Letters That Spell Middle Eastern Misery, <http://www.cija.ca/middle-east/unrwa-five-letters-that-spell-middle-eastern-misery/>

For 60 years, UNRWA has been paying four generations of Palestinians to remain refugees, reproduce refugees and live in refugee camps. It is UNRWA that put them in refugee cages and watched the number of inhabitants grow. The Palestinian refugee population in Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, the West Bank and Gaza has exploded from 726,000 in 1950 to 4.8 million in 2010. About 95% receive some form of UNRWA care. The unprecedented nature of this guardianship is rooted in the unusual nature of this institution. UNRWA is a supranational welfare state that pays its residents not to build their own nation-state; for, were they to do so, they would forfeit their refugee status and its entitlements of cash, housing, health care, education, credit and other largesse. It is these perverse incentives above all that have undermined efforts to improve the lot of the Palestinian people. If the international community truly wishes to serve the needs of the Palestinians and improve their lot, its first task would be the abolition of UNRWA.

ADVANTAGE 3.  Reduced terrorism.  Transferring UNRWA’s operations would help weed out terrorists.

Prof. Nitza Nachmias 2009. (Senior Research Fellow at The Jewish-Arab Center, University of Haifa and a Visiting Professor at the Department of Political Science, Towson University, Maryland. 12 Oct 2009 “UNRWA at 60: Are There Better Alternatives?“ (brackets added) <http://www.meforum.org/2481/unrwa-at-60-better-alternatives>

UNRWA is using disturbing tactics to permit keeping Hamas and Hezbollah members on its payroll. By denying that these two organizations are "terrorism supporting organizations", as they are identified in US law, UNRWA is able to keep their members on the payroll. Thus, when vetting employees, questions about membership or support of Hamas and Hezbollah are not asked nor is this information recorded. In contrast to UNRWA's tolerance of Hamas and Hezballah activities, the PA [Palestinian Authority] and the Jordanian governments denounce Hamas terrorist activities and systematically carry out counter terrorism operations against them. A transfer of UNRWA's operations to the PA and the host governments, e.g. giving the PA control of UNRWA's schools and health care facilities in Gaza and the West Bank, would help weed out Hamas members and prevent terrorists from using schools and health clinics as shelters.

13. SHOW ME THE MONEY: THE CASE FOR VOLUNTARY FUNDING

It’s always more fun to spend other people’s money than your own.  It’s even better when the other people don’t ask you how you’re spending it and promise to keep giving you more, no matter what.  A childish fantasy, perhaps … but it’s also an accurate description of current UN budgeting.  Offering you today the comparative advantages of reforming this abusive system, my partner and I are happy to affirm: That the United Nations should be significantly reformed or abolished.

OBSERVATION 1.  We will use the following DEFINITIONS

**United Nations** - “The United Nations is an international organization founded in 1945 after the Second World War by 51 countries committed to maintaining international peace and security, developing friendly relations among nations and promoting social progress, better living standards and human rights.” *(UN official website copyright 2012. “UN At A Glance,”* [*http://www.un.org/en/aboutun/index.shtml*](http://www.un.org/en/aboutun/index.shtml)

**Significant:  “**2a**:** having or likely to have influence or effect **:** important <a significant piece of legislation>; also**:** of a noticeably or measurably large amount”  *(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/significant*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/significant)*)*

**Reform:  “**1*a***:** to put or change into an improved form or condition*“ (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2012.* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reform)

OBSERVATION 2.  INHERENCY, or  facts about the Status Quo.  The basic fact you need to understand is how the UN raises money.   The UN raises money today with two different methods, depending on the specific budget.  Those methods are: Assessments and Voluntary Contributions.

Marjorie Anne Browne 2011. (Specialist in International Relations with Congressional Research Service)  “United Nations System Funding:Congressional Issues,”  14 Jan 2011 <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL33611.pdf>

The United Nations (U.N.) system is made up of variously interconnected components including specialized agencies, voluntary funds and programs, peacekeeping operations, and the U.N. organization itself. The system is financed by contributions from member and/or participant states. The contributions are usually made in two ways: assessed contributions—required “dues” at percentages established by the membership of each organization involved—and voluntary contributions, which represent more than half of the total aggregated funds received by the U.N. system.  
**Assessed Contributions**Assessed contributions finance the regular budgets of the United Nations, the specialized agencies, and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Payment of the assessed contribution is one of the legal obligations accepted by a country when it joins the organization. In this way, the organization has a regular source of income for staffing and implementation of authorized programs. Most U.N. peacekeeping operations are funded through special assessed accounts created by the U.N. General Assembly.

OBSERVATION 3.  Current UN funding leads to FAILURES in the present system of assessments.  Some UN agencies have to rely on money donated to them voluntarily by UN members, and they take that responsibility seriously.  But the ones that rely on assessments, where the money is taken from mandatory dues, they’re in the habit of spending other people’s money without any responsibility.  We see this in 3 FAILURES:

FAILURE 1.  Lack of budget accountability and oversight.  The disconnect between financial obligation and voting power blocks budget accountability and oversight

Brett Schaefer 2012 (master's degree in international development from the School of International Service at American University;  Jay Kingham Fellow in International Regulatory Affairs at Heritage's Margaret Thatcher Center for Freedom, Heritage Foundation) 2 April 2012 “The History of the Bloated U.N. Budget: How the U.S. Can Rein It In” <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/04/the-history-of-the-bloated-un-budget-how-the-us-can-rein-it-in>

The bulk of the U.N. member states simply do not pay enough for growth in the U.N. regular budget to trouble them. For instance, Sierra Leone is assessed 0.001 percent of the U.N. regular budget. The U.S. is assessed 22 percent. Therefore, while Sierra Leone and the dozens of other countries with the same assessment will pay less than $26,000 this year for the U.N. regular budget, the U.S. will pay $567 million. With this in mind, it is unsurprising that the U.S. cares about the size of the U.N. regular budget, while most countries do not. The 128 countries with the lowest assessments pay less than 1.3 percent of the U.N. regular budget *combined*, yet those countries could approve a budget over the objections of countries paying nearly 99 percent of the budget. This disconnect between financial obligations and voting power makes it very difficult to constrain growth in the budget or enact reforms intended to improve effectiveness, accountability, and oversight without the use of financial withholding.

FAILURE 2.  Needs unmet.  Because certain UN budgets are guaranteed funding from Assessments, the resulting lack of performance incentives leaves poor and desperate people unserved by agencies designed to help.

Mark D. Wallace 2011. (President and CEO of United Against Nuclear Iran; former US representative to the UN for Management & Reform )  3 March 2011 “REFORMING THE UNITED NATIONS: LESSONS LEARNED”  written statement submitted to the hearing before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs  <http://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=6350>

There are times when it is necessary to design proper incentive structures to channel the productive energies of personnel at institutions and agencies.  The United Nations is not unique in this regard.  Unfortunately, what we observe today is that a number of UN agencies are essentially guaranteed a budget without having to develop, much less meet, even the most basic performance criteria.  The consequence is that a number of UN agencies are not operating nearly as efficiently or effectively as possible and are therefore failing in their mission to meet the needs of not only Member States, but many of the world's most desperate and indigent people.

FAILURE 3.  Irresponsible spending growth.  Irresponsible spending will grow until we solve the disconnect between financial obligation and influence over the budget process

Brett Schaefer 2012 (master's degree in international development from the School of International Service at American University;  Jay Kingham Fellow in International Regulatory Affairs at Heritage's Margaret Thatcher Center for Freedom, Heritage Foundation) 2 April 2012 “The History of the Bloated U.N. Budget: How the U.S. Can Rein It In” <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/04/the-history-of-the-bloated-un-budget-how-the-us-can-rein-it-in>

The 2012–2013 U.N. regular budget is historic because it marks the end of a decade of unprecedented growth of the U.N. budget. However, the U.N. budget process suggests that this will likely be an aberration and that irresponsible budget growth will resume shortly. Until the disconnect between financial obligations and influence over the U.N. budget process is overcome, the U.N. budget will likely continue to grow unchecked.

OBSERVATION 4.  We can make things better with our PLAN, to be implemented by UN member governments.

1.  UN budget assessments will be abolished.  All UN budgets will be funded by voluntary contributions.

2.  Plan takes effect January 1 of the year following an Affirmative ballot.

3.  Enforcement through UN member governments.

4.  All Affirmative speeches may clarify the plan as needed.

OBSERVATION 5.  The ADVANTAGE.  Total Voluntary Funding produces the comparative ADVANTAGE of better UN agency performance.  We see this in 3 subpoints:

A.  We break the entitlement mentality.  Voluntary contribution funding breaks the entitlement mentality

John Bolton 2010. (former US ambassador to the UN) 28 Oct 2010 “The Key to Changing the United Nations System” published by American Enterprise Institute <http://www.aei.org/article/foreign-and-defense-policy/international-organizations/the-key-to-changing-the-united-nations-system-outlook/>

The shift toward a voluntary payment system would impose a stronger market incentive for UN programs and activities to meet their goals and justify continued funding. The accumulated evidence of decades proves that only a major shift in attitudes within the UN system can lay the foundation for sustained improvements in UN performance, accountability, and transparency. That shift must entail breaking the grip of one-country, one-vote decision making and the entitlement mentality that have long pervaded the UN system. There is only one reform that can accomplish these objectives: shifting from today's predominant financing system, which relies on assessed contributions to defray the costs of UN agency budgets, to voluntary contributions. Transparency alone cannot succeed, even though the United States and a few other UN members have continued to work to bring greater transparency to the UN system.

B.  Competition drives improvement.  The best performing agencies are the ones that are funded voluntarily

Mark D. Wallace 2011. (President and CEO of United Against Nuclear Iran; former US representative to the UN for Management & Reform )  3 March 2011 “REFORMING THE UNITED NATIONS: LESSONS LEARNED”  written statement submitted to the hearing before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs   (brackets in original) <http://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=6350>

Yet we also observe some UN agencies performing at a higher standard than their counterparts.  What accounts for this variation? While there is no single variable or factor to be sure, it should not come as much of a surprise that many of the UN's best performing agencies do so because they have to actually compete with their counterparts in the world of non-governmental organizations.  The World Food Program (WFP) is but one such example.  The WFP, unlike many UN agencies, must compete against other NGOs for resources from governments and corporations alike.  Its budget is based entirely on voluntary contributions.  The Impact on the culture at WFP has been profound.  Many of you here know Catherine Bertini, former director WFP and also the former Under Secretary for Management Reform at the United Nations. The quote I'm about to recite you may have been heard before, but it bears repeating. In her own words:    "[V]oluntary funding creates an entirely different atmosphere at WFP than at the U.N. At WFP, every staff member knows that we have to be as efficient, accountable, transparent, and results-oriented as is possible.  If we are not, donor governments can take their funding elsewhere in a very competitive world among U.N. agencies, NGOs, and bilateral governments."

C.  Millions benefit.  Budget accountability promotes international peace and stability and benefits millions who receive assistance from vital programs

Mark D. Wallace 2011. (President and CEO of United Against Nuclear Iran; former US representative to the UN for Management & Reform )  3 March 2011 “REFORMING THE UNITED NATIONS: LESSONS LEARNED”  written statement submitted to the hearing before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs  <http://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=6350>

While the budgetary implications are no doubt important, we are also talking about issues vital to our long-term national security interests.  By adopting reform measures to make the United Nations more accountable and transparent, we are also taking steps to help the United Nations fulfill the goals outlined in its original charter to promote international peace and stability.  The United states plays a unique and powerful role in this regard.  We should not shirk this responsibility, not only for our own sake, but for the millions throughout the world who are the recipient of assistance from vital UN programs.