I negate: Economic Sanctions ought not be used to achieve foreign policy objectives

Ought implies moral obligation (OED), so the value is Morality. All conceptions of morality agree human life is good and ought to be protected or maximized. If a particular event can cause a massive loss to human life, then it ought to be avoided at all costs. (Tim Stelzig writes,

Stelzig, Tim (prof. of philosophy @ West Virginia University), University of Pennsylvania Law Review, Vol. 146, No. 3, “Deontology, Governmental Action, and the Distributive Exemption: How the Trolley Problem Shapes the Relationship Between Rights and Policy”, March 1998, p. 902-903

Yet, as Blackstone also realizes, **the "local or occasional necessities of the state" sometimes demand that rights be "modified, narrowed, or enlarged.**" **Bluntly put**, sometimes **the public good wins out. Rights clearly must give way in catastrophic cases, where harms of colossal proportion will be suffered unless some right is violated. For example, if stopping a terrorist from launching a salvo of nuclear missiles against China required killing several innocent hostages, it would be undeniably" morally permissible**-though nevertheless unfortunate **to sacrifice the hostages for the greater good.** **Even a healthy respect for the hostages' rights cannot suffer consequences of such magnitude. Catastrophic cases" do not fundamentally challenge the notion that rights protect us from being sacrificed for the public good. Such cases merely reveal that rights have thresholds."**

Moreover, in the modern international climate, this threat is real.) Orde Kittrie explains,

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

**Armed only with boxcutters, the nineteen al Qaeda hijackers on September 11, 2001, killed almost 3,000 people and caused tens of billions of dollars in damage to New York City, the Pentagon, and the global economy. n1 This toll would be dwarfed by a "nuclear 9/11" - a nuclear attack launched by a terrorist state or group. Detonation of a small, crude nuclear weapon in a major city could kill more than 500,000 people and cause over one trillion dollars in damage**. n2

Thus the standard for morality is Preventing Terrorism. This involves not only preventing the acquisition of nuclear weapons by terrorist groups, but also attempting to prevent the terrorism that causes physical, social and economic harm.

I advocate the use of financial asset sanctions towards terrorist organizations and state sponsors of terrorism, consistent with UN Security Council Resolution 1566. Gurule 2009 argues**,**

Gurule, Jimmy (Professor of Law, Notre Dame Law School) “The Demise of the U.N. Economic Sanctions Regime to Deprive Terrorists of Funding.” Case W. Res. J. Int’l L. Vol. 41:19, 2009.

**The successful implementation of an effective terrorist asset freezing regime is critical in combating the financing of terrorism.** The U.N. working group of counter-terrorism experts, established by 2004 Security Council Resolution 1566, states that, “freezing of financial assets is an indispensable tool in curtailing terrorism.” It is estimated that approximately **$85 million in terrorist-related funds have been frozen under the international sanctions regime.**

This $85 million could have been used to commit hundreds of terrorist acts. Crimm argues,

Crimm, Nina J. (Professor of Law, St. John’s University School of Law.) “High Altert: The Government's War on the Financing of Terrorism and its Implications for Donors, Domestic Charitable Organizations, and Global Philanthropy” William & Mary Law Review, March 2004

Intrinsically, **to commit a terrorist attack—even a large-scale one—does not require a large amount of funds.** For instance **the attacks of 9/11 cost Al-Qaeda somewhere in the range of $400,000 to $500,000.**

Sanctions also have other ways to stop terrorism. Gururle 2,

Gurule, Jimmy (Professor of Law, Notre Dame Law School) “The Demise of the U.N. Economic Sanctions Regime to Deprive Terrorists of Funding.” Case W. Res. J. Int’l L. Vol. 41:19, 2009.

However, **the economic sanctions program serves several other valuable purposes. First, asset freeze acts as a deterrent against those who might otherwise be willing to finance terrorist activity**. Second, **persons designated under relevant Security Council resolutions are isolated from the international financial community. Their funds, financial assets and economic resources are subject to being frozen anywhere in the world.** Thus, **the fear of having their funds and other assets frozen may cause potential donors to reconsider funding terrorist activities. Second, asset freeze reduces the flow of money and other support to terrorists and makes the transfer of funds more difficult to effect. The economic sanctions program “terminate[s] terrorist cash flows by shutting down pipelines used to move terrorist-related assets.” Third, an effective financial ban may expose terrorist financing “money trails” that may generate leads to previously unknown terrorist cells and financiers. Finally, asset freeze may restrict terrorists from operating extensive terrorist networks, training camps and social programs for funding the families of homicide bombers.**