I affirm. Thihan Nyun[[1]](#footnote-0) explains that academic literature accepts the following definition of economic sanctions:

Economic sanctions can be defined, depending on the particular role one would like sanctions to play in international affairs, in two different ways. Economic sanctions can either encompass every measure designed to inflict economic deprivation or include only the most comprehensive of embargoes imposed for well-defined political reasons. A broad definition based solely on the ends would take into consideration only the economic deprivation inflicted upon a target country, and not the means employed to bring about that deprivation. As a result, any measure - economic or military - that disrupts the economic activity of an adversary would qualify as an economic sanction. Conversely, **a definition based on the means, which is commonly accepted today, narrows the scope of what constitutes economic sanctions by focusing only on trade-disrupting measures.** Hufbauer and colleagues define economic sanctions as "the deliberate, government-inspired withdrawal, or threat of withdrawal, of customary trade or financial relations." **A further synthesis of the literature reveals the following definition,** which will be used for this Article: **economic sanctions are the** actual or threatened **withdrawal of normal trade or financial relations**, imposed by the sender against the target, for foreign policy purposes. Under this approach, economic sanctions are **limited to restrictions on trade, investment, and other cross-border economic activity that reduce[s] the target country's revenues, thereby facilitating the desired change without resorting to military action.**

Moreover, even if I lose that this is the preferable definition for economic sanctions, that it is accepted by many in the literature demonstrates its reasonability. Thus, if the negative wins that a different definition must be used, it is most fair to adjudicate the round normally under that new definition instead of punishing me with a loss.

Finally, prefer reasonable aff definitions absent actual substantial abuse because shifting definitions in the middle of the round dissolves the full 1AC strategy and 6 minutes of affirmative speech time which is a far greater loss to the affirmative than the use of a reasonable definition is to the negative.

Ought is **“used to express** justice, **moral rightness,** or the like**”**[[2]](#footnote-1), so I value **morality**. Moral rules must be universally applicable; that is, if they apply to me in a given circumstance, then they ought apply to all people similarly situated. Absent universality, morality fails in its role of guiding our actions, because individuals are no longer capable of referring to a single set of rules governing moral and immoral action for all people.

Only a consequentialist system seeking to maximize good ends meets this requirement. Ascribing to deontological rules, inviolable regardless of its ability to stop others from committing more of the same bad act, is inconsistent with universality. Philip Pettit[[3]](#footnote-2) explains,

The upshot is that **if as a non-consequentialist theorist I** straightforwardly **universalize the prescription that** in a certain situation **I should instantiate a favored pattern** **[such as** **conforming to the categorical imperative or protecting citizens]**, P, **then the prescription to which I thereby commit myself — that** in that situation **any** **[person]** X **ought to instantiate [the same] pattern,** P — **may force me to revise my original self-prescription**. I have equal reason to prefer both that I instantiate [the pattern] P and that any agent instantiate P — **this** reason **is expressed by the use of the word ‘right’ or ‘ought’ in each case — and the spirit of universalisability blocks me from treating myself** as **in any way special.** Thus, if the preferences are inconsistent in a certain situation — if the choice is between my instantiating P alone, for example, or my acting so that many others instantiate P instead — then I will have reason not to instantiate P myself. As a would-be non-consequentialist thinker my initial claim must have been that the point is to instantiate P in my own life, not promote it generally. But I countenance the general claims of the P-pattern **when I universalize in the straightforward way: I prescribe general conformity to that pattern, not just conformity in my own case. Thus** it now seems that what I must think is that this **general conformity is to be promoted, even if that means not myself instantiating the pattern in my own behavior** or psychology or relationships**.** It seems that what I must embrace, in effect, is a consequentialism in which conformity to [the] pattern P is the ultimate value to be promoted.

Thus, because morality should seek to maximize good consequences and all moral systems assert the moral value of people, the criterion is **minimizing human suffering.**

**Contention 1: sanctions increase interstate military conflict.**

**First,** Sanctions lead to military conflict by ending commerce that gives both nations a mutual interest in peaceful relations. Mark Souva and Brandon Prins[[4]](#footnote-3) explain:

**[First,]** Global **commerce constrains decision makers from pursuing militarily aggressive foreign policies by promoting peaceful interests within a state.** In liberal systems the use of force is especially costly for political elites because **commercial transactions lead to the development of interest groups that organize around protecting and enhancing economic self-interest. These** interest **groups inevitably pressure policymakers to avoid breaking political and economic relationships** (Rosecrance, 1986). **Trade and investment, then, reduce the likelihood of interstate conflict by helping to form interest groups that have a financial stake in maintaining a stable and cooperative political environment.** Domke (1988) makes a similar argument. “Foreign trade,” he writes, “produces a constraint on decisions for war through the growth of international, domestic, and governmental forces with a stake in open and unfettered foreign dealings [thus] the relevant indicator of foreign trade would measure an economy’s involvement in trade” (Domke, 1988, p. 118). Rational elites undoubtedly recognize the potential political and economic costs for failing to support these important constituency groups through coercive foreign policy actions that destabilize commercial ties. The opportunity cost arguments of Polachek (1980), Polachek, Robst, and Chang (1999), and Oneal and Russett (1997, 1999a, 1999b) are also anchored in domestic politics. “Fearful of the domestic political consequences of losing the benefits of trade,” Oneal and Russett (1999b, pp. 4–5) write, “policymakers avoid the use of force against states with which they engage in economically important trade.” Similarly, Polachek, Robst, and Chang (1999, p. 405) note that countries with the most dependence on international trade ‘face the highest costs of potentially lost trade and hence engage in the least conflict and the most cooperation.’ While the arguments of Polachek and his colleagues and Oneal and Russett emphasize dyadic trade, they are compatible with arguments linking commerce and peace at both monadic and systemic levels as well. **[Second,] Commercial dependence promotes peaceful foreign policies by deepening political, social, and cultural contacts** as well. **As part of** the growth of **interstate trade, formal and informal rules and procedures have developed to help guide states in their decisionmaking and political bargaining** (Keohane and Nye, 1989). Deutsch et al. (1957) offered a similar insight. Complex **interdependence helps mitigate violent conflict by fostering a sense of community or** shared identity. Indeed, interdependence “cements bonds of friendship” **by enabling governments to more effectively discern mutual interests** (Barbieri and Schneider, 1999, p. 387). The end result, according to Buzan, Jones, and - (1993) may be an attenuation in the structural effects of anarchy.While we emphasize the domestic roots of commercial dependence as a constraint on the use of force, an alternative argument emphasizes the informational properties associated with commercial interaction. In the informational perspective, **[Third,] uncertainty is central to conflict,** a factor directly addressed by commercial exchange**. The result of international trade,** according to Hegre (2000, p. 5), **is ‘improved communication between the inhabitants of the trading states. This reduces the chances of misunderstanding and helps to build institutions for the peaceful resolution of conflict.’** Therefore, if uncertainty and deception contribute to the collapse of negotiations, then **economic dependence can help state leaders anticipate the intentions and reactions of adversaries, reduce bluffing, and prevent bargaining breakdowns.** Similarly, Keohane (1984, p. 245) alleges that international systems with institutional structures that produce valuable information are less conflict prone than international systems where these information-providing institutions are absent. Trade and foreign investment, then, may function as a medium for information exchange, allowing states to demonstrate resolve without resorting to military violence (Gartzke, Li, and Boehmer, 2001). While uncertainty and resolve may arguably condition strategic interactions, it is not clear that an informational argument applies at a monadic level of analysis, which remains the focus of the research here.

Thus, by severing economic contact between countries, sanctions remove economic impediments to war.

**Second,** sanctions demand military escalation because nations face audience costs to backing down, trapping them in an antagonistic relationship. David Lektzian and Christopher Sprecher[[5]](#footnote-4) write:

However, economic costs are not the only type of cost associated with sanctions. **Given the public nature of a proclamation breaking trade, audience costs** (Fearon 1994; Partell and Palmer 1999; Smith 1998, 623; Schultz 1998) **will** also **be generated.** Barber describes the costs associated with sanctions in a manner consistent with the type of costs typically associated with audience costs. Speaking about sanctions, he writes, **‘Once commitments have been made to a policy, whether by individual political leaders, or by governments or international organizations, reputations and pride are at stake’** (1979, 380). **Domestic actors could choose to punish a leader who loses a crisis or** war-be it a **trade war** or military war (Bueno de Mesquita and Siverson 1995; Bueno de Mesquita et al. 1999; Smith 1996). Thus, we argue that states can enhance the credibility of their resolve in a dispute by incurring both economic and political costs through the imposition of economic sanctions. However, **this strategy of incurring costs through the imposition of economic sanctions is not without risk.** There are important differences in the way states behave as a result of political or economic costs. Essentially, economic costs are lost throughout the imposition of sanctions while political costs are only paid after a perceived policy failure. **The political costs of backing down in a public dispute, such as economic sanctions, tie the hands** (Fearon 1997) **of the sender nation, making it too costly to back down from a threat, and may lead to a greater likelihood of achieving policy goals while simultaneously increasing the likelihood that the dispute will escalate to the military level.**

**Third,** Even sanctions designed to curtail military conflict will only exacerbate the problem. David Keen[[6]](#footnote-5) writes,

Sanctions may worsen a conflict. One risk is that sanctions will feed into violence through ‘bottom-up’ processes. In particular, [**First,] where sanctions interfere with humanitarian aid, this may encourage people to turn to violence as a survival strategy, especially where sanctions are weakening an already fragile state.** To the extent that **poverty drives conflict,** sanctions-as conflict- resolution may even be said to represent a bizarre concept. Aside from these ‘bottom-up’ effects, withholding aid, trade or investment may impact on the political economy in ways that deepen the abuses of rebels and/or governments. Again, Angola is illustrative. Whilst **sanctions** on UNITA rebels **in Angola** possibly shortened the civil war, the human cost included **not only deepen[ed]**ing **food shortages but also** **intensified abuses – for an extended period** – by UNITA itself. One factor here was that despite the arms embargo, UNITA was still able to access significant quantities of arms (Cater 2003). During the renewed warfare in Angola between 1998 and 2002, the UNITA **forces –** faced with a combination of international sanctions and military reversals – actually **stepped up their exploitation of civilians in areas they controlled; this included pillage, extortion, mutilations and the forced recruitment of** men and **children** (Messiant 2004). Thus, while sanctions had some restraining effect on the rebels’ capacity for violence, in some ways they actually increased the propensity for violence. In this connection, Charles Cater (2003: 39-40), an expert on Angola, refers to ‘the false premise that profit motivates insurgency and that therefore the denial of resources will alter the incentive of rebel groups’. In terms of **[Second, for] the government** side, **sanctions seem to** have **give**n **a ‘green light’ for all-out warfare, including depriving rebel-held areas of food**. Cater asks: ‘Are targeted sanctions regimes… intended to facilitate the peaceful resolution of conflict or to assist the pursuit of coercive war termination?’ Somewhat similarly, Jeffrey Herbst (quoted in Cater 2003: 40) has commented: ‘**Demanding such sanctions is an implicit call for the military defeat of the rebels by the government’**. It is important to note that ‘peace’ can be pursued by a variety of means, some of which may be more harmful (and more violent) than others. A related danger is that **sanctions on one side will make the other side more inflexible when it comes to negotiations.** In Sri Lanka, pressures on the Tamil Tiger rebels have included attempts to reduce diaspora remittances (ICG 2006a). But as an insightful Conciliation Resources report puts it: ‘International pressures exerted on one party may encourage the other side to escalate its demands or refuse compromise’ (Griffiths and Barnes 2008). **Mediation may also be discouraged when sanctions effectively criminalise rebel groups** (Cater 2003: 40). Suthaharan Nadarajah (2008) argues that in Sri Lanka after a ceasefire agreement in 2002, a pattern of aid favouring government areas combined with the ‘terrorist’ label for the rebel Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) to induce a feeling within the LTTE that the peace process was heavily biased in favour of the government, thereby hardening positions within the LTTE. Somewhat similarly, Brian Smith (2008: 91) notes a tendency to treat the LTTE as the ‘bad guys’ and the government as the ‘comparatively good guys’, adding: ‘This bias has driven the LTTE even further to the margins of a debate where they consider that they will never be treated fairly’.

**Fourth**, statistical evidence proves that sanctions increase violent conflict. Analyzing sanctions data from 1948 to 1998 for a total of 1,554 sanction-years, Lektzian and Sprecher 2[[7]](#footnote-6) find that

While Model 2 provides strong support for the expectation that sanctions complement rather than substitute for uses of force, as noted above, one might question whether the comparison group is appropriate. Models 3 through 5 in Table 1 **restrict[ing]** the **analysis to** dyads that experienced an **[International Crisis Behavior conflicts]** ICB crisis. This allows us **to view how crisis actors respond to the use of sanctions.** The fact that there is a crisis tells us that **[where] there is a serious dispute**, but not necessarily that it is militarized. Therefore, in the models presented in Table 1, the focus shifts and the question becomes, are actors that are involved in a crisis, that use sanctions, more likely to be involved in militarized disputes? Even within states already involved in a crisis, we find that the use of sanctions is associated with an increased probability for militarized interstate disputes. Once again, **sanctions are seen as complementary to, rather than a substitute for, military force.** While the lagged sanctions variable in Model 4 is only significant at the 10% level, it does exert a strong positive influence on crisis escalation to the use of military force. We also show in Model 5 that the reason for the relatively weak significance of the sanctions variable in this model is that the effect is masked by the difference in dispute propensity for democracies and nondemocracies following sanctions. Nonetheless, the effect of sanctions being used in a crisis dyad has a more statistically significant effect on a militarized dispute occurrence than does the presence of a jointly democratic dyad. Substantively, the effect of sanctions can be seen by calculating the change in the predicted probability of a crisis involving militarized action with and without sanctions, **while holding the other variables** in the model **constant** at their means. **The effect of sanctions on the likelihood of a crisis involving the use of military force is to increase the probability of militarized conflict by 17%, resulting in a near doubling of the probability of conflict** from .18 without sanctions to .35 with sanctions.

They then tested the validity of their methodology by using the same dataset and procedure to see if it controlled for correlative characteristics of economic sanctions and war. The results confirm the validity of the study. Letzkian and Sprecher 3 conclude,

Of most importance to this article is that lagged **militarized conflict does not significantly increase the probability of sanctions onset in** either the all-dyads model, or **the model of existing crises.** This may be why existing empirical work on the onset of sanctions by Cox and Drury(2006) and Lektzian and Souva (2003) does not include militarized conflict as an explanatory variable for the on-set of sanctions.20Evaluatingthe BIC statistic for Models6 and 7 provides very strong support for the all-dyads model without lagged militarized conflict (difference in BIC = 12.864) and positive support for the model with-out lagged militarized conflict in the crises dyads sample (difference in BIC = 2.990). **Thus, we conclude that there is more to this relationship than one form of conflict simply being associated with the other. Sanctions,** as our signaling argument expects, **increase the probability of militarized conflict** when they are used by democracies and when they are made to be costless to the sender. **Militarized conflicts, however, do not increase the probability of economic sanctions.**

Thus, every sanction increases the chance of interstate military conflict. Even relatively small conflicts kill hundreds of thousands of innocent people each year. Richard Garfield[[8]](#footnote-7) explains:

Beyond WHO, a second source of data has been compiled by several political science and peace organizations that have attempted, since 2000, to count the number of deaths worldwide due to armed conflict. **The Uppsala Conflict Data Project** (UCDP) **in Sweden,** the most widely used of these sources, **estimated the number of battle deaths from** mid-**2002 to** mid-**2003 to be** between 33,000 and 62,000, with **a** most **likely** estimate of **36,000.** While various analysts count the number of armed conflicts differently, they agree that both the number of armed conflicts and the magnitude of conflicts have declined since peaking in 1996. **Counting battle deaths alone, however, understates the impact of armed conflict.  In countries with armed conflict, many other deaths occur - mainly among noncombatants** -and there is a wide variation in this excess mortality in the general population.  **In the least developed countries,** especially in Africa **where most armed conflicts now occur, the mortality rate in the general population during war may increase up to 10-fold.  Estimated excess deaths among noncombatants and battle deaths may exceed 500,000 per year.**

Contention 2: Economic engagement is a better way to change policies in foreign states.

**First,** Michael Mastanduno summarizes Hirschmann[[9]](#footnote-8) to prove economic ties create successful leverage.

The basic causal logic of economic engagement, and the emphasis on domestic politics, can be traced to Hirschman. He viewed economic engagement as a long-term, transformative strategy. **As one state** gradually **expands economic interaction with its target, the resulting** (asymmetrical) **interdependence creates vested interests within the target society and government. The beneficiaries of interdependence become addicted to it, and they protect their interests by pressuring the government to accommodate the source of interdependence. Economic engagement is a form of structural linkage; *it is a means to get other states to want what you want, rather than to do what you want*. The causal chain runs from economic interdependence through domestic political change to foreign policy accommodation.**

Since commerce creates sustainable motivation to achieve shared interests, it best changes the policies of target nations and maintains peace.

**Second,** economic integration undermines authoritarian systems, achieving the same goals as many economic sanctions. Craig Forcese[[10]](#footnote-9) writes,

U.S. business is said to foster political liberalization in a number of ways. **First, American companies support the rule of law by seeking** “certain **assurances when operating in foreign countries,** **including respect for the rule of law (honoring contracts, arbitration of disputes, objective legal systems,** etc.), protection of intellectual property rights, **and restraints on conduct that generates commercial uncertainty (corruption and nepotism).” Second,** U.S. investment prompts the development of local infrastructure that supports business operations, resulting in “significant benefits to the locality, such as telephone systems, roads and health care facilities or even food production.” Third, **U.S. businesses demand, and contribute to the training of, skilled workers.** **Executives retained by U.S. investors are usually drawn from “the class that is most opposed to a corrupt and repressive government.** For the same reason, corporate independence from such a government frequently is essential to successful recruiting: the very fact that the corporation is American, and brings with it American values and practices, is a powerful draw.” Fourth, **[Third,] the very production systems used by American companies have an anti- authoritarian bent.** In particular, **“[t]he operating and productions systems of American businesses assume that employees are prepared to think and act independently, to show initiative, and to be creative. . . . When introduced overseas, such systems require fundamentally different organizational systems and ways of thinking, particularly in formerly authoritarian workplaces.”** Last, U.S. investment is said to prompt the development of a local supply chain run by local entrepreneurs.
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