## Shunning

#### Venezuela is a massive human rights violator

Sullivan 13 **– Specialist in Latin American Affairs at Congressional Research Service** (Mark, 1/10/2013, “Venezuela: Issues for Congress,” Congress of the United States of America, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R40938.pdf>, Accessed 9/12/13)

Human Rights Concerns Human rights organizations and U.S. officials have expressed concerns for several years about the deterioration of democratic institutions and threats to freedom of speech and press in Venezuela under the Chávez government. According to Human Rights Watch’s World Report 2012, “the weakening of Venezuela’s democratic system of checks and balances under President Hugo Chávez has contributed to a precarious human rights situation.” It maintained that “without judicial checks on its actions, the government has systematically undermined the right to free expression, workers’ freedom of association, and the ability of human rights groups to protect rights.”87 An extensive Human Rights Watch report on Venezuela issued in July 2012 maintains that the human rights situation in the country has become even more precarious in recent years.88 It noted that the pro-Chávez majority in the National Assembly approved legislation in 2010 expanding the government’s powers to limit free speech and punish its critics. It asserts that the Supreme Court “has explicitly rejected the principle that the judiciary should serve as a check on presidential power, while joining with the president in dismissing the authority of the Inter- American system of human rights.” For almost a decade, President Chávez has not allowed the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights to visit the country, while in July 2012 he announced that Venezuela would withdraw from the jurisdiction of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights. The report contends that “the accumulation of power in the executive, the removal of institutional safeguards, and the erosion of human rights guarantees have given the Chávez government free reign to intimidate, censor, and prosecute Venezuelans who criticize the president or thwart his political agenda.” The State Department’s 2011 human rights report (issued in May 2012) maintains that the “principal human rights abuses reported during the year included government actions to impede freedom of expression and criminalize dissent.”89 According to the State Department, the Venezuelan government harassed and intimidated privately owned television stations, other media outlets, and journalists. The government was reported to have thwarted judicial independence, and to have used the judiciary to intimidate and selectively prosecute political, union, business, and civil society leaders critical of the government. The State Department report also cites other human rights problems such as unlawful killings; torture and degrading treatment; prison violence and harsh prison conditions; inadequate juvenile detention centers; arbitrary arrests and detentions; police corruption and impunity; interference with property rights; and threats against domestic nongovernmental organizations. The significant problem of prison violence was highlighted once again on August 19, 2012, when a clash between gangs at a prison in Miranda state reportedly resulted in at least 25 deaths.

#### Reject engagement with human rights abusers — moral duty to shun

Beversluis 89 **– Philosophy, Economics and Humanities Professor** [Eric, Ph.D. in philosophy from Northwestern and economics from OSU, April 1989. “On Shunning Undesirable Regimes: Ethics and Economic Sanctions.” Public Affairs Quarterly, April, vol. 3, no. 2, <http://www.ericsinfotech.com/ShunningUndesirableRegimes.pdf>]

A fundamental task of morality is resolving conflicting interests. If we both want the same piece of land, ethics provides a basis for resolving the conflict by identifying "mine" and "thine." If in anger 1 want to smash your face, ethics indicates that your face's being unsmashed is a legitimate interest of yours which takes precedence over my own interest in expressing my rage. Thus ethics identifies the rights of individuals when their interests conflict. But how can a case for shunning be made on this view of morality? Whose interests (rights) does shunning protect? The shunner may well have to sacrifice his interest, e.g., by foregoing a beneficial trade relationship, but whose rights are thereby protected? In shunning there seem to be no "rights" that are protected. For shunning, as we have seen, does not assume that the resulting cost will change the disapproved behavior. If economic sanctions against South Africa will not bring apartheid to an end, and thus will not help the blacks get their rights, on what grounds might it be a duty to impose such sanctions'? We find the answer when we note that there is another "level" of moral duties. When Galtung speaks of "reinforcing... morality," he has identified a duty that goes beyond specific acts of respecting people's rights. The argument goes like this: There is more involved in respecting the rights of others than not violating them by one's actions. For if there is such a thing as a moral order, which unites people in a moral community, then surely one has a duty (at least prima facie) not only to avoid violating the rights of others with one's actions but also to support that moral order. Consider that the moral order itself contributes significantly to people's rights being respected. It does so by encouraging and reinforcing moral behavior and by discouraging and sanctioning immoral behavior. In this moral community people mutually reinforce each other's moral behavior and thus raise the overall level of morality. Were this moral order to disintegrate, were people to stop reinforcing each other's moral behavior, there would be much more violation of people's rights. Thus to the extent that behavior affects the moral order, it indirectly affects people's rights. And this is where shunning fits in. Certain types of behavior constitute a direct attack on the moral order. When the violation of human rights is flagrant, willful, and persistent, the offender is, as it were, thumbing her nose at the moral order, publicly rejecting it as binding her behavior. Clearly such behavior, if tolerated by society, will weaken and perhaps eventually undermine altogether the moral order. Let us look briefly at those three conditions which turn immoral behavior into an attack on the moral order. An immoral action is flagrant if it is "extremely or deliberately conspicuous; notorious, shocking." Etymologically the word means "burning" or "blazing." The definition of shunning implies therefore that those offenses require shunning which are shameless or indiscreet, which the person makes no effort to hide and no good-faith effort to excuse. Such actions "blaze forth" as an attack on the moral order. But to merit shunning the action must also be, willful and persistent. We do not consider the actions of the "backslider," the weak-willed, the one-time offender to be challenges to the moral order. It is the repeat offender, the unrepentent sinner, the cold-blooded violator of morality whose behavior demands that others publicly reaffirm the moral order. When someone flagrantly, willfully, and repeatedly violates the moral order, those who believe in the moral order, the members of the moral community, must respond in a way that reaffirms the legitimacy of that moral order. How does shunning do this? First, by refusing publicly to have to do with such a person one announces support for the moral order and backs up the announcement with action. This action reinforces the commitment to the moral order both of the shunner and of the other members of the community. (Secretary of State Shultz in effect made this argument in his caB for international sanctions on Libya in the early days of 1986.). Further, shunning may have a moral effect on the shunned person, even if the direct impact is not adequate to change the immoral behavior. If the shunned person thinks of herself as part of the moral community, shunning may well make clear to her that she is, in fact, removing herself from that community by the behavior in question. Thus shunning may achieve by moral suasion what cannot be achieved by "force." Finally, shunning may be a form of punishment, of moral sanction, whose appropriateness depends not on whether it will change the person's behavior, but on whether he deserves the punishment for violating the moral order. Punishment then can be viewed as a way of maintaining the moral order, of “purifying the community” after it has been made “unclean,” as ancient communities might have put it.

#### Any compromise sanctions evil — reject every instance regardless of consequences

Gordon and Gordon 95 — Haim Gordon, Senior Lecturer in the Department of Education at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, and Rivca Gordon, general director of the Foundation for Democratic Education in Israel and chairperson of the Gaza Team for Human Rights, 1995 (“Introduction,” *Sartre and Evil: Guidelines for a Struggle*, Published by Greenwood Press, ISBN 031327861X, p. xvi-xviii)

Put differently, this book is also about us, a man and a woman who, often with others, have for years been struggling for freedom, for dialogue, for justice, for human rights in Israel and in the Middle East, and about what we have learned from Sartre that has helped us to conduct this daily struggle. Yet it should also be clear: We are not standard do-gooders. When we use the word "struggle," we mean fighting, attacking, pointing at evildoers, demanding that they be prosecuted. We mean accepting the profound loneliness that often characterizes such struggles. We mean living with the stupid decisions and the mistakes that we have often made, and, we hope, learning from them. We mean knowing that we too have done Evil. [end page xvi] Like Sartre we do not need to be identified with a party or an organization or a large group when we attack an evildoer, although we are, at times, happy when such occurs. For instance, when human rights are blatantly abused in the Gaza Strip, or when violence against women is ignored by the Israeli police, we are unwilling to compromise such a destruction of human freedom with the goals of a party or an organization so that the organization or party can attain its political ends from this Evil. Learning from Sartre, we condemn the Evil and the oppression and exploitation as loudly and clearly as possible. And like Sartre, our condemnations often fall on deaf ears. Again and again we have failed, as this book will often indicate. The Israeli military administration in Gaza, the Israeli press, Israeli politicians, other intellectuals and academics, and even other human rights organizations have often made us feel frustrated, impotent, stuck, irrelevant. But we continue. It is in this kind of struggle, we believe, that one can learn much from Sartre's writings. Hence, in what follows, while we shall discuss in detail and in depth quite a few philosophical themes central to Sartre's writings, we shall always attempt to suggest how these themes can help in the day-to-day struggle against Evil. To do so, we often add to our discussion of Sartre's insights on Evil an instance from our personal experiences or from events in the world that these insights have helped to clarify. We firmly believe that Sartre would have preferred such a book to a strict scholarly study of his relationship to Evil. He repeatedly pointed out that he was deeply concerned with the relevance of his writings to day-to-day praxis, to day-to-day struggles, to the situation in which persons find themselves. He wanted his writings to make a concrete difference in the world, not only to be a topic of analysis and discussion among scholars and philosophers. We also believe that Sartre would have liked a book that at times reeks of the blood, sweat, and tears -- and yes, the rage, the passion, the debilitating loneliness, and the ongoing fight against impotence -- that characterize any worthy struggle for freedom today. In the first section of this book we deal with the problem of intuitively responding to Evil. Our experience has taught us that too many people have learned to pass by or to ignore the Evil that confronts them here and now. They purposely refrain from perceiving a specific and concrete instance of Evil. Hence they never need to fight it. Of course, they thus support the evildoer and the evil regime, but that only partially concerned us in this section. Different questions seemed more crucial: What characterizes [end page xvii] the consciousness and the freedom of a person who does respond intuitively to Evil, and who tries to fight it? What attitudes interfere with such an intuitive response? We sought significant answers to these questions in Sartre's literature and drama.

## Framework

#### The Aff’s failure to advance a defense of the federal government substantially increasing its economic engagement toward Cuba, Mexico, or Venezuela undermines debate’s transformative and intellectual potential

#### A limited topic of discussion that provides for equitable ground is key to productive inculcation of decision-making and advocacy skills in every and all facets of life---even if their position is contestable that’s distinct from it being valuably debatable---this still provides room for flexibility, creativity, and innovation

Steinberg & Freeley 8 \*Austin J. Freeley is a Boston based attorney who focuses on criminal, personal injury and civil rights law, AND \*\*David L. Steinberg , Lecturer of Communication Studies @ U Miami, Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making pp45-

Debate is a means of settling differences, so there must be a difference of opinion or a conflict of interest before there can be a debate. If everyone is in agreement on a tact or value or policy, there is no need for debate: the matter can be settled by unanimous consent. Thus, for example, it would be pointless to attempt to debate "Resolved: That two plus two equals four," because there is simply no controversy about this statement. (Controversy is an essential prerequisite of debate. Where there is no clash of ideas, proposals, interests, or expressed positions on issues, there is no debate. In addition, debate cannot produce effective decisions without clear identification of a question or questions to be answered. For example, general argument may occur about the broad topic of illegal immigration. How many illegal immigrants are in the United States? What is the impact of illegal immigration and immigrants on our economy? What is their impact on our communities? Do they commit crimes? Do they take jobs from American workers? Do they pay taxes? Do they require social services? Is it a problem that some do not speak English? Is it the responsibility of employers to discourage illegal immigration by not hiring undocumented workers? Should they have the opportunity- to gain citizenship? Docs illegal immigration pose a security threat to our country? Do illegal immigrants do work that American workers are unwilling to do? Are their rights as workers and as human beings at risk due to their status? Are they abused by employers, law enforcement, housing, and businesses? I low are their families impacted by their status? What is the moral and philosophical obligation of a nation state to maintain its borders? Should we build a wall on the Mexican border, establish a national identification can!, or enforce existing laws against employers? Should we invite immigrants to become U.S. citizens? Surely you can think of many more concerns to be addressed by a conversation about the topic area of illegal immigration. Participation in this "debate" is likely to be emotional and intense. However, it is not likely to be productive or useful without focus on a particular question and identification of a line demarcating sides in the controversy. To be discussed and resolved effectively, controversies must be stated clearly. Vague understanding results in unfocused deliberation and poor decisions, frustration, and emotional distress, as evidenced by the failure of the United States Congress to make progress on the immigration debate during the summer of 2007.¶ Someone disturbed by the problem of the growing underclass of poorly educated, socially disenfranchised youths might observe, "Public schools are doing a terrible job! They are overcrowded, and many teachers are poorly qualified in their subject areas. Even the best teachers can do little more than struggle to maintain order in their classrooms." That same concerned citizen, facing a complex range of issues, might arrive at an unhelpful decision, such as "We ought to do something about this" or. worse. "It's too complicated a problem to deal with." Groups of concerned citizens worried about the state of public education could join together to express their frustrations, anger, disillusionment, and emotions regarding the schools, but without a focus for their discussions, they could easily agree about the sorry state of education without finding points of clarity or potential solutions. A gripe session would follow. But if a precise question is posed—such as "What can be done to improve public education?"—then a more profitable area of discussion is opened up simply by placing a focus on the search for a concrete solution step. One or more judgments can be phrased in the form of debate propositions, motions for parliamentary debate, or bills for legislative assemblies. The statements "Resolved: That the federal government should implement a program of charter schools in at-risk communities" and "Resolved: That the state of Florida should adopt a school voucher program" more clearly identify specific ways of dealing with educational problems in a manageable form, suitable for debate. They provide specific policies to be investigated and aid discussants in identifying points of difference.¶ To have a productive debate, which facilitates effective decision making by directing and placing limits on the decision to be made, the basis for argument should be clearly defined. If we merely talk about "homelessness" or "abortion" or "crime'\* or "global warming" we are likely to have an interesting discussion but not to establish profitable basis for argument. For example, the statement "Resolved: That the pen is mightier than the sword" is debatable, yet fails to provide much basis for clear argumentation. If we take this statement to mean that the written word is more effective than physical force for some purposes, we can identify a problem area: the comparative effectiveness of writing or physical force for a specific purpose.¶ Although we now have a general subject, we have not yet stated a problem. It is still too broad, too loosely worded to promote well-organized argument. What sort of writing are we concerned with—poems, novels, government documents, website development, advertising, or what? What does "effectiveness" mean in this context? What kind of physical force is being compared—fists, dueling swords, bazookas, nuclear weapons, or what? A more specific question might be. "Would a mutual defense treaty or a visit by our fleet be more effective in assuring Liurania of our support in a certain crisis?" The basis for argument could be phrased in a debate proposition such as "Resolved: That the United States should enter into a mutual defense treatv with Laurania." Negative advocates might oppose this proposition by arguing that fleet maneuvers would be a better solution. This is not to say that debates should completely avoid creative interpretation of the controversy by advocates, or that good debates cannot occur over competing interpretations of the controversy; in fact, these sorts of debates may be very engaging. The point is that debate is best facilitated by the guidance provided by focus on a particular point of difference, which will be outlined in the following discussion.

#### That’s key to social improvements in every and all facets of life

Steinberg & Freeley 8 \*Austin J. Freeley is a Boston based attorney who focuses on criminal, personal injury and civil rights law, AND \*\*David L. Steinberg , Lecturer of Communication Studies @ U Miami, Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making pp9-10

If we assume it to be possible without recourse to violence to reach agreement on all the problems implied in the employment of the idea of justice we are granting the possibility of formulating an ideal of man and society, valid for all beings endowed with reason and accepted by what we have called elsewhere the universal audience.14¶ I think that the only discursive methods available to us stem from techniques that are not demonstrative—that is, conclusive and rational in the narrow sense of the term—but from argumentative techniques which are not conclusive but which may tend to demonstrate the reasonable character of the conceptions put forward. It is this recourse to the rational and reasonable for the realization of the ideal of universal communion that characterizes the age-long endeavor of all philosophies in their aspiration for a city of man in which violence may progressively give way to wisdom.13¶ Whenever an individual controls the dimensions of" a problem, he or she can solve the problem through a personal decision. For example, if the problem is whether to go to the basketball game tonight, if tickets are not too expensive and if transportation is available, the decision can be made individually. But if a friend's car is needed to get to the game, then that person's decision to furnish the transportation must be obtained.¶ Complex problems, too, are subject to individual decision making. American business offers many examples of small companies that grew into major corporations while still under the individual control of the founder. Some computer companies that began in the 1970s as one-person operations burgeoned into multimillion-dollar corporations with the original inventor still making all the major decisions. And some of the multibillion-dollar leveraged buyouts of the 1980s were put together by daring—some would say greedy—financiers who made the day-to-day and even hour-to-hour decisions individually.¶ When President George H. W. Bush launched Operation Desert Storm, when President Bill Clinton sent troops into Somalia and Haiti and authorized Operation Desert Fox, and when President George W. Bush authorized Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan and Operation Iraqi Freedom in Iraq, they each used different methods of decision making, but in each case the ultimate decision was an individual one. In fact, many government decisions can be made only by the president. As Walter Lippmann pointed out, debate is the only satisfactory way the exact issues can be decided:¶ A president, whoever he is, has to find a way of understanding the novel and changing issues which he must, under the Constitution, decide. Broadly speaking ... the president has two ways of making up his mind. The one is to turn to his subordinates—to his chiefs of staff and his cabinet officers and undersecretaries and the like—and to direct them to argue out the issues and to bring him an agreed decision…¶ The other way is to sit like a judge at a hearing where the issues to be decided are debated. After he has heard the debate, after he has examined the evidence, after he has heard the debaters cross-examine one another, after he has questioned them himself he makes his decision…¶ It is a much harder method in that it subjects the president to the stress of feeling the full impact of conflicting views, and then to the strain of making his decision, fully aware of how momentous it Is. But there is no other satisfactory way by which momentous and complex issues can be decided.16¶ John F. Kennedy used Cabinet sessions and National Security Council meetings to provide debate to illuminate diverse points of view, expose errors, and challenge assumptions before he reached decisions.17 As he gained experience in office, he placed greater emphasis on debate. One historian points out: "One reason for the difference between the Bay of Pigs and the missile crisis was that [the Bay of Pig\*] fiasco instructed Kennedy in the importance of uninhibited debate in advance of major decision."18 All presidents, to varying degrees, encourage debate among their advisors.¶ We may never be called on to render the final decision on great issues of national policy, but we are constantly concerned with decisions important to ourselves for which debate can be applied in similar ways. That is, this debate may take place in our minds as we weigh the pros and cons of the problem, or we may arrange for others to debate the problem for us. Because we all are increasingly involved in the decisions of the campus, community, and society in general, it is in our intelligent self-interest to reach these decisions through reasoned debate.

#### Only portable skill---means our framework turns case

Steinberg & Freeley 8 \*Austin J. Freeley is a Boston based attorney who focuses on criminal, personal injury and civil rights law, AND \*\*David L. Steinberg , Lecturer of Communication Studies @ U Miami, Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making pp9-10

After several days of intense debate, first the United States House of Representatives and then the U.S. Senate voted to authorize President George W. Bush to attack Iraq if Saddam Hussein refused to give up weapons of mass destruction as required by United Nations's resolutions. Debate about a possible military\* action against Iraq continued in various governmental bodies and in the public for six months, until President Bush ordered an attack on Baghdad, beginning Operation Iraqi Freedom, the military campaign against the Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein. He did so despite the unwillingness of the U.N. Security Council to support the military action, and in the face of significant international opposition.¶ Meanwhile, and perhaps equally difficult for the parties involved, a young couple deliberated over whether they should purchase a large home to accommodate their growing family or should sacrifice living space to reside in an area with better public schools; elsewhere a college sophomore reconsidered his major and a senior her choice of law school, graduate school, or a job. Each of these\* situations called for decisions to be made. Each decision maker worked hard to make well-reasoned decisions.¶ Decision making is a thoughtful process of choosing among a variety of options for acting or thinking. It requires that the decider make a choice. Life demands decision making. We make countless individual decisions every day. To make some of those decisions, we work hard to employ care and consideration; others seem to just happen. Couples, families, groups of friends, and coworkers come together to make choices, and decision-making homes from committees to juries to the U.S. Congress and the United Nations make decisions that impact us all. Every profession requires effective and ethical decision making, as do our school, community, and social organizations.¶ We all make many decisions even- day. To refinance or sell one's home, to buy a high-performance SUV or an economical hybrid car. what major to select, what to have for dinner, what candidate CO vote for. paper or plastic, all present lis with choices. Should the president deal with an international crisis through military invasion or diplomacy? How should the U.S. Congress act to address illegal immigration?¶ Is the defendant guilty as accused? Tlie Daily Show or the ball game? And upon what information should I rely to make my decision? Certainly some of these decisions are more consequential than others. Which amendment to vote for, what television program to watch, what course to take, which phone plan to purchase, and which diet to pursue all present unique challenges. At our best, we seek out research and data to inform our decisions. Yet even the choice of which information to attend to requires decision making. In 2006, TIMI: magazine named YOU its "Person of the Year." Congratulations! Its selection was based on the participation not of ''great men" in the creation of history, but rather on the contributions of a community of anonymous participants in the evolution of information. Through blogs. online networking. You Tube. Facebook, MySpace, Wikipedia, and many other "wikis," knowledge and "truth" are created from the bottom up, bypassing the authoritarian control of newspeople. academics, and publishers. We have access to infinite quantities of information, but how do we sort through it and select the best information for our needs?¶ The ability of every decision maker to make good, reasoned, and ethical decisions relies heavily upon their ability to think critically. Critical thinking enables one to break argumentation down to its component parts in order to evaluate its relative validity and strength. Critical thinkers are better users of information, as well as better advocates.¶ Colleges and universities expect their students to develop their critical thinking skills and may require students to take designated courses to that end. The importance and value of such study is widely recognized.¶ Much of the most significant communication of our lives is conducted in the form of debates. These may take place in intrapersonal communications, in which we weigh the pros and cons of an important decision in our own minds, or they may take place in interpersonal communications, in which we listen to arguments intended to influence our decision or participate in exchanges to influence the decisions of others.¶ Our success or failure in life is largely determined by our ability to make wise decisions for ourselves and to influence the decisions of others in ways that are beneficial to us. Much of our significant, purposeful activity is concerned with making decisions. Whether to join a campus organization, go to graduate school, accept a job oiler, buy a car or house, move to another city, invest in a certain stock, or vote for Garcia—these are just a few of the thousands of decisions we may have to make. Often, intelligent self-interest or a sense of responsibility will require us to win the support of others. We may want a scholarship or a particular job for ourselves, a customer for out product, or a vote for our favored political candidate.¶

#### Resolved requires a policy

**Louisiana House** 3-8-2005, <http://house.louisiana.gov/house-glossary.htm>

Resolution A legislative instrument that generally is used for making declarations, stating policies, and making decisions where some other form is not required. A bill includes the constitutionally required enacting clause; a resolution uses the term "resolved". Not subject to a time limit for introduction nor to governor's veto. ( Const. Art. III, §17(B) and House Rules 8.11 , 13.1 , 6.8 , and 7.4)

#### Federal government is the national government

Black’s Law 4 (Dictionary, 8th Edition, June 1, 2004, pg.716.)

Federal government. 1. A national government that exercises some degree of control over smaller political units that have surrendered some degree of power in exchange for the right to participate in national politics matters – Also termed (in federal states) central government. 2. the U.S. government – Also termed national government. [Cases: United States -1 C.J.S. United States - - 2-3]

#### “Its” refers to the United States Federal Government and is possessive

Updegrave 91 (W.C., “Explanation of ZIP Code Address Purpose”, 8-19, <http://www.supremelaw.org/ref/zipcode/updegrav.htm>)

More specifically, looking at the map on page 11 of the National ZIP Code Directory, e.g. at a local post office, one will see that the first digit of a ZIP Code defines an area that includes more than one State. The first sentence of the explanatory paragraph begins: "A ZIP Code is a numerical code that identifies areas within the United States and its territories for purposes of ..." [cf. 26 CFR 1.1-1(c)]. Note the singular possessive pronoun "its", not "their", therefore carrying the implication that it relates to the "United States" as a corporation domiciled in the District of Columbia (in the singular sense), not in the sense of being the 50 States of the Union (in the plural sense). The map shows all the States of the Union, but it also shows D.C., Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, making the explanatory statement literally correct.

#### Discussion of specific policy-questions is crucial for skills development---we control uniqueness: university students already have preconceived and ideological notions about how the world operates---government policy discussion is vital to force engagement with and resolution of competing perspectives to improve social outcomes

Esberg & Sagan 12 \*Jane Esberg is special assistant to the director at New York University's Center on. International Cooperation. She was the winner of 2009 Firestone Medal, AND \*\*Scott Sagan is a professor of political science and director of Stanford's Center for International Security and Cooperation “NEGOTIATING NONPROLIFERATION: Scholarship, Pedagogy, and Nuclear Weapons Policy,” 2/17 The Nonproliferation Review, 19:1, 95-108

These government or quasi-government think tank simulations often provide very similar lessons for high-level players as are learned by students in educational simulations. Government participants learn about the importance of understanding foreign perspectives, the need to practice internal coordination, and the necessity to compromise and coordinate with other governments in negotiations and crises. During the Cold War, political scientist Robert Mandel noted how crisis exercises and war games forced government officials to overcome ‘‘bureaucratic myopia,’’ moving beyond their normal organizational roles and thinking more creatively about how others might react in a crisis or conflict.6 The skills of imagination and the subsequent ability to predict foreign interests and reactions remain critical for real-world foreign policy makers. For example, simulations of the Iranian nuclear crisis\*held in 2009 and 2010 at the Brookings Institution’s Saban Center and at Harvard University’s Belfer Center, and involving former US senior officials and regional experts\*highlighted the dangers of misunderstanding foreign governments’ preferences and misinterpreting their subsequent behavior. In both simulations, the primary criticism of the US negotiating team lay in a failure to predict accurately how other states, both allies and adversaries, would behave in response to US policy initiatives.7¶ By university age, students often have a pre-defined view of international affairs, and the literature on simulations in education has long emphasized how such exercises force students to challenge their assumptions about how other governments behave and how their own government works.8 Since simulations became more common as a teaching tool in the late 1950s, educational literature has expounded on their benefits, from encouraging engagement by breaking from the typical lecture format, to improving communication skills, to promoting teamwork.9 More broadly, simulations can deepen understanding by asking students to link fact and theory, providing a context for facts while bringing theory into the realm of practice.10 These exercises are particularly valuable in teaching international affairs for many of the same reasons they are useful for policy makers: they force participants to ‘‘grapple with the issues arising from a world in flux.’’11 Simulations have been used successfully to teach students about such disparate topics as European politics, the Kashmir crisis, and US response to the mass killings in Darfur.12 Role-playing exercises certainly encourage students to learn political and technical facts\* but they learn them in a more active style. Rather than sitting in a classroom and merely receiving knowledge, students actively research ‘‘their’’ government’s positions and actively argue, brief, and negotiate with others.13 Facts can change quickly; simulations teach students how to contextualize and act on information.14

#### Their framework’s exclusive, moralizing presupposition that they have to be outside of the state prevents self-reflexivity and results in the total breakdown of dialogue and engagement – thinking about costs and benefits for societies as a whole is important because we are less likely to be violent towards others which is the only way to prevent totalitarian thought and atrocities

Keenan, 1998 (Alan, Ph.D., Member of the Committee on Degrees in Social Studies at Harvard University, Theory and Event, Vol. 2 No. 1, http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/journals/theory\_and\_event/v002/2.1keenan.html)

The anti-political nature of guilt, in turn, helps explain the political failures of left "moralism" and its particular mode of politicization. By "moralism," I mean that form of discourse that speaks, acts, and calls others to act, from a presumed, or desired, position of moral and political purity and unquestionable correctness. 39 While not always explicitly grounding its political appeals in the language of guilt and innocence, moralism nonetheless amounts to the project of regulating personal and collective behavior according a preexisting code of right and wrong, the existence of which assures the possibility of correct behavior and decisions, the aim being to map behavior onto code without any excess or remainder. The most obvious and publicized examples of left moralism would be codes of speech and behavior, both explicit and implicit, concerned with issues of race, gender, sexuality, and other "sensitive" concerns, yet the animating moralistic attitude goes beyond any particular set of issues, and can be found throughout both the left and the right. 40 Moralism, especially when it is engaged in apparently political work, is profoundly anti-political. Its promised purity depends on the possibility of a non-interpretive and fully adequate relationship to a code or set of guiding principles, a relationship in which the subjectivity, peculiarities, interests, and power of the interpreter, together with the context of the action or interpretation, are ideally of no consequence. By promising a clear and complete set of rules, ones that can be lived by without ambiguity and without cost to other equally important values, moralism expresses the desire to remain untouched by, and without implication in, that which one rejects or is working to change (even when that includes much of the world within which one must work). The point is to purify oneself of society's and politics' dirt, rather than to work in and through the dirt to rearrange it in more just and equitable ways. 41 Hence moralism's reluctance to engage the doubtful, the uncommitted, or those with opposing political convictions in serious debate and argument. Refusing to entertain the possibility of any connections between itself and the attitudes of its political opponents, the rhetoric of moralism often effectively refuses the process of argumentation itself; its invocations of the code often function as little more than gestures of one's good moral intentions--even as they express a basic mistrust, even cynicism about the value, of democratic political give and take. Thus its anti-rhetorical rhetoric drives away more than it converts, polarizing those it doesn't simply turn off from political discussion altogether. 42 Indeed, the discipline, policing, and purifying that is required to achieve the correct attitude and behavior necessarily appeal to a limited constituency. So, too, with moralism's willful reduction of the world's complexity: simply too many people know that the world is more complicated than any single code or set of codes can manage. This is especially so in a society as saturated with everyday cynicism as ours, where the thought of remaining uncontaminated by guilt, injustice, and power is an impossible one for many. As with political rhetorics more explicitly based on guilt, the pretense to purity of any form of moralizing discourse is a ripe target for cynical unmasking. To the extent that left moralism exudes a resentment at the political condition, then, it merely reinforces and recapitulates the anti-politics that is a major source of the problems it is ostensibly trying to change. 43 It sustains the mode of "politics"--with its over-simplification, polarization, inability to accommodate conflict and ambivalence, and disinterest in even listening to "the enemy"--that drives so much of contemporary cynicism and alienation from politics. It thus feeds the vicious cycle that needs to be reversed. Instead of yet another anti-political politics, the political cynic and the politically alienated need something able to pull them away from their investment in the state of emergency and its displays of technical power, by challenging their belief in the futility, aggressivity, and dreariness of political action.