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1. Resolved: The United States Federal Government should substantially reduce its material support for one of the following: the International Monetary Fund, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the United Nations, or the World Bank.

2. Resolved: The United States Federal Government should substantially reduce its material support for one or more existing programs of the United Nations.

3. Resolved: The United States Federal Government should substantially reduce its material support towards an existing agency of the United Nations.

4. Resolved: The United States Federal Government should substantially reduce its material support for international organizations.

5. Resolved: The United States Federal Government should substantially increase its material support for one of the following organizations: the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the United Nations (UN), or the World Bank.

6. Resolved: The United States Federal Government should substantially increase its material support for one or more existing programs of the United Nations.

7. Resolved: The United States Federal Government should substantially increase its material support for existing non-peacekeeping operations of the United Nations.

8. Resolved: The United States Federal Government should substantially reduce its material support for one of the following: United Nations Development Program, United Nations Drug Control Program, United Nations Population Fund, World Bank, or the International Monetary Fund.

Author’s Preface

In accepting this topic assignment, the initial proposal was to look only at resolutions that would decrease the United States’ role in the selected international organizations (IMF, NATO, UN, and the World Bank). However, as research progressed in this area, it seems that there has been a significant evolution in my thought process regarding the approach to this problem area. In the early stages of the development of the paper, it seemed that affirmatives on a “reduce” resolution would have some inherent susceptibility to core negative arguments (such as hegemony), particularly at the link level – the idea being that it would be hard to argue that the United States becoming less involved in these organizations would boost leadership, meaning that affirmatives either have to argue that hegemony is somehow durable or bad. However, in *Superpower: Three Choices for America’s Role in the World*, Ian Bremmer makes compelling arguments for three different approaches regarding America’s place in the world:

- **Independent America** – given that there are no credible threats to United States primacy, the nation should seek to lead by example, meaning that by focusing on key domestic issues (specifically, Bremmer identifies infrastructure, education, and veterans’ affairs in his book), we maximize our potential, which then becomes a beacon for other nations to follow. While Bremmer would not consider this isolationist, it certainly does entail a significant withdrawal from the world stage.

- **Moneyball America** – Using the namesake for the approach used by Billy Beane to build the Oakland A’s, Moneyball America seeks to look at international conflicts more critically and to act only on those with a significant impact to American interests, either here or abroad. While it denies a strict “American exceptionalism” approach, the primary basis for this is a lack of omniscience in terms of considering the repercussions of our actions in attempting to impose our value system on the rest of the world. As such, a foreign policy approach based on more careful consideration of likely consequences, modesty, and discretion is in order.

- **Indispensable America** – This is the traditional approach that we see articulated in a multitude of “Hegemony Good” cards, many of which we can cite and recite by memory. At the core of Bremmer’s argument for this approach is the increasingly interconnected nature of the world, meaning that a failure to act proactively with threats overseas will ultimately lead to those threats coming to our shores. As such, our strategy for engaging the world must be proactive.

Another issue is that (with some exceptions), even when there are criticisms, more of the evidence appears to advocate reform of the status quo as opposed to a reduction or elimination of support. Additionally, while at least one reviewer believes that this is less of an issue than I, the natural advantage ground for affirmatives may be relatively small, making it almost too predictable, potentially limiting the range of appealing strategic choices for affirmative teams. Thus, in addition to the reviews received, I ask the Marshall and Wording Committees for insight on this as we develop a final wording and direction for this resolution.
Introduction

Books such as Robert Kagan’s *The World America Made*, Ian Bremmer’s previously mentioned *Superpower: Three Choices for America’s Role in the World*, and Richard Haass’ *Foreign Policy Begins at Home: The Case for Putting America’s House in Order* all speak to a fundamental question facing the United States – in a world where all of the following seem to be happening at once:

- the economic and geopolitical rise of China
- an increasingly assertive Russia seeking to reclaim its place on the world stage
- the emergence of Japan and Brazil as regional powers
- the potential of several other nations to emerge as regional powers in the near term (Mexico, Nigeria, India, Saudi Arabia, and South Africa would all fit this billing)
- a Europe that seems to be shirking its collective security duty and is dealing with its own continental fiscal issues
- a rising national debt (though the rate of increase has slowed in recent years)
- America recovering from two conflicts in the last decade and potentially immersing itself into a new battle with the Islamic State.
- the rise of a whole range of non-state actors with significant economic and political resources along with technological and media savvy (including various NGOs, multi-national corporations, and terrorist groups)

In light of all this, it is not hard to see that the world is much more complex, with power much more diffused, than the relatively simple days of the Cold War or even those immediately after the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991.

Internally, the debate rages as well. Those with a strong libertarian streak contend that the United States should not attempt to be the policeman/ombudsman/financier/help center/support desk for the rest of the world, either because such efforts undercut our ability to undertake other worthwhile projects at home (Bremmer speaks to this pretty specifically), or because the United States shouldn’t be attempting to impose its political or economic culture on the rest of the world (this is perhaps less true regarding NATO, but could become more true should Russia’s adventurism extend beyond where it is as of June 2015). Internationalists respond by saying that American involvement in such efforts serves a preemptive function in that we are helping to address such problems before the problems come to our shores in any one of a number of ways.

This paper, thus, seeks to propose that the role of the United States in supporting these various international organizations should be examined over the course of the 2016-2017 academic year. As required by the NFHS, the focus for 2016-2017 will be on foreign policy. It is worth noting that should this topic be selected, it will be the first time since the United Nations peacekeeping topic in 2004-2005 that a foreign policy topic doesn’t identify a specific nation or region of the world as the venue for action. While some may be concerned about the lack of such a defined area as a limiter for the topic, this should not be seen as a real issue due to the ability of the Wording Committee to include or exclude various organizations to serve this limiting function.

Key Issues/Harms Areas

Note: Given the as yet uncertain nature of the direction of the resolution, this section is presented with the understanding that some harms areas will be inherently bidirectional in nature and other harms areas will be dependent on the final wording of the resolution.
Hegemony – On any topic involving the role to which the United States should or should not be engaging in leadership with the rest of the world, hegemony is certainly going to be a key issue. Teams looking for increased United States hegemony will likely argue that other actors (notably China but also Russia) are vying to challenge American leadership and that such leadership, based on our principles of government and other factors, makes us uniquely qualified to assume this role, likely with the Kagan ‘11 and/or Khalizad ‘95 evidence waiting as the terminal impact. Conversely, teams will argue that when the United States looks at the world from this unipolar perspective and acts accordingly, it breeds resentment and drags the United States into conflicts which then create no-win situations for America.

Capitalism – Because the United States holds the largest share of votes in the IMF and the various agencies of the World Bank, it is natural for some to criticize these organizations for being more interested in promoting marketization over development or stabilization. As noted by Tina Lynn Evans, “in the global context, the IMF insists that ‘countries have an independent central bank focusing on [reducing] inflation’ (Stiglitz, 2002, p.45). This policy embodies a clear creditor bias. If the IMF were more concerned with diverse and widespread economic development, it might focus at least as intently on employment and growth, which we have seen it does not (Stiglitz, 2002, p.45). We see that the fiscal and monetary policies within globally hegemonic economies and within international banks that serve the interests of hegemonic capital serve to advance the interests of capitalist elites within the world-system, thereby helping these elites to perpetuate global economic culture in their own image.” (Evans, www)

Aid Dependency – Teams arguing against increased support for international organizations would argue that such aid, which is intended to be temporary, becomes a permanent lifeline for developing nations, who then become addicted to this aid. The impact to this is that the addiction prevents the sort of structural reform needed to put such nations on the path to greater prosperity and stability. International economist Dambisa Moyo articulates this when she writes, “The notion that aid can alleviate systemic poverty, and has done so, is a myth. Millions in Africa are poorer today because of aid; misery and poverty have not ended but increased. Aid has been, and continues to be, an unmitigated political, economic, and humanitarian disaster for most parts of the developing world.” (Moyo, xix)

North-South/Economic Imperialism/Neocolonialism – This sort of argument would claim that international organizations such as the World Bank and the IMF are inherently slanted towards the policy approaches of the developed nations of the North. While some of these arguments are similar to that which one might find in a capitalism position, there is also the argument that economically developed nations use their control over organizations such as the IMF and World Bank to force underdeveloped nations to provide their resources to developed nations under less than favorable conditions so that the “North” can remain in its dominant global position.

Economics – Most everyone has heard the classic joke about putting two economists in a room and always getting a disagreement. One variation goes something like this: The First Law of Economics: For every economist, there exists an equal and opposite economist. The Second Law of Economics: They’re both wrong.

One obvious argument that will emerge in cases involving the IMF and the World Bank is the relationship of their policies to the global economy. While you will not likely see the sort of “U.S. economy is key to the global economy” claims that were in evidence on some parts of the oceans topic, there may well be teams that will advance the idea that the lack of support for the IMF and World Bank
forces them to pick and choose which economies to support, keeping the global economy shackled. Other teams may argue that, for example, when the IMF mandates austerity on nations as a condition of receiving aid also serves to keep national economies in dire straits. Finding evidence on both sides of these debates shouldn’t be too terribly difficult.

**Russian Expansionism** – This particular area is likely to be limited to a resolution that allows for a definitive change to America’s role *viz a viz* NATO. Of course, everyone is aware of the situation that has been transpiring in the Ukraine and Crimea for some time. However, other nations that border Russia (particularly the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania) believe that they may be future targets of Russian aggression and that the only way to check this back is through a robust response on the part of the United States to redouble its commitment to the NATO alliance. The question in the American foreign policy community is whether it is worth going into an actual shooting war with Russia over the Ukraine and/or the Baltic states.

While this list is not intended to be exhaustive, it is worth noting that in the case of the resolutions where United Nations support is increased, the harms areas will depend considerably on the particular program or agency that the affirmative chooses to support. Thus, it seems likely that there will be sufficient harms ground to provide for affirmatives to craft plans that are strategic in nature. In the review, the suggestion was put forth to consider limiting the range of UN agencies and/or programs up for consideration. Given the range of those agencies, this would probably make even more sense on a resolution where support is increased. Limiting to only those programs defined as agencies would allow the resolution to include the IMF and the World Bank.

**Timeliness**

There are a couple factors that make this particular topic a timely one at this moment in history. In October of 2014, the IMF released data showing that on a purchasing power parity (PPP) basis, China’s Gross Domestic Product has exceeded that of the United States, at $17.6 trillion versus $17.4 trillion. (Atlanta Journal Constitution) While economists debate whether using PPP is the most appropriate measure of economic power (for example, some advocate using dollar-denominated GDP, in which case the United States remains comfortably ahead), the ascendancy of the Chinese economy cannot be denied. Further, China has begun to make significant inroads in its trading relationship with countries in sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America, thus beginning to establish a greater footing on the world stage. The logical question from this development is whether Beijing will seek a greater role in organizations such as the IMF and World Bank and will they be willing to foot the bill to achieve this increased influence.

Regarding NATO specifically, up until recently, the debate seemed to be dominated by the fact that many of the alliance’s nations were not committing the fiscal resources pledged to NATO less than a decade previous. In fact, “In 2006, the 28 members of NATO agreed to spend at least 2% of their GDP on defense. According to NATO records, by 2012 only four members met this bare minimum standard; the United States, Great Britain, Greece, and Estonia. During the Cold War, the U.S. accounted for roughly 50% of defense spending by NATO members. Now after years of shrinking defense budgets in Europe, the U.S. share is more than 75%.” (Benitez, www). Even nations that aspire to be regional powers in Western Europe, such as France and Germany, were reducing their defense budgets in 2013, France to an average of $50 billion per year (1.9% of GDP) and Germany cutting over $10 billion per year out of its defense expenditures, along with a reduction in its active duty force by one-third and an ending of conscription there. (Francis, www)
Since the publication of the two articles referenced in the preceding paragraph, however, two events are forcing politicians and scholars to rethink this position. In February of 2014, Russian forces entered southeastern Ukraine following the ouster of Viktor Yanukovych. Subsequently, Russian forces then annexed Crimea in March 2014. In response to these developments, “NATO is responding to Russia’s illegal occupation of Ukrainian territory with the largest reinforcement of collective defense since the end of the Cold War, NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg said over the weekend in Brussels… Russia also has troops in Moldova and Georgia, and Russian forces are working to destabilize Eastern Ukraine. Russian actions have spurred NATO to make sweeping changes…. The alliance is doubling the size of its response force, the secretary general said. Once finished, he said, the lead elements of this force will be able to move in within as little as 48 hours. The alliance, he added, is establishing command and control units in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania and Bulgaria.” (Garamone, www)

The other security crisis, of course, is the rise of the Islamic State (ISIS). While the organization has been around in some form since the late 1990s, it has only within the last year or so emerged in the public consciousness with the declaration of their caliphate in June of 2014. As ISIS grew in power and the nature of their aggression has become more well-known, at least twenty NATO countries have responded either through direct military action (mainly in the form of airstrikes) or through the provision of weapons to forces fighting ISIS.

More recently, however, it is worth noting that during NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg’s visit to Washington in March of 2015, the Obama Administration failed to even respond to a request for face time with President Obama, as Josh Rogin wrote on March 24, 2015: “President Barack Obama has yet to meet with the new head of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and won’t see Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg this week, even though he is in Washington for three days. Stoltenberg’s office requested a meeting with Obama well in advance of the visit, but never heard anything from the White House, two sources close to the NATO chief told me.” (Rogin, www) While a meeting was able to be set up between Stoltenberg and Defense Secretary Ashton Carter, the administration’s inability to carve out time for Obama to meet with the NATO chief is seen by some as reason to question the United State’s commitment to the alliance, although “America’s commitment to defend its NATO allies is its biggest treaty obligation, said Volker, adding that European security is at its most perilous moment since the Cold War.” (Rogin, www)

As far as the United Nations is concerned, the debate over what the United States’ role should be is like blue jeans in as much as that it never seems to go out of style. Conservatives of a more isolationist bent would just as soon see the United States leave the UN altogether or, failing that, use its leverage to negotiate substantially better deals with the organization. Those who believe that U.S. hegemony is unmanageable or disruptive to the international system will want to maintain U.S. involvement but may be okay with shunting off some of the responsibility for funding and managing these programs to other nations.

Scope, Range, Quality

At first glance, it appears that the range of cases available to affirmatives is likely to be somewhat larger with a resolution that advocates increased United States involvement as opposed to decreased involvement. As such, a resolution that advocates an increase in support would probably necessitate some other limiting language in order to keep affirmative teams from finding a small program, modestly increasing support for it, and daring negative teams to link a disadvantage to it. Additionally, it naturally seems that the advantage areas available to cases that propose expanded U.S. involvement have a greater range than those advocating decreased U.S. involvement. Also influencing
this will be whether or not the United Nations is included as part of the resolution – if it is, the topic area will be considerably larger than one without the United Nations.

Regarding the question of whether the resolution will be effective educational tool for both varsity and novice debaters (especially given that freshmen novices will debate a second foreign policy topic as a senior), it seems that novices would be most easily able to access the resolution if the United Nations in included, given that they will almost certainly have heard of this organization, even if only through history classes that discuss the creation of this body after World War II. Varsity debaters will find sufficient complexity in the interactions of international relations, especially where those relationships involve groups that are supranational organizations and may include as part of counterplan ground non-governmental organizations.

Brief History and Explanation of Organizations

International Monetary Fund

The International Monetary Fund is a creation of the 1944 Bretton Woods Conference, formally coming into existence the following year, along with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, which later became part of the World Bank. Beginning with 29 countries, the organization has steadily grown in membership, now counting 188 countries as member nations. (IMF) Specifically, as per its own website, the IMF provides the following:

- policy advice to governments and central banks based on analysis of economic trends and cross-country experiences
- research, statistics, forecasts, and analysis based on tracking of global, regional, and individual economies and markets
- loans to help individual countries overcome economic difficulties
- concessional loans to help fight poverty in developing countries
- technical assistance and training to help countries improve the management of their economies

(IMF)

While the World Bank’s primary function is to assist with nations seeking economic development, the International Monetary Fund’s goal is to promote economic stability and promote international trade, particularly through downturns in individual nations. To that end, the IMF provided more than a quarter of a trillion dollars in loans to nations struggling with the effects of the global economic downturn that began in 2008, with many of those loans being made to the world’s poorest nations at below-market interest rates. (IMF) One way that this was done is through the establishment of Special Drawing Rights (SDRs, also designated as XDRs in something called the ISO 4217 currency code) which are accessible to nations with payment imbalances. While not used extensively today (even the IMF has deemed them to be no longer significant to most nations), they can provide a way for developing nations to access credit on favorable terms, provided that they can get another nation to exchange their currency reserves for the SDRs (they can only be exchanged for one of four currencies – the U.S. dollar, the Euro, the Japanese yen, and the British pound).

In 2012, the nations of the IMF agreed to increase their contributions to the fund to nearly double the amount of loanable funds to $430 billion (IMF). Voting power within the IMF is based on basic votes (which every nation receives based on membership in the organization) added to the amount of SDRs a nation contributes to the fund. (IMF) As a result, the United States commands slightly more than 1/6 of the total votes, which is more than double the vote share of any other IMF member nation (Japan is second with a little more than 6 percent of the vote).
North Atlantic Treaty Organization

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was founded in 1949 in response to the establishment by the Soviet Union of puppet states across Eastern Europe. Created as a league of mutual defense, Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty requires member states to come to the defense of a member state in the event of armed attack. While set up to check the ambitions of the USSR, Article 5 itself was first invoked in 2001 after the 9/11 attacks, resulting in the deployment of forces from NATO member nations to Afghanistan. Prior to this, though, NATO did intervene in the events surrounding the breakup of Yugoslavia, first through air campaigns and later through Operation Joint Endeavor, providing 60,000 troops to enforce the Dayton Accords, signed in 1995.

While Article 5 deals specifically with the conditions under which member nations are compelled to come to the defense of other member nations, there is also Article 4 of the North Atlantic Treaty, which authorizes consultation between the member nations whenever the security of one is threatened. This has been invoked a handful of times, all since 2003 (thrice by Turkey and once by Poland).

Initially a collection of Western European nations, NATO has undergone six enlargements (the first in 1952 with the addition of Greece and Turkey, the most recent in 2009 with the addition of Albania and Croatia), so that now every territory that had been a non-USSR portion of the Warsaw Pact is now a member of NATO. Additionally, three former Soviet Republics (the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania) are also members, having entered in 2004.

Additionally, in the years following the dissolution of the Soviet Union, NATO commenced the Partnership for Peace Program, focused on creating bilateral cooperation around several areas (disaster response, civil-military relations, military exercises among others). Nations need not be NATO members to be in the Partnership for Peace, and in fact, every one of the twelve non-NATO former Soviet republics (including Russia) are members. (The Partnership for Peace programme)

United Nations

The United Nations was founded in 1945 at the end of World War II in an attempt to keep the conditions that allowed for the failure of the League of Nations and the resulting war from occurring, especially given the increased stakes with the advent of nuclear weapons. While the conflicts of the Cold War kept the United Nations on the sidelines in a number of hotspots, UN forces were sent in during the Korean War and the Suez Crisis in the 1950s. During the Cold War, though, a number of specialized agencies were founded that expanded the role of the United Nations from an organization focused of keeping the global peace to include various functions such as international health, atomic energy, and food security (a list of United Nations’ agencies and programs can be found in Appendix I).

Since the end of the Cold war, the United Nations has been involved in a number of peacekeeping missions, including interventions in the former Yugoslavia, Rwanda, and East Timor, among others. Current UN peacekeeping missions include the now half-century monitoring of the border of the partition of Cyprus, the placement of UN forces in Darfur, and a decade-long stabilization mission in Haiti. While the United Nations has received significant criticism for perceived failures in some of its peacekeeping missions, a 2005 RAND Corporation report found that two out of every three UN peacekeeping missions had been successful.

Criticism of the United Nations comes from a number of different sources and for many different reasons. While some of the criticism comes from isolationist groups such as the John Birch Society who oppose the United States even being a member of the United Nations, there is also opposition from conservatives over specific programs and funding mechanisms, specifically population
control measures in nations that have led to the use of abortions or sterilization as population control measures. Some foreign nations perceive the United Nations to be dominated by the “elite” nations (the veto power of the five permanent members of the Security Council would be an example of this), while other criticisms focus on the effectiveness of various UN programs.

**World Bank**

The World Bank was founded at the Bretton Woods Conference in 1944, along with the IMF, with which it works closely. While the bank has a number of organizations under its banner, the one that is most closely associated with the World Bank is the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. While the IMF is primarily focused on macroeconomic stability, the World Bank’s principal focus is on development. Nations either pay directly into the World Bank coffers or provide callable subscriptions, which can be then requested by the World Bank to provide funds for development. Developing nations solicit money from the World Bank through the International Development Association (IDA).

One of the principal goals of the World Bank is poverty reduction, as evidenced by their own website which lays out two primary goals to be achieved by 2030:

- “End extreme poverty by decreasing the percentage of people living on less than $1.25 a day to no more than 3%”
- “Promote shared prosperity by fostering the income growth of the bottom 40% for every country.” (World Bank)

This is achieved primarily through the granting of low-interest loans and grants to developing nations, geared towards investing in a wide range of projects (including areas such as education, agriculture, infrastructure, and public health). One such program is the Development Marketplace Awards, which focuses on innovative development projects with high potential to be replicated, with a focus on those that address the concerns of the very poorest segments of the population.

**Definitions**

**increase**

“become or make greater in size, amount, intensity, or degree”. Oxford Online Dictionary

“to become greater or larger” American Heritage Online Dictionary

**reduce**

“make smaller or less in amount, degree, or size” Oxford Online Dictionary

“To bring down, as in extent, amount, or degree; diminish” American Heritage Online Dictionary.

**should**

“used to indicate obligation, duty, or correctness, typically when criticizing someone’s actions”. Oxford Online Dictionary

“used to express obligation or duty”. American Heritage Online Dictionary

**substantially**
Author’s note – as anyone who has coached or debated will know, several legal definitions exist that assign a precise percentage to this term. However, those definitions are often, by their context, limited to addressing the issue that was at bar in that particular case. Thus, while a list of cases could cite substantially as meaning anything from 10 percent up to 90 percent, I will refrain from listing all of them here. Debaters historically have proven themselves plenty adept at finding these interpretations. However, I have included two at the end worthy of consideration, the first from a UN agency and the second making the claim that because substantially is not a term of art, it inherently should be evaluated in context.

“to a great or significant extent”. Oxford Online Dictionary

“considerable in importance, value, degree, amount, or extent”. American Heritage Online Dictionary

“Change in selected pressures on natural ecosystems 2002-32. For the ecosystem quality component, see the explanation of the Natural Capital Index. Values for the cumulative pressures were derived as described under Natural Capital Index. The maps show the relative increase or decrease in pressure between 2002 and 2032. ‘No change’ means less than 10 per cent change in pressure over the scenario period; small increase or decrease means between 10 and 50 per cent change; substantial increase or decrease means 50 to 100 per cent change; strong increase means more than doubling of pressure. Areas which switch between natural and domesticated land uses are recorded separately.” – United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP 2, United Nations Environmental Program, 10-2, www.unep.org/geo/geo3/english/584.htm)

“Plaintiffs should argue that the term "substantially prevail" is not a term of art because if considered a term of art, resort to Black's 7th produces a definition of "prevail" that could be interpreted adversely to plaintiffs. It is commonly accepted that words that are not legal terms of art should be accorded their ordinary, not their legal, meaning, 100 and ordinary-usage dictionaries provide FOIA fee claimants with helpful arguments. The Supreme Court has already found favorable, temporally relevant definitions of the word "substantially" in ordinary dictionaries: "Substantially" suggests "considerable" or "specified to a large degree." See Webster’s Third New International Dictionary 2280 (1976) (defining "substantially" as "in a substantial manner" and "substantial" as "considerable in amount, value, or worth" and "being that specified to a large degree or in the main"); see also 17 Oxford English Dictionary 66-67 (2d ed. 1989) ("substantial": "relating to or proceeding from the essence of a thing; essential"; "of ample or considerable amount, quantity or dimensions"). 101” – David Arkush ’02 (JD Candidate – Harvard University, “Preserving 'Catalyst' Attorneys' Fees Under the Freedom of Information Act in the Wake of Buckhannon Board and Care Home v. West Virginia Department of Health and Human Resources”, Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review, Winter, 37 Harv. C.R.-C.L. L. Rev. 131)

**material support**

the term “material support or resources” means any property, tangible or intangible, or service, including currency or monetary instruments or financial securities, financial services, lodging, training, expert advice or assistance, safehouses, false documentation or identification, communications equipment, facilities, weapons, lethal substances, explosives, personnel (1 or more individuals who may be or include oneself), and transportation, except medicine or religious materials; -- Title 18 of the United States Code, Section 2239A, (b) (1)
“The definition of material support includes not just providing weapons, or cash, or bomb-making skills. It includes providing any sort of personnel, expert advice, or training — including advice on how to resolve disputes peaceably or training on how to make human rights claims before the U.N.” – NPR (“Supreme Court Examines Limits of Material Support”, February 23, 2010, last accessed June 23, 2015, http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=124012925)

**United States federal government**

“The United States Federal Government is established by the US Constitution. The Federal Government shares sovereignty over the United States with the individual governments of the States of US. The Federal government has three branches: i) the legislature, which is the US Congress, ii) Executive, comprised of the President and Vice president of the US and iii) Judiciary.” US Legal.com Definitions

“The government of the United States, established by the Constitution, is a federal republic of 50 states, a few territories and some protectorates. The national government consists of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches.” Word IQ.com
Appendix I – List of United Nations Programs (taken directly from the United Nations Foundation website and reformatted)

The United Nations’ system is comprised of the UN itself and more than 30 affiliated organizations — known as programs, funds, and specialized agencies — with their own membership, leadership, and budget processes. These groups work with and through the UN to promote worldwide peace and prosperity.

**UN Programs and Funds**

UN programs and funds are financed through voluntary contributions rather than assessed contributions.

They include the following programs:

• **United Nations Development Program (UNDP)** – On the ground in 166 countries, UNDP is the UN’s global development network, focusing on the challenges of democratic governance, poverty reduction, crisis prevention and recovery, energy and environment, and HIV/AIDS. UNDP also coordinates national and international efforts to achieve the Millennium Development Goals aimed at poverty reduction. Recently UNDP helped Liberia prepare for national elections that put Africa’s first woman president, Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf, in office. It has helped Thailand build solar-power water pumping stations. And it has helped earthquake damaged regions of Pakistan with long-term development planning. UNDP also publishes the annual Human Development Report.

• **Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)** – Headquartered in Geneva, Switzerland, UNHCR protects refugees worldwide and facilitates their return home or resettlement. UNHCR is working on the ground in over 116 countries, helping 20.8 million persons in areas including Lebanon, Darfur, southern Sudan, Afghanistan, and Iraq.

• **United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF)** – UNICEF provides long-term humanitarian and development assistance to children and mothers. Recent UNICEF initiatives have included polio immunization for 5.5 million children in Angola, helping girls enroll and stay in school in 34 African countries, and reintegrating child soldiers in Sierra Leone into civil society.

• **World Food Program (WFP)** – WFP, which aims to eradicate hunger and malnutrition, is the world’s largest humanitarian agency. Every year, the program feeds almost 100 million people in over 80 nations. WFP has delivered aid to Darfur, to Pakistan in the aftermath of the 2005 earthquake, and to southern Asia following the tsunami.

• **United Nations Drug Control Program (UNDCP)** – UNDCP helps Member States fight drugs, crime, and terrorism. Aside from providing laboratory services, this Program helps to improve cross-border cooperation.

• **United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)** – UNFPA works on the ground in 140 nations to “ensure that every pregnancy is wanted, every birth is safe, every young person is free of HIV/AIDS, and every girl and woman is treated with dignity and respect.”
• **United Nations Environment Program (UNEP)** – UNEP coordinates the United Nations’ environmental activities. It develops international environmental conventions, assesses global environmental trends, encourages new civil sector partnerships, and strengthens institutions so they might better protect the environment.

• **UN Women** – The creation of UN Women came about as part of the UN reform agenda, bringing together resources and mandates for greater impact. It merges and builds on the important work of four previously distinct parts of the UN system, which focused exclusively on gender equality and women’s empowerment.

**UN Specialized Agencies**

The United Nations’ specialized agencies are autonomous organizations working with the United Nations and funded by both voluntary and assessed contributions. These agencies include the:

• **World Bank** – The World Bank focuses on poverty reduction and the improvement of living standards worldwide by providing low-interest loans, interest-free credit, and grants to developing countries for education, health, infrastructure, and communications, among other things. The World Bank works in over 100 countries.

• **International Monetary Fund (IMF)** – The IMF fosters economic growth and employment by providing temporary financial assistance to countries to help ease balance of payments adjustment and technical assistance. The IMF currently has $28 billion in outstanding loans to 74 nations.

• **World Health Organization (WHO)** – WHO is responsible for global vaccination campaigns, responding to public health emergencies, defending against pandemic influenza, and leading the way for eradication campaigns against life-threatening diseases like polio and malaria. Last year WHO eliminated avian flu in Vietnam, removed two countries from the list of polio-endemic nations, and provided humanitarian assistance in Lebanon and Darfur.

• **United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)** – UNESCO focuses on everything from teacher training to helping improve education worldwide to protecting important historical and cultural sites around the world. UNESCO added 28 new World Heritage Sites this year to the list of irreplaceable treasures that will be protected for today’s travelers and future generations.

• **International Labor Organization (ILO)** – ILO promotes international labor rights by formulating international standards on the freedom to associate, collective bargaining, the abolition of forced labor, and equality of opportunity and treatment.

• **Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)** – FAO leads international efforts to fight hunger. It is both a forum for negotiating agreements between developing and developed countries and a source of technical knowledge and information to aid development.

• **International Maritime Organization (IMO)** – IMO has created a comprehensive shipping regulatory framework, addressing safety and environmental concerns, legal matters, technical cooperation, security, and efficiency.
• **World Meteorological Organization (WMO)** – WMO facilitates the free international exchange of meteorological data and information and the furtherance of its use in aviation, shipping, security, and agriculture, among other things.

• **World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)** – WIPO protects intellectual property throughout the world through 23 international treaties.

• **International Civilian Aviation Organization (ICAO)** – ICAO sets international rules on air navigation, the investigation of air accidents, and aerial border-crossing procedures.

• **United Nations specialized agency for information and communication technologies (ICT)** – ITU coordinates the shared global use of the radio spectrum, promotes international cooperation in assigning satellite orbits, works to improve communication infrastructure in the developing world, and establishes the worldwide standards that foster seamless interconnection of a vast range of communications systems. ITU is committed to connecting the world's people – wherever they live and whatever their means. Through our work, we protect and support everyone's fundamental right to communicate.
Appendix II – Notes on the Organizational Structure of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization

In examining the organizational structure of NATO as presented on its webpage, it became apparent that to format the contents of the page or to transcribe it would be an effort that would be less valuable than the time required in making such a transposition. Additionally, while the portion of the NATO website that presents the organizational structure includes many agencies and offices that would not likely be part of any debate case that would be run, it also seems presumptuous to make a subjective determination of what agencies and programs should be included. Thus, the easiest thing to do to provide a comprehensive and more aesthetically pleasing guide to the range of NATO operations is to merely list the website where this information can be found, which is: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/structure.htm#OA
Appendix III – International Monetary Fund

In examining the means by which the International Monetary Fund operates, it seems that there are less a series of institutions by which the IMF operates as opposed to a number of means by which loanable funds are provided to member nations. For low income countries, such monies are often lent on a concessional (a.k.a. “soft”) basis, meaning that the terms under which funds are lent are generally more favorable than what would be available to such a nation in the open market. For other nations, most lending is done at non-concessional rates. Funding programs under the auspices of the IMF are divided as follows:

Concessional funding
- Extended Credit Facility (ECF)
- Standby Credit Facility (SCF)
- Rapid Credit Facility (RCF)

Non-concessional funding
- Stand-By Arrangements (SBA)
- Flexible Credit Line (FCL)
- Precautionary and Liquidity Line (PLL)
- Extended Fund Facility (EFF)
- Rapid Financing Instrument (RFI)

A further discussion of these programs and some of the terms under which money from these funds are lent can be found at http://www.imf.org/external/np/exr/facts/howlend.htm
Appendix IV – World Bank

In general, the World Bank operates through five primary units, geared around major organizational headings either by function, region, or structure. There are five primary institutional structures through which many of the goals of the other units are achieved, which are:

- The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD)
- The International Development Association (IDA)
- The International Finance Corporation (IFC)
- Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA)
- International Centre for the Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID)

These five organizations comprise what is known as the World Bank Group, and most affirmatives will utilize at least one of the organizations in implementing the plan. For a more complete list of the entire structure of the World Bank, please refer to http://www.worldbank.org/en/about/unit.


The International Monetary Fund, [www.imf.org], last accessed April 3, 2015.


