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#### Interpretation: the affirmative must defend that only just governments ought to recognize an unconditional right to strike

#### Just governments respect liberties

Dorn 12 James A. Dorn, Cato Journal, "The Scope of Government in a Free Society", Fall 2012, https://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/serials/files/cato-journal/2012/12/v32n3-10.pdf

If laws are just, liberty and property are secure. The most certain test of justice is negative—that is, justice occurs when injustice (the violation of natural rights to life, liberty, and property) is prevented. The emphasis here is on what Hayek (1967) called “just rules of conduct,” not on the fairness of outcomes. No one has stated the negative concept of justice better than the 19th century French classical liberal Frederic Bastiat ([1850] 1964: 65): When law and force confine a man within the bounds of justice, they do not impose anything on him but a mere negation. They impose on him only the obligation to refrain from injuring others. They do not infringe on his personality, or his liberty or his property. They merely safeguard the personality, the liberty, and the property of others. They stand on the defensive; they defend the equal rights of all. They fulfill a mission whose harmlessness is evident, whose utility is palpable, and whose legitimacy is uncontested. In short, the purpose of a just government is not to do good with other people’s money, but to prevent injustice by protecting property and securing liberty.

#### The German government is polluted with racism – that doesn’t’ secure liberties

Deutsche **Welle** (Www.Dw, 09.06.20**20**, "Racism on the rise in Germany," DW, [https://www.dw.com/en/racism-on-the-rise-in-germany/a-53735536 //](https://www.dw.com/en/racism-on-the-rise-in-germany/a-53735536%20//) JB

As Black Lives Matter protests persist worldwide, a German study reveals that discrimination against people based on their ethnic origin has increased. The report warns of serious consequences for society. Ever since the [violent death of an African-American man, George Floyd](https://www.dw.com/en/george-floyd-killing-spurs-fresh-protests-across-europe/a-53706536), at the hands of police two weeks ago, a wave of protests has been rolling across the US. Many people in [Germany were also shocked by footage](https://www.dw.com/en/germany-shocked-by-george-floyd-killing-calls-for-end-to-violence/a-53674811) in which he is seen in mortal agony while being subjected to brutal mistreatment for almost nine minutes. [Tens of thousands of people across the country took to the streets](https://www.dw.com/en/germany-thousands-attend-anti-racism-protests-honoring-george-floyd/a-53700909) this past weekend to protest against racism, despite restrictions imposed to stem the coronavirus pandemic, Amid considerable media attention, they also decried racial discrimination in Germany. For the image of German society, too, has repeatedly been blemished by everyday racism, xenophobic riots and right-wing extremist attacks like those carried out by the [National Socialist Underground (NSU)](https://www.dw.com/en/germany-nsu-murder-verdict-facing-challenges-from-all-sides/a-53453001). **Almost 1,200 complaints of racism** Recent statistics back up the protesters' criticism and confirm a dismal trend: Racial discrimination has increased significantly in Germany. According to the 2019 annual report presented Tuesday by the German Federal Anti-Discrimination Agency (ADS), the number of such cases reported in Germany rose by almost 10% to 1,176. They make up 33% of the cases dealt with by the agency. That is the largest share, and not for the first time: In 2016, it was already 25%. Since 2015, when 545 reported cases were listed, the number has more than doubled. Germany has an "ongoing problem with racial discrimination and does not give enough consistent legal support to victims," said Bernhard Franke, the acting head of the anti-discrimination agency, when presenting the report. The feeling of being left alone with injustice has "dire consequences in the long run that endanger social cohesion," Franke warned, adding, "Discrimination wears people down." For this reason, the ADS' annual report focuses on the issue of racism in great detail. **Deep traces in society** In the report's foreword, Franke writes that 2019 was a year in which "hatred and hostility toward particular groups left deep and painful traces" — from the [right-wing extremist murder of Walter Lübcke](https://www.dw.com/en/german-politicians-killing-leaves-unanswered-questions-one-year-on/a-53621981), a Christian Democratic (CDU) politician who campaigned for refugees, to the [terrorist attack on a synagogue in Halle](https://www.dw.com/en/germany-halle-synagogue-shooting-suspect-charged-with-double-murder/a-53201696). But he wrote that there were many small incidents and everyday discrimination that had left their mark as well. To illustrate concretely what this means, the report includes anonymized quotes from people who describe the discrimination they face every day. For example: "A customer recently called through the store, '[Where's my (N-word)?](https://www.dw.com/en/always-derogatory-germany-battles-over-the-n-word/a-52327824) I like it best when he massages my head!'" Or: "A kid at school insulted my brother because he has dark skin. Then the kid hit him. The teacher saw everything, but did nothing.'" One more example: "Two colleagues from another department approached me, laughing, and asked if I worked in the company to make coffee. I am a civil engineer from Syria and am employed as a structural engineer. When I told them that, they laughed even louder and asked whether I worked according to German or Syrian standards." **Tip of the iceberg** The annual report goes on to say that many of those affected have the feeling that the overall situation has not improved over the past years. They feel that although attacks and murders have shaken society, "the worries, fears and experiences of exclusion had by people with a migration background are ultimately not taken seriously." Violence, hatred and agitation are only the tip of the iceberg of racist attitudes and resentment, which become apparent much earlier in acts of everyday discrimination, the report says. As examples of this, the report cites ads for rented apartments that stipulate "no foreigners," the discotheque where some are told that "people like you" always cause trouble and the bosses who say a colleague who made a racist joke "didn't really mean it." In 2019, according to the report, one out of three people with migrant roots looking for housing within the last 10 years said they had experienced discrimination. At the same time, 41% of all respondents in a representative sample stated they had serious or very serious reservations about renting an apartment to an immigrant.

#### Prefer –

#### 1] Precision — anything else justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### 2] Limits – there are 200 governments in the world – letting them pick an unjust ones explodes limits via infinite permutations of governments

#### 3] Phil ed – 1AR will claim no government is just but that just means that we defend ideal theory. That’s good –

#### A] forces philosophical contestation which can uniquely happen in LD debate whereas you can util debate on any topic

#### B] outweighs – framework debate allows to identify injustice which is a prereq to any other theory voter because they’re all philosophically grounded

#### Fairness – debate is a competitive activity that requires fairness for objective evaluation. Outweighs because it’s the only intrinsic part of debate – all other rules can be debated over but rely on some conception of fairness to be justified.

#### 4] TVA – Defend whole res – you can defend a full democracy or just don’t defend a state that has been committing racial atrocities and purposefully not giving legal support to victims

## 2

#### Interp: If the affirmative defends anything other than “Resolved: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.” then they must provide a counter-solvency advocate for their specific advocacy in the 1AC. (To clarify, you must have an author that states we should not do your aff, insofar as the aff is not a whole res phil aff)

#### Violation

#### Prefer

#### 1. Limits – there are infinite things you could defend outside the exact text of the resolution which pushes you to the limits of contestable arguments, even if your interp of the topic is better, the only way to verify if it’s substantively fair is proof of counter-arguments. Nobody knows your aff better than you, so if you can’t find an answer, I can’t be expected to. Our interp narrows out trivially true advocacies since counter-solvency advocates ensure equal division of ground for both sides.

#### 2. Research – Forces the aff to go to the other side of the library and contest their own view points, as well as encouraging in depth-research about their own position. Having one also encourages more in-depth answers since I can find responses. Key to education since we definitionally learn more about positions when we contest our own.

## 3

#### Interpretation—the affirmative may not specify a just government in the plan text

#### Violation – They specify \_\_\_\_\_

#### Vote negative, they allow hundreds of affs—one for every single state—they could defend the US, China, Russia, Israel, Iran, Canada, India, UK, Hungary, Yemen, or anyone else that doesn’t have a RTS—the aff will always be over-prepared against negs who have to prep against numerous tiny affs. Two impacts –

**1] Limits – it explodes the amount of affs from one country which makes neg prep terminally impossible against 10s of affs with tangential labor laws – they’ll say that 10 isn’t too much but core topic lit means that they can cut tiny advantages with little negative topic lit zapping da links and cp competition. Their aff doesn’t change with a plan text, proves competitive merit drives decision making—can’t stop PICs, the only PICs that exist are about a sector of employees which broadly exist among any aff**

#### 2] Clash- specifying scenarios lets affs spike out of core, reduction-based disads like Bizcon and Small Businesses. Links are already non-existent on this topic – letting affs specify further makes it even narrower

**3] TVA solves, defend a whole res aff with the advantages, solves all of your offense**

#### Education is a voter since it is the only portable and durable skill that influences our subject formation. Fairness is a voter since a] debate is a game, competition equity matters proven by desire for wins, b] is worthless without rules and equal access.

#### a] Topicality is Drop the Debater – it’s a fundamental baseline for debate-ability, any substantive debate is impossible under an abusive aff, vote them down to deter practices in the future

#### b] Use Competing Interps – 1] Topicality is a yes/no question, you can’t be reasonably topical and 2] Reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation.

#### c] No RVI’s - 1] Forces the 1NC to go all-in on Theory which kills substance education, 2] Encourages Baiting since the 1AC will purposely be abusive, and 3] Illogical – you shouldn’t win for not being abusive.

#### 1] Germany

#### 2] EU
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#### EU Air Traffic Strikes cause massive disruption – singular strikes can have ripple effects on international flights.

Xinhua 18 4-10-2018 "Germany faces air transport chaos as public sector strikes" <http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/2018-04/10/c_137100895.htm> //Elmer

FRANKFURT, April 10 (Xinhua) -- Warning **strikes across Germany began** early on Tuesday morning, **affecting** an estimated **90,000** passengers. Public sector workers across the country are demanding a pay rise of 6 percent, according to the local media. On Monday, public service union Ver.di announced that nationwide warning strikes would take place the following day. **Thousands of employees at airports and local transport companies stopped working** on Tuesday. An estimated 90,000 air passengers reportedly have been affected by **flight cancellations across the country**. German airline giant **Lufthansa** **cancelled** **more than 800 out of its 1,600 flights** scheduled for Tuesday. **Frankfurt Airport**, Germany's largest airport, has already **reported "considerable delays" and cancellations**. Aircraft handlers and the fire brigade stopped working at Frankfurt Airport in the morning. A spokesman for the hub's operator Fraport also said that flight safety control was affected. Major German labor union Ver.di leading the strike, which represents 2.3 million public workers in the country, is asking for a six percent pay increase for public service workers from state and local governments, with a minimum increase of 200 euros per month.

#### Empowered Unions is our Link – they take and endorse aggressive Strike Action.

France24 10 2-23-2010 "Air traffic controller strike to disrupt flights from French airports" <https://www.france24.com/en/20100223-air-traffic-controller-strike-disrupt-flights-french-airports> //Elmer

School holidays will likely be disrupted this week as a strike by air traffic controllers gets underway at French airports, the civil aviation authority has said. Five **air traffic unions** have **called for a strike to protest Europe’s single sky policy**. AFP - Travellers in Europe faced more misery on Tuesday as French air traffic controllers launched a five-day strike and British and German **airlines sought to head off threats of industrial action.** A quarter of flights from Paris Charles de Gaulle, a major international hub, were cancelled, along with around half out of Paris Orly, which mainly serves domestic routes and the French overseas territories. The strike also **disrupted flights due to pass through French air space from other hubs**, including Amsterdam, Brussels and Geneva, airlines and authorities said. Some French provincial airports were closed. Queues built up at Orly, but most passengers appeared resigned as flights flashed up "cancelled" on information screens. Air France vowed to fly all long-haul services during the strike, to last until Saturday morning. Dutch carrier KLM reported major delays on southbound flights from another of Europe's biggest airports, Amsterdam-Schiphol. Swiss International Air and Lufthansa also reported delays on flights due to overfly France. "I was supposed to leave at 8:20 am for Barcelona but my flight is cancelled," said Bruno Lacroix, 49, who turned up to Orly early but was told to come back and get a flight in the evening. "I'm crossing my fingers but I have no guarantee for the return flight on Friday." A spokeswoman for Europe's busiest airport, London Heathrow, said there was "no major impact on our operations" though some airlines were "consolidating flights," bundling passengers onto fewer departures. Four French unions called Tuesday's strike in order to protest against the planned merger of the Belgian, Dutch, French, German, Luxembourg and Swiss air traffic control networks. More widespread air chaos was prevented, or at least postponed, late on Monday, when German flag-carrier Lufthansa persuaded pilots to return to negotiations after only one day of a planned four-day stoppage. Lufthansa, which normally offers 1,800 flights daily, had scrubbed 800 as a preventive measure ahead of the strike. This special schedule was also in force on Tuesday. Lufthansa, Europe's biggest airline in terms of passenger numbers, said Tuesday it hoped to get services running normally by the end of the week as talks with unions started. "Our goal is to have the network running at 100 percent by Friday at the latest," airline spokesman Klaus Walther told ZDF television. The Cockpit **union** is **pressing for** a 6.4-percent **pay raise** but its main **demand** is that **pilots not lose their jobs** when Lufthansa begins to operate more flights using cheaper foreign affiliates. **British Airways** meanwhile **faced the threat of** a crippling **protest after cabin crew voted** by more than 80 percent **in favour of new strike action** **in** a long, bitter **dispute over working conditions** and a planned pay freeze. European **airlines have been fighting for survival** as they battle with the low-cost airlines poaching customers, soaring fuel costs and the worst global recession in decades. French air traffic controllers meanwhile fear the merger plans will end their protected role as French state employees, but the French aviation authority DGAC has insisted that its status will not be changed. France's national audit office gave a severe assessment of the air traffic control sector last month. It estimated controllers get 30 weeks' holiday a year, winning generous allowances because bosses fear disputes with them. The report hinted that the threat of a strike in the security-sensitive sector made bosses reluctant to crack down on the excessive leave system, which is defended by labour unions. Howard Wheeldon, an analyst at BGC Partners financial group in London, said Tuesday's strike was a symptom of "a bad industrial relations situation that seems evenly spread across Europe."

#### Strong Airline Industry key to global trade and the economy – strikes obliterate these benefits.

PWC 16, Pricewaterhouse Coopers. "Economic impact of air traffic control strikes in Europe." (2016). (PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP)//Elmer

2.2.1 The importance of connectivity The International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) defines connectivity as an indicator of a network’s concentration and its ability to move passengers from their origin to their destination seamlessly22. **Air connectivity is key to economic growth**, in part because it **enables States to attract business investment and human capital**. An increase in air connectivity **also spurs tourism, which is vital to many countries’ economic prosperity**. There is a **range of evidence produced** by airline industry authorities and academics which **suggests** that **as aviation expands, productivity and hence GDP increases**.23 In 2013 PwC completed a **deep-dive analysis** into **how aviation connectivity** **contributes to** the UK’s economy. The study identified five channels through which aviation plays a “positive enabling role”: **trade** in services, trade in goods, tourism, **business investment and innovation**, and productivity. A key finding emerging from academic and industry studies is the **strong linkage that has been observed over the last 20 years between airline industry growth and GDP growth.** In addition, studies have found that **a 10 percent increase in business air usage, or air travel connectivity, leads to an increase in whole economy productivity of between 0.07 percent and 0.9 percent.24** This includes: x reducing air travel times, giving businesses greater efficiency of access to a wider marketplace; x facilitating oversight of far-flung operations and thereby helping control their risks; thus x enabling investment and human capital to flow more freely across borders and exploit comparative advantages. In particular, a 2006 Oxford Economics study highlights the statistical linkage between business air usage and the level of GDP – in technical terms the study found that business air usage and Total Factor Productivity have a robust co-integrating relationship. Their key result implies that, “other things equal, a 10% increase in business air usage could raise GDP by 0.6% in the long run”. The report also notes that the growth in air transport in the 10 years prior to 2006 “boosted long-run underlying productivity by 2.0% across the EU25.”25 Further evidence on the specific channels of impact of aviation on GDP is outlined in the literature review in Section 4.3 of this report. Air transport is an important enabler to achieving economic growth and development. **Air transport facilitates integration into the global economy** **and provides vital connectivity on a** national, regional, and **international scale**. World Bank In the context of this study, if an **air traffic control strike** **causes** a reduction in the ability for airlines to operate flights as scheduled, this reduces the number of passengers and shipments able to reach their desired destinations as planned. Both **cancelled and delayed flights** **obstruct trade and connectivity**. Furthermore, a **pattern of disruptions will create** **uncertainty and discourage businesses** and consumers **from activities** that require air travel, therefore **reducing trade and connectivity further**. Given the importance of the link between the whole economy productivity and the airline sector output, it is therefore crucial to incorporate this linkage directly into our economic modelling of the impact of ATC strikes.

#### Germany is key to Global Trade.

Sprich 19 Christoph Sprich 11-11-2019 "Germany in World Trade: A Clear Winner of Globalisation" <https://english.bdi.eu/article/news/germany-in-world-trade-a-clear-winner-of-globalisation/> (Senior Manager External Economic Policy)//Elmer

Germany as Trading Power **Germany** **has long known how to take advantage of the benefits of globalisation**. Today, exports of goods and services account for around half of the country’s value added. One in four jobs depends on exports; in industry, this is true for even more than every other job. Exports are not the only decisive factor here. As a manufacturing nation, Germany also heavily depends on inexpensive, high-quality imports. According to WTO data, around 25 percent of the value added in German exports in goods was directly attributable to foreign suppliers in 2015. **For years**, **Germany has ranked high on the list of top trading nations, placing third in 2018** (exports of goods and services taken together); **only China and the U**nited **S**tates **sold more globally**. The nation is also **one of the top three importing countries** after the United States and China. Germany could not maintain its position as a competitive exporter without **German industry being** **deeply integrated in reliable, international value chains**.

#### Collapse of Trade causes Hotspot Escalation – goes Nuclear.

Kampf 20 David Kampf 6-16-2020 “How COVID-19 Could Increase the Risk of War” <https://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/28843/how-covid-19-could-increase-the-risk-of-war> (Senior PhD Fellow at the Center for Strategic Studies at The Fletcher School)//Elmer

But that overlooked the ways in which the risk of interstate war was already rising before COVID-19 began to spread. Civil wars were becoming more numerous, lasting longer and attracting more outside involvement, with dangerous consequences for stability in many regions of the world. And the global dynamics most commonly cited to explain the falling incidence of interstate war—democracy, economic prosperity, international cooperation and others—were being upended. If the spread of democracy kept the peace, then its global decline is unnerving. **If globalization and** economic **interdependence kept** the **peace, then** a looming global depression and the **rise of** nationalism and **protectionism are disconcerting**. If regional and global institutions kept the peace, then their degradation is unsettling. If the balance of nuclear weapons kept the peace, then growing risks of proliferation are disquieting. And if America’s preeminent power kept the peace, then its relative decline is troubling. Now, the pandemic, or more specifically the world’s reaction to it, is revealing the extent to which the factors holding major wars in check are withering. The idea that war between nations is a relic of the past no longer seems so convincing. The Pessimists Strike Back More than any other individual, it was cognitive scientist Steven Pinker who popularized the idea that we are living in the most peaceful moment in human history. Starting with his 2011 bestseller, “The Better Angels of Our Nature: Why Violence Has Declined,” Pinker argued that the frequency, duration and lethality of wars between great powers have all decreased. In his 2019 book, “Enlightenment Now: The Case for Reason, Science, Humanism, and Progress,” he wrote that war “between the uniformed armies of two nation-states appears to be obsolescent. There have been no more than three in any year since 1945, none in most years since 1989, and none since the American-led invasion of Iraq in 2003.” Optimists like Pinker held that, rather than the world falling apart, as a quick glance at headline news might suggest, the opposite was true: Humanity was flourishing. More regions are characterized by peace; fewer mass killings are occurring; governance and the rule of law are improving; and people are richer, healthier, better educated and happier than ever before. In their book, “Clear and Present Safety: The World Has Never Been Better and Why That Matters to Americans,” Michael A. Cohen and Micah Zenko argued that the evidence is so overwhelming that it is difficult to argue against the idea that wars between great powers, and all other interstate wars, are becoming vanishingly rare. Even when wars do break out, they tend to be shorter and less deadly than they were in the past. John Mueller, a senior fellow at the Cato Institute, also reasoned that the idea of war, like slavery and dueling before it, was in terminal decline, while Joshua Goldstein, an international relations researcher at American University, credited the United Nations and the rise of peacekeeping operations for helping win the “war on war.” But in recent years, a range of critics have begun to poke holes in these arguments. Tanisha M. Fazal, an international relations professor at the University of Minnesota, contends that the decline in war is overstated. Major advances in medicine, speedier evacuations of wounded soldiers from the field of battle and better armor have made war less fatal—but not necessarily less frequent. Fazal and Paul Poast, who is at the University of Chicago, further assert that the notion of war between great powers as a thing of the past is based on the assumption that all such conflicts resemble World War I and II—both are historical anomalies—and overlooks the actual wars fought between great powers since 1945, from the Korean War and the Vietnam War to proxy wars from Afghanistan to Ukraine. Meanwhile, Bear F. Braumoeller, an Ohio State political science professor, analyzed the same historical data on conflicts used by Pinker, Mueller and Goldstein, and found no general downward trend in either the initiation or deadliness of warfare over the past two centuries. What’s more, Braumoeller contends that the so-called “long peace”—the 75 years that have passed without systemic war since World War II—is far from invulnerable, and that wars are just as likely to escalate now as they used to be. Just because a major interstate war hasn’t happened for a long time, doesn’t mean it never will again. In all probability, it will. And by focusing solely on interstate wars, the optimists miss half the story, at least. Wars between states have declined, but civil wars never disappeared—and these **internal conflicts** **could easily escalate into regional or global wars**. The number of conflicts in the world reached its highest point since World War II in 2016, with 53 state-based armed conflicts in 37 countries. All but two of these conflicts were considered civil wars. To make matters worse, new studies have shown that civil wars are becoming longer, deadlier and harder to conclusively end, and that these internal conflicts are not really internal. Civil wars harm the economies and stability of neighboring countries, since armed groups, refugees, illicit goods and diseases all spill over borders. Some 10 million refugees have fled to other countries since 2012. The countries that now host them are more likely to experience war, which means states with huge refugee populations like Lebanon, Jordan and Turkey face legitimate security challenges. Even after the threat of violence has diminished in refugees’ countries of origin, return migration can reignite conflicts, repeating the brutal cycle. A Yugoslav Federal Army tank. Perhaps most importantly, recent research indicates that civil wars increase the risk of interstate war, in large part because they are attracting more and more outside involvement. In a 2008 paper, researchers Kristian Skrede Gleditsch, Idean Salehyan and Kenneth Schultz explained that, in addition to the spillover effects, two other factors in civil wars increase international tensions and could possibly provoke wider interstate wars: external interventions in support of rebel groups and regime attacks on insurgents across international borders. Immediately after the Cold War, none of the ongoing civil wars around the world were internationalized. According to the Uppsala Conflict Data Program, there were 12 full-fledged civil wars in 1991—in Afghanistan, Iraq, Peru, Sri Lanka, Sudan, and elsewhere—and foreign militaries were not active on the ground in any of them. Last year, by contrast, every single full-fledged civil war involved external military participants. This is due, in part, to the huge growth in U.S. military interventions abroad into civil conflicts, but it’s not only the Americans. All of today’s major wars are in essence proxy wars, pitting external rivals against one another. Conflicts in Syria, Yemen and Libya are best understood not as civil wars, but as international warzones, attracting meddlers including the United States, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Iran, France and many others, which often intervene not to build peace, but to resolve conflicts in a way that is favorable to their own interests. These internationalized wars are more lethal, harder to resolve and possibly more likely to recur than civil wars that remain localized. It is not that difficult to imagine how these conflicts could spark wider international conflagrations. Wars, after all, can quickly spiral out of control. As Risks Increase, Deterrents Decline To make matters worse, most of the global trends that explained why interstate war had decreased in recent decades are now reversing. The theories that democracy, prosperity, cooperation and other factors kept the peace have been much debated—but if there was any truth to them, their reversals are likely to increase the chance of war, irrespective of how long the coronavirus pandemic lasts. Democracy is often considered a prophylactic for war. Fully democratic countries are less likely to experience civil war and rarely, if ever, go to war with other democracies—though, of course, they do still go to war against non-democracies. While this would be great news if democracy and pluralism were spreading, there have now been 14 consecutive years of global democratic decline, and there have been signs of additional authoritarian power grabs in countries like Hungary and Serbia during the pandemic. If democracy backslides far enough, internal conflicts and foreign aggression will become more likely. Other theories posit that **economic bonds between countries** have **limited wars** in recent decades. Dale Copeland, a professor of international relations at the University of Virginia, has argued that **countries work to preserve ties when there are high expectations for future trade**, **but war becomes** increasingly **possible when trade is predicted to fall.** If **globalization brought peace**, the recent wave of far-right nationalism and populism around the world may increase the chances of war, as tariffs and other trade barriers go up—mostly from the United States under President Donald Trump, who has launched trade wars with allies and adversaries alike. The coronavirus pandemic immediately elicited further calls to reduce dependence on other countries, with Trump using the opportunity to pressure U.S. companies to reconfigure their supply chains away from China. For its part, China made sure that it had the homemade supplies it needed to fight the virus before exporting extras, while countries like France and Germany barred the export of face masks, even to friendly nations. And widening economic inequalities, a consequence of the pandemic, are not likely to enhance support for free trade. This assault on open trade and globalization is just one aspect of a decaying liberal international order, which, its proponents argue, has largely helped to preserve peace between nations since World War II. But that old order is almost gone, and in all likelihood isn’t coming back. The U.N. Security Council appears increasingly fragmented and dysfunctional. Even before Trump, the world’s most powerful country ratified fewer treaties per year under the Obama administration than at any time since 1945. Trump’s presidency only harms multilateral cooperation further. He has backed out of the Paris Agreement on climate change, reneged on the Iran nuclear deal, picked fights with allies, questioned the value of NATO and defunded the World Health Organization in the middle of a global health crisis. Hyper-nationalism, rather than international collaboration, was the default response to the coronavirus outbreak in the U.S. and many other countries around the world. It’s hard to see the U.S. reluctance to lead as anything other than a sign of its inevitable, if slow, decline. The country’s institutionalized inequalities and systemic racism have been laid bare in recent months, and it no longer looks like a beacon for others to follow. The global balance of power is changing. China is both keen to assert a greater leadership role within traditionally Western-led institutions and to challenge the existing regional order in Asia. Between a rising China, revanchist Russia and new global actors, including non-state groups, we may be heading toward an increasingly multipolar or nonpolar world, which could prove destabilizing in its own right. Finally, the pacifying effect of nuclear weapons could be waning. While vast nuclear arsenals once compelled the United States and the Soviet Union to reach arms control agreements, old treaties are expiring and new talks are breaking down. **Mistrust is growing**, and the **chance of an** unwanted **U.S.-Russia nuclear confrontation is** arguably as **high** as it has been since the Cuban missile crisis. The theory of nuclear peace may no longer hold if more countries are tempted to obtain their own nuclear deterrent. Trump’s decision to abandon the Iran nuclear deal, for one thing, has only increased the chance that Tehran will acquire nuclear weapons. It’s almost easy to forget that, just a few short months ago, the United States and Iran were one miscalculation or dumb mistake away from waging all-out war. And despite Trump’s efforts to negotiate nuclear disarmament with Kim Jong Un’s regime in Pyongyang, it is wishful thinking to believe North Korea will give up its nuclear weapons. At this point, negotiators can only realistically try to ensure that North **Korea’s** **nuclear menace** **doesn’t get** even **more potent**. In other words, by turning inward, the United States is choosing to leave other countries to fend for themselves. The end result may be a less stable world with more nuclear actors. If leaders are smart, they will take seriously the warning signs exposed by this global emergency and work to reverse the drift toward war. If only one of these theories for peace were worsening, concerns would be easier to dismiss. But **together**, they are unsettling. While the world is not yet on the brink of **World War III** and no two countries are destined for war, the odds of avoiding future conflicts don’t look good. The pandemic is already degrading democracies, harming economies and curtailing international cooperation, and it also seems to be fostering internal instability within states. Rachel Brown, Heather Hurlburt and Alexandra Stark argue that the coronavirus could in fact sow more civil conflict. If this proves accurate, the increase in civil wars is likely to lead to more external meddling, and these next **proxy wars** **could** soon **precipitate all-out international conflicts** if outsiders aren’t careful. **With** the **usual deterrents to conflict declining** around the world, **major wars could soon return**.

## 5

#### German centrist coalition seals the deal next week but relies on FDP.

Gehrke 11/16 [LAURENZ GEHRKE (politics reporter to cover German politics and the general election at Politico, Master’s degree in Economic History at the London School of Economics and a Bachelor’s degree in American Studies at the University of Munich). “Future German coalition: Deal due next week”. Politico. November 16, 2021. Accessed 11/19/21. <https://www.politico.eu/article/germany-coalition-talks-deal-election-eu/> //Xu]

BERLIN — The three parties likely to constitute Germany’s next governing coalition are close to sealing a deal, their respective general secretaries announced Tuesday.

“The goal is very clearly to have a finished coalition agreement in the coming week,” said Lars Klingbeil, secretary-general of the center-left Social Democrats (SPD), the prospective senior partner in a coalition with the Greens and the liberal Free Democrats (FDP). “We made faster progress in certain areas than we had hoped,” he added.

Speaking alongside Klingbeil, his FDP counterpart Volker Wissing pointed at the “very good progress” negotiators had made on Monday, laying the groundwork for a “coalition agreement that we can discuss with our respective parties next week.”

Both Klingbeil and Wissing — as well as the Greens’ whip Michael Kellner, who was speaking at the same press conference — emphasized the “constructive and good atmosphere” under which a total of 300 politicians from the three parties have been working to hash out compromises across 22 different working groups since mid-October.

Once the deal is done, it will be put to the wider parties for consideration, with the Greens planning to consult all party members, while the SPD has already scheduled an extraordinary party conference for December 4, where it will decide whether to accept the coalition agreement. The FDP plans to do the same at its own party conference on December 5.

Both dates are set in time to have Olaf Scholz, the SPD finance minister who won the election in September, elected the ninth chancellor of Germany in the week starting December 6, Saint Nicholas’ Day, as repeatedly promised by all parties — and mere days before current office holder Angela Merkel would replace Helmut Kohl as longest-serving post-war chancellor on December 17.

If nothing goes wrong, that is.

Four years ago this coming Friday, coalition talks following the 2017 election collapsed when the FDP walked away, plunging Germany into political disarray until the current government was finally established in March 2018.

#### Plan causes fighting – the FDP is centered on pro-business and anti-working class policies.

DW 10/5 “Germany's political parties — what you need to know” DW, Oct 5, 2021, <https://www.dw.com/en/spd-green-party-fdp-cdu-left-party-afd/a-38085900> SM

Voters: As a neo-liberal, pro-free market party, the FDP traditionally finds the most voters among the self-employed, especially business owners and professionals like dentists and lawyers. Its support from the working class is very marginal.

#### Empirics prove the FDP stands alone in opposition to the plan.

Gaisenkersting 6/13 “German labour legislation strengthens hand of trade unions” Dietmar Gaisenkersting 13 June 2021 <https://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2021/06/14/germ-j14.html> SM

German labour legislation strengthens hand of trade unions

On 21 May the Bundestag (parliament) passed the Works Council Modernisation Act. The new legislation makes it easier to set up works councils and provides them with additional powers with regard to the use of artificial intelligence and the organisation of mobile forms of working.

Germany’s ruling coalition parties, the Christian Democratic Union (CDU), Christian Social Union (CSU) and Social Democratic Party (SPD) voted in favour of the law, together with the Green Party. The far-right Alternative for Germany (AfD) and the new liberal Free Democratic Party (FDP) voted against. The Left Party abstained, arguing that the act was inadequate and should award even more powers to trade unions.

The new law is designed to strengthen the influence of these organisations in workplaces. The German Trade Union Confederation (DGB), which was involved in drafting the bill, expressed its alarm in 2019 that only 9 percent of German concerns had a works council and only 40 percent of workers in Germany were represented by a works council. Presenting the law in the Bundestag, Federal Labour Minister Hubertus Heil (SPD) proclaimed: “We need more works councils in Germany.”

#### Failure to form a centrist coalition drives Germany coalition politics too far too the left – that kills German NATO participation.

Bloomberg 9/25 Editorial Board, September 25, 2021 “How Germany’s Election Could Go Dangerously Wrong” <https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2021-09-25/germany-s-election-could-go-dangerously-wrong> SM

As voters in Europe’s largest economy go to the polls, much is at stake for their country, their continent and the world. After 16 years as Germany’s chancellor, Angela Merkel is bowing out. No obvious successor has emerged. Nor is a winner likely to be clear right after polls close. Coalition talks could consume the country for some time, keeping its government in limbo. Note that the form of the coalition that eventually emerges will matter more than who leads it — and don’t assume all will be well.

Outsiders are apt to view the contest as resembling an American or French presidential election — a race between individuals where all that counts is who becomes chancellor. Seen like that, it boils down to a choice between Armin Laschet, a state governor from the center-right CDU/CSU bloc, or Olaf Scholz, the finance minister and a Social Democrat. The two are more similar than they’d care to admit: pragmatic, centrist and cautious, but also uncharismatic, underwhelming and unambitious.

However, Germans cast their votes for parties, not chancellors, and what really matters is the coalition that comes to power. This is the political chemistry that determines whether things blow up or remain stable — and three such compounds look plausible. In one, Scholz would govern with the environmentalist Greens and the pro-business, pro-market Free Democrats. In the second, Laschet would lead, but with the same two junior partners. And in the third, Scholz would be in charge, but with the support of the Greens and the Left, an extremist party descended from East Germany’s communist regime.

The first two would be centrist coalitions defined largely by areas of overlap and compromise between the junior partners. Either would be promising. The third would be something else.

As part of a centrist coalition led by either Laschet or Scholz, the Greens would bring their zeal in fighting climate change, as well as their newly hawkish tone against Russia and China, and their eagerness to integrate the EU. They’d have to drop ideas the Free Democrats would veto, such as tax hikes and an environmental policy based on bans and prohibitions. In the same way, the Free Democrats would emphasize a strong economy, leaner governance to accelerate Germany’s digital and climate transformations, and transatlantic cooperation with the U.S. To please the Greens, they’d temper their devotion to fiscal austerity, both in Germany and the EU. Either blend, regardless of whether the CDU/CSU or the SPD took the lead, could be good for both Germany and its friends.

The problem is the third possibility: an all-left government composed of Social Democrats, Greens and the Left party, also called red-green-red. The Left is anti-capitalist, anti-American, anti-NATO, anti-EU and pro-Russian. Even though it stands outside the mainstream, some Social Democrats, senior members of the party among them, think fondly of reuniting the two post-Marxist movements.

Even with the moderate Scholz in charge, red-green-red might converge on hard-left policies that raise taxes and tighten economic regulation to a degree that would hold back growth. Germany would become less reliable as an ally — because the Left opposes all foreign missions and wants to shrink an army that’s already too small. In addition, a red-green-red coalition would be fragile, and could break in the first international crisis.

How likely is this unnerving prospect? Once the results are in, Laschet and Scholz will put out feelers to the Greens and the Free Democrats. If efforts to form a centrist coalition fail, the Social Democrats might then turn to the Left as partner instead. Germany, Europe and the world must hope this doesn’t happen. Moderates among the conservatives, Social Democrats, Greens and Free Democrats need to recognize their responsibility and, for everybody’s sake, bridge their differences.

#### German alliance commitment key to NATO.

Palocaren 20 “A REALIST CASE FOR GERMANY TO RESURRECT NATO”, October 1, 2020 Antony Palocaren is a Captain in the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army. He is an Instructor of International Affairs in the Department of Social Sciences at the United States Military Academy. <https://warroom.armywarcollege.edu/articles/germany-nato/> SM

Germany can provide the European leadership that NATO urgently requires to stay relevant. As the Eurozone powerhouse with one of the lowest consolidated gross debts among major western European economies, Germany has the wealth to invest in NATO’s defense strategy. France, Italy, Belgium, and the U.K. cannot sustain a higher debt-to-GDP ratio that would result from spending more on defense. Germany is a global leader in innovation and research and possesses the technological expertise required to spearhead NATO’s defense. Today’s NATO challenges differ from those at the height of the Cold War. There is no longer a threat of the Red Army marching across Europe and Russia’s dwindling population, economic stagnation, fallout from the COVID-19 pandemic, and subsequent oil war with Saudi Arabia have stymied Vladimir Putin’s ambitions. However, Russia can still achieve its goals of delegitimizing democracies and sowing division within Europe through hybrid warfare.

It is natural to expect severe opposition to increased German defense spending.

Such threats do not require a new German panzer division or other new military hardware. Moreover, U.S. military assets will still be present in Europe as part of NATO. The Russian threat to NATO requires a robust defense strategy focused on countering hybrid warfare, including cyber and information warfare capabilities, as highlighted by former U.S. Army Europe Commander Lt. Gen (Ret.) Ben Hodges, former NATO Supreme Allied Commander Europe Admiral (Ret.) James Stavridis, and German Minister of Defense Annegret Kramp-Karrenbauer. Reinvigorated German military spending to the 1980 level of over 3.14% of GDP and added focus on combating Russian gray zone threats would enhance existing NATO capabilities and help adapt to a multipolar world.

It is natural to expect severe opposition to increased German defense spending. Anti-military sentiments still run very deep in domestic German politics. Other European nations will also be concerned and may object to Germany’s taking on a more significant leadership role in NATO, given the former’s history. Although these are valid concerns, three main points need emphasis. First, the United States is still part of NATO and U.S. forces will still be present in Europe. As an effective international organization that upholds the norms of collective defense, NATO will tamp down any fears of a return to European power politics. Second, concerns of a resurgent German hegemony in Europe are misplaced, because unlike pre-WWII, German demographics point toward an aging population with a declining labor productivity forecast. The declining productivity of the German population will limit the technological advancement that is required to become a military superpower. Third, the Basic Law of the Federal Republic of Germany (the German Constitution) closes the loopholes for the reemergence of authoritarian institutions through a separation of powers and a parliamentary democracy. The new constitution also prohibits the suspension of fundamental rights of the people of Germany under any circumstances including national emergencies – a marked difference from the Weimar Constitution.

In a complex world, NATO is still relevant and has a vital role in guaranteeing European stability by keeping power politics at bay. NATO has mitigated the reversion of European defense policy to individual European states and brought about European stability for over seven decades – after two previous millennia of conflict – by allowing European countries to pass the buck of security to NATO. European states were happy with this outcome because, in addition to lasting peace, it allowed them to focus on their respective domestic social policies rather than defense. Similarly, the United States also benefited from NATO, given the expanded U.S. influence over the foreign and military policies of European states. It was a win-win situation as liberalist theories point, and it was an enduring factor for the survival of NATO after the end of the Cold War, unlike the winning grand military coalitions of the World Wars.

History illustrates an example of how European leadership could save the alliance while the United States is preoccupied with other challenges. For example, when the United States was fighting the Korean War in 1950 within the broader context of the Cold War, West Germany stepped up under the leadership of Konrad Adenauer to enhance European defense against the former Soviet Union. Even before Germany formally joined NATO, West Germany overcame a domestic “Ohne Mich“ (without me) protest movement and made the painful decision to rearm just four years after the Third Reich ended, for the sake of European collective defense. This difficult decision not only brought credibility to western democratic values when juxtaposed against the Soviet communist values in eastern Europe, but it also heightened NATO readiness to take on the Soviet threat, even with the United States occupied on the Korean Peninsula.

At a time when the world is becoming multipolar with the rise of China along with the sustained Russian threats to European stability, German Chancellor Angela Merkel is right to point out that Europe is in no position to defend itself without NATO. But NATO has a leadership crisis at hand, and Germany has a choice to step-up and calm the tempest by contributing more towards the collective security agreement. Continuing with the status quo of depending on U.S. forces will lead to the deterioration of NATO and a probable return to the renationalization of European defense policies. On the other hand, Germany could revitalize the alliance, which would enable NATO to be less dependent on U.S. forces and which would balance the power structure within the alliance, thereby boosting NATO’s credibility. NATO is critical to peace and stability in the Western Hemisphere, and Germany can ensure NATO persists in maintaining both of these objectives.

#### NATO cohesion solves laundry list of Impacts – Economy, Climate Change, Pandemics, Terrorism, Cyber, and Democracy

Burns 18 Nicholas Burns 7-11-2018 “What America Gets Out of NATO” <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/07/11/opinion/what-america-gets-out-of-nato.html> (former under-secretary of state and ambassador to NATO and teaches diplomacy and international relations at Harvard)//Elmer

* checked

None of this, of course, is likely to disturb Mr. Trump, who remains steadfast in his belief that whatever benefits the United States gained from the trans-Atlantic alliance in the past, the country no longer profits. But he’s wrong — there are compelling reasons that NATO in particular will be a distinct advantage for America’s security far into the future. First, NATO’s formidable conventional and nuclear forces are the most effective way to **protect North America and Europe** — the **heart of the democratic world** — from attack. Threats to our collective security have not vanished in the 21st century. Mr. Putin remains a determined adversary preying on Eastern Europe and American elections. **NATO is a force multiplier**: The United States has allies who will stand by us, while Russia has none. And while it’s true that most of America’s NATO allies need to increase their defense spending under the treaty, they’re not freeloaders: The United States has **relied on NATO allies to strike back against Al Qaeda in Afghanistan and the Islamic State in the Middle East**. European troops have replaced American soldiers in peacekeeping missions in Bosnia and contribute the large majority in Kosovo. Our NATO allies are also getting better about contributing their fair share. They have increased their defense spending by a total of more than $87 billion since Mr. Putin annexed Crimea in 2014. Fourteen more allies will reach NATO’s military spending target — 2 percent of gross domestic product — by 2024. Mr. Trump would be smart to claim credit for this at this week’s summit. A second reason for maintaining the trans-Atlantic alliance is America’s economic future. The European Union is our country’s largest trade partner, and its largest investor. The United States and the European Union are the world’s two largest economies, and can steer global trade to their advantage if they stick together. More than four million Americans work for European companies in the United States. Forty-five of the 50 states export more to Europe than to China. Mr. Trump is right that the two sides are also economic competitors, and trade disputes are inevitable. His predecessors kept this tension in balance lest there be damaging consequences for American businesses, workers and farmers — a good reminder for Mr. Trump, whose ill-conceived trade war with Canada and Europe risks harming the American economy. Third, future American leaders will find Europe is our most capable and willing partner in tackling the biggest threats to global security: **climate change; drug and cybercrime cartels; terrorism; pandemics and mass migration from Africa and the Middle East**. And America’s **NATO allies will continue to be indispensable in safeguarding democracy** and freedom, under assault by Russia and China.