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#### [Brudney 1] The right to strike is Customary International Law – that should acknowledged by all just governments, but many fall short of recognizing *opinio juris* standards, which undermines international legitimacy.
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II. THE INTERNATIONAL RIGHT TO STRIKE AS CIL That an international right to strike is widely recognized by governments does not mean the right has assumed the status of CIL. This Part seeks to forge that link, to show how the international right to strike qualifies as CIL. It begins (II.A) by identifying the two basic elements of CIL and explaining why the right to strike is an integral textual and conceptual component of FOA. It then establishes (II.B and C) that FOA and the right to strike satisfy both elements of CIL—a general practice accepted by States, stemming from a sense of legal obligation. While there are variations and qualifiers at the national level, the contours of CIL status are clear: a basic right subject to three substantive restrictions; a recognition that strikers retain their employment relationship during the strike itself; and certain procedural prerequisites or limitations. 105 This Part next demonstrates (II.D) that the two U.S. practices discussed earlier as deviating from the international right to strike—denying all public employees the right and authorizing permanent replacement of lawful strikers— contravene core aspects of the right to strike as CIL. Finally (II.E), this Part introduces the complexities of the U.S. position on FOA and the right to strike as international rights, reflected in the failure to ratify Convention 87 while both Congress and the executive branch embrace Convention 87 principles including the right to strike. A. Initial Definitions and Considerations 1. CIL Standards The two basic elements that determine the existence and content of a rule of CIL are first, the requirement of a general practice by States, and second, the requirement that the general practice be undertaken from a sense of legal right or obligation (opinio juris).106 The first element is objective: whether there is a sufficiently widespread and consistent practice of States endorsing and adhering to the rule. Evidence of such a general practice may include governmental conduct in connection with treaties; legislative or administrative acts; decisions of national courts; conduct in relation to resolutions adopted by an international organization; diplomatic acts and correspondence; and executive operational conduct on the ground.107 The second element, opinio juris, is more subjective: the general practice must be undertaken based on its acceptance as law, rather than being accepted based on mere usage or habit or some pragmatic motive. As is true for general practice, evidence of acceptance as law may come in a range of forms. These include public statements made on behalf of States; government legal opinions; decisions of national courts; treaty provisions; diplomatic correspondence; and conduct related to resolutions adopted by an international organization.108 2. The Right to Strike as Integral to FOA Freedom of association is one of the core principles on which the ILO was founded and continues to exist. 109 As set forth under Convention 87, FOA includes a series of integral elements, of which the right to strike is one. The two ILO supervisory mechanisms that have regularly applied or interpreted Convention 87 have understood it to include the right to strike from the early days of the Convention’s existence.110 Leading U.N. human rights covenants also recognize FOA as a basic right, including the right to strike as a component. 111 And the labor provisions of the 2019 U.S.-Mexico-Canada trade agreement include the following statement: “For greater certainty, the right to strike is linked to the right to freedom of association, which cannot be realized without protecting the right to strike.”112 Accordingly, if FOA is seen as Customary International Law (CIL), and the right to strike is an essential component of FOA, then the right to strike should also be understood to be part of CIL. Consider in this regard the following integral elements of Convention 87. The fact that as part of FOA, workers and employers “shall have the right to establish and . . . to join organizations of their own choosing without previous authorization”113 means the State may not impose unreasonably high membership requirements that hinder the establishment of organizations, or require that members may not join several different organizations. 114 Similarly, the fact that under FOA, workers and employers “shall have the right to . . . elect their representatives in full freedom [and that] public authorities shall refrain from any interference which would restrict this right or impede the lawful exercise thereof,”115 means the State may not impose limits on candidates due to their nationality, literacy, political opinions, moral standing, or for workers, their non-employment in the employer’s occupation or enterprise. 116 And the fact that as part of FOA, workers “shall have the right . . . to organize their. . . activities and to formulate their programs” free “from any interference [by the public authorities]”117 means that worker organizations, in order to defend the occupational interests of their members, have the right to hold trade union meetings, the right to have access to places of work and to communicate with management, and the right to organize nonviolent protest action including strikes. 118 B. FOA and the Right to Strike as General Practice There is ample support that FOA is widely accepted in objective terms. Convention 87 has been ratified by 155 countries, or 83 percent of the 187 ILO Member States. 119 In addition, the ILO Constitution, endorsed by all members, specifies the critical role of FOA both in its 1919 founding document and the 1944 Declaration of Philadelphia as a constitutional addition.120 More recently, ILO Declarations issued in 1998 and 2008, again embraced by all members, make clear that even Member States that have not ratified Convention 87 are obligated to act in good faith to respect and effectuate FOA principles.121 Beyond the ILO realm, workers’ freedom of association, including the right to form and join trade unions and expressly the right to strike, is recognized in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), adopted by the United Nations General Assembly to be effective 1976.122 The Covenant has been ratified by 171 countries, including two of the four large-population countries that have not ratified Convention 87.123 Another major UN Human Rightstreaty, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), also adopted by the U.N. General Assembly to be effective in 1976, recognizes FOA including the right to form and join trade unions. 124 The ICCPR has been ratified by 173 countries, including three of the four largepopulation countries that have not ratified Convention 87; its human rights committee has consistently recognized the right to strike as part of FOA under the Covenant. 125 Indeed, of the 187 ILO Member States, only 11 relatively smallpopulation countries have not ratified at least one of Convention 87, the ICESCR, or the ICCPR.126 FOA is also expressly recognized in a labor setting in the European Convention on Human Rights, which has been ratified by all 48 countries in the Council of Europe. 127 At a national level, the vast majority of constitutions provide for freedom of association, although some use general language that (unlike the international instruments just mentioned) does not specify workers or trade unions. 128 Apart from States’ nearly-universal embrace of FOA as a general matter, the right to strike itself has been broadly accepted by governments. As noted earlier, more than 90 countries have made a public commitment to the right to strike in their constitutions. 129 These commitments have translated to actual practice when national courts have relied on guidance from the CEACR and CFA in assuring compliance with their constitutional right to strike. Judicial interpretation of the international right as part of applying a domestic constitution often involves assuring compliance by governments or employers,130 though it also may require compliance by unions. 131 And compliance with the international right to strike may even emanate from application of a national constitution that endorses FOA without being explicit about the right to strike.132 Among the many national courts that have invoked the CEACR and/or CFA in support of a right to strike,133 two other cases worth noting involve Brazil and Kenya because neither country has ratified Convention 87. In 2012, the Labour Court in Brazil ordered reinstatement of workers terminated for participating in a work stoppage. 134 Under Brazil’s Constitution, “norms that define fundamental rights and guarantees are directly applicable.”135 Given that the Court found that the employer’s conduct had violated the principle of freedom of association and the free exercise of the right to strike, it seems that the “principle of freedom of association” was being directly applied as a matter of customary international law rather than through a ratified treaty or convention.136 In 2013, the Industrial Court of Kenya ordered the reinstatement of five workers dismissed for participating in a strike and strike-related activities. The Court’s reasoning derived from Kenya’s general participation in the ILO, including “respect for International Labour Standards,” rather than direct application of fundamental norms as in the Brazil case.137 The Industrial Court invoked a report by the CEACR and decisions by the CFA to support its decision; its recognition of FOA as an accepted international standard suggests that reports from the ILO supervisory bodies served as evidence of CIL.138 Finally, states’ widespread practice is reflected in the negotiation of trade agreements over the past two decades that recognize both FOA and the right to strike. Since 2003, labor provisions in U.S. trade agreements have regularly featured linkages to FOA as one of the fundamental ILO norms. 139 The commitment by signatory states to FOA as understood under the 1998 ILO Declaration has been progressively strengthened during this period—from providing that parties “shall strive to ensure” protection of FOA under domestic laws140 to specifying that parties shall “adopt and maintain [FOA rights] in [their] statutes and regulations, and practices thereunder.”141 The latest trade agreement, involving the United States, Mexico, and Canada (approved as a successor to NAFTA) expressly provides that the right to FOA necessarily includes protection for the right to strike.142 Trade agreements involving EU countries also feature commitments to respect and implement under domestic law the principles of FOA as understood in the ILO context. 143 This wide network of similarly worded, mostly bilateral trade agreements addressing the subject of FOA constitutes additional evidence of general practice for CIL purposes. 144 The pervasive nature of actual practice regarding FOA and the right to strike does not mean that the right’s content is static or fixed. To be sure, there is broad acceptance of the two previously discussed features on which U.S. law is out of step: the prohibition on permanent replacements145 and public employees’ right to strike with certain exceptions. 146 And although particular limits on the right may vary from one country to another, there is an international consensus that the right exists and that any limits should be reasonable.147 The International Court of Justice (ICJ) does not require uniformity in practice in order to establish CIL, and indeed, it has countenanced some degree of variation: The Court does not consider that, for a rule to be established as customary, the corresponding practice must be in absolutely rigorous conformity with the rule. In order to deduce the existence of customary rules, the Court deems it sufficient that the conduct of States should, in general be consistent with such rules.148 C. FOA and the Right to Strike as Opinio Juris There is also considerable support for the proposition that the general practice of states on FOA and the right to strike stems from acceptance as a matter of legal obligation. Admittedly, while the existence of opinio juris may be inferred from a general practice, the International Court of Justice (ICJ) has at times noted the insufficiency or inconclusiveness of such practice, instead seeking confirmation that “[states’] conduct is ‘evidence of a belief that this practice is rendered obligatory by the existence of a rule of law requiring it.’”149 Trade agreements, for instance, may represent treaty law and may qualify as evidence of general practice, but they are typically entered into by States that have specific economic or political objectives rather than from a desire to embrace obligations arising under international law.150 Further, it is possible that even with respect to ILO conventions, widespread ratification is in part a function of acculturation, insofar as endorsements across a region contribute to socialized acceptance of norms on FOA, reassuring peer countries that protecting rights to association including the right to strike will not place them in an inferior competitive position.151 That said, the ICJ often does infer the existence of opinio juris from a general practice and/or from determinations by national or international tribunals.152 And there are ample reasons to draw such an inference here. To start, FOA is consciously accepted as an obligation by ILO member states not simply through ratification of Convention 87 (covering more than 80 percent of them) but by virtue of membership itself. The ILO Constitution expressly requires support for FOA principles, and these principles are further imbedded through a tripartite governance structure that allocates power-sharing roles to worker organizations alongside governments and employers.153 Thus, ILO members understand there is an underlying obligation to respect FOA in law and practice.154 A second reason is that domestic law can provide relevant evidence regarding the presence of opinio juris among states. Commitments to FOA expressed in national constitutions, statutes, and court decisions are not necessarily evidence of a state’s belief that the principle is international as opposed to domestic law. Nonetheless, the International Law Commission has made clear that evidence of acceptance as law (opinio juris) “may take a wide range of forms,” including but not limited to “official publications; government legal opinions; [and] decisions of national courts.”155 In this regard, the CEACR in 2012 identified 92 countries where “the right to strike is explicitly recognized, including at the constitutional level”; the list includes six countries that have not ratified Convention 87.156 Recognition in domestic law of a right to strike alongside a conscious decision not to ratify Convention 87 could give rise to an inference that these six countries are rejecting the right as a principle of international law. However, as explained earlier, national courts for two of the six non-ratifying countries (Brazil and Kenya) expressly invoke ILO membership and/or principles as guidance in their domestic law decisions. 157 In addition, Canada—a country not listed among the 92 endorsing the right to strike in the 2012 General Survey— has since recognized a constitutional right to strike under national law, relying in part on international law principles including CEACR and CFA determinations. 158 The Canadian Supreme Court had previously been explicit in invoking Convention 87, ICESCR, and ICCPR as “documents [that] reflect not only international consensus but also principles that Canada has committed itself to uphold.”159 Further, a third country in the group of six—South Korea—has affirmed in its trade agreements with the United States and the EU its obligation to “adopt and maintain in its statutes and regulations, and practices” FOA in accordance with the ILO Declaration.160 And in various CFA complaints against South Korea for violating FOA principles, including the right to strike, the Government has disputed the facts of the complaints while at the same time recognizing that such rights are embedded in international law.161 Accordingly, a more relevant reference point in this setting may be that “when States act in conformity with a treaty provision by which they are not bound . . . this may evidence the existence of acceptance as law (opinio juris) in the absence of any explanation to the contrary.”162 Stepping back, domestic law on FOA and the right to strike, which for many countries developed after Convention 87 and its initial applications by the CEACR and CFA, may be viewed in part as a window into countries’ sense of obligation in law and practice. A state may at times adopt labor provisions of a trade agreement for reasons of comity or relative competitive advantage. These reasons may play a more modest role with respect to adoption of certain human rights treaties or ILO conventions. 163 But evidence of practice and obligation in the domestic law sphere—especially when informed by regard for international instruments—seems almost by definition to be a function of acceptance as law rather than susceptibility to strategic motivations. In this regard, there are numerous instances in recent years where governments have expanded their legislative protections for the right to strike following a period of dialogue with the CEACR, and that committee has recognized and applauded the changes in law.164 Of particular relevance to the U.S. setting, these expansions have included assuring the right to strike for public sector employees and prohibiting the hiring of replacements for strikers.165 A third reason to infer opinio juris (in addition to the centrality of FOA principles within the ILO Constitution and the strong evidence of FOA and rightto-strike practice and obligation under domestic law) involves recent statements from high officials in the United Nations indicating that the right to strike is understood by its leaders as CIL. In his 2016 report to the U.N. General Assembly, the U.N. Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and association explained, “The right to strike has been established in international law for decades, in global and regional instruments, and is also enshrined in the constitutions of at least 90 countries. The right to strike has, in fact, become customary international law.”166 In 2018, responding to a press briefing on a strike by U.N. employees following announced pay cuts, the Deputy Spokesman for the U.N. SecretaryGeneral reiterated the U.N. view that the right to strike is indeed CIL and did so in the context of the right being asserted by public employees not involved in the administration of the state: Question: Does the Secretary-General believe that U.N. staff have a right to take part in industrial action? Deputy Spokesman: We believe the right to strike is part of customary international law.167 These statements did not simply materialize in recent times. Two major U.N. Human Rights treaties—the ICESCR and the ICCPR—have been interpreted by their relevant treaty bodies to include a right to strike; these bodies have reaffirmed their joint commitment to the right to strike as part of FOA, and they regularly monitor governments’ record of compliance with this right. 168 And as noted earlier, the two treaties—each ratified by over 80 percent of U.N members—include a clause explicitly identifying respect for ILO Convention 87. In sum, the principles of FOA including the right to strike would appear to satisfy both prongs of the CIL test. The widely recognized general practice on strikes has sufficient shape and contours: a basic right, three substantive exceptions (public servants involved in administration of the state, essential services in the strict sense of the term, and acute national emergencies), a recognition that strikers retain their employment relationship during the strike itself, and certain procedural prerequisites or attached conditions. 169 There are variations in national practice and also disagreements at the margins about what the right to strike protects, but these aspects are not different in kind from diversity and contests regarding international rights prohibiting child labor, or for that matter domestic constitutional rights involving freedom of expression or the right to bear arms. As for opinio juris, a broad range of sources combine to establish that the general practice stems from a sense of acceptance and obligation: ILO foundation and structure; two widely endorsed United Nations human rights treaties; national constitutions; government representations; domestic legislative and judicial decisions that expressly refer to or impliedly accept international standards and practices; and contemporary U.N. leadership.

#### [Gwisai] And it's not just the U.S. – Other nations have a true unconditional right to strike and lots more are looking to follow suit if similar legal norms become internationally accepted – Zimbabwe proves.
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Communist revolutionary leader, Karl Marx long pointed out that the emancipation of the working class will be an act of the class itself. To successfully resist oppression and exploitation the working class needs to organize and build collective organs of resistance. The right to organize, in particular the right to form trade unions, is therefore one of the most important rights of labour, which the capitalists have been forced to, concede to through centuries of struggle. Invariably linked to the right to trade unionism is the right to collective bargaining. The right is recognized in various international laws. • UDHR Art 23 (4) provides that - “Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his/her interests." • The ICESCR Art 8; ILO Protection of the Right to Organise Convention, 1948 (No. 87) and ILO Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention, 1948 (No. 98) provide fuller details of the right to trade unionism including: ♦ The right of workers to form and/or join trade unions of their choice subject only to the rules of the organisation concerned. No restrictions may be placed on this right other than those prescribed by law and which are necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security or public order or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others. ♦ The right of trade unions to form national federations and international trade union organisations. , ♦ The right of trade unions to function freely subject to no limitations other than those prescribed by law and which are necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security or public order or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others. ♦ Excerptions are provided whereby lawful restrictions may be placed on the exercise of these rights on “members of the armed forces or of the police or of the administration of the State." The right to trade unionism and collective bargaining is recognized in some national constitutions and Zimbabwean constitutional documents including: Art. 40 (3) Constitution of Uganda; Art. 42 Constitution of Ethiopia; and:- • Section 23 of the South African Constitution providing - -81- (2) Every worker has the right - (a) to form and join a trade union; (b) to participate in the activities and programmes of a trade union; and (c ) to strike. (3) Every employer has the right - (a) to form and join an employer's organization; (b) to participate in the activities and programmes of an employer’s organization. (4) Every trade union and every employers' organization has the rightfa) to determine its own administration, programmes and activities; (b) to organise; and (c ) to form and join a federation. (5) Every trade union, employer's organization and employer has the right to engage in collective bargaining. National legislation may be enacted to regulate collective bargaining. To the extent that the legislation may limit a right in this Chapter, the limitation must comply with section 36 (1). (6) National legislation may recognize union security arrangements contained in collective agreements. To the extent that the legislation may limit a right in this Chapter, the limitation must comply with section 36 (1)." • The Constitution of Venezuela also provides for an extensive right to trade unionism in various provisions including - ♦ Art 95: Workers without any distinction of any kind and without need for authorization in advance, have the right freely to establish such union organizations as they may deem appropriate for the optimum protection of their rights and interests, as well as the right to join or not join the same, in accordance with law. These organizations are not subject to administrative dissolution, suspension or intervention. Workers are protected against any act of discrimination or interference contrary to the exercise of this right. The promoters and the members of the board of directors of the union enjoy immunity from dismissal from their employment for the period and on the terms required to enable them to carry out their functions. For purposes of the exercise of union democracy, the by-laws and regulations of union organizations, shall provide for the replacement of boards of directors and representatives by universal, direct and secret suffrage. Any union leaders and representatives who abuse the benefits deriving from union freedom for their personal gain or benefit shall be punished in accordance with law. Members of boards of directors of union organizations shall be required to file a sworn statement of asserts. ♦ Art 96: **All employees in both public and the private sector have the right to voluntary collective bargaining and to enter into collective bargaining agreements, subject only to such restrictions as may be established by law.** **The State guarantees this process, and shall establish appropriate provisions to encourage collective bargaining and the resolution of labour conflicts. Collective bargaining agreements cover all workers who are active as of the time they are signed, and those hired thereafter. • In Zimbabwe the right is provided in the following constitutional documents:** ♦ The Kariba Draft Constitution Section 47 provides an enforceable right to form trade unions and participate in their activities as part of the freedom of assembly and association and modeled on section 21 of the current Constitution of Zimbabwe. V Section 25 provides a duty on the state to endeavor to secure the national objective of “the rights of employers and employees to engage in collective bargaining ad, where necessary, to engage in appropriate collective job action to enforce their rights." ♦ The NCA Draft Constitution Section 28 provides that - V “Every person has the right to form and join trade unions or employers associations of their choice." V “Every trade union, employer’s organization and employer has the right to engage in collective bargaining." ♦ The Labour Act [Chapter 28:01] section 35 provides an important right to the rank and file members of the trade unions to ensure union democracy, namely the requirement that the constitution of every registered trade union must include provisions requiring consultation between the various governing bodies or branches of the trade union before such trade union inter alia - (i) enters upon a collective bargaining agreement; or (ii) recommends collective job action. -82- I Right to strike The ultimate weapon of workers to advance and protect their rights and to force employers, capitalists and their state to concede reforms beneficial to the working class or to defend themselves from attacks from such class enemies, is their ability to collectively withhold their labour or to strike. The right to strike is an essential component of the right to trade unionism and collective bargaining. As observed by labour law historian Kahn-Freund, “if the workers could not, in the last resort, collectively refuse to work, they could not bargain collectively. **The power of management to shut down the plant** (which is inherent in the right of property) **would not be matched** by a corresponding power **on the side of labour.** **There can be no equilibrium without a freedom to strike**.” Finally strikes potentially play a key function in developing proletarian consciousness in the working class. As observed by Bolshevik revolutionary leader V I Lenin - “A strike opens the eyes of the workers to the nature not only of the capitalist but of the government and laws as well. Just as factory owners try to pose as benefactors of workers, the **government officials** ... try to **assure the workers that the government is equally solicitous** of both the **factory owners** and the **workers** as justice requires. **Then comes a strike.** The public prosecutor, the factory inspector, the police and frequently the **troops appear at the factory**, the **workers learn they have violated the law**.” The right to strike is provided under some international laws and national constitutions to varying degrees: • The ICESCR, Art 8 (4) provides that everyone has the right to strike, “provided that it is exercised in conformity with the laws of the particular country." • The Constitution of **South Africa**n, Section 23 (2) (c ) stipulates the broadest right to strike with the least restrictions, explicitly and unconditionally stating - “Every worker has the right to strike.” • For other national constitutions see: Art. 42 (1) Constitution of **Ethiopia**; Section 31 (4) Constitution of **Malawi**; Art. 40 (3) Constitution of **Uganda**; Art. 91, Constitution of **Mozambique**; and Art. 97, Constitution of **Venezuela**. • In Zimbabwe constitutional documents provide as follows; ♦ The NCA Draft Constitution Section 28 (3) provides an explicit and **unconditional right to strike** providing - **“Every worker has the right to strike, sit-in or stayaway, or such other concerted action.”** ♦ The Kariba Draft Constitution Section 25 (2) (f) (quoted above) provides a duty on the state to endeavour to secure a non-enforceable national objective of the right to collective job action.

This special issue of the Kempton Makamure Labour Journal is a joint effort of the Zimbabwe Labour Centre and the Kempton Makamure Labour Lecture Series Board. Its focus is on constitutional reform from a working people's perspective. It is based on presentations made at the Conference on Constitutional Reform in Zimbabwe and Labour, Gender and Socio-Economic Rights jointly hosted by the two organisations on 30th October 2008 and supported by the Rosa Luxemburg Foundation. The need for constitutional reform in Zimbabwe could not be more urgent. At the end of 2008 the country stands at the climax of an unprecedented political and economic crisis that has been festering for the last decade. As the crisis climaxes consensus has emerged amongst all key sectors of society that central to any effective long term resolution of the crisis is the need for a new legitimate constitutional framework. Yet past experience from Zimbabwe and across Africa shows that unless there is sustained mobilization and intervention by working people and their movements, the elites of society, in business, politics and civic society, will impose constitutions that prioritise their own economic and political interests at the expense of those of the working people, the majority of society. Hence denied and trampled upon are provisions providing for full economic democracy that subordinate private property to the public and social needs of the ordinary people and denial of effective and legally enforceable socio-economic, labour and gender rights in the constitution. Already the three main political parties under the GPA, have agreed to try and impose on society an elitist and political party driven constitutional reform process based on a drat’ neoliberal constitution, the so-called Kariba Draft, which excludes provisions of economic democracy and socio-economic, labour and gender rights. The central objective of this special issue of the journal as with the conference is to marshal **well-researched theoretical positions** that support the demands of working people and the poor for their demands on economic democracy including socio-economic justice and labour and gender rights to be an integral part of any new constitutional dispensation in Zimbabwe. The journal attempts to do so by consolidating the **intellectual and academic outputs** from struggles for progressive constitutional reform from our region and from the Global South, especially from South Africa, Venezuela and Bolivia, all countries where struggles against neoliberalism and dictatorship have gone the furthest in the last two decades. We also draw from the progressive outputs of our own struggles in Zimbabwe, principally as reflected in the NCA Draft Constitution and the Zimbabwe Peoples Charter. We hope the journal will act as an **important theoretical** and **advocacy tool**, for the **working people's movements** in the struggle for a true people-driven constitution.

## Advantage

#### [Seifert] Lack of adherence to Convention 87 prevents harmonization of norms and throws the functioning of international institutions into question – prefer empirics.
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For several decades, the right to strike has been one of the most controversial parts of the law of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). Even though it has not been explicitly enshrined in the Conventions on the right to freedom of association (especially not in Convention 87 on Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise (1948) and in Convention 98 on the Application of the Principles of the Right to Organise and to Bargain Collectively (1949)), since the early 1950s, the ILO supervisory bodies have recognised the right to strike as an essential element of trade union rights enabling workers to collectively defend their economic and social interests. Since its seminal recommendation in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland case of 1952,1 the Governing Body’s Committee on Freedom of Association (CFA) has considered that Article 3 of Convention 87 also guarantees the right to strike, and has developed, since then, detailed ‘case law’ which has been summarised by the International Labour Office in a ‘Digest’ and since 2018 in a ‘Compilation’.2 The Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations (CEACR), another body established by the ILO Governing Body, has taken the same path since the late 1950s.3 Despite this long-standing interpretive practice of these two important supervisory bodies in respect of Convention No. 87, the right to strike has become controversial since the end of the Cold War. In the 81st session of the International Labour Conference (ILC) in 1994, it was already being challenged by the employers’ group.4 But the Rubicon was definitely crossed in 2012, when the employers’ representatives on the ILO Conference Committee on the Application of Standards (CAS) refused, for the first time, to deal—as it had done previously—with a list of Member States that had seriously violated Conventions of the ILO as long as the workers’ group would not accept a revision of the mandate of the CEACR.5 At the heart of this incident was the recognition of the right to strike by the CEACR even though, according to the view of the employers’ side, the Committee was not empowered to interpret ILO law with binding effect. This incident temporarily resulted in an institutional crisis within the ILO supervisory system, since the ILO’s tripartite structure which underlies the constitution of the ILO presupposes that the three constituents cooperate in good faith within the organisation’s bodies. An attitude of refusal on the part of only one of the constituents therefore necessarily brings into question the functioning of the ILO.

#### [Brudney 2] Violations of CIL prevent multinational cooperation over labour and human rights issues.
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It is worth emphasizing this series of developments. United States political diplomacy and input from executive branch experts has helped the transnational legal process to strengthen the international right to strike. The U.S. has been a leading advocate on the international stage promoting both FOA principles and the right to strike—in its trade legislation, bilateral and regional trade agreements, and official positions at the ILO Governing Body. That the U.S. has not ratified Convention 87 does not mean it is somehow undemocratic or improper for U.S. officials to be bound by rules that U.S. influence helped create. To be sure, Sosa recognizes that Congress may “shut the door to the law of nations” explicitly or implicitly by treaties or statutes that occupy the field.271 And there is some domestic law that is inconsistent with the right to strike set forth in CIL. As discussed in Part I.C, this law notably includes a 1935 statutory provision exempting states as “employers” under the NLRA, thereby relegating public employees to state-by-state regulation of FOA and the right to strike; and a 1938 Supreme Court decision allowing private employers to hire permanent replacements for strikers.272 But these expressions of domestic law do not appear to be “controlling” in the relevant sense of addressing or responding to the CIL that is asserted here. The 1935 statutory provision and 1938 Supreme Court decision predate the promulgation of Convention 87 by a decade or more—hence they are not in any way responsive to the existence of FOA or the right to strike at an international level.273 The Court has relied on its 1938 statutory interpretation decision approving of permanent replacements in more recent decades.274 And there were legislative efforts in the early 1990s to overturn the permanent replacement doctrine that did not succeed. 275 It is possible to contend that despite the absence of legislative approval for permanent replacements, the Court’s continuing endorsement of its jurisprudence, and Congress’s failure to override those decisions, are sufficiently controlling in this context. On the other hand, there is a respectable and perhaps persuasive argument that these judicial decisions and instances of congressional inaction do not amount to a sufficiently comprehensive scheme of statutes and regulations addressing the precise issue.276 Relatedly, there is no indication that either the Court or Congress acted with a purpose to preclude the application of CIL in the right-to-strike setting, or even with an awareness that relevant CIL existed.277 In this regard, it is noteworthy that the international right to strike assumed increased visibility and importance beginning in the mid to late 1990s, following elevation of FOA as one of the eight fundamental ILO conventions and the promulgation of the 1998 Declaration. The Supreme Court in the context of admiralty law—relying on the law of nations—has applied recent CIL to overrule its own precedents, or to bypass or distinguish earlier statutory provisions. 278 In doing so, the Court has recognized the primacy of evolving developments in CIL so long as these changes in the law of nations are not directly contradicted by earlier federal statutory text. 279 Violations of CIL, like violations of international law generally, can produce friction between nations that hinders the accomplishment of foreign relations goals.280 As noted earlier, government officials and scholars have expressed concern in recent decades that failure to ratify Convention 87 and other fundamental ILO conventions can undermine U.S. standing on matters of international labor and human rights law.281 At the same time, the U.S. has been a leading advocate on the international stage promoting both FOA principles and the right to strike—in its trade legislation, bilateral and regional trade agreements, and official positions at the ILO Governing Body. And again, while CIL can give way when there is genuinely controlling positive law, such law must be meant to control an otherwise applicable CIL. The mere presence of a relevant statutory provision or judicial decision, without evidence that Congress or the court was aware the CIL existed, is unlikely to qualify. Moreover, if there is a potential conflict between established CIL and sufficiently clear federal statutes, the relative timing of these two sources of law becomes important. The Court has made clear that Congress can override CIL based on subsequent clear legislation.282 It is also well-settled that federal statutes and treaties are equal in authority such that “if a treaty and a federal statute conflict, ‘the one last in date will control the other.’”283 Given the status accorded to CIL as federal law comparable to treaties, it should follow that the last-in-time rule also applies to resolve any differences between an earlierenacted federal statute and a later CIL norm, at least one that meets the Sosa standard of definiteness, specificity, and widespread acceptance.284 Applying the last-in-time rule in our setting, the two most prominent divergences between CIL and existing federal statutory law would be resolved in favor of CIL. The NLRA doctrine allowing employers to permanently replace lawful strikers is not addressed at all in the text. It was derived from the 1935 law as part of a 1938 Supreme Court interpretation that has been relied upon in subsequent Court decisions through the late 1980s. The exemption of state and local government workers from federal law was itself part of the 1935 statute. Both the Court decisions establishing a permanent replacement doctrine and the text exempting state and local governments arose well before—and with no evident awareness of—the establishment and evolution of CIL on FOA and the right to strike. This CIL began emerging in the late 1960s and became fully developed from the late 1990s, continuing to the present.

#### [Meissner] That’s key to solve climate change - rigorous *opinio juris* compliance determines our ability to solve environmental crises.

Meissner 15

[Lisa; Vol: 5/1/2015; Associate Attorney with Hobbs Straus Dean & Walker, LLP, an Indian law firm located in Washington, DC. My primary practice areas are education, healthcare, natural resources/environmental law, and lands issues. I am licensed to practice in Washington State and Washington, DC. I am also a proud member of the Fighting Irish and the Golden Eagles - holding my Juris Doctor from the University of Notre Dame and my Bachelor's degrees from Marque0074te University; “Saving the Paper Tiger: Biodiversity as an Irreplaceable Element of Our Common Cultural Heritage,” Notre Dame Journal of International & Comparative Law, Volume 5, Issue 1, <https://scholarship.law.nd.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1034&context=ndjicl>] Justin -recut CAT

The two-pronged requirement for the formation of customary law requires both state conduct and opinio juris sive necessitatis that are in compliance with a rule of law, and not merely with concepts of morality, courtesy, or ceremony.29 The ICJ has recognized the existence of “obligations of a state towards the international community as a whole” distinct from those that arise between individual nation-states.30 These are obligations erga omnes, which prohibit the use of state territory for acts that may harm other states, such as the spread of transboundary pollution.31 Consequently, as more states adopt environmental conservation measures, basic principles of environmental law have been incorporated into customary international law through state practice, multilateral treaties, and judicial decisions. Such internationally recognized norms include the precautionary principle, the polluter-pays principle, and the principle of transboundary harm.32 Debate has arisen, however, over the precise legal status of many international environmental norms and principles assumed to enjoy binding force as customary international law. For example, assertions about the prohibition on transboundary harm and the precautionary principle that are based on the utilization of texts produced by state and non-state actors, such as courts, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, and legal scholars, seem to characterize these norms as “declarative” rather than customary law.33 However, these ambiguous legal roots still contribute significantly to the process of custom generation, and allow the norms to play an important role in terms of voluntary compliance and in bilateral and multilateral negotiations.34 The consistent articulation of certain rules in conventional regimes lends support to the argument that such rules have achieved the status of customary international law.35 Many critics would argue that biodiversity protection has not yet crystallized into a peremptory international norm for two related reasons. First, it remains an extremely underdeveloped legal regime dependent upon a non-integrated mix of soft law declarations and regional initiatives.36 Second, it takes place within the evolving framework of the concept of sustainable development. Despite these defects, however, a colorable argument still exists that the prevention of biodiversity loss is at least carving a path towards becoming a principle of customary international law, even if it has not yet reached its final destination. The World Commission on Environment and Development’s Experts Group on Environmental Law, for instance, linked the obligation to cooperate closely with the principle of equitable utilization, stating that, “the duty to provide information may in principle pertain to many factors . . . which may have to be taken into account in order to arrive at a reasonable and equitable use of a transboundary natural resource.”37 States are therefore under a binding obligation to notify, in form, and consult with neighboring nations regarding domestic actions with the potential to affect shared natural resources.38 This standard facilitates international cooperation towards the effective application of the equitable utilization principle in environmental law Transboundary natural resources do not exist in isolation, but form an integrated whole within which the legal concepts of biodiversity conservation and human development coexist. Likewise, cultural heritage and migratory species— such as the tiger—do not stop at arbitrary national borders. Rather, they exist in a transboundary state themselves. As a result, and consistent with the principles articulated above, species and the communities that utilize them as part of their cultural heritage should be protected under customary international law. “Indeed, regardless of whether or not they have formally achieved customary status, the sophisticated and detailed articulation of the rules and principles of international environmental law provides a comprehensive set of reference standards and procedures to assist the consideration of transboundary environmental impacts and benefits” in a wide variety of areas, including species conservation and cultural heritage preservation.39 A Concept of “World Heritage Species” under the World Heritage Convention The Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (World Heritage Convention) was adopted by the UNESCO General Conference in Paris on November 16, 1972.40 In order to facilitate its goals of preserving sites important to the “common heritage of humankind,” the Convention called for the development of a World Heritage List to protect “cultural and natural heritage [sites] of outstanding universal value.”41 The notion of “outstanding value” embraces a common view of global history and recognizes that loss of such heritage would be irreplaceable. The World Heritage List “often serves as a catalyst to raising awareness for heritage preservation,” and can increase tourism to the heritage site, which in turn “can bring important funds to the site and to the local economy.”42 It can also serve as a catalyst for preserving the surrounding habitat of a site,43 often to the benefit of the species therein. Once a site is listed, parties must do their “utmost” to protect and conserve those sites and are precluded from taking “any deliberate measures” that might directly or indirectly damage listed sites.44 The concept of World Heritage Species has been discussed since early 2001, primarily in reference to the conservation of the world’s great apes.45 Whereas the World Heritage Convention protects cultural and natural sites of “outstanding universal value” to humankind, the World Heritage Species Protocol would protect species of comparable value.46 While the question remains open as to how to quantify such a value threshold, the increasing number of registers established by organizations such as UNESCO provide objective parameters for at least a prima facie determination of a given species’ international significance.47 Tigers, with their deep cultural connection to humans, clearly have such value, and their disappearance would constitute a critical loss for humanity. They, like other emblematic species, are “irreplaceable testaments to human evolution,” cultural pillars to many indigenous populations, and natural legacies to be passed on for future generations.48 Obviously, tigers are not cultural sites, such as monuments, buildings, or sites within the meaning of the World Heritage Convention. Therefore, any amendment to incorporate species into the World Heritage regime requires additional ratification by the parties; those who do not ratify the amendment would not be bound by it.49 However, a designation that highlights the significance of the area to the species, such as a “Malayan Tiger World Heritage Site,” could lend itself to listing under the current regime. As a result, the concept could benefit the conser vation of those species, such as the tiger, whose conservation status is diminished by a variety of threats or by a lack of political will, by bringing their conservation within the parameters of UNESCO’s World Heritage mandate. Consequently, a World Heritage Species register could be effectively established by amalgamating existing legal obligations with an emphasis on cooperative decision-making in species conservation and management.50 IV International Environmental Law and Human Rights A review of the existing multilateral agreements most applicable to tiger conservation—that is, CITES, the Convention on Biological Diversity, and the World Heritage Convention—concludes that none of these adequately protects the species from the various threats to their survival, including poaching and habitat destruction. It is therefore necessary to approach biodiversity conservation from a new perspective: its link to human rights and cultural identity. The 1972 Stockholm Declaration on the Human Environment triggered the discussion on adopting a human rights approach to environmental protection.51 In its preamble, the Stockholm Declaration clearly established the link between these two legal realms, stating, “[b]oth aspects of man’s environment, the natural and the man-made, are essential to his well-being and to the enjoyment of basic human rights—even the right to life itself.”52 Vice-President Christopher Weeramantry later accentuated this linkage in his eloquent separate opinion to GabˇcíkovoNagymaros. 53 For the most part, biodiversity exists within a matrix of resources lying within the sovereign boundaries of nation-states and the local sphere. This dynamic contributes to an acute tension between conservation needs and economic and social development needs, especially in Southeast Asia. For example, of the 15 countries that feature prominently in terms of diversity of higher species (reptiles, birds and mammals), none has an average annual per capita income greater than $2000.54 In fact, most of these countries register annual incomes that are among the lowest in the world, around $200–$500 annually.55 Conservationists recognize that many of the primary threats to species survival are often driven by poverty, and that poverty reduction is thus essential if conservation objectives are to be achieved.56 The Millennium Development Goals, which commit the international community to halving poverty by 2015, indicate that several important targets for poverty reduction in these regions have or will be met by 2015, but that progress in many regions is far from sufficient to meet its stated goals.57 A Human Right to a Healthy Environment The human right to a healthy environment is defined through diverse and controversial terminology. For present purposes, it refers to a human right to live in an environment of such minimum quality as to allow for the realization of a life of dignity and well-being.58 The focus—neither rightly nor wrongly—is on humans and the global disparity between communities and their development, rather than the environment in its own right.59 Principle 1 of the Rio Declaration provides that “[h]uman beings are at the centre of concerns for sustainable development. They are entitled to a healthy and productive life in harmony with nature.”60 This principle was accepted without reservations by almost every nation and captures the ideals of linking a human right to a healthy environment with the principle of sustainable development, if not explicitly recognizing it as a right per se.61 Even if the right to a healthy environment cannot be regarded as a “human right” in any orthodox sense, it may still be considered a political and civil right, or an economic and social right, with particular applicability to indigenous peoples.62 The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, for example, contains complex language linking the rights of indigenous peoples, future generations, sustainable development, and the environment,63 as does the Organization of American States (O.A.S.) Proposed American Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.64 Considering Principle 1 in conjunction with the contextual development of a right to a healthy environment, a right to sustainable development, and the rights of future generations, it follows that effects on health and a continuation of an established way of life are integral components of any right to a healthy environment for the local communities involved.65 Moreover, Article 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights has been interpreted by the Human Rights Committee to ensure special entitlement to minorities and indigenous groups to have access to natural resources.66 Such entitlement necessarily entails a negative obligation not to interfere and a positive obligation to protect on the part of the state, in contrast to current international documents reaffirming exclusive state sovereignty over natural resources.67 A healthy environment thus entails more than a minimum quality of tangible resources, such as air, water, and shelter, and encompasses intangible elements, such as culture and a way of life. Emblematic species, such as the tiger, form pillars of cultural identity for communities around the world. For example, the Makah Tribe of the Olympic Peninsula in Washington is a seafaring culture in which whales and whaling hold a preeminent role in maintaining traditional culture and religious expression.68 Access to this species, a natural resource, is thus essential to their way of life and to enjoying a healthy environment. Without the whale, the Makah would not be able to realize their economic, social, and cultural rights to the full extent required by international law. Such a right consequently respects the complex linkages between local communities and their immediate environment and seeks to mitigate the global disparity in natural resource management, including of the species therein. As a result, the articulation of a human right to a healthy environment ultimately seeks to influence domestic decisions through international law.69 An international agreement on the issue would offer states an aspirational framework in which to operate to pursue the combined purposes of promoting human development and environmental protection. Such an endeavor, however, would require national conservation programs to move beyond principled legislation to the serious consideration of local needs and cultural norms.70 The interim gap between national and local levels of natural resource management capacity could be filled by non-governmental organizations, working with local communities to administer national programs. Moreover, the development of committed, sustainable sources of funding and enforcement must be pursued and may be more attainable if coupled with regional commitments that facilitate cooperation and accountability.71

#### [Spektor] That risks extinction – contrary models are incorrect.

Specktor 19 [Brandon; 6/4/19; Writes about the science of everyday life for Live Science, and previously for Reader's Digest magazine, where he served as an editor for five years; "Human Civilization Will Crumble by 2050 If We Don't Stop Climate Change Now, New Paper Claims," livescience, <https://www.livescience.com/65633-climate-change-dooms-humans-by-2050.html>] Justin

The current climate crisis, they say, is larger and more complex than any humans have ever dealt with before. General climate models — like the one that the [United Nations' Panel on Climate Change](https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/) (IPCC) used in 2018 to predict that a global temperature increase of 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit (2 degrees Celsius) could put hundreds of millions of people at risk — fail to account for the sheer complexity of Earth's many interlinked geological processes; as such, they fail to adequately predict the scale of the potential consequences. The truth, the authors wrote, is probably far worse than any models can fathom. How the world ends What might an accurate worst-case picture of the planet's climate-addled future actually look like, then? The authors provide one particularly grim scenario that begins with world governments "politely ignoring" the advice of scientists and the will of the public to decarbonize the economy (finding alternative energy sources), resulting in a global temperature increase 5.4 F (3 C) by the year 2050. At this point, the world's ice sheets vanish; brutal droughts kill many of the trees in the [Amazon rainforest](https://www.livescience.com/57266-amazon-river.html) (removing one of the world's largest carbon offsets); and the planet plunges into a feedback loop of ever-hotter, ever-deadlier conditions. "Thirty-five percent of the global land area, and 55 percent of the global population, are subject to more than 20 days a year of [lethal heat conditions](https://www.livescience.com/55129-how-heat-waves-kill-so-quickly.html), beyond the threshold of human survivability," the authors hypothesized. Meanwhile, droughts, floods and wildfires regularly ravage the land. Nearly one-third of the world's land surface turns to desert. Entire ecosystems collapse, beginning with the planet's coral reefs, the rainforest and the Arctic ice sheets. The world's tropics are hit hardest by these new climate extremes, destroying the region's agriculture and turning more than 1 billion people into refugees. This mass movement of refugees — coupled with [shrinking coastlines](https://www.livescience.com/51990-sea-level-rise-unknowns.html) and severe drops in food and water availability — begin to stress the fabric of the world's largest nations, including the United States. Armed conflicts over resources, perhaps culminating in nuclear war, are likely. The result, according to the new paper, is "outright chaos" and perhaps "the end of human global civilization as we know it."

#### [Mecklin] Weakening international law supercharges interlocking catastrophic risks, the combination of which risks extinction and multiplies every other threat.

Mecklin 21

John Mecklin, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, “This is your COVID wake-up call: It is 100 seconds to midnight.” 2021 Doomsday Clock Statement, January 27, 2021. *Founded in 1945 by Albert Einstein and University of Chicago scientists who helped develop the first atomic weapons in the Manhattan Project, the*Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists *created the Doomsday Clock two years later, using the imagery of apocalypse (midnight) and the contemporary idiom of nuclear explosion (countdown to zero) to convey threats to humanity and the planet. The Doomsday Clock is set every year by the Bulletin’s Science and Security Board in consultation with its Board of Sponsors, which includes 13 Nobel laureates. The Clock has become a universally recognized indicator of the world’s vulnerability to catastrophe from nuclear weapons, climate change, and disruptive technologies in other domains.* <https://thebulletin.org/doomsday-clock/current-time/> -CAT

* This card is also an independent disad to PICs

Humanity continues to suffer as the COVID-19 pandemic spreads around the world. In 2020 alone, this novel disease killed 1.7 million people and sickened at least 70 million more. The pandemic revealed just how unprepared and unwilling countries and the international system are to handle global emergencies properly. In this time of genuine crisis, governments too often abdicated responsibility, ignored scientific advice, did not cooperate or communicate effectively, and consequently failed to protect the health and welfare of their citizens. As a result, many hundreds of thousands of human beings died needlessly. Though lethal on a massive scale, this particular pandemic is not an existential threat. Its consequences are grave and will be lasting. But COVID-19 will not obliterate civilization, and we expect the disease to recede eventually. Still, the pandemic serves as a historic wake-up call, a vivid illustration that national governments and international organizations are unprepared to manage nuclear weapons and climate change, which currently pose existential threats to humanity, or the other dangers—including more virulent pandemics and next-generation warfare—that could threaten civilization in the near future. Accelerating nuclear programs in multiple countries moved the world into less stable and manageable territory last year. Development of hypersonic glide vehicles, ballistic missile defenses, and weapons-delivery systems that can flexibly use conventional or nuclear warheads may raise the probability of miscalculation in times of tension. Events like the deadly assault earlier this month on the US Capitol renewed legitimate concerns about national leaders who have sole control of the use of nuclear weapons. Nuclear nations, however, have ignored or undermined practical and available diplomatic and security tools for managing nuclear risks. By our estimation, the potential for the world to stumble into nuclear war—an ever-present danger over the last 75 years—increased in 2020. An extremely dangerous global failure to address existential threats—what we called “the new abnormal” in 2019—tightened its grip in the nuclear realm in the past year, increasing the likelihood of catastrophe. Governments have also failed to sufficiently address climate change. A pandemic-related economic slowdown temporarily reduced the carbon dioxide emissions that cause global warming. But over the coming decade fossil fuel use needs to decline precipitously if the worst effects of climate change are to be avoided. Instead, fossil fuel development and production are projected to increase. Atmospheric greenhouse gas concentrations hit a record high in 2020, one of the two warmest years on record. The massive wildfires and catastrophic cyclones of 2020 are illustrations of the major devastation that will only increase if governments do not significantly and quickly amplify their efforts to bring greenhouse gas emissions essentially to zero. As we noted in our [last Doomsday Clock statement](https://thebulletin.org/doomsday-clock/current-time/), the existential threats of nuclear weapons and climate change have intensified in recent years because of a threat multiplier: the continuing corruption of the information ecosphere on which democracy and public decision-making depend. Here, again, the COVID-19 pandemic is a wake-up call. False and misleading information disseminated over the internet—including misrepresentation of COVID-19’s seriousness, promotion of false cures, and politicization of low-cost protective measures such as face masks—created social chaos in many countries and led to unnecessary death. This wanton disregard for science and the large-scale embrace of conspiratorial nonsense—often driven by political figures and partisan media—undermined the ability of responsible national and global leaders to protect the security of their citizens. False conspiracy theories about a “stolen” presidential election led to rioting that resulted in the death of five people and the first hostile occupation of the US Capitol since 1814. In 2020, online lying literally killed. Considered by themselves, these negative events in the nuclear, climate change, and disinformation arenas might justify moving the clock closer to midnight. But amid the gloom, we see some positive developments. The election of a US president who acknowledges climate change as a profound threat and supports international cooperation and science-based policy puts the world on a better footing to address global problems. For example, the United States has already announced it is rejoining the Paris Agreement on climate change and the Biden administration has offered to extend the New START arms control agreement with Russia for five years. In the context of a post-pandemic return to relative stability, more such demonstrations of renewed interest in and respect for science and multilateral cooperation could create the basis for a safer and saner world. Because these developments have not yet yielded substantive progress toward a safer world, they are not sufficient to move the Clock away from midnight. But they are positive and do weigh against the profound dangers of institutional decay, science denialism, aggressive nuclear postures, and disinformation campaigns discussed in our 2020 statement. The members of the Science and Security Board therefore set the Doomsday Clock at 100 seconds to midnight, the closest it has ever been to civilization-ending apocalypse and the same time we set in 2020. It is deeply unfortunate that the global response to the pandemic over the past year has explicitly validated many of the concerns we have voiced for decades. We continue to believe that human beings can manage the dangers posed by modern technology, even in times of crisis. But if humanity is to avoid an existential catastrophe—one that would dwarf anything it has yet seen—national leaders must do a far better job of countering disinformation, heeding science, and cooperating to diminish global risks. Citizens around the world can and should organize and demand—through public protests, at ballot boxes, and in other creative ways—that their governments reorder their priorities and cooperate domestically and internationally to reduce the risk of nuclear war, climate change, and other global disasters, including pandemic disease. We have experienced the consequences of inaction. It is time to respond.

## Plan

#### Thus, the plan “Resolved: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.”

## Solvency

#### 1] [Brudney 3] Courts are normal means; they can enforce the right to strike as Customary International Law.

Brudney 21 [James; 2/8/21; Joseph Crowley Chair in Labor and Employment Law, Fordham Law School; “The Right to Strike as Customary International Law,” THE YALE JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, Vol 46, <https://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1710&context=yjil>] Justin \*\* Brackets in original

In order for the international right to strike to receive protection in a U.S. domestic law setting, this CIL right must be cognizable in federal court. Workers asserting such a right would be seeking direct application of CIL, stemming from legal principles set forth in The Paquete Habana233 and subsequent cases. The Paquete Habana involved U.S. seizure of two Spanish fishing vessels during the Spanish American War. The Court relied on customary international law to hold that the vessels and their cargoes were exempt from capture as prizes of war.234 Justice Gray’s oft-quoted language, recognizing that CIL is part of the law of the United States, is as follows: International law is part of our law and must be ascertained and administered by the courts of justice of appropriate jurisdiction as often as questions of right depending upon it are duly presented for their determination. For this purpose, where there is no treaty and no controlling executive or legislative act or judicial decision, resort must be had to the customs and usages of civilized nations . . . . 235 In a number of decisions beginning in the 1960s, the Court has applied CIL rules when determining the legal status of submerged offshore areas, helping guide its application of federal statutes and treaties implicating the law of the seas. 236 The Court has also invoked CIL in determining when an instrumentality of a sovereign state becomes the “alter ego” of that state, a question not controlled by the relevant foreign sovereign immunity statute.237 Relatedly, the Court in Banco Nacional de Cuba v. Sabbatino238 relied on a judge-made principle of U.S. foreign relations law—the Act of State doctrine—to decline to examine the validity of the taking of property by a foreign sovereign government within its own territory.239 Turning to lower federal courts, the courts of appeals have regularly applied the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties “as an articulation of the customary international law of treaty interpretation, even though the United States is not a party to the treaty itself.”240 And at least one district court has recognized FOA and the right to organize as CIL when denying a motion to dismiss.241 Finally, the executive branch also has applied CIL in certain circumstances. Although the U.S. voted against adoption of the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Seas, the U.S. government accepts its key provisions regarding the maximum breadth of territorial sea and the extent of exclusive economic zones as CIL.242 In short, U.S. courts and executive branch officials have directly applied CIL and been guided by its teachings in a range of doctrinal settings. 243 As noted earlier, CIL on human rights has been deemed applicable in U.S. courts for suitably defined misconduct occurring in other countries. 244 These doctrinal precedents do not involve direct application of CIL in a domestic law setting akin to the labor and human rights claims being proposed here. That said, lower courts have invoked CIL when applying federal rules of decision in a range of domestic law contexts. Indeed, the use of CIL when applying and construing various federal statutes has increased markedly in recent decades.245 Examples include its use when applying an armed conflict statute to establish limits on detention of a U.S. citizen within the U.S.;246 when construing the same statute to help establish requirements for release and repatriation of a foreign national held on U.S. soil;247 and when limiting the scope of an immigration statute’s authorization of detention.248 In addition, CIL has been applied to help courts apply the choice between indefinite detention and exclusion under a different immigration statute,249 and to assist judicial construction of a statute regulating recovery of sunken warships in U.S. waters. 250 It is not obvious why CIL should be deemed inapplicable when construing federal statutes that implicate appropriately qualified labor/human rights misconduct occurring within our borders.251 Moreover, as previously noted, a number of other countries have accepted the right to strike as a principle of international law when applying their own domestic law despite their conscious decision not to ratify Convention 87.252 Once one accepts that recognized CIL has substantive traction in a domestic law setting, the focus should be on whether this CIL can be situated in relation to certain procedural or jurisdictional limitations that characterize the U.S. judicial context. Accordingly, application of CIL to sustain claims based on FOA and the right to strike requires consideration of how this CIL relates to other aspects of U.S. law. B. CIL as Federal Common Law A threshold question is whether U.S. courts should determine matters of CIL as federal common law or as state law in light of the Erie doctrine.253 The question has been extensively debated by able international law scholars,254 and I will not attempt to add new value in this setting. I am persuaded that CIL should be understood and litigated as federal common law, for reasons presented at length in a range of sources. 255 Indeed, as one international law scholar has recently and thoroughly explained, “[t]he law of nations was the original federal common law.”256 The basic contours of this position were set forth by the Supreme Court in Sabbatino, when it held that the Act of State doctrine is federal law, binding on the states and not within the scope of Erie. 257 In the words of Justice Harlan for an eight-member majority, “an issue concerned with a basic choice regarding the competence and function of the Judiciary and National Executive in ordering our relationships with other members of the international community must be treated exclusively as an aspect of federal law.”258 Subsequently, leading commentators have joined the Court in concluding that Erie was never meant to apply to CIL;259 that federal courts’ incorporation of the CIL of labor and human rights follows post-Erie precedent recognizing and helping to create a federal common law for labor relations and for other uniquely federal interests;260 that CIL may reflect developments in the international arena of labor and human rights in addition to filling gaps with respect to jurisdictional statutes such as the ATS and the Torture Victim Prevention Act (TVPA); 261 and that CIL remains subject to the democratic checks of supervision, endorsement, or revision by the federal political branches.262 Relying on the weight of these arguments in Boyle v. United Technologies Corp., Justice Scalia for the Court recognized that a few areas involving “uniquely federal interests” are committed to federal control, including the development of federal common law, and he cited Court precedent on CIL as one such area.263 C. The Presence or Absence of Controlling Law As indicated in The Paquete Habana excerpt above, an important additional consideration is whether there is a treaty or any “controlling executive or legislative act or judicial decision” that would preclude federal courts from recognizing a right to strike as CIL. Lower court decisions invoking the “controlling law” principle from Paquete Habana have applied a fairly rigorous standard, relying on a comprehensive scheme of statutes and regulations addressing the precise issue,264 or on a treaty ratified by the U.S. directed to the same problem.265 These lower courts also have invoked Supreme Court statements that focus on the central role of legislative expression when concluding that certain controlling congressional acts were taken with a purpose to preclude the application of CIL to a particular situation.266 Under this standard, controlling U.S. domestic law does not preclude federal courts’ authority to recognize a right to strike as CIL; on the contrary, it arguably supports such authority. As an ILO member, the U.S. is a party to the 1944 Declaration of Philadelphia, the 1998 Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, and the 2008 Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization.267 Each of these core ILO commitments specifies the fundamental importance of FOA. Congress in two separate trade statutes has incorporated FOA as an “internationally recognized worker right.”268 In addition, the U.S. has ratified the ICCPR, which has incorporated the right to strike as part of FOA, and has signed the ICESCR, which expressly recognizes that right within its text. 269 And both the Administration’s 2015 statement at ILO Governing Body proceedings and its most recent trade agreement, drafted and executed by the Trump Administration, have specified that the right to strike is an integral part of FOA.270

#### 2] [Brudney 4] Federal laws are ambiguous – the plan clarifies exceptions; there is a valid legal Cause of Action.

Brudney 21 [James; 2/8/21; Joseph Crowley Chair in Labor and Employment Law, Fordham Law School; “The Right to Strike as Customary International Law,” THE YALE JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, Vol 46, <https://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1710&context=yjil>] Justin \*\* Brackets in original

The D.C. Circuit in Reich relied on the canon disfavoring implied repeals, because the later-enacted Procurement Act (on which the Executive Order was based) did not contradict the NLRA itself.313 By contrast, the later-evolved CIL on the right to strike does directly contradict the text and application of the NLRA. As evidenced by the CEACR General Survey, the CFA Compilation, and numerous other transnational and national sources, there is a direct conflict between CIL and the Supreme Court interpretation of the NLRA on permanent replacement, as well as the NLRA provisions declining to apply federal law to strikes by public employees. Regarding the permanent replacement of private strikers, a different canon than the one disfavoring implied repeals becomes important. The Charming Betsy canon provides that when legislation is ambiguous, it should be construed to conform to international law, including the “law of nations” or CIL.314 Federal courts have made clear that they will apply the Charming Betsy principle if conflict exists between CIL and statutes that are ambiguous or inconclusive.315 Thus, a federal appeals court—recognizing a “clear international prohibition” against prolonged and arbitrary detention, evidenced inter alia in the ICCPR— construed an ambiguous statutory immigration provision so as not to authorize the indefinite detention of removable aliens. 316 And a district court—relying on a ratified OECD Convention—construed an ambiguous criminal statute so as to authorize broad prosecution of bribes involving officials of State-owned enterprises. 317 At the same time, lower courts have indicated that the Charming Betsy canon comes into play only when the statute itself is ambiguous. “It is always the case that clear congressional action trumps customary international law and previously enacted treaties.”318 When a statute makes plain Congress’s intent, “Article III courts . . . must enforce the intent of Congressirrespective of whether the statute conforms to customary international law.”319 In this context, the permanent replacement doctrine is best understood as reflecting not clear congressional action but rather an inconclusive statutory text. When the Supreme Court grafted a permanent replacement doctrine onto the NLRA in 1938, it acknowledged that the doctrine was not based on any language in the text itself.320 Statutory amendments from 1947 and 1959 make no reference to an employer’s right to hire permanent replacements for lawful strikers. The only mention of strikers not entitled to reinstatement is language added in 1947 and modified in 1959, 321 discussing voting eligibility for employees engaged in an economic strike who are not entitled to reinstatement. But that reference, in a section titled “Representatives and Elections” that is unrelated to the section dealing with lawfulness of employer practices, is at best ambiguous. 322 Non-entitlement to reinstatement could be for various reasons, and the agency is given broad discretion to determine voter eligibility “consistent with the purposes and provisions of this subchapter.”323 As previously noted, subsequent Supreme Court decisions have invoked the permanent replacement doctrine.324 Yet still other Court decisions are arguably inconsistent with Mackay Radio, 325 and the legal basis for allowing permanent replacements has been harshly criticized for decades.326 In the early 1990s, Congress came close to prohibiting the doctrine, while making no textual changes during its effort. 327 Overall, continued reliance on a controversial Court decision that construed statutory silence, and instances of congressional failures to act, would not appear to qualify as unambiguous statutory action trumping the CIL that has developed during and after the Court actions and congressional inactions, and that is now well-established. As discussed in Section III.C, the Supreme Court in admiralty law has overruled precedents or distinguished statutes when newer developments in CIL justify such action.328 In this setting, the Charming Betsy canon could encourage an updated construction of the NLRA, essentially forcing the Court to rethink its position. Regarding the prohibition on coverage for state employers, this statutory language is unambiguous and therefore the Charming Betsy canon has no application. The conflict here involves the United States allowing the states unlimited rights to control the strike-related activities of their employees. As explained above, the United States has justified this unlimited right of control before the CFA by relying on the dual sovereignty of federalism as a constitutional matter.329 But that is not obviously applicable after Garcia altered the constitutional equation in 1985 with respect to laws of general applicability. Moreover, CIL on the right to strike comes into its own long after the 1938 exclusion ofstatesfrom federalstatutory coverage. Instead, the U.S.should grant injunctive relief prohibiting states from violating CIL regarding the right to strike, at least until Congress has addressed the issue.

#### 3] [Chow and Schoenbaum] Unconditional can be interpreted to mean preventing from adding additional exceptions to international law. In the absence of alternative non-contextual definitions, prefer mine –

Chow and Schoenbaum 17 [Daniel Chow and Thomas Schoenbaum; 2017; Professor Chow served as a law clerk to the Honorable Constance Baker Motley, chief judge for the Southern District of New York, following graduation from law school, and then became an associate with Debevoise and Plimpton in New York. He came to Ohio State in 1985 and teaches International Law, International Transactions, Jurisprudence, Asian Law, and Property. He is a member of Phi Beta Kappa, Thomas J. Schoenbaum is presently the Harold S. Shefelman Professor of Law at the University of Washington in Seattle. He received his Juris Doctor degree from the University of Michigan and his PhD degree from Gonville and Caius College, University of Cambridge (UK). He is also Research Professor of Law at George Washington University in Washington DC. He is a practicing lawyer, admitted in several U.S. states and before the Bar of the Supreme Court of the United States. He has been a professor at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and was Associate Dean at Tulane University in New Orleans, “International Trade Law: Problems, Cases, and Materials,” Aspen Casebook Study] Justin

1. Belgian Family Allowances helped to establish two basic principles of GATT jurisprudence: MFN applies to internal measures (in this case the 7.5 percent levy), and the same treatment extended to France and others (foregoing of the levy) must be extended unconditionally to all other WTO members. The unconditional extension of MFN must occur even if Norway or Denmark did not have a system of family allowances. While Belgian Family Allowances interprets the unconditional extension of MFN to mean without any conditions, it is also possible to interpret this requirement to prohibit any additional conditions beyond what is required of the original recipient of the benefit or privilege. See Matsushita, Schoenbaum, Mavroidis and Hahn The World Trade Organization: Law, Practice and Policy 167-177 (3d ed. 2015).

## Framing

#### The standard is maximizing expected wellbeing. Prefer:

#### 1] [Bostrom] Extinction first – You can’t be 100% sure about any framework, so you must keep people alive to make future ethical determinations.

Bostrom 12

[Nick Bostrom, Faculty of Philosophy & Oxford Martin School University of Oxford. “Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority”. 2012. www.existential-risk.org/concept.html]

These reflections on moral uncertainty suggest an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk; they also suggest a new way of thinking about the ideal of sustainability. Let me elaborate. Our present understanding of axiology might well be confused. We may not now know — at least not in concrete detail — what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. If we are indeed profoundly uncertain about our ultimate aims, then we should recognize that there is a great option value in preserving — and ideally improving — our ability to recognize value and to steer the future accordingly. Ensuring that there will be a future version of humanity with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely is plausibly the best way available to us to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value. To do this, we must prevent any existential catastrophe.

#### 2] Degrees of wrongness – If I break a promise to meet for lunch, that’s not as bad as breaking one to take a dying person to the hospital. Only the consequences explain why the second one is so much worse than the first.

#### 3] Aggregation – States lack unified intent. Because different people have different ethical systems, the only non-arbitrary way to aggregate is to help the most people.

#### 4] [Blum] Util’s a prerequisite to all other moral theories; robust neuroscience proves – pleasure and pain are the only intrinsic values and disvalues – everything else regresses

Blum et al. 18
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Pleasure is not only one of the three primary reward functions but it also defines reward. As homeostasis explains the functions of only a limited number of rewards, the principal reason why particular stimuli, objects, events, situations, and activities are rewarding may be due to pleasure. This applies first of all to sex and to the primary homeostatic rewards of food and liquid and extends to money, taste, beauty, social encounters and nonmaterial, internally set, and intrinsic rewards. Pleasure, as the primary effect of rewards, drives the prime reward functions of learning, approach behavior, and decision making and provides the basis for hedonic theories of reward function. We are attracted by most rewards and exert intense efforts to obtain them, just because they are enjoyable [10]. Pleasure is a passive reaction that derives from the experience or prediction of reward and may lead to a long-lasting state of happiness. The word happiness is difficult to define. In fact, just obtaining physical pleasure may not be enough. One key to happiness involves a network of good friends. However, it is not obvious how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to an ice cream cone, or to your team winning a sporting event. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure [14]. Pleasure as a hallmark of reward is sufficient for defining a reward, but it may not be necessary. A reward may generate positive learning and approach behavior simply because it contains substances that are essential for body function. When we are hungry, we may eat bad and unpleasant meals. A monkey who receives hundreds of small drops of water every morning in the laboratory is unlikely to feel a rush of pleasure every time it gets the 0.1 ml. Nevertheless, with these precautions in mind, we may define any stimulus, object, event, activity, or situation that has the potential to produce pleasure as a reward. In the context of reward deficiency or for disorders of addiction, homeostasis pursues pharmacological treatments: drugs to treat drug addiction, obesity, and other compulsive behaviors. The theory of allostasis suggests broader approaches - such as re-expanding the range of possible pleasures and providing opportunities to expend effort in their pursuit. [15]. It is noteworthy, the first animal studies eliciting approach behavior by electrical brain stimulation interpreted their findings as a discovery of the brain’s pleasure centers [16] which were later partly associated with midbrain dopamine neurons [17–19] despite the notorious difficulties of identifying emotions in animals. Evolutionary theories of pleasure: The love connection BO:D Charles Darwin and other biological scientists that have examined the biological evolution and its basic principles found various mechanisms that steer behavior and biological development. Besides their theory on natural selection, it was particularly the sexual selection process that gained significance in the latter context over the last century, especially when it comes to the question of what makes us “what we are,” i.e., human. However, the capacity to sexually select and evolve is not at all a human accomplishment alone or a sign of our uniqueness; yet, we humans, as it seems, are ingenious in fooling ourselves and others–when we are in love or desperately search for it. It is well established that modern biological theory conjectures that organisms are the result of evolutionary competition. In fact, Richard Dawkins stresses gene survival and propagation as the basic mechanism of life [20]. Only genes that lead to the fittest phenotype will make it. It is noteworthy that the phenotype is selected based on behavior that maximizes gene propagation. To do so, the phenotype must survive and generate offspring, and be better at it than its competitors. Thus, the ultimate, distal function of rewards is to increase evolutionary fitness by ensuring the survival of the organism and reproduction. It is agreed that learning, approach, economic decisions, and positive emotions are the proximal functions through which phenotypes obtain other necessary nutrients for survival, mating, and care for offspring. Behavioral reward functions have evolved to help individuals to survive and propagate their genes. Apparently, people need to live well and long enough to reproduce. Most would agree that homo-sapiens do so by ingesting the substances that make their bodies function properly. For this reason, foods and drinks are rewards. Additional rewards, including those used for economic exchanges, ensure sufficient palatable food and drink supply. Mating and gene propagation is supported by powerful sexual attraction. Additional properties, like body form, augment the chance to mate and nourish and defend offspring and are therefore also rewards. Care for offspring until they can reproduce themselves helps gene propagation and is rewarding; otherwise, many believe mating is useless. According to David E Comings, as any small edge will ultimately result in evolutionary advantage [21], additional reward mechanisms like novelty seeking and exploration widen the spectrum of available rewards and thus enhance the chance for survival, reproduction, and ultimate gene propagation. These functions may help us to obtain the benefits of distant rewards that are determined by our own interests and not immediately available in the environment. Thus the distal reward function in gene propagation and evolutionary fitness defines the proximal reward functions that we see in everyday behavior. That is why foods, drinks, mates, and offspring are rewarding. There have been theories linking pleasure as a required component of health benefits salutogenesis, (salugenesis). In essence, under these terms, pleasure is described as a state or feeling of happiness and satisfaction resulting from an experience that one enjoys. Regarding pleasure, it is a double-edged sword, on the one hand, it promotes positive feelings (like mindfulness) and even better cognition, possibly through the release of dopamine [22]. But on the other hand, pleasure simultaneously encourages addiction and other negative behaviors, i.e., motivational toxicity. It is a complex neurobiological phenomenon, relying on reward circuitry or limbic activity. It is important to realize that through the “Brain Reward Cascade” (BRC) endorphin and endogenous morphinergic mechanisms may play a role [23]. While natural rewards are essential for survival and appetitive motivation leading to beneficial biological behaviors like eating, sex, and reproduction, crucial social interactions seem to further facilitate the positive effects exerted by pleasurable experiences. Indeed, experimentation with addictive drugs is capable of directly acting on reward pathways and causing deterioration of these systems promoting hypodopaminergia [24]. Most would agree that pleasurable activities can stimulate personal growth and may help to induce healthy behavioral changes, including stress management [25]. The work of Esch and Stefano [26] concerning the link between compassion and love implicate the brain reward system, and pleasure induction suggests that social contact in general, i.e., love, attachment, and compassion, can be highly effective in stress reduction, survival, and overall health. Understanding the role of neurotransmission and pleasurable states both positive and negative have been adequately studied over many decades [26–37], but comparative anatomical and neurobiological function between animals and homo sapiens appear to be required and seem to be in an infancy stage. Finding happiness is different between apes and humans As stated earlier in this expert opinion one key to happiness involves a network of good friends [38]. However, it is not entirely clear exactly how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to a sugar rush, winning a sports event or even sky diving, all of which augment dopamine release at the reward brain site. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure. Remarkably, there are pathways for ordinary liking and pleasure, which are limited in scope as described above in this commentary. However, there are many brain regions, often termed hot and cold spots, that significantly modulate (increase or decrease) our pleasure or even produce the opposite of pleasure— that is disgust and fear [39]. One specific region of the nucleus accumbens is organized like a computer keyboard, with particular stimulus triggers in rows— producing an increase and decrease of pleasure and disgust. Moreover, the cortex has unique roles in the cognitive evaluation of our feelings of pleasure [40]. Importantly, the interplay of these multiple triggers and the higher brain centers in the prefrontal cortex are very intricate and are just being uncovered. Desire and reward centers It is surprising that many different sources of pleasure activate the same circuits between the mesocorticolimbic regions (Figure 1). Reward and desire are two aspects pleasure induction and have a very widespread, large circuit. Some part of this circuit distinguishes between desire and dread. The so-called pleasure circuitry called “REWARD” involves a well-known dopamine pathway in the mesolimbic system that can influence both pleasure and motivation. In simplest terms, the well-established mesolimbic system is a dopamine circuit for reward. It starts in the ventral tegmental area (VTA) of the midbrain and travels to the nucleus accumbens (Figure 2). It is the cornerstone target to all addictions. The VTA is encompassed with neurons using glutamate, GABA, and dopamine. The nucleus accumbens (NAc) is located within the ventral striatum and is divided into two sub-regions—the motor and limbic regions associated with its core and shell, respectively. The NAc has spiny neurons that receive dopamine from the VTA and glutamate (a dopamine driver) from the hippocampus, amygdala and medial prefrontal cortex. Subsequently, the NAc projects GABA signals to an area termed the ventral pallidum (VP). The region is a relay station in the limbic loop of the basal ganglia, critical for motivation, behavior, emotions and the “Feel Good” response. This defined system of the brain is involved in all addictions –substance, and non –substance related. In 1995, our laboratory coined the term “Reward Deficiency Syndrome” (RDS) to describe genetic and epigenetic induced hypodopaminergia in the “Brain Reward Cascade” that contribute to addiction and compulsive behaviors [3,6,41]. Furthermore, ordinary “liking” of something, or pure pleasure, is represented by small regions mainly in the limbic system (old reptilian part of the brain). These may be part of larger neural circuits. In Latin, hedus is the term for “sweet”; and in Greek, hodone is the term for “pleasure.” Thus, the word Hedonic is now referring to various subcomponents of pleasure: some associated with purely sensory and others with more complex emotions involving morals, aesthetics, and social interactions. The capacity to have pleasure is part of being healthy and may even extend life, especially if linked to optimism as a dopaminergic response [42]. Psychiatric illness often includes symptoms of an abnormal inability to experience pleasure, referred to as anhedonia. A negative feeling state is called dysphoria, which can consist of many emotions such as pain, depression, anxiety, fear, and disgust. Previously many scientists used animal research to uncover the complex mechanisms of pleasure, liking, motivation and even emotions like panic and fear, as discussed above [43]. However, as a significant amount of related research about the specific brain regions of pleasure/reward circuitry has been derived from invasive studies of animals, these cannot be directly compared with subjective states experienced by humans. In an attempt to resolve the controversy regarding the causal contributions of mesolimbic dopamine systems to reward, we have previously evaluated the three-main competing explanatory categories: “liking,” “learning,” and “wanting” [3]. That is, dopamine may mediate (a) liking: the hedonic impact of reward, (b) learning: learned predictions about rewarding effects, or (c) wanting: the pursuit of rewards by attributing incentive salience to reward-related stimuli [44]. We have evaluated these hypotheses, especially as they relate to the RDS, and we find that the incentive salience or “wanting” hypothesis of dopaminergic functioning is supported by a majority of the scientific evidence. Various neuroimaging studies have shown that anticipated behaviors such as sex and gaming, delicious foods and drugs of abuse all affect brain regions associated with reward networks, and may not be unidirectional. Drugs of abuse enhance dopamine signaling which sensitizes mesolimbic brain mechanisms that apparently evolved explicitly to attribute incentive salience to various rewards [45]. Addictive substances are voluntarily self-administered, and they enhance (directly or indirectly) dopaminergic synaptic function in the NAc. This activation of the brain reward networks (producing the ecstatic “high” that users seek). Although these circuits were initially thought to encode a set point of hedonic tone, it is now being considered to be far more complicated in function, also encoding attention, reward expectancy, disconfirmation of reward expectancy, and incentive motivation [46]. The argument about addiction as a disease may be confused with a predisposition to substance and nonsubstance rewards relative to the extreme effect of drugs of abuse on brain neurochemistry. The former sets up an individual to be at high risk through both genetic polymorphisms in reward genes as well as harmful epigenetic insult. Some Psychologists, even with all the data, still infer that addiction is not a disease [47]. Elevated stress levels, together with polymorphisms (genetic variations) of various dopaminergic genes and the genes related to other neurotransmitters (and their genetic variants), and may have an additive effect on vulnerability to various addictions [48]. In this regard, Vanyukov, et al. [48] suggested based on review that whereas the gateway hypothesis does not specify mechanistic connections between “stages,” and does not extend to the risks for addictions the concept of common liability to addictions may be more parsimonious. The latter theory is grounded in genetic theory and supported by data identifying common sources of variation in the risk for specific addictions (e.g., RDS). This commonality has identifiable neurobiological substrate and plausible evolutionary explanations. Over many years the controversy of dopamine involvement in especially “pleasure” has led to confusion concerning separating motivation from actual pleasure (wanting versus liking) [49]. We take the position that animal studies cannot provide real clinical information as described by self-reports in humans. As mentioned earlier and in the abstract, on November 23rd, 2017, evidence for our concerns was discovered [50] In essence, although nonhuman primate brains are similar to our own, the disparity between other primates and those of human cognitive abilities tells us that surface similarity is not the whole story. Sousa et al. [50] small case found various differentially expressed genes, to associate with pleasure related systems. Furthermore, the dopaminergic interneurons located in the human neocortex were absent from the neocortex of nonhuman African apes. Such differences in neuronal transcriptional programs may underlie a variety of neurodevelopmental disorders. In simpler terms, the system controls the production of dopamine, a chemical messenger that plays a significant role in pleasure and rewards. The senior author, Dr. Nenad Sestan from Yale, stated: “Humans have evolved a dopamine system that is different than the one in chimpanzees.” This may explain why the behavior of humans is so unique from that of non-human primates, even though our brains are so surprisingly similar, Sestan said: “It might also shed light on why people are vulnerable to mental disorders such as autism (possibly even addiction).” Remarkably, this research finding emerged from an extensive, multicenter collaboration to compare the brains across several species. These researchers examined 247 specimens of neural tissue from six humans, five chimpanzees, and five macaque monkeys. Moreover, these investigators analyzed which genes were turned on or off in 16 regions of the brain. While the differences among species were subtle, there was a remarkable contrast in the neocortices, specifically in an area of the brain that is much more developed in humans than in chimpanzees. In fact, these researchers found that a gene called tyrosine hydroxylase (TH) for the enzyme, responsible for the production of dopamine, was expressed in the neocortex of humans, but not chimpanzees. As discussed earlier, dopamine is best known for its essential role within the brain’s reward system; the very system that responds to everything from sex, to gambling, to food, and to addictive drugs. However, dopamine also assists in regulating emotional responses, memory, and movement. Notably, abnormal dopamine levels have been linked to disorders including Parkinson’s, schizophrenia and spectrum disorders such as autism and addiction or RDS. Nora Volkow, the director of NIDA, pointed out that one alluring possibility is that the neurotransmitter dopamine plays a substantial role in humans’ ability to pursue various rewards that are perhaps months or even years away in the future. This same idea has been suggested by Dr. Robert Sapolsky, a professor of biology and neurology at Stanford University. Dr. Sapolsky cited evidence that dopamine levels rise dramatically in humans when we anticipate potential rewards that are uncertain and even far off in our futures, such as retirement or even the possible alterlife. This may explain what often motivates people to work for things that have no apparent short-term benefit [51]. In similar work, Volkow and Bale [52] proposed a model in which dopamine can favor NOW processes through phasic signaling in reward circuits or LATER processes through tonic signaling in control circuits. Specifically, they suggest that through its modulation of the orbitofrontal cortex, which processes salience attribution, dopamine also enables shilting from NOW to LATER, while its modulation of the insula, which processes interoceptive information, influences the probability of selecting NOW versus LATER actions based on an individual’s physiological state. This hypothesis further supports the concept that disruptions along these circuits contribute to diverse pathologies, including obesity and addiction or RDS.