## 1

#### Interpretation - the aff can't defend that one country ought to recognize a right to strike. The article “a” implies a nonspecific or generic reading of “a just government”

Walden 20 Walden University [The Writing Center provides a broad range of writing instruction and editing services for students at Walden University, including writing assistance for undergraduates, graduate students, and doctoral capstone writers], “"A" or "An"” last modified July 14 2020, <https://academicguides.waldenu.edu/writingcenter/grammar/articles> SM

When to Use "A" or "An" "A" and "an" are used with singular countable nouns when the noun is nonspecific or generic. I do not own a car. In this sentence, "car" is a singular countable noun that is not specific. It could be any car. She would like to go to a university that specializes in teaching. "University" is a singular countable noun. Although it begins with a vowel, the first sound of the word is /j/ or “y.” Thus, "a" instead of "an" is used. In this sentence, it is also generic (it could be any university with this specialization, not a specific one). I would like to eat an apple. In this sentence, "apple" is a singular countable noun that is not specific. It could be any apple.

#### Violation – they only defend Brazil

#### Vote neg—

#### 1] Semantics outweigh:

#### a] Topicality is a constitutive rule of the activity and a basic aff burden, they agreed to debate the topic when they came to the tournament

#### b] Jurisdiction -- you can’t vote affirmative if they haven’t affirmed

#### c] It’s the only stasis point we know before the round so it controls the internal link to engagement, and there’s no way to use ground if debaters aren’t prepared to defend it.

#### 2] Limits:

#### a] Education – they overexplode the topic – skirts from core to fringes of lit which kills education

#### b] Fairness – we would have to prep for infinite affs which is literally impossible

#### 3] TVA solves – read the aff as advantage

#### Topicality is a voting issue for predictable limits – the debate is irreparably skewed. It should be evaluated through competing interpretations- it’s not what you do it’s what you justify.

## 2

#### The AC is an effort in “left legalism”, they believe the right to strike is not adequately protected and the solution is to codify it. This ignores that it is the nature of rights themselves in liberal societies that produce conflict

Dimick, JD/PhD, 19

(Matt, Law@Buffalo, *Counterfeit Liberty*, Catalyst Vol 3 No 1 Spring)

A third example concerns the legal status of concerted activity taken in response to an employer’s unfair labor practices. The Supreme Court addressed this issue in a widely cited and discussed decision, NLRB v. Fansteel Metallurgical Corp.49 In that case, the employees responded to a series of the employer’s unfair labor practices — recognizing only an “independent,” company-dominated union, and employing a labor spy to engage in espionage within the bona fide, “outside” union — by “seizing the employer’s property” in a sit-down strike. The employer countered by announcing that “all of the men in the plant were discharged for the seizure and retention of the buildings.” The employer then appealed to the local sheriff, who with an “increased force of deputies” evicted the workers from the plant and arrested them; most of the workers were eventually fined and given jail sentences. As a remedy for the employer’s unfair labor practices, the Board ordered “‘immediate and full reinstatement to their former positions,’ with back pay.” However, the Supreme Court denied enforcement of this order, concluding that the workers had been legitimately discharged for illegally seizing the employer’s property. The court’s decision has been widely criticized for taking a narrow view of “concerted, protected activity,” and ignoring the workers’ claims to be acting in self-defense against the employer’s violation of their rights granted to them by the Wagner Act. According to Karl Klare, the language of the Fansteel decision reinforces the role of workers as sellers of labor power and consumers of commodities, rather than as producers, and obstructs an alternative perspective presaged by the “‘dereifying’ explosion of repressed human spirit” expressed in the sit-down strike.50 According to James Gray Pope, the Fansteel decision inverts appropriate legal hierarchies, placing the employer’s common-law property rights above those of the employee’s statutory right to engage in collective action, a conclusion that can only be justified by an unstated appeal to a discredited interpretation of the Constitution.51 Both critics, however, overlook the very first words of Chief Justice Hughes’s decision following its statement of facts: “For the unfair labor practices of [the employer] the Act provided a remedy. Interference in the summer and fall of 1936 with the right of self-organization could at once have been the subject of complaint to the Board.”52 Once again, using the strike to enforce workers’ statutory rights is legally duplicitous because the Board already possesses the power to enforce those rights. The court continued, “To justify such conduct because of the existence … of an unfair labor practice would be to put a premium on resort to force instead of legal remedies and to subvert the principles of law and order which lie at the foundations.”53 Responding to this language, Klare is correct to draw attention to the inherently peaceful nature of workers’ concerted activity in general and the sit-down strike in particular.54 But it is not the court’s hysterics that are most interesting; instead, it is the overlooked rationale that, whether violent or not, concerted action to enforce rights already subject to Board administration and enforcement subverts the appropriate scheme of rights enacted by the NLRA. Thus, it is not (or not just) ideologically freighted judicial reasoning that has undermined the labor movement, but the very rights themselves, created and enforced by the state apparatus, that have justified restrictions on concerted worker activity.

#### Subordination- rights weaken labor movements by making them dependent on a corrupt legal system. Cross-national analysis shows rights never help, they only hurt

Dimick, JD/PhD, 19

(Matt, Law@Buffalo, *Counterfeit Liberty*, Catalyst Vol 3 No 1 Spring)

Labor law presents an inescapable problem for the labor movement. If that claim was not already obvious, then the US Supreme Court’s decision in Janus v. AFSCME should have made this clear. Even labor law scholars, who once viewed labor law as a path of liberation for the labor movement, now see it as an ossified millstone around its neck. Recommendations for the reform and renewal of labor law therefore abound. In nearly all of these recommendations, there is no question that the law can and should play a fundamental role in revitalizing the labor movement. Indeed, labor law’s current flaw according to these recommendations is not the rights they provide, but only the “weakness” of these rights. In this essay, I want to ask a question that has quite a different implication for how trade unions should approach labor law: how did the regulation of labor relations come to assume the form of law? The first objective of this essay is to answer this question. As labor movements developed under capitalism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the regulation of labor relations took different paths. The path that a particular country took was determined by various material, political, and ideological causes that this essay will try to describe. While some amount of legal regulation is inescapable in a society based on private property and generalized commodity exchange — which logically imply the contestation of private interests — labor movements in some parts of the world have been able to avoid the dependency and displacement that always follows a regime of full-blown legal regulation. Trade unions in Scandinavia in particular have been able to develop a system of labor regulation that avoids the subordination to the state that has been the fate of Anglophone countries, such as the US and Australia, as well as on the Continent, in France and Germany. Another objective of this essay is to show that even labor law sympathetic to unions, rather than loosening, came to bind ever more tightly the cords constraining labor. This is not, or at least not only, because of capitalist-class interest or ideology extrinsic to labor law, but in fact is quite intrinsic to law itself. As this essay will demonstrate, many of the restrictions and prohibitions that hobble the labor movement today are justified by the very rights the labor law statute, the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA), confers. Statutory labor law confers rights, and rights are distinguished by the fact that they constitute claims that are enforced through the machinery of the state apparatus. In the mind of a judge or bureaucrat, one can hardly complain about the suppression of workers’ self-activity to advance or enforce some interest or claim, because the existence of a corresponding legal right makes such activity legally redundant. Of course, there is an enormous sociological difference: if strikes are the means by which workers build solidarity and develop class consciousness, then the substitution of the strike for other means of reaching working-class objectives may, whether intentionally or not, undermine working-class interests.

#### Methodological questions should be prioritized over policy -it’s a logical prior question to solvency

Bartlett ‘90, professor of law at Duke University, 1990 (Katharine, 103 Harvard Law Review 829, February, lexis)

Feminists have developed extensive critiques of law n2 and proposals for legal reform. n3 Feminists have had much less to say, however, about what the "doing" of law should entail and what truth status to give to the legal claims that follow. These methodological issues matter because methods shape one's view of the possibilities for legal practice and reform. Method "organizes the apprehension of truth; it determines what counts as evidence and defines what is taken as verification." n4 Feminists cannot ignore method, because if they seek to challenge existing structures of power with the same methods that [\*831] have defined what counts within those structures, they may instead "recreate the illegitimate power structures [that they are] trying to identify and undermine." n5

#### CP Text: The Federative Republic of Brazil should recognize an unconditional freedom of workers to strike.

#### A “right” gives power to the state, a freedom reduces it. The alternative is mutually exclusive with the case and solves better

Dimick, JD/PhD, 19

(Matt, Law@Buffalo, *Counterfeit Liberty*, Catalyst Vol 3 No 1 Spring)

What then should be the attitude of the labor movement toward the law? The very existence of the state and law requires some engagement with it, if only to avoid it. I address these issues in the next section. LABOR LAW AND UNION STRATEGY I have argued that the regulation of labor relations need not always assume the form of law, and that in fact it does not always assume the extreme form of legalism that we find in the United States. I have also demonstrated the contradictory nature of rights in the regulation of labor relations. What kind of labor legal strategy emerges from this analysis? The introduction drew the distinction between rights and freedoms.68 Rights are those interests or actions that are protected by the coercive power of the state. Freedoms on the other hand are those interests or actions that are not prohibited by the state, but also with which others may interfere; freedoms are neither legally protected nor prohibited. My contention is that the labor movement should advance labor freedoms and be wary about labor rights. This contention follows from the previous analysis. Since rights are distinguished by the fact that they are protected by the coercive power of the state, bureaucrats, judges, and legislators can use that fact to restrict labor’s own means and powers to enforce these interests and claims, subordinating society to the state. Indeed, as I have shown, state officials, with interests and power of their own, are likely to view labor’s competing power as legally redundant and particularly subversive. Labor freedoms restrict the coercive power of the state in a way that gives priority to labor’s autonomous sources of power, subordinating the state to society. Advancing labor freedoms is hardly an unambitious strategy, since direct prohibitions on concerted activities are abundant. The three most restrictive prohibitions on strike activity are those directed to (1) mass picketing,69 (2) organizing and bargaining strikes,70 and (3) secondary strikes and boycotts.71 Each is an affirmative ban on worker collective action, by which an employer may have the actions enjoined and the union fined. As such, they are restraints on workers’ freedom of action. The first ban has done the most to destroy the power of the strike and, as discussed below, to open the door to the employer’s use of replacement workers. The second has done the most to squelch coordinated worker activity across firms and industries. As identified earlier, the third has done the most to derail and suppress organic worker self-organization. These restrictions could be eliminated through various means. Congress could amend the National Labor Relations Act, and remove the offending provisions. Some labor law scholars have argued that these provisions violate the First Amendment and therefore should be declared unconstitutional. The labor movement should entertain all options, but I have little doubt that massive civil disobedience though direct worker confrontation with these legal barriers will also be necessary to discredit and overcome them. If such labor freedoms were achieved, employers would be under no state-imposed duty to refrain from interfering with workers engaged in such activities. Workers could be terminated for engaging in mass picketing, organizing strikes, or secondary picketing. Freedoms may therefore strike some readers as insufficient. Yet, it has been the burden of this essay’s comparative, historical, and legal analysis to demonstrate the self-defeating sociological effects of labor rights. Nevertheless, there is truth to the claim that certain, fundamental labor rights remain essential. Thus, insofar as it facilities worker solidarity and collective action, there seems little reason to eschew, for example, a worker’s right to join a union. Even more fundamentally, the rights of workers to be free from the employer’s physical assaults or from the state’s interference with speech and expression are also necessary. The distinction between rights and freedoms is no talisman. Rather, the ultimate objective must be kept in mind: the collective self-organization of the working class.72 To convince the reader that this proposal is not merely wishful thinking, we should recall the self-regulation models of Scandinavia. In Denmark and Sweden, the regulation of labor relations — including such fundamental matters as union recognition and minimum wages — falls within the purview of unions and organized employer associations. Strikes that are banned in the United States remain viable options in Scandinavia. Enforcement of the rules and agreements depends primarily (though not exclusively) on the economic weapons of labor and employers, rather than the physical compulsion administered by the state. Labor courts, unlike the NLRB, operate outside the hierarchy of the bureaucracy and courts of the state apparatus.

#### Statism destroys value to life

**Kateb** – Professor of Politics and Director of the Program in Political Philosophy at Princeton – **1992** (George, The Inner Ocean p. 117-118)

What is statism? From a broad range of possible meanings, we may confine ourselves for the moment to the sense present in nuclear rhetoric. Let us say that this statism is the belief that a government is not a mere government but a state and that as such it is the locus of identity of a society; that it is not only distinct from but above society; that it has rights (not merely duties); that its survival can be secured at any cost to its own society or to others. We ordinarily associate such thinking with absolute monarchy or with modern party and military dictatorships. We certainly do not think that such a belief is compatible with the Constitution or with the moral ideas connected with political legitimacy in general. Statism is a vision of life in which people are means to the end of the survival of power, in which society is understood as one great quasi-military organization or power base and in which the state is seen not only as a society's leadership but also as its reason for being. Officials may not recognize their rhetoric and themselves in this description. But I do not see what the expressed determination to risk or engage in a sizable exchange of nuclear weapons could mean except that the idea of statism has been accepted. This point becomes especially evident when we see that American nuclear rhetoric explicitly refers to a protracted nuclear war and thus to the readiness to accept massive numbers of American deaths. Even if we choose to leave aside the rhetoric concerning limited or special nuclear uses, and also to leave aside the massive numbers of deaths in other countries, we are compelled to take in the fact that the American government says it is willing to have the American people endure countless deaths. This willingness, in turn, can only mean that officials think that as long as the executive upper echelons survive intact, and with them a corps of military and police, the only other need is enough people left alive to supply the means necessary for the government—that is, the state—and its purposes. Its purposes are one: to remain and continue to bear the true existence and meaning of society, even when millions have been passively victimized unto death. I do not see what other implication can be drawn from any rationalization of the use of nuclear weapons in a sizable exchange. If we insist that even a so-called special or limited use carries with it the immediate or delayed possibility of escalation, then we simply say that the rationalization of any use of nuclear weapons is the most extreme form of statism and therefore is the most extreme form of illegitimate or anti-constitutionalist doctrine.

#### Statism causes extinction

**Beres, 1994** (Louis Rene, Professor of International Law in the Department of Political Science at Purdue University, Spring,, Arizona Journal of International and Comparative Law, Lexis)

The State presents itself as sacred. The idea of the State as sacred is met with horror and indignation, especially in the democratic, secular West, but this notion is indisputable. Throughout much of the contemporary world, the expectations of government are always cast in terms of religious obligation. And in those places where the peremptory claims of faith are in conflict with such expectations, it is the latter that invariably prevail. With States as the new gods, the profane has become not only permissible, it is now altogether sacred. Consider the changing place of the State in world affairs. Although it has long been observed that States must continually search for an improved power position as a practical matter, the sacralization of the State is a development of modern times. This sacralization, representing a break from the traditional [\*20] political realism of Thucydides, n57 Thrasymachus n58 and Machiavelli, n59 was fully developed in Germany. From Fichte n60 and Hegel, through Ranke and von Treitschke, n61 the modern transformation of Realpolitik has led the planet to its current problematic rendezvous with self-determination. Rationalist philosophy derived the idea of national sovereignty from the notion of individual liberty, but cast in its modern, post-seventeenth century expression, the idea has normally prohibited intervention n62 and acted to oppose human dignity and human rights. n63 Left to develop on its continuous flight from reason, the legacy of unrestrained nationalism can only be endless loathing and slaughter. Ultimately, as Lewis Mumford has observed, all human energies will [\*21] be placed at the disposal of a murderous "megamachine" with whose advent we will all be drawn unsparingly into a "dreadful ceremony" of worldwide sacrifice. n64 The State that commits itself to mass butchery does not intend to do evil. Rather, according to Hegel's description in the Philosophy of Right, "the State is the actuality of the ethical Idea." It commits itself to death for the sake of life, prodding killing with conviction and pure heart. A sanctified killer, the State that accepts Realpolitik generates an incessant search for victims. Though mired in blood, the search is tranquil and self-assured, born of the knowledge that the State's deeds are neither infamous nor shameful, but heroic. n65 With Hegel's characterization of the State as "the march of God in the world," John Locke's notion of a Social Contract -- the notion upon which the United States was founded n66 -- is fully disposed of, relegated to the ash heap of history. While the purpose of the State, for Locke, is to provide protection that is otherwise unavailable to individuals -- the "preservation of their lives, liberties and States" -- for Hegel, the State stands above any private interests. It is the spirit of the State, Volksgeist, rather than of individuals, that is the presumed creator of advanced civilization. And it is in war, rather than in peace, that a State is judged to demonstrate its true worth and potential. [\*22] How easily humankind still gives itself to the new gods. Promised relief from the most terrifying of possibilities -- death and disappearance -- our species regularly surrenders itself to formal structures of power and immunity. Ironically, such surrender brings about an enlargement of the very terrors that created the new gods in the first place, but we surrender nonetheless. In the words of William Reich, we lay waste to ourselves by embracing the "political plague-mongers," a necrophilous partnership that promises purity and vitality through the killing of "outsiders."

## Case

### Inequality

#### Econ growth doesn’t cause war – it encourages decreased defense spending, threat deflation, threat prioritization, international coop, and better leaders.

Clary ’15 (Christopher; 4/25/15; Ph.D. in political science from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, M.A. in National Security Affairs, Postdoctoral fellow, Watson Institute for International Studies, Brown University; MIT Political Science Department Research Paper, “Economic Stress and International Cooperation: Evidence from International Rivalries,” https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2597712)

Do economic downturns generate pressure for diversionary conflict? Or might downturns **encourage austerity and economizing behavior** in foreign policy? This paper provides new evidence that economic stress is associated with conciliatory policies between strategic rivals. For states that view each other as military threats, the biggest step possible toward bilateral cooperation is to terminate the rivalry by taking political steps to manage the competition. Drawing on **data** from 109 **distinct rival** dyads **since 1950**, 67 of which terminated, the evidence suggests rivalries were approximately twice as likely to terminate during economic downturns than they were during periods of economic normalcy. This is true controlling for all of the main alternative explanations for peaceful relations between foes (democratic status, nuclear weapons possession, capability imbalance, common enemies, and international systemic changes), as well as many other possible confounding variables. This research questions existing theories claiming that economic downturns are associated with diversionary war, and instead argues that in certain circumstances peace may **result from economic troubles**. I define a rivalry as the perception by national elites of two states that the other state possesses conflicting interests and presents a military threat of sufficient severity that future military conflict is likely. Rivalry termination is the transition from a state of rivalry to one where conflicts of interest are not viewed as being so severe as to provoke interstate conflict and/or where a mutual recognition of the imbalance in military capabilities makes conflict-causing bargaining failures unlikely. In other words, rivalries terminate when the elites assess that the risks of military conflict between rivals has been reduced dramatically. This definition draws on a growing quantitative literature most closely associated with the research programs of William Thompson, J. Joseph Hewitt, and James P. Klein, Gary Goertz, and Paul F. Diehl.1 My definition conforms to that of William Thompson. In work with Karen Rasler, they define rivalries as situations in which “[b]oth actors view each other as a significant politicalmilitary threat and, therefore, an enemy.”2 In other work, Thompson writing with Michael Colaresi, explains further: The presumption is that decisionmakers explicitly identify who they think are their foreign enemies. They orient their military preparations and foreign policies toward meeting their threats. They assure their constituents that they will not let their adversaries take advantage. Usually, these activities are done in public. Hence, we should be able to follow the explicit cues in decisionmaker utterances and writings, as well as in the descriptive political histories written about the foreign policies of specific countries.3 Drawing from available records and histories, Thompson and David Dreyer have generated a universe of strategic rivalries from 1494 to 2010 that serves as the basis for this project’s empirical analysis.4 This project measures rivalry termination as occurring on the last year that Thompson and Dreyer record the existence of a rivalry. Economic crises lead to conciliatory behavior through five primary channels. (1) Economic crises lead to austerity pressures, which in turn incent leaders to search for ways to cut defense expenditures. (2) Economic crises also encourage strategic reassessment, so that leaders can argue to their peers and their publics that defense spending can be arrested without endangering the state. This can lead to threat deflation, where elites attempt to **downplay** **the seriousness** of the threat posed by a former rival. (3) If a state faces multiple threats, economic crises provoke elites to **consider** threat prioritization, a process that is postponed during periods of economic normalcy. (4) Economic crises increase the political and economic benefit from international **economic** cooperation. Leaders **seek foreign aid**, **enhanced trade**, and **increased investment** from abroad during periods of economic trouble. This search is made easier if tensions are reduced with historic rivals. (5) Finally, during crises, elites are more prone to select leaders who are perceived as **capable of** resolving **economic** difficulties, permitting the emergence of leaders who hold heterodox foreign policy views. Collectively, these mechanisms make it **much more likely** that a leader will prefer conciliatory policies compared to during periods of economic normalcy. This section reviews this **causal logic** in greater detail, while also providing **historical examples** that these mechanisms recur in practice. Economic Crisis Leads to **Austerity** Economic crises generate pressure for austerity. Government revenues are a function of national economic production, so that when production diminishes through recession, revenues available for expenditure also diminish. Planning almost **invariably assumes growth** rather than contraction, so the deviation in available revenues compared to the planned expenditure can be sizable. When growth slowdowns are prolonged, the cumulative departure from planning targets can grow even further, even if no single quarter meets the technical definition of recession. Pressures for austerity are **felt** most **acutely** in governments that face difficulty borrowing to finance deficit expenditures. This is **especially the case** when this borrowing relies on international sources of credit. Even for states that can borrow, however, intellectual attachment to balanced budgets as a means to restore confidence—a belief in what is sometimes called “expansionary austerity”—generates incentives to curtail expenditure. These incentives to cut occur precisely when populations are experiencing economic hardship, making reductions especially painful that target poverty alleviation, welfare programs, or economic subsidies. As a result, mass and elite constituents strongly resist such cuts. Welfare programs and other forms of public spending may be especially susceptible to a policy “ratchet effect,” where people are **very reluctant** to forego benefits once they have become accustomed to their availability.6 As Paul Pierson has argued, “The politics [of welfare state] retrenchment is typically treacherous, because it imposes **tangible losses** on concentrated groups of voters in return for diffuse and uncertain gains.”7

#### Alt causes to inequality

Bhala 15 – Kara Tan Bhala, President and Founder, Seven Pillars Institute for Global Finance and Ethics - ‎Seven Pillars Institute for Global Finance and Ethics (“The Causes of Economic Inequality” January 21st, 2015, <http://sevenpillarsinstitute.org/case-studies/causes-economic-inequality>) LADI

(ii) Education affects wages Individuals with different levels of education often earn different wages [2]. This is probably related to reason one: the level of education is often proportional to the level of skill. With a higher level of education, a person often has more advanced skills that few workers are able to offer, justifying a higher wage. The impact of education on economic inequality is still profound in developed countries and cities [3]. Although there are usually policies of free education in developed nations, levels of education received by each individual still differ, not because of financial ability but innate qualities like intelligence, drive and personal ability. For example, in Hong Kong, 12 years of free education are provided for each citizen, not covering tertiary education, offered only when students receive certain results on public exams. Moreover, receiving the same level of education does not mean receiving education of the same quality. This accounts for the difference in abilities and hence wages for individuals all receiving, for example, 12 years of education. Therefore, it seems no matter how good the social welfare policy of a country is at preventing denial of education due to financial difficulties, differences in education, in terms of levels and quality, still play a prominent role in economic inequality. (iii) Growth in technology widens income gap Growth in technology arguably renders joblessness at all skill levels [3]. For unskilled workers, computers and machinery perform a lot of tasks these workers used to be do. In many jobs, such as packaging and manufacturing, machinery works even more effectively and efficiently. Hence, jobs involving repetitive tasks have largely been eliminated. Skilled workers are not immune to the nightmare of losing jobs. The rapid development in artificial intelligence may ultimately allow computers and robots to perform knowledge-based jobs [3]. The impact of increasing unemployment is stagnant or decreasing wages for most workers, as there is a low demand for but high supply of labor. A small portion of society, usually the owners of capital, controls an ever-increasing fraction of the economy [3]. The income gap between workers who earn by their skills and owners who earn by investing in capital has widened. Although both skilled and unskilled workers are adversely affected by the technological advance, it seems unskilled workers are subject to worse outcomes [3]. This is because the labor market may still need skilled workers to use computers and operate the advanced machines. The rightward shift in the demand for skilled labor creates an increase in the relative wages of the skilled compared to the unskilled workers. Hence, the income gap among workers also has widened. (iv) Gender does matter In many countries, there is a gender income gap in the labor market [3]. For example, in America, the median full-time salary for women is 77 percent of that of men [4]. However, women who work part time make more on average than men who work part-time [4]. Additionally, among people who never marry or have children, women make more than men [4]. It may be difficult to justify such differences. According to a U.S. Census report [4], the wage gap is not fully explained even after accounting for key factors that affect earnings, such as discrimination and the tendency of women to consider factors other than pay when looking for work. The only thing we know for sure is that gender does contribute to a difference in wages in society and hence economic inequality. (v) Personal factors It is generally believed that innate abilities play a part in determining the wealth of an individual. Hence, individuals possessing different sets of abilities may have different levels of wealth, leading to economic inequality [3]. For example, more determined individuals may keep improving themselves and striving for better achievements, which justifies a higher wage. Another example is intelligence [3]. A lot of people believe that smarter people tend to have higher income and hence more wealth. This is debatable. In the book IQ and the Wealth of Nations, Dr. Richard Lynn opined that there is a correlation of 0.82 between average IQ and GDP. However, Stephen Jay Gould, in the book The Mismeasure of Man, criticized it for employing the wrong methods of evaluation. In addition to innate abilities, diversity of preferences, within a society or among different societies, contributes to the difference in wealth [3]. When it comes to working harder or having fun, equally capable individuals may have totally different priorities, resulting in a difference in their incomes. Their saving patterns may also differ, leading to different levels of accumulated wealth. Inequality is a vicious cycle “The rich get richer, the poor get poorer” is not just a cliche. The concept behind it is a theoretical process called “wealth concentration.” Under certain conditions, newly created wealth is concentrated in the possession of already-wealthy individuals [5]. The reason is simple: People who already hold wealth have the resources to invest or to leverage the accumulation of wealth, which creates new wealth. The process of wealth concentration arguably makes economic inequality a vicious cycle. The effects of wealth concentration may extend to future generations [3]. Children born in a rich family have an economic advantage, because of wealth inherited and possibly education, which may increase their chances of earning a higher income than their peers. These advantages create another round of the vicious cycle.

#### 1AC Tornaghi says Brazil’s inequality reached the highest its ever been earlier this year – should have triggered all impacts, they cant even tell you why!!

#### 1AC Boito is their only strikes key ev –

#### Its from 2011 and it gives no reason why strikes work. COVID turns UQ because businesses took a huge hit and cant afford

#### Command-find “minimum wage” and nothing comes up – that’s their literal internal link

#### 1AC Lachman is wrong –

#### It says it’s the eighth largest economy, the other 7 are many multiples greater, so they check

#### Alt causes – COVID will kill the economies anyways, even this ev concedes that

#### 1AC Tønnesson concludes neg – deterrence solves

Tønnesson 15

(Stein, “Deterrence, interdependence and Sino–US peace,” International Area Studies Review, Volume 18, Number 3) BW

The best way to enhance global peace is no doubt to multiply the factors protecting it: build a Pacific security community by topping up economic interdependence with political rapprochement and trust, institutionalized cooperation, and shared international norms. Yet even without such accomplishments, the combination of deterrence and economic interdependence may be enough to prevent war among the major powers. Because the leaders of nuclear armed nations are fearful of getting into a situation where peace relies uniquely on nuclear deterrence, and because they know that their adversaries have the same fear, they may accept the risks entailed by depending economically on others. And then there will be neither trade wars nor shooting wars, just disputes and diplomacy.

### Climate

#### Adaptation checks extinction from warming but CO2 prevents famine, collapse of ag, and ice age- those are coming now

Moore 16

(Dr. Patrick Moore is a Senior Fellow with the Energy, Ecology and Prosperity program at the Frontier Centre for Public Policy. He has been a leader in the international environmental field for over 40 years. Dr. Moore is a Co-Founder of Greenpeace and served for nine years as President of Greenpeace Canada and seven years as a Director of Greenpeace International. Following his time with Greenpeace, Dr. Moore joined the Forest Alliance of BC where he worked for ten years to develop the Principles of Sustainable Forestry, which have now been adopted by much of the industry. In 2013, he published Confessions of a Greenpeace Dropout – The Making of a Sensible Environmentalist, which documents his 15 years with Greenpeace and outlines his vision for a sustainable future. THE POSITIVE IMPACT OF HUMAN CO2 EMISSIONS ON THE SURVIVAL OF LIFE ON EARTH, June 2016, <https://fcpp.org/sites/default/files/documents/Moore%20-%20Positive%20Impact%20of%20Human%20CO2%20Emissions.pdf>)

CO2 in the Modern Era The most important question facing a species on Earth today is how long would it have been in the absence of human-caused CO2 emissions until the gradual depletion of CO2 in the atmosphere fell to levels that began to decrease biomass due to starvation, thus signaling the beginning of the end of life on Earth? It is commonly believed that volcanic activity results in massive emissions of CO2 comparable to or greater than human-caused emissions. This is not the case. Whereas the original atmospheric CO2 was the result of massive outgassing from the Earth’s interior, there is no evidence that large volumes of new CO2 were added to the atmosphere during the 140-million-year decline leading to the present era. The eruption of Mount Pinatubo, the largest in recent history, is estimated to have released the equivalent of 2 per cent of the annual human-caused CO2 emissions. Therefore, in the absence of human-caused emissions, it could reasonably be presumed that CO2 levels would have continued to fall as they had done for the previous 140 million years.20 Judging by the timing of the many glacial and interglacial periods during the Pleistocene Ice Age, the next major glaciation period could begin any time. Interglacial periods have generally been of 10,000 years’ duration, and this Holocene interglacial period began nearly 12,000 years ago. In the absence of human-caused CO2 emissions and other environmental impacts, there is no reason to doubt that another major glaciation would have occurred, following the pattern that has been established for at least the past 800,000 years, as established by the European Project for Ice Coring in Antarctica (EPICA),21 and presumably for the past 2.5 million years of the Pletstocene Ice Age. These glaciations have coincided with the Milankovitch cycles.22 (See Figure 5) The Milankovitch cycles are determined by oscillations in the Earth’s orbit and by cycles of the tilt of the Earth toward the sun. The strong correlation between the onset of major periods of glaciation during the past 800,000 years and the Milankovitch cycles has led the majority of earth scientists and climatologists to accept the hypothesis that the major glaciations are tied to the Milankovitch cycles in a causeeffect relationship. For 90 million years from the late Jurassic Period to the Early Tertiary Period, global temperature rose considerably while CO2 levels steadily declined. Then after the Paleocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum, there began a 50-million-year cooling trend in global temperature to the current era. (See Figure 6) The Paleocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum saw an average global temperature [13] FRONTIER CENTRE FOR PUBLIC POLICY as much as 16°C higher than the temperature today. Yet, the ancestors of every species living today must have survived through this period, as they had also survived through previous much colder climates. It is instructive to note that despite the numerous periods of extreme climatic conditions and cataclysmic events, every species alive today is descended from species that survived those conditions. This leads one to question the predictions of mass species extinction and the collapse of human civilization if the average global temperature exceeds a rise of 2°C above today’s level.25 It may seem surprising that the average global temperature could have been 16°C higher in previous ages, as this Figure 5. Graph showing the atmospheric CO2 concentration and temperature from Antarctica for the most recent four interglacial periods, closely tied to the Milankovitch cycles of 100,000 years. This graph is based on data from the 420,000 year record obtained from the Vostok ice cores drilled by Russian scientists.23 Note the gradual nature of the onset of colder temperatures and the rapid warming at the end of the cycle. Note that the peak warming during the most recent interglacial period (the Holocene) is lower than during the previous three interglacial periods.24 Figure 6. Global surface temperature from 65 million YBP showing the major cooling trend over the past 50 million years. While the poles were considerably warmer than they are today, there was much less warming in the tropics, which remained habitable throughout. The Earth is in one of the coldest periods during the past 600 million years.26 [14] FRONTIER CENTRE FOR PUBLIC POLICY would appear to render parts of the Earth that are warm today virtually uninhabitable. The key to understanding this is that when the Earth warms, it does so disproportionally, depending on the latitude. While the Arctic and Antarctic experience considerable warming, there is much less warming in the tropics. Thus, the tropical regions remain habitable while the high latitudes shift from polar to temperate, and during the warmest ages, they shift to a tropical climate. It is clear from the 800,000-year Antarctic ice core record that the coldest periods during major glaciations coincide with the lowest levels of CO2 in the atmosphere. (see Figure 5) The correlation is certainly strong enough during this period to suggest a causal relationship between CO2 and temperature. However, there is disagreement in the literature about which is the cause and which is the effect. Those who ascribe the warming over the past century to greenhouse gas emissions, CO2 in particular, also tend to agree with the position set forth in Al Gore’s An Inconvenient Truth: The Planetary Emergency of Global Warming and What We Can Do about It, that the warming during the interglacial periods is caused by rising CO2 levels.27 However, it is problematic to postulate how the Milankovitch cycles could cause an increase or decrease in atmospheric CO2 levels, whereas it is plausible that the Milankovitch cycles could cause a fluctuation in global temperature due to changes in solar radiation, which in turn could cause either CO2 outgassing from or absorption into the oceans. Indeed, both sets of ice core data from Antarctica show that changes in temperature usually precede changes in CO2 levels, suggesting that temperature change is the cause of change in the level of CO2. 28 Some have suggested that although the onset of warming after a glaciation is caused by the Milankovitch cycles, the subsequent outgassing of CO2 from the ocean then becomes the predominant driver of further warming.29 Presumably, it would also be postulated that the cooling leading to glaciation is triggered by the Milankovitch cycle and then driven by reduced CO2 levels due to ocean absorption. This hypothesis is not proven. It is extremely unlikely or perhaps impossible to imagine how CO2 could have increased from a pre-industrial 280 ppm to 400 ppm in the absence of human-caused emissions. No other species, existing or imagined in the near future, is capable of digging and drilling into the massive deposits of fossil fuels and then burning them so as to release CO2 back into the atmosphere from where it had come in the first place. Many scientists think this increase in atmospheric CO2 is the dominant cause of the slight warming (0.5C) of the atmosphere over the past 65 years. Only time will tell if this is the case. Since the Little Ice Age peaked around 1700, the climate has been warming in fits and starts for about 300 years. It is possible that the most recent warming is a continuation of the longer period of warming that had already begun long before human-caused CO2 emissions could have been a factor. [15] FRONTIER CENTRE FOR PUBLIC POLICY HIGHER CO2 CONCENTRATIONS WILL INCREASE PLANT GROWTH AND BIOMASS It has been well demonstrated that the increase in CO2 in the atmosphere is responsible for increased plant growth on a global scale. Many studies suggest that nearly 25 per cent of human-caused CO2 emissions, or 2.5 Gt of carbon annually, are absorbed by plants, thus increasing global plant biomass. A recent study postulates that up to 50 per cent of human CO2 emissions are absorbed by increased plant growth.30 This has been described as a “greening of the Earth” as CO2 reaches concentrations well above the near-starvation levels experienced during the major glaciations of the Pleistocene.31 The most prestigious Australian science body, the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO), has shown that CO2 particularly benefits plants that are adapted to dry climates. In higher CO2 environments, they become more efficient at photosynthesis, growing faster without using more water.32 One of the most impressive records comes from an experimental forest in Germany where there is a continuous Figure 8. Change in net primary productivity of vegetation 1982 to 2010. The driest regions, such as Western Australia, sub-Saharan Africa, western India and the Great Plains of North America, show the greatest increase in plant growth.36 Figure 7. Craig Idso,expert on CO2 and author of the CO2Science website34 demonstrating the growth-rate of pine trees under ambient conditions versus the addition of 150 ppm, 300 ppm and 450 ppm CO2. In a higher CO2 world there will be a great increase in the growth of food crops, forests, and wild landscapes around the world. Studies also demonstrate that higher CO2 levels in the oceans will result in increased growth of phytoplankton and other marine plants.35 [16] FRONTIER CENTRE FOR PUBLIC POLICY record of forest growth since 1870. Since 1960, as CO2 emissions began to rise rapidly, the growth rate of individual trees has increased by 32 per cent to 77 per cent. While some of this may be due to the slight increase in temperature since 1960, the much higher growth rate is consistent with laboratory and field studies on the effect of increased CO2 levels on plants.33 It is not widely known that greenhouse operators worldwide inject additional CO2 into their greenhouses in order to increase the growth and yield of their crops. Among horticulturalists, it is well known that this practice can increase growth by 40 per cent or more. This is because the optimum level of CO2 for plant growth is between 1,000 ppm and 3,000 ppm in air, much higher than the 400 ppm in the global atmosphere today.37 Every species on Earth, including our own, is descended from ancestors that thrived in climates with much higher levels of CO2 than are present today. Discussion The debate about climate change has one side insisting that the “science is settled.” Yet, there is no scientific proof that increased CO2 will result in disaster, as CO2 has been higher during most of the history of life on Earth than it is today. On the other hand, it can be stated without a doubt that if CO2 once again falls to the level it was only 18,000 years ago, or lower, there would be a catastrophe unlike any known in human history. We are advised by many scientists that we should be worried about CO2 levels climbing higher when, in fact, we should actually be worried about CO2 levels sinking lower. Atmospheric CO2 Concentrations in the Future If humans had not begun to use fossil fuels for energy, it is reasonable to assume that atmospheric CO2 concentration would have continued to drop as it has done for the past 140 million years. It is also reasonable to assume that the Earth’s climate would continue to fluctuate between relatively long periods of glaciation and relatively short periods of interglacial climate similar to the present climate. Given continued withdrawal of carbon from the atmosphere into the ocean sediments, it would only be a matter of time before CO2 dropped to 150 ppm or lower during a period of glaciation. At the average rate of 32 Kt of carbon lost annually, this would occur in less than two million years from now. In other words, the beginning of the end of most life on planet Earth would begin in fewer years into the future than our genus of primates, Homo, has existed as a distinct taxonomic unit. It is instructive to note that our species is a tropical species that evolved at the equator in ecosystems as warm or warmer than today’s. We were only able to leave the warmth of the tropical climate due to harnessing fire, wearing clothing and building shelters. This allowed us to settle in temperate climes and even Arctic conditions by the sea where domesticated dogs as well as marine mammals made life possible for a very small population. However, we cannot grow food crops in abundance on glaciers or in frozen soil. Moreover, we would not be able to grow much of anything anywhere if the level of CO2 went below 150 ppm. There is a distinct possibility that no amount of additional CO2 will shift the climate out of the next major period of glaciation. This is not a reason to abandon hope but rather to marvel at the fact that we can actually put some of the CO2 needed for life back into the atmosphere while at the same time enjoying abundant, reasonably priced energy from fossil fuels. There has been a gradual net loss of CO2 from the atmosphere during the past 550 million years from approximately 14,000 Gt to approximately 370 Gt at the lowest level during the height of the last glaciation. This is a reduction of nearly 98 per cent of one of the most essential nutrients for life on Earth. In the absence of human CO2 emissions over the past century, it is difficult to imagine how this process of continuous removal of CO2 would be interrupted. Massive volcanism on a scale not seen for more than 200 million years would be required to [17] FRONTIER CENTRE FOR PUBLIC POLICY bring about a reversal in the long-term CO2 trend that has now been achieved by human CO2 emissions. There is no doubt the Earth’s interior has cooled substantially over its roughly 4.6-billion-year existence. This makes massive volcanism an ever-decreasing likelihood. There is no other plausible natural mechanism to return carbon to the global atmosphere in the form of CO2. The present Holocene interglacial has already endured longer than some previous interglacial periods. The Holocene is also somewhat cooler than previous interglacial periods. Of more urgent concern than the possible starvation of life two million years from now is what would happen at the onset of the next glaciation, possibly a relatively short time from now. In the absence of human CO2 emissions, both temperature and CO2 would have dropped to levels that would result in a continuous reduction in plant growth, bringing in climatic conditions similar to or perhaps even more severe than those that occurred in previous glaciations

#### No internal link – Bolsonaro’s fine on climate now

#### A] Emissions pledges and deforestation empirics that postdate their card – most recent UN conferences

UN News 9/21 “Brazilian President commits country to climate neutrality by 2050” UN News, Sept 21, 2021, <https://news.un.org/en/story/2021/09/1100472> TG

“We anticipated, from 2060 to 2050, the goal of achieving climate neutrality. Human and financial resources, destined to the strengthening of environmental agencies, were doubled, with a view to eliminating illegal deforestation,” he [said](https://estatements.unmeetings.org/estatements/10.0010/20210921/AT2JoAvm71nq/1a6r0NkCnoc6_ot2.pdf).

Mr. Bolsonaro was speaking at UN Headquarters at the opening of the high-level week of the [General Assembly.](https://www.un.org/en/ga/76/agenda/) After being held virtually last year due the [coronavirus](https://www.un.org/coronavirus) pandemic, this year’s gathering will feature “hybrid” activities that will include leaders in person along with virtual participants. Brazil has opened the debate since 1955.

For the Brazilian President, the results of this action on climate “have already started to appear.” In the Amazon, he pointed to a 32 per cent reduction in deforestation in the month of August, when compared to the same month last year.

He introduced the country as “an example in energy generation”, with 83 per cent coming from renewable sources, and said he would we will seek consensus on the rules of the global carbon credit market at the [COP26](https://ukcop26.org/), the UN Climate Conference that starts at the end of October in Glasgow.

“We expect industrialized countries to effectively meet their climate finance commitments in relevant volumes,” Mr. Bolsonaro said.

He recalled that his country’s agriculture sector feeds more than 1 billion people in the world, using only 8 per cent of the national territory, and assured that “no country in the world has such complete environmental legislation.”

“Our Forest Code must set an example for other countries,” he said.

He recognized the country faces “great environmental challenges”, being a nation of continental dimensions. The Amazon region alone is equivalent to the area of ​​the whole of Western Europe

For him, “the future of green jobs is in Brazil: renewable energy, sustainable agriculture, low-emission industry, basic sanitation, waste treatment and tourism.”

#### B] COP26 pledges prove the flip

Andreoni 11/2, Manuela. “Once a Climate Leader, Brazil Falls Short in Glasgow,” NYT, Nov 2, 2021, <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/11/02/world/americas/brazil-climate.html> TG

On Tuesday, Brazil [joined more than 100 other countries](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/11/02/climate/biden-methane-climate.html) in pledging to reduce methane emissions by 30 percent by 2030. It has historically resisted making such a commitment because most of its methane is discharged by the farming sector, a major driver of the Brazilian economy.

#### Amazonian biodiversity loss inevitable

Sample 12

(Ian, The Gaurdian, “Amazon's doomed species set to pay deforestation's 'extinction debt'”, 12 July 2012, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/jul/12/amazon-deforestation-species-extinction-debt?newsfeed=true>,)

The destruction of great swaths of the Brazilian Amazon has turned scores of rare species into the walking dead, doomed to disappear even if deforestation were halted in the region overnight, according to a new study. Forest clearing in Brazil has already claimed casualties, but the animals lost to date in the rainforest region are just one-fifth of those that will slowly die out as the full impact of the loss of habitat takes its toll. In parts of the eastern and southern Amazon, 30 years of concerted deforestation have shrunk viable living and breeding territories enough to condemn 38 species to regional extinction in coming years, including 10 mammal, 20 bird and eight amphibian species, scientists found. The systematic clearance of trees from the Amazon forces wildlife into ever-smaller patches of ground. Though few species are killed off directly in forest clearances, many face a slower death sentence as their breeding rates fall and competition for food becomes more intense. Scientists at Imperial College, London, reached the bleak conclusion after creating a statistical model to calculate the Brazilian Amazon's "extinction debt", or the number of species headed for extinction as a result of past deforestation. The model draws on historical deforestation rates and animal populations in 50 by 50 kilometre squares of land. It stops short of naming the species most at risk, but field workers in the region have drawn attention to scores of creatures struggling to cope with habitat destruction and other environmental threats. White-cheeked spider monkeys, which feed on fruits high in the forest canopy, are endangered largely because of the expansion of farmland and road building. The population of Brazilian bare-faced tamarins has halved in 18 years, or three generations, as cities, agriculture and cattle ranching has pushed into the rainforest. The endangered giant otter, found in the slow-moving rivers and swamps of the Amazon, faces water pollution from agricultural runoff and mining operations in the area. Writing in the journal Science, Robert Ewers and his co-authors reconstructed extinction rates from 1970 to 2008, and then forecast future extinction debts under four different scenarios, ranging from "business as usual" to a "strong reduction" in forest clearance, which required deforestation to slow down 80% by 2020. "For now, the problem is along the arc of deforestation in the south and east where there is a long history of forest loss. But that is going to move in the future. We expect most of the species there to go extinct, and we'll pick up more extinction debt along the big, paved highways which are now cutting into the heart of the Amazon," Ewers told the Guardian from Belém, northern Brazil. Under the "business as usual" scenario, where around 62 sq miles (160 sqkm) of forest are cleared each year, at least 15 mammal, 30 bird and 10 amphibian species were expected to die out locally by 2050, from around half of the Amazon. Under the most optimistic scenario, which requires cattle ranchers and soy farmers to comply with Brazilian environmental laws, the extinction debt could be held close to 38 species. Ewers said the model reveals hotspots in the Brazilian Amazon where conservation efforts should be focused on the most vulnerable wildlife. "This shows us where we are likely to have high concentrations of species which are all in trouble, and that becomes a way for directing our conservation efforts. We are talking about an extinction debt. Those species are still alive, so we have an opportunity to get in there and restore the habitat to avoid paying that debt," Ewers said. The Brazilian Amazon is home to 40% of the world's tropical forest and one of the most biodiverse regions on the planet. About 54% of the area is under environmental protection, and in the past five years, stricter controls and better compliance have driven deforestation rates down to a historical low. The trend towards less deforestation might not last though. Under pressure from the financial crisis, the Brazilian government has proposed a rapid development programme in the Amazon to fuel the economy. The move foresees the construction of more than 20 hydroelectric power plants in the Amazon basin and an extensive push into the rainforest. Environmentalists are further concerned about an overhaul to Brazil's Forest Code, which is widely expected to weaken the protection of the rainforest, and potentially speed up deforestation once more, according to an accompanying article in Science by Thiago Rangel, an ecologist at the Federal University of Goiás in Brazil. "Extinction debts in the Brazilian Amazon are one debt that should be defaulted on," he writes. Reducing the rate that extinction debts build up is not enough to preserve the Amazon's biodiversity, Rangel argues. "The existing debt may eventually lead to the loss of species. To prevent species extinctions, it is necessary to take advantage of the window of opportunity for forest regeneration. Restored or regenerated forests initially show lower native species richness than the original forests they replaced, but they gradually recover species richness, composition and vital ecosystems functions, reducing extinction debt and mitigating local species loss," he writes.

#### Biomes Resilient

* Permian-Triassic extinction proves resiliency
* No data on tipping points
* Ecosystems never outright collapse
* 600 models prove no ecosystem collapse

Hance 18 [Jeremy Hance, wildlife blogger for the Guardian and a journalist with Mongabay focusing on forests, indigenous people, climate change and more. He is also the author of Life is Good: Conservation in an Age of Mass Extinction. Could biodiversity destruction lead to a global tipping point? Jan 16, 2018. https://www.theguardian.com/environment/radical-conservation/2018/jan/16/biodiversity-extinction-tipping-point-planetary-boundary]

Just over 250 million years ago, the planet suffered what may be described as its greatest holocaust: ninety-six percent of marine genera (plural of genus) and seventy percent of land vertebrate vanished for good. Even insects suffered a mass extinction – the only time before or since. Entire classes of animals – like trilobites – went out like a match in the wind. But what’s arguably most fascinating about this event – known as the Permian-Triassic extinction or more poetically, the Great Dying – is the fact that anything survived at all. Life, it seems, is so ridiculously adaptable that not only did thousands of species make it through whatever killed off nearly everything (no one knows for certain though theories abound) but, somehow, after millions of years life even recovered and went on to write new tales. Even as the Permian-Triassic extinction event shows the fragility of life, it also proves its resilience in the long-term. The lessons of such mass extinctions – five to date and arguably a sixth happening as I write – inform science today. Given that extinction levels are currently 1,000 (some even say 10,000) times the background rate, researchers have long worried about our current destruction of biodiversity – and what that may mean for our future Earth and ourselves. In 2009, a group of researchers identified nine global boundaries for the planet that if passed could theoretically push the Earth into an uninhabitable state for our species. These global boundaries include climate change, freshwater use, ocean acidification and, yes, biodiversity loss (among others). The group has since updated the terminology surrounding biodiversity, now calling it “biosphere integrity,” but that hasn’t spared it from critique. A paper last year in Trends in Ecology & Evolution scathingly attacked the idea of any global biodiversity boundary. “It makes no sense that there exists a tipping point of biodiversity loss beyond which the Earth will collapse,” said co-author and ecologist, José Montoya, with Paul Sabatier Univeristy in France. “There is no rationale for this.” Montoya wrote the paper along with Ian Donohue, an ecologist at Trinity College in Ireland and Stuart Pimm, one of the world’s leading experts on extinctions, with Duke University in the US. Montoya, Donohue and Pimm argue that there isn’t evidence of a point at which loss of species leads to ecosystem collapse

#### Even if you don’t buy the adaptation turn, there are infinite alt causes to climate change –

#### Brazil is one of 195 countries so even if you buy the whole advantage, other countries still cause climate change just as fast because 1/195 is an ignorable impact

#### Innovation, carbon emissions, power plants, driving, etc all trigger warming anyways

#### Goodwell never says spillover to US – its mentioned once and its just about promises the two made diplomatically

#### No brightline for biodiversity loss – we’ve lost way more than 99% of all species in history and nothing triggered

### Solvency

**A right does not guarantee more/better strikes – multiple warrants**

**Waas PhD 12**

Professor Bernard Waas, Sep 2012, "Strike as a Fundamental Right of the Workers and its Risks of Conflicting with other Fundamental Rights of the Citizens " World Congress General Report, [https://www.islssl.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/Strike-Waas.pdf //](https://www.islssl.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/Strike-Waas.pdf%20//) AW

No national laws on strike action are alike. Notably, the law on strike action is part of a much broader picture. As strikes are mostly related to collective bargaining, distinct perspectives that may exist in national systems in this regard inevitably influence assessments of strikes. If the room for bargaining is deemed an area in which the state does not interfere, the decision to use strike action may essentially be left to the autonomous decision-making of trade unions. If, on the other hand, the state tightly regulates collective bargaining, then it seems plausible for regulations on strikes to be subject to similar rules. A possible link between collective bargaining and strikes may also have other implications. If the right to conclude collective agreements is, for instance, limited to the most representative unions only, then the case might be that only members from those unions actually enjoy the right to strike. More generally, legal systems differ considerably with respect to who may represent workers´ interests. In many countries, trade unions exercise monopoly power in the representation of workers. In other countries, dual systems are in place. Works councils, for instance, may be the representative bodies at the level of the individual establishment, while trade unions may represent workers´ interests at the company and, in particular, at the branch level. Though collective agreements can be concluded at all these levels, it may very well be that works councils are prevented from staging a strike when the employer is reluctant to conclude an agreement. Instead of calling a strike, the works council may have to take recourse to arbitration as is indeed the case, for instance, in Germany. 2 Second, entirely different attitudes exist towards strikes.