### Framework

**I value morality,**

**The value criterion is maximizing well being by promoting pleasure**

**Pleasure and pain are the starting points of moral reasoning. Every impact can be explained as good because it promotes pleasure, or bad bc it promotes pain. We know death is bad, bc it causes massive amounts of suffering, and we know saving lives is good bc it promotes pleasure. Therefore because pleasure is an intrinsic good, we should seek to maximize it in the world, and save the most amount of people possible.**

**Moen ’16** – (Ole Martin, PhD, Research Fellow in Philosophy @ University of Oslo, "An Argument for Hedonism." Journal of Value Inquiry 50.2 (2016): 267). Modified for glang

Let us start by observing, empirically, that a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value and disvalue is that pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable. On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues**.** This inclusion makes intuitive sense, moreover, for **there is something undeniably good about the way pleasure feels and something undeniably bad about the way pain feels,** and neither the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be exhausted by the further effects that these experiences might have. “Pleasure” and “pain” are here understood inclusively, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative. 2 The special value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning about values. If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store, I might ask: “What for?” This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable. You might answer, for example: “To buy soda.” This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: “What is buying the soda good for?” This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: “Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it.” If I then proceed by asking “But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?” the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. The reason is that the pleasure is not good for anything further; it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good. 3 As Aristotle observes: “**We never ask what her**~~is~~ **end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself.**”4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says “This is painful!” we never respond by asking: “And why is that a problem?” We take for granted that if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value. Although pleasure and pain thus seem to be good candidates for intrinsic value and disvalue, several objections have been raised against this suggestion: (1) that pleasure and pain have instrumental but not intrinsic value/disvalue; (2) that pleasure and pain gain their value/disvalue derivatively, in virtue of satisfying/frustrating our desires; (3) that there is a subset of pleasures that are not intrinsically valuable (so-called “evil pleasures”) and a subset of pains that are not intrinsically disvaluable (so-called “noble pains”), and (4) that pain asymbolia, masochism, and practices such as wiggling a loose tooth render it implausible that pain is intrinsically disvaluable. I shall argue that these objections fail.

**Prefer—  
1 – A just government refers to one that acts utilitarian meaning that a utilitarian framework is key to understand the perspective of the actor in the topic  
MVO 18’** What does a just government mean? [https://www.mvorganizing.org/what-does-a-just-government-mean/]

**A just government is fair to ALL people that it governs**. This includes not only the governed, but also the governors. Subjecting the governors **to** the same laws as the governed will help to **ensure that no one group’s interests are served at the expense of others**.

#### Plan text: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.

### Contention 1 is Climate Change

#### Climate strike participants get arrested now.

**Scanlan 19** [Quinn. Quinn Scanlan. Voting, campaigns & elections for [@ABC](https://twitter.com/ABC). “Jane Fonda arrested in climate change strike outside Capitol”. 10-11-2019. ABC News. https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/jane-fonda-arrested-climate-change-strike-capitol/story?id=66209415.]

**Academy Award winning actress Jane Fonda, 81, was arrested by police with a group of about a dozen protesters Friday after being warned repeatedly to leave the steps of the U.S. Capitol.** Inspired by youth climate activists like Sweden's Greta Thunberg, 16, who herself recently came to Washington to [testify in front of Congress](https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/greta-thunberg-teen-climate-activist-tells-us-lawmakers/story?id=65692288), Fonda, who, throughout her long career, has engaged in activism, dating as far back as the Vietnam War, recently told ABC News that while she's in the nation's capital, every Friday, she'll attend "Fire Drill Friday," a weekly event featuring scientists, celebrities and activists addressing the various facets and impacts of climate change. **The event title is a play on Thunberg saying during a speech at the World Economic Forum's annual meeting in Davos, Switzerland in January, "I want you to act as if our house is on fire. Because it is." "11 o'clock every Friday morning come get arrested with me or choose not to it doesn't matter," told ABC News in an earlier interview about her planned effort.**  Fonda said she decided to leave her home, and comfort zone, through the holidays, and move to Washington for four months, because she wanted to "make a commitment to" the issue of climate change. In an interview with ABC News Deputy Political director MaryAlice Parks for an episode of of ABC News Live's "The Briefing Room," Fonda said that while they bear no blame for causing it, the [kids are leading the charge](https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/teenage-climate-change-activist-greta-thunbeerg-takes-global/story?id=65601228) on fighting climate change. "They're saying, 'Come on, you know, you're taking our future away from us. We need -- we need you to support us.' And so grandmas unite," she said. "I want to stand with them and raise up... their message. This is -- this is serious... This is a crisis unlike anything that has ever faced humankind." Stressing she was not being hyperbolic, Fonda said this is the "one issue" that matters because it "will [determine the survival of our species](https://abcnews.go.com/International/united-nations-report-details-looming-climate-crisis/story?id=58354235)," and said that's why she'll be attending Fire Drill Fridays weekly. David Swanson/AP, FILE *Actress and activist Jane Fonda talks to a crowd of protestors during a global climate rall...Read More* "I think every single human being has to say, 'What can I do to put this at the forefront?'" she said. "(With) everything that's going on in the news, well, we have to fight our way through that and find ways to get climate change in people's minds." **The esteemed actress pushed back against criticism that Hollywood's presence could make climate change a more polarizing issue.** "What we're facing is so important and so urgent, it doesn't matter. Those -- those things don't even matter," she told Parks. "This is the future. This is whether we're going to survive." **Fonda also said that the United States needs "to lead the way" on this issue, so that other countries who contribute heavily to greenhouse gas emissions, like China and India, "follow suit." While she's been passionate about this issue for "decades," she credits her current endeavors on** [**Thunberg's recurring protest**](https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/teenage-climate-change-activist-greta-thunbeerg-takes-global/story?id=65601228) **outside Swedish parliament, and other student climate strikers around the world for taking on this issue so passionately.**

#### Strikes incentivize companies to take climate action seriously.

**Ivanova 19** [Irin. Work, tech, climate and data for [@CBSNews](https://twitter.com/CBSNews). Priors: [@HuffPost](https://twitter.com/HuffPost), [@CrainsNewYork](https://twitter.com/CrainsNewYork), [@newmarkjschool](https://twitter.com/newmarkjschool). “These businesses are closing for Friday's climate strike”. 9-20-2019. No Publication. https://www.cbsnews.com/news/global-climate-strike-businesses-close-their-doors-in-time-for-climate-strike-2019/.]

**Thousands of people are planning to walk out of work or school on Friday to press global leaders for solutions to rapidly escalating climate change. And while it was students who started the movement, more and more workers—and even companies—are joining them in support.** Some businesses are letting workers take the day off to protest, while others plan to close their doors outright. They tend to be small or mid-sized businesses — most of the country's largest corporations have yet to weigh in on the strike, although plenty of people who work at them might yet participate when walkouts are set to start Friday afternoon. Here are the ways workers and companies are supporting the strike. **Walkouts Amazon is expected to see more than 1,500 employees walk out, with the largest contingent exiting its Seattle headquarters, as they push the company to cut ties with fossil-fuel companies and stop funding groups that deny climate science. The company on Thursday announced it would make its operations carbon-neutral by 2040 and run entirely on renewable energy within a decade.** More than 900 **Google** workers and unknown numbers of workers from **Facebook, Atlassian, Cobot, Ecosia, Microsoft** and **Twitter** are vowing walkouts. The strikers have details at [Tech Workers Coalition.](https://techworkerscoalition.org/climate-strike/) Some smaller companies are giving workers paid time off to participate in the walkouts. These include **Atlassian, Sustain Natural, Grove Collaborative** and others. **Closures Ben & Jerry's corporate offices in South Burlington, Vermont, will be closed during the strike** on Friday, while shops worldwide will either be closed or open later than usual. The company is also stopping production at its manufacturing plants in Vermont and the Netherlands, according to [Adweek](https://www.adweek.com/brand-marketing/brands-are-closing-their-doors-in-support-of-the-global-climate-strike/). **"We recognize that climate change is an existential threat to our planet and all its inhabitants, and therefore we are proud standing with the youth-led movement demanding bold action in response to the climate emergency," a spokesperson said.** **Patagonia** is closing its retail stores for 24 hours on Friday. "For decades, many corporations have single-mindedly pursued profits at the expense of everything else — employees, communities and the air, land and water we all share," CEO Rose Marcario wrote on [LinkedIn](https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/enough-join-climate-strikes-demand-action-rose-marcario/?sf219300827=1). "[C]apitalism needs to evolve if humanity is going to survive." **Lush Cosmetics will close its manufacturing facilities and retail outlets on September 20 in the U.S. and on September 27 in Canada.** It's also halting online sales on Friday. **Badger Balm** is closing for the day and giving workers paid time off to demonstrate or volunteer. The company is also donating 5% of online sales from September 16 to 27 to AmazonWatch.org to aid in preserving the shrinking Amazon's ecological systems, it said. **Burton**, the outdoor retailer, is closing its offices and owned retail stores on September 20th or 27th (depending on their country of location). It also won't make any online sales for 24 hours on Friday. **SodaStream**, the seltzer maker owned by PepsiCo, is shuttering its headquarters and closing e-commerce on Friday. **Digital doings and more The heart of the strike will be in the streets, but that doesn't mean the action stops there. More than 7,000** [**companies**](https://digital.globalclimatestrike.net/) **have pledged to draw attention to the protest by either donating ad space or putting banners on their sites.** Participants include **Tumblr, WordPress, Imgur, Kickstarter, BitTorrent,** **Tor, BoingBoing**, **Greenpeace, Change.org**, among many others.

#### Companies’ influence is the key internal link to passing important Climate Policy while also boosting the economy WRL 19’ [WRI develops practical solutions that improve people’s lives and protect nature. Our more than 1,200 staff have deep expertise in policy, research, data analysis, economics, political dynamics and more. We work with partners in more than 50 countries and currently have offices in 12 countries: Brazil, China, Colombia, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, the Netherlands, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States. https://www.wri.org/insights/3-ways-business-must-use-political-influence-champion-climate-ambition]

Reducing your "carbon footprint" may have qualified your company as a leader on climate change 10 years ago. But today you must do more than that. The definition of leadership has changed—and it increasingly includes responsible, proactive lobbying for climate action that reduces emissions. More than 500 companies have committed to emissions reductions targets based in science, and more than 150 have committed to powering their operations entirely with renewable energy by 2030. Businesses are disclosing their emissions and evaluating their supply chains for climate risks. But checking even these boxes won't be enough to be considered a corporate leader on climate in 2019, and it certainly won't be enough to stop a changing climate's worst impacts. A new report from EDF highlights how most corporate climate leadership rankings overlook policy advocacy, and argues that this is a huge "blind spot" for any true measure of a company's contribution to climate change solutions. They are correct. Companies can and must reduce emissions, but only public policy can elevate these efforts to the scale and pace of emissions reductions needed to mitigate climate change. The political influence of climate-forward businesses with long histories of successful lobbying on other industry-specific issues can lend climate policies the credibility they need to achieve lasting impact. For aspiring firms looking to start real impact at the state and national level, here are 3 important starting points for responsible climate policy advocacy. This is your 2019 corporate climate lobbying checklist: 1. Share Your "Climate Story" Companies have an authentic and credible perspective to share on the long-term threat from climate change to their operations. This perspective is your climate story; crafting an honest, persuasive one is the first step in engaging elected officials. Corporate government affairs teams need to know and show how climate connects to the company's interest areas. Climate change poses real business risks that affect the economy, jobs and the private sector's ability to provide goods and services. The person who knows the company's climate story best and the person who relays it to policymakers may not be the same. Do those who interface with policymakers in your company know what your firm is doing on climate? When sustainability and policy don't interact internally, the result is that most businesses are not getting the credit they deserve for their science-based targets and emissions reduction measures within the halls of government or having influence. When companies can share their "climate story" using data points and anecdotes, it gives policymakers the credibility and confidence to then go and advocate for ambitious policy. When elected officials can be informed by business, it gives them the confidence to speak to climate issues with authority. 2. Meet Policymakers "Where They Are" Most of us want a safe, stable climate, but engaging policymakers while lobbying isn't a conversation that starts with "I want." Government Affairs staff know this, but sustainability practitioners helping to draft talking points for interaction with policymakers may not. Recognizing that elected officials represent constituents with certain needs is an important baseline for drawing a Venn diagram between what responsible business wants and what policymakers want. Understand the local context in order to make compelling cases about whatever your issue is, whether that's procuring renewable energy or buying fleets of electric vehicles. Tailor your advocacy to issues at the core of a district or state's interests, and you are more likely to generate buy-in from elected officials. 3. Push Government to Be Bolder When businesses advocate for climate ambition and send governments clear signals of commitment, this enables governments to be bolder in their own commitments. Likewise, when government sends the private sector clear, long-term signals about climate policy, business can act with the confidence it needs to make low-carbon investments. The Ambition Loop, a paper produced by WRI with We Mean Business and the UN Global Compact, highlights instances where business and government have sent one another these clear signals, which created the enabling conditions for more confident climate action. A few market leaders have begun to harness their influence and engage in thoughtful climate advocacy. Danone North America, Nestle USA, Unilever United States and Mars, Incorporated formed the Sustainable Food Policy Alliance to advocate for public policy in the United States in five key areas, one of which is the environment and climate change. The group focuses on communicating to policymakers their support of policies such as putting a price on carbon, and recently released a set of principles advocating for ambitious action on climate. Time to Lobby Firms on the leading edge must harness their political influence and recognize that climate policy is urgently needed to protect their customers, employees, suppliers and their own business interests. The Global Commission on the Economy and Climate found that bold climate action could deliver at least $26 trillion in economic benefits and generate over 65 million new low-carbon jobs in 2030. One of the most compelling narratives a business can tell comes from the private sector harnessing the potential trillions in economic growth to be had when they do well by doing good. The pressure is on companies to put their lobbying where their climate leadership is, with investors, NGOs, and US consumers increasingly expecting companies to act. Policymakers will need to listen, but companies first must step up with authentic, credible narratives and demonstrate that they are willing to spend their political capital to further climate objectives.

#### Marginalized Groups are Disproportionately Affected by Climate Change Yip 7/21 Why Marginalized Groups are Disproportionately Affected by Climate Change<https://earth.org/marginalised-groups-are-disproportionately-affected-by-climate-change/>

**Environmental racism refers to the injustices suffered by marginalized communities in terms of unequal distribution of environmental resources and hazards, and discrimination in environmental support and policy-making.** In essence, the burdens of pollution, natural disasters, and poisoned resources are distributed unequally in society, with marginalised communities being hit disproportionately harder.When it comes to severing climate change, this means that racial minorities will be bearing the brunt of the environmental impacts. One such case of environmental racism can be observed **in the United States**, where **people of color suffer from a multitude of environmental injustices. In the US, air pollution is distributed unevenly among the different racial groups, with people of color being hit the hardest**. An important ratio to consider when assessing the distribution of adverse impacts of pollution is the ratio of how much pollution one is responsible for relative to how much pollution one is exposed to. **Scientists have found that Hispanics and African-Americans breathe in** [**63% and 56%**](https://apnews.com/article/f6bf2f47c81c4958811dc4e99d526197) **more pollution than they make respectively. On the other hand, Caucasians are exposed to 17% less air pollution than they make. This means that relative to their contribution to pollution, people of color in the US are disproportionately exposed to pollutants.** Across the country, people of colour on average are also exposed to [far higher levels of air pollutants](https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/people-of-color-breathe-more-unhealthy-air-from-nearly-all-polluting-sources/) (PM2.5), regardless of region or household income. In short, people of colour in the United States are disproportionately impacted by an increasingly polluted climate, both in relative and absolute terms. **Inequality also exists on the global scale, where there exist large disparities in emissions and climate impacts from country to country.** There is a large asymmetry when it comes to the proportion of CO2 emissions from region to region. For example, **North America is home to only 5% of the world’s population, but it emits 18% of the world’s total CO2. Conversely, Africa is home to 16% of the world’s population, but emits only 4% of total CO2**. In other words, different continents hold different amounts of responsibility when it comes to climate change, and some regions should bear more of the blame. Moreover, in terms of aggregate income, **86% of global CO2 emissions are emitted by the richest half of countries in the world, whilst the bottom half only emits 14%.** This inequality in global emissions renders the issue of international climate change responsibility very delicate and contentious. In light of this, the countries hit hardest by climate change are coincidentally the countries with less relative responsibility for climate change. **For example, the Philippines** consists of 1.41% of the total world population, but it only **produces** [**0.35% of total world’s emissions of CO2**](https://www.worldometers.info/co2-emissions/philippines-co2-emissions/)**. Yet, it has been hit disproportionately hard from climate change; every year it suffers numerous casualties and damage from typhoons, floods, and landslides of increasing frequency and intensity.**

### Contention 2 is Democracy

#### Civic engagement – strikes increase democratic participation which reinvigorates democracy.

**McElwee 15** [Sean; Research Associate at Demos; “How Unions Boost Democratic Participation,” The American Prospect; 9/16/15; https://prospect.org/labor/unions-boost-democratic-participation/] Justin

Labor organizer Helen Marot once observed, "The labor unions are **group efforts in the direction of democracy**." What she meant is that more than simply vehicles for the economic interests of workers (which they certainly are), labor unions also foster **civic participation** for workers. And **nowhere is this clearer** than in **voter turnout**, which has suffered in recent years along with union membership. Indeed, new data from the Census Bureau and a new analysis of American National Election Studies data support the case that unions' declining influence has also **deeply harmed democracy**.

In 2014, voter turnout was **abysmal**, even for a midterm. Census data suggest that only **41.9 percent of the citizen population** over 18 turned out to vote. However, as I note in my new Demos report Why Voting Matters, there are **dispiriting gaps in turnout** across **class**, **race**, and **age**. To examine how unions might affect policy, I performed a **new analysis** of both Census Bureau and American National Election Studies data. The data below, from the 2014 election, show the **differences in voter turnout** between union and non-union workers (the sample only includes individuals who were employed, and does not include self-employed workers). While only 39 percent of non-union workers voted in 2014, fully 52 percent of union workers did.

As part of ongoing research, James Feigenbaum, an economics PhD candidate at Harvard, ran a regression using American National Election Studies data suggesting that **union members are about 4 percentage points more likely to vote** and **3 points more likely to register** (after controlling for demographic factors) and individuals living in a union household are 2.5 points more likely to vote and register. This is largely in line with the earlier estimates of Richard Freeman.

These numbers may appear modest, but in a close national election they could be enough to change the result.

Other research has found an **even stronger turnout effect from unions**. Daniel Stegmueller and Michael Becher find that after applying numerous demographic controls, union members are **10 points more likely to vote**.

What's particularly important is that unions boost turnout among low- and middle-income individuals. In a 2006 study, political scientists Jan Leighley and Jonathan Nagler found that, "the **decline** in union membership since 1964 has **affected** the **aggregate turnout of both low and middle-income individuals** more than the aggregate turnout of high-income individuals." In 2014, the **gap** between unions and non-union workers shrunk at the highest rung of the income ladder. There was a **15-point gap among those earning less than $25,000** (40 percent turnout for union workers, and 25 percent turnout for non-union workers). Among those earning more than $100,000, the gap was far smaller (49 percent for non-union workers and 52 percent for union workers).

Individuals living in union households are also more progressive than those in non-union households. I examined 2012 ANES data and find that union households aren't largely different from non-union households on many issues regarding government spending, but they are more likely to have voted for Obama, identify as Democratic, and support a robust role for the government in reducing income inequality. When looking at union members specifically, the gaps become slightly larger.

More upscale union members are far more progressive than their non-union counterparts. Non-union households with an income above $60,000 oppose government intervention to reduce inequality by 11 points, with 32.2 percent in favor and 43.4 percent against. But richer union households support government intervention, with 42.5 percent in favor and 29.9 percent opposed. As Richard B. Freeman has pointed out, "union members are more likely to vote for a Democrat for the House or Presidency than demographically comparable nonunion voters." He similarly finds that "unionism moves members to the left of where they would be given their socioeconomic status," in line with the data I examined from 2012.

A 2013 study by Jasmine Kerrissey and Evan Schofer finds that union members are **not only** more likely to vote, but also **more likely to belong to other associations**, and to protest. They also find that these **effects** are strongest among people with **lower levels of education**, suggesting that unions may help mobilize the **least politically active groups**. A recent study of European countries finds union members vote more and identifies those aspects of union membership that contribute to the higher turnout.

The strongest factor is that workers who engage in **democratic organizations** in the workplace (via **collective bargaining**) are **more likely to engage in democracy more broadly** by, for instance, voting.

Other studies support the idea that civic participation creates a feedback loop that leads to higher voting rates. Another factor is that union members make more money, and higher income is correlated with voting behavior. Finally, union members are encouraged by peers and the union to engage in politics, which also contributes to higher levels of turnout.

It's not entirely surprising that politicians who savage unions often share a similar contempt for the right to vote. Democracy in the workplace leads to democracy **more broadly throughout society**. Workers with more democratic workplaces are more likely to democratically engage in in society. Further, when **unions** and **progressives** demonstrate that government can benefit them, Americans are more likely to **want to participate in decision-making**. For all these reasons, unions play a unique and indispensable role in the progressive project. As Larry Summers, certainly not a leftist, recently argued, "the weakness of unions leaves a broad swath of the middle class largely **unrepresented** in the political process."

#### Corruption reduction – the right to strike fights concentration of power while reducing inequality.

**IER 17** [Institute of Employment Rights. The IER exists to inform the debate around trade union rights and labour law by providing information, critical analysis, and policy ideas through our network of academics, researchers and lawyers. “UN Rights Expert: Right to strike is essential to democracy”. 3-10-2017. . https://www.ier.org.uk/news/un-rights-expert-right-strike-essential-democracy/.] SJ//VM

The United Nations’ Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association, Maina Kiai, has reminded member states of the International Labour Organization (ILO) – including the UK – that they have a positive obligation to uphold the right to strike. **Speaking at an ILO meeting on Monday 06 March 2017 in Geneva, Kiai argued that the right to strike is fundamental to the preservation of democracy. “The concentration of power in one sector – whether in the hands of government or business – inevitably leads to the erosion of democracy, and an increase in inequalities and marginalization with all their attendant consequences. The right to strike is a check on this concentration of power,”** he explained. **The right to strike has been established in international law as a corollary to the right of freedom of association for decades, and is enshrined in the European Convention on Human Rights as Article 11.** As a member state of the ILO and of the EU, the UK is legally obliged to uphold the right to strike, although through the Trades Union Act 2016 and the anti-trade union laws that preceded it, the government is making it harder and harder for trade unions to take industrial action. Kiai criticised such actions, saying government’s have a duty not to impede workers’ ability to take industrial action. “I deplore the various attempts made to erode the right to strike at national and multilateral levels,” the expert said, reminding delegates: “**Protest action in relation to government social and economic policy, and against negative corporate practices, forms part of the basic civil liberties whose respect is essential for the meaningful exercise of trade union rights.** This right enables them to engage with companies and governments on a more equal footing, and Member States have a positive obligation to protect this right, and a negative obligation not to interfere with its exercise.”

#### Democracies are not a monolithic system—even if some democracies are problematic, ones with more accountability and civic engagement are less likely to engage in regional warfare, have armed conflict, etc.

**Cortright 13** [David Cortright, American Scholar and peace activist, director of policy studies at the Kroc Institute for international peace studies at the university of Notre Dame and Chair of the Board of the Fourth Freedom forum, “How State Capacity and Regime Type Influence the prospects for war and peace, <https://oefresearch.org/sites/default/files/documents/publications/Cortright-Seyle-Wall-Paper.pdf> ] JJ

**A** recurring **trend runs through nearly all of the empirical studies on the democratic peace effect. Fully mature democratic states with high threshold scores on indicators of voice and accountability have the lowest risk of war and armed conflict.** **The characteristics of democracy that are most strongly associated with the absence of armed conflict and violent repression are political representativeness and inclusiveness**. **These are made possible by,** and help to sustain, essential **civil liberties and human rights.**

 Walter, Reynal-Querol, Joshi, Davenport, and other scholars come to similar conclusions on the irenic effect of inclusive and participatory forms of governance. Jeffrey Dixon confirms these findings in his synthesis of quantitative studies on the correlates of civil war. **As democracies become more inclusive, their risk of armed conflict diminishes**. **Discriminatory policies increase the risk of civil war, while guarantees of political freedom reduce that risk.**140 **The more participatory and open the political governance system the lower the chances of armed conflict and political violence. Peace is more likely when people are free to participate actively in choosing political decision makers and when diverse interests have effective political representation.** **Programs that foster citizen participation, inclusive institutions, accountability mechanisms, and greater public oversight bolster the conditions for peace.**

The two parts of this paper examine state capacity and democracy separately, but the irenic features of these separate dimensions overlap and reinforce one another. **Effective institutions prevent armed conflict when they provide security and civilian services, and when they are inclusive and representative**. A narrow focus on one dimension of governance—for example building strong institutions while ignoring the need for democratic accountability—could be counterproductive. **Effective capacity and democratic governance go hand in hand and need to be combined to create the greatest peace effect.**

Social science research confirms that **governments are better able to prevent armed conflict if they have strong institutions and maintain effective control over their territory, and if they provide the full range of public goods, including essential social services.** **The findings also highlight the importance of fostering governance systems with greater citizen participation and oversight, more inclusive and accountable forms of representation, and guarantees of political freedom and human rights. These and other policy approaches help to reduce the risk of armed conflict and are part of the process through which good governance promotes peace.**

**Democracies respect human dignity the most, and are far better than any alternative system of governance when it comes to saving lives and respecting others. Think about how China, an authoritarian government sanctions the literal genocide of entire populations such as the Uighurs. Therefore to help respect the dignity of people, as well as provide the best system of governance that prevents wars, you should vote aff to increase democracy.**

## UV

#### 1] Aff gets 1AR theory to prevent infinite abuse it’s DTD since the 1AR needs it to make the time investment worth, no RVIs because you can dump on a 30 sec shell for 6 minutes, and competing interps since the 2n can’t dump on a reasonability bright-line that excludes only what they did wrong – 1AR theory comes first the 1AR is too short to be able to rectify abuse and adequately cover substance.

#### 2] Procedural fairness first a) probability – one round cant alter subjectivity, but it can rectify fairness skews, b) link turns their role of the ballot since it proves we couldn’t engage in it and it is exclusionary, c) answers are self-defeating since they presuppose the judge evals them fairly.

#### 3 – Permissibility and presumption substantively affirm: A] Statements are true before false since if I told you my name, you’d believe me B] Epistemics – we wouldn’t be able to start a strand of reasoning since we’d have to question that reason C] If anything is permissible, then definitionally so is the aff since there is nothing that prevents us from doing it.