## 1

#### Interpretation: The affirmative may not specify a Government which recognizes the unconditional right of workers to strike.

#### “Just Government” is a generic indefinite singular.

Leslie 12 Leslie, Sarah-Jane. “Generics.” In Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Language, edited by Gillian Russell and Delia Fara, 355–366. Routledge, 2012. <https://www.princeton.edu/~sjleslie/RoutledgeHandbookEntryGenerics.pdf> SM

GENERICS VS. EXISTENTIALS The interpretation of sentences containing bare plurals, indefinite singulars, or definite singulars can be either generic as in (1) respectively or existential/specific as in (2): (1) Tigers are striped A tiger is striped The tiger is striped. (2) Tigers are on the front lawn A tiger is on the front lawn The tiger is on the front lawn. The subjects in (1) are prima facie the same as in (2), yet their interpretations in (1) are intuitively quite different from those in (2). In (2) we are talking about some particular tigers, while in (1) we are saying something about tigers in general. There are some tests that are helpful in distinguishing these two readings. For example, the existential interpretation is upward entailing, meaning that the statement will always remain true if we replace the subject term with a more inclusive term. For example, if it is true that tigers are on the lawn, then it will also be true that animals are on the lawn. This is not so if the sentence is interpreted generically. For example, it is true that tigers are striped, but it does not follow that animals are striped (Lawler 1973 Laca 1990; Krifka et al 1995). Another test concerns whether we can insert an adverb of quantification (in the sense of Lewis 1975) with minimal change of meaning (Krifka et al 1995). For example, inserting “usually” in the sentences in (1) (e.g. “tigers are usually striped”) produces only a small change in meaning, while inserting “usually” in (2) dramatically alters the meaning of the sentence (e.g. “tigers are usually on the front lawn). (For generics such as “mosquitoes carry malaria”, the adverb “sometimes” is perhaps better used than “usually”.)

#### This applies to gov – 1] Upward entailment test – “Just governments ought to recognize” doesn’t imply that “Political bodies ought to recognize” since the res doesn’t imply NATO should do it 2] Adverb test -- “Just governments always ought to recognize the unconditional right to strike” doesn’t substantially change the meaning of the res

#### Precision is an independent voter and outweighs – a) jurisdiction – the judge is contractually obligated to vote affirmative if the rez is proven true they can’t vote aff if you aren’t defending it, b) outweighs – anything else justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### 1] Limits – they can specify anything from US, China, Norway, Russia, Japan, etc. – there’s no unifying generics since each gov has different circumstances. That explodes neg prep and leads to random government of the week affs, which makes cutting stable links for disads or counterplan competition impossible.

#### 2] TVA – read the aff as an advantage to a whole rez aff.

#### Fairness – debate is a competitive activity that requires fairness for objective evaluation. Outweighs because it’s the only intrinsic part of debate.

#### Drop the debater – because you skewed the entire round.

#### Competing interps – a] reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention since there’s no clear norm. b] it creates a race to the top so we set the best norms

#### No RVIs – a) RVIs incentivize baiting T and prepping it out which leads to maximally abusive practices and creates a chilling effect where people don’t check real abuse. B) logic – you shouldn’t win by proving you’re topical

#### T before 1AR theory – A) Norms – we only have a couple months to set T norms but can set 1AR theory norms any time B) Magnitude – it impacts a larger portion of the round since the aff advocacy determines every speech after it

## 2

**Interpretation: Just governments must be a full democracy on the 2021 index cited below.**

**Violation: India is flawed not full.**

**Prefer our definition because its from a legal dictionary**

**The Free Dictionary**, "Declaration of Independence," TheFreeDictionary, <https://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/Declaration+of+Independence> //SR

Scholars have long debated the relative importance of the different sources Jefferson used for his ideas in the Declaration. Most agree that the natural rights philosophy of English philosopher John Locke greatly influenced Jefferson's composition of the Declaration. In particular, Locke advanced the ideas that a just government derives its legitimacy and power from the consent of the governed, that people possess inalienable rights that no legitimate government may take away, and that the people have the right and duty to overthrow a government that violates their rights. Jefferson also paralleled Locke in his identification of three major rights—the rights to "Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness"—though the last of his three is a change from Locke's right to "property."

**Table

Description automatically generated**

**India violates - check screenshots above its a flawed democracy**

**Wikipedia cites Economist Intelligence Unit, 2020**, Democracy Index, <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Democracy_Index> //SR

Full democracies are nations where civil liberties and fundamental political freedoms are not only respected but also reinforced by a political culture conducive to the thriving of democratic principles. These nations have a valid system of governmental checks and balances, an independent judiciary whose decisions are enforced, governments that function adequately, and diverse and independent media. These nations have only limited problems in democratic functioning.[8] Flawed democracies are nations where elections are fair and free and basic civil liberties are honoured but may have issues (e.g. media freedom infringement and minor suppression of political opposition and critics). These nations have significant faults in other democratic aspects, including underdeveloped political culture, low levels of participation in politics, and issues in the functioning of governance.[8] Hybrid regimes are nations with regular electoral frauds, preventing them from being fair and free democracies. These nations commonly have governments that apply pressure on political opposition, non-independent judiciaries, widespread corruption, harassment and pressure placed on the media, anaemic rule of law, and more pronounced faults than flawed democracies in the realms of underdeveloped political culture, low levels of participation in politics, and issues in the functioning of governance.[8] Authoritarian regimes are nations where political pluralism is nonexistent or severely limited. These nations are often absolute monarchies or dictatorships, may have some conventional institutions of democracy but with meagre significance, infringements and abuses of civil liberties are commonplace, elections (if they take place) are not fair and free, the media is often state-owned or controlled by groups associated with the ruling regime, the judiciary is not independent, and censorship and suppression of governmental criticism are commonplace.[8]

#### Flawed democracies aren’t democracies, meaning they aren’t just governments.

Flawed Democracy: The Bane of Ghana’s Success in Curbing Corruption, 2017, [Kofi Nsia-Pepra, PhD in political science, professor of political science at Ohio Northern University] <https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Portals/10/ASPJ_French/journals_E/Volume-08_Issue-2/nsia-pepra_e.pdf> SM

Flawed or immature democracies, however, experience upsurges of corruption (because they lack the institutional requisites to yield higher administrative quality and capacity that are normally associated with consolidated democracies to deal with corruption.10 A flawed democracy is defective and is marked by impaired democratic attributes that sustain corruption despite having elections. EIU categorizes immature democracies into hybrid and flawed. Hybrid regimes are flawed with substantial electoral irregularities that often prevent elections from being both free and fair. The judiciary is not independent, and there is weak civil society and rule of law as well as widespread corruption that goes unpunished.11 According to Fareed Zakaria, an illiberal or flawed democracy entails an elected polity where liberty and rule of law are secure in theory but violated in practice because of massive corruption, flawed electoral processes and disregard for the rule of law to punish corrupt officials.12 They are democratic in word but not in substance. Flawed democracies are corrupt because they lack the established democratic norms, institutions and the political will to expose and punish corrupt officials. Institutions of accountability are limited in curbing corruption mainly because they are captured by the ruling elites who are beneficiaries

**Vote neg for limits and ground - they can literally pick any of the 70+ governments that are full and flawed not grounded in the resolution making it impossible for us to predict and arbitrarily prepare specific political scenarios that we can never possibly expect. Especially true for governments with severe political flaws who have a lot worse conditions than democracies which means uniqueness will ALWAYS flip aff and their affs are objectively more likely to be true and unturnable. Our interp solves - just pick a full democracy which is still 20 + different affs. C/a the ! to limits and precision**

## 3

#### The Global Economy is stabilizing and set for increases in 2021 but is still vulnerable to shocks

World Bank 6-8 6-8-2021 "The Global Economy: on Track for Strong but Uneven Growth as COVID-19 Still Weighs" <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2021/06/08/the-global-economy-on-track-for-strong-but-uneven-growth-as-covid-19-still-weighs>

A year and a half since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, the global economy is poised to stage its most **robust post-recession recovery** in 80 years in 2021. But the rebound is expected to be **uneven across countries**, as major economies look set to register strong growth even as many developing economies lag. Global growth is expected to accelerate to 5.6% this year, largely on the strength in major economies such as the United States and China. And while growth for almost every region of the world has been revised upward for 2021, many continue to grapple with COVID-19 and what is likely to be its long shadow. Despite this year’s pickup, the level of global GDP in 2021 is expected to be **3.2% below** pre-pandemic projections, and per capita GDP among many emerging market and developing economies is anticipated to remain below pre-COVID-19 peaks for an extended period. As the **pandemic continues to flare**, it will shape the path of global economic activity.

#### Strikes hurt the Economy – two warrants:

#### 1] They hurt critical core industries that is necessary for economic growth

McElroy 19 John McElroy 10-25-2019 "Strikes Hurt Everybody" <https://www.wardsauto.com/ideaxchange/strikes-hurt-everybody> (MPA at McCombs school of Business)

This creates a **poisonous relationship** between the company and its workforce. Many GM hourly workers don’t identify as GM employees. They identify as UAW members. And they see the union as the source of their jobs, not the company. It’s an unhealthy dynamic that puts GM at a disadvantage to non-union automakers in the U.S. like Honda and Toyota, where workers take pride in the company they work for and the products they make. Attacking the company in the media also **drives away customers**. Who wants to buy a shiny new car from a company that’s accused of underpaying its workers and treating them unfairly? Data from the Center for Automotive Research (CAR) in Ann Arbor, MI, show that **GM loses market share during strikes and never gets it back**. GM lost two percentage points during the 1998 strike, which in today’s market would represent **a loss of 340,000 sales**. Because GM reports sales on a quarterly basis we’ll only find out at the end of December if it lost market share from this strike. UAW members say one of their greatest concerns is job security. But causing a company to lose market share is a sure-fire path to **more plant closings and layoffs**. Even so, unions are incredibly important for boosting wages and benefits for working-class people. GM’s UAW-represented workers earn considerably more than their non-union counterparts, about $26,000 more per worker, per year, in total compensation. Without a union they never would have achieved that. Strikes are a powerful weapon for unions. They usually are the only way they can get management to accede to their demands. If not for the power of collective bargaining and the threat of a strike, management would largely ignore union demands. If you took away that threat, management would pay its workers peanuts. Just ask the Mexican line workers who are paid $1.50 an hour to make $50,000 BMWs. But strikes don’t just hurt the people walking the picket lines or the company they’re striking against. They hurt **suppliers, car dealers and the communities located near the plants.** The Anderson Economic Group estimates that 75,000 workers at supplier companies were temporarily laid off because of the GM strike. Unlike UAW picketers, those supplier workers won’t get any strike pay or an $11,000 contract signing bonus. No, most of them lost close to a month’s worth of wages, which must be financially devastating for them. GM’s suppliers also lost a lot of money. So now they’re cutting budgets and delaying capital investments to make up for the lost revenue, which is a further drag on the economy. According to CAR, the communities and states where GM’s plants are located collectively lost a couple of hundred million dollars in payroll and tax revenue. Some economists warn that if the strike were prolonged it could knock the state of Michigan – home to GM and the UAW – **into a recession.** That prompted the governor of Michigan, Gretchen Whitmer, to call GM CEO Mary Barra and UAW leaders and urge them to settle as fast as possible. So, while the UAW managed to get a nice raise for its members, the strike left a path of destruction in its wake. That’s not fair to the innocent bystanders who will never regain what they lost. John McElroyI’m not sure how this will ever be resolved. I understand the need for collective bargaining and the threat of a strike. But there’s got to be a better way to get workers a raise without torching the countryside.

#### 2] Strikes create a stigmatization effect over labor and consumption that devastates the Economy

Tenza 20, Mlungisi. "The effects of violent strikes on the economy of a developing country: a case of South Africa." Obiter 41.3 (2020): 519-537. (Senior Lecturer, University of KwaZulu-Natal)

When South Africa obtained democracy in 1994, there was a dream of a better country with a new vision for industrial relations.5 However, the number of violent strikes that have bedevilled this country in recent years seems to have shattered-down the aspirations of a better South Africa. South Africa recorded 114 strikes in 2013 and 88 strikes in 2014, which cost the country about **R6.1 billion** according to the Department of Labour.6 The impact of these strikes has been hugely felt by the mining sector, particularly the platinum industry. The biggest strike took place in the platinum sector where about 70 000 mineworkers’ downed tools for better wages. Three major platinum producers (Impala, Anglo American and Lonmin Platinum Mines) were affected. The strike started on 23 January 2014 and ended on 25 June 2014. Business Day reported that “the five-month-long strike in the platinum sector pushed the economy to the brink of recession”. 7 This strike was closely followed by a four-week strike in the metal and engineering sector. All these strikes (and those not mentioned here) were characterised with violence accompanied by damage to property, intimidation, assault and sometimes the killing of people. Statistics from the metal and engineering sector showed that about 246 cases of intimidation were reported, 50 violent incidents occurred, and 85 cases of vandalism were recorded.8 Large-scale unemployment, soaring poverty levels and the dramatic income inequality that characterise the South African labour market provide a broad explanation for strike violence.9 While participating in a strike, workers’ stress levels leave them feeling frustrated at their seeming powerlessness, which in turn provokes further violent behaviour.10 These strikes are not only violent but **take long to resolve.** Generally, a lengthy strike has a **negative effect on employment, reduces business confidence and increases the risk of economic stagflation**. In addition, such strikes have a major setback on the growth of the economy and investment opportunities. It is common knowledge that consumer spending is directly linked to economic growth. At the same time, if the economy is not showing signs of growth, employment opportunities are shed, and poverty becomes the end result. The economy of South Africa is in need of rapid growth to enable it to deal with the high levels of unemployment and resultant poverty. One of the measures that may boost the country’s economic growth is by attracting potential investors to invest in the country. However, this might be difficult as investors would want to invest in a country where there is a likelihood of getting returns for their investments. The wish of getting returns for investment may not materialise if the labour environment **is not fertile** for such investments as a result of, for example, unstable labour relations. Therefore, investors may be reluctant to invest where there is an unstable or fragile labour relations environment. 3 THE COMMISSION OF VIOLENCE DURING A STRIKE AND CONSEQUENCES The Constitution guarantees every worker the right to join a trade union, participate in the activities and programmes of a trade union, and to strike. 11 The Constitution grants these rights to a “worker” as an individual.12 However, the right to strike and any other conduct in contemplation or furtherance of a strike such as a picket13 can only be exercised by workers acting collectively.14 The right to strike and participation in the activities of a trade union were given more effect through the enactment of the Labour Relations Act 66 of 199515 (LRA). The main purpose of the LRA is to “advance economic development, social justice, labour peace and the democratisation of the workplace”. 16 The advancement of social justice means that the exercise of the right to strike must advance the interests of workers and at the same time workers must refrain from any conduct that can affect those who are not on strike as well members of society. Even though the right to strike and the right to participate in the activities of a trade union that often flow from a strike17 are guaranteed in the Constitution and specifically regulated by the LRA, it sometimes happens that the right to strike is exercised for purposes not intended by the Constitution and the LRA, generally. 18 For example, it was not the intention of the Constitutional Assembly and the legislature that violence should be used during strikes or pickets. As the Constitution provides, pickets are meant to be peaceful. 19 Contrary to section 17 of the Constitution, the conduct of workers participating in a strike or picket has changed in recent years with workers trying to emphasise their grievances by causing disharmony and chaos in public. A media report by the South African Institute of Race Relations pointed out that between the years 1999 and 2012 there were 181 strike-related deaths, 313 injuries and 3,058 people were arrested for public violence associated with strikes.20 The question is whether employers succumb easily to workers’ demands if a strike is accompanied by violence? In response to this question, one worker remarked as follows: “[T]here is no sweet strike, there is no Christian strike … A strike is a strike. [Y]ou want to get back what belongs to you ... you won’t win a strike with a Bible. You do not wear high heels and carry an umbrella and say ‘1992 was under apartheid, 2007 is under ANC’. You won’t win a strike like that.” 21 The use of violence during industrial action affects not only the strikers or picketers, the employer and his or her business but it also affects innocent members of the public, non-striking employees, the environment and the economy at large. In addition, striking workers visit non-striking workers’ homes, often at night, threaten them and in some cases, assault or even murder workers who are acting as replacement labour. 22 This points to the fact that for many workers and their families’ living conditions remain unsafe and vulnerable to damage due to violence. In Security Services Employers Organisation v SA Transport & Allied Workers Union (SATAWU),23 it was reported that about 20 people were thrown out of moving trains in the Gauteng province; most of them were security guards who were not on strike and who were believed to be targeted by their striking colleagues. Two of them died, while others were admitted to hospitals with serious injuries.24 In SA Chemical Catering & Allied Workers Union v Check One (Pty) Ltd,25 striking employees were carrying various weapons ranging from sticks, pipes, planks and bottles. One of the strikers Mr Nqoko was alleged to have threatened to cut the throats of those employees who had been brought from other branches of the employer’s business to help in the branch where employees were on strike. Such conduct was held not to be in line with good conduct of striking.26 These examples from case law show that South Africa is facing a problem that is affecting not only the industrial relations’ sector but also the economy at large. For example, in 2012, during a strike by workers employed by Lonmin in Marikana, the then-new union Association of Mine & Construction Workers Union (AMCU) wanted to exert its presence after it appeared that many workers were not happy with the way the majority union, National Union of Mine Workers (NUM), handled negotiations with the employer (Lonmin Mine). AMCU went on an unprotected strike which was violent and resulted in the loss of lives, damage to property and negative economic consequences including a weakened currency, reduced global investment, declining productivity, and increase unemployment in the affected sectors.27 Further, the unreasonably long time it takes for strikes to get resolved in the Republic has a negative effect on the business of the employer, the economy and employment. 3 1 Effects of violent and long strikes on the economy Generally, South Africa’s economy is on a downward scale. First, it fails to create employment opportunities for its people. The recent statistics on unemployment levels indicate that unemployment has increased from 26.5% to 27.2%. 28 The most prominent strike which nearly brought the platinum industries to its knees was the strike convened by AMCU in 2014. The strike started on 23 January 2014 and ended on 24 June 2014. It affected the three big platinum producers in the Republic, which are the Anglo American Platinum, Lonmin Plc and Impala Platinum. It was the longest strike since the dawn of democracy in 1994. As a result of this strike, the platinum industries lost billions of rands.29 According to the report by Economic Research Southern Africa, the platinum group metals industry is South Africa’s second-largest export earner behind gold and contributes just over 2% of the country’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP).30 The overall metal ores in the mining industry which include platinum sells about 70% of its output to the export market while sales to local manufacturers of basic metals, fabricated metal products and various other metal equipment and machinery make up to 20%. 31 The research indicates that the overall impact of the strike in 2014 was driven by a reduction in productive capital in the mining sector, accompanied by a decrease in labour available to the economy. This resulted in a sharp increase in the price of the output by 5.8% with a **GDP declined by 0.72 and 0.78%**.32

#### Err Negative – over-estimate the effect on Strikes on the economy since traditional economic measures underestimate the damage.

Babb No Date Katrina Babb "Chapter 11: The Economic Impact of Unions" <http://isu.indstate.edu/conant/ecn351/ch11/chapter11.htm> (Professor of Economic at Indiana State)

Strikes ­ Simple statistics on strike activity suggest that strikes are relatively rare and the associated aggregate economic losses are relatively minimal. Table 11-3 provides data on major work stoppages, defined as those involving 1000 or more workers and lasting at least one full day or one work shift. But these data **can be misleading** **as a measure of the costliness of a strike.** On the one hand, employers in the struck industry may have anticipated the strike and worked their labor force overtime to accumulate inventories to supply customers during the strike period, so that the work lost data overstates the actual loss. On the other hand, the amount lost **can be understated** by the data if production in associated industries ( those that buy inputs from the struck industry or sell products to it) **is disrupted**. As a broad generalization, the adverse effects of a strike on nonstriking firms and customers are likely to be greater **when services are involved** and less when products are involved. Remember, that strikes are the result of the failure of both parties to the negotiation, so it is inaccurate to attribute all of the costs associated with a strike to labor alone.

#### Economic Collapse goes Nuclear.

Tønnesson 15, Stein. "Deterrence, interdependence and Sino–US peace." International Area Studies Review 18.3 (2015): 297-311. (the Department of Peace and Conflict, Uppsala University, Sweden, and Peace research Institute Oslo (PRIO), Norway)

Several recent works on China and Sino–US relations have made substantial contributions to the current understanding of how and under what circumstances a combination of nuclear deterrence and economic interdependence may reduce the risk of war between major powers. At least four conclusions can be drawn from the review above: first, those who say that interdependence may both inhibit and drive conflict are right. Interdependence raises the cost of conflict for all sides but asymmetrical or unbalanced dependencies and negative trade expectations may generate tensions leading to trade wars among inter-dependent states that in turn increase the risk of military conflict (Copeland, 2015: 1, 14, 437; Roach, 2014). The risk may increase if one of the interdependent countries is governed by an inward-looking socio-economic coalition (Solingen, 2015); second, the risk of war between China and the US should not just be analysed bilaterally but include their allies and partners. Third party countries could drag China or the US into confrontation; third, in this context it is of some comfort that the three main economic powers in Northeast Asia (China, Japan and South Korea) are all deeply integrated economically through production networks within a global system of trade and finance (Ravenhill, 2014; Yoshimatsu, 2014: 576); and fourth, decisions for war and peace are taken by very few people, who act on the basis of their future expectations. International relations theory must be supplemented by foreign policy analysis in order to assess the value attributed by national decision-makers to economic development and their assessments of risks and opportunities. If leaders on either side of the Atlantic begin to seriously fear or anticipate their own nation’s decline then they may blame this on external dependence, appeal to anti-foreign sentiments, contemplate the use of force to gain respect or credibility, adopt protectionist policies, and ultimately refuse to be deterred by either nuclear arms or prospects of socioeconomic calamities. Such a dangerous shift could happen abruptly, i.e. under the instigation of actions by a third party – or against a third party. Yet as long as there is both nuclear deterrence and interdependence, the tensions in East Asia are unlikely to escalate to war. As Chan (2013) says, all states in the region are aware that they cannot count on support from either China or the US if they make provocative moves. The greatest risk is not that a territorial dispute leads to war under present circumstances but that changes in the world economy alter those circumstances in ways that render inter-state peace more precarious. If China and the US fail to rebalance their financial and trading relations (Roach, 2014) then a trade war could result, interrupting transnational production networks, provoking social distress, and exacerbating nationalist emotions. This could have unforeseen consequences in the field of security, with nuclear deterrence remaining the only factor to protect the world from Armageddon, and unreliably so. Deterrence could lose its credibility: one of the two great powers might gamble that the other yield in a cyber-war or conventional limited war, or third party countries might engage in conflict with each other, with a view to obliging Washington or Beijing to intervene.

## Case

#### No 1ar theory – a)7-6, 2-1 skew proves its always skewed to the aff, b) resolvability double bind – either the judge has to intervene to decide whether the 2ar’s answers to the 2nr’s Counter interp are sufficient or they auto accept every answer and you auto win. Intervention ow since it takes the round out of the debaters hands. That also means reasonability on 1ar theory since some level of intervention is inevitable so it’s net better to focus on things like substance education, Drop the argument on 1ar theory – they can initiate offensive drop the debater theory in the aff and in the 1ar while no judge would vote on 2n theory on severance.

#### Presumption and permissibility negate—

#### 1) they haven’t proven a moral obligation which is a distinction from an action being permissible—they must prove the res is permissible not the plan is permissible

#### 2) Statements are more often false than true because any part can be false. This means you negate if there is no offense because the resolution is probably false.

### AT: Agriculture

#### No Indo China conflict *or* doesn’t go nuclear

Jones 11 [Rodney, Jones Policy Architects International. The report is the product of collaboration between the Defense Threat Reduction Agency’s Advanced Systems and Concepts Office and Policy Architects International. Nuclear Escalation Ladders in South Asia. 2011]

Until relatively recently, China appears to have regarded India strategically as a third order concern, rather than a high priority. China has given a more strategic importance to India only since the turn of the century, roughly correlated with its growing commercial maritime dependence on distant sources of petroleum and minerals, especially in the Middle East and Africa, but also more recently in Latin America. India’s nuclear break out in 1998 may have been an added factor, but probably not a driving one. The growing U.S. interest in India over three administrations also played a part. China’s reach for oil, gas, and minerals has not been exclusively maritime but has also gone over land, and resulted in successful oil and gas pipelines connecting Central Asia to western China in the last three years. Nevertheless, the bulk carriage on maritime routes remains crucial. India’s geographical position which can influence the security of these routes from China’s littoral on the Pacific Ocean past Singapore and the Malacca Straits, and onward through the Indian Ocean to Africa and the Persian Gulf, gives India potential naval leverage that China would be foolish to ignore. China has also encouraged a rapidly growing and mutually beneficial trade relationship with India, with a total value reaching about S60 Billion in 2010, so their relationship has important cooperative dimensions, and is not overwhelmingly zero-sum. Both have worked to tamp down bilateral issues of potential confrontation.

That said, both India and China are pursuing blue-water naval expansion, including aircraft carriers and nuclear-powered submarines. At least in some cases, their longdistance submarines are, or are expected to be, nuclear weapon-equipped. Modern naval development is so costly, however, that the R&D and production schedules on both sides stretch over many years. India has expanded the naval share of its defense budget, but China has more money to spend, and is already exercising its military access to the Arabian Sea with rotating, conventionally-armed naval flotillas (primarily destroyers and frigates, but also some landing-support ships). In the longer term, maritime nuclear escalation ladders for India and China will come into play and should be mapped. They probably will not be exclusively dyadic, however, because many other national navies, including the U.S. Navy, operate in the same waters.

For the time being, Indian and Chinese maritime escalation ladders do not reflect the operational deployment of strategic nuclear platforms within the Indian Ocean and their operational conventional naval assets would not impinge much on their land border confrontations in the Himalayas. Some day this picture is likely to change. But the bilateral escalation ladders that matter operationally between them today have a land warfare focus.

#### No Extinction – 1AC Gettleman never says goes nuclear – at best hundreds of soldiers die

#### Not Reverse causal – Strong Indian economy solves China war but collapse doesn’t cause it

### AT: Environment

#### No tipping point

* 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, globally or even locally. If the planet didn’t collapse after the Permian-Triassic extinction event, it won’t collapse now – though our descendants may well curse us for the damage we’ve done.

Instead, according to the researchers, every loss of species counts. But the damage is gradual and incremental, not a sudden plunge. Ecosystems, according to them, slowly degrade but never fail outright.

“Of more than 600 experiments of biodiversity effects on various functions, none showed a collapse,” Montoya said. “In general, the loss of species has a detrimental effect on ecosystem functions...We progressively lose pollination services, water quality, plant biomass, and many other important functions as we lose species. But we never observe a critical level of biodiversity over which functions collapse.”

#### No water wars

* Most water crises don’t cause conflict
* Often results in collaboration through water sharing agreement development
* Main causation for water wars is weak institutional capacity and political and economic dynamics

Gleick 18 [Peter Gleick, MacArthur “Genius” Fellowship and was elected to the U.S. National Academy of Sciences, world-renowned expert, innovator, and communicator on water and climate issues, cofounded the Pacific Institute, which he led as president until mid-2016, pHd from UC Berkeley, and Charles Iceland, s Director, Global and National Water Initiatives with WRI’s Food, Forests, and Water Programs, “Water, Security, & Conflict”, https://pacinst.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Water-Security-and-Conflict\_Aug-2018-2.pdf]

3.2. The Role of Governance in Water Security

Most water crises do not end in conflict, migration, or acute food insecurity. Instead, people muddle through until the crises recede. Some crises even generate cooperation among local or regional parties. Understanding why water crises lead to adverse outcomes in some places and better outcomes in others will help inform strategies for reducing the risks of conflict. Why, for example, did Syria sink into civil war following a record-breaking five-year drought, while .Iordan and Lebanon avoided strife following that same drought (Adams et al. 2018)? This requires integrating analyses of meteorological and resource-related events with the diverse social, political, and economic dynamics at play.

We can postulate—based on research conducted by Wolf and his colleagues (2003) on transboundary basins— that when rapid change, either on the institutional side or in the physical system, outpaces the institutional capacity to absorb that change, the stage is set for possible water insecurity. Therefore, when we go looking for water insecurity, we need to be on the lookout for large-scale water-related change and low capacity to handle such change (this Is what the Water, Peace, and Security [WPS] consortium is attempting to do via the development of a near realtime global early warning system for potential water-related threats to human security—more on this further on in this brief).

#### No Indo-Pak War – Specific scenarios don’t solve, they will never escalate

* Leaders know risks and deescalate
* US, Soviet Union, China, Britain, France are historical examples of deescalating dyads
* South Asia doesn’t fight large scale wars anymore
* Impact is too large so neither side even considers starting war

Shellenberger 2/21/19 [Michael Shellenberger, Time Magazine “Hero of the Environment,” Green Book Award Winner, and President of Environmental Progress, a research and policy organization. His writings have appeared in The New York Times, Washington Post and Wall Street Journal, Scientific American, Nature Energy, and PLOS Biology. His TED talks have been viewed over 1.5 million times. Stop Letting Your Cartoon Fears Of Nuclear Bombs Kill The Planet. Februrary 21, 2019. https://www.forbes.com/sites/gradsoflife/2019/03/04/to-end-the-ever-growing-skills-gap-employers-must-change-their-outdated-hiring-practices/#7fa29a8f2d16]

But then political leaders in India and Pakistan considered the likely impacts of nuclear war and frightened each other into peace, just as the US, Soviet Union, China, Britain, and France had done before them.

Vox’s Dylan Matthews asked India-Pakistan expert, Sumit Ganguly, a professor of political science at University of Indiana, what the impact of nuclear weapons proliferation on the region was.

“In South Asia,” Ganguly said, “it has, for all practical purposes, done away with the prospect of full scale war. It's just not going to happen. The risks are so great as a consequence of the nuclearization of the subcontinent that neither side can seriously contemplate starting a war.”

### Democracy – War

#### Democratization is even more dangerous than authoritarian backsliding – robust statistical evidence proves it causes war.

Doorenspleet, PhD, ‘19 (Renske, **ProfComparativePtx@UWarwick, PhDPoliSci@LeidenU**, “Rethinking the Value of Democracy: A Comparative Perspective,” p. 94-96, Department of Politics and International Studies, University of Warwick) BW

Is it a good idea to democratize a country in order to give peace more of a change? No, probably not. It is not only a bad idea because of the three caveats as described above, but also because the democratizing itself could be a very dangerous process during which conflicts are more likely. Countries that are in the process of making a transition to democracy are likely to be involved in wars between countries. As Edward Mansfield and Jack Snyder (1995a, b, 2002a, b, 2005) convincingly argued, countries become more aggressive and war-prone in the transitional phase of democratization. Such countries are likely to fight wars with not just dictatorships but also democracies. Democratizing countries are most likely to be involved in an interstate war, even more compared to political systems which are in transition towards dictatorship. The distinction between democratic and democratizing political systems is crucial. Systems can be considered to be democratizing if they change from a less democratic type of system to a democracy during a given period of time. Conversely, systems are autocratizing if they change from democracy to a less democratic type of system (Mansfeld and Snyder 1995a, b).37 Democratic peace scholars tended to work with a crude binary political system variable (so a country is either democratic or not), while this might hide a negative aspect of the process of democratization. However, by taking into account change and transitions and levels of democracy, Mansfeld and Snyder found that democratizing states were more likely to fight wars than were states that had undergone no regime change. Based on the strong empirical evidence for the negative effects of democratization, they recommended to always including the factor of democratization as one of the independent variables in the analyses, as it appears that democratic transitions are actually quite dangerous periods of instability. Transitioning democracies are generally more likely to fight wars than either consolidated dictatorships or consolidated democracies. Some studies did not find a relationship between democratization and conflict (Thompson and Tucker 1997; Oneal and Russett 1997), and some studies (Braumoeller 2004) showed that the link between democratization and war only holds for those democratizing countries where the executive lacks sufficient power, independence and institutional strength. At the same time, many studies found evidence that transition processes can be very dangerous (Ward and Gleditsch 1998; Gleditsch and Ward 2000; Mansfeld and Snyder 1995a, b, 2002a, b, 2005). Some excellent studies have distinguished between political systems which went through a complete process of autocratization (a full change, all the way to a dictatorial system) or democratization (all the way to a democratic system, regardless of starting point) on the one hand, and an incomplete change on the other hand (e.g. a change into a hybrid political system). Based on such distinctions, it can be concluded that the only change that has an effect is incomplete democratization: such a change is very risky and dangerous. Complete democratization has generally peaceful effects, although this effect is not significant (see, e.g., Mansfeld and Snyder 2002a, b, 2005).38 Rocky or especially rapid transitions or reversals increase the risk of being involved in warfare (Ward and Gleditsch 1998), and large swings back and forth between democracy and dictatorship can increase war proneness as well (Gleditsch and Ward 2000). Moreover, a regional context plagued by conflict greatly magnifies the risk of war (Gleditsch and Ward 2000) while the regional context of undemocratic neighbouring countries also increases the risk of war in democratizing countries (see Ray 2003). Not only democratizing a country can be risky, but there is also evidence that semi-democracies are inherently unstable (Baliga et al. 2011; Knutsen and Nygard 2015). For the period 1816–2000, the study by Sandeep Baliga et al. (2011) found that semi-democracies (or ‘hybrid systems’) are more aggressive than other types of political systems, including dictatorships; this is the case in general, so not only during periods when the political system is changing. Hybrid systems are particularly unstable political systems, and there is robust statistical evidence that hybrid systems are inherently less durable than both democracies and dictatorships (Knutsen and Nygard 2015). The General Lesson from the Results in a Nutshell (Caveat 4) Transition processes can be risky and lead to war, particularly when the changes are rapid or large. Some studies did not find a relationship between democratization and conflict, but most studies did, so it is not to be recommended to democratize a country in order to prevent war and to give the people a more peaceful life; to the contrary, a growing number of statistical studies show that transitions (both towards democracy and towards dictatorship) can easily lead to conflict and war (Table 3.4).

#### Democratization doesn’t lead to peace.

Stephen M. **Walt, 17** – Professor at Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government (June 2, 2017, Retrieved Apr. 14, 2019, from <https://bigthink.com/design-for-good/why-promoting-human-rights-may-not-be-the-way-to-a-better-world>) Justin

I think liberal democracy is the best form of government to live under, but it’s not a particularly good way to promote peace. First of all, democracies start as many wars as non-democracies do. Think of the United States, for example, where we have not been bashful about using military force and sometimes initiating conflicts, even when we weren’t attacked. So, spreading democracy doesn’t necessarily guarantee peace. Finally, once democracies get into a big war, like World War I and World War II, they kill just as many people, including just as many civilians as non-democracies do. If the way you are spreading democracy is through military force, you have something of a contradiction there. There are better ways to promote peace than trying to aggressively create democracies.

### Democracy – Warming

#### Democracy will catastrophically delay action on climate change---authoritarianism is necessary to ensure rapid state-led transformation

Mann & Wainwright ’18 (Geoff, teaches political economy and economic geography at Simon Fraser University, where he directs the Centre for Global Political Economy, Joel *Climate Leviathan: A Political Theory of Our Planetary Future*, pp. 38-40, ME)

Relative to the institutional means currently available to capitalist liberal democracy and its sorry attempts at “consensus,” this trajectory has some distinct advantages with respect to atmospheric carbon concentration, notably in terms of the capacity to coordinate massive political-economic reconfiguration quickly and comprehensively. In light of our earlier question—how can we possibly realize the necessary emissions reductions?—it is this feature of Climate Mao that most recommends it. As the climate justice movement struggles to be heard, most campaigns in the global North are premised on an unspoken faith in a lop-sided, elite-biased, liberal proceduralism doomed to failure given the scale and scope of the changes required. If climate science is even half-right in its forecasts, the liberal model of democracy is at best too slow, at worst a devastating distraction. Climate Mao reflects the demand for rapid, revolutionary, state-led transformation today. Indeed, calls for variations on just such a regime abound on the Left. Mike Davis and Giovanni Arrighi have more or less sided with Climate Mao, sketching it as an alternative to capitalist Climate Leviathan.35 We might even interpret the renewal of enthusiasm for Maoist theory (including Alain Badiou’s version) as part of the prevailing crisis of ecological-political imagination.36 Minqi Li’s is arguably the best developed of this line of thought, and like Arrighi he locates the fulcrum of global climate history in China, arguing that Climate Mao offers the only way forward: [U]nless China takes serious and meaningful actions to fulfill its obligation of emissions reduction, there is little hope that global climate stabilization can be achieved. However, it is very unlikely that the [present] Chinese government will voluntarily take the necessary actions to reduce emissions. The sharp fall of economic growth that would be required is something that the Chinese government will not accept and cannot afford politically. Does this mean that humanity is doomed? That depends on the political struggle within China and in the world as a whole.37 Taking inspiration from Mao, Li says a new revolution in the Chinese revolution—a re-energization of the Maoist political tradition—could transform China and save humanity from doom. He does not claim this is likely; one need only consider China’s massive highway expansions, accelerated automobile consumption, and subsidized urban sprawl.38 But he is right that if an anticapitalist, planetary sovereign is to emerge that could change the world’s climate trajectory, it is most likely to emerge in China.