### 1NC – FW

#### The aff should be topical.

#### Resolved means to establish a policy by law

Words & Phrases 64. [Words and Phrases; 1964; Permanent Edition]

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolutionor vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

#### A Just Government is confined to legal boundaries

Merriam Webster [Merriam Webster, No Date. “Just” [https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/just Accessed 10/24](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/just%20Accessed%2010/24) //gord0]

Definitions of Just 1a **:** having a basis in or conforming to fact or reason **:** [reasonable](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reasonable) had just reason to believe he was in danger b **:** conforming to a standard of correctness **:** [proper](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/proper) just proportions c archaic **:** faithful to an original 2a (1) **:** acting or being in conformity with what is morally upright or good **:** [righteous](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/righteous) a just war (2) **:** being what is merited **:** [deserved](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/deserved) a just punishment b **:** legally correct **:** [lawful](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/lawful) just title to an estate

#### Violation – they don’t defend a policy by law.

#### There are 2 impacts –

#### First is fairness — absent adherence to the agent and mechanism of the resolution, debate becomes unmanageable — all 2AC defense will depend on concessionary ground which isn’t a stable basis for a year of debates. Fairness is an intrinsic good and independent impact — they would be mad if we won and didn’t give a 2NR and debate as a competitive activity requires it to function. – every time they say that fairness isn’t an impact, remember that they rely on you to judge this round fairly.

#### Second is clash — absent a resolutional stasis point, teams have a competitive incentive to defend truisms and no link every 1NC argument. Clash is an intrinsic good — it’s key to research and truth-testing — it results in nuanced discussions about the best reasons protection of water resources would be good or bad and avoids one-sided monologues. Ideological reflexivity and deep argumentation are unique to adversarial nature of debate.

#### Turns the aff /education– the only reason it is necessary to read their advocacy in debate is so that there is RIGOROUS DISCUSSION AND DELIBERATION about their advocacy – without a PREPARED OPPONENT – the aff turns that discussion into a monologue which destroys aff solvency

#### Debates without clash create a tribal epistemology – where each group becomes further radicalized and just choose to refuse the truth. That turns case – it’s the same method that allowed Trump and his alt-right group to rise.

Roberts 17 [David Roberts, writer on energy and climate change for Vox. America is facing an epistemic crisis, Vox, 11-2-2017, Accessible Online at https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2017/11/2/16588964/america-epistemic-crisis] SW 12-5-2017

Over at the Gothamist, Jake Offenhartz has an astounding and richly symbolic story about the latest bit of “fake news” burped up by the alt-right. At Columbia University on Monday, alt-right self-promoter Mike Cernovich gave a speech to College Republicans. Other students showed up to protest. And then some alt-right members in attendance, posing as protesters, unfurled this banner: [image in original] The banner has a NAMBLA (North American Man/Boy Love Association) logo on it, making it look like the protesters are defending pedophilia. Ha ha. Cernovich grabbed the image off Twitter, stripped it of context, and sent it bouncing around the right-o-sphere. When Offenhartz reported the copyright violation, Twitter removed the photo from Cernovich’s account. That led the alt-right to cry censorship, which led to more publicity for the photo, which led, in the end, to thousands, possibly tens of thousands, of conservatives believing that students of Columbia University were openly marching in favor of pedophilia. Basically, the alt-right tricked itself into believing even more stupid, wrong things. Burn, I guess? Crazy conservative fairy tales have become numbingly common The sheer absurdity of the tale is familiar these days, reminiscent of “Pizzagate,” the bonkers story about Democrats running a child prostitution ring out of a DC pizza joint. Even after it went viral on Reddit and some jacked-up angry white guy showed up at Comet Pizza with a gun, it still had the scent of parody. It is quite simply impossible for most people to imagine believing all the things that would be required to also believe that DC Democrats are into organized child trafficking. It is similarly difficult for most people to imagine believing that Hillary Clinton has had multiple people killed, that Obama is a secret Muslim who wasn’t born in the US, that Trump had millions of votes stolen, that Barack Obama wiretapped Trump’s White House, that Seth Rich (the mid-level Democratic staffer who was tragically murdered) was assassinated for stealing DNC emails and giving them to WikiLeaks, or that Antifa, the fringe anti-fascist movement, will begin going door-to-door, killing white people, starting on November 4. And yet millions of Americans fervently believe these things. Different polls find different things, and it’s always difficult to distinguish what people really believe from what they say on surveys. But if 30 percent of America’s 200 million registered voters are Republicans, and 40 percent of those don’t believe Obama was born in the US, well, that’s 24 million people, among them the most active participants in Republican politics. [figure in orginal] In short, an increasingly large chunk of Americans believes a whole bunch of crazy things, and it is warping our politics. This basic story has been told plenty of times (my longer version is here), but the reason we should not let it out of our sights right now is the Mueller investigation. As Ezra Klein laid out, there is enough on the record now to make it at the very least highly probable that there was collusion between the Trump campaign and Russia, meant to affect the outcome of the election. Er, despite what Trump says. Donald J. Trump✔@realDonaldTrump ....Also, there is NO COLLUSION! 6:28 AM - Oct 30, 2017 90,786 90,786 Replies 23,298 23,298 Retweets 93,528 93,528 likes We don’t know yet if Mueller has the goods — documentary or testimonial proof of explicit collusion — or if he can get them, so we have no idea how this is ultimately going to play out. But we are disturbingly close to the following scenario: Say Mueller reveals hard proof that the Trump campaign knowingly colluded with Russia, strategically using leaked emails to hurt Clinton’s campaign. Say the president — backed by the Wall Street Journal editorial page, Fox News, Breitbart, most of the US Cabinet, half the panelists on CNN, most of the radio talk show hosts in the country, and an enormous network of Russian-paid hackers and volunteer shitposters working through social media — rejects the evidence. They might say Mueller is compromised. It’s a Hillary/Deep State plot. There’s nothing wrong with colluding with Russia in this particular way. Dems did it first. All of the above. Whatever. Say the entire right-wing media machine kicks to life and dismisses the whole thing as a scam — and conservatives believe them. The conservative base remains committed to Trump, politicians remain scared to cross the base, and US politics remains stuck in partisan paralysis, unable to act on what Mueller discovers. In short, what if Mueller proves the case and it’s not enough? What if there is no longer any evidentiary standard that could overcome the influence of right-wing media? The US is undergoing an epistemic breach Epistemology is the branch of philosophy having to do with how we know things and what it means for something to be true or false, accurate or inaccurate. (Episteme, or ἐπιστήμη, is ancient Greek for knowledge/science/understanding.) The US is experiencing a deep epistemic breach, a split not just in what we value or want, but in who we trust, how we come to know things, and what we believe we know — what we believe exists, is true, has happened and is happening. The primary source of this breach, to make a long story short, is the US conservative movement’s rejection of the mainstream institutions devoted to gathering and disseminating knowledge (journalism, science, the academy) — the ones society has appointed as referees in matters of factual dispute. In their place, the right has created its own parallel set of institutions, most notably its own media ecosystem. But the right’s institutions are not of the same kind as the ones they seek to displace. Mainstream scientists and journalists see themselves as beholden to values and standards that transcend party or faction. They try to separate truth from tribal interests and have developed various guild rules and procedures to help do that. They see themselves as neutral arbiters, even if they do not always uphold that ideal in practice. The pretense for the conservative revolution was that mainstream institutions had failed in their role as neutral arbiters — that they had been taken over by the left, become agents of the left in referee’s clothing, as it were. But the right did not want better neutral arbiters. The institutions it built scarcely made any pretense of transcending faction; they are of and for the right. There is nominal separation of conservative media from conservative politicians, think tanks, and lobbyists, but in practice, they are all part of the conservative movement. They are prosecuting its interests; that is the ur-goal. Indeed, the far right rejects the very idea of neutral, binding arbiters; there is only Us and Them, only a zero-sum contest for resources. That mindset leads to what I call “tribal epistemology” — the systematic conflation of what is true with what is good for the tribe. There’s always been a conspiratorial and xenophobic fringe on the right, but it was (fitfully) held in place by gatekeepers through the early decades of America’s post-war prosperity. The explosion of right-wing media in the 1990s and 2000s swept those gatekeepers away, giving the loudest voice, the most exposure, and the most power to the most extreme elements on the right. The right-wing media ecosystem became a bubble from which fewer and fewer inhabitants ever ventured. As the massive post-election study of online media from Harvard (which got far too little attention) showed, media is not symmetrical any more than broader polarization is. “Prominent media on the left are well distributed across the center, center-left, and left,” the researchers found. “On the right, prominent media are highly partisan.” When mapping out sources of online news, researchers found that the two basic poles were the center-left and the far-right. The center of gravity of the overall landscape is the center-left. Partisan media sources on the left are integrated into this landscape and are of lesser importance than the major media outlets of the center-left. The center of attention and influence for conservative media is on the far right. The center-right is of minor importance and is the least represented portion of the media spectrum. In short, they conclude, “conservative media is more partisan and more insular than the left.” That insular partisan far-right media is also full of nonsense like Pizzagate that leaves the base continuously pumped up — outraged, infuriated, terrified, and misled. At this point, as the stories above show, the conservative base will believe anything. And they are pissed about all of it. As Brian Beutler wrote in a scathing piece recently, the mainstream media has never learned to deal with the right-wing bubble — it has not learned how not to take bad-faith lies seriously. And now we will all reap the consequences. The incentives facing GOP politicians are not good For Mueller’s findings to have any effect, they will have to break some part of the basic dynamic on the right. Here’s how it works: Pundits and yellers in right-wing media compete to freak out the base and reinforce its allegiance to Donald Trump. The base leans on politicians. And most elected GOP officials are in seats safe enough that they fear a primary challenge from the base more than a Democratic challenger. The only way to stave off a primary is to pay obeisance. That’s why Jeff Flake and Bob Corker are leaving the Senate. They no longer have any control over what their constituents believe or want, and their constituents believe and want increasingly ugly things. Sen. John McCain is saying all the right things now, but back when he faced his own Tea Party challenger, he sprinted right as fast as he could. GOP politicians cannot (or feel that they cannot) cross the base. And the base is currently being lied to about the Mueller investigation at a furious pace. The entire right-wing machine has kicked into high gear, led by the president himself, furiously throwing out chaff about Comey, Mueller, Obama, Hillary, the dossier, the uranium, the emails, and whatever else. Donald J. Trump✔ @realDonaldTrump Report out that Obama Campaign paid $972,000 to Fusion GPS. The firm also got $12,400,000 (really?) from DNC. Nobody knows who OK'd! 3:37 AM - Oct 30, 2017 42,535 42,535 Replies 34,930 34,930 Retweets 110,515 110,515 likes On Monday, Fox News practically had a blackout of the Mueller news. Instead it covered fake Clinton scandals and cheeseburger emojis. Mike Birbiglia✔ @birbigs Manafort was indicted. I think he's the cheeseburger on the left. 7:58 AM - Oct 31, 2017 19 19 Replies 170 170 Retweets 1,264 1,264 likes It was such an embarrassing performance that multiple people on the news side leaked their disappointment to reporter Oliver Darcy. Oliver Darcy✔ @oliverdarcy I spoke to Fox News employees who told me their network's coverage of yesterday's Russia news was "an embarrassment" http://money.cnn.com/2017/10/31/media/fox-news-employees-russia-mueller-coverage/index.html … 9:23 AM - Oct 31, 2017 In contrast with CNN and MSNBC, which aired non-stop rolling coverage throughout the day, Fox News found plenty of time to cover other topics, like the NFL protests, North Korea, and tax reform. As always, the goal of this media/political offensive (there is no longer much distinction) is less to present some coherent alternative account of the facts than to fill the atmosphere with fog, to give those on the right enough cover to slough off the charges as yet another liberal plot. (See Vox’s Sean Illing’s great interview with Charlie Sykes, the conservative talk-radio host who criticized Trump and was excommunicated, for more on how this happens.) This reaction to Mueller in right-wing media was predictable enough. Similar things have happened so many times before, and been studied, analyzed, and documented. But to this day, no one knows how to stop or counter it. Mainstream institutions seem as unable as ever to resist its warping effects. It’s all playing out like some morbid script that we can only watch, stupefied. Jay Rosen✔ @jayrosen\_nyu This is what a lot of us have been warning about. I sit and watch it unfold— in helplessness and dread. It's all true. Recommended thread. https://twitter.com/drvox/status/924848605457825792 … 9:56 AM - Oct 30, 2017 24 24 Replies 236 236 Retweets 413 413 likes As familiar as this dynamic is, however, this episode is different. We are drifting perilously close to a serious constitutional crisis. What if we find out Trump is guilty and just can’t do anything about it? As long as the base is convinced that Mueller is an agent of the deep state (or whatever), it will punish any Republican politician that strays from the pack and criticizes Trump. For a GOP officeholder, standing up for democratic integrity could mean sacrificing reelection in 2018 or 2020. As long as Republican politicians are frightened by the base, the base is frightened by scary conspiracies in right-wing media, and right-wing media makes more money the more frightened everyone is, Trump appears to be safe. As long as the incentives are aligned in that direction, there will be no substantial movement to censure, restrain, or remove him from office. What happens if nothing happens? Mainstream scholars do not think that Trump will be able to get away with simply ignoring Mueller’s findings or pardoning everyone involved. As Andy Wright, a law professor at Savannah Law School, put it, “with each abnormal, unbecoming, or dishonorable act, President Trump makes it harder for his appointees to defend him, harder for traditional Republicans to maintain their uneasy power alliance with him, and easier for Democrats to take the moral high ground and secure political advantage." But if there’s one thing non-experts like me have learned over the last few decades of watching US politics, it’s that experts are frequently caught flat-footed by the growing intensity of partisanship and the destruction of norms it has wrought. They are operating based on certain assumptions that it simply doesn’t occur to them that a politician can ignore. But politicians can. Mitch McConnell can simply refuse to hold a vote on a Supreme Court nominee. There’s no explicit rule or law that says he can’t, so he can, and he did. That one shocked and flabbergasted experts too, but just like all the other perverse steps down this road to illiberal lawlessness, they eventually took it on board and normalized it. Now they’re sure Donald Trump can’t simply brazen his way out of an indictment. What if they’re wrong about that? Say he pardons everyone. People will argue on cable TV about whether he should have. One side will say up, the other will say down. Trump may have done this, but what about when Obama did that? What about Hillary’s emails? Whatabout this, whatabout that, whatabout whatabout whatabout? There is no longer any settling such arguments. The only way to settle any argument is for both sides to be committed, at least to some degree, to shared standards of evidence and accuracy, and to place a measure of shared trust in institutions meant to vouchsafe evidence and accuracy. Without that basic agreement, without common arbiters, there can be no end to dispute. If one side rejects the epistemic authority of society’s core institutions and practices, there’s just nothing left to be done. Truth cannot speak for itself, like the voice of God from above. It can only speak through human institutions and practices. The subject of climate change offers a crystalline example here. If climate science does its thing, checks and rechecks its work, and then the Republican Party simply refuses to accept it ... what then? That’s what US elites are truly afraid to confront: What if facts and persuasion just don’t matter anymore? As long as conservatives can do something — steal an election, gerrymander crazy districts to maximize GOP advantage, use the filibuster as a routine tool of opposition, launch congressional investigations as political attacks, hold the debt ceiling hostage, repress voting among minorities, withhold a confirmation vote on a Supreme Court nominee, defend a known fraud and sexual predator who has likely colluded with a foreign government to gain the presidency — they will do it, knowing they’ll be backed by a relentlessly on-message media apparatus. And if that’s true, if the very preconditions of science and journalism as commonly understood have been eroded, then all that’s left is a raw contest of power.

### 1NC - T

#### Our interpretation is that a Just Government is confined to legal boundaries

Merriam Webster [Merriam Webster, No Date. “Just” [https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/just Accessed 10/24](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/just%20Accessed%2010/24) //gord0]

Definitions of Just 1a **:** having a basis in or conforming to fact or reason **:** [reasonable](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reasonable) had just reason to believe he was in danger b **:** conforming to a standard of correctness **:** [proper](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/proper) just proportions c archaic **:** faithful to an original 2a (1) **:** acting or being in conformity with what is morally upright or good **:** [righteous](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/righteous) a just war (2) **:** being what is merited **:** [deserved](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/deserved) a just punishment b **:** legally correct **:** [lawful](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/lawful) just title to an estate

#### The US violates – they are extra topical.

Patterson 16 [Margot Patterson is a writer who lives in Kansas City, Mo. October 12, 2016. “How the U.S. violates international law in plain sight” [https://www.americamagazine.org/politics-society/2016/10/12/how-us-violates-international-law-plain-sight Accessed 10/24](https://www.americamagazine.org/politics-society/2016/10/12/how-us-violates-international-law-plain-sight%20Accessed%2010/24) //gord0]

Americans used to be big supporters of international law. It was President Woodrow Wilson who proposed the League of Nations after World War I. Politics kept the United States from joining, but after World War II the United States played a leading role in creating the United Nations as well as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and a host of other international organizations. Because of  new international trade and investment agreements, intellectual property accords and treaties on the environment, international law has grown; yet when it comes to waging war, a cornerstone principle, more and more the United States acts as if international law applies to other countries but not to itself.

The law of war prohibits force unless force has been approved by the U.N. Security Council or unless a country has been attacked and is acting in self-defense. Even under those conditions, force is regarded as a last resort, permissible only if it is likely to be successful.

Diminishing respect for international law can be linked to the rise of the United States as a military power after World War II, to the domination of U.S. foreign policy by realists who emphasize U.S. military might and our willingness to use it, and even to the civil rights and feminist movements of the 1960s. As interest in the Constitution was renewed, Americans turned inward and perceived the struggle for justice almost exclusively through their own legal system.

According to Mary Ellen O’Connell, a professor of international law at the University of Notre Dame, there has been a decline in the knowledge of international law at every level of our society, from our highest government officials to the person on the street. Along with that some key misconceptions have taken hold—among them that international law is ineffective and unenforceable. Such views are “factually incorrect,” said O’Connell, author of the book *The Power and Purpose of International. Law.*

#### Vote neg – their interpretation crushes negative ground premised on stable generics which don’t exist when you switch governments – the inflation DA is a good generic but can’t apply to all affirmatives since each nation’s economy is distinct.

#### Paradigm issues:

#### 1] Use competing interps – Reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention bc we don’t know ur bs meter

#### 2] No RVI’s – they are illogical because you shouldn’t win for meeting the burden of being fair and encourage baiting that allows the 1ar to collapse to the RVI.

#### 3] Drop the Debater on Topicality – they should be tied to their advocacy and being T is an aff burden.

New affs are a voting issue

1. Hypo-Testing – a new aff forces us to rely on generics instead of developing sound strategies with which to engage the aff – this is intrinsically valuable as it improves clash and depth of argumentation in debates – it also improves breadth of good arguments and good argumentation will improve when subjected to peer review – our form of education comparatively solves this better than the neg’s interp– equitable ground ensures that teams engage each other which provides a good starting point for education - the only kind of education endemic to debate is crushed by the “element of surprise” – other forms of education can be accessed by a quick search on the internet – if we don’t have effective clash, then debate literally doesn’t matter.
2. New Above Good – the educational praxis that the aff endorses is one that destroys the educational value of debate – the debate leaves the room which means that if you don’t reject new affs in this instance – the knowledge production of the round shows that it’s ok to prioritize always breaking a new aff to put the neg on the backfoot is a good idea which kills neg flex because it undermines the prep advantage that disclosure gives.

Our counter interpretation solves all of your offense – you still get to read your new stuff – you just have to post it on the wiki before your debate which allows for prep.

Potential abuse – they are new to LD – Use your ballot show them they have to follow good practices if they want to win debates. Sets a precedent for future rounds and other teams.

### 1NC – CP

#### A Just Government should recognize an unconditional right of workers, except for teachers, to strike.

#### Teacher strikes specifically gut community bonds in Education

Finne 15 [Liv Finne is the education director at Washington Policy Center, an independent policy-research organization. September 1, 2015. “Teacher Strikes Hurt Students and Divide the Community” <https://www.seattletimes.com/opinion/teachers-please-dont-strike-again/> Accessed 10/19 //gord0]

Families across our state are getting kids ready to go back to school. Yet too many families have to prepare for a different ritual — when a teacher strike hits their local school.

Teacher strikes close schools in Washington with depressing regularity. Reporting by the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that a child in Washington is at proportionately greater risk of missing school due to a union walkout here than in any other state.

A number of teacher strikes are looming now, on top of those called by union executives in just the last few years. Union executives in Seattle say they want to call a strike to get a 21 percent pay raise over three years. In Pasco, union leaders say they plan to close schools unless they receive a 9 percent pay increase. In April and May, union leaders around the state called rolling one-day strikes across the state, affecting 65 districts and closing the schools of 573,000 children, affecting more than half of all Washington students.

In recent years, union strikes in Tacoma temporarily closed schools to 30,000 students, closed schools in Bellingham to 10,000 students, closed schools in Kent to 26,000 students, and in Bellevue closed schools to 16,000 students.

As union executives call for new strikes to close schools, it is helpful to know how much teachers make now. On average, public-school teachers in Washington receive just over $83,000 in pay and benefits for a 10-month work year. This amount is scheduled to increase. This year, the Legislature increased school spending by 19 percent. It also provided full funding for two teacher pay raises over the next two years — a 3 percent cost-of-living raise to K-12 employees over the next two years, plus an additional temporary 1.8 percent increase that expires in 2017.

By comparison, the average worker pay with benefits in our state is about $68,300 for a 12-month work year. Most working families do not know whether they will receive a raise this year, let alone what they might receive over two years.

The relatively high level of average teacher pay is good news, both for the public and for children. Most teachers work hard and should be well paid. The work they do is essential to building bright futures for Washington’s children.

This is why strikes are so hurtful to communities, families and children. People work hard to pay their taxes and support local schools. When union executives continually ask for more and seek leverage in contract talks by shutting kids out of school, it weakens the bonds of community that should draw people together

Strikes divide parents from teachers, and teachers from administrators. Strikes damage the social fabric of school communities, especially when families are returning to school with high hopes for a successful year of learning.

The community is already working to boost teacher pay, even as many teachers make more than the average family income in their area.

The public money is already there. Union executives do not need to disrupt the lives of thousands of students and their families to get teacher pay increases.

Not all children are at risk of school closures. The education of students at religious and other private schools, students at public charter schools, and children who are home-schooled or take online courses are protected from the politics and controversy of union strikes. Strikes are illegal under state law, so in theory all children are protected — now parents, teachers and school board members need to work collaboratively to make this true in practice as well.

#### Quality of education is key for innovation to stop climate change

Kwauk et al 3/26’ [Christina Kwauk and Rebecca Winthrop, 3-26-2021, "Unleashing the creativity of teachers and students to combat climate change: An opportunity for global leadership," Brookings, <https://www.brookings.edu/research/unleashing-the-creativity-of-teachers-and-students-to-combat-climate-change-an-opportunity-for-global-leadership/>]

**Recent research shows** that if only 16 percent of high school students in high- and middle-income countries were to receive climate change education, we could see a nearly 19 gigaton reduction of carbon dioxide by 2050.When education helps students develop a strong personal connection to climate solutions, as well as a sense of personal agency and empowerment, it can have consequential impact on students’ daily behaviors and decisionmaking that reduces their overall lifetime carbon footprint. **Imagine if 100 percent of students in the world received such an education.** New evidence also shows that the combination of women’s empowerment and education that includes everyone—especially the 132 million out-of-school girls across the developing world—could result in an 85 gigaton reduction of carbon dioxide by 2050. By these estimates, leveraging the power of education is potentially more powerful than solely increasing investments in onshore wind turbines (47 gigaton reduction) or concentrated solar power (19 gigaton reduction) alone. **When we say that all climate solutions are needed to draw down greenhouse gases, we must also mean education solutions, too. When we say that all climate solutions are needed to draw down greenhouse gases,** we must also mean education solutions, too. But beyond education’s potential impact on reducing carbon emissions, education—especially for girls—can save lives in the context of natural disasters exacerbated by climate change by reducing climate risk vulnerability. In a study of 125 countries, researchers found that the death toll caused by floods, droughts, wildfires, extreme temperature events, and extreme weather events could be 60 percent lower by 2050 if 70 percent of women were able to achieve a lower-secondary-school education. **Imagine if 100 percent of women were to achieve a full 12 years of education.** An equally important outcome of education is its potential to increase young people’s capacity to adapt to the harsh impacts of climate change by building important knowledge and a breadth of “green skills.” **For example, young people need both a strong knowledge base around the causes of a warming climate but also a strong set of skills that will allow them to apply their knowledge in the real world, including problem-solving, critical thinking, teamwork, coping with uncertainty, empathy, and negotiation. Indeed these very “transferable skills” are needed equally to thrive in the world of work and to be constructive citizens. Today it is those communities that have historically contributed the least to present-day carbon emissions—such as minority and indigenous communities in the U.S. and many low- and middle-income countries and small island developing states✎ EditSign—that are often the most vulnerable to its risks and impacts. In the U.S. for example, 6,000 schools are located in flood zones and 1 million children had their learning disrupted during California’s 2018-2019 wildfire season, hitting students in low-income communities the hardest. Across the globe, schools and entire communities in the poorest countries in the world are regularly upended due to severe floods and hurricanes, all expected to worsen in intensity and frequency due to climate change. For example, in 2013 Super Typhoon Haiyan✎ EditSign killed more than 6,000 people in the Philippines, damaged or destroyed more than 3,200 schools and day care centers, disrupted the education of more than a million children, and placed 49,000 young girls and women✎ EditSign at risk of sex trafficking due to their displacement in crowded and unsafe shelters**. For these communities, climate change is an unchecked threat multiplier. Combating climate change is a move toward climate justice and gender justice. And education has a role to play. High quality climate-change education can also help empower girls and youth to become powerful change agents for sustainability in their communities, charting new paths forward for what life can and should be like.

#### Extinction – tipping points, sea level rise, adaptability limit

Ng ’19 [Yew-Kwang; May 2019; Professor of Economics at Nanyang Technology University, Fellow of the Academy of Social Sciences in Australia and Member of the Advisory Board at the Global Priorities Institute at Oxford University, Ph.D. in Economics from Sydney University; Global Policy, “Keynote: Global Extinction and Animal Welfare: Two Priorities for Effective Altruism,” vol. 10, no. 2, p. 258-266]

Catastrophic climate change

Though by no means certain, CCC causing global extinction is possible due to interrelated factors of non‐linearity, cascading effects, positive feedbacks, multiplicative factors, critical thresholds and tipping points (e.g. Barnosky and Hadly, [2016](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0005); Belaia et al., [2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0008); Buldyrev et al., [2010](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0016); Grainger, [2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0027); Hansen and Sato, [2012](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0029); IPCC [2014](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0031); Kareiva and Carranza, [2018](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0033); Osmond and Klausmeier, [2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0056); Rothman, [2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0066); Schuur et al., [2015](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0069); Sims and Finnoff, [2016](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0072); Van Aalst, [2006](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0079)).[7](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-note-1009_67)

A possibly imminent tipping point could be in the form of ‘an abrupt ice sheet collapse [that] could cause a rapid sea level rise’ (Baum et al., [2011](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0006), p. 399). There are many avenues for positive feedback in global warming, including:

* the replacement of an ice sea by a liquid ocean surface from melting reduces the reflection and increases the absorption of sunlight, leading to faster warming;
* the drying of forests from warming increases forest fires and the release of more carbon; and
* higher ocean temperatures may lead to the release of methane trapped under the ocean floor, producing runaway global warming.

Though there are also avenues for negative feedback, the scientific consensus is for an overall net positive feedback (Roe and Baker, [2007](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0065)). Thus, the Global Challenges Foundation ([2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0026), p. 25) concludes, ‘The world is currently completely unprepared to envisage, and even less deal with, the consequences of CCC’.

The threat of sea‐level rising from global warming is well known, but there are also other likely and more imminent threats to the survivability of mankind and other living things. For example, Sherwood and Huber ([2010](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0071)) emphasize the adaptability limit to climate change due to heat stress from high environmental wet‐bulb temperature. They show that ‘even modest global warming could … expose large fractions of the [world] population to unprecedented heat stress’ p. 9552 and that with substantial global warming, ‘the area of land rendered uninhabitable by heat stress would dwarf that affected by rising sea level’ p. 9555, making extinction much more likely and the relatively moderate damages estimated by most integrated assessment models unreliably low.

While imminent extinction is very unlikely and may not come for a long time even under business as usual, the main point is that we cannot rule it out. Annan and Hargreaves ([2011](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0004), pp. 434–435) may be right that there is ‘an upper 95 per cent probability limit for S [temperature increase] … to lie close to 4°C, and certainly well below 6°C’. However, probabilities of 5 per cent, 0.5 per cent, 0.05 per cent or even 0.005 per cent of excessive warming and the resulting extinction probabilities cannot be ruled out and are unacceptable. Even if there is only a 1 per cent probability that there is a time bomb in the airplane, you probably want to change your flight. Extinction of the whole world is more important to avoid by literally a trillion times.

### 1NC - CP

#### Just governments should request the International Court of Justice issue an advisory opinion over whether they ought to establish an unconditional right to strike. Just governments should abide by the outcome of the advisory opinion.

#### Solves – the ICJ will rule in favor of an unconditional right to strike.

Seifert ’18 (Achim; Professor of Law at the University of Jena, and adjunct professor at the University of Luxembourg; December 2018; “The protection of the right to strike in the ILO: some introductory remarks”; CIELO Laboral; http://www.cielolaboral.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/seifert\_noticias\_cielo\_n11\_2018.pdf; Accessed: 11-3-2021; AU)

The **recognition of a right to strike** in the legal order of the **International Labour Organization** (ILO) is probably one of the most controversial questions in international labor law. Since the foundation of the ILO in the aftermath of World War I, the recognition of the right to strike as a **core element** of the principle of freedom of association has been discussed in the International Labour Conference (ILC) as well as in the Governing Body and the International Labour Office. As is well known, the ILO, in its long history spanning almost one century, has not explicitly recognized a right to strike: neither Article 427 of the Peace Treaty of Versailles (1919), the Constitution of the ILO, including the Declaration of Philadelphia (1944), nor the Conventions and Recommendations in the field of freedom of association - namely Convention No. 87 on Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise (1948) - have explicitly enshrined this right. However, the Committee on Freedom of Association (CFA), established in 1951 by the Governing Body, recognized in 1952 that Convention No. 87 guarantees also the **right to strike** as an **essential element of trade** union rights enabling workers to collectively defend their economic and social interests1. It is worthwhile to note that it was a complaint of the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU), at that time the Communist Union Federation on international level and front organization of the Soviet Union2, against the United Kingdom for having dissolved a strike in Jamaica by a police operation; since that time the controversy on the right to strike in the legal order of the ILO was also embedded in the wider context of the Cold War. In the complaint procedure initiated by the WFTU, the CFA **recognized** a **right to strike** under Convention No. 87 but considered that the police operation in question was lawful. In the more than six following decades, the CFA has elaborated a **very detailed case law** on the right to strike dealing with many concrete questions of this right and its limits (e.g. in essential services) and manifesting an even more complex structure than the national rules on industrial action in many a Member State. This case law of the CFA has been compiled in the “Digest of Decisions and Principles of the Freedom of Association Committee of the Governing Body of the ILO”3. In 1959, i.e. seven years after case No. 28 of the CFA, the Committee of Experts for the Application of Conventions and Recommendations (CEACR) also recognized the right to strike as **a core element of freedom** of association under Article 3 of Convention No. 874. Since then, the CEACR has **reconfirmed** its view on many occasions. Both CFA and CEACR coordinate their interpretation of Article 3 of Convention No. 875. Hence there is one single corpus of rules on the right to strike developed by both supervisory Committees of the Governing Body. Moreover, the ILC also has made clear in various Resolutions adopted since the 1950s that it considers the **right to strike** as an **essential element of freedom of association6**. On the whole, the recognition of the right to strike resulted therefore from the interpretative work of CFA and CEACR as well as of the understanding of the principle of freedom of association the ILC has expressed on various occasions. It should not be underestimated the wider political context of the Cold War had in this constant recognition of a right to strike under ILO Law. Although the very first recognition of the right to strike -as mentioned above- went back to a complaint procedure before the CFA, initiated by the Communist dominated WFTU, it was the Western world that particularly emphasized on the right to strike in order to blame the Communist Regimes of the Warsaw Pact that did not explicitly recognize a right to strike in their national law or, if they legally recognized it, made its exercise factually impossible; to this end, unions, employers’ associations but also Governments of the Western World built up an alliance in the bodies of the ILO7. In accomplishing their functions, CFA and CEACR necessarily have to interpret the Conventions and Recommendations of the ILO whose application in the Member States they shall control. In so doing, they need to concretize the principle of freedom of association that is only in general terms guaranteed by the ILO Conventions and Recommendations on freedom of association. But as supervisory bodies, which the Governing Body has established and which are not foreseen in the ILO Constitution, both probably do not have the power to interpret ILO law with binding effect8. This is also the opinion that the CEACR expresses itself in its yearly reports to the ILC when explaining that, “its opinions and recommendations are non-binding”9. As a matter of fact, the Governing Body, when establishing both Committees, could not delegate to them a power that it has never possessed itself: nemo plus iuris ad alium transferre potest quam ipse haberet10. According to Article 37(1) of the ILO Constitution, it is within the **competence of the International Court of Justice** to decide upon “any question or dispute relating to the **interpretation of this Constitution** or of any subsequent Convention concluded by the Members in pursuance of the provisions of this Constitution.” Furthermore, the ILC has not established yet under Article 37(2) of the ILO Constitution an ILO Tribunal, competent for an authentic interpretation of Conventions11. However, it **cannot be denied** that this constant interpretative work of CFA and CEACR possesses an **authoritative character** given the high esteem the twenty members of the CEACR -they are all internationally renowned experts in the field of labor law and social security law- and the nine members of the CFA with their specific expertise have. As the CEACR reiterates in its Reports, “[the opinions and recommendations of the Committee] derive their persuasive value from the legitimacy and rationality of the Committee’s work based on its impartiality, experience and expertise”12. Already this interpretative authority of both Committees justifies that **national legislators or courts take into consideration** the views of these supervisory bodies of the ILO when implementing ILO law. Furthermore, the long-standing and uncontradicted interpretation of the principle of freedom of association by CFA and CEACR as well as its recognition by the Member States may be considered as a **subsequent practice** in the application of the ILO Constitution under Article 31(3)(b) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (1968): such subsequent practices shall be taken into account when interpreting the Agreement. Their constant supervisory practice probably reflects a volonté ultérieure, since other bodies of the ILO also have **recognized a right to strike** as the two above-mentioned Resolutions of the ILC of 1957 and 1970 as well as the constant practice of the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards to examine **cases of violation** of the right to strike as **examples for breaches of the principle of freedom of association** demonstrate. As this constant practice of the organs of the ILO has not been contradicted by Member States, there is a **strong presumption** for recognition of a right to strike as a subsequent practice of the ILO under Article 31(3)(b) of the **Vienna Convention** on the Law of Treaties.

#### Credible ICJ solves Global Conflict

Davis 18, Christina L., and Julia C. Morse. "Protecting trade by legalizing political disputes: Why countries bring cases to the international court of justice." International Studies Quarterly 62.4 (2018): 709-722. (Professor of Government, Harvard University)//Elmer

Over the last seventy years, three broad trends have characterized international politics: an increase in economic interdependence between states, a growing number of international institutions, and a decrease in interstate war. Deepening exchanges between countries make states more vulnerable to disruptions in ongoing cooperation (Keohane and Nye, 1977). This vulnerability creates a demand for international institutions to constrain powerful states and preserve cooperative outcomes. As interdependence and institutionalized cooperation increase, they may be linked to a decrease in war (Mansfield and Pevehouse, 2000; Russett and Oneal, 2001). A significant body of literature tests the relationship between bilateral trade and conflict, with mixed findings.1 Studies also show correlation between membership in international organizations and avoidance of conflict.2 But despite substantial work on this topic, the relationship between economic interdependence, institutions, and conflict remains ambiguous. How does economic interdependence shape political relations between states? In this paper, we examine the impact of economic interdependence on dispute resolution. More specifically, we ask whether trade increases the probability that countries will use the International Court of Justice (ICJ). The ICJ is one of the oldest international courts: established by the Charter of the United Nations in 1945, it began work the following year. Its long history and jurisdiction over many types of disputes make it ideal for analyzing how trade ties affect a country’s decision to seek third party mediation. We find that trade dependence creates demand for the ICJ. As countries develop stronger trading relationships, they are increasingly willing to settle disputes through the Court. This demonstrates a new pathway through which economic interdependence fosters peaceful relations – it encourages states to use legalized forms of dispute settlement. Whereas bilateral mediation efforts often remain secret, when a state files a complaint with the ICJ, it sends a public signal of its peaceful intentions to both governments and economic actors. Through our study of ICJ adjudication, we test how economic interdependence shapes the use of institutions as part of conflict management strategies. At first glance, it seems surprising that countries ever use legal venues to solve disputes. A court cannot change the underlying power distribution between states. Realist theory suggests that international law has no independent power in international affairs. Indeed, the ICJ seems to have been designed with this perspective in mind. For the ICJ to hear a case, both parties to a dispute must either have accepted the jurisdiction of the Court or have agreed to submit the specific dispute to the Court for a judgment. Even after the Court hears a case, states can essentially ignore its ruling since it cannot enforce its judgment. Why would a state bother to file a case under these circumstances? Yet despite these limitations, governments have turned to the ICJ for third-party dispute resolution on a range of issues including territorial claims, political asylum, and environmental damage. Ninety-two countries ranging widely in income and military capacity have participated in 134 ICJ cases since the Court’s inception in 1946. While this represents a small number relative to the total number of economic disputes addressed in the WTO or investment arbitration bodies, it nonetheless constitutes an important area of cooperation. Moreover, if one considers the frequency of usage given a potential dispute, the ICJ record looks strong. For example, perhaps the most common reason that states file cases at the ICJ is due to territorial disputes. Over the period from 1960 to 2000, Huth, Croco and Appel (2011) document 82 unique territorial disputes, and countries filed cases at the ICJ relating to 18 of them – a surprising 22 percent frequency when comparing filed cases to identified potential cases. The ICJ is a significant venue for interstate disputes, forming a key component in the legal structure of the international system. We argue that states use the ICJ to protect trade flows. Intense political disputes create uncertainty, which can depress trade flows. Legal action isolates the problem, minimizing the potential adverse effects on trade flows. Although delegating to an international court is not without costs – states incur high legal fees and risk the possibility of an unfavorable court ruling – these costs are offset by the economic gains from protecting an important trading relationship. Some disputes, of course, have such high stakes that political or strategic costs outweigh all other considerations, just as some trading relationships are so essential that even major disputes will not disrupt ties. On average, however, we argue that governments with higher trade dependence are more likely to decide that gambling on a court decision makes them better off than risking spill-over to trade. Surprisingly, with the exception of studies about economic policy disputes, research on international adjudication has given scarce attention to the role of economic interests. Instead, scholars have emphasized the importance of domestic political institutions, which encourage states engaged in territorial disputes to pursue adjudication as a means to overcome veto players or avoid blame (Simmons, 2002; Allee and Huth, 2006a). Others examine the legal context within a country or specific to the dispute. Mitchell and Powell (2011), for example, pay careful attention to how states view the law, arguing that domestic legal tradition shapes ICJ usage rates. Huth, Croco and Appel (2011) offer a different legal argument, suggesting that the strength of the legal claim shapes a country’s decision to delegate dispute settlement to a legal venue. These theories offer compelling insights, but ignore economic relations. Our theory aims to fill this gap by highlighting the connection between trade and international adjudication. More broadly, understanding the conditions that lead countries to initiate legal action will inform theories about bargaining strategies and conflict behavior (Fang, 2010; Chapman and Wolford, 2010). We assess the empirical implications of our argument through a comprehensive analysis of ICJ filing decisions, and we also revisit research on territorial disputes. We analyze the filing pattern observable in data on more than 190 countries from 1960 to 2013.3 We use several different approaches to identify potential disputes, modeling country characteristics that are associated with the dispute generating process. We first select a politically-relevant sample of countries that are likely to have frequent interaction as neighbors or great powers. Second, we use matching techniques to prune the politically-relevant sample of dyads to a subset with similar propensities for trade. We test our theory by estimating how trade dependence, measured as bilateral trade share of total trade for a potential applicant, changes the likelihood that a state files an ICJ case against its trade partner. Using a logistic regression, we estimate the effect of trade dependence on the probability of filing in a pooled cross-section time series analysis. We also apply conditional logit estimation to focus on variation in selection of respondents among those states that file an ICJ case. The conditional logit estimation helps to control for unobserved variables that may shape a state’s propensity to file cases. Our results show that higher trade dependence increases a country’s likelihood of filing a case against a trade partner. This relationship holds when we examine different sets of potential disputes and control for key variables like contiguity and power asymmetry. We also analyze how trade dependence reduces the likelihood that states use military force to resolve territorial disputes. Data on territorial disputes allows us to examine potential cases where military action looms large as an option for resolving a dispute (Huth, Croco and Appel, 2011). We find that trade dependence shapes a state’s selection of strategy, lowering the likelihood of militarized action. Examining ICJ adjudication and territorial disputes helps to alleviate the concern that an unobservable dyadic measure of political relations generates a spurious relationship between trade and peace.4 By focusing on dispute resolution strategies, we gain insight into an important mechanism by which interdependence changes political relations. Our results demonstrate that trading states are more likely to work out their problems in court and are less likely to exchange fire We argue that countries turn to an international court in order to protect trade flows under conditions of strong economic interdependence. This argument is built on two key assumptions. First, states believe that an international dispute over territory, fishing rights, or another salient issue could harm trade. Second, states view international adjudication as an effective way to end the dispute. Each point merits further discussion as the building blocks for our theory about the economic rationale for turning to law. Given the risk of harm to economic relations and the potential for courts to contribute to conflict resolution, states with high trade value vested in a relationship will be more willing to undertake costly litigation. Extensive debate exists about the relationship between conflict and trade. The premise that conflict disrupts trade is central to the theory of commercial peace. Russett and Oneal (2001) draw on the work of philosopher Immanuel Kant to argue that interdependence deters conflict by raising its costs. According to this line of reasoning, war interrupts trade while peace promotes stable commerce, leading states to calculate that gains of peace are significant compared to the costs of war. Other perspectives focus on the informational role of interdependence to lower uncertainty between states (Reed, 2003). Gartzke, Li and Boehmer (2001) contend economic interdependence allows states to signal their resolve through their willingness to bear economic costs from confrontation.5 A host of empirical studies support the idea that conflict reduces trade (Keshk, Reuveny and Pollins, 2004; Long, 2008). Several potential channels connect trade and conflict, including direct damage to infrastructure and transportation resulting from actual conflict, sanctions policies, and informal discrimination by governments or private actors. In a comprehensive study of data from 1870 - 1997, Glick and Taylor (2010) find that the effect of war on trade is significant and persistent. The negative impact of conflict also extends to foreign direct investment (e.g. Lee and Mitchell, 2012). The negative relationship is not limited to full scale war. Several studies demonstrate that political tensions may also suppress trade (Pollins, 1989; Fuchs and Klann, 2013). In an analysis of the period from 1950 to 1995, Simmons (2005) finds that territorial disputes have a sizable negative impact on trade even in the absence of militarized action. Others suggest states anticipate the potential adverse impact of conflict on trade, and therefore trade less to begin with if they think that war is likely. In such a scenario, the marginal economic costs of war should be insufficient to change a state’s calculation for going to war (Barbieri, 2002; Morrow, 1999). Gowa and Hicks (forthcoming) contend that trade is largely diverted through third party channels, which compensates for having less direct trade with the adversary. In this paper, we assume that leaders and business constituencies on average believe that conflict damages trade relations. Political conflict could lead governments to adopt sanctions against an adversary or to restrict financial flows, and violence is likely to disrupt trading routes and slow the movement of goods from one country to another. Substitution through third parties could alleviate the harm, but this would still increase trade costs. The expected harm to trade underlies the motivation for states to pursue resolution of disputes. When states want to resolve an interstate dispute, why would they choose adjudication rather than negotiations, economic sanctions, or militarized action? In some cases, the decision follows an episode of military conflict as part of an effort to normalize relations. Such a decision may be taken in the immediate aftermath of a conflict or decades later, after a long process of normalization. Indonesia and Malaysia, for example, jointly submitted their territorial dispute over the Sipadan and Ligitan islands to the ICJ in 1998 after three decades of efforts to improve relations following an unofficial war between the countries in the 1960s. In other cases, countries may turn to a legal venue to prevent a problem from ever reaching the stage that could produce serious political tensions or threats of force. Adjudication reshapes the context of diplomatic negotiations. In most disputes, governments pursue negotiations first and only resort to international adjudication when diplomatic avenues have stalled. Initiating legal action reduces outside options as states agree to submit the matter to court proceedings. By taking this step, governments signal both their willingness to forgo the use of force, and their priority to resolve the dispute in a public process. After filing, negotiations often continue alongside the legal procedures, but participants have more information that the matter will neither escalate into violence nor disappear through neglect. The literature offers three broad types of explanations for why states might choose to pursue adjudication: legitimacy, informational benefits, and domestic obstacles to settlement. At the systemic level, international norms have developed to support peaceful conflict resolution over war; these norms are likely to influence the calculations of some states about how to settle disputes. Finnemore and Sikkink (1998) contend that rule of law has come to shape the identity of states, which forms a meta-belief affecting views about appropriate action in both the domestic and international spheres. When international law has been established through fair procedures and offers coherent principles, it forms a legitimate source of authority in international affairs that generates an independent “compliance pull” on state behavior (Franck, 1990). International courts combine both legitimacy and authority as they help states solve specific disputes about how to interpret international law; the growing role for international courts in international affairs represents an important trend (Alter, 2014; Alter, Helfer and Madsen, 2015). This significance of the ICJ is supported by findings that the Court has a relatively high level of compliance with its rulings (Schulte, 2004; Mitchell and Hensel, 2007; Llamzon, 2007; Johns, 2011). Legal settlement can help states coordinate policies and produce more cooperative outcomes through the provision of information. A court ruling offers a focal point amidst uncertainty about how to interpret the terms of an agreement (Ginsburg and McAdams, 2004; Huth, Croco and Appel, 2011). As the recordkeeper of past actions, courts support systems of tit-for-tat and reputational enforcement (Milgrom, North and Weingast, 1990; Carrubba, 2005; Mitchell and Hensel, 2007). In these informational theories of courts, states may comply with court rulings in the absence of coercive measures or the threat of sanctions because the reputational costs of non-compliance are too high. Rather than simply interpret law, courts matter because they coordinate expectations about enforcement and engage the attention of third parties (Johns, 2011). In their empirical analysis of territorial disputes, Huth, Croco and Appel (2011) find that strong legal claims significantly increase the likelihood that leaders will negotiate resolutions to their disputes and avoid conflict. International courts also offer a way for states to frame settlement in a way that appeals to domestic audiences (Fang, 2008). Simmons notes that even when the same deal could be reached in negotiations or through a court decision, a negotiated settlement could be viewed as sign of weakness while a legal resolution would be seen as positive cooperation beneficial for future interactions (Simmons, 2002, p. 834). This dynamic occurs because “domestic groups will **find it more attractive to make concessions to** a disinterested institution **than to a political adversary**” (Simmons, 2002, p. 834). In research on several prominent ICJ cases, Fischer (1982) emphasizes the Court has helped governments to save face. Consequently, those governments unable to reach agreements over domestic opposition may find it easier to do so with the involvement of third party ruling. Allee and Huth (2006a) further extend this argument to show that governments with higher levels of domestic political constraints are more likely to choose adjudication over negotiation for settling territorial disputes. Domestic political constraints also increase the probability of filing complaints at the WTO (Davis, 2012).

### 1NC – Case

#### Capitalism solves extinction through environmental collapse – reject evidence that ignores synergistic deployment of adaptative tech – the public won’t transition to socialism but WILL channel political energies into innovative solutions that turn case.

Bailey ’18 [Ronald; March 12; B.A. in Economics from the University of Virginia, member of the Society of Environmental Journalists and the American Society for Bioethics and Humanities, citing a compilation of interdisciplinary research; Reason, “Climate Change Problems Will Be Solved Through Economic Growth,” <https://reason.com/2018/03/12/climate-change-problems-will-be-solved-t>; RP]

"It is, I promise, worse than you think," David Wallace-Wells wrote in an infamously apocalyptic 2017 New York Magazine article. "Indeed, absent a significant adjustment to how billions of humans conduct their lives, parts of the Earth will likely become close to uninhabitable, and other parts horrifically inhospitable, as soon as the end of this century." The "it" is man-made climate change. Temperatures will become scalding, crops will wither, and rising seas will inundate coastal cities, Wallace-Wells warns. But toward the end of his screed, he somewhat dismissively observes that "by and large, the scientists have an enormous confidence in the ingenuity of humans….Now we've found a way to engineer our own doomsday, and surely we will find a way to engineer our way out of it, one way or another." Over at Scientific American, John Horgan considers some eco-modernist views on how humanity will indeed go about engineering our way out of the problems that climate change may pose. In an essay called "Should We Chill Out About Global Warming?," Horgan reports the more dynamic and positive analyses of two eco-modernist thinkers, Harvard psychologist Steven Pinker and science journalist Will Boisvert. In an essay for The Breakthrough Journal, Pinker notes that such optimism "is commonly dismissed as the 'faith that technology will save us.' In fact, it is a skepticism that the status quo will doom us—that knowledge and behavior will remain frozen in their current state for perpetuity. Indeed, a naive faith in stasis has repeatedly led to prophecies of environmental doomsdays that never happened." In his new book, Enlightenment Now, Pinker points out that "as the world gets richer and more tech-savvy, it dematerializes, decarbonizes, and densifies, sparing land and species." Economic growth and technological progress are the solutions not only to climate change but to most of the problems that bedevil humanity. Boisvert, meanwhile, tackles and rebuts the apocalyptic prophecies made by eco-pessimists like Wallace-Wells, specifically with regard to food production and availabilty, water supplies, heat waves, and rising seas. "No, this isn't a denialist screed," Boisvert writes. "Human greenhouse emissions will warm the planet, raise the seas and derange the weather, and the resulting heat, flood and drought will be cataclysmic. Cataclysmic—but not apocalyptic. While the climate upheaval will be large, the consequences for human well-being will be small. Looked at in the broader context of economic development, climate change will barely slow our progress in the effort to raise living standards." Boisvert proceeds to show how a series of technologies—drought-resistant crops, cheap desalination, widespread adoption of air-conditioning, modern construction techniques—will ameliorate and overcome the problems caused by rising temperatures. He is entirely correct when he notes, "The most inexorable feature of climate-change modeling isn't the advance of the sea but the steady economic growth that will make life better despite global warming." Horgan, Pinker, and Boisvert are all essentially endorsing what I have called "the progress solution" to climate change. As I wrote in 2009, "It is surely not unreasonable to argue that if one wants to help future generations deal with climate change, the best policies would be those that encourage rapid economic growth. This would endow future generations with the wealth and superior technologies that could be used to handle whatever comes at them including climate change." Six years later I added that that "richer is more climate-friendly, especially for developing countries. Why? Because faster growth means higher incomes, which correlate with lower population growth. Greater wealth also means higher agricultural productivity, freeing up land for forests to grow as well as speedier progress toward developing and deploying cheaper non–fossil fuel energy technologies. These trends can act synergistically to ameliorate man-made climate change." Horgan concludes, "Greens fear that optimism will foster complacency and hence undermine activism. But I find the essays of Pinker and Boisvert inspiring, not enervating….These days, despair is a bigger problem than optimism." Counseling despair has always been wrong when human ingenuity is left free to solve problems, and that will prove to be the case with climate change as well.

#### Uniqueness goes neg – growth is sustainable, physical limits aren’t absolute or are chronically underestimated, AND resource use is declining now – BUT – degrowth unleashes disaster that slips into Malthusian population crunches.

Bailey ’18 [Ronald; February 16; B.A. in Economics from the University of Virginia, member of the Society of Environmental Journalists and the American Society for Bioethics and Humanities, citing a compilation of interdisciplinary research; Reason, “Is Degrowth the Only Way to Save the World?” https://reason.com/2018/02/16/is-degrowth-the-only-way-to-save-the-wor; RP]

Unless us folks in rich countries drastically reduce our material living standards and distribute most of what we have to people living in poor countries, the world will come to an end. Or at least that's the stark conclusion of a study published earlier this month in the journal Nature Sustainability. The researchers who wrote it, led by the Leeds University ecological economist Dan O'Neill, think the way to prevent the apocalypse is "degrowth." Vice, pestilence, war, and "gigantic inevitable famine" were the planetary boundaries set on human population by the 18th-century economist Robert Thomas Malthus. The new study gussies up old-fashioned Malthusianism by devising a set of seven biophysical indicators of national environmental pressure, which they then link to 11 indicators of social outcomes. The aim of the exercise is to concoct a "safe and just space" for humanity. Using data from 2011, the researchers calculate that the annual per capita boundaries for the world's 7 billion people consist of the emission of 1.6 tons of carbon dioxide per year and the annual consumption of 0.9 kilograms of phosphorus, 8.9 kilograms of nitrogen, 574 cubic meters of water, 2.6 tons of biomass (crops and wood), plus the ecological services of 1.7 hectares of land and 7.2 tons of material per person. On the social side, meanwhile, the researchers say that life satisfaction in each country should exceed 6.5 on the 10-point Cantril scale, that healthy life expectancy should average at least 65 years, and that nutrition should be over 2,700 calories per day. At least 95 percent of each country's citizens must have access to good sanitation, earn more than $1.90 per day, and pass through secondary school. Ninety percent of citizens must have friends and family they can depend on. The threshold for democratic quality must exceed 0.8 on an index scale stretching from -1 to +1, while the threshold for equality is set at no higher than 70 on a Gini Index where 0 represents perfect equality and 100 implies perfect inequality. They set the threshold for percent of labor force employed at 94 percent. So how does the U.S. do with regard to their biophysical boundaries and social outcomes measures? We Americans transgress all seven of the biophysical boundaries. Carbon dioxide emissions stand at 21.2 tons per person; we each use an average of 7 kilograms of phosphorus, 59.1 kilograms of nitrogen, 611 cubic meters of water, and 3.7 tons of biomass; we rely on the ecological services of 6.8 hectares of land and 27.2 tons of material. Although the researchers urge us to move "beyond the pursuit of GDP growth to embrace new measures of progress," it is worth noting that U.S. GDP is $59,609 per capita. On the other hand, those transgressions have provided a pretty good life for Americans. For example, life satisfaction is 7.1; healthy life expectancy is 69.7 years; and democratic quality stands at 0.8 points. The only two social indicators we just missed on were employment (91 percent) and secondary education (94.7 percent). On the other hand, our hemisphere is home to one paragon of sustainability—Haiti. Haitians breach none of the researchers' biophysical boundaries. But the Caribbean country performs abysmally on all 11 social indicators. Life satisfaction scores at 4.8; healthy life expectancy is 52.3 years; and Haitians average 2,105 calories per day. The country tallies -0.9 on the democratic quality index. Haiti's GDP is $719 per capita. Other near-sustainability champions include Malawi, Nepal, Myanmar, and Nicaragua. All of them score dismally on the social indicators, and their GDPs per capita are $322, $799, $1,375, and $2,208, respectively. The country that currently comes closest to the researchers' ideal of remaining within its biophysical boundaries while sufficient social indicators is…Vietnam. For the record, Vietnam's per capita GDP is $2,306. "Countries with higher levels of life satisfaction and healthy life expectancy also tend to transgress more biophysical boundaries," the researchers note. A better way to put this relationship is that more wealth and technology tend to make people happier, healthier, and freer. O'Neill and his unhappy team fail drastically to understand how human ingenuity unleashed in markets is already well on the way toward making their supposed planetary boundaries irrelevant. Take carbon dioxide emissions: Supporters of renewable energy technologies say that their costs are already or will soon be lower than those of fossil fuels. Boosters of advanced nuclear reactors similarly argue that they can supply all of the carbon-free energy the world will need. There's a good chance that fleets of battery-powered self-driving vehicles will largely replace private cars and mass transit later in this century. Are we about to run out of phosphorous to fertilize our crops? Peak phosphorus is not at hand. The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) reports that at current rates of mining, the world's known reserves will last 266 years. The estimated total resources of phosphate rock would last over 1,140 years. "There are no imminent shortages of phosphate rock," notes the USGS. With respect to the deleterious effects that using phosphorus to fertilize crops might have outside of farm fields, researchers are working on ways to endow crops with traits that enable them to use less while maintaining yields. O'Neill and his colleagues are also concerned that farmers are using too much nitrogen fertilizer, which runs off fields into the natural environment and contributes to deoxygenated dead zones in the oceans, among other ill effects. This is a problem, but one that plant breeders are already working to solve. For example, researchers at Arcadia Biosciences have used biotechnology to create nitrogen-efficient varieties of staples like rice and wheat that enable farmers to increase yields while significantly reducing fertilizer use. Meanwhile, other researchers are moving on projects to engineer the nitrogen fixation trait from legumes into cereal crops. In other words, the crops would make their own fertilizer from air. Water? Most water is devoted to the irrigation of crops; the ongoing development of drought-resistant and saline-tolerant crops will help with that. Hectares per capita? Humanity has probably already reached peak farmland, and nearly 400 million hectares will be restored to nature by 2060—an area almost double the size of the United States east of the Mississippi River. In fact, it is entirely possible that most animal farming will be replaced by resource-sparing lab-grown steaks, chops, and milk. Such developments in food production undermine the researchers' worries about overconsumption of biomass. And humanity's material footprint is likely to get smaller too as trends toward further dematerialization take hold. The price system is a superb mechanism for encouraging innovators to find ways to wring ever more value out less and less stuff. Rockefeller University researcher Jesse Ausubel has shown that this process of absolute dematerialization has already taken off for many commodities. After cranking their way through their models of doom, O'Neill and his colleagues lugubriously conclude: "If all people are to lead a good life within planetary boundaries, then the level of resource use associated with meeting basic needs must be dramatically reduced." They are right, but they are entirely backward with regard to how to achieve those goals. Economic growth provides the wealth and technologies needed to lift people from poverty while simultaneously lightening humanity's footprint on the natural world. Rather than degrowth, the planet—and especially its poor people—need more and faster economic growth.

#### It’s key to CCS – link-turns every impact.

Graciela ‘16 (/16 – Professor of Economics and of Statistics at Columbia University and Visiting Professor at Stanford University, and was the architect of the Kyoto Protocol carbon market (being interviewed by Marcus Rolle, freelance journalist specializing in environmental issues and global affairs, “Reversing Climate Change: Interview with Graciela Chichilnisky,” http://www.globalpolicyjournal.com/blog/01/09/2016/reversing-climate-change-interview-graciela-chichilnisky)//cmr

GC: Green capitalism is a new economic system that values the natural resources on which human survival depends. It fosters a harmonious relationship with our planet, its resources and the many species it harbors. It is a new type of market economics that addresses both equity and efficiency. Using carbon negative technology™ it helps reduce carbon in the atmosphere while fostering economic development in rich and developing nations, for example in the U S., EU, China and India. How does this work? In a nutshell Green Capitalism requires the creation of global limits or property rights nation by nation for the use of the atmosphere, the bodies of water and the planet’s biodiversity, and the creation of new markets to trade these rights from which new economic values and a new concept of economic progress emerges updating GDP as is now generally agreed is needed. Green Capitalism is needed now to help avert climate change and achieve the goals of the 2015 UN Paris Agreement, which are very ambitious and universally supported but have no way to be realized within the Agreement itself. The Carbon Market and its CDM play critical roles in the foundation of Green Capitalism, creating values to redefine GDP. These are needed to remain within the world’s “CO2 budget” and avoid catastrophic climate change. As I see it, the building blocks for Green Capitalism are then as follows; (1) Global limits nation by nation in the use of the planet’s atmosphere, its water bodies and biodiversity - these are global public goods. (2) New global markets to trade these limits, based on equity and efficiency. These markets are relatives of the Carbon Market and the SO2 market. The new market create new measures of economic values and update the concept of GDP. (3) Efficient use of Carbon Negative Technologies to avert catastrophic climate change by providing a smooth transition to clean energy and ensuring economic prosperity in rich and poor nations. These building blocks have immediate practical implications in reversing climate change and can assist the ambitious aims of Paris COP21 become a reality. MR: What is the greatest advantage of the new generation technologies that can capture CO2 from the air? GC: These technologies build carbon negative power plants, such as Global Thermostat, that clean the atmosphere of CO2 while producing electricity. Global Thermostat is a firm that is commercializing a technology that takes CO2 out of air and uses mostly low cost residual heat rather than electricity to drive the capture process, making the entire process of capturing CO2 from the atmosphere very inexpensive. There is enough residua heat in a coal power plant that it can be used to capture twice as much CO2 as the plant emits, thus transforming the power plant into a “carbon sink.” For example, a 400 MW coal plant that emits 1 million tons of CO2 per year can become a carbon sink absorbing a net amount of 1 million tons of CO2 instead. Carbon capture from air can be done anywhere and at any time, and so inexpensively that the CO2 can be sold for industrial or commercial uses such as plastics, food and beverages, greenhouses, bio-fertilizers, building materials and even enhanced oil recovery, all examples of large global markets and profitable opportunities. Carbon capture is powered mostly by low (85°C) residual heat that is inexpensive, and any source will do. In particular, renewable (solar) technology can power the process of carbon capture. This can help advance solar technology and make it more cost-efficient. This means more energy, more jobs, and it also means economic growth in developing nations, all of this while cleaning the CO2 in the atmosphere. Carbon negative technologies can literally transform the world economy. MR: One final question. You distinguish between long-run and short-run strategies in the effort to reverse climate change. Would carbon negative technologies be part of a short-run strategy? GC: Long-run strategies are quite different from strategies for the short-run. Often long-run strategies do not work in the short run and different policies and economic incentives are needed. In the long run the best climate change policy is to replace fossil fuel sources of energy that by themselves cause 45% of the global emissions, and to plant trees to restore if possible the natural sources and sinks of CO2. But the fossil fuel power plant infrastructure is about 87% of the power plant infrastructure and about $45-55 trillion globally. This infrastructure cannot be replaced quickly, certainly not in the short time period in which we need to take action to avert catastrophic climate change. The issue is that CO2 once emitted remains hundreds of years in the atmosphere and we have emitted so much that unless we actually remove the CO2 that is already there, we cannot remain long within the carbon budget, which is the concentration of CO2 beyond which we fear catastrophic climate change. In the short run, therefore, we face significant time pressure. The IPCC indicates in its 2014 5th Assessment Report that we must actually remove the carbon that is already in the atmosphere and do so in massive quantities, this century (p. 191 of 5th Assessment Report). This is what I called a carbon negative approach, which works for the short run. Renewable energy is the long run solution. Renewable energy is too slow for a short run resolution since replacing a $45-55 trillion power plant infrastructure with renewable plants could take decades. We need action sooner than that. For the short run we need carbon negative technologies that capture more carbon than what is emitted. Trees do that and they must be conserved to help preserve biodiversity. Biochar does that. But trees and other natural sinks are too slow for what we need today. Therefore, negative carbon is needed now as part of a blueprint for transformation. It must be part of the blueprint for Sustainable Development and its short term manifestation that I call Green Capitalism, while in the long run renewable sources of energy suffice, including Wind, Biofuels, Nuclear, Geothermal, and Hydroelectric energy. These are in limited supply and cannot replace fossil fuels. Global energy today is roughly divided as follows: 87% is fossil, namely natural gas, coal, oil; 10% is nuclear, geothermal, and hydroelectric, and less than 1% is solar power — photovoltaic and solar thermal. Nuclear fuel is scarce and nuclear technology is generally considered dangerous as tragically experienced by the Fukushima Daichi nuclear disaster in Japan, and it seems unrealistic to seek a solution in the nuclear direction. Only solar energy can be a long term solution: Less than 1% of the solar energy we receive on earth can be transformed into 10 times the fossil fuel energy used in the world today. Yet we need a short-term strategy that accelerates long run renewable energy, or we will defeat long-term goals. In the short term as the IPCC validates, we need carbon negative technology, carbon removals. The short run is the next 20 or 30 years. There is no time in this period of time to transform the entire fossil infrastructure — it costs $45-55 trillion (IEA) to replace and it is slow to build. We need to directly reduce carbon in the atmosphere now. We cannot use traditional methods to remove CO2 from smokestacks (called often Carbon Capture and Sequestration, CSS) because they are not carbon negative as is required. CSS works but does not suffice because it only captures what power plants currently emit. Any level of emissions adds to the stable and high concentration we have today and CO2 remains in the atmosphere for years. We need to remove the CO2 that is already in the atmosphere, namely air capture of CO2 also called carbon removals. The solution is to combine air capture of CO2 with storage of CO2 into stable materials such as biochar, cement, polymers, and carbon fibers that replace a number of other construction materials such as metals. The most recent BMW automobile model uses only carbon fibers rather than metals. It is also possible to combine CO2 to produce renewable gasoline, namely gasoline produced from air and water. CO2 can be separated from air and hydrogen separated from water, and their combination is a well-known industrial process to produce gasoline. Is this therefore too expensive? There are new technologies using algae that make synthetic fuel commercially feasible at competitive rates. Other policies would involve combining air capture with solar thermal electricity using the residual solar thermal heat to drive the carbon capture process. This can make a solar plant more productive and efficient so it can out-compete coal as a source of energy. In summary, the blueprint offered here is a private/public approach, based on new industrial technology and financial markets, self-funded and using profitable greenmarkets, with securities that utilize carbon credits as the “underlying” asset, based on the KP CDM, as well as new markets for biodiversity and water providing abundant clean energy to stave off impending and actual energy crisis in developing nations, fostering mutually beneficial cooperation for industrial and developing nations. The blueprint proposed provides the two sides of the coin, equity and efficiency, and can assign a critical role for women as stewards for human survival and sustainable development. My vision is a carbon negative economy that represents green capitalism in resolving the Global Climate negotiations and the North–South Divide. Carbon negative power plants and capture of CO2 from air and ensure a clean atmosphere together innovation and more jobs and exports: the more you produce and create jobs the cleaner becomes the atmosphere. In practice, Green Capitalism means economic growth that is harmonious with the Earth resources.

#### Elites react with war – if goods don’t cross borders, then soldiers will.

Liu ’18 [Qian; November 2; Economist, Managing Director at Greater China, citing the economist Thomas Piketty and political scientist Samuel Huntington; Project Syndicate, “From economic crisis to World War III,” p. 1-2; RP]

The next economic crisis is closer than you think. But what you should really worry about is what comes after: in the current social, political, and technological landscape, a prolonged economic crisis, combined with rising income inequality, could well escalate into a major global military conflict. The 2008-09 global financial crisis almost bankrupted governments and caused systemic collapse. Policymakers managed to pull the global economy back from the brink, using massive monetary stimulus, including quantitative easing and near-zero (or even negative) interest rates. But monetary stimulus is like an adrenaline shot to jump-start an arrested heart; it can revive the patient, but it does nothing to cure the disease. Treating a sick economy requires structural reforms, which can cover everything from financial and labour markets to tax systems, fertility patterns, and education policies. Policymakers have utterly failed to pursue such reforms, despite promising to do so. Instead, they have remained preoccupied with politics. From Italy to Germany, forming and sustaining governments now seems to take more time than actual governing. Greece, for example, has relied on money from international creditors to keep its head (barely) above water, rather than genuinely reforming its pension system or improving its business environment. The lack of structural reform has meant that the unprecedented excess liquidity that central banks injected into their economies was not allocated to its most efficient uses. Instead, it raised global asset prices to levels even higher than those prevailing before 2008. In the United States, housing prices are now 8% higher than they were at the peak of the property bubble in 2006, according to the property website Zillow. The price-to-earnings (CAPE) ratio, which measures whether stock-market prices are within a reasonable range, is now higher than it was both in 2008 and at the start of the Great Depression in 1929. As monetary tightening reveals the vulnerabilities in the real economy, the collapse of asset-price bubbles will trigger another economic crisis – one that could be even more severe than the last, because we have built up a tolerance to our strongest macroeconomic medications. A decade of regular adrenaline shots, in the form of ultra-low interest rates and unconventional monetary policies, has severely depleted their power to stabilise and stimulate the economy. If history is any guide, the consequences of this mistake could extend far beyond the economy. According to Harvard’s Benjamin Friedman, prolonged periods of economic distress have been characterised also by public antipathy toward minority groups or foreign countries – attitudes that can help to fuel unrest, terrorism, or even war. For example, during the Great Depression, US President Herbert Hoover signed the 1930 Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, intended to protect American workers and farmers from foreign competition. In the subsequent five years, global trade shrank by two-thirds. Within a decade, World War II had begun. To be sure, WWII, like World War I, was caused by a multitude of factors; there is no standard path to war. But there is reason to believe that high levels of inequality can play a significant role in stoking conflict. According to research by the economist Thomas Piketty, a spike in income inequality is often followed by a great crisis. Income inequality then declines for a while, before rising again, until a new peak – and a new disaster. Though causality has yet to be proven, given the limited number of data points, this correlation should not be taken lightly, especially with wealth and income inequality at historically high levels. This is all the more worrying in view of the numerous other factors stoking social unrest and diplomatic tension, including technological disruption, a record-breaking migration crisis, anxiety over globalisation, political polarisation, and rising nationalism. All are symptoms of failed policies that could turn out to be trigger points for a future crisis. Voters have good reason to be frustrated, but the emotionally appealing populists to whom they are increasingly giving their support are offering ill-advised solutions that will only make matters worse. For example, despite the world’s unprecedented interconnectedness, multilateralism is increasingly being eschewed, as countries – most notably, Donald J. Trump’s US – pursue unilateral, isolationist policies. Meanwhile, proxy wars are raging in Syria and Yemen. Against this background, we must take seriously the possibility that the next economic crisis could lead to a large-scale military confrontation. By the logic of the political scientist Samuel Huntington, considering such a scenario could help us avoid it because it would force us to take action. In this case, the key will be for policymakers to pursue the structural reforms that they have long promised while replacing finger-pointing and antagonism with a sensible and respectful global dialogue. The alternative may well be global conflagration.

#### Growth solves war AND root causes their impacts – throw out non-empirical analyses.

Cortright ’16 (David; 5/18/16; Ph.D. in Political Science from the Union Graduate School, M.A. in History from New York University, B.A. in History from the University of Notre Dame, Director of Policy Studies at the Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, former research associate at the Center for National Security Studies; Kroc Institute, “Linking Development and Peace: The Empirical Evidence,” <https://peacepolicy.nd.edu/2016/05/18/linking-development-and-peace-the-empirical-evidence/)>

The connections between **development and peace** are firmly supported by social science research. All the standard indicators of economic development, including per capita income, economic growth rates, levels of trade and investment, and degree of market openness, are **significantly correlated** with peace. Virtually every study on the causes of war finds a strong connection between low income and the likelihood of armed conflict. Economist Edward Miguel describes this link as “one of the most **robust empirical relationships** in the economic literature.” Irrespective of all other variables and indicators, poverty as measured by low income bears a strong and **statistically significant** relationship to increased risk of civil conflict. No one has made this point more convincingly over the years than Paul Collier. He and his colleagues have shown that civil conflict is heavily concentrated in the poorest countries. The risk of civil war is strongly associated with joblessness, poverty and a general lack of development. They famously conclude, “The **key root cause** of conflict is the failure of economic **development**.” They also make the reverse point. Raising economic **growth rates** and levels of per capita income may be “the single **most important step** that can be taken” to reduce the likelihood of armed conflict. War is reverse development. It undermines economic well-being and reduces income levels. War may bring profit for the few, those ‘masters of war’ as Bob Dylan called them, but it creates economic misery for many. Once started, war becomes a self-sustaining system, an “economy of war” Mary Kaldor calls it in New and Old Wars, a feeding trough for profiteers, warlords and mobsters that becomes exceedingly difficult to stop. War reduces life expectancy and destroys education and public health systems. It tears apart the social fabric. The World Development Report 2011 calculates the cost of a major civil war as equivalent to more than **30 years of typical growth** for a medium-size developing country. Trade levels take 20 years to recover. The negative economic impact of conflict helps to explain why countries at war are often caught in a deadly conflict trap, why the chief legacy of a civil war is another war. The linkage between **poverty and war** has a human face. We can see it the hallowed out stare and angry glare of the mostly young men who fight in these wars. Surveys of insurgents and militia fighters confirm that many are driven by poverty and unemployment. The majority of child soldiers “are drawn from the poorest, least educated and most marginalized sections of society.” The link between low income and conflict risk does not mean that poverty causes war, however. There is no automatic connection. Some poor countries, such as Zambia or Bangladesh, have not experienced recent major civil conflict. Other mid-level income countries, such as Croatia and Serbia, have fought bitter wars. It is not poverty per se but a general lack of **economic development** that is most strongly associated with armed conflict. Poverty and a lack of opportunity are **most disruptive** when communities experience a decline in social and economic status, and when they perceive an unjust discrepancy between what they have and what they expect or feel they deserve.