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#### Interpretation: Just government must be all governments

#### Standards:

#### 1] Shiftiness – allows them to siphon out of key negative ground on what the right to strike includes. The definition is different in multiple legal contexts, so explaining what the plan does to the right to strike solves. It could be a creating of a new strike, or removing of all conditions, etc.. that all tries to draw a line that negs can’t predict

Reddy, 1-6, ““There Is No Such Thing as an Illegal Strike”: Reconceptualizing the Strike in Law and Political Economy”, Yale Law Journal, Diana Reddy is a Doctoral Fellow at the Law, Economics, and Politics Center at UC Berkeley Law, and a PhD candidate in UCB's Jurisprudence and Social Policy Program. Her research interests lie at the intersection of work law, law and political economy, law and social movements, and social stratification and inequality. You can find her recent scholarship and commentary in Yale Law Journal Forum and Emory Law Journal, as well as in less formal outlets, like the Law and Political Economy blog. URL: https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy , KR

The strike has never fit easily within extant legal categories. According to Craig Becker, “the law has variously categorized strikes as criminal activity, as an invasion of property rights, and as a fundamental component of labor’s right to engage in collective bargaining.”77 Jurisprudentially, striking has been theorized as either an associational freedom upon which law cannot intrude, or in the alternative, conduct so coercive and disorderly as to be antithetical to the rule of law—industrial vigilante justice.78 Following enactment of the NLRA, strikes ostensibly became legal for the private sector workers covered by it. But especially after the 1947 Taft-Hartley Amendments to the NLRA, striking’s legality was tied to an increasingly narrow understanding of its purpose. In this Part, I provide a brief overview of how current law—shaped by its Progressive Era mortal weakness—codifies long-lasting legal ambivalence about striking, by constructing the strike as an “economic weapon,” and in so doing, as apolitical.

A. The “Right” to Strike: Under the NLRA, workers are generally understood to have a “right” to strike. Section 7 of the Act states that employees have the right to engage in “concerted activities for . . . mutual aid or protection,”79 which includes striking. To drive this point home, section 13 of the NLRA specifies, “Nothing in this [Act] . . . shall be construed so as either to interfere with or impede or diminish in any way the right to strike . . .”80 Note that it is a testament to deeply-held disagreements about the strike (is it a fundamental right which needs no statutory claim to protection, or a privilege to be granted by the legislature?) that the statute’s language is framed in this way: the law which first codified a right to strike does so by insisting that it does not “interfere with or impede or diminish” a right, which had never previously been held to exist.

#### Government is a state

**Merriam Webster ND** (https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/government)

the group of people who control and make decisions for a country, state, etc.The government has been slow to react to the crisis.She works for the federal government.[See More Examples](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/government)

2: a particular system used for controlling a country, state, etc.He is a firm believer in democratic/representative government.

3: the process or manner of controlling a country, state, etc.We learned about different methods/systems of government.The country has been damaged by many years of weak/corrupt government.

#### Violation: They specify a a sector of specific governments – this is unpredictable

#### Key to ground and limits they justify “government of the week” affs

#### T is a voter for fairness and education

#### Competing interps:

#### 1] specificity – you can’t win you’re reasonably right because any small shift of the right to strike is enough to trigger new debates in the 1ar

#### 2] race to the bottom and norm setting – we can’t set norms without setting a clear standard

#### 3] arbitrary and missing brightline – increases judge intervention AND new 2AR arguments since the counter-interp will be newly contextualized
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#### Healthcare systems are ready for the next pandemic BUT frontline workers are key

Nundy, 21 -- Accolade chief medical officer and primary care physician

[Dr. Shantanu, interview with John Henning Schumann, "How Health Care In The U.S. May Change After COVID: An Optimist's Outlook," NPR, 5-13-2021, https://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2021/05/13/996233365/how-health-care-in-the-u-s-may-change-after-covid-an-optimists-outlook, accessed 10-18-2021]

With more than one-third of U.S. adults now fully vaccinated against COVID-19, there's growing optimism on many fronts. A majority of states have either lifted health-related restrictions or have announced target dates for doing so.

Already, many clinicians and health policy experts are thinking about what the post-pandemic world will look like.

COVID-19 demonstrated that even in a behemoth industry like health care, change can come quickly when it's necessary. Patients understandably avoided hospitals and clinics because of the risk of viral exposure — leading to quick opportunities for innovation.

For example, the use of telemedicine skyrocketed, and many think it's an innovation that's here to stay. Patients like the convenience — and for many conditions, it's an effective alternative to an in-person visit.

Dr. Shantanu Nundy, for one, is optimistic about the future of health care in the U.S. He is a primary care physician practicing just outside Washington, D.C., and the chief medical officer at Accolade, a company that helps people navigate the health care system.

Nundy has bold views, based on his current roles as well as prior positions with the Human Diagnosis Project, a crowd-sourcing platform for collaboration on challenging medical cases, and as a senior health specialist for the World Bank, where his work took him to Africa, Asia and South America.

He spoke with Shots about his new book, Care After Covid: What the Pandemic Revealed Is Broken in Healthcare and How to Reinvent It.

This interview has been edited for length and clarity.

You seem pretty optimistic about changes to U.S. health care because of the pandemic. What changes or new practices do you think are most likely to stick around?

I am optimistic. Health care has changed more in the past year than during any similar period in modern U.S. history. And it changed for the better.

Doctors and other front-line workers finally started meeting patients where they are: in the community (e.g., at drive-through testing and mass vaccination sites), at home (e.g., with house calls and even hospital-level care at home), and on their devices. Doctors and patients connected in new ways: In my clinic, which serves low-income patients in the Washington, D.C., area, I was given an iPhone for the first time for video and audio visits and found myself messaging with patients between visits to refill medications or follow up on their symptoms.

Some of these changes will reverse as things get back to normal, but what won't change is the fundamental culture shifts. The pandemic magnified long-standing cracks in the foundation of the U.S. health care system and exposed those cracks to populations that had never witnessed them before. All of us — not just patients with chronic diseases or patients who live at the margin — have the shared experience of trying to find a test or vaccine, of navigating the byzantine healthcare system on our own.

The crisis also exposed just how inequitable the health care system is for Black and brown communities. The numbers don't lie — these populations died of COVID-19 at a rate much higher than their white counterparts. I'm hopeful these shared experiences and revelations have created the empathy and impetus to demand change.

Your book envisions a care framework that will be "distributed, digitally enabled, and decentralized." Let's take them one at a time. What do you mean by "distributed care?"

"Distributed care" refers to the notion that care should happen where health happens, at home and in the community. We need to redistribute care from clinics and hospitals to homes, pharmacies and grocery stores, barbershops and churches, workplaces and online, where patients are on-the-go. This doesn't mean we should eliminate traditional health care settings. Hospitals and clinics will continue to play a major role in health care delivery, but for most people, these will become secondary, rather than primary, sources of care.

The most obvious upside to distributed care is that it's more affordable. Without the overhead costs of expensive medical facilities, costs decrease. It also has the potential to be more effective and equitable. Our health is largely driven by our behaviors and our environment. By delivering it where we live and work, care can better address the root causes of poor health, including social isolation, poor nutrition, physical inactivity, and mental and emotional distress. Distributed care can also reach communities too far from the nearest clinic or hospital — or who are too distrustful to even step foot in one.

We already have digitally enabled care to some extent: We use apps, our medical records are electronic, and many of us have now used telemedicine to connect with clinicians. What is your vision of the future of "digitally enabled care?"

"Digitally enabled" refers to the idea that the right role of technology in health care is simply to increase the care in healthcare. ... For a glimpse of what's possible, I'll share my mom's experience during the pandemic. For 25 years, she struggled with Type 2 diabetes (and for the past 10 years, has been on insulin). But faced with all the reports of patients with diabetes having higher rates of COVID-19 complications, she signed up for a virtual diabetes service that was completely different than anything she had tried in the past two decades.

She was shipped a free glucose meter and weighing scale to send her data to her new diabetes care team. She downloaded a mobile app where she did video visits with her doctor — more frequently than she ever had in person — and 24/7 access to a health coach that she sometimes messaged with multiple times per day in the first few weeks of the program. She also was connected with another patient — a gentleman in Chicago who, like my mom, followed an Indian vegetarian diet — to exchange recipes with. The result: Within weeks, my mom lost over 10 pounds and safely got off of insulin. Nearly a year later, she still is.

How do you envision future care that is decentralized? Will U.S. health care become more of a do-it-yourself industry?

"Decentralized care" refers to a model where decisions about care are in the hands of those closest to it, including doctors and patients.

But health care is highly centralized and heavily regulated, and what doctors can do often comes down to what we can charge insurance companies for.

One example: I had a patient who was in and out of the hospital for heart failure. After one of these hospitalizations, I saw her in-clinic and learned that she didn't have a scale and couldn't afford one. Daily weigh-ins are critical for patients like her, as a few pounds gained can be an indicator of impending heart failure. So, I handed her a $20 bill from my pocket for a scale, and she was never admitted to the hospital again. If our health care system was decentralized, I would be able to get my patients the $20 piece of equipment they need instead of racking up thousands of dollars in expensive medical tests and hospitalizations.

With all of the innovation you foresee, will there be actual market-based competitive pricing reform, or will all of the whistles and bells just drive health care costs inexorably upward?

The type of innovation we need most is true "disruptive innovation." This is a term that gets thrown around liberally, but the real definition refers to products or services that dramatically lower prices and increase quality, much more so than those currently available.

I see two steps we must take to get there: First, we need to stop nibbling around the edges. Often, our solution to, say, Type 2 diabetes, is training doctors in better management or approving a drug that is 1% better (and 200 times more expensive) than what we have now. A truly disruptive innovation is what my mom used: a digitally enabled service that reversed her diabetes and got her off of insulin completely.

Second, we need to get out of our own way. Early on in the pandemic, when we finally allowed patients to test themselves for COVID-19, we still required a doctor to sign off on the test. Patients filled out a questionnaire and a doctor then needed to scan through dozens of forms an hour to approve or reject the test applications (these were almost always approved). That's crazy! Now, we've finally let doctors off the hook, and patients can walk into a CVS or Walgreens to pick up a rapid COVID-19 test over the counter.

What are some ways that your future vision could go off the rails and lead us toward a care system that is less open, less transparent or less patient-centered?

The biggest threat is the continued monopolization of health care. In many parts of the country, there are only one or two large health systems and a few options for health insurance. This drives up prices with little to no benefit for patients or doctors.

Will the lessons of COVID-19 make us more prepared, and our health care system more adept for the next global challenge?

Absolutely. The pandemic has created medicine's greatest generation. By shepherding this country through the crisis, an entire generation of doctors, nurses, pharmacists and administrators learned an entirely new set of skills: public communication, front-line innovation, data-driven decision-making.

An outside force — a new virus — accelerated much-needed change in health care, but the work is just beginning. The future of care is now on us.

#### Strikes spur closures and collapse healthcare- empirics prove

Essien, 18 -- University of Uyo economics professor

[Madara, University of Uyo Department of Microbiology head & Vice Dean of Science, International Centre for Energy and Environmental Sustainability Research research fellow, "The Socio-Economic Effects of Medical Unions Strikes on the Health Sector of Akwa Ibom State of Nigeria," Asia Business Review, 8.2, May/August 2018, https://doi.org/10.18034/abr.v8i2.157, accessed 10-16-21, modified for ableist language]

The Nigerian economy has been disturbed and its economic activities disrupted from time to time due to labour union strike actions. Its first recorded labour strike was on June 21,1945 where about 150,000 clerical and nonclerical workers in the Nigerian Civil Service were demanding for better wages due to the rising cost of living brought about by the Second World War. This was possible because workers formed themselves into a labour union. The essence of the union amongst others was negotiation of wages, work rules, complaint procedures, rules governing hiring, firing and promotion of workers, workplace safety and policies to enforce strikes.

Despite the fact that the Trade Dispute Act of 1976 declared strike illegal; and the institutionalization of "no work, no pay" rule strike actions in Nigeria has no abated. The Nigerian health system has experienced exponential increase in industrial conflict. It appears that no part of public service in Nigeria has experienced more strikes than the health sector. In recent times there are many incidences of health workers strike; but the most interesting is the case of the Federal Medical Centre in Owerri. The health workers came to work every day but spend their time singing and praying on the hospital grounds, while ignoring their patients in the wards, protesting against the privatization of some of the hospital services. In many other parts of the country public sector hospitals were closed for about half of the year due strikes by doctors. But as soon as they returned, other health sector workers under the aegis of the Joint Health Sector Unions (JOHESU) proceeded to strike from November 2014 to February, 2015. Several patients including those in critical conditions were forced to discharge themselves following paralysis of medical and clinical services. It also made children to be abandoned in the children ward. All accident and emergency (A & E) department were under lock and key. Wards were deserted. This has impacted on the health care system, leading to several avoidable deaths, complication and outgoing medical tourism, as the wealthy seek health services abroad.

It can be seen so far that strikes in the health sector have assumed an astronomical proportion. This is occasioned by the inability of the government to settle her health workers duly and at the right time. Also, for harmony to exist in any productive sector of a country, there need to be an efficient interplay of both individuals (workers) and the country (employer). Perhaps, strikes are sustained because this interplay is not efficient enough and so disharmony becomes the order of the day in the sector. The impact of these different strikes on the health sector tends to place more negative values on local and national economy. Thus, this work aimed at analyzing the socio-economic dynamics of these strikes and how it impacts on the health sector of Nigeria - focusing on the health sector of Akwa Ibom State.

Statement of the Problem

Nigeria as a country has suffered from several health workers' strikes involving different categories of health workers. Frequent health workers' strikes result in the closure of public health care institutions preventing Nigerians access to quality health services. Health care workers are specialized in different areas; an optician does a different work from a surgeon and so on. It is the integration of all their works as well as the interrelationship that exists in these different medical services that makes the health system, as a whole function effectively. Thus, if any of these categories withholds services due to strikes, the health sector will definitely not function efficiently. This posed serious hardship to the relations of patients as they complained they had no money to go to private hospitals. Strikes [freeze]~~paralyze~~ healthcare delivery services at the detriment of people's lives. It has so far sent many people to their untimely graves. Incessant strikes do not only create animosity, acrimony and supremacy tussle among various units and departments in the public health institutions but it also ~~cripple~~[destroys] the health system economic-wise. On the account of this observation, the study aim to highlights the economic consequences of the strike actions. It set out to analyze the positive and negative socio-economic effect of medical union strike on health sector of Akwa Ibom State. In other words, the work aims to show how medical union strike impact on the State's economic indices.

#### Medical strikes collapse access which spurs disease and turns the case- healthcare is a prereq to fix inequality and poverty

Essien, 18 -- University of Uyo economics professor

[Madara, University of Uyo Department of Microbiology head & Vice Dean of Science, International Centre for Energy and Environmental Sustainability Research research fellow, "The Socio-Economic Effects of Medical Unions Strikes on the Health Sector of Akwa Ibom State of Nigeria," Asia Business Review, 8.2, May/August 2018, https://doi.org/10.18034/abr.v8i2.157, accessed 10-16-21]

The result of this study has serious social and economic implications for the society in terms of its effects on micro-economic and macro-economic indices of the country. The impact is usually higher in developing economies. In other words, in less developed economies, medical unions' strikes further worsens already worse socioeconomic circumstances to the extent that citizens lack or have little options to turn to. From the study, 20% of the respondents reported that medical union strike worsen patients' health conditions, 14.7% reported that it leads to spreading of disease, and 6.7% indicated that medical union strike increases social inequality (Figure 1).

In Nigeria about 70% of the population is reported to live below poverty line, this means that the little money individuals and household have is used to purchase essential services such as food, shelter, clothing and healthcare. Yet, healthcare is cheaper in government-managed facilities. However, when the health workers within such facilities down tools, this decreases the ability of many individuals and households to obtain healthcare because they usually lack the wherewithal to finance such alternatives. This leads to worsening of the conditions of both inpatients and outpatients and also leads to spreading of diseases in the case of contagious diseases. This also means that the affected population would be less productive in terms of their involvement in pursuit of economic productive ends achieve through exerting labour. At the macro-economic level, the aggregate productivity of the national economy will be negatively affected.

From the study, it was reported that medical Union strike leads to increased social inequality. This means that during strike the gap between the poor and the rich as well as between the male and female gender becomes increasingly obvious. Many rich people could obtain medical services at private clinics during which fewer poor could do same. In the same vein, fewer female than their male counterparts could obtain medical services at private healthcare facility. The impact of worsening social inequality implies that, most of the disadvantaged group could not contribute to economic growth at per capita level. This would also have negative effects on national aggregates. 12.7% of respondents indicated that medical union strike increases mortality rate (Figure 1); particularly that of children who are known to be more vulnerable to disease (Todaro and Smith 2012).

Studies have indicated that healthier people earn higher wages. In Cote d' Ivoire it was reported that unhealthy people, that is people who were likely to lose a day of work per month due to illness earned 19% lower than healthy people (Todaro and Smith 2012).This further means that, a healthy population is a prerequisite for successful economic development. This study indicates that medical unions' strike worsens outpatients' health and reduces the opportunity of the population to obtain healthcare services (Figure 1). Good health standard in a population is unimportant to achieve goals of poverty reduction. As Todaro and Smith (2012) note, "if parents are two weak, unhealthy, and unskilled to be productive enough to support their family, the children have to work. But if the children work, they cannot get the education they need, so when they grow up, they will have to send their own children to work "(p.403). Thus, the cycle of poverty and low productivity extend across generations. Health and education are pivotal to economic development (Todaro and Smith 2012).

Strike itself is based on microeconomic self-interest. Umo (1993) noted that "the economic world draws its dynamism from the self-interest motivation of individuals, firms and governments in response to some desirable incentives" (p.3). Umo (1993) also noted that every economic activity is a response to a reward or loss system. The existence of appropriate incentives elicits appropriate (correct) economic behavior. The level of efficiency in public institutions depends on the structure of positive and or negative incentives facing the operators (Umo 1993). People work to earn a living. Health workers also work to earn a living. Their motivation to work is the reward that they get. However, when the incentive is distorted, they are bound to react. A restoration of these incentives means restoration of efficiency to the system. We can say that strike is an economic corrective mechanism necessary for the effective functioning of the work environment in terms of protecting the reward system of the economy thereby, ensuring efficiency and productivity.

Conclusion and Recommendations

From the findings of the study, it can be concluded that strikes interrupt the smooth flow of medical services to citizens and it is slowly and irredeemably destroying the public health system. This is a result of incompatible demand of the employers and her employees. Also, the study also reveal that denial of salary review and accumulated salary arrears were identified as major causes of medical union strikes. It is noteworthy that the impact of industrial conflict is felt in the productive sector of the economy, both at microeconomic and macroeconomic levels. When people's health conditions get worsened or there is high mortality rate due to strikes, they become unable to shoulder their responsibilities effectively and hence cannot make progress that will contribute to the growth of the society. This will also reduce labour force drastically both currently and in the future and will in turn affect aggregate production and income negatively. Poor health and negative economic growth are inextricably linked. Improving the health of a nation's citizens can directly result in economic growth. When human capital is deteriorated, economic productivity is at stake. Health workers have been seen as valuable assets to the society. Their intrinsic value, in terms of human capital, should be respected rather than focusing on economic productivity that may be derived from it. Whenever that is ignored, labour unions utilize the threat of strike (Owoye, 1994).

#### Strikes collapse healthcare worker morale even if they succeed- spurs brain drain and severe healthcare disruption

Chima, 13 -- University of Kwazulu-Natal public health professor

[Sylvester, Programme of Bio & Research Ethics and Medical Law head, former Professor of Pathology and Medical Law at the International American Medical University, "Global medicine: Is it ethical or morally justifiable for doctors and other healthcare workers to go on strike?," BMC Medical Ethics, 12-19-2013, https://bmcmedethics.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1472-6939-14-S1-S5, accessed 10-16-2021]

*NOTE: HCWs = health care workers*

Impact of strikes on doctors and HCWs

It would appear that strikes may have a disproportionate deleterious impact on doctors and other HCWs when compared to patients. Striking HCWs frequently face a loss of income, job insecurity, and emotional distress, plus long hours of work for those who choose not to participate in the strike action. Further, there could be derangement of working relationships as well as loss of established leadership [11, 41]. Whether or not their demands are eventually met, doctors who have been involved in strikes usually end up disillusioned and demotivated and many end-up emigrating overseas or relocating within the country thereby leading to either internal or external brain drain. For example, striking doctors in Timaru, New Zealand reported an "overwhelming feeling of complete lack of confidence and trust in the hospital management team" [11, 16, 25, 55, 66]. The impact of such movements could be as severe as occurred in Malta, where the Maltese medical school lost its GMC accreditation due to a prolonged doctor's strike [9]. It could also lead to a situation where close to 25% of a national doctors threatened to quit their jobs and leave the country unless they received wage increases, as reported recently from the Czech Republic [16]. The brain drain which occurred in Malta, New Zealand and Israel following doctors strikes led to major disruptions in healthcare service delivery in the centers and regions affected [9, 14].

#### Next pandemic causes extinction- strong public health is key to solve

Bhadelia, 21 -- Center for Emerging Infectious Diseases Policy & Research founding director

[Nahid, MD, MALD, "What do we need to build resilience against the next pandemic?," Center for Emerging Infectious Diseases Policy & Research, 5-18-2021, https://www.bu.edu/ceid/2021/05/18/placeholder-blog-post/, accessed 10-18-2021]

What do we need to build resilience against the next pandemic?

We have lost close to 3.4 million souls to COVID-19 globally over the last year. By some estimates, the real number may be much higher than that because the excess deaths this year are closer to between 7 and 13 million, after accounting for those who died without a diagnosis and those who died because they could not receive timely care for another medical condition. And the pandemic, despite the receding cases in high-resource countries, is nowhere near its end.

Lives lost are the tip of iceberg. We cannot quantify the pain felt by family members remaining behind. Livelihoods and businesses have been devastated. The pandemic’s impact reaches into all recesses of our personal and public lives. It has and will continue to undo decades of work globally on reducing poverty, improving education and health, and empowering women. An IMF study last year showed how, in the five years after major epidemics, income inequality continues to increase in affected countries. Similar trends are already being seen in five countries with the heaviest death tolls from COVID-19. As communities around the world deal with the wreckage of their economies, 95 million more people have been pushed into extreme poverty, with another 200 million predicted to be at risk between now and the year 2030. And this does not even cover the multidimensional impact of poverty. How long will it take for us to recover from this pandemic? How do we take stock and pandemic-proof our communities?

More urgently, COVID-19 may not be the last pandemic we face in our lifetimes. The existential threat of pandemics doesn’t decrease because we are already facing one. In fact, this pandemic worsens the risk for new threats because our effort and resources are depleted, and our surveillance and healthcare systems are overstretched. And because the risk of new infectious diseases seeping into the human population from animal reservoirs is going to continue to grow as we see grow in numbers, require more land, raise more animals, put down more roads, use up more wetlands, and close the gap between us and natural habitats where yet undiscovered viruses lurk. How can we ensure that economically devastated communities coming out of this pandemic recover without worsening the tenuous balance we have with the world around us?

Within our own lifetimes, we have seen the impact of climate change, another existential crisis, transition from something we heard about in news reports to something we experience in our personal lives in the form of changing weather patterns, health effects, increased risk of natural disasters, and rising sea levels. Over the next decades, these factors will exponentially increase the incidence of many infections and change the distribution of others.

And as we tackle these complex problems, new challenges are arising: despite becoming ever more globally connected, our perceptions of reality continue to be disparate. In the deluge of digital data, many among us are falling prey to misinformation and disinformation. The urgency of outbreaks, the shifting scientific knowledge base that comes from tackling emerging pathogens, and political interference have all contributed to the signal getting lost in the noise. The role of disinformation is only going to expand in future emergencies. How do we share timely information in crisis? How do we, in government, science, and public health, earn and build the trust of our communities so ours is the voice they listen to during the fray? How do we listen more carefully to them? How do we involve them in making us all safer?

We can no longer ignore infectious threats on the other side of the world, and we can no longer practice isolationist policies. Because COVID-19 painfully instructed us that outbreaks aren’t just something that happen on the news in distant communities, but instead, they can reach into our homes and rip away our loved ones.

There are moments in history when our actions require collective metacognition and urgency. This has to be one of those moments.

The Center for Emerging Infectious Diseases (CEID) Policy & Research was founded because the time is now for collective transdisciplinary research and response. Every step of the way in this pandemic, the questions haven’t been just scientific, they have also been legal, economic, cultural, and ethical. CEID’s mission is to tug at the threads of all the complex systems that leave us vulnerable to new epidemics and help us answer some of the questions posed above. Through research, collaborative action, community engagement, and training, we hope to find ways to secure us against future global threats. I hope you will reach out with ideas, collaborate with us, and check back often to see where our work is taking us.

We are not rudderless as we head into this future. The COVID-19 pandemic, like recent Ebola virus disease outbreaks and other recent emergencies, has shown that investment in sciences, global collaboration, public health, and health-systems readiness can decrease our vulnerability. We need not only to invest in diagnostics, vaccines, and therapeutics but also find a new way of approaching the problems. My own experience serving as an outbreak responder in multiple emergencies has underscored for me again and again that epidemics fracture us along lines of existing weakness. Because at the terminus of all international surveillance for outbreaks are many communities that do not have access to care. When families can’t access care, we can’t stop cases from becoming clusters, which then become outbreaks. When communities can’t equitably access vaccines, it makes it harder for them to recover, and we continue to suffer collectively from the global economic impact and through the appearance of new variants. When structural racism keeps parts of our communities from being protected, diagnosed, and cared for, all of us are at risk. When it comes to infectious diseases outbreaks, health inequity is a threat to all our survival.

At the launch of our center, we asked public health experts and scientists, “What do we need to do to build resilience against the next pandemic?” Over the next few months, we will continue asking this question to different disciplines, covering those working on health and economic equity, lawmakers, the business community, artists and musicians, and those in media and journalism. Because the solutions, like the questions, require all of us.
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#### Counterplan: The European Union should recognize the fundamental right of workers to organize unions

#### Fundamental rights are highly enforceable and challenges will be struck down- but they’re distinct from unconditional rights which are absolute and can’t be restricted by conditions- any perm severs “unconditional”

Sharma, 18 – iPleaders author

[Deepanshi, "Are Fundamental Rights Unconditional?," iPleaders, 1-8-18, https://blog.ipleaders.in/are-fundamental-rights-unconditional/, accessed 11-3-21]

What are Fundamental rights?

Fundamental rights are the basic human rights that are guaranteed to the citizens of India (to all people in case of article 14) by the Indian Constitution. They act as a limitation to the power of the State. These rights are highly revered and any law that is found to be in contravention of them can be challenged in the Supreme Court by the virtue of article 32 of the Constitution, and subsequently struck down to the extent of the inconsistency. The Supreme court can also pass any appropriate order, direction, or writ for the enforcement of these rights. Similar powers are present with the High Courts under article 226 as well.

In case of violation of the fundamental rights, the Courts can be approached not only by the aggrieved person but by any public-spirited person or social action group, acting in good faith, for the socially and economically disadvantaged people who otherwise cannot approach the Court (Subhash Kumar v state of Bihar). This can be done through a simple letter as well (State Of Himachal Pradesh vs A Parent Of A Student Of Medical College). Therefore these rights can be enforced relatively easily. Moreover, a fundamental right cannot be given up by individuals through their own consent. In Behram Singh v State of Bombay, it was held that they are provided not only for benefit of the citizens but on the grounds of public policy as well.

However, can fundamental rights be amended/changed by the legislature?

The Basic Structure Doctrine

A thirteen-judge bench in Keshwananada Bharti v State of Kerala, overturning the landmark judgment of Golak Nath, I.C. v State of Punjab, held that any part of the constitution can be amended, abrogated or abridged without changing the basic foundational values and structure of the constitution. However, a definitive list of what constituted the basic structure was not declared.

The Court in Indira Nehru Gandhi, Smt. v Rajnarain noted that whether any particular part of the constitution forms a part of the basic structure, or not, has to be judged individually as it comes before the court. Post this, several features have been declared as a part of it in different cases. For instance, the Minerva Mills Case declared a constitutional amendment which removed the limitation imposed on the power of the legislature as unconstitutional. It held that limited amending power is part of the basic structure of the constitution and thus, cannot be altered.

Fundamental Rights as Basic Structure

A nine-judge bench in I R Coelho v Union of India recalled the importance given to the articles 14, 19 and 21 in various precedents, including by Justice Chandrachud in Minerva Mills Case. It noted that these three articles have been considered as the part of the basic structure in the Indian Constitutional History. Since the inclusion of a law in the 9th schedule resulted in the abrogation of article 32 of the constitution, it effectively removed such a law from being tested against article 14, 19 and 21 and thus were held to be in contravention of the basic structure doctrine.

Along with enlarging the idea of the basic structure doctrine to include these three Fundamental right, the Court held that any law has to satisfy the direct impact and effect test which judges the effects of such law on the basic structure of the Constitution.

Therefore, the essence of these Fundamental Rights cannot amended, abrogated or abridged. However, are these rights themselves absolute?

Fundamental rights are not absolute

Right to Equality

It is incorrect to say that all laws have to be made applicable to everyone uniformly owing to the right to equality. The concept of equality envisioned in the Constitution necessitates giving consideration to the social and economic inequalities present in the society (para 100, St. Stephen College v University of Delhi). To elevate these, the State, through legislation, are entitled to make reasonable classification to treat differently placed people differently (State of Bombay v Balsara).

Doctrine of Reasonable Classification

While article 14 prohibits class legislation, it does not prohibit classification for the purpose of ensuring equality to those who, by virtue of nature, attainment or circumstances, are differently positioned. For this purpose, differential law based on reasonable classification is permitted. A classification to be considered reasonable has to satisfy two tests-

Intelligible Differentia: The classification must be made on an intelligible differentiating factor which distinguishes persons or things that are included in a group from those who are left out.

Reasonable nexus with the object: The classification must have a reasonable nexus with the object that such a statute aims to achieve. Such an aim, needless to mention, should be lawful in nature (Das J. in State of W.B. v Anwar Ali Sarkar)

Ps. Article 14 is a general provision and therefore, has to be read with all other provisions in Part III of the Constitution.

Special Law for Women and Children

Article 15(3) provides an exception to the rule against discrimination in article 15(1) and 15(2) (Dattaraya Mootiram v State of Bombay). This sub-section carves a place for special laws to be made for the benefit of women and children. For instance, an act mandating provision of maternity leave to women, or one for reservations for women in public employment [Government of A.P. v P.B. Vijaykumar; even beyond 50% (Taguru Sudhakar Reddy v govt of A. P.] would not be a contravention of the prohibition against discrimination.

Special Law made for Social and Economically Backward Classes, Scheduled Castes, and Scheduled Tribes

Aiming to correct the historic discrimination that some classes/groups of people have had experienced or still experience, the Constitution allows positive discrimination for their benefit in Article 15(4).

Added in the First Amendment, this subsection is another exception to the rule against discrimination. It provides the State with the power to make special laws for the Backward classes, Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. It is also an exception to Article 29(2) that prohibits denial of admission into any public educational institution based on religion, race, caste or language (M. R. Balaji and Ors. v State of Mysore). However, it must be ensured that policies undertaken under this section, if compensatory and protective discriminatory in nature, are reasonable and consistent with the public interest (Preeti Shrivastava Dr. v State of M.P.).

Furthermore, article 16 (4), (4A), and (4B) make it possible for the state to make reservations in appointments in the public sector for those “backward classes” [emphasis] which are not adequately represented in such services.

While the case of Indra Sawhney mentioned that reservations cannot be made in respect of promotions, it held that short of reservations, special provisions could be made to facilitate promotions of members of such backward classes.

Right to Freedom

Article 19 grants the right to speech and expression, to assemble peacefully without arms, to form unions and association, to move freely throughout India, to reside and settle in anyplace such, and to practice any profession, occupation, trade or business. However, these rights given under Article 19(1) can be restricted by law made by the state under respective conditions mentioned in the clause 2 of the same article.

Reasonable Restrictions

Owing to the addition of word “reasonable” by the first amendment, such restrictions have to be within reasonable limits. These restrictions should be reasonable in substance as well as in the procedure laid in such a law. For instance, the procedure for carrying out such law should be in consonance with principles of natural justice. Moreover, the reasonability of the restriction should be judged from the aspect of the general public’s interest (Mohd. Hanif Quershi v State of Bihar)

Grounds for restriction in article 19(2)

Reasonable restrictions on freedom can be placed for the following purposes:

Sovereignty and Integrity of India (added in the sixteenth amendment): To guard against attack on the territorial sovereignty and integrity of India (not the constituent states, as per Romesh Thapar v State of Madras)

Security of the State: To guard against the use of freedom to overthrow, wage, or rebel against the government. This includes restriction of indirect actions towards these aims, for instance, incitement.

Friendly relations with foreign nations (first amendment): To restrict the speech of individuals that can hamper friendly relations of India with a foreign state.

Public order (first amendment): To preserve public order or “public peace, safety and tranquility” (Central Prison v Ram Manohar Lohia). Restriction on indirect acts, which have a tendency to lead to disorder is also within the scope of this restriction as long as there is a reasonable and direct nexus of the restricted act with the objective of maintaining public peace.

Decency and morality: To protect and promote public decency and morality.

Contempt of Court: To prevent contempt of court as defined in section 2 of the Contempt of Court Act. Such contempt of court has to be manifest, malicious, and substantial in nature (E.M.S. Namboodiripad v T.N. Nambiar).

Defamation: To prevent defamation as it results in hatred or ridicule of another citizen.

Incitement of an offence: To prevent speech that results in incitement to commit a crime and violate another person’s rights.

Sedition: To prevent all those actions that lead to disturbance to the tranquillity of the state. However, criticism of the existing system and expression of a desire for a different system of state does not amount to sedition. The expression has to be judged based on the intention and likelihood of inciting disorder. (Nihrindu v.Empror the; Kedar Nath v State of Bihar)

Right to Life

Limited by the “procedure established by law”

Article 21 ensures right to life and personal liberty. However, it is immediately followed by the words “except according to procedure established by law”. This creates the possibility of limitations on various rights that come under the right to life and liberty. For example, punitive detention is a limitation that can be placed on the right to liberty. However, this right cannot be limited in any way except by following the procedure that is laid down by the act that prescribes such detention.

The limitation can only be placed by a law that has been enacted by any competent legislature and such procedure has to be “just, fair, and reasonable”. Also, the validity of the procedure established has to be judged against Article 14 (therefore, reasonability is requisite) as well as Article 19 as these rights are not exclusive of each other (Golden triangle rule) (Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India).

It is also important to note that while the right to life includes several other rights, it does not include the right to die (Aruna Ramchandra Shanbaug v Union Of India).

Religious Freedom

On the grounds of Public order, Morality, and Health

While Article 25 provides for equal right to profess, practice, and propagate any religion, such freedom cannot be used to do acts which are harmful to public order, health, and morality (Ramjilal Modi v. State of UP). For instance, creation of hatred among groups while practising religion, which can have possible ramifications over public order as well as health, was held to be outside the scope of freedom of religion (Subhash Desai v Sharad J. Rao)

While converting is permissible and within the scope of this freedom, conversion for the purpose of taking the benefit of polygamy that was allowed in another religion, while a marriage in the previous one subsisted, was not held to be valid in the case of Lily Thomas v Union of India.

Similar conditions restrict the freedom to manage religious affairs under Article 26 as well.

Limited by other Fundamental Rights

Presence of this phrase in Article 25 (only) results in positioning the Freedom to Religion on a lower niche than other Fundamental Rights. To exemplify, playing of loud preachings was considered to promote noise pollutions and conflict with other people’s liberty to not hear such preachings (Church of God v. KKR Magestic Colony Welfare Ass.).

Conclusion

While the Fundamental Rights are an integral part of the Constitution, it would be incorrect to term them as unconditional. These rights, by the Constitution itself, are restricted by conditions which aim to balance the individual freedom and rights to the necessity of public good and welfare.

# ON

#### US solve global democracy – strikes are high there now. Kellogs, Harvard, John Deere, and Keiser to name a few. They only state that strikes are key, not EU strikes. Any strike in any country should solve for their impacts.

#### No EU collapse – new trends strengthen unity

**Weiss ’20** [Andrew S. Weiss is the James Family Chair and a vice president for studies at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, where he oversees research in Washington and Moscow on Russia and Eurasia, “Russia and Europe: Stuck on Autopilot,” 9-24-20, https://carnegieendowment.org/2020/09/24/russia-and-europe-stuck-on-autopilot-pub-82773]

At the same time, the Kremlin has frequently overestimated the quality of the cards it has to play in Europe. Repeated **Russian attempts to split** NATO or **the EU have fallen flat** over the past several decades. The staying power of both institutions—and the European unity that undergirds them—has been quite impressive, even in extreme circumstances like the current pandemic, the annexation of Crimea and war in eastern Ukraine in 2014, and the Euromissile crisis of the early 1980s. Along the way, Russian leaders have demonstrated a repeated propensity to shoot themselves in the foot. Their overreach has stiffened European resolve and reinforced the central role of Germany, which precisely because of its special relationship with Russia has been crucial in managing the EU’s ties with a truculent neighbor. Moscow has also demonstrated time and again that it simply does not get the importance of the EU for Germany and France, and that lack of understanding frequently backfires for the Kremlin. For their part, U.S. diplomats and military officers have long strived to reconcile the competing priorities and goals of their European allies. As one very experienced NATO hand put it, the leaders of the alliance have generally proved themselves to be masters at balancing conventional and nuclear defense, balancing détente and defense, balancing the process of European integration which de Gaulle wanted with alliance of the Atlantic solidarity, balancing national interests, which are very strong, with the need for a common denominator of collective security.2 With Russian behavior once again posing a direct threat to NATO members, this balancing act has become increasingly important of late, but the alliance has generally succeeded in restoring a proper level of focus to its original core mission of deterrence and collective defense. The United States has traditionally relied on high-level diplomacy and informal decisionmaking and coordination mechanisms to help shape transatlantic policy toward Russia and to bridge differences with its core European allies. During former U.S. president Gerald Ford’s administration, the Quad was created to facilitate regular dialogue among the United States, France, Germany, and the United Kingdom at the level of foreign ministers and senior diplomats. More recently, this mechanism has played an important role in the response to Russia’s military aggression against Ukraine, including joint U.S./EU economic sanctions, the revitalization of NATO, and steps to improve the resilience of EU and frontline countries to respond to Russian malign activities. 3

1. **Pope 18 doesn’t mention that unconditional strikes are essential, it just speaks about strikes in general. It also speaks about the US, not the EU – card is not related to their case**

#### No impact to authoritarianism – it’s media hype

**Leong ’19** [Ho Wai Clarence Leong holds an MSc from the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism and an MA in English and Modern History from the University of St. Andrews, is the Asia newswire editor for Dow Jones, “In an age of authoritarianism, the world sees glimmers of hope,” 3-19-19, <https://www.csmonitor.com/World/Progress-Watch/2019/0319/In-an-age-of-authoritarianism-the-world-sees-glimmers-of-hope>]

In the past year, citizens of Hungary, Poland, the Czech Republic, and Ethiopia have taken to the streets to demand accountability from their governments, while voters in Malaysia and the Maldives ousted corrupt governments at the ballot box. Countries with a strong civil society or decent-sized middle class continue to push back against autocrats, even though the headlines are more often about the threats to democracy. That’s not to say democracy has nothing to worry about. A new paper published this month found that the world has been in “a wave of autocratization” since 1994, and as many as 75 democracies have seen a reversal to autocracy. Modern-day autocrats know better than to blatantly shore up power, but do so gradually and under a legal facade, making it harder to detect, researchers say. Autocrats pit authoritarianism against democracy, promoting it as a more efficient form of governance and spreading the technology that strengthens control. Social media amplifies the spread of misinformation, clouding voters’ judgment. Global freedom, which is composed of political rights and civil liberties, has been in decline for the 13th year in a row, according to a new report from Freedom House. But the same report also notes significant improvement in accountability for corruption in Angola, Armenia, and other nations. Political participation in most parts of the world has seen a continuous upward trend, reports The Economist. And while **autocrats** threaten democracies, they **are** also “**fueling a powerful counterattack**,” Human Rights Watch notes in its latest annual report. “Those who are bemoaning this authoritarian turn in the world were overstating the case,” says Steven Levitsky, a political scientist at Harvard and co-author of “How Democracies Die.” The euphoric expansion of democracy in the 1990s led to the over-optimistic belief that authoritarianism was a thing of the past, and now that expectation has been dashed, he says. But “there’s yet to emerge a real, viable, truly legitimate alternative to democracy in the world.” That doesn’t discount the fact that people are disillusioned with traditional political parties and losing confidence in democracy. But rather than disengaging from it, that dissatisfaction is driving citizens to participate in political processes, according to The Economist. Voter turnout and membership of political parties rose, reversing a downward trend. A larger proportion of the world’s population is now willing to engage in lawful demonstrations. The Economist also notes a particularly striking area of progress coming from female participation in politics. “Women have become much more active, not just in [the] U.S. but around the world,” says Steven Leslie, lead analyst at The Economist Intelligence Unit. “There is an ongoing surge of female participation in politics and in activities that are essential to democracy.” Barriers like discriminatory laws and socioeconomic obstacles are gradually being removed. In Rwanda and Ethiopia, half of the cabinet ministers are women. New legislation in Japan encourages gender parity in parliament. In the United States, the voters in the November midterms elected the highest number of women to Congress in history – though they still make up only 23.7 percent. Still, the international atmosphere has become less favorable to the expansion of democracy. Not only is the totalitarian state of China spreading its influence, but cracks are appearing in decades-old alliances such as the European Union and NATO. In the EU, both Italy and Turkey saw their rankings in The Economist’s democracy index fall by at least 10 places. Meanwhile, on the other side of the Atlantic, the U.S. is becoming more isolationist, analysts say. “America’s commitment to the global progress of democracy in its foreign policy has been seriously compromised,” says Sarah Repucci, senior director for research and analysis at Freedom House. In one example, when the U.S. withdrew from the council on human rights at the United Nations, it left “a huge vacuum of power,” says Rosa Freedman, a professor of law, conflict, and global development at the University of Reading in England and author of several books on the U.N. Despite the downward trends, however, countries are forming new alliances to put pressure on repressive regimes, reports Human Rights Watch. It points to the example of the EU and a group of Muslim-majority countries working together to create a mechanism at the U.N. to collect evidence on the ethnic cleansing of Rohingyas, which could be used in future trials of the Myanmar government. A group of Latin American countries led a resolution in the Human Rights Council to condemn the severe persecution of Venezuelans under President Nicolás Maduro. Other human rights mechanisms have sprung up in unexpected places, adds Joseph Saunders, deputy program director at Human Rights Watch. For example, the organizing bodies of big sports tournaments, such as the World Cup and the Olympics, will scrutinize the bidders and hosts’ human rights records. “These are obviously dark times,” says Mr. Saunders. “But [you] miss a large part of the picture if you don’t see the pushback that is also happening.”

#### No impact to EU nationalism/populism

**Moravcsik ’20** [Andrew Moravcsik is professor of politics and director of the European Union Program at Princeton University, “Why Europe Wins,” 9-24-20, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/09/24/euroskeptic-europe-covid-19-trump-russia-migration/>]

In fact, **populists were never as powerful as headlines made them seem**. Consider the case of Marine Le Pen, who heads the French extreme-right National Rally party. When she ran for the French presidency in 2017, newspapers across the globe proclaimed, as one New York Times article put it, that “the next president of France will be Marine Le Pen” and speculated what her administration would do once in office. Yet her campaign was clearly hopeless from the start. All of her potential rivals, polls showed, could defeat her by comfortable double-digit margins, and Emmanuel Macron eventually did so by winning twice as many votes. Today, the National Rally holds just seven of 577 seats in the National Assembly. Outside of Britain, extreme Euroskepticism enjoys scant support. The impotence of the extreme-right in France is no exception. Outside of Britain, extreme Euroskepticism enjoys scant support. Of 27 EU members (plus Britain), 12 have no extreme-right or Euroskeptic party at all or none that scores above 10 percent in national elections. In 10 more countries, including France and Germany, other parties consistently exclude extremists from government coalitions. In three more—Latvia, Estonia, and Bulgaria—extremists participate only as minority coalition partners, which reduces their influence close to zero. Only in Britain, Hungary, and Poland does an extreme-right or Euroskeptic party actually lead the government. Of course, their extremism poses threats to the quality of democracy and rule of law, as in the United States, but their effect on foreign policy is slight. Migration is the only EU issue on which policy has moved in a direction extremists favor—but this, as we have seen, is only because the position held by extremists happens to be that of large majorities of moderate voters in nearly every country. Otherwise, Poland and Hungary, both of which are among the biggest beneficiaries of EU policies and have exceptionally pro-EU populations, follow their neighbors on nearly every aspect of external policy, from sanctions on Russia to development aid to Africa—dissenting occasionally only on symbolic declarations. That leaves Brexit as the only major Euroskeptic achievement of a populist party in recent years. Yet Brexit is, at best, an exception that proves the rule. That it happened at all reflects a perfect storm of astonishingly unlikely circumstances unrepeatable elsewhere. Britain is the only European country where Euroskepticism attracts more than a tiny fringe of the electorate. Even so, Brexit could happen only because a prime minister overruled his advisors to call an unnecessary referendum, which happened to fall at the only brief moment in the last five years when a majority of Britons opposed EU membership. Brexit was later ratified by an election in which a 44 percent vote share gave Boris Johnson a comfortable majority: Without Britain’s electoral institutions, the most biased in Europe, a pro-EU majority would have ruled instead. Today, Brexit remains stalled. Britain is much smaller and dependent on Europe’s good will to gain access for nearly half of its exports, particularly of services like banking. This allows Europe to take a tough stance in negotiations over the terms of the U.K. withdrawal. British Brexiteers once hoped that Trump would bail them out with a quick trade agreement. Yet U.S.-U.K. negotiations have gone nowhere after the United States badgered the British about agricultural imports and aircraft subsidies. Trump embarrasses prime ministers on his visits, remains unpopular among the British public, and is struggling to be reelected. Britain is running out of options. These realities, combined with the more general lack of support for their Euroskeptic views, have led populists elsewhere to moderate their ideas rather than follow London’s lead. Five years ago, 15 extreme-right parties, including Le Pen’s National Rally, advocated a Brexit-style withdrawal from the EU or the eurozone. Today none do. Even so, the most worrisome populist challenger in Europe, Matteo Salvini of the League party, is hemorrhaging popular support to the Brothers of Italy, a new and less Euroskeptic right-wing party. **The wave of populist Euroskepticism seems to have crested**.

#### No impact – anti-democratic leaders won’t derail stability or the liberal order

**Kentikelenis and Krogh ’20** [Alexander Kentikelenis is assistant professor of political economy and sociology at Bocconi University in Milan, Erik Voeten is Peter F. Krogh Professor of Geopolitics and Justice in World Affairs at Georgetown University, “Biden promises to embrace multilateralism again. World leaders agree.” 12-16-20, https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2020/12/16/biden-promises-embrace-multilateralism-again-world-leaders-agree/]

In a recently published article, in fact, we found explicit criticisms of the global economic order have been on the decline for the past 15 years and are now at an all-time low. Each year, leaders have an opportunity to speak for about 15 minutes during the General Debate of the U.N. General Assembly. Leaders sometimes use this opportunity to vent their criticisms of global economic institutions. For example, President Trump remarked in 2018 that: “the world trading system is in dire need of change. … While the United States and many other nations play by the rules, [some] countries use Government-run industrial planning and State-owned enterprises to rig the system in their favor.” When we analyzed all 2,908 such speeches between 1970 and 2018, we found leaders rarely criticize the order in this way anymore. In our analysis, we tagged criticisms as statements of intent to abandon the global economic governance organizations, like the IMF and the World Bank, or broader challenges to underlying norms and practices and calls for their reform. Endorsements took the form of clear statements of support, or involved neutral statements that a country is cooperating with global institutions. As the figure below shows, despite a brief spike around the 2008 financial crisis, the heyday of critiques of the economic order was the 1975 to 2005 period. This reflects debates over the New International Economic Order in the 1970s and early 1980s, when some developing countries sought to shift the global economic system to aid developing economies grow faster and become less dependent on rich countries. At the time, the IMF, the World Bank and their controversial “structural adjustment programs” drew the ire of world leaders, while in the 1990s and early 2000s the world trade system attracted much negative attention. But **since 2016** — **a period of rising populist forces** around the world — we found only a minor increase in criticisms. Moreover, these **criticisms were outweighed by an increase in endorsements**. Very few leaders followed Trump in using their moment in the global spotlight to criticize global economic institutions. These broad trends mask an important shift Here’s what we think is happening. During the Cold War, the nature of contestation over the multilateral order was largely an insider-outsider conflict. Critiques came primarily from low-income countries that sought to overhaul the entire economic order. In contrast, **membership in the core global economic institutions has become near universal**. What we’re seeing is insider contestation, as members argue over the rules of the game. Leaders of countries that are highly open to economic globalization are more likely to criticize established arrangements. But they rarely call for wholesale reforms or abandonment of these institutions. Of course, there are exceptions. Our paper notes a number of leftist Latin American leaders with strong ideological objections to the liberal international order were strongly overrepresented among heads of state using the U.N. General Assembly platform to call for exits, including appeals by Hugo Chávez (Venezuela), Daniel Ortega (Nicaragua), Fidel Castro (Cuba) and Evo Morales (Bolivia). The defining feature of leader speeches in the U.N. in recent years is the relative silence about the international economic order and its institutions. Silence — while difficult to interpret — can also be a passive granting of legitimacy: It’s exceedingly rare for countries to abandon the system altogether, so attempts to delegitimate it in major international forums is a key avenue available to countries looking to challenge the established system. **But very few leaders take this route, which suggests the liberal order has become institutionalized**. Decades of multilateral organizations spreading free-market policies around the world have increased the order’s perceived immutability and staying power. Many leaders around the world probably see the U.N., WTO and other elements of the liberal order as no longer up for debate — they take them for granted.

#### No democratic decline now

**Fox ’20** [M.J. Fox holds a PhD from the Institute for Peace and Conflict Research, Uppsala University, Sweden, “Democracy Alive and Kicking,” 10-6-20, <https://transatlanticpuzzle.com/2020/10/06/democracy-alive-and-kicking/>]

However, this myopic focus on the USA makes it easy to overlook just how much democratic principles have also taken root in the hearts and minds of people in other places around the globe. From relentless mass demonstrations to defiantly exposing corruption, these global efforts boil down to the pursuit of one form or another of democratic principles. So **battles for democracy** are not only located in the Trumpian trajectory towards authoritarian rule nor in Barack Obama’s clarion call for democratic engagement. They **are alive and kicking** and taking place in various forms well beyond America’s borders. Most recently, from exposing corruption in Russia to large demonstrations in Israel, and from efforts to take down ‘Europe’s last dictator’ in Belarus to the removal of corrupt leadership in Mali, the inclination for democratic political life continues to repeatedly resurrect itself in unexpected ways and unexpected places. So it turns out that while we are not necessarily watching the death of democracy, we are surely watching it being put to the test. It is in fact good news as it reveals itself in different ways in different cases, reflecting democracy’s great breadth. Taking a closer look at the recent cases mentioned above avoids limiting any understanding of democracy as singularly or primarily electoral in nature; democracy is many things, and substantially more than the right to vote. For example, there is the important and indeed perilous investigative work of Alexei Navalny, the Russian corruption hunter who, at the time of this writing was in a Berlin hospital due to deliberate poisoning by his detractors. His efforts reflect the democratic principle of transparency, where without it, there is a lack of trust in leadership and the system itself. This in turn is commonly known to lead to social and political instability and more. Navalny’s individual work against corruption contrasts with other expressions of democratic principles, such as public protest, no matter if the protest comprises a small or large turnout, a minor or major issue, or singular versus a chain of events. In recent months there have been thousands of Israelis who were publicly protesting against their Prime Minister Benyamin Netanyahu, referred to by some as ‘crime’ minister. These public protests have taken place at Netanyahu’s official residence on Jerusalem’s Balfour Street. Currently Netanyahu is facing formal corruption charges, with the public expectation that he should give up his position while facing the charges. There is also disapproval of his poor handling of the corona virus pandemic and its resulting economic damage. It is here in these critical public protests that we see the democratic principles of the right to free speech and the right to assembly and public protest, all resting on a lack of trust and transparency. Yet in a similar vein, there has also been the ongoing case of Aleksandr Lukashenko, Belarus’ dictator of twenty-six years, and his own police and security troops. Having arrested almost all his opposition, including Siarhei Tsikhanouski, Lukashenko initially appeared to be unassailable. However, under the surrogate leadership of Tsikhanouski’s articulate, politically astute and now self-exiled wife, Svetlana Tikhanovskava, the resistance to Lukashenko lives on in several forms. Their repeated and massive open resistance has reportedly numbered in the tens of thousands and has even been estimated at more than 100,000. As it has taken place on the capital’s streets and reported in the media, it is a powerful living example of exercising such democratic principles as right to assembly and right to free speech, something which the people have not been formally granted and yet have fearlessly and admirably seized for themselves, and with the avid support of the European Parliament members. Elsewhere there is the carefully orchestrated military coup that took place in Mali in northwest Africa on 18 August. Responding to disputes arising from spring legislative elections, by early June a coalition had formed calling for the removal and detention of not only President Keita but also Prime Minister Boubou Cissé. The newly formed National Committee for the Salvation of the People (CNSP) was eager to appear compliant and not intimidating, announcing Colonel Assimi Goita, commander of a special forces battalion and described as a ‘calm and thoughtful man’ as the head of their committee to ensure ‘continuity of state services.’ Goita is also to serve as their head of state during a transition period as well as to representatives of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Thus far, with its delegation headed up by former Nigerian President Goodluck Jonathan, ECOWAS reports having met with the deposed president and prime minister, who have conceded to step down. Negotiations have been underway for a transfer to civilian rule, and at this early stage agreement has been reached on some points but not all, and so there is plenty more work to be done. This thus-far peaceful and stepwise transition to democratic rule is also a hallmark of democratic principles. What these recent cases point to is that **calls predicting democracy’s death are premature**. Perhaps its once almighty American centre is in the midst of being battered and indeed tested, but that is a far cry from its complete demise. Clearly, the idea and practice of democratic principles has been around long enough where it has made an impact on people elsewhere. In collective political and community efforts from Hong Kong to Beiruit, and global concerns on human rights from the Uyghurs to the Royhinga, **democratic principles will** continue to **ceaselessly rise** and rise again. Indeed, while the primary twentieth century seat of democracy might be experiencing its own challenges in 2020, elsewhere it is being jealously pursued and seized for the extraordinary promise and empowerment it brings to us all.

#### Democratic peace theory is wrong

**Seitz ’20** [Sam Seitz holds a Master’s in Security Studies from the Georgetown University Walsh School of Foreign Service, “The Democratic Peace and its Deficiencies,” 7-17-20, <https://politicstheorypractice.com/2020/07/17/the-democratic-peace-and-its-deficiencies/>]

The final problem with democratic peace theory is that there are several major exceptions that it struggles to explain. The biggest problem, at least in my view, is that new democracies act exactly opposite to the predictions of the theory. Far from reigning in their aggressive impulses, new democracies tend to find themselves in more wars than other states. This is not as damning as it may seem, because the research actually shows that it’s only during the transition to democracy that countries tend to experience violent conflict at much higher rates. Once democracy is established, young democracies are about as pacific as their mature democratic peers. This is not that surprising given work that shows that revolutionary regimes can be destabilizing and spark fear in their neighbors. Other work suggests that major shocks in the international system lead to corresponding waves of regime changes, and this unstable period might plausibly contribute to more inter- and intra-state violence. Still, the fact that specifically democratic transitions tend to me more violent is curious and suggests the dangers of demagoguery that exist in democratic regimes. The theory also struggles to explain the behavior of the United States, a country that has engaged in near endless warfare throughout its history. The American Indians, European powers, and a range of smaller proxy and rogue states around the world have all experienced the sting of American military power at some point or another. In the roughly thirty years since the end of the Cold War, the US has been at war during about half of them. But this would seem strange, as the US has always been a democracy (though, as we’ve already discussed, a flawed one). Perhaps the answer to this paradoxical finding is that regime type is actually not that important after all. Yes, more democratic regimes tend to be more peaceful on the margins, but ultimately it’s the structure of the international system that matters. The US is the hegemonic power, and thus it seeks to dominate and control the system to ensure that its preferences dominate. If this were true, we’d expect the US to not fight other democratic states, as they were allies against the threatening Soviets and today serve to broadly support America’s international priorities. That they are democracies is purely coincidence, not causal. We’d also expect the US to be engaged in near constant warfare against marginal states that attempt to defy its rule and pursue strategies (like nuclear proliferation) that weaken American power. Of course, this is an extreme version of the argument, but it’s probably not totally incorrect. The balance of power matters, and the US—like every great power—seeks to retain its advantages, democracy or not.

#### No impact to populism – liberal order outweighs

**Kentikelenis and Voeten ’20** [Alexander Kentikelenis is an assistant professor of sociology and political economy at Bocconi University, Erik Voeten is the Peter F. Krogh Professor of Geopolitics and Global Justice in the School of Foreign Service and the director of graduate studies in the Department of Government at Georgetown University, “Legitimacy challenges to the liberal world order: Evidence from United Nations speeches, 1970–2018,” 10-9-20, https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs11558-020-09404-y]

The liberal international economic order has been facing high-profile legitimacy challenges in recent years. This article puts these challenges in historical context through a systematic analysis of rhetorical challenges towards both the order per se and specific global economic institutions. Drawing on Albert Hirschman’s classic typology of exit, voice and loyalty, we coded leaders’ speeches in the General Debate at the UN General Assembly between 1970 and 2018 as articulating intentions to abandon elements of the order, challenges or calls for reform, unequivocal support, or factual mentions of cooperation. Surprisingly, we find that explicit criticisms towards the liberal order are at an all-time low and that exit threats remain rare. An analysis of the historical evolution of criticisms to global economic institutions reveals a move away from the Cold War insider-outsider conflict towards insider contestation. For example, we find that as countries’ economies become more open, their leaders expressed more support for global economic institutions during the Cold War but less support since. Finally, we demonstrate consistency between the public policy positions leaders announce in UNGA General Debate speeches and their government positions on consequential reform debates on debt relief. The ongoing deadly pandemic and the looming global economic crisis—both requiring multilateral interventions—arrived at a time when the established liberal international order had already been facing severe strains (Adler-Nissen and Zarakol 2020; Copelovitch et al. 2020; Eilstrup-Sangiovanni and Hofmann 2020; Ikenberry 2018). **The global** economic **order faces challenges from** both states that reject its liberal aspirations as well as from liberal democracies in which **nationalists and populists** have acquired political power. Since 2016, the United States—the most powerful actor in this order—has impeded the functioning of the World Trade Organization’s (WTO) Appellate Body, abandoned the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) trade negotiations, selected a critic of international financial institutions to lead the World Bank, and announced it will cut ties with the World Health Organization (WHO). However, at the same time, countries—including non-liberal regimes and multilateralism-skeptics—are seeking to salvage elements of this order. The EU, China and other countries agreed to a temporary work-around to the impasse at the WTO Appellate Body, the other participants of the TPP negotiations forged ahead without the US, and many countries pledged additional contributions to the World Bank and the WHO. Indeed, no state has recently abandoned global lynchpins like the WTO, World Bank, or International Monetary Fund (IMF). This is not the first time global economic institutions find themselves in the firing line. To the contrary, challenges to the legitimacy of the liberal order have abounded: calls for a New International Economic Order (NIEO) in the 1970s, major mishandled debt crises in the 1980s and 1990s, the IMF’s disappointing performance in financial crises of the late 1990s and 2000s, the 1999 Seattle protests against the WTO and the aftermath of the global financial crisis that started in 2007 are just some of the most consequential instances. As this list suggests, legitimacy challenges are common, even though the driving forces behind them may change. This article puts current legitimacy challenges in historical context through a comprehensive analysis of the discourse of governments towards the liberal international economic order in the past half-century. Legitimacy refers to the belief that authority is appropriately exercised within established institutional arrangements (Tallberg and Zürn 2019). Attempts at legitimation or de-legitimation entail justification or contestation of these arrangements (Buchanan and Keohane 2006), which—in turn—shape beliefs. This is a discursive process that takes place in multiple settings and that entails many actors. But perhaps no setting is as symbolically laden as the podium of the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA), where world leaders take the stage every September for the General Debate to deliver their remarks (Binder and Heupel 2015; Boehme 2018; Steffek 2003). We leverage the corpus of speeches for the 1970–2018 period, digitized and made publicly available by Baturo et al. (2017). This setting offers an annual opportunity for leaders to justify or contest the appropriateness of the global economic order, and it also presents an opportunity for social scientists to employ this data to glean patterns and elaborate on a key source of ‘input legitimacy’ to the global institutional order (see Risse 2006; Schmidt 2013). In examining legitimacy challenges articulated by leaders in the UNGA, our analytical aim is twofold: we study challenges both to the order per se, as well as to its three most prominent organizational underpinnings—the world trading regime (GATT/WTO), the World Bank and the IMF. By liberal international economic order, we understand the post-war system entailing multilateral organizations, open markets, collective responses to policy problems, and hegemonic leadership by the US (Ikenberry 2010, 2011). While the order rests above any single organization, it is upheld by a complex web of such multilateral structures, the most privileged of which being the focal institutions of world trade, development finance, and financial stability (Jupille et al. 2013; Mattli and Woods 2009). In other words, powerful organizations are core elements of the order, while the order is not wholly reducible to them. Indeed, given the global dominance of the order, it affects even countries that are not their member-states or signatories.