## 1

**Interpretation: You need to have a page on the wiki**

**Violation –- They have no page on the wiki.’ Screenshots prove.**

Graphical user interface

Description automatically generated

**Standards:**

**a] predictability – a page on the wiki allows people to get sent the case to understand the arguments that will be read in round. If there is no contact info or open source, there is no way for people to know the args. Predictability is key to education because in round clash can be maximized when the arguments are known beforehand. Clash increases education which is the purpose of debate.**

**b] strat skew - contact info/open source allows for disclosure which helps smaller schools get access to better evidence. Small schools have access to more and better evidence, this increases the quality of the debate, and allows for more clash. Stopping strat skew is key to fairness because bigger schools have access to more prep than smaller schools.**

**c] reciprocity – I have my contact info on the wiki for disclosure. Harms fairness if I contribute to the norm, and they do not.**

#### Even if you feel like me being unable to clash effectively is not enough in this round, it is still an awful model of debate which is fundamentally exclusionary.

**Voters:**

**a]. Education is a voter because education is the goal and purpose of debate. Education furthers life skills and thus must be protected.**

**b]. Fairness is a voter because debate is a competition, so protecting fairness in the round is key.**

**It’s drop the debater – a] deter future abuse and b] set better norms for debate c] indicts the debater d] time investment**

**Competing interps – [a] reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention since there’s no clear norm, [b] it creates a race to the top where we create the best possible norms for debate.**

**No RVIs – a] illogical, you don’t win for proving that you meet the burden of being fair, logic outweighs since it’s a prerequisite for evaluating any other argument, b] RVIs incentivize baiting theory and prepping it out which leads to maximally abusive practices c] you can’t win for having good disclosure practices, d] chills the checking of abuse**

## 1

**The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who proves the truth or falsity of the resolution through textual or conceptual args.**

**[a] – Inclusion. The Truth Testing role of the ballot allows for far more args then the assumed comparative worlds debate. This ROB includes all other args.**

**[b] – Reciprocity. Only way to weigh Ks and other args which test the truth of my position is the Truth Testing ROB.**

**[c] – Affirming or negating means assigning truth or falsity**

**Affirm means as per Dictionary.com – maintain as true**

**Negate means as per Dictionary.com - to deny the existence, evidence, or truth of**

**Presumption and permissibility flow aff: If I told you my name was Sid, you’d believe me. Theories are presumed true until proven false. IE. history; we can’t prove for sure that history is correct; we must presume its truth. If something has the chance or risk of being morally obligated, we should probably do it.**

**A prioris and semantics first – A priori ideas must be discussed first because they control the links to the ethics and framing issues in the comp worlds debate. Semantics too because we must understand the logic of the words we speak right now. Understanding linguistics is essential to figure out the true impacts of any claim.**

**1] – Curry’s Paradox – implies modus ponens; I say if my name is Sid, you affirm. Modus Ponens says that if the first statement is true then the second statement is true, and my name is Sid :)**

**2] – Paradox of Entailment – It is snowing, and it is also not snowing, thus you affirm.**

**3] – Principle of Explosion – [a] All songs are made by Carti. [b] Not all songs are made by Carti. [c] All songs are made by Carti or you affirm. Since it is clear that all songs are not made by Carti, you affirm. Not the [a] point is considered true, and the [b] point is true, the first part of the [c] statement is false forcing, through the principle of explosion, the second part to be true, so you affirm.**

#### 4] – Contestation – Args that would contest parts of my position presuppose the validity and truth of our claims which means they are true.

**5] – Trivialism – All statements are true in the form that something is [a] or they are not [a] every other descriptor was just made up for semantic ease. Thus, the resolution is true.**

### 1AC—framework – mitigation

#### 1]. Morality

#### 2]. Mitigate existential risk

#### 3]. Extinction is a distinct phenomenon that requires prior consideration

**Burke et al 16** Associate Professor of International and Political Studies @ UNSW, Australia, 2016 (Anthony, Stefanie Fishel is Assistant Professor, Department of Gender and Race Studies at the University of Alabama, Audra Mitchell is CIGI Chair in Global Governance and Ethics at the Balsillie School of International Affairs, Simon Dalby is CIGI Chair in the Political Economy of Climate Change at the Balsillie School of International Affairs, and, Daniel J. Levine is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Alabama, “Planet Politics: Manifesto from the End of IR,” Millennium: Journal of International Studies 1–25)

8. Global ethics must respond to mass extinction. In late 2014, the Worldwide Fund for Nature reported a startling statistic: according to their global study, 52% of species had gone extinct between 1970 and 2010.60 This is not news: for three decades, conservation biologists have been warning of a ‘sixth mass extinction’, which, by definition, could eliminate more than three quarters of currently existing life forms in just a few centuries.61 In other words, it could threaten the practical possibility of the survival of earthly life. Mass extinction is not simply extinction (or death) writ large: **it is a qualitatively different phenomena that demands its own ethical categories.** It cannot be grasped by aggregating species extinctions, let alone the deaths of individual organisms. Not only does it erase diverse, irreplaceable life forms, their **unique histories** and **open-ended possibilities**, but it **threatens the ontological conditions of Earthly life**.

IR is one of few disciplines that is explicitly devoted to the pursuit of survival, yet it has almost nothing to say in the face of a possible mass extinction event.62 It utterly lacks the conceptual and ethical frameworks necessary to foster diverse, meaningful responses to this phenomenon. As mentioned above, Cold-War era concepts such as ‘nuclear winter’ and ‘omnicide’ gesture towards harms massive in their scale and moral horror. However, they are asymptotic: they imagine nightmares of a severely denuded planet, yet they do not contemplate the comprehensive negation that a mass extinction event entails. In contemporary IR discourses, where it appears at all, extinction is treated as a problem of scientific management and biopolitical control aimed at securing existing human lifestyles.63 Once again, this approach fails to recognise the reality of extinction, which is a **matter of being and nonbeing**, not one of life and death processes.

#### 4]. Debating ethics is infinitely regressive since there are infinite ethics – whatever Sid says is the index.

#### 5]. Even small chances of existential risk come first

**Sánchez ’17** (David; 2/8/17; BA in Public Policy, BA in Economics and Philosophy, expert at the Kenan Institute for Ethics, citing Nick Bostrom, PhD in Philosophy; Duke’s The Chronicle; “Existential risks”;<http://www.dukechronicle.com/article/2017/02/existential-risks-questions-and-considerations>; DOA:  4/21/17) ahsBC

How often do you think about the end of the world? Some people think about it quite a bit. Within Effective Altruism circles, many people share a concern for the future of humanity. Effective Altruists attempt to combine good intentions with science and reasoning to find the best ways to do good, whether for humans or non-human animals. **Mitigation of** so-called “**existential risks” is a** huge **priority** for some of their more risk-seeking members. An existential risk, put simply, is some class of possible event that presents a risk of extinction to humanity. Nick Bostrom, Oxford philosopher and existential risk extraordinaire, defines it this way: “One where an adverse outcome would either annihilate Earth-originating intelligent life or permanently and drastically curtail its potential.” Some **main** classes of **existential risk include** catastrophic climate change, malicious artificial superintelligence, the emergence of malicious nanotechnology, **nuclear war** and malicious bio-tech, among others. When considering the threats posed by so-called “x-risks,” there are at least three factors to keep in mind. First, bear in mind that if humanity continues for the foreseeable future, then the number of potential people in the future will be significantly higher than the number who exist today or have existed in the past. Additionally, the expected disutility of extinction-level events is massive, meaning that even a small mitigation of those probabilities results in a huge positive. Per one interpretation of the evidence, “even if we use the most conservative of these estimates… we find that the expected loss of an existential catastrophe is greater than the value of 1016 human lives. This implies that **the** expected **value of reducing** existential **risk by** a mere **one millionth of one percentage point is** at least **a hundred times the value of a million human lives**.” If this holds even remotely true, then surely we should keep listening. Second, consider that some experts believe the probability of extinction-level events is somewhat high. In a report released by Oxford’s Future of Humanity Institute, a survey of experts found the likelihood of extinction by the year 2100 to be a whopping 19 percent. While this number should be taken with a grain of salt, it is unsettling that people in the know are so pessimistic about our odds.

#### 6]. Ethical policy making mitigates

**Bostrom 2** [Bostrom, Nick. “Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority.” Existential Risk Prevention as a Global Priority, 2013, [www.existential-risk.org/concept.html./](http://www.existential-risk.org/concept.html./)] FMST

We also note that an existential catastrophe would entail the frustration of many strong preferences, suggesting that from a preference-satisfactionist perspective it would be a bad thing. In a similar vein, **an ethical view emphasizing that public policy should be determined through informed democratic deliberation by all stakeholders would favor existential-risk mitigation if we suppose, as is plausible, that a majority of the world's population would come to favor such policies upon reasonable deliberation (even if hypothetical future people are not included as stakeholders).** We might also have custodial duties to preserve the inheritance of humanity passed on to us by our ancestors and convey it safely to our descendants.23 **We do not want to be the failing link in the chain of generations, and** we ought not to delete or abandon the great epic of human civilization **that humankind has been working on for thousands of years, when it is clear that the narrative is far from having reached a natural terminus.** Further, many **theological perspectives** deplore naturalistic existential catastrophes, especially ones induced by human activities: **If God created the world and the human species, one would imagine that He might be displeased if we took it upon ourselves to smash His masterpiece** (or if, through our negligence or hubris, we allowed it to come to irreparable harm).24 We might also consider the issue from a less theoretical standpoint and try to form an evaluation instead by considering analogous cases about which we have definite moral intuitions. Thus, for example, if we feel confident that committing a small genocide is wrong, and that committing a large genocide is no less wrong, we might conjecture that committing omnicide is also wrong.>25 **And if we believe we have some moral reason to prevent natural catastrophes that would kill a small number of people, and a stronger moral reason to prevent natural catastrophes that would kill a larger number of people, we might conjecture that** **we have an even stronger moral reason to prevent catastrophes that would kill the entire human population.**

### Adv 1 – Climate

#### Climate change is a public health emergency according to WHO definitions

Harmer 20 [Andrew Harmer, lecturer in Global Health Policy in the Global Health and Innovation Unit, Centre for Primary Care and Public Health at the University of London with a PhD in International Relations from the University of Southampton, 3-30-2020, "WHO should declare climate change a public health emergency," BMJ, https://www.bmj.com/content/368/bmj.m797]/Kankee

One way to stimulate action is for the World Health Organization to declare climate change a public health emergency of international concern. Several voices have already called for this step. At the opening plenary of the World Health Assembly in Geneva in May 2019, the editor of the Lancet, Richard Horton, urged member states and WHO secretariat to “declare a planetary emergency.”4 A couple of days later, during a side event on air pollution, climate change, oceans, and health sponsored by the Swedish government, the minister of health for the Seychelles, Jean Paul Adam, argued forcefully that: “we have to recognise that climate change is a public health emergency at the international level.” We examine how WHO could and should use the authority it derives from its constitution and the International Health Regulations to declare climate change an international public health emergency. WHO’s authority to act on climate change WHO’s constitution defines health as “a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity.” Climate change threatens each of the elements in that definition. It also authorises WHO “to foster the ability to live harmoniously in a changing total environment,” and the planet is now experiencing total environmental change.5 Furthermore, the constitution allows WHO’s executive board “to take emergency measures within the functions and financial resources of the Organisation to deal with events requiring immediate action... and undertake studies and research the urgency [of those events]” (article 28, i).6 The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change reported in 2018 that we could have as few as 11 years in which to prevent the world from warming beyond 1.5°C, a temperature threshold that, if breached, will have serious consequences for global health.7 The International Health Regulations incorporate a multihazard perspective on health emergencies that enables WHO to assist countries to: “prepare for and respond to a wide range of public health events” resulting from conflict, technological hazard, and natural disasters.8 However, the regulations use a very narrow definition of a health emergency. Specifically, a public health emergency of international concern is “an extraordinary event which is determined ... to constitute a public health risk to other States through the international spread of disease and to potentially require a coordinated international response,”9 where event “means a manifestation of disease or an occurrence that creates a potential for disease.”9 In practice, therefore, public health emergencies have been declared only for infectious disease outbreaks, such as the recent outbreak of covid-19.10 More than a risk factor Under current WHO definitions climate change does not constitute an event appropriate for consideration as a public health emergency. Furthermore, WHO’s emergency response framework describes climate change as a “risk factor” that can trigger health emergencies rather than an emergency in its own right.11 We argue that climate change can no longer be understood merely as a risk factor. It is a totalising event that will, according to WHO’s quantitative risk assessment, cause an additional 250 000 deaths between 2030 and 2050.12 This figure is an underestimate because of the limited number of health conditions reviewed—malaria, heat exposure in elderly people, diarrhoea, and childhood undernutrition. Food insecurity, for example, could account for a further 529 000 adult deaths by 2050.13 In terms of mortality, climate change will directly and indirectly lead to a higher number of deaths than all of the previous public health emergencies combined (box 1). Non-communicable diseases such as cancer and cardiovascular stroke also cause considerable mortality, but despite the increase in global burden, non-communicable diseases are unlikely to have the same escalation rate and health impact as climate change will have on the global population. There is clearly a need for an internationally coordinated response to infectious diseases outbreaks, and we fully support the mandate of WHO to declare public health emergencies for such events. However, given the high mortality that will result from climate change, the impact it will have on health systems, and the need to mitigate its effects immediately, we argue that climate change warrants similar treatment.Even within WHO’s restricted definition of a health emergency, we argue that climate change satisfies the conditions of a public health emergency of international concern. Increasing heat and precipitation alter the range of disease vectors, increasing it in some locations while decreasing it in others. Climate change thus induces “a potential for disease” by increasing the conditions suitable for disease transmission. The number of people newly at risk of potential viral transmission by the mosquito species Aedes aegypti and A albopictus will approach one billion within this century.20 This includes dengue virus, for which global vectorial capacity is increasing “in step” with global carbon dioxide emissions, and yellow fever; both these diseases are mentioned in annex 2 of the International Health Regulations as having the potential to constitute an international public health emergency.21 Country borders offer little defence against the global expansion and redistribution of disease, so climate change requires a coordinated international response. Triggering an emergency The International Health Regulations set out the five stages that the director general must consider before declaring a public health emergency of international concern (box 2). The first step is to assess information from member states on events detected by their national surveillance system. In the context of climate change, this information has already been provided in the form of “country profiles” for 45 countries (including six small island states) and will be monitored closely by WHO.22 With that information, the director general would seek the advice of the emergency committee, consult scientific evidence, and assess the risk of climate change to human health. Various disease specific, climate induced events could trigger an international public health emergency. Article 13 of the International Health Regulations puts the responsibility for the response on member states but, in consultation, WHO may offer further assistance, “including an assessment of the severity of the international risk and the adequacy of control measures.” In the case of increased Aedes transmitted viruses, an adequate control measure would begin with the implementation of a rapid zero emissions strategy, with the aim of limiting global warming to 1.5°C, and grounded in principles of climate justice and rights. Though not sufficient, as noted above it could protect one billion people from infection. Wider definition

#### Climate change is increasing and at its tipping point

**Cho 21** [Renee Cho, “How Close Are We to Climate Tipping Points?” State of the Planet, 10 Nov. 2021, news.climate.columbia.edu/2021/11/11/how-close-are-we-to-climate-tipping-points/.] // VS

As world leaders gather at the United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP26) in Glasgow, Scotland, to take bolder action against climate change, human activity has already warmed the planet 1.1°C above pre-industrial levels. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has warned that exceeding 2°C of warming could have catastrophic consequences and that we need to keep global warming to 1.5°C. The world is currently on track to surpass both of those limits. Under the most optimistic scenario, if all 140 countries that have announced net zero targets or are considering them actually reach these goals, as well as their more ambitious 2030 commitments under the Paris Agreement, warming could be limited to 1.8°C by 2100. But will overshooting 1.5°C push us over climate tipping points, triggering irreversible and abrupt changes? The IPCC’s latest report warned of that possibility, and UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres recently said, “…time is running out. Irreversible climate tipping points lie alarmingly close.” What are the tipping points? And how close are they? A tipping point is the point at which small changes become significant enough to cause a larger, more critical change that can be abrupt, irreversible, and lead to cascading effects. The concept of tipping points was introduced by the IPCC 20 years ago, but then it was thought they would only occur if global warming reached 5°C. Recent IPCC assessments, however, suggested that tipping points could be reached between 1°C and 2°C of warming. Here are the major climate tipping points (include). Greenland ice sheet The Greenland ice sheet contains enough water to raise global sea levels by over 20 feet and its melting is accelerating. From 1992 to 2018, it lost close to four trillion tons of ice. While its disintegration is not likely to be abrupt, there could come a point beyond which its eventual collapse is irreversible for millennia. A new study found that ice-sheet height and melting rates in the Jakobshavn basin, one of the fastest melting basins in Greenland, are destabilizing the ice sheet. Most of the melting occurs on the ice surface because of warming temperatures, but as the height of the ice sheet is reduced, the surface is exposed to warmer air at lower altitudes, which further speeds melting. In addition, less snowfall leaves the ice surface darker so it absorbs more of the sun’s heat and warms faster. Scientists are not sure if a tipping point has been passed but the study found that there would likely be more melting in the near future. In other research, scientists speculated that the critical temperature range at which the Greenland ice sheet would go into irreversible disintegration is between 0.8°C and 3.2°C of warming above pre-industrial levels. The West Antarctic Ice Sheet (WAIS) The WAIS is vulnerable to collapse (right now) because it sits on bedrock below sea level and is affected by the ocean’s warming. A 2018 study found that the WAIS went from ice loss of almost 58.5 billion tons a year between 1992 and 1997 to 175 billion tons from 2012 to 2017. The Thwaites Glacier on West Antarctica’s Amundsen Sea has lost a trillion tons of ice since the early 2000s, and some scientists believe it could be headed for an irreversible collapse, which could threaten a large part of the WAIS and raise global sea levels by two feet or more. The Pine Island glacier, also on the Amundsen Sea, is thinning rapidly as well. A new study found that current policies, heading for almost 3°C of warming, would result in an abrupt hastening of Antarctic ice loss after 2060, while other research suggests that the tipping point for the WAIS lies between 1.5°C and 2.0°C of warming. Another new study found that if the WAIS melted, it could raise sea levels three feet more than previous projections of 10.5 feet; Antarctica as a whole contains enough ice to raise global sea levels by over 200 feet. Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation (AMOC) The AMOC is one of the main global ocean currents and is critical to regulating climate. Cold salty water, which is dense and heavy, sinks deep into the ocean in the North Atlantic, and moves along the bottom until it rises to the surface near the equator, usually in the Pacific and Indian Oceans. Heat from the sun then warms the water, and evaporation leaves the water saltier. The warm salty water travels up the coast via the Gulf Stream, warming the U.S. East Coast and Western Europe. Once the water releases its heat and reaches the North Atlantic, it becomes cold and dense again, and the cycle, which can take water 1,000 years to complete, continues. But as glaciers and ice sheets melt, they add fresh, less dense water to the North Atlantic, which prevents the water from sinking and impedes circulation. This may be why AMOC has slowed 15 percent since the 1950s. A recent study found that the AMOC is in its weakest state in 1,000 years. Moreover, the latest climate models project that continued global warming could weaken the AMOC by 34 to 45 percent by 2100. If the AMOC shuts down, it would cause significant cooling along the east coast of the U.S. and Western Europe. This, in turn, would alter rainfall patterns, make sea levels rise, cause more drying, and reduce agriculture in the U.K. It could also potentially set off other tipping points. And even if global warming is reversed, once shut down, the AMOC would not switch back on for a long time. Scientists believe this occurred during the last ice age when a glacial lake burst and poured freshwater into the Atlantic. As the AMOC shut down, the Northern Hemisphere entered a cold spell that lasted 1,000 years. While there are still many uncertainties, some studies suggest that the AMOC’s tipping point could be reached between 3°C and 5.5°C of warming. Amazon rainforest The Amazon rainforest, the world’s largest tropical rainforest, stores 200 billion tons of carbon—equal to about five years of global carbon emissions from the burning of fossil fuels—and is home to millions of species of plants and wildlife. The moisture from the Amazon’s rainfall returns to the atmosphere from the soil through evaporation and from plants through transpiration. This self-sustaining process creates clouds and more rainfall. Because of logging, ranching, mining, agriculture, and fires, the Amazon has lost about 17 percent of its tree cover and at the current rate of deforestation, could reach a loss of 27 percent by 2030. The policies of Brazil’s pro-development president, Jair Bolsonaro, have led to widespread clear-cutting and the rate of deforestation in Brazil is the highest since 2008. If 20-25 percent of the Amazon were deforested, its tipping point (close) could be crossed, according to one study. Fewer trees would mean less evapotranspiration, and without enough rainfall to sustain itself, the Amazon could start to die back. In other words, parts of the rainforest could transition into a savannah, a drier ecosystem characterized by grasslands and few trees. In the process, it would potentially release 90 gigatons of CO2, exacerbating climate change. Crossing this tipping point would also result in the loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services, affect global weather patterns, and threaten the lives of 30 million people, many Indigenous, who depend on the rainforest to survive. One study found that dieback would occur if we reach 3°C of warming. The Amazon is already feeling the effects of climate change, as over the last century, temperatures in the region have increased 1°C to 1.5°C. The Amazon is experiencing longer and hotter dry seasons that make it more vulnerable to wildfires, reduced evapotranspiration in response to higher levels of CO2, and there are now more drought-tolerant tree species. Scientists are unsure whether the Amazon has a single overall tipping point, or when exactly it might be reached, and the ecosystem has some ability to adapt to changing conditions. But fires and drought could cause local changes that spread drying conditions to other regions because of an overall reduction of moisture. Twenty-eight percent of the eastern part of the Amazon is already losing more carbon than it is absorbing due to deforestation. And some climate models predict that by 2035, the Amazon will be a permanent source of carbon. Thawing permafrost Permafrost is ground that remains frozen for two or more consecutive years and is composed of rock, soil, sediments, and ice. Some permafrost has been frozen for tens or hundreds of thousands of years. It is found in northern hemisphere lands without glaciers, including parts of Siberia, Alaska, northern Canada and Tibet. In the Southern Hemisphere, there is permafrost in parts of Patagonia, Antarctica and the Southern Alps of New Zealand. Fourteen hundred billion tons of carbon are thought to be frozen in the Arctic’s permafrost, which is twice as much carbon as is currently in the atmosphere. But the Arctic is warming two times faster than the rest of the planet—it has already warmed 2°C above pre-industrial levels. As it warms and thaws the permafrost, microbes come out of hibernation and break down the organic carbon in the soil, releasing CO2 and methane, which then trigger even more warming and melting. The 2019 Arctic Report Card from NOAA found that the Arctic’s thawing permafrost could be releasing 300 to 600 million tons of carbon per year into the atmosphere. Methane stored in ice-like formations called hydrates are also found in permafrost in ocean sediments. This methane may be released as hydrates are thawed by warming seawater. Scientists recently discovered methane leaking from a giant ancient reservoir of methane below the permafrost of the Laptev Sea in the East Siberian Arctic Ocean. Scientists don’t know exactly how much carbon could ultimately be released by thawing permafrost or when. According to one report, 2°C of warming could mean the loss of 40 percent of the world’s permafrost. ENSO El Niño and La Niña are the warm and cool, naturally occurring weather patterns across the tropical Pacific—the El Niño-Southern Oscillation, or ENSO. Every two to seven years, the pattern alternates, bringing disruptions in temperature and precipitation. El Niño causes impacts around the world, such as more drought in India, Indonesia and Brazil, and flooding in Peru. As the ocean warms, it could push ENSO past a tipping point, which would make El Niño events more severe and frequent and could increase drought in the Amazon. Tipping point interactions A recent study of the WAIS, the Greenland ice sheet, the AMOC, ENSO, and the Amazon rainforest tipping points found that they could interact with one another before temperatures reach 2°C. This interaction would enable tipping to occur at lower thresholds than previously expected. The risk analysis found that a cascade could potentially begin with the melting of the ice sheets because their critical thresholds are lower. For example, as the Greenland ice sheet releases fresh water into the North Atlantic, the AMOC could slow. This would result in less heat being transported towards the north. As the North got colder, it could potentially help stabilize the Greenland ice sheet. However, it would also result in warmer water in the Southern Ocean and this could lead to more drought in some parts of the Amazon while others get more rainfall. Changes in the AMOC could also trigger changes in ENSO, leading to a more permanent El Niño state, whose impacts could lower the critical threshold for Amazon dieback. The scientists say that these changes would occur over long time scales, and that the limits of computing power make it impossible to represent each climate system’s tipping point or their interactions exactly. Can we avoid the climate tipping points? Seventy-three percent of people in G20 countries think Earth is close to climate tipping points, according to a Global Commons Alliance poll. And much research indicates that if we do not curb our carbon emissions immediately to keep global warming below 2°C, we are headed for irreversible and catastrophic conditions. But some experts are more sanguine. Robin Bell, a polar scientist at Columbia University’s Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, who specializes in ice sheet dynamics, doesn’t believe the ice sheets are at a tipping point yet. “The most recent science is suggesting that maybe some of the runaway mechanisms we were worried about, might not occur,” she said. “For example, in terms of the WAIS, pressure on the giant river of ice could keep it from flowing. It means either we just need to keep icebergs in the way, or maybe it’s something we can think about engineering. It’s not that we have to hold the whole thing back, we just have to put a little pressure on it, and it will possibly not collapse—the ice sheet may not be as bad as we thought and maybe we have some time to get our act together.” Bell worries more about the social tipping points than the physical ones. Will they occur fast enough to forestall climate tipping points? Social tipping points are the points where many members of society quickly and dramatically change their behavior or thinking. A 2020 study proposed six social tipping points that could help stabilize Earth’s climate: removing fossil-fuel subsidies and incentivizing decentralized energy generation, building carbon-neutral cities, divesting from assets linked to fossil fuels, clarifying the moral implications of fossil fuels, expanding climate education and engagement, and making greenhouse gas emissions transparent. ”The real question is: Is there the social will to act?” Bell said. “And it appears that the social will is emerging. We really are starting to have serious conversations. People from the individual scale to the government scale are taking action, and that’s what needs to happen.” Steve Cohen, senior vice dean of Columbia University’s School of Professional Studies and a professor in the Practice of Public Affairs at Columbia’s School of International and Public Affairs, places his hope in technology. “The most important driver of change in the modern world has been technology,” he said. “And it’s a pretty simple equation: technological change leads to economic change, leads to social and cultural change, which leads to political change.” Technological change can be difficult to predict but can sometimes lead to rapid changes, said Cohen, citing the ubiquitous and indispensable smart phone as a prime example. “The phone is the most important thing you take when you leave the house because it’s a portable computer that you bring around with you. Would anybody have predicted that 25 years ago?” He also puts great hope in young people. “If you look at polling data, young people by a huge margin understand the climate issue. And it cuts across ideology, cuts across everything. It you’re under 30, you know, there’s a climate crisis.” The pledges countries make in Glasgow at COP26 and the policies they implement afterwards will ultimately determine how close the world will come to climate tipping points. Greta Thunberg, the 18-year-old Swedish climate activist with millions of young followers, went to Glasgow to join a climate strike and put pressure on politicians to get them to make real commitments to curb climate change. “We know that change is possible because we can look back in history and see that there have been massive changes in society that have been unprecedented,” Thunberg said. “If we felt like there wasn’t any hope, we wouldn’t be activists.”

#### Fake news *decimates* climate goals – assumes thumpers and adaptation

IANS ’21 [Indo-Asian News Service or IANS is a private Indian news agency, “Fake news is stopping us from achieving climate goals, claim scientists”, 03-23-2021, https://www.freepressjournal.in/science/fake-news-is-stopping-us-from-achieving-climate-goals-claim-scientists]//pranav

London: While technologies such as Artificial Intelligence (AI) could help the world deal with dangerous climate and environmental change, fake news on social media about global warming and biodiversity loss has emerged as a barrier in the climate change mitigation efforts, a group of scientists has warned. The report, published in Ambio, a journal of the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, concludes that inequality and environmental challenges are deeply linked. Reducing inequality will increase trust within societies. Trust is essential for governments to make long-term decisions, the report argues. Social media and access to reliable knowledge is also highlighted as a barrier to progress. "As the pressure of human activities accelerates on Earth, so too does the hope that technologies such as artificial intelligence will be able to help us deal with dangerous climate and environmental change," said Co-author Victor Galaz, Deputy Director of the Stockholm Resilience Centre. "That will only happen however, if we act forcefully in ways that redirects the direction of technological change towards planetary stewardship and responsible innovation." Human actions are threatening the resilience and stability of Earth's biosphere -- the wafer-thin veil around Earth where life thrives, according to the report published for the first Nobel Prize Summit, a digital gathering to be held in April to discuss the state of the planet in the wake of the Covid-19 pandemic. "In a single human lifetime, largely since the 1950s, we have grossly simplified the biosphere, a system that has evolved over 3.8 billion years. Now just a few plants and animals dominate the land and oceans," said lead author Carl Folke, Director of the Beijer Institute of Ecological Economics and Chair of the Stockholm Resilience Centre at Stockholm University. "Our actions are making the biosphere more fragile, less resilient and more prone to shocks than before."

#### Fake news *weakens* perception of climate change – misinformation *uniquely* targets climate science.

Drummond & Woods ’20 [Interview of Caitlin Drummond with questions asked by Taylor Woods, Caitlin Drummond - assistant professor at ASU's​ ​School of Human Evolution and Social Change​, teaching courses within the school’s environmental social science program, “Study finds brief exposure to 'fake news' can affect beliefs on climate change”, 08-31-2020, https://news.asu.edu/20200831-study-finds-brief-exposure-fake-news-can-affect-beliefs-climate-change]//pranav

Question: What is the overall goal of this research?

Answer: Our research sought to better understand how exposure to fake news that casts doubt on the existence of climate change might influence people's subsequent beliefs. People’s beliefs, such as whether or not they believe in climate change or whether or not they trust scientists, are important to the decisions they make around climate change. Q: What is fake news? A: Fake news is false information that doesn't occur through the same journalistic processes as regular news but mimics regular news. It can be difficult to identify fake news because online, it's relatively easy to mimic the formatting and the style associated with real news. Q: What did you find in this study? A: People who are exposed to fake news about climate change report slightly lower levels of belief in climate change and slightly weaker perceptions of the scientific consensus on changes in our climate. But overall, those effects are small. What seems to be the bigger driver of people's belief in climate change is their political ideology, which has been widely studied before. Q: How did your team conduct this research? A: We recruited a nationally representative sample of people to take an online survey, and each participant was randomly assigned to a different experimental condition. Some people were assigned to read fake news headlines about pop culture topics, and that was our control group. The other people were randomly assigned to see fake news on climate change. The second part of the experiment included questions about a participant’s beliefs, values and attitudes on different sociocultural issues. Among those were questions about whether or not someone believed in climate change. Q: Are there implications for future research? A: This study suggests to me that there is a lot more work to be done to better understand how exposure to misinformation actually affects people's decision-making.​ ​In terms of fake news specifically about climate change, there's been a lot of concern that exposure to fake news, and holding scientifically inaccurate beliefs regarding climate change, might lead people to not support climate policy or make decisions that are not in the best interests of the climate. Q: Is climate change more of a “target” for fake news than other political topics? A: There has been a concerted effort to promote misinformation on climate change by a variety of different parties. But I think it’s important to separate overall trust in science as a whole from trust in subgroups of scientists, like climate scientists, who have been the target of misinformation and disinformation campaigns. There are specific controversial areas of science, but there are also many other areas of science where we see a healthier relationship between the public and scientists.

#### Objectivity solves – checks back against misinformation and lets awareness spillover into action.

Biddlestone & van der Linden ’21 [Mikey Biddlestone - Postdoctoral Research Associate, Social Decision-Making Lab, University of Cambridge, Sander van der Linden - Professor of Social Psychology in Society and Director, Cambridge Social Decision-Making Lab, University of Cambridge, “Climate change misinformation fools too many people – but there are ways to combat it”, 10-28-2021, https://theconversation.com/climate-change-misinformation-fools-too-many-people-but-there-are-ways-to-combat-it-170658]//pranav

Despite widespread awareness of the problems caused by fake news, many people we surveyed didn’t recognise their own role in this process. While large majorities worried about the effects of climate change misinformation and said that they didn’t share it themselves, 24% reported hardly ever fact-checking the information they read. This could suggest the public aren’t sure which sources are reliable, making them more vulnerable to the very misinformation they see as damaging to the cause of tackling climate change. Clearly, more can be done to educate people on how to distinguish real from fake climate change information. One way to do this is through a process called inoculation, or prebunking. Just as vaccines train cells to detect foreign invaders, research has shown that stories which pre-emptively refute short extracts of misinformation can help readers develop mental antibodies that allow them to detect misinformation on their own in the future. Recent work has even used games to help people detect the larger strategies that are used to spread misinformation about climate change. Although social media companies such as Facebook have started to debunk climate myths on their platform, politicians and social media outlets appear to have an untrustworthy reputation. This was not the case for sources with perceived expertise on the topic, such as scientists. We therefore recommend that the trust held towards experts should be harnessed, by more frequently disseminating their views on social media and in traditional media outlets. In our survey, only 21% of people understood that between 90% and 100% of climate scientists have concluded that humans are causing climate change (99% according to a recent paper). Decades-long campaigns by fossil fuel companies have sought to cast doubt on the scientific consensus. Media messages should therefore continue to communicate the overwhelming scientific consensus on climate change. Through years of research on the topic, we have identified several ingredients for trustworthy science communication. These include prebunking myths and falsehoods, reliably informing people (don’t persuade), offering balance but not false balance (highlight the weight of evidence or scientific consensus), verifying the quality of the underlying evidence, and explaining sources of uncertainty. If communicators want to earn people’s trust, they need to start by displaying trustworthy behaviour.

#### Climate change causes extinction.

**Specktor 19** [Brandon; writes about the science of everyday life for Live Science, and previously for Reader's Digest magazine, where he served as an editor for five years; "Human Civilization Will Crumble by 2050 If We Don't Stop Climate Change Now, New Paper Claims," livescience, 6/4/19; <https://www.livescience.com/65633-climate-change-dooms-humans-by-2050.html>] Justin

The current climate crisis, they say, is larger and more complex than any humans have ever dealt with before. General climate models — like the one that the [United Nations' Panel on Climate Change](https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/) (IPCC) used in 2018 to predict that a global temperature increase of 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit (2 degrees Celsius) could put hundreds of millions of people at risk — fail to account for the **sheer complexity of Earth's many interlinked geological processes**; as such, they fail to adequately predict the scale of the potential consequences. The truth, the authors wrote, is probably far worse than any models can fathom. How the world ends What might an accurate worst-case picture of the planet's climate-addled future actually look like, then? The authors provide one particularly grim scenario that begins with world governments "politely ignoring" the advice of scientists and the will of the public to decarbonize the economy (finding alternative energy sources), resulting in a global temperature increase 5.4 F (3 C) by the year 2050. At this point, the world's ice sheets vanish; brutal droughts kill many of the trees in the [Amazon rainforest](https://www.livescience.com/57266-amazon-river.html) (removing one of the world's largest carbon offsets); and the planet plunges into a feedback loop of ever-hotter, ever-deadlier conditions. "Thirty-five percent of the global land area, and **55 percent of the global population, are subject to more than 20 days a year of** [**lethal heat conditions**](https://www.livescience.com/55129-how-heat-waves-kill-so-quickly.html), beyond the threshold of human survivability," the authors hypothesized. Meanwhile, droughts, floods and wildfires regularly ravage the land. Nearly **one-third of the world's land surface turns to desert**. Entire **ecosystems collapse**, beginning with the **planet's coral reefs**, the **rainforest and the Arctic ice sheets.** The world's tropics are hit hardest by these new climate extremes, destroying the region's agriculture and turning more than 1 billion people into refugees. This mass movement of refugees — coupled with [shrinking coastlines](https://www.livescience.com/51990-sea-level-rise-unknowns.html) and severe drops in food and water availability — begin to **stress the fabric of the world's largest nations**, including the United States. Armed conflicts over resources, perhaps culminating in nuclear war, are likely. The result, according to the new paper, is "outright chaos" and perhaps "the end of human global civilization as we know it."

## UV

#### 1] – Aff gets 1AR theory; check back against infinite abuse from the neg. It’s DTD – DTA illogical; time skew; you can’t drop the arg if the round revolves around the arg which it does. No RVIs – illogical, baiting; people can bait theory, losing on calling out abuse makes people less comfortable to call out abuse, and you don’t win for proving you are fair. CI – race to the top for the best norms; reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention.

#### 2] - Perf cons are independent voters. Any proven contradiction of my opponent destroys debatability because they turn into a moving target, and I don’t know which of my opponent’s points they are actually going for and which to actually attack. This creates grounds issues where I don’t know what I am debating, and time skew issues where I must give up my already limited time to either figuring out which point they mean or winning both. This decks fairness and education.

#### 3]. No LOS shells; they’re infinitely regressive and cx checks.

#### 4]. Err heavily aff on theory and t since the neg gets to dump on any issue in blocks which manipulates my time. This means I get RVIs on their shells, but they don’t get RVIs on mine since they get the block of time which means infinite wins.

### 1AC – advantage --- democracy

#### Indian democracy is *declining*

Biswas 21 [Soutik is a correspondent in India. He has covered elections in Afghanistan and Sri Lanka, the tsunami in India and Sri Lanka in 2005, and militancy in Kashmir. Before joining the BBC, he worked in Indian newspapers and magazines. BBC “'Electoral autocracy': The downgrading of India's democracy”https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-56393944] aaditg

\*modi governance

\* democracy index

\*freedom house

Earlier this month, in its annual report on global political rights and liberties, US-based non-profit Freedom House downgraded India from a free democracy to a "partially free democracy". Last week, Sweden-based V-Dem Institute was harsher in its latest report on democracy. It said India had become an "electoral autocracy". And last month, India, described as a "flawed democracy", slipped two places to 53rd position in the latest Democracy Index published by The Economist Intelligence Unit. The rankings blame Mr Modi and his Hindu nationalist BJP government for the backsliding of democracy. Under Mr Modi's watch, they say, there has been increased pressure on human rights groups, intimidation of journalists and activists, and a spate of attacks, especially against Muslims. This, they add, has led to a deterioration of political and civil liberties in the country. Freedom House said civil liberties have been in decline since Mr Modi came to power in 2014, and that India's "fall from the upper ranks of free nations" could have a more damaging effect on the world's democratic standards. Many viewed the 2019 election as a referendum on Mr Modi (L) who won a landslide IMAGE SOURCE,AFP Image caption, Mr Modi won a landslide election in 2019 V-Dem said the "diminishing of freedom of expression, the media, and civil society have gone the furthest" during Mr Modi's rule, and that far as censorship goes India was "as autocratic as Pakistan and worse than its neighbours Bangladesh and Nepal". And The Democracy Index said the "democratic backsliding" by authorities and "crackdowns" on civil liberties had led to a decline in India's rankings. Mr Modi's policies, it said, had "fomented anti-Muslim feeling and religious strife and damaged the political fabric of the country". How has India's government reacted? Not surprisingly, the flurry of downgrades have riled Mr Modi's government and cast a shadow on the global image of India's democracy. Why journalists in India are under attack The jailed Indian activist linked to Greta Thunberg Jailed and 'tortured' for trying to report a rape On the Freedom House report, the foreign ministry said that India had "robust institutions and well established democratic practices" and did not "need sermons especially from those who cannot get their basics right." The political judgements of the report were "inaccurate and distorted", it said. In parliament, the chairman of the upper house, Venkaiah Naidu, did not allow an opposition MP to pose a question related to the V-Dem report saying: "All countries which are commenting on India should first look inward and then comment on India." At the weekend, Foreign Minister S Jaishankar came out with the strongest denunciation of these reports. A resident passes by a burnt house after communal violence in northeast Delhi last week over the Citizenship Amendment Act (CAA), at Shiv Viihar, on March 5, 2020 IMAGE SOURCE,HINDUSTAN TIMES Image caption, The freedom report criticised the government's response to protests against a controversial citizenship bill "You use the dichotomy of democracy and autocracy. You want the truthful answer…it is called hypocrisy. Because you have a set of self-appointed custodians of the world, who find it very difficult to stomach that somebody in India is not looking for their approval, is not willing to play the game they want to be played," Mr Jaishankar told a news network. "So they invent their rules, their parameters, they pass their judgements and then make out as though this is some kind of global exercise".

#### Modi and the BJP’s Nationalist views kills democracy – pressed news outlets, advertisement cut-off, and tax investigations.

Goel et al 20 [Vindu Goel, Jeffrey Gettleman and Saumya Khandelwal, 4-2-2020, "Under Modi, India’s Press Is Not So Free Anymore (Published 2020)," No Publication, [https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/02/world/asia/modi-india-press-media.html]//](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/02/world/asia/modi-india-press-media.html%5d//) akhileshp

NEW DELHI — The Media One anchorman Vinesh Kunhiraman went on air as usual on March 6, ready to tell the station’s five million viewers in India’s Kerala State about the death anniversary of a beloved comedian and the latest news on the coronavirus pandemic. Just a few minutes into the broadcast, he saw the managing editor rush to the studio floor, gesturing wildly. “I realized something was not right,” Mr. Kunhiraman recalled. The station’s uplink suddenly went dead. Mr. Kunhiraman’s image dissolved into a blue screen. A bland message told viewers there was no signal. “We regret the inconvenience,” it said. But this was no technical difficulty. The station had been cut off by an order from India’s Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. The government decided to block the channel for 48 hours because it had covered February’s biggest news story — the mob attacks on Muslims in New Delhi that flared into broader unrest — in a way that seemed “critical toward Delhi Police and R.S.S.,” the order said. The R.S.S. is a Hindu-nationalist social movement with close ties to Prime Minister [Narendra Modi](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/05/02/world/asia/india-west-bengal-elections-modi.html) and his Bharatiya Janata Party. “It was shocking the central government took such a decision,” said R. Subhash, an editor at Media One. “It was an attack on the freedom of the press.” India’s free press has played a crucial role in protecting this country’s democracy since its independence from Britain in 1947. But journalists here now feel under attack. Since Mr. Modi came to power in 2014, they say, his government has tried to control the country’s news media, especially the airwaves, like no other prime minister in decades. Mr. Modi has shrewdly cultivated the media to build a cult of personality that portrays him as the nation’s selfless savior. At the same time, senior government officials have pressed news outlets — berating editors, cutting off advertising, ordering tax investigations — to ignore the uglier side of his party’s campaign to transform India from a tolerant, religiously diverse country into an assertively Hindu one. Right before he [announced the world’s largest coronavirus lockdown](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/24/world/asia/india-coronavirus-lockdown.html), on 1.3 billion people, Mr. Modi [met with top news executives](https://caravanmagazine.in/media/hours-before-lockdown-modi-asked-print-media-owners-editors-refrain-negative-covid-coverage) and urged them to [publish “inspiring and positive stories”](https://www.narendramodi.in/prime-minister-narendra-modi-interacts-with-print-media-journalists-and-stakeholders-548937) about the government’s efforts. Then, after the [lockdown](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/29/world/asia/coronavirus-india-migrants.html) stranded half a million migrant workers, with [some dying along the highways](https://thewire.in/rights/coronavirus-national-lockdown-migrant-workers-dead), his lawyers persuaded the Supreme Court this week to [order all media](https://www.barandbench.com/news/litigation/coronavirus-lockdown-fake-news-and-panic-driven-migration-caused-untold-misery-to-migrant-labourers-supreme-court-read-order) to “publish the official version” of coronavirus developments, although outlets are still allowed to carry independent reporting. An association of leading broadcasters was quick to praise the court decision, which many intellectuals said was yet another attack on India’s constitutionally guaranteed freedom of speech. Through an aide, India’s information and broadcasting minister, Prakash Javadekar, initially agreed to discuss the government’s media policies. But in the two weeks since then, Mr. Javadekar has declined to answer any questions, including a written list emailed to him. His aide cited the demands of the coronavirus crisis. India’s media universe is vast, perhaps the biggest in the world: More than 17,000 newspapers, 100,000 magazines, 178 television news channels and countless websites in dozens of languages. Thousands of Facebook pages call themselves news publishers, and YouTube is filled with local bulletins on everything from real estate trends to police raids. But Mr. Modi’s ministers have leaned on business leaders to cut off support to independent media, slowly strangling their operations. His government has pressured media owners to fire journalists who have criticized the prime minister and told them to stop running features like hate-crime trackers that have embarrassed Mr. Modi’s party. Mr. Modi is backed up by an army of online allies who discredit and harass independent journalists; female journalists, in particular, have been besieged with abuse and rape threats. And the [police say Hindu nationalists](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/06/08/world/asia/india-lankesh-kalburgi-gun.html) were behind the [2017 murder of Gauri Lankesh](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/03/14/magazine/gauri-lankesh-murder-journalist.html), a female newspaper editor hailed as one of India’s most crusading journalists. Like other populist leaders, Mr. Modi and his ministers bristle at any public criticism, whether from [business executives](https://indianexpress.com/article/india/day-after-rahul-bajaj-spoke-up-bjp-and-ministers-hit-back-6145942/), [foreign leaders](https://www.businesstoday.in/current/world/caa-in-eu-parliament-european-parliament-to-not-vote-on-caa-to-thursday/story/394966.html), or even [schoolchildren](https://www.ndtv.com/india-news/karnataka-school-sedition-case-challenged-in-supreme-court-2183845). And for the most part, Indian news outlets have knuckled under, concluding that since much of the public supports the prime minister, they should, too. Even skeptical journalists censor themselves, afraid to be branded anti-national by a government that equates patriotism with support for Mr. Modi. His government has also imposed the strictest restrictions on foreign journalists in decades, suddenly and without explanation. Visas have been tightened, and foreign journalists have been banned from hotbeds of unrest such as northeast India and Jammu and Kashmir, a Muslim-majority area that was stripped of its statehood in August and put under [a severe crackdown](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/10/07/world/asia/kashmir-doctors-phone.html). The Kashmir story was seismic, but many Indian journalists, looking back on it, feel that they toed the government line and overlooked grave human rights abuses. “We didn’t do justice to the big story,’’ said Rajdeep Sardesai, one of the country’s leading news anchors. “We should have gone out there and reported the situation from the ground aggressively and independently.’’ There were security restrictions on where Indian reporters could go, Mr. Sardesai said, but he admitted it was more than that. “A large section of the Indian media,” he said, “has become a lap dog, not a watchdog.” The business model in India doesn’t help. Well before Mr. Modi first became prime minister in 2014, newspapers and television stations have relied on government advertising, allowing politicians to reward friendly outlets and punish critics. And media owners often run other businesses for which they need the government’s favor, making them reluctant to take on those in power. With the coronavirus pandemic dampening advertising and restricting newspaper circulation, news organizations are now sliding into crisis. One of the most independent, [The Indian Express](https://indianexpress.com/), just decided to cut salaries. Even as Mr. Modi constantly touts India as the world’s largest democracy, its ranking on the [Reporters Without Borders press freedom index](https://rsf.org/en/ranking) is 140 out of 180. “In the past six years, the Indian media has deteriorated,” said Shakuntala Banaji, a media professor at the London School of Economics. “There is no semblance of truth or responsibility left in the vast majority of media reports.” The apologetic calls from advertisers have become so common that NDTV executives are no longer surprised. One corporate boss begged the station to take his company’s logo off the screen, saying the government was squeezing him too hard. Another executive broke down in tears as he canceled a large advertising contract. No TV channel has come under more pressure from Mr. Modi’s government than NDTV, an influential network that airs in English and Hindi. Mr. Modi’s grudge goes back to 2002, when he was chief minister of Gujarat State, and NDTV journalists reported that his government stood by while hundreds of Muslims were massacred in religiously driven violence. When Mr. Modi became prime minister, his administration began a full-scale assault on NDTV. The government accused it of laundering money through a deal with NBC, the American TV network. The accusations have dragged on for years, and NDTV denies any wrongdoing. “The thing in India is, you can file a case, and win it 10 years later,” said Prannoy Roy, one of NDTV’s founders. “The process is the punishment.” The effort to brand NDTV as unpatriotic has been devastatingly effective. In one November 2016 email, the luxury automaker Daimler told NDTV that it would not proceed with a marketing campaign because “there are people associated with the channel that are linked to anti-India stuff, by the public at large.” A Daimler spokeswoman said Friday that the email did not reflect the company’s views and that the campaign had been rejected for economic reasons. As money dried up, the station laid off hundreds of journalists. NDTV now gets much of its advertising from state governments, many of which are controlled by opposition parties. Many within India’s news firmament have embraced Mr. Modi, sensing how much the popular mood has swung away from India’s founding secularism and toward Mr. Modi’s brand of strident Hindu nationalism. Right-wing TV anchors, led by Arnab Goswami of Republic TV, compete to outdo one another as the loudest Modi supporters. As [the government announced the crackdown in Kashmir](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/08/09/podcasts/the-daily/kashmir-india-modi.html), M.K. Anand, the managing director of Times Network, sent his editors a directive. “We are India’s leading news broadcasters,” he wrote in a WhatsApp message, seen by The New York Times. “It is important that we stay firmly with the national government at this juncture instead of focusing on finding faults.” The Modi government has been particularly concerned about broadcast media, which reach into every corner of the country. It has approved very few new TV channels, and even Bloomberg, the American media giant, has been unable to get a license, despite investing millions of dollars with its Indian partner. In this environment, sharp criticism of Mr. Modi can end careers. After a host at the Hindi news channel ABP questioned the results of one of the prime minister’s initiatives to help poor farmers, the satellite transmission of the show was interrupted every time it was broadcast, said several people who worked at the station. The channel’s owners pressured the host, Punya Prasun Bajpai, to resign, and as soon as he left, the transmission interruptions stopped, the former employees said. And after another ABP anchor, Abhisar Sharma, criticized Mr. Modi on live television about public safety, he was pulled off the air the same day. He, too, said he was pressured to quit. Mr. Sharma then took to YouTube to broadcast his commentary, but pro-Modi trolls followed him into cyberspace. Every time he uploaded a video — and some drew millions of views — YouTube would receive thousands of complaints that he had made inappropriate remarks, Mr. Sharma said. The site’s algorithm then blocked any advertising revenue he would have made. “You can’t escape them,” he said. Small-town journalists have come under government attack, as well. Last August, Pawan Kumar Jaiswal, a part-time journalist who also ran a tiny mobile phone accessories shop, broke a story revealing how poor children in a school near Varanasi, Mr. Modi’s parliamentary constituency, were being fed only flatbread and salt for lunch — a clear violation of government nutrition rules. After his [short video](https://www.indiatoday.in/india/video/watch-school-kids-served-rotis-with-salt-under-mid-day-meal-scheme-in-up-s-mirzapur-1590873-2019-08-23) went viral, a state education officer filed a criminal complaint against Mr. Jaiswal, accusing him of conspiracy, false evidence and cheating, a crime that can draw up to seven years in jail. His source at the school was promptly arrested. Fearing he was next, Mr. Jaiswal fled to New Delhi, where he hid for several weeks. “Sometimes I felt like committing suicide,’’ he said. Even though an investigation eventually vindicated his reporting and the police dropped the charges against him, Mr. Jaiswal continues to be stalked by people connected to the school, he said. He has reason to be afraid. Several Indian journalists have been killed in recent years, from a [Kashmiri newspaper editor shot](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/06/14/world/asia/kashmir-journalist-killed.html) outside his office to a [young journalist in Jharkhand](https://cpj.org/data/people/chandan-tiwari/index.php) who was abducted and found unconscious in a forest. “This is the life of a local reporter,” Mr. Jaiswal said. The shutdown of Media One and another Kerala television station, Asianet News, in March was a new twist. Both stations broadcast in Malayalam, a local language spoken by less than 3 percent of Indians. And both channels had aired witness accounts that echoed what many other outlets aired during the violence in Delhi: that [the police had done little to stop Hindu mobs as they rampaged](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/12/world/asia/india-police-muslims.html) against Muslims. But the broadcast ministry claimed that what these two stations reported “could enhance the communal disharmony across the country.” After many complaints about the shutdown, the broadcasting minister, Mr. Javadekar, reversed the orders the next morning. “Press freedom is absolutely essential in a democratic setup and that is the commitment of the Modi government,” Mr. Javadekar said at a news conference, implying that the orders had been issued without his consent. “But let me also say,” he concluded, “that everybody accepts that it has to be a responsible freedom.”

#### Current Indian news *cripples* democracy because of lack of objectivity: *fake news*, mob *lynchings*

Sharma 20 [Mahak Sharma is working in content and documentation in a women-oriented project. I believe that knowledge is power, and should be used for the upliftment of the society. Chai is life! Animals are love, more so cats! Cats have it all - admiration, an endless sleep and company only when they want it. “Opinion: Journalism, The Crumbling Pillar Of Indian Democracy” YKA <https://www.youthkiawaaz.com/2020/04/journalism-the-crumbling-pillar-of-indian-democracy/>] aaditg

\*defines india as a democracy

\*solvency bc the end explains why recognizing it can fix problems

In these extraordinary times of a global pandemic which has quite literally spread across every nook and corner of the world, from the small island states of Papua New Guinea to the military superpower United States of America, the world and people are filled with a sense of disquietude, making it difficult for all of us to cope with this precariousness. Therefore, many of us consider it wise to rely on news channels, newspapers, online news portals, websites, etc. to stay alert and aware of the disease and its consequences. But the sad state of Indian journalism which is reduced to a ‘Whatsapp University’ has created it difficult for the citizens to count on the Indian media for legitimate information and a sense of security. Lately, it has become a gargantuan task to differentiate between ‘fake’ news and ‘legit’ news, and the onus lies on the viewers and consumers of the news. Amount of ‘fake news’ has increased exponentially, so much so that different media outlets were created to deal with the ‘menace of fake news’. India recently witnessed another lynching where three people (two of them were sadhus) were killed by a mob of over 100 men in Palghar, Maharashtra. The lynching and the angry mob were incited on mistaken identity where they considered the three men to be involved in child kidnapping. The recent ‘panel discussion’ which turned into a shouting match by the panelists and the moderator on ‘Palgtghar Lynching’ completely baffled me. There were ‘news anchors’ who quoted wrong information, and turned themselves into a chest-thumping, liberal-hating, Hindu-loving and anti-opposition puppets, and used communally-charged language and hate speech

#### India democracy is key to sustain and predict the state of US democracy

Blank 21 (Jonah Blank is an American author, journalist and foreign policy expert, specializing in the culture, history and affairs of the Indian subcontinent. Blank earned a [PhD](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Doctor_of_Philosophy) in 1998 from [Harvard University](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Harvard_University), and joined the staff of [U.S. News and World Report](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/U.S._News_and_World_Report), as well as writing for [The New Yorker](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_New_Yorker) and [Foreign Affairs](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Foreign_Affairs). But Blank decided to leave the magazine to work actively to influence the foreign policy of the U.S. government on Near Eastern affairs, becoming the policy advisor on South Asia/Near East policy to the [Senate Committee on Foreign Relations](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Senate_Committee_on_Foreign_Relations). He is also a member of the [Council on Foreign Relations](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Council_on_Foreign_Relations). He currently works as a Senior Political Scientist at the [RAND Corporation](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/RAND_Corporation).[[4]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jonah_Blank#cite_note-4) 6-10-2021, "India’s Democracy Is the World’s Problem," Atlantic, <https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2021/06/g7-india-narendra-modi-democracy/619144/>, Accessed 2-11-2022)//AY

When the G7 group of rich democracies assembles this weekend in southwest England, it will discuss issues including COVID-19, taxes, and climate change. One item overhanging the formal agenda, however, will be the global deterioration of democracy itself, and the nation on which this question may hinge won’t be any of the hosts, but a guest invited to this year’s confab: India. Democracy’s fate there may determine its fate throughout the world. At the moment, the signs aren’t looking good—and that should be a flashing-red warning beacon for the rest of us. Why is India the hinge point? The most obvious answer is the optics: When propagandists in Beijing [describe democracy as a Western ideal](https://www.globaltimes.cn/page/202104/1221285.shtml) unsuited to non-Western peoples, having a standard-bearer from the formerly colonized rather than the former colonizers is vital. But India’s importance goes far beyond narrative. The world’s most successful democracies are mostly small, wealthy, and homogenous. Any list you might consult will highlight nations such as Denmark, the Netherlands, and Norway. The Economist Intelligence Unit gives [all of the top 10 spots](https://www.eiu.com/n/campaigns/democracy-index-2020/) in its annual Democracy Index to rich Western nations—most of which have populations smaller than that of Maryland. But these nations look nothing like the places where the mass of humanity lives. Of the world’s 10 most populous nations, only the United States and India are long-established democracies. Two (China and Russia) are undisguised autocracies, and the other six can be charitably described as “democracies in progress.” That a political system works for Iceland—which has 341,000 residents, almost all of them [practically relatives](https://www.bbc.com/news/av/technology-24304415)—means little to Brazil, Indonesia, or Nigeria. A real proof of concept can be found only in a nation that is big, low-income, and abundantly diverse—in ethnicity, language, religion, and every other way a society can be divided. That’s India. If democracy can make it there, it can make it anywhere. Until recently, democracy clearly could make it there. Upon gaining independence in 1947, India established a parliamentary system and enacted [a liberal, far-reaching constitution](https://journalofdemocracy.org/articles/indias-democracy-at-70-the-impact-of-instant-universal-suffrage/). Its sole deviation from the democratic path was a period of [“Emergency”](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-33269607) (1975 to 1977), which stemmed more from then–Prime Minister Indira Gandhi’s paranoia than any challenge to her party’s rule. With this and several other notable exceptions (periods of insurgency in Kashmir and Punjab, too-frequent local injustices against marginalized communities), rule of law has done better in India than in most other nations. But India’s democracy has seen worrisome erosion. On [The Economist’s list](https://www.economist.com/media/pdf/DEMOCRACY_TABLE_2007_v3.pdf), the country has slid from No. 35 in 2006 to No. 53 today. And the ways in which democracy is being undermined there provide a wake-up call to those watching from afar—including in the United States. At the root of the backsliding, in India as elsewhere, is a rejection of the core democratic principle that all citizens are equal. India’s governing Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) champions Hindutva, an ideology that privileges the Hindu majority over religious minorities. First articulated [a century ago](https://aeon.co/ideas/how-hindutva-recast-multi-faith-india-as-the-hindu-homeland), Hindutva has grown from a fringe movement into the focus of national politics. Its immediate target has been the country’s Muslims, who represent [14 percent](https://www.census2011.co.in/religion.php) of the population. If India transforms itself from a secular democracy (as is mandated by its constitution) into an avowedly Hindu nation, 276 million non-Hindus will become second-class citizens. Sectarian tensions flared throughout the BJP’s rise to power, and the flames were often fanned by the party itself. In 2014, Narendra Modi supplanted a generation of soft-edged figures and led the party to electoral victory. Although the only previous BJP prime minister, Atal Bihari Vajpayee, had downplayed Hindutva in favor of less divisive center-right policies, Modi has made it the centerpiece of his governing strategy. The first illiberal thrust was launched not against the hardware of democracy (the electoral system) but the software that enables it to operate—that is, an apolitical judiciary, a free press, and other elements of civil society. India’s judicial system has bent to the wishes of politicians since 2014. In the early years of Modi’s premiership, Uttar Pradesh, India’s biggest state, whose population is larger than all but four of the world’s nations, saw [dozens of murderous attacks](https://www.hrw.org/report/2019/02/18/violent-cow-protection-india/vigilante-groups-attack-minorities) on Muslims by Hindu mobs, who accused their victims (in almost all cases falsely) of cow slaughter. The BJP sided with the killers: When the party won state elections in 2017, it appointed as chief minister a firebrand Hindu cleric who had [promoted](https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/politics-and-nation/yogi-adityanath-orders-closure-of-slaughter-houses-bans-cow-smuggling-in-up/articleshow/57769113.cms) this vigilante action. Since then, the state’s judicial system has declined to punish most of the offenders—and the nation’s Supreme Court has [contented itself with issuing only tsk-tsks](https://indianexpress.com/article/india/lynchings-by-cow-vigilantes-supreme-court-states-5243938/). Likewise, attacks on India’s press have grown brazen. Of the past decade’s 405 cases filed against journalists under a colonial-era sedition law, [all but a few have been registered since Modi took office](https://www.newindianexpress.com/opinions/2021/feb/26/indiscriminateapplication-ofsedition-law-2269140.html). The Caravan, an outlet known for its dogged investigation of the BJP, has been [singled out for special harassment](https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2021/02/narendra-modi-assault-indian-idea/617904/). Less than a month ago, Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram acceded to [government demands](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/04/25/business/india-covid19-twitter-facebook.html) to block some journalists’ posts. The bans are under review by the platforms, but they have achieved their purpose. Many feisty Indian journalists now choose their words carefully. Weakening these civil-society foundations enabled the next stage of Modi’s program: the use of democracy’s mechanisms to undermine democracy’s core. In 2019, Modi returned to office with an absolute parliamentary [majority](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-48347081). Shortly after, he abrogated the [special status](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/08/05/world/asia/india-pakistan-kashmir-jammu.html) written into the constitution for Jammu and Kashmir (India’s sole Muslim-majority state). Protests in Kashmir were met with a months-long clampdown. Modi followed up with actions that [officially](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-50670393) and [unofficially](https://indianexpress.com/article/explained/explained-citizenship-amendment-act-nrc-caa-means-6180033/) advantaged Hindus over Muslims nationwide. Demonstrations against these moves peaked in December 2019, and were extinguished only by a COVID-19 lockdown three months later. All of these moves would have been anathema to the drafters of India’s constitution. Yet all were within the technical limits of the law, and none has been seriously challenged in the nation’s now-quiescent courts. The fecklessness of opposition parties made the BJP’s task easier, but the tools were provided by the governing system itself: The BJP has never earned anything close to a majority of the popular vote, but because of India’s first-past-the-post electoral system, its lock on power is firm. In [2019](https://www.thehindu.com/elections/lok-sabha-2019/analysis-highest-ever-national-vote-share-for-the-bjp/article27218550.ece), 37.4 percent of the vote (the BJP’s highest total ever) translated into 55.8 percent of the seats in Parliament. Gyan Prakash, a scholar of the Emergency, sees the greatest threat to democracy in this “shadow legality”: the use of lawfare to subvert the foundation of constitutional government. And he sees India’s example as having global implications. “Modi is part of a much larger phenomenon,” he told me. “This is a project to mobilize all state institutions, and change India’s democratic and plural politics and culture.” Do constitutional questions matter to a farmer scraping by on [$4 a day](https://m.rbi.org.in/Scripts/PublicationsView.aspx?id=20083) (the national average)? They should. As the Nobel laureate Amartya Sen once noted, “[No famine has ever taken place in the history of the world in a functioning democracy](https://www.nytimes.com/2003/03/01/arts/does-democracy-avert-famine.html).” India is now facing its most serious natural disaster since independence, in the coronavirus pandemic. Even by [official figures](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/world/india-covid-cases.html) (which significantly undercount the victims), India is the world’s coronavirus epicenter: 29 million sickened, more than 350,000 dead, and no end in sight. A great many of these cases were preventable. Modi’s response to the pandemic has swung from [oppressive lockdown](https://www.isas.nus.edu.sg/papers/covid-19-lockdown-in-india-impact-on-the-poor-and-the-governments-response/) to [maskless political rallies](https://www.reuters.com/world/india/indias-modi-scorned-over-reckless-rallies-religious-gathering-amid-virus-mayhem-2021-04-19/) and the encouragement of a [super-spreader Hindu pilgrimage](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-57005563) with 9 million attendees. A political system in which the government could be held accountable might have yielded a different outcome. All of this may sound familiar to American ears. President Donald Trump labeled the press the [“enemy of the people”](https://thehill.com/homenews/administration/437610-trump-calls-press-the-enemy-of-the-people) and attempted to intimidate sitting judges. A critical mass of the Republican Party is at least as motivated by [white grievance](https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2021/04/22/republicans-and-democrats-move-further-apart-in-views-of-voting-access/) as the BJP base is by Hindutva. And laws recently [passed in Georgia](https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2021/04/georgia-voting-rights-fiasco/618537/) and [proposed elsewhere](https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2021/03/voting-rights-act-democracy/617792/) would let partisan state officials rather than voters determine elections. This might be technically in accord with the Constitution, but would be at odds with—well, democracy. Perhaps the most dangerous threat of all is complacency. Whether doomscrolling Twitter or ignoring politics completely, most Americans share a baseline confidence that democracy will endure. But will it? American democracy isn’t nearly as deeply rooted as we like to believe. Half of the population (that is: the female half) weren’t generally [permitted to vote](https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2019/06/most-dangerous-women-american-politics/590959/) until 1920. Black Americans in Jim Crow states (that is, most of them) had to wait nearly another half century. If measured by universal suffrage, how long has America [been a true democracy](https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2021/03/voting-rights-act-democracy/617792/)? For less time than the Rolling Stones have been touring. This is why Americans should be paying close attention to the politics of India. The U.S. is not Iceland; it’s huge, diverse, and tough to govern. Only one other country with comparable size and complexity has given democracy a sustained, multigenerational shot. If the system fails in India, it can certainly fail closer to home.

**Democratic governance stops nuclear transition wars with Russia and China AND drives global technological innovation---extinction.**
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The Rise of a Global Society Let me first sketch the global democratic project for global governance as a point of reference. We must first recognize that globalization has given rise to a global society for the **first time** in the evolution of the human **species**. We are now **stuck with each other**; **seven and half billion** people today — nine to **ten** by **2050**: all **super connected** and **interdependent**. In greater or lesser measure, humans are mutually dependent on each other in the pursuit of their most salient values, interests, needs, and preferences — concerns about personal, community, and national **security**, sustainable economic **growth**, protection of the **environment**, the equitable **distribution** of the globe’s material wealth, human **rights**, and even the validation of their personal and social identities by others. Global **warming** is a metaphor of this morphological social change in the human condition. **All** humans are **implicated** in this looming Anthropogenic-induced **disaster** — the exhausts of billions of automobiles, the methane released in fracking for natural gas, outdated U.S. coal-fired power plants and newly constructed ones in China. Even the poor farmer burning charcoal to warm his dinner is complicit. Since interdependence surrounds, ensnares, and binds us as a human society, the dilemma confronting the world’s diverse and divided populations is evident: the **expanding scope** as well as the **deepening**, **accumulating**, and **thickening** interdependencies of globalization urge global government. But the Kantian ideal of universal governance is beyond the reach of the world’s disparate peoples. They are **profoundly divided** by religion, culture, language, tribal, ethnic and national loyalties as well as by class, social status, race, gender, and sexual orientation. How have the democracies responded to this dilemma? How have they attempted to reconcile the growing interdependence of the world’s disputing peoples and need for global governance? What do we mean by the governance of a human society? A working, **legitimate government** of a human society requires simultaneous responses to three competing imperatives: Order, Welfare, and Legitimacy. While the forms of these OWL imperatives have differed radically over the course of human societal evolution, these constraints remain predicable of all human societies if they are to replicate themselves and flourish over time. The OWL imperatives are no less applicable to a global society. 1. Order refers to a society’s investment of awesome material power in an individual or body to arbitrate and resolve value, interest, and preference conflicts, which cannot be otherwise resolved by non-violent means — the Hobbesian problematic. 2. The Welfare imperative refers to the necessity of humans to eat, drink, clothe, and shelter themselves and to pursue the full-range of their seemingly limitless acquisitive appetites. Responses to the Welfare imperative, like that of Order, constitute a distinct form of governing power and authority with its own decisional processes and actors principally associated either with the Welfare or the Order imperative. Hence we have the Marxian-Adam Smith problematic. 3. Legitimacy is no less a form of governing power and authority, independent of the Order and Welfare imperatives. Either by choice, socialization, or coerced acquiescence, populations acknowledge a regime’s governing authority and their obligation to submit to its rule. Here arises the Rousseaunian problematic. The government of a human society emerges then as an evolving, precarious balance and compromise of the ceaseless struggle of these competing OWL power domains for ascendancy of one of these imperatives over the others. It is against the backdrop of these OWL imperatives — Order, Welfare, and Legitimacy — that we are brought to the democratic project for global governance. The Democratic Project For Order, open societies constructed the global democratic state and, in alliance, the democratic global-state system. Collectively these initiatives led to the creation of the United Nations, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the World Trade Organization, and the European Union to implement the democratic project’s system of global governance. The democratic global state assumed all of the functions of the Hobbesian Westphalian security state — but a lot more. The global state became a Trading, Banking, Market, and Entrepreneurial state. To these functions were added those of the Science, Technology and the Economic Growth state. How else would we be able to enjoy the **Internet**, **cell phones** and iPhones, or **miracle cures**? These are the products of the **iron triangle** of the global democratic state, academic and non-profit research centers, and corporations. It is a **myth** that the Market System did all this **alone**. Fueled by increasing material wealth, the democratic global state was afforded the means to become the **Safety Net** state, providing **ed**ucation, **health**, **social security**, leisure and recreation for its population. And as the global state’s power expanded across this broad and enlarging spectrum of functions and roles, the global state was also constrained by the social compacts of the democracies to be bound by popular rule. The ironic result of the expansion of the global state’s power and social functions and its obligation to accede to popular will was a Security state and global state-system that vastly outperformed its principal authoritarian rivals in the Cold War. So much briefly is the democratic project’s response to the Order imperative. Now let’s look at the democratic project’s response to the Welfare imperative. The democracies institutionalized Adam Smith’s vision of a global Market System. The Market System trucks and barters, Smith’s understanding of what it means to be human. But it does a lot more. The Market System facilitates and fosters the free movement of people, goods and services, capital, ideas, values, scientific discoveries, and best technological practices. Created is a vibrant global civil society oblivious to state boundaries. What we now experience is De Tocqueville’s Democracy in America on global steroids. As for the imperative of Legitimacy, the social compacts of the democracies affirmed Rousseau’s conjecture that all humans are free and therefore equal. Applied to elections each citizen has one vote. Democratic regimes are also obliged to submit to the rule of law, to conduct free and fair elections, to honor majority rule while protecting minority rights, and to **promote** human rights at home and **abroad**. The Authoritarian Threat to the Democratic Project The **democratic project** for **global governance** is now at **risk**. Let’s start with the challenges posed by authoritarian regimes, with Russia and China in the lead. Both Russia and China would **rest global governance** on Big Power spheres of influence. Both would assume **hegemonic status** in their respective regions, asserting their versions of the **Monroe Doctrine**. Their regional hegemony would then **leverage** their claim to be global **Big Powers**. Moscow and Beijing would then have an equal say with the United States and the West in sharing and shaping global governance. **The** Russo-Chinese global **system** of Order would ascribe to Russia and China governing privileges not accorded to the states both aspire to dominate. Moscow and Beijing would enjoy **unconditional** recognition of their state **sovereignty**, territorial integrity, and non-interference in their domestic affairs, but they would reserve to themselves the right to **intervene** in the domestic and foreign affairs of the states and peoples under their tutelage in pursuit of their hegemonic interests. President Putin has announced that Russia’s **imperialism** encompasses the **millions** of Russians living in the former republics of the Soviet Union. Russia contends that Ukraine and Belarus also fall under Moscow’s purported claim to historical sovereignty over these states. Forceful re-absorption of **Crimea** and control over eastern **Ukraine** are viewed by President Putin as Russia’s historical inheritances. Self-determination is not extended to these states or to other states and peoples of the former Soviet Union. Moscow rejects their right to freely align, say, with the European Union or, god forbid, with NATO. In contrast to the democratic project, universal in its reach, the Russo-Chinese conception of a stable global order rests on more **tenuous** and **conflict-prone ethno-national foundations**. Russia’s proclaimed enemies are the United States and the European Union. Any means that undermines the unity of these entities is viewed by Moscow as a gain. The endgame is a **poly-anarchical** interstate system, potentially as **war-prone** as the Eurocentric system **before** and **after World War I**, but now populated by states with **nuclear weapons.** Global politics becomes a **zero-sum game**. Moscow has **no compunctions** about **corrupting** the **electoral processes** of democratic states, conducting threatening **military exercises** along NATO’s east border, or violating the more than 30-year old treaty to ban the deployment of Intermediate-Range **missile launchers**, capable of **firing nuclear weapons**. Nothing less than the **dissolution** of the democratic project is Moscow’s solution for global Order. China also seeks a revision of the global Order. It declares sovereignty over the **South China Sea**. Rejected is The Hague Tribunal’s dismissal of this claim. Beijing continues to build artificial islands as military bases in the region to assert its control over these troubled waters. If it could have its way, China would decide which states and their naval vessels, notably those of the United States, would have access to the South China Sea. Where Moscow and Beijing depart sharply are in their contrasting responses to the Welfare imperative. Moscow has **no solution** other than to use its oil and gas resources as instruments of **coercive diplomacy** and to weaken or **dismantle** existing Western **alliances** and international economic **institutions**. China can ill-afford the dismantling of the global market system. In his address to the Davos gathering in January of this year, Chinese President Xi asserted that “any attempt to cut off the flow of capital, technologies, products, industries and people between economies, and channel the waters in the ocean back into isolated lakes and creeks is simply not possible.” Adam Smith could not have said it better. Both Moscow and Beijing have been particularly assiduous to legitimate their regimes. President Putin’s case for legitimacy is much broader and deeper than a pure appeal to Russian nationalism. He stresses the spiritual and cultural unity of Russianspeaking populations spread across the states of the post-Soviet space. A central core of that unity is the Russian Orthodox Church, a key prop of the regime. Reviled is Western secularism, portrayed as corrupt and decadent, viewed by Putin as an existential threat to the Russian World. The Chinese regime, secular and atheistic, can hardly rely on religion to legitimate the regime. Beijing principally rests its legitimacy on its record of economic development and nationalism. The regime’s success in raising the economic standards of hundreds of millions of Chinese reinforces its claim to legitimacy in two ways. On the one hand, the Communist Party can rightly claim to have raised hundreds of millions of Chinese from poverty within a generation. On the other hand, the Communist Party insists that its model of economic growth, what critics scorn as crony capitalism, is superior to the unfettered, market-driven model of the West. Hence capitalism with Chinese characteristics is more effective and legitimate than the Western alternative. Where Moscow and Beijing do **converge** is in fashioning their responses to the Legitimacy imperative. They **repudiate Western liberal democracy**. Both reject criticisms of their human rights abuses as interventions into their domestic affairs. Dissidents are harassed, incarcerated, or, in some instances, assassinated. Journalists are co-opted, selfcensored, silenced, or imprisoned. Social media is state controlled. Both the Putin regime and the Chinese Communist Party monopolize the public narratives evaluating governmental policy. Transparency and accountability are hostage to governmental secrecy. Civil society has few effective avenues to criticize governmental actions. Moscow adds an ironic twist to these controls in manipulating national elections to produce an elected authoritarian regime. Whether either of these authoritarian responses to the Legitimacy imperative will survive remains to be seen. Beijing’s use of economic performance and nationalism to underwrite its legitimacy is a double-edged sword. If economic performance falters, then legitimacy suffers. Whether top-down nationalism will always control nationalism from the bottom-up is also problematic. In resting legitimacy on nationalism, dubious historical claims, and crypto-religious beliefs, Moscow is spared Beijing’s economic performance test. That said, there is room for skepticism that in the long-run Russians will exchange lower standards of living for corrupt rule in pursuit of an elusive Russian mission antagonistic to the West. The implosion of the Soviet Union, due in no small part to its retarded economic and technological development, suggests that the patience of the Russian people has limits. Demonstrations in March 2017 against state corruption in 82 Russian cities, led largely by Russian youth, reveal these limits. They are an ominous omen for the future of the Putin kleptocracy. Meanwhile, neither Russia nor China offers much to solve the Legitimacy imperative of global governance.

## UV

#### 1] – Aff gets 1AR theory; check back against infinite abuse from the neg. It’s DTD – DTA illogical; time skew; you can’t drop the arg if the round revolves around the arg which it does. No RVIs – illogical, baiting; people can bait theory, losing on calling out abuse makes people less comfortable to call out abuse, and you don’t win for proving you are fair. CI – race to the top for the best norms; reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention.

#### 2] - Perf cons are independent voters. Any proven contradiction of my opponent destroys debatability because they turn into a moving target, and I don’t know which of my opponent’s points they are actually going for and which to actually attack. This creates grounds issues where I don’t know what I am debating, and time skew issues where I must give up my already limited time to either figuring out which point they mean or winning both. This decks fairness and education.

#### 3]. No LOS shells; they’re infinitely regressive and cx checks.

#### 4]. Err heavily aff on theory and t since the neg gets to dump on any issue in blocks which manipulates my time.