## 1NC – T

#### Interpretation: topical affs must fiat an action through the World Trade Organization

#### Member nations of the WTO make policies as a whole

WTO ND [(World Trade Organization) “What is the WTO?” https://www.wto.org/english/thewto\_e/whatis\_e/whatis\_e.htm] BC

The WTO is run by its member governments. All major decisions are made by the membership as a whole, either by ministers (who usually meet at least once every two years) or by their ambassadors or delegates (who meet regularly in Geneva).

In this respect, the WTO is different from some other international organizations such as the World Bank and International Monetary Fund. In the WTO, power is not delegated to a board of directors or the organization’s head.

When WTO rules impose disciplines on countries’ policies, that is the outcome of negotiations among WTO members. The rules are enforced by the members themselves under agreed procedures that they negotiated, including the possibility of trade sanctions. But those sanctions are imposed by member countries, and authorized by the membership as a whole. This is quite different from other agencies whose bureaucracies can, for example, influence a country’s policy by threatening to withhold credit.

Reaching decisions by consensus among some 150 members can be difficult. Its main advantage is that decisions made this way are more acceptable to all members. And despite the difficulty, some remarkable agreements have been reached. Nevertheless, proposals for the creation of a smaller executive body — perhaps like a board of directors each representing different groups of countries — are heard periodically. But for now, the WTO is a member-driven, consensus-based organization.

#### Collective nouns are singular – this means “member nations” refers to a singular entity

MLA 3/8 [“Should I use a singular or plural verb with a collective noun?” MLA Style Center, 3/8/2021] JL

Collective nouns, like *team*, *family, class*, *group*, and *host*, take a singular verb when the entity acts together and a plural verb when the individuals composing the entity act individually. The following examples demonstrate this principle:

The team is painting a mural. (The team collectively paints the mural, so the verb is singular*.*)

#### “The” indicates all member states.

Merriam-Webster [Merriam-Webster, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/the, ]//Lex AKu

used as a function word before a noun or a substantivized adjective to indicate reference to a group as a whole

#### Violation – they don’t – EU member states are distinct from WTO member nations

#### Prefer

#### Precision – even if all EU member states are in the WTO that doesn’t mean all WTO member nations are in the EU – prefer our interp – we have evidence from the WTO that explains what coordinated action looks like and

#### Limits and ground – explodes the topic to include affs about any country reducing IP – only our interp ensures link magnitude by ensuring it is an international reduction for IPP for medicine which is key to generics like the innovation DA which requires reducing IP across the board, WTO bad, negotiations and politics DAs, circumvention – stretches pre-tournament neg prep too thin and precluding rigorous testing – theory and medicine spec affs solve PICs

#### TVA – spec a medicine

#### Topic ed – WTO patent waivers are the topic – their aff is just domestic policy passed in EU– none of their internal links are about medical trade secrets which proves their interpretation is a cheap way of getting a relations impact about any two countries – justifies the US-Mexico or China-Japan aff. Outweighs – prep is determined by the lit and we only have 2 months to debate the topic

#### Paradigm issues:

#### Drop the debater – their abusive advocacy skewed the debate from the start

#### Competing interps – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation

#### Fairness is a voter ­– necessary to determine the better debater

#### Education is a voter – why schools fund debate

## 1NC – Generic

#### CP: The EU should enter into a prior and binding consultation with the World Health Organization over reducing trade secret protections for medicines by requiring that plaintiffs prove that the acquisition, use, and disclosure of the trade secret did not pertain to revealing misconduct, wrongdoing, or illegal activity, or to protecting the general public interest. The EU will support the proposal and adopt the results of consultation.

#### WHO says yes

Moorthy et al 15 [(Vasee S., malaria vaccine focal point for the World Health Organization (WHO) in Geneva, Secretariat for two WHO malaria vaccine advisory committees, PhD in malaria immunology from the Institute of Molecular Medicine, Oxford) “Rationale for WHO's New Position Calling for Prompt Reporting and Public Disclosure of Interventional Clinical Trial Results,” PLOS Medicine, 4/14/2015] JL

On April 14, 2015, the World Health Organization (WHO) published a new statement on the public disclosure of clinical trial results (S1 Text) [1]. The WHO statement not only re-affirms the ethical imperative of clinical trial results reporting, it also defines reporting timeframes, calls for results-reporting of older but still unpublished trials, and outlines steps to improve linkages between clinical trial registry entries and their published results. This updates and expands WHO’s 2005 statement that “the registration of all interventional trials is a scientific, ethical, and moral responsibility” [2].

#### Consultation displays strong leadership, authority, and cohesion among member states which are key to WHO legitimacy

Gostin et al 15 [(Lawrence O., Linda D. & Timothy J. O’Neill Professor of Global Health Law at Georgetown University, Faculty Director of the O’Neill Institute for National & Global Health Law, Director of the World Health Organization Collaborating Center on Public Health Law & Human Rights, JD from Duke University) “The Normative Authority of the World Health Organization,” Georgetown University Law Center, 5/2/2015] JL

Members want the WHO to exert leadership, harmonize disparate activities, and set priorities. Yet they resist intrusions into their sovereignty, and want to exert control. In other words, ‘everyone desires coordination, but no one wants to be coordinated.’ States often ardently defend their geostrategic interests. As the Indonesian virus-sharing episode illustrates, the WHO is pulled between power blocs, with North America and Europe (the primary funders) on one side and emerging economies such as Brazil, China, and India on the other. An inherent tension exists between richer ‘net contributor’ states and poorer ‘net recipient’ states, with the former seeking smaller WHO budgets and the latter larger budgets.

Overall, national politics drive self-interest, with states resisting externally imposed obligations for funding and action. Some political leaders express antipathy to, even distrust of, UN institutions, viewing them as bureaucratic and inefficient. In this political environment, it is unsurprising that members fail to act as shareholders. Ebola placed into stark relief the failure of the international community to increase capacities as required by the IHR. Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone had some of the world's weakest health systems, with little capacity to either monitor or respond to the Ebola epidemic.20 This caused enormous suffering in West Africa and placed countries throughout the region e and the world e at risk. Member states should recognize that the health of their citizens depends on strengthening others' capacity. The WHO has a central role in creating systems to facilitate and encourage such cooperation.

The WHO cannot succeed unless members act as shareholders, foregoing a measure of sovereignty for the global common good. It is in all states' interests to have a strong global health leader, safeguarding health security, building health systems, and reducing health inequalities. But that will not happen unless members fund the Organization generously, grant it authority and flexibility, and hold it accountable.

#### WHO is critical to disease prevention – it is the only international institution that can disperse information, standardize global public health, and facilitate public-private cooperation

Murtugudde 20 [(Raghu, professor of atmospheric and oceanic science at the University of Maryland, PhD in mechanical engineering from Columbia University) “Why We Need the World Health Organization Now More Than Ever,” Science, 4/19/2020] JL

WHO continues to play an indispensable role during the current COVID-19 outbreak itself. In November 2018, the US National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine organised a workshop to explore lessons from past influenza outbreaks and so develop recommendations for pandemic preparedness for 2030. The salient findings serve well to underscore the critical role of WHO for humankind.

The world’s influenza burden has only increased in the last two decades, a period in which there have also been 30 new zoonotic diseases. A warming world with increasing humidity, lost habitats and industrial livestock/poultry farming has many opportunities for pathogens to move from animals and birds to humans. Increasing global connectivity simply catalyses this process, as much as it catalyses economic growth.

WHO coordinates health research, clinical trials, drug safety, vaccine development, surveillance, virus sharing, etc. The importance of WHO’s work on immunisation across the globe, especially with HIV, can hardly be overstated. It has a rich track record of collaborating with private-sector organisations to advance research and development of health solutions and improving their access in the global south.

It discharges its duties while maintaining a dynamic equilibrium between such diverse and powerful forces as national securities, economic interests, human rights and ethics. COVID-19 has highlighted how political calculations can hamper data-sharing and mitigation efforts within and across national borders, and WHO often simply becomes a convenient political scapegoat in such situations.

International Health Regulations, a 2005 agreement between 196 countries to work together for global health security, focuses on detection, assessment and reporting of public health events, and also includes non-pharmaceutical interventions such as travel and trade restrictions. WHO coordinates and helps build capacity to implement IHR.

#### Extinction – defense is wrong

Piers Millett 17, Consultant for the World Health Organization, PhD in International Relations and Affairs, University of Bradford, Andrew Snyder-Beattie, “Existential Risk and Cost-Effective Biosecurity”, Health Security, Vol 15(4), http://online.liebertpub.com/doi/pdfplus/10.1089/hs.2017.0028

Historically, disease events have been responsible for the greatest death tolls on humanity. The 1918 flu was responsible for more than 50 million deaths,1 while smallpox killed perhaps 10 times that many in the 20th century alone.2 The Black Death was responsible for killing over 25% of the European population,3 while other pandemics, such as the plague of Justinian, are thought to have killed 25 million in the 6th century—constituting over 10% of the world’s population at the time.4 It is an open question whether a future pandemic could result in outright human extinction or the irreversible collapse of civilization.

A skeptic would have many good reasons to think that existential risk from disease is unlikely. Such a disease would need to spread worldwide to remote populations, overcome rare genetic resistances, and evade detection, cures, and countermeasures. Even evolution itself may work in humanity’s favor: Virulence and transmission is often a trade-off, and so evolutionary pressures could push against maximally lethal wild-type pathogens.5,6

While these arguments point to a very small risk of human extinction, they do not rule the possibility out entirely. Although rare, there are recorded instances of species going extinct due to disease—primarily in amphibians, but also in 1 mammalian species of rat on Christmas Island.7,8 There are also historical examples of large human populations being almost entirely wiped out by disease, especially when multiple diseases were simultaneously introduced into a population without immunity. The most striking examples of total population collapse include native American tribes exposed to European diseases, such as the Massachusett (86% loss of population), Quiripi-Unquachog (95% loss of population), and theWestern Abenaki (which suffered a staggering 98% loss of population).

In the modern context, no single disease currently exists that combines the worst-case levels of transmissibility, lethality, resistance to countermeasures, and global reach. But many diseases are proof of principle that each worst-case attribute can be realized independently. For example, some diseases exhibit nearly a 100% case fatality ratio in the absence of treatment, such as rabies or septicemic plague. Other diseases have a track record of spreading to virtually every human community worldwide, such as the 1918 flu,10 and seroprevalence studies indicate that other pathogens, such as chickenpox and HSV-1, can successfully reach over 95% of a population.11,12 Under optimal virulence theory, natural evolution would be an unlikely source for pathogens with the highest possible levels of transmissibility, virulence, and global reach. But advances in biotechnology might allow the creation of diseases that combine such traits. Recent controversy has already emerged over a number of scientific experiments that resulted in viruses with enhanced transmissibility, lethality, and/or the ability to overcome therapeutics.13-17 Other experiments demonstrated that mousepox could be modified to have a 100% case fatality rate and render a vaccine ineffective.18 In addition to transmissibility and lethality, studies have shown that other disease traits, such as incubation time, environmental survival, and available vectors, could be modified as well.19-2

#### WHO diplomacy solves great power conflict

Murphy 20 [(Chris, U.S. senator from Connecticut serving on the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee) “The Answer is to Empower, Not Attack, the World Health Organization,” War on the Rocks, 4/21/2020] JL

The World Health Organization is critical to stopping disease outbreaks and strengthening public health systems in developing countries, where COVID-19 is starting to appear. Yemen announced its first infection earlier this month, and other countries in Africa, Asia and the Middle East are at severe risk. Millions of refugees rely on the World Health Organization for their health care, and millions of children rely on the WHO and UNICEF to access vaccines.

The World Health Organization is not perfect, but its team of doctors and public health experts have had major successes. Their most impressive claim to fame is the eradication of smallpox – no small feat. More recently, the World Health Organization has led an effort to rid the world of two of the three strains of polio, and they are close to completing the trifecta.

These investments are not just the right thing to do; they benefit the United States. Improving health outcomes abroad provides greater political and economic stability, increasing demand for U.S. exports. And, as we are all learning now, it is in America’s national security interest for countries to effectively detect and respond to potential pandemics before they reach our shores.

As the United States looks to develop a new global system of pandemic prevention, there is absolutely no way to do that job without the World Health Organization. Uniquely, it puts traditional adversaries – like Russia and the United States, India and Pakistan, or Iran and Saudi Arabia – all around the same big table to take on global health challenges. It has relationships with the public health leaders of every nation, decades of experience in tackling viruses and diseases, and the ability to bring countries together to tackle big projects. This ability to bridge divides and work across borders cannot be torn down and recreated – not in today’s environment of major power competition – and so there is simply no way to build an effective international anti-pandemic infrastructure without the World Health Organization at the center.

## 1NC – Shell

#### WTO is near consensus on fisheries subsidies – success will require continued focus, flexibility, and cooperation among members

WTO 7/15 [(World Trade Organization) “WTO members edge closer to fisheries subsidies agreement,” News and Events, 7/15/2021] JL

During an all-day meeting with 104 ministers and heads of delegation, WTO members pledged to conclude the negotiations soon and certainly before the WTO's Ministerial Conference in early December, and to empower their Geneva-based delegations to do so. Members also confirmed that the negotiating text currently before them can be used as the basis for the talks to strike the final deal.

“I feel new hope this evening. Because ministers and heads of delegation today demonstrated a strong commitment to moving forward and doing the hard work needed to get these negotiations to the finish line. I applaud you for this. In 20 years of negotiations, this is the closest we have ever come towards reaching an outcome — a high-quality outcome that would contribute to building a sustainable blue economy,” said Director-General Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala.

“One fundamental conclusion that I draw from your interventions today is that members are ready to use the text as the basis for future negotiations. A second takeaway from today was that there is universal agreement about the importance of the food and livelihood security of artisanal fishers in developing and least developed countries. The prospect for a deal in the autumn ahead of our Ministerial Conference has clearly improved.”

The UN Food and Agriculture Organization estimates that one-third of global fish stocks are overfished and most of the rest is fully exploited. This is up from 10% in 1970 and 27% in 2000. Depleted stocks threaten the food security of low-income coastal communities, and the livelihoods of poor and vulnerable fishers who must go further and further from shore only to bring back smaller and smaller hauls.

Each year, governments hand out around $35 billion in fisheries subsidies, two-thirds of which go to commercial fishers. These subsidies keep at sea vessels which would otherwise be economically unviable. World leaders in 2015 made a fisheries subsidies agreement by 2020 part of the Sustainable Development Goals and trade ministers reaffirmed this pledge in 2017.

The negotiations on fisheries subsidies disciplines have been ongoing for nearly 20 years. Although there has been recent progress thanks to the intensive work that led to the development of the negotiating text on which members are working, the lack of political impetus in the talks to close the remaining gaps inspired Director-General Okonjo-Iweala to call this meeting of ministers.

Among the thorniest issues to resolve has been how to extend special and differential treatment to developing and least developed country WTO members while preserving the overall objective of enhanced sustainability of the oceans. Ministers said that the livelihoods and food security of poor and vulnerable artisanal fishers in developing and least developed countries were of great importance, as was preserving the sustainability objective of the negotiations.

Amb. Santiago Wills of Colombia, who chairs the Rules Negotiating Group overseeing the fisheries subsidies negotiations, said he had received some valuable inputs from the discussions. He now has greater clarity on the path forward and the next steps that would be required to harvest an agreement. He will be consulting with the Director-General and WTO members about charting the path forward for the next stage of the talks.

“I am very heartened by the responses and messages that we have heard today. What we sought from ministers today was political guidance to help close these negotiations soon. And we did hear that guidance. We have been given the ingredients to reach a successful conclusion; a commitment to finish well ahead of our Ministerial Conference a text that can be the platform for this final stage of the negotiations and fully empowered heads of delegations in Geneva. This represents a real success,” said Amb. Wills.

The Director-General said that delegations needed to prepare for an intensive period of line by line negotiations.

“As we enter this new phase of text-based discussions, the responsibility to conclude these negotiations is truly in the hands of members. To get from here to an agreement, it will be your job to find the necessary trade-offs and flexibilities. A successful outcome by MC12 is ultimately your responsibility,” she said. “The world is watching. The fisheries subsidies negotiations are a test both of the WTO's credibility as a multilateral negotiating forum and of the trading system's ability to respond to problems of the global commons.  If we wait another 20 years, there may be no marine fisheries left to subsidise — or artisanal fishing communities to support.”

#### IP disputes fragment WTO unity and trade off with subsidies negotiation

Patnaik 3/12 [(Priti, journalist in Geneva, Switzerland, master’s in Development Studies from The Graduate Institute in Geneva and a master’s in Business and Economic Reporting from New York University) “Could Vaccine Nationalism Spur Disputes At The WTO?” Geneva Health Files, 3/12/2021] JL

To protect domestic manufacturers and constituencies, countries may resort to filing disputes, if only to send a signal to other members, experts believe. To be sure, this is not only about vaccines. Going forward, export restrictions on raw materials can have implications for therapeutics as well. So the threat of a dispute may be a tool to deal with competition for scarce medical products during the pandemic, experts say.

Although trade restrictive measures are short-sighted and not a preferred policy option, governments see them as powerful instruments to meet political goals, to send a message to domestic stakeholders, sources said.

“My hunch is that all countries are sort of sitting on both sides of the fence. On the one hand, governments would like to maintain the discretion and the ability to impose export restrictions if they need to or if they think they need to. Whether that is medical products or personal protective equipment. On the other hand, everybody dislikes it when other countries impose export restrictions. So I think there is enough of an incentive for countries to sit down and negotiate,” one legal expert noted.

Sources also pointed to political declarations last year where WTO members came together and said that they would not impose restrictive trade measures. “In order to be constructive, countries decided that they were going to signal to members that will not introduce exports restrictive measures even though it may be expedient to do so,” one trade expert said. The way out, some feel, is to find solution to placing limits on export restrictions.

It is not just trade restrictive measures that could result in trade disputes. The heated political discussions on the TRIPS waiver at WTO is also aggravating the potential for disputes, according to experts involved in litigations in international trade in Geneva. Therefore these ostensibly independent processes, can catalyse disputes.

“The waiver discussion is very heated and it is aggravating the discussion on the EU's export restrictions. If the waiver succeeds, then the opposing members cannot do anything about it. So they will be looking at other ways to beat up on behavior they do not like on the COVID-19 front,” one trade law expert said.  Do not rule out disputes against supporters of the TRIPS waiver proposal, in case the waiver is adopted, the source added.

In their statement at the WTO General Council meeting last week, the EU said, “In order to ensure that vaccines and their ingredients are not directed to export destinations in unjustified volumes, the European Union had no choice but to introduce a transparency mechanism on Covid-19 vaccine export transactions.” The EU has said that the measures are WTO-consistent.

It added “Since the entry into force of the scheme on the 1 February, we have received 150 requests for export authorisation. All of them have been accepted. I repeat, all of them.” This week, the European Commission extended transparency and authorisation mechanism for exports of COVID-19 vaccines.

The EU is also a part of the Ottawa Group proposal on Trade and Health that also spells out commitments towards export restrictions. (See also *E.U. Exports Millions of Covid Vaccine Doses Despite Supply Crunch at Home*)

“Members bring disputes all the time, even when they know that it's going to take a long time to get a result and often they bring a dispute as leverage for negotiations. Filing a dispute does not mean they are looking for a solution. It does not mean the dispute will be litigated all the way to the end,” a trade lawyer said.

It could also result in a negotiated arrangement, like it was in 2001 in the U.S.-Brazil case. “Why did the U.S. bring a case against Brazil? It gave them leverage in negotiations, and to satisfy domestic stakeholders,” the lawyer added.

The impasse at the Appellate Body may not be a deterrent for countries to dissuade countries from bringing a dispute, some believe.

“The Appellate Body not being functional is not a problem. Countries have recourse to Article 25 under the Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU) that provides for ‘expeditious arbitration as a alternate means to dispute settlement’,” a source involved in the WTO litigation process said. (The EU, for example, is a signatory to the Multi-party interim appeal arbitration arrangement, MPIA.)

While disputes may take up precious energy and resources of members already stretched in fighting to address the pandemic, it may likely be a strategy to address trade protectionism. Not all agree.

“I think the law is not really an answer here, I hate to say that because I'm a lawyer. But I really don't think the law is an answer because the law is so generically drafted right that and it's politically so sensitive. Which WTO panel will tell a member that restricting vaccines is not legitimate? It will ultimately harm the legitimacy of the trading system,” the person added.

#### Overfishing collapses biodiversity

DUJS 12 [(Dartmouth Undergraduate Journal of Science, official open access science journal of Dartmouth College, publishing original scientific research, multidisciplinary review articles, and science news) “The Threats of Overfishing: Consequences at the Commercial Level,” 3/11/2012] JL

According to marine ecologists, overfishing is the greatest threat to ocean ecosystems today (1). Overfishing occurs because fish are captured at a faster rate than they can reproduce (2). Advanced fishing technology and an increased demand for fish have led to overfishing, causing several marine species to become extinct or endangered as a result (3, 4). In the long-term, overfishing can have a devastating impact on ocean communities as it destabilizes the food chain and destroys the natural habitats of many aquatic species (2).

In the past, fishing was more sustainable because fishermen could not access every location and because they had a limited capacity for fish aboard their vessels. Today, however, small trawlers and fishing boats have been replaced by giant factory ships that can capture and process extremely large amounts of prey at a given time (2). These ships use sonar instruments and global positioning systems (GPS) to rapidly locate large schools of fish (1). Fishing lines are deployed with thousands of large hooks that can reach areas up to 120 kilometers deep. The trawling vessels and machines can even reach depths of 170 kilometers and can store an extraordinarily large volume of fish. Each year, these huge trawling ships comb an area twice the size of the United States. They use massive nets 50 meters wide with the capacity to pull the weight of a medium-sized plane (2). They also have several plants for processing and packing fish, large freezing systems, fishmeal processing plants, and powerful engines that can carry this enormous fishing gear around the ocean. Because these ships have all the equipment necessary to freeze and tin fish, they only need to return to their base once they are full. Even when the ships are filled, however, the fish are often transferred to refrigerated vessels in the middle of the ocean and are processed for consumption later (4). As such, industrial fishing has expanded considerably and fishermen can now explore new shores and deeper waters to keep up with the increased demand for seafood. In fact, it has been reported by the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) that over 70 percent of the world’s fisheries are either ‘fully exploited’, ‘over exploited’ or ‘significantly depleted’ (5). The annual total global catch of fish is 124 million metric tons, which is equivalent in weight to 378 Empire State Buildings (2).

Fishing gear is often non-selective in the fish it targets. For example, any fish that are too big to get through the mesh of a net are captured. Therefore, overfishing does not only threaten the species of fish that is targeted for food, but also many non-target species. As a result, these other species, including marine mammals and seabirds, are accidentally caught in the fishing gear and killed (6). For example, for every ton of prawn caught, three tons of other fish are killed and thrown away. Those in the trade refer to this practice of inadvertent catching of other species as bycatch (4). The FAO has pointed out that about 25 percent of the world’s captured fish end up thrown overboard because they are caught unintentionally, are illegal market species, or are of inferior quality and size. Many of the fish caught this way include endangered and over exploited species, 95 percent of which are eventually thrown away (2). Bycatch is not just limited to just unwanted fish, but rather affects all types of marine life, including whales, dolphins, porpoises, fur seals, albatrosses, and turtles. For example, tuna fisheries are indirectly responsible for the deaths of an estimated one million sharks annually due to bycatch. Small cetaceans, such as dolphins and porpoises, are also targets of bycatch as they are often caught in fishing nets. In fact, hundreds of dolphin corpses are washed up on the beaches of Europe every year, bringing attention to the growing scale of this problem (6).

Many modern fishing methods are also irreversibly destructive. For example, bottom trawling, a technique that uses extremely wide nets armed with heavy metal rollers, can crush everything in the path of the gear, destroying fragile corals, smashing rock formations, and killing several tons of fish and animals as bycatch (7). As such, these practices can wreak havoc on delicate marine ecosystems.

Not surprisingly, it has been reported that industrial fishing takes between only 10 and 15 years to wipe out a tenth of whichever species it targets (2). In fact, several marine species have already been fished to commercial extinction, and this number is rapidly increasing (1). One of the reasons for this is that the regulation of fishing vessels and the fishing industry is universally inadequate. Roughly two-thirds of the ocean is free of laws and fishing vessels only follow the laws ratified by their country of origin. However, most fishing countries have not ratified any international convention to protect the sea or marine life (2). Moreover, fishing factory ships and companies are given access to fisheries before the long–term impact of their fishing practices is understood (1).

Today, the number of fish caught worldwide is actually shrinking as the fishing industry is in decline from many years of overfishing (2). The year 1988 was the first time in human history that global wild fish catches dropped and they have continued to fall ever since. In European waters, four out of every five known fish stocks are already beyond safe biological limits (7). Illegal and unreported fishing have also contributed a great deal to the depletion of the oceans and continues to be a serious problem.

A new study conducted by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) found that 5 out of the 8 tuna species are at risk of extinction (8). All three species of bluefin tuna, for example, are threatened with extinction and are at a population that makes their recovery practically irreversible (2). The IUCN has also reported that freshwater fish are among the most endangered species, with more than a third facing extinction. Not surprisingly, among those at the greatest risk are species like the Mekong giant catfish, the freshwater stingray, and the European eel, which are used to make some of the most expensive caviars. The Mekong giant catfish is the closest to extinction, with as few as 250 left. Overfishing has reduced the numbers of Mekong freshwater stingray by over 50 percent in Southeast Asia and has reduced the giant Mekong salmon carp population by over 90 percent (9).

As previously mentioned, shark populations have also been greatly affected by overfishing. There are already more than 135 species of shark on the IUCN’s list of endangered animals and more are being added each year. For example, the number of scalloped hammerhead shark has decreased by 99% over the past 30 years. Other species recently added to the endangered list include the smooth hammerhead, shortfin mako, common thresher, big-eye thresher, silky, tiger, bull, and dusky (10). Besides being caught as bycatch, sharks are now also being targeted by commercial fishermen for their fins which can fetch a substantial price on the Asian food market. Sharks are particularly vulnerable to exploitation because they have long life spans, are exceptionally slow to mature (taking as long as 16 years in some cases), and are relatively unprolific breeders (11). Recent reports suggest that over fishing has caused a 90% decline in shark populations across the world’s oceans and up to 99% along the US east coast, which are some of the best managed waters in the world. Because sharks are at the top of the food chain, a decline in their numbers has devastating consequences on marine ecosystems (10).

Overfishing impacts not just the particular species that is exploited, but also damages other species of fish and disrupts local ecosystems. The stability of ecological communities depends largely on the interactions between predators and prey (12). Thereby, the balance of the food chain is disturbed when certain species are removed. As a result, many ocean species are disappearing and losing their habitats. The evolutionary process of marine species is also being altered, causing cycles of premature reproduction and relative decreases in the size of fish across generations. As predators diminish, the populations of smaller fish escalate because they were previously the food source of the bigger fish. In addition, the disappearance of these species affects many other species, like seabirds and sea mammals, which are vulnerable to the lack of food (2).

A recent study found that overfishing is also decreasing the genetic diversity of fish worldwide. Diversity is projected to be reduced further if overfishing continues at the same rate (13). This has serious effects on nutrient recycling in marine ecosystems because fish species vary widely in their rates of nitrogen and phosphorus excretion. As such, altering fish communities creates divergent nutrient recycling patterns and disrupts the functioning of the ecosystem. Recently conducted studies in lakes affected by overfishing show that loss of species contributes to a decline in nutrient recycling and destabilizes the ecosystem (14).

While it is often overlooked for other environmental issues, overfishing has historically caused more ecological extinction than any other human influence on coastal ecosystems, including water pollution (5). Unfortunately, due to a lack of data, the extent of this damage has only recently been recognized (15).

#### Continued biodiversity loss causes extinction

Carrington 18 [(Damian, the Guardian's Environment editor) "Humanity has wiped out 60% of a animal populations since 1970, report finds," The Guardian, 10/29/18] TDI

Humanity has wiped out 60% of mammals, birds, fish and reptiles since 1970, leading the world’s foremost experts to warn that the annihilation of wildlife is now an emergency that threatens civilisation.

The new estimate of the massacre of wildlife is made in a major report produced by WWF and involving 59 scientists from across the globe. It finds that the vast and growing consumption of food and resources by the global population is destroying the web of life, billions of years in the making, upon which human society ultimately depends for clean air, water and everything else.

“We are sleepwalking towards the edge of a cliff” said Mike Barrett, executive director of science and conservation at WWF. “If there was a 60% decline in the human population, that would be equivalent to emptying North America, South America, Africa, Europe, China and Oceania. That is the scale of what we have done.”

“This is far more than just being about losing the wonders of nature, desperately sad though that is,” he said. “T**his is** actually now jeopardising the future of people. Nature is not a ‘nice to have’ – it is our life-support system.”

“We are rapidly running out of time,” said Prof Johan Rockström, a global sustainability expert at the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research in Germany. “Only by addressing both ecosystems and climate do we stand a chance of safeguarding a stable planet for humanity’s future on Earth.”

Many scientists believe the world has begun a sixth mass extinction, the first to be caused by a species – Homo sapiens. Other recent analyses have revealed that humankind has destroyed 83% of all mammals and half of plants since the dawn of civilisation and that, even if the destruction were to end now, it would take 5-7 million years for the natural world to recover.

The Living Planet Index, produced for WWF by the Zoological Society of London, uses data on 16,704 populations of mammals, birds, fish, reptiles and amphibians, representing more than 4,000 species, to track the decline of wildlife. Between 1970 and 2014, the latest data available, populations fell by an average of 60%. Four years ago, the decline was 52%. The “shocking truth”, said Barrett, is that the wildlife crash is continuing unabated.

Wildlife and the ecosystems are vital to human life, said Prof Bob Watson, one of the world’s most eminent environmental scientists and currently chair of an intergovernmental panel on biodiversity that said in March that the destruction of nature is as dangerous as climate change.

“Nature contributes to human wellbeing culturally and spiritually, as well as through the critical production of food, clean water, and energy, and through regulating the Earth’s climate, pollution, pollination and floods,” he said. “The Living Planet report clearly demonstrates that human activities are destroying nature at an unacceptable rate, threatening the wellbeing of current and future generations.”

The biggest cause of wildlife losses is the destruction of natural habitats, much of it to create farmland. Three-quarters of all land on Earth is now significantly affected by human activities. Killing for food is the next biggest cause – 300 mammal species are being eaten into extinction – while the oceans are massively overfished, with more than half now being industrially fished.

Chemical pollution is also significant: half the world’s killer whale populations are now doomed to die from PCB contamination. Global trade introduces invasive species and disease, with amphibians decimated by a fungal disease thought to be spread by the pet trade.

The worst affected region is South and Central America, which has seen an 89% drop in vertebrate populations, largely driven by the felling of vast areas of wildlife-rich forest. In the tropical savannah called cerrado, an area the size of Greater London is cleared every two months, said Barrett.

“It is a classic example of where the disappearance is the result of our own consumption, because the deforestation is being driven by ever expanding agriculture producing soy, which is being exported to countries including the UK to feed pigs and chickens,” he said. The UK itself has lost much of its wildlife, ranking 189th for biodiversity loss out of 218 nations in 2016.

The habitats suffering the greatest damage are rivers and lakes, where wildlife populations have fallen 83%, due to the enormous thirst of agriculture and the large number of dams. “Again there is this direct link between the food system and the depletion of wildlife,” said Barrett. Eating less meat is an essential part of reversing losses, he said.

The Living Planet Index has been criticised as being too broad a measure of wildlife losses and smoothing over crucial details. But all indicators, from extinction rates to intactness of ecosystems, show colossal losses. “They all tell you the same story,” said Barrett.

Conservation efforts can work, with tiger numbers having risen 20% in India in six years as habitat is protected. Giant pandas in China and otters in the UK have also been doing well.

But Marco Lambertini, director general of WWF International, said the fundamental issue was consumption: “We can no longer ignore the impact of current unsustainable production models and wasteful lifestyles.”

## Case

### Advantage 2

#### Uniqueness ev is from 2016— no warrant for why its low specifically now, means the advantage is nonunique.

#### Unsustainable now— your ev is from 2016 means it would have already collapsed or harmonization now is sustainable.

#### Econ decline doesn’t cause war – it encourages decreased defense spending, threat deflation, threat prioritization, international coop, and better leaders.

Clary ’15 (Christopher; 4/25/15; Ph.D. in political science from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, M.A. in National Security Affairs, Postdoctoral fellow, Watson Institute for International Studies, Brown University; MIT Political Science Department Research Paper, “Economic Stress and International Cooperation: Evidence from International Rivalries,” https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2597712)

Do economic downturns generate pressure for diversionary conflict? Or might downturns **encourage austerity and economizing behavior** in foreign policy? This paper provides new evidence that economic stress is associated with conciliatory policies between strategic rivals. For states that view each other as military threats, the biggest step possible toward bilateral cooperation is to terminate the rivalry by taking political steps to manage the competition. Drawing on **data** from 109 **distinct rival** dyads **since 1950**, 67 of which terminated, the evidence suggests rivalries were approximately twice as likely to terminate during economic downturns than they were during periods of economic normalcy. This is true controlling for all of the main alternative explanations for peaceful relations between foes (democratic status, nuclear weapons possession, capability imbalance, common enemies, and international systemic changes), as well as many other possible confounding variables. This research questions existing theories claiming that economic downturns are associated with diversionary war, and instead argues that in certain circumstances peace may **result from economic troubles**. I define a rivalry as the perception by national elites of two states that the other state possesses conflicting interests and presents a military threat of sufficient severity that future military conflict is likely. Rivalry termination is the transition from a state of rivalry to one where conflicts of interest are not viewed as being so severe as to provoke interstate conflict and/or where a mutual recognition of the imbalance in military capabilities makes conflict-causing bargaining failures unlikely. In other words, rivalries terminate when the elites assess that the risks of military conflict between rivals has been reduced dramatically. This definition draws on a growing quantitative literature most closely associated with the research programs of William Thompson, J. Joseph Hewitt, and James P. Klein, Gary Goertz, and Paul F. Diehl.1 My definition conforms to that of William Thompson. In work with Karen Rasler, they define rivalries as situations in which “[b]oth actors view each other as a significant politicalmilitary threat and, therefore, an enemy.”2 In other work, Thompson writing with Michael Colaresi, explains further: The presumption is that decisionmakers explicitly identify who they think are their foreign enemies. They orient their military preparations and foreign policies toward meeting their threats. They assure their constituents that they will not let their adversaries take advantage. Usually, these activities are done in public. Hence, we should be able to follow the explicit cues in decisionmaker utterances and writings, as well as in the descriptive political histories written about the foreign policies of specific countries.3 Drawing from available records and histories, Thompson and David Dreyer have generated a universe of strategic rivalries from 1494 to 2010 that serves as the basis for this project’s empirical analysis.4 This project measures rivalry termination as occurring on the last year that Thompson and Dreyer record the existence of a rivalry. Economic crises lead to conciliatory behavior through five primary channels. (1) Economic crises lead to austerity pressures, which in turn incent leaders to search for ways to cut defense expenditures. (2) Economic crises also encourage strategic reassessment, so that leaders can argue to their peers and their publics that defense spending can be arrested without endangering the state. This can lead to threat deflation, where elites attempt to **downplay** **the seriousness** of the threat posed by a former rival. (3) If a state faces multiple threats, economic crises provoke elites to **consider** threat prioritization, a process that is postponed during periods of economic normalcy. (4) Economic crises increase the political and economic benefit from international **economic** cooperation. Leaders **seek foreign aid**, **enhanced trade**, and **increased investment** from abroad during periods of economic trouble. This search is made easier if tensions are reduced with historic rivals. (5) Finally, during crises, elites are more prone to select leaders who are perceived as **capable of** resolving **economic** difficulties, permitting the emergence of leaders who hold heterodox foreign policy views. Collectively, these mechanisms make it **much more likely** that a leader will prefer conciliatory policies compared to during periods of economic normalcy. This section reviews this **causal logic** in greater detail, while also providing **historical examples** that these mechanisms recur in practice. Economic Crisis Leads to **Austerity** Economic crises generate pressure for austerity. Government revenues are a function of national economic production, so that when production diminishes through recession, revenues available for expenditure also diminish. Planning almost **invariably assumes growth** rather than contraction, so the deviation in available revenues compared to the planned expenditure can be sizable. When growth slowdowns are prolonged, the cumulative departure from planning targets can grow even further, even if no single quarter meets the technical definition of recession. Pressures for austerity are **felt** most **acutely** in governments that face difficulty borrowing to finance deficit expenditures. This is **especially the case** when this borrowing relies on international sources of credit. Even for states that can borrow, however, intellectual attachment to balanced budgets as a means to restore confidence—a belief in what is sometimes called “expansionary austerity”—generates incentives to curtail expenditure. These incentives to cut occur precisely when populations are experiencing economic hardship, making reductions especially painful that target poverty alleviation, welfare programs, or economic subsidies. As a result, mass and elite constituents strongly resist such cuts. Welfare programs and other forms of public spending may be especially susceptible to a policy “ratchet effect,” where people are **very reluctant** to forego benefits once they have become accustomed to their availability.6 As Paul Pierson has argued, “The politics [of welfare state] retrenchment is typically treacherous, because it imposes **tangible losses** on concentrated groups of voters in return for diffuse and uncertain gains.”7

#### EU collapse is inevitable:

#### Economic crisis

Nasir 8/3 [(Muhammad Ali, Associate Professor in Economics and Finance at the University of Huddersfield, former Senior Lecturer in Economics at Leeds Business School, PhD in Economics) “Four reasons why EU is staring down the barrel of a second lost decade,” The Conversation, 8/3/2021] JL

When COVID broke out, the eurozone growth rate remained well below its long-term trajectory. It was behind the US and UK, both of whom were hit harder by the global financial crisis, and even worse compared to the leading emerging economies. Neither was this a one-off. Looking at the past five recessions, the eurozone nations have been successively slower to recover from each one.

Since 2008, the ECB has tried numerous measures to improve growth. Like most major powers, it has done a lot of quantitative easing (QE), which involves creating money to buy sovereign bonds and other financial assets. It has sought to prop up its retail banks in various ways, while also pioneering negative interest rates and giving the markets more forward guidance about monetary policy.

Famously in 2012, then ECB president Mario Draghi said he would do “whatever it takes” to save the euro. This forward guidance kept the euro stable, but the same cannot be said of growth.

Policy errors are partly to blame for this. With the benefit of hindsight, the eurozone went into the global financial crisis with lending rates on the low side, so had less room to cut than other regions. It was also more reluctant than central banks like the Bank of England and US Federal Reserve to start QE, preferring to focus on curbing inflation and making the euro “*stabil wie die mark*” (stable like the German mark). The ECB did not unveil a QE programme until 2015.

Countries with the capacity to spend to stimulate their economies, such as Germany, France and the Netherlands, also did too little. Spain’s stimulus was poorly designed, while Italy was more interested in balancing its books at the time. Too soon after the crisis struck, austerity then became the priority for the whole eurozone.

A related problem has been public and private investment. In middle-income EU regions, investment rates fell by about 14% between 2002 and 2018. In thrifty Germany, public and private fixed investments declined as a percentage of GDP for decades, despite a huge surplus in public spending.

Before COVID hit, EU infrastructure investment was at a 15-year low, with the greatest declines in regions that were already lagging. Initiatives intended to help, such as the European Economic Recovery Plan of 2008 and the European Commission Investment Plan in 2014, were too little.

The overall result was that weakness: Germany and the eurozone as a whole were showing 0% growth at the time of the COVID outbreak, while Austria, France and Italy were all contracting slightly. In response, the ECB had cut its main interest rate by 0.1 percentage points to -0.5% in September 2019, and restarted monthly QE to the tune of €20 billion (£17 billion) from November 1 of that year – the date Christine Lagarde became ECB president.

The eurozone economy was therefore needing life support even before the pandemic – indeed, many of the ECB’s other unconventional support measures were in place throughout. Tellingly, the ECB’s only new measure during the pandemic has been a new form of cheaper refinancing for banks. It raises the prospect of the ECB running out of the ammunition needed to keep stimulating the eurozone’s sickly economy.

#### Poland and Hungary

Reuters 7/16 [“Poland's Tusk says conflicts with EU could eventually end the bloc,” Reuters, 7/16/2021] JL

WARSAW, July 16 (Reuters) - Poland and Hungary's conflicts with the European Union could start a process that results in the bloc falling apart, former European Council President Donald Tusk warned on Friday, amid a worsening standoff over democratic standards.

Brussels is at loggerheads with Warsaw and Budapest over issues such as the independence of the judiciary and press freedoms, a conflict which deepened this week as Poland's Constitutional Tribunal ruled the country should not comply with demands from the EU's top court, while the European Commission took legal action against both countries over LGBT rights.

"If more of these kinds of countries are found who insist on damaging... the European Union it may simply mean the end of this organisation," Tusk, who has returned to domestic politics as leader of Poland's main opposition party Civic Platform (PO), told private broadcaster TVN24.

#### Economic collapse is inevitable – runaway growth and debt crises

Goldstein 7/7 [(Steve, responsible for MarketWatch's coverage of financial markets in Europe, internally cites Patrick Artus, professor at the Paris School of Economics, member of the Economic Analysis Council, PhD from the Institute of Political Studies of Paris) “Here are four reasons the West is headed for a ‘very drastic crisis,’ according to a veteran economist,” Marketwatch, 7/7/2021] JL

Patrick Artus, a senior economics adviser at French bank Natixis and a professor at the Paris School of Economics, isn’t sharing in the joy. In a very blunt memo to clients, Artus says a crisis is “inevitable.”

The total outstanding debt of the U.S., the U.K., the eurozone and Japan relative to gross domestic product has come off the highest levels of the pandemic as economies have reopened but still is at elevated levels. “Borrower solvency cannot be ensured if debt-to-income ratios increase continuously,” he says.

The money supply also is at records. “The money supply cannot be increased continuously relative to income, as soon or later demand for money, which is linked to savings and income, can no longer increase,” said Artus, whose résumé includes stints at the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and the Banque de France.

Also zooming higher is wealth, with both stock and housing prices surging. “Rising relative asset prices cannot be extrapolated: If they become too high, the savings of asset buyers will no longer suffice to buy then, leading inevitably to a downward correction in prices,” he says. Finally, he notes a skewing of income distribution against wage earners: “If wage earnings do not receive productivity gains over a long period, demand for goods and services will become too weak to absorb production, which grows rapidly when earnings are invested.”

So how will this unwind? Artus says a correction in income distribution will lead to faster wage growth and higher inflation. That, in turn, will need to more restrictive monetary policy and higher inflation-adjusted interest rates. The more restrictive monetary policy will then stabilize asset prices and wealth, forcing deleveraging. And that deleveraging will lead to a recession due to the necessary fall in demand among households, companies and governments.

“The stabilization of these variables will lead to a very drastic crisis, due to faster growth in wages and inflation, a restrictive monetary policy, a fall in wealth and asset prices, and a recession caused by a fall in domestic demand,” he concludes.

#### Only degrowth solves– infinite growth relies on burning fossil fuels, depleting natural resources, mining REMS, and pollution – COVID means a transition is possible

Herbert and Mastini 20 [(Joe Herbert, a doctoral researcher in Human Geography at Newcastle University) (Riccardo Mastini, a doctoral researcher in Political Ecology in the Institute of Environmental Science and Technology at the Autonomous University of Barcelona) “Economic Growth Can't Go Back to Normal If We Are to Solve the Ecological Crisis” Common Dreams, 6/8/2020] BC

The COVID-19 pandemic has delivered a sharp and sudden shock to the global economy’s usual diet of ever-expanding economic growth. Measures to tackle the virus have seen industries grind to a halt, and high streets become ghost towns. Experts are predicting the worst global recession since the 1930s, and the UK’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP) is forecast to fall by 14% in 2020.

For the beneficiaries of our existing economic system, this hit to growth is a waking nightmare.

Growth is heralded as a rising tide that lifts all boats, creating larger incomes and more jobs, as well as funding essential public services like healthcare and education. Strong and uninterrupted growth is considered an unquestionable good that benefits all of society.

The problems with growth

But what drives economic growth? Our economy relies on burning fossil fuels and depleting natural resources to expand production and consumption, while polluting the environment with the waste. Most of us are forced to work for wages in order to survive, creating the goods and services which generate growth, while a minority siphon off the profits. In 2018, 82% of new wealth created went to the world’s richest 1%, while the poorest half of the global population got nothing.

Most scientists agree that an unprecedented economic transformation is now needed to limit global temperature rise to 1.5°C and avert climate breakdown. Meanwhile, the destruction of ecosystems to claim land and resources in service of more economic growth is contributing to the sixth mass extinction of life on Earth.

“Green growth” has been touted as a solution to these problems. But recent research suggests that growth cannot be decoupled from environmental pressures at a scale or speed sufficient to halt ecological breakdown.

Transitioning to renewable energy can reduce carbon emissions, but it increases pressures on rare Earth minerals and land to build wind and solar farms. Reducing emissions in one country often involves exporting dirty production processes to another. When goods are made more efficient, they become cheaper to produce, and their lower ecological impact is often offset by increased consumption. Think of someone switching to a fuel efficient car but driving more often. Put simply, attempts at “greening” growth often shift, rather than eliminate, environmental impact.

Governments have taken action to reduce the spread of COVID-19 at the expense of economic growth. But as the post-pandemic recession kicks in, rebooting growth will be the priority. This would set us right back on the path of ecological catastrophe.

Yet, polling suggests a public appetite to prioritise wellbeing over growth in the post-COVID economy. To achieve this while tackling ecological crisis would require turning the current short-term disruption to growth into a long-term managed downscaling of the economy. As researchers, we work with a concept which can guide this task: degrowth.

mic economy begins, we must resist the return to infinite growth. The future of life on Earth depends upon it.

* 1. **Warming causes extinction**

**Ramanathan et al. 17** [Veerabhadran Ramanathan is Victor Alderson Professor of Applied Ocean Sciences and director of the Center for Atmospheric Sciences at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego, Dr. William Collins is an internationally recognized expert in climate modeling and climate change science. He is the Director of the Climate and Ecosystem Sciences Division (CESD) for the Earth and Environmental Sciences Area (EESA) at the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL), Prof. Dr Mark Lawrence, Ph.D. is scientific director at the Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies (IASS) in Potsdam, Örjan Gustafsson is a Professor in the Department of Environmental Science and Analytic Chemistry at Stockholm University, Shichang Kang is Professor, Cold and Arid Regions Environmental and Engineering Research Institute, Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS); CAS Center for Excellence in Tibetan Plateau Earth Sciences, and Molina, M.J., Zaelke, D., Borgford-Parnell, N., Xu, Y., Alex, K., Auffhammer, M., Bledsoe, P., Croes, B., Forman, F., Haines, A., Harnish, R., Jacobson, M.Z., Lawrence, M., Leloup, D., Lenton, T., Morehouse, T., Munk, W., Picolotti, R., Prather, K., Raga, G., Rignot, E., Shindell, D., Singh, A.K., Steiner, A., Thiemens, M., Titley, D.W., Tucker, M.E., Tripathi, S., & Victor, D., authors come from the following 9 countries - US, Switzerland, Sweden, UK, China, Germany, Australia, Mexico, India, “Well Under 2 Degrees Celsius: Fast Action Policies to Protect People and the Planet from Extreme Climate Change,” Report of the Committee to Prevent Extreme Climate Change, September 2017, http://www.igsd.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/Well-Under-2-Degrees-Celsius-Report-2017.pdf] TDI

**Climate change is becoming an existential threat with warming in excess of 2°C within the next three decades and 4°C to 6°C within the next several decades. Warming of such magnitudes will expose as many as 75% of the world’s population to deadly heat stress in addition to disrupting the climate and weather worldwide. Climate change is an urgent problem requiring urgent solutions**. This paper lays out urgent and **practical solutions that are ready for implementation now, will deliver benefits in the next few critical decades**, and places the world on a path to achieving the longterm targets of the Paris Agreement and near-term sustainable development goals. The approach consists of four building blocks and 3 levers to implement ten scalable solutions described in this report by a team of climate scientists, policy makers, social and behavioral scientists, political scientists, legal experts, diplomats, and military experts from around the world. These solutions will enable society to decarbonize the global energy system by 2050 through efficiency and renewables, drastically reduce short-lived climate pollutants, and stabilize the climate well below 2°C both in the near term (before 2050) and in the long term (post 2050). It will also reduce premature mortalities by tens of millions by 2050. As an insurance against policy lapses, mitigation delays and faster than projected climate changes, the solutions include an Atmospheric Carbon Extraction lever to remove CO2 from the air. The amount of CO2 that must be removed ranges from negligible, if the emissions of CO2 from the energy system and SLCPs start to decrease by 2020 and carbon neutrality is achieved by 2050, to a staggering one trillion tons if the carbon lever is not pulled and emissions of climate pollutants continue to increase until 2030.

There are numerous living laboratories including 53 cities, many universities around the world, the state of California, and the nation of Sweden, who have embarked on a carbon neutral pathway. These laboratories have already created 8 million jobs in the clean energy industry; they have also shown that **emissions of greenhouse gases and air pollutants can be decoupled from economic growth**. Another favorable sign is that **growth rates of worldwide carbon emissions have reduced from 2.9% per year during the first decade of this century to 1.3% from 2011 to 2014 and near zero growth rates during the last few years. The carbon emission curve is bending, but we have a long way to go and very little time for achieving carbon neutrality**. We need institutions and enterprises that can accelerate this bending by scaling-up the solutions that are being proven in the living laboratories. We have less than a decade to put these solutions in place around the world to preserve nature and our quality of life for generations to come. The time is now.

The Paris Agreement is an historic achievement. For the first time, effectively all nations have committed to limiting their greenhouse gas emissions and taking other actions to limit global temperature change. Specifically, 197 nations agreed to hold “the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels and pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels,” and achieve carbon neutrality in the second half of this century.

**The climate has already warmed by 1°C. The problem is running ahead of us, and under current trends we will likely reach 1.5°C in the next fifteen years and surpass the 2°C guardrail by mid-century with a 50% probability of reaching 4°C by end of century**. Warming in excess of 3°C is likely to be a global catastrophe for three major reasons:

• **Warming in the range of 3°C to 5°C is suggested as the threshold for several tipping points in the physical and geochemical systems; a warming of about 3°C has a probability of over 40% to cross over multiple tipping points, while a warming close to 5°C increases it to nearly 90%, compared with a baseline warming of less than 1.5°C, which has only just over a 10% probability of exceeding any tipping point.**

**• Health effects of such warming are emerging as a major if not dominant source of concern. Warming of 4°C or more will expose more than 70% of the population, i.e. about 7 billion by the end of the century, to deadly heat stress and expose about 2.4 billion to vector borne diseases such as Dengue, Chikengunya, and Zika virus among others**. Ecologists and paleontologists have proposed that warming in excess of 3°C, accompanied by increased acidity of the oceans by the buildup of CO2 , can become a major causal factor for exposing more than 50% of all species to extinction. 20% of species are in danger of extinction now due to population, habitat destruction, and climate change.

The good news is that **there may still be time to avert such catastrophic changes**. The Paris Agreement and **supporting climate policies must be strengthened substantially within the next five years to bend the emissions curve down faster, stabilize climate, and prevent catastrophic warming**. To the extent those efforts fall short, societies and **ecosystems will be forced to contend with substantial needs for adaptation—a burden that will fall disproportionately on the poorest three billion**