

# Democracy NC

## Framing

The Sing Standard is Utilitarianism defined as maximizing the greatest good for the greatest number of people.

There's 2 reasons to prefer

1]

The objective goodness of pleasure and badness of pain are undeniable and intrinsically motivating.

Nagel '97

[Thomas Nagel, University Professor of Philosophy and Law at New York University, The View From Nowhere, Book, <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/~uctytho/dfwVariousNagel.htm>, 1989]

I shall defend the unsurprising claim that **sensory pleasure is good and pain bad, no matter whose they are**. The point of the exercise is to see how the pressures of objectification operate in a simple case. Physical pleasure and pain do not usually depend on activities or desires which themselves raise questions of justification and value. They are just sensory experiences in relation to which we are fairly passive, but toward which we feel involuntary desire or aversion. Almost

**everyone takes the avoidance of his [or her] own pain and the promotion of his [or her] own pleasure as subjective reasons for action** in a fairly simple way; they are not back up by any further reasons. On the other hand if someone pursues pain or avoids pleasure, either it as a means to some end or it is backed up by dark reasons like guilt or sexual masochism. What sort of general value, if any, ought to be assigned to pleasure and pain when we consider these facts from an objective standpoint? What kind of judgment can we reasonably make about these things when we view them in abstraction from who we are? We can begin by asking why **there is no plausibility in the zero position, that pleasure and pain have no value of any kind that can be objectively recognized. That would mean that I have no reason to take**

**aspirin for a severe headache**, however I may in fact be motivated; and that looking at it from outside, **you couldn't even say that someone had a reason not to put his [their] hand on a hot stove, just because of the pain**. Try looking at it from the outside and see whether you can manage to withhold that judgment. If the idea of objective practical reason makes any sense at all, so that there is some judgment to withhold, it does not seem possible. If the general arguments against the reality of objective reasons are no good, then it is at least possible that I have a reason, and not just an inclination, to refrain from putting my hand on a hot stove. But given the possibility, it seems meaningless to deny that this is so. Oddly enough, however, we can think of a story that would go with such a denial. It might be suggested that the aversion to pain is a useful phobia—having nothing to do with the intrinsic undesirability of pain itself—which helps us avoid or escape the injuries that are signaled by pain. (The same type of purely instrumental value might be ascribed to sensory pleasure: the pleasures of food, drink, and sex might be regarded as having no value in themselves, though our natural attraction to them assists survival and reproduction.) There would then be nothing wrong with pain in itself, and someone who was never motivated deliberately to do anything just because he knew it would reduce or avoid pain would have nothing the matter with him. He would still have involuntary avoidance reactions, otherwise it would be hard to say that he felt pain at all. And he would be motivated to reduce pain for other reasons—because it was an effective way to avoid the danger being signaled, or because interfered with some physical or mental activity that was important to him. [Imagine someone] He just wouldn't regard the pain as itself something he had any reason to avoid, even though he hated [it] the feeling just as much as the rest of us. (And of course he wouldn't be able to justify the avoidance of pain in the way that we customarily justify avoiding what we hate without reason—that is, on the ground that even an irrational

hatred makes its object very unpleasant!) There is nothing self-contradictory in this proposal, but it seems nevertheless insane. **Without some positive reason to think there is nothing in itself good or bad about having an experience you intensely like or dislike, we can't seriously regard the common impression to the contrary as a collective illusion.**

Such things are at least good or bad for us, if anything is. What seems to be going on here is that we cannot from an objective standpoint withhold a certain kind of endorsement of the most direct and immediate subjective value judgments we make concerning the contents of our own consciousness. We regard ourselves as too close to those things to be mistaken in our immediate,

nonideological evaluative impressions. **No objective view we can attain could possibly overrule our subjective authority** in such cases. There can be no reason to reject the appearances here.

2] Maximizing all lives is the only way to affirm equality

Cummiskey 96 – Professor of Philosophy, Bates (David, Kantian Consequentialism, Ethics 100.3, p 601-2, p 606, jstor, AG)

We must not obscure the issue by characterizing this type of case as the sacrifice of individuals for some abstract "social entity." **It is not a question of some persons having to bear the cost for some elusive "overall social good."** Instead, the question is whether some persons must bear the inescapable cost for the sake of other persons. Nozick, for example, argues that "to use a person in this way does not sufficiently respect and take account of the fact that he is a separate person, that his is the only life he has."<sup>30</sup> Why, however, is this not equally true of all those that we do not save through our failure to act? **By emphasizing solely the one who must bear the cost if we act, one fails to sufficiently respect and take account of the many other separate persons, each with only one life, who will bear the cost of our inaction. In such a situation, what would a conscientious Kantian agent, an agent motivated by the unconditional value of rational beings, choose? We have a duty to promote**

the conditions necessary for the existence of rational beings, but both choosing to act and choosing not to act will cost the life of a rational being. Since the basis of Kant's principle is "rational nature exists as an end-in-itself" (GMM, p. 429), the reasonable solution to such a dilemma involves promoting, insofar as one can, the conditions necessary for rational beings. **If I sacrifice some for the sake of other rational beings, I do not use them arbitrarily and I do not deny the unconditional value of rational beings.** Persons may have "dignity", an unconditional and incomparable value that transcends any market value (GMM, p. 436), but, as rational beings, persons also have **a fundamental equality which dictates that some must sometimes give way for the sake of others.** The formula of the end-in-itself thus does not support the view that we may never force another to bear some cost in order to benefit others. If one focuses on the equal value of all rational beings, then **equal consideration dictates that one sacrifice some to save many.** [continues] According to Kant, the objective end of moral action is the existence of rational beings. **Respect for rational beings requires that, in deciding what to do, one give appropriate practical consideration to the unconditional value of rational beings and to the conditional value of happiness.** Since agent-centered constraints require a non-value-based rationale, the most natural interpretation of **the demand that one give equal respect to all rational beings lead to a consequentialist normative theory.** We have seen that there is no sound Kantian reason for abandoning this natural consequentialist interpretation. In particular, a consequentialist interpretation does not require sacrifices which a Kantian ought to consider unreasonable, and **it does not involve doing evil so that good may come of it. It simply requires an uncompromising commitment to the equal value and equal claims of all rational beings and a recognition that, in the moral consideration of conduct, one's own subjective concerns do not have overriding importance.**

## Contentions

### Contention 1 – Objectivity is a dangerous illusion that undermines democratic and critical journalism

**Rob Wijnberg 17** [The founding editor of The Correspondent. At age 27, he became Europe's youngest editor-in-chief at Dutch print daily nrc.next. He studied philosophy at the University of Amsterdam and has written six books on news, media and philosophy. He was voted Journalist of the Year in The Netherlands in 2013. Languages: Dutch, English, Slovakian. (He/him), "Why objective journalism is a misleading and dangerous illusion" The Correspondent, 07 October 2017]

"It's very easy for an editorial team to appear to be taking a position. And that's exactly what I don't want. We don't ever want to do that. **We don't want to take a position on the news. We want the viewers to take a position on the news.**" Those are the words of Marcel Gelauff. Gelauff said this **on a primetime TV talk show in the Netherlands.** You can watch a clip here (in Dutch only).head of the Dutch public broadcasting company NOS's news department. **Objectivity, the tenet being expressed here, may be the most poorly understood, tenacious, dangerous illusion journalism has ever believed in. Misunderstood, because it's confused with independence and impartiality.**

Tenacious, because it seems easy and it's cheap. **Dangerous, because it's the biggest lie you can tell the public.**

**And an illusion, because it doesn't exist.** The origins of the ideal **Journalistic objectivity,** like many Western articles of faith, **began as a late 19th-century ideal with very different aims than we attach to it today.** Originally, journalism was nothing more than a megaphone for the powerful: the king dictated, and the reporters wrote it down. Newspapers were filled with pronouncements from on high: declarations of war, changes in navigation routes, calls to prayer, that kind of thing. **The Enlightenment and the rise of modern science eventually ushered in the idea of journalism as a critical counterpower: it should act as a watchdog, not a messenger.** **This conviction was rooted in a new ideal known as objectivity, which was linked to independence. We, the press, would decide what to report on. And we'd only do so once we'd made sure it was true.**

Now, more than a century later, we've gained a fully professionalized PR and information industry and lost every modern illusion about Truth with a capital T, and objectivity has come to mean precisely the opposite. **What gets reported, we believe, shouldn't be determined by the press but by "what's happening in the world."** The media's job is merely to "report the news." In Gelauff's words, **we shouldn't take a position.** "We'll figure it out" has become "You figure it out." Readers familiar with my news philosophy will already know what I think of objectivity. (De Correspondent's founding principles Read our founding principles, in which we pledge to be explicitly subjective.explicitly renounce it). But at a time when Facebook and Google have devised fake-news I wrote an essay on the fake-news earnings model: "Truth is whatever people click on" (in Dutch only).earnings models, the White House is inhabited by a pathological bullshitter, Here's what I mean by "bullshitter" (in Dutch only).and his counterparts are popping up in political races all across Europe, it's worth saying again: the ideal of journalistic objectivity is an outright threat to democracy. Here's

why. 1. There's no such thing as objectivity Marcel Gelauff says he doesn't want his editorial team to take a position on the news. Let me be the first to say that, alas, it's a vain hope. Describing the world with no idea of what's good or bad, relevant or trivial, true or false is literally impossible. Behind every report, every feature, every news item, lies a worldview rooted in assumptions ontological (what's real?), epistemological (what's true?), methodological (how do we find out?), and moral (why does it matter?). Or, to put it in Gelauffian terms, all news comes from a position. Why doesn't the evening newscast ever lead with crop circles made by UFOs? Because the editorial department takes the position that UFOs don't exist. Why doesn't the news ever lead with a delayed train between St. Petersburg and Novosibirsk? Because the editors take the position that a late Russian train doesn't matter here. Why does the news never open with the biggest, most powerful Dutch company Correspondents Maurits Martijn and Tomas Vanheste have written about Vitol: "Nobody's ever asked a question in Parliament about this Dutch oil giant" (in Dutch only).in the world, the oil and gas trader Vitol? Because the editors take the position that Vitol isn't doing anything wrong. The reverse is true too: why does the news open with a Trump tweet, a bombing in Syria, a domestic policy proposal, chaos at a national transportation hub? Because the editors take the position that statements by a US president, wars in the Middle East, our own leaders' plans, and travel snafus in our own country matter. And why does the news always call bombings by ISIS "terrorist attacks" and those by Western governments "bombardments"? Because the editors take the position that that's what they are. Why does the news always frame the growth of the economy as something positive and not as a disaster for the climate, the environment, or the corals in the ocean? Because the editors take the position that economic growth is good. So when an editor claims not to take a position on the news, he or she is making the most basic misrepresentation possible. And it's also the worst Even worse than making your anchors deliver the news standing up, which Gelauff called "an important moment in the history of NOS news" (in Dutch only).instruction you can give your editorial team. 2. Objectivity is a poor ideal So there's no such thing as objectivity. But even if there were, journalists would need to steer clear of it. That's because the word "objectivity" is usually understood in terms of its moral dimension. Journalists are expected to suspend moral judgment. They're not supposed to say what they think. Yet this has never been an amoral business. On the contrary, journalism is moral through and through. It's about what we as a society consider important, or should. All journalism, then, begins and ends with ideas about good and evil. The planet getting hotter isn't news because it's fact. The planet getting hotter is news because that's a bad thing. Journalism is moral through and through. It begins and ends with ideas of good and evil If you order journalists to check their moral judgments at the door, one of two things will happen. Either they'll have no clue what to report on and go home without a story, or they'll figure it out in the only way possible: by letting others decide. In practice, that means becoming a mouthpiece for the establishment I talk in depth about objectivity and being a mouthpiece for the establishment in this interview with Esther van Fennema (in Dutch only).– the people with the power to decide what's important, trivial, good, or bad. (Or, like the Dutch premier, to define what's "normal" and what isn't.) Premier Rutte wrote an open letter "to all Dutch people" effectively calling on immigrants to "act normal or leave" (in Dutch only). Objective journalism, defined as not taking a position or having an opinion, has become precisely the opposite of what it was originally intended to be. Today, it equates to unquestioningly repeating the opinions of the powerful. By leaving the position-taking to the public, we reduce our task as journalists to issuing press releases on behalf of elites. In short, we fail to fulfill our most basic duty. That brings us to the third and most urgent problem with objectivity. 3. Objectivity threatens democracy News is one of the most important sources of information in a democratic society. Today more than ever, it determines what we know, understand, and think about the world. It influences our voting behavior and how we see other people, cultures, and countries. To a large degree, it even shapes our image of ourselves. Our view of the world is increasingly fueled by half-truths, whole fairytales, and bald-faced lies issuing from the uppermost ranks of global politics, amplified by the loudest yellers in domestic politics, and spread across millions of phones, laptops, and TVs in milliseconds. Today it's more crucial than ever that journalism stand for something. We must commit to the values that are essential to a democratic society: to a check on power, to the pursuit of truth, to providing context and perspective. When the president of the United States fabricates the number of attendees at his inauguration and then lashes out at every media organization that presents the evidence to show he's lying, it's not enough to report "Trump accuses media despite ample counterevidence," as the NOS news did. Or to broadcast some even-handed variant that leaves the public in the lurch: "So-and-so reports X number of people. Trump says there were Y. And now over to Philip with the weather." Instead, you need to clearly announce that one of the world's most powerful politicians is demonstrably lying yet again. The New York Times did a better job of this, with its story "With False Claims, Trump Attacks Media" And you'd better figure out why. The Washington Post provided an excellent explanation of why Trump ordered his press chief to peddle lies. Meanwhile, you should be keeping track The award-winning website Politifact.com keeps an eye on all Trump's campaign promises, of his actions and not just his words. Otherwise, "not taking a position" means being not only a mouthpiece for power but a conduit for lies. If demagogues loathe the political correctness, journalistic correctness is their best friend. And democracy's no match for that.

## Con 2: Media key to sustaining democracy

### a. Media outlets function as an important role and represent the people by asking questions of those in power and examining the daily events

**Policinski 22** [Gene Policinski, Chief Operating officer of the Freedom Forum Institute and of the Institute's First Amendment Center. A veteran multimedia journalist, he also writes, lectures and is interviewed regularly on First Amendment issues., Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, "There can be no American democracy without a free press," 03/16/21, <https://www.jsonline.com/story/news/solutions/2021/03/16/there-can-no-american-democracy-without-free-press/4703141001/>]

There's a reason **we need a free press**, despite its faults and foibles: **Democracy won't work without it**. The grand experiment in self-governance that is **the United States is rooted in trust and confidence we all will work toward the greater good**. But the nation's founders had experience with a king and his expected benevolence — and what could happen when things didn't work out. So, they provided for three branches of government to balance each other, along with periodic elections and the rights for us to assemble and seek change when we think things have gone astray. All fine, but also relatively long-term solutions. **How do we know what our government is doing, how well it is operating or whether our elected officials are up to the job?** Enter the only profession mentioned in the Constitution: **A free press, to serve as a "watchdog on government." A free press the government cannot control, to offer an independent, regular update** on behalf of the rest of us. During this Sunshine Week (celebrating open government), let's stop to acknowledge that many of us are dissatisfied with the free press we have. Survey after survey shows low public trust in our news outlets and in the journalists who staff them. But in those same Freedom Forum surveys about the First Amendment that began in 1997, **the desire for that watchdog role remains high** often supported by a majority of people questioned. How can these two results co-exist? The answers rest in what kind of press we mean. Much of the highly visible kerfuffle on social sites today concerns national reporting, and more narrowly, the political pundits on cable TV and the tiny percentage of journalists who are the White House press corps. For most of us, **today's journalism is something different** — and much more relevant to us. We see a news media **bringing us the day-to-day information we need to live our lives**: What local officials are saying, weather forecasts and crime, health and safety reports for our communities. The work of journalists helps us get things done. Reporters ask the questions we would ask if we could be there. Jurors in Des Moines, Iowa, last week appeared to support the role of journalists as watchdog when they acquitted reporter Andrea Sahouri, who was arrested while covering a Black Lives Matter protest despite her repeated protestations that she was a journalist. Local journalists, who are the vast majority of the 24,000-plus on the job today, live in the communities on which they report. In just the past month, they have reported on COVID-19 vaccination programs — both the successes and failures by officials we depend upon to keep us safe and fight the pandemic. Other recent stories told by big and small news operations alike will benefit hundreds of thousands, if not millions of us.

### B. Subjectivity is inherent in journalism which is key to uphold democracy.

**Dholaki 18**

Dholaki, Aditi. "OPINION: Subjective Perspectives Are Vital To Effective Journalism." Technician. May 27, 2018. Web. February 13, 2022.

<[https://www.technicianonline.com/opinion/opinion-subjective-perspectives-are-vital-to-effective-journalism/article\\_56944d9c-6207-11e8-bd85-7325fe7c6aee.html](https://www.technicianonline.com/opinion/opinion-subjective-perspectives-are-vital-to-effective-journalism/article_56944d9c-6207-11e8-bd85-7325fe7c6aee.html)>.

The bigger issue I want to highlight in all of this is that, firstly, bias is everywhere, in everything. There is no way to escape bias, or partisanship, or subjectivity of any kind. **News outlets and organizations who claim to offer the most objective news are, in essence, lying to their viewers.** What's worse, the viewers are falling for the rouse. This brings me to the second part of the bigger issue: **not only is subjectivity inherent in journalism, but it is in fact necessary in order for consumers to understand and relate to the news being fed to them everywhere they go. Subjectivity leads to empathy**, which is something that is often lacking in the race to be the first ones to get the scoop on breaking news. Subjectivity leads to **understanding, which is vital to being informed about things going on**. Subjectivity leads to **thoroughness**, in the way that all perspectives are accounted for, rather than just one (in the name of objectivity). At the end of the day, it does a disservice to the reporter's veracity, the news organization's credibility and the consumer experience when multiple subjective perspectives are sidelined in the name of

objective reporting. **If journalism is a vital part of a well-informed democracy, it is important to make sure that the journalism that is being produced represents the democracy it is helping to inform. Embracing the inherent subjectivity in journalism is a part of that process of information**

## Con 3: Democracy solves change

a. Democracies are key to solving climate change – data, empirics, metastudies, etc.

**Looney 16** [[Robert Looney](https://foreignpolicy.com/2016/06/01/democracy-is-the-answer-to-climate-change//), JUNE 1, 2016, “Democracy Is the Answer to Climate Change”, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2016/06/01/democracy-is-the-answer-to-climate-change//> JB]

But is it really necessary to choose between democracy and saving the planet? **A comprehensive review of various countries’ progress towards environmental sustainability** suggests otherwise. In fact, the case against democracy as a vehicle for environmental sustainability may be grossly overstated, based less on the actions of the world’s democracies as a whole than on the failures of a conspicuous few.

**Two data sets can help us identify the impact of democracy on climate change: The Economist Intelligence Unit’s (EIU) Democracy Index 2015 and the World Energy Council’s Energy Trilemma Index.** The **Democracy Index divides 167 countries into four main groups: full democracies, flawed democracies, hybrid regimes, and authoritarian regimes.** The countries are ranked best (Norway) to worst (North Korea). **The Energy Trilemma Index ranks 130 countries in terms of their progress in** three key energy performance measures: **energy security** (the availability of reliable supplies of energy), **energy equity** (the domestic price of energy) **and environmental sustainability** (the effect of the country’s energy sources on greenhouse gas emissions). Based on these measures, countries are ranked from best (Switzerland) to worst (South Africa).

**In 2015, the twenty countries** grouped by the EIU **as democracies had an average ranking of 34.2 on the energy sustainability index**, while the **27 authoritarian regimes for which climate data existed scored much worse, with an average ranking of 85.6.** In the two intermediate regime types, **environmental sustainability fell off with democracy, with flawed democracies having an average ranking of 62.9** compared to hybrid countries at 67.5. **The bad reputation of democracies in combatting climate change likely reflects** the extremely low environmental sustainability scores of several of the more prominent members of this group, namely **Canada** (71), the **United States** (95), and **Australia** (110).

As the name “Energy Trilemma” suggests, countries are forced to make trade-offs between energy security, energy equity, and environmental sustainability when determining their energy policies. For instance, a country that prioritizes energy equity might opt to import cheap fossil fuels at the expense of energy security and environmental sustainability until it can develop low-cost green domestic energy sources. Thus, the Energy Trilemma Index can provide insights not just into a country’s performance, but also into its priorities.

As it turns out, **countries that prioritized environmental sustainability ranked considerably higher on democracy than those that didn’t (75.4 vs. 103.5).** These countries also had somewhat lower average per capita income (\$25,015 vs. \$37,095), demonstrating that taking action against climate change is far from a luxury that only the richest nations can afford.

As these patterns clearly show, **democracies are much more likely than authoritarian regimes to give environmental sustainability priority over either energy security or affordable energy supplies.** This fact appears counter-intuitive, given that an often-cited flaw of democracy is that politicians are forced to make short-run decisions based on the



election cycle. However, the effects of climate change, in the form of more severe storms, damaging droughts, falling agricultural yields, and increased flooding of coastal areas, are already being felt. And voters whose lives and livelihoods are increasingly impacted by climate change are beginning to demand immediate action, effectively forcing politicians to take a longer-run view. As a result, democratic governments become more likely to comply with global agreements that set specific targets for carbon reduction.

Nevertheless, as noted above, several of the more prominent democracies — in particular, Canada, the United States, and Australia — have failed to adopt a national strategy for combatting climate change. The governments of these countries have not only come under pressure from their domestic fossil fuel industries, but from other constituencies that oppose changing the status quo, due in particular to the perception that environmentalism comes at the expense of jobs and low energy prices. In the U.S., a long-term campaign of [disinformation](#) funded by the fossil fuel sector has given rise to a large group of climate-change naysayers, although their numbers may be [shrinking](#).

Even in these countries, however, democracy is at work subtly prodding the government toward greater environmental responsibility. For now, this work is taking place at the provincial, state, and municipal levels. [British Columbia](#) has imposed a carbon tax, [California](#) has initiated a cap-and-trade carbon plan, and [Melbourne](#) has set a goal of zero net emissions by 2020. In most cases where local action has taken place, the effects of climate change have already begun to affect people's lives. Once the consequences of climate change begin to be felt in other parts of these countries, it is reasonable to expect movements of this sort to gain momentum.

Public concerns about the effects of climate change are unlikely to have the same force in authoritarian regimes as in democracies for two basic reasons. Authoritarian regimes almost invariably prioritize energy security and equity over environmental sustainability, since rising fuel prices risk social unrest. This overarching concern with [keeping energy prices low](#) encourages increased usage of fossil fuels and a bias against green technologies. **At the same time, authoritarian governments control information through state dominance of the media and access to official data.** For example, [China](#) recently **reported a sizable drop in coal consumption** to placate citizens' concerns about the country's choking air pollution. **According to the New York Times, however, Chinese coal consumption during the period of supposed reduction actually rose by 600 million tons,** an increase equal to 70 percent of annual coal usage in the United States. Even **as Chinese greenhouse gas emissions from coal grew, a Pew Research report noted the number of Chinese who expressed serious concern about global warming fell from 41 percent in 2010 to just 18 percent in 2015. The only explanation** for the drop the report's author could suggest **was a relative lack of public discussion of climate change.**

## B. Climate change leads to 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] 6-4-2019, "Human Civilization Will Crumble by 2050 If We Don't Stop Climate Change Now, New Paper Claims," [livescience, https://www.livescience.com/65633-climate-change-dooms-humans-by-2050.html](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** (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-added 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** (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, 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 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."

## **Impacts**

### **Democracy key to growth—statistically significant correlation**

**Acemoglu et. al. 14**

Daron Professor of Applied Economics MIT, Suresh Naidu Assistant Professor of Economics and Public Affairs, Columbia University, Pascual Restrepo Massachusetts Institute of Technology, James A. Robinson David Florence Professor of Government, Harvard University; and Research Fellow, CEPR, Democracy Does Cause Growth, NBER Working Paper No. 20004, <http://www.nber.org/papers/w20004>

Skepticism about the performance of democratic institutions is as old as democracy itself. Plato, for example, denigrated democracy as the second worst form of government after tyranny. The view that democracy is a constraint on economic growth has recently been gaining ground. In this paper, we show that once the dynamics of GDP are controlled for in a fixed effects OLS regression, there is an economically and statistically significant positive correlation between democracy and future GDP per capita. This result remains true in GMM estimates that account for any bias due to lagged dependent variables, as well as with semi-parametric estimators based on a propensity score for democratic transitions estimated using past lags of log GDP. Our preferred specifications imply that long-run GDP increases by about 20% following a democratic transition.<sup>a</sup> We also document regional waves of democratization, and use this fact to generate a new instrument for democracy. We show that the probability of a country transitioning to democracy or nondemocracy is strongly correlated with the same transition recently occurring in other countries in the same region. Using this instrument, we find that democracy again increases GDP, controlling for lags of GDP and a variety of regional controls.<sup>a</sup> The channels via which democracy raises growth include greater economic reforms, greater investment in primary schooling and better health, and may also include greater investment, greater taxation and public good provision, and lower social unrest. In contrast to the equally popular claims that democracy is bad for growth at early stages of economic development, we find no heterogeneity by level of income. There is some heterogeneity depending on the level of human capital, but these effects are not large enough to lead to negative effects of democracy for low human capital countries.<sup>a</sup> These results taken together suggest that democracy is more conducive to economic growth than its detractors have argued, and that there are many complementarities between democratic institutions and proximate causes of economic development. Work using cross-country and within-country variation to shed more light on how democracy changes economic incentives and organizations and pinpointing what aspects of democratic institutions are more important for economic success is an obvious fruitful area for future research.

### **Subpoint B: Economic growth key to check every world crisis — disease, food shortages, pollution, poverty, military readiness Ferrara 14**

Ferrara 14 \*\*\*edited for ableist language\*\*\* 2014, January 14\*. Peter Ferrara: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/peterferrara/2014/01/14/why-economic-growth-is-exponentially-more-important-than-income-inequality/#4b4f36b91483>) SW

Such **economic growth has produced dramatic improvements in personal health** as well. Throughout most of human history, a typical lifespan was 25 to 30 years, as Moore and Simon report. But “from the mid-18th century to today, life spans in the advanced countries jumped from less than 30 years to about 75 years.” Average life expectancy in the U.S. has grown by more than 50% since 1900. Infant mortality declined from 1 in 10 back then to 1 in 150 today. Children under 15 are at least 10 times less likely to die, as one in four did during the 19th century, with their death rate reduced by 95%. The maternal death rate from pregnancy and childbirth was also 100 times greater back then than today. Moore and Simon further recount, “Just three infectious diseases – tuberculosis, pneumonia, and diarrhea – accounted for almost half of all deaths in 1900.” Today, **we have** virtually **eliminated** or drastically reduced these and other **scourges of** infectious **disease** that have killed or [injured] billions throughout human history, such as typhoid fever, cholera, typhus, plague, smallpox, diphtheria, polio, influenza, bronchitis, whooping cough, malaria, and others. Besides the advances in the development and application of modern health sciences, this has resulted **from the** drastic **reduction in** filthy and **unsanitary** living **conditions** that **economic growth has made possible** as well. More recently, great progress is being made against heart disease and cancer. Also greatly contributing to the well-being of working people, the middle class, and the poor in America has been the dramatically declining cost of food resulting from economic growth and soaring productivity in agriculture. As Moore and Simon report, “Americans devoted almost 50 percent of their incomes to putting food on the table in the early 1900s compared with 10 percent in the late 1900s.” While most of human history has involved a struggle against starvation, today in America the battle is against obesity, even more so among the poor. Moore and Simon quote Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation, “The average consumption of protein, minerals, and vitamins is virtually the same for poor and middle income children, and in most cases is well above recommended norms for all children. Most poor children today are in fact overnourished.” That cited data comes from the U.S. Census Bureau. As a result, poor children in America today “grow up to be about 1 inch taller and 10 pounds heavier than the GIs who stormed the beaches of Normandy in World War II.” That has resulted from a U.S. agricultural sector that required 75% of all American workers in 1800, 40% in 1900, and just 2.5% today, to “grow more than enough food for the entire nation and then enough to make the United States the world’s breadbasket.” Indeed, today, “The United States feeds three times as many people with one-third as many total farmers on one-third less farmland than in 1900,” in the process producing “almost 25 percent of the world’s food.” Moreover, it is economic growth that has provided the resources **enabling us to** dramatically reduce pollution and **improve the environment, without trashing our standard of living**. Moore and Simon write that at the beginning of the last century, “Industrial cities typically were enveloped in clouds of black soot and smoke. At this stage of the industrial revolution, factories belched poisons into the air—and this was proudly regarded as a sign of prosperity and progress. Streets were smelly and garbage-filled before the era of modern sewage systems and plumbing.” Not any of these truly dramatic advances for the poor, working people and the middle class could have been achieved by redistribution from “the rich.” **Only economic growth could achieve these results.** Nor would it have been worth sacrificing any of these world shattering gains for greater economic “equality.” And Barack Obama’s leftist protestations to the contrary notwithstanding, economists have long recognized the conflict between economic equality and maximizing economic growth. Put most simply, penalizing investors, successful entrepreneurs, and job creators with higher taxes, to reward the less productive with government handouts, to make everyone more equal, is a sure fire way to get less productivity, fewer jobs, lower wages, and reduced economic growth. The above history, and the future prospects below, are why to most benefit the poor, working people, and the middle class, our nation’s overriding goal must be to maximize economic growth. Consider, if total real compensation, wages and benefits, grow at just 1% a year, after 20 years the real incomes of working people would be only 22% greater. After 40 years, a generation, real incomes would be 50% more. But with sustained real compensation growth of 2%, after just 20 years the real incomes and living standards of working people would be nearly 50% greater, and after 40 years they would be 120% greater, more than doubled. At sustained 3% growth in wages and benefits, after 20 years the living standards of working people will have almost doubled, and after 40 years they will have more than tripled. The U.S. economy sustained a real rate of economic growth of 3.3% from 1945 to 1973, and achieved the same 3.3% sustained real growth from 1982 to 2007. (Note that this 3.3% growth rate for the entire economy includes population growth. Real wages and benefits discussed above is a per worker concept). It was only during the stagflation decade of 1973 to 1982, reflecting the same Keynesian economics that President Obama is pursuing today, that real growth fell to only half long term trends. If we could revive and sustain that same 3.3% real growth for 20 years, our total economic production (GDP) would double in that time. After 30 years, our economic output would grow by 2 and two-thirds. After 40 years, our prosperity bounty would grow by 3 and two-thirds. If we are truly following growth maximizing policies, we could conceivably do even better than we have in the past. At sustained real growth of 4% per year, our economic production would more than double after 20 years. After 30 years, GDP would more than triple. After 40 years, a generation, total U.S. economic output would nearly quadruple. America would by then have leapfrogged another generation ahead of the rest of the world. Achieving and **sustaining** such **economic growth should be the central focus of national economic policy**, for **it** would **solve[s] every problem that plagues** and threatens **us today**. Such booming economic growth would produce surging revenues that would make balancing the budget so much more feasible. Surging GDP would reduce the national debt as a percent of GDP relatively quickly, particularly with balanced budgets not adding any further to the debt. Sustained, rapid economic growth is also the ultimate solution to poverty, as after a couple of decades or so of such growth, the poor



would climb to the same living standards as the middle class of today. With sustained, robust, economic growth, maintaining the most powerful military in the world, and thereby ensuring our nation's security and national defense, will require a smaller and smaller percentage of GDP over time. That security itself will promote capital investment and economic growth in America. The booming economy will produce new technological marvels that will make our defenses all the more advanced. With the economy rapidly advancing, there will be more than enough funds for education. There will also be more than enough to clean up and maintain a healthy environment.

## Democracy is vital to contain disease outbreaks

**Mitchell 7-12-17** - senior advisor to the Asia Program at the U.S. Institute of Peace

Derek, American Leadership in the Asia Pacific, Part 3: Promoting Democracy, Human Rights, and the Rule of Law, United States Institute of Peace,

<https://www.usip.org/publications/2017/07/american-leadership-asia-pacific-part-3-promoting-democracy-human-rights-and>

Indeed, it has been my observation and experience that commitment to values of human rights and democracy is not merely an idealistic goal or an ideology but quite proven in practice. When countries promote individual human dignity and protect civil liberties, they tend to be more highly functioning and stable societies. They create conditions for peaceful interaction within and among states. They provide platforms for individual achievement. They also become more appealing destinations for business investment, and are able to prevent their territory from becoming a source of international instability or transnational challenge. Stable democratic nations rarely become the source of refugee flows, or the epicenter of pandemic disease, human trafficking, and the like.

## Autocracy makes pandemics inevitable—democracy solves

**Krasner 3-28-17** - Graham H. Stuart professor of international relations at Stanford, a senior fellow at the Freeman Spogli Institute and the Stanford Institute for Economic Policy research, and a senior fellow at the Hoover Institution

Stephen D., Foreign Assistance for American National Security, United States Institute of Peace,

<https://www.usip.org/publications/2017/03/foreign-assistance-american-national-security>

Poorly governed, failing, or weak malign states pose three threats to the United States and our core allies. The first is transnational terrorism. The second is a pandemic disease outbreak. The third is massive migration. Terrorist attacks can arise from anywhere. The husband in the San Bernardino murders, Syed Farook, was raised in the United States and attended California State University Fullerton. But he was inspired by ISIS ideology. Failed and badly governed states provide safe havens for radicalized Salafist Islamic groups such as ISIS and Al Qeda; places where they can train adherents, propagate their message, and refine their ideology. These groups and the individuals they inspire are a direct security threat to the United States. This threat has been amplified by the fact that nuclear or dirty nuclear weapons might be secured from failed, malign, or badly governed states and that biological pathogens can be more easily fabricated by individuals or groups. Naturally occurring pandemic diseases are a second threat. About 400 diseases have jumped from animals to humans over the last 70 years. Most of these diseases have originated in tropical areas where human populations are impinging on areas that had previously been populated only by animals. Up to now we have been lucky. The most well known of these diseases, HIV/AIDs and Ebola, have been difficult to transmit. A disease that was however, transmissible through the air

instead of via bodily fluids could kill hundreds of thousands or millions of Americans. Stopping these diseases when they first break is our best line of defense. Finally massive migration threatens liberal and humanitarian values. European states have been most afflicted by the massive displacement of people from wars in the broader Middle East. There are no good policy options to address such movements once they begin: accepting unlimited numbers of individuals is untenable; sending refugees back to unsafe countries could bring a humanitarian catastrophe. Our best policy option is to prevent such flows in the first place. One half of the dilemma that the American government faces is that we ignore badly governed, failed, and malign states at our peril. If states are reasonably well governed, at least if they have adequate security, terrorism, potential pandemic diseases, and massive migrant flows could be better contained. If states are weak, failing, or governed by malign autocrats our security challenges will be greater.

## **! - T/Econ**

### **Democracy solves war, terror, economy and trade**

**Radnitz et al. 11** - Associate Professor in the Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies and Director of the Ellison Center for Russian, East European, and Central Asian Studies at the University of Washington

(Scott, 3-10-11, Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies, Task Force 2011, “The Future of U.S. Democracy Promotion: Strategies for a Sustainable Fourth Wave of Democratization”

<https://digital.lib.washington.edu/researchworks/bitstream/handle/1773/16487/Task%20Force%20C%202011%20Web.pdf?sequence=1>)

Based on the concept of democratic peace theory, democratic nations are reliable in the sense that they neither go to war one with another, nor harbor or sponsor terrorism against other democracies (Diamond 1992, 30). Promotion of democracy produces in the words of Larry Diamond, —a safer, saner and more prosperous world for the United States (Ibid). U.S. national security is dependent on the promotion of democracy, due to the threat authoritarian and autocratic states pose. Therefore, an interest in safeguarding the national security of the U.S., means, as Larry Diamond argues that —democracy should be the central focus- [and] the defining feature-of U.S. foreign policy (Diamond 1992, 31). The preservation of the U.S. image as an exemplar of liberty (democratic values), prosperity (capitalistic endeavors) and religious freedom (theistic pluralism) is an important factor in the promotion of democracy abroad (Gunn 2009, 8). This often entails consistency both in rhetoric and action in the spread of democracy throughout the world. The danger of using an inconsistent and often contradictory rhetoric can result in backlashes to U.S. democracy promotion as evident during the Bush era (Carothers 2006). It is in the best interests of the U.S. to maintain a consistent rhetoric that helps repair the damaged U.S. image previously caused by the inconsistency in rhetoric and action for the process of democratization throughout the world. Among the basic tenets of liberal democracy is the preservation of the civil and political rights for individuals. The preservation of human rights is an integral part of U.S. democracy promotion, particularly in regions where democracy is negatively received (i.e. the Middle East). Human rights, as proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), are pivotal in determining the autocratic status of the nation-state under scrutiny. McFaul contends that indeed America has many needs and wants to function as a society and certainly as the world’s most powerful nation. However, McFaul holds, to further reduce autocratic impulses of nations throughout the world, U.S. interests would be best served, when it favors —euphemistic phrases such as —good governance or —human dignity in relation to human rights (McFaul 2010, 153). Just as the other interests are an integral part of U.S. foreign interests, so too is the enhancement of U.S. economic interests through democracy promotion abroad. The enhancement of U.S. economic interests requires the democratization of states. Democracies form better international economic relations, as they are more likely to uphold treaties (Diamond, 1992, 30). In addition to improving trade relations with other nations, the successful promotion of democracy would also reduce the cost of conflict for the U.S. If, as the democratic peace theory declares, democracies do not go to war with each other, then the U.S. would find itself in fewer military conflicts that require large amounts of funding and commitment. In the long run, these factors would greatly benefit the U.S.’s economic situation.