### 1

#### CP Text – In a Democracy, a Free Press ought to prioritize Objectivity over Advocacy, except for instances of Investigative Journalism.

### 2

#### The CP competes – the tension between Objectivity and Advocacy lies in Objective Journalisms separation of opinion and personal bias from discussions.

Reavy 13, Matthew. "Objectivity and advocacy in journalism." Media Ethics 25.1 (2013). (Communication Department Chairperson at University of Scranton)//Elmer

Advocacy Journalism Public journalism and, for the most part, citizen journalism can be viewed as examples of advocacy journalism, a form of journalism that endeavors to be fact-based, but does not separate editorial opinion from news coverage and often approaches the news from a specific viewpoint. Advocacy journalists distinguish the “good guys” from the “bad guys” and “actively participate in the debate, becoming more activists than observers of the events” (Ruigrok, 2010). Thus, they can be said to exhibit the same kind of “interventionist impulse” that scholars such as Hanitzsch (2007, p. 373) see at work in public journalism. Advocacy journalism has been at times credited with everything from combating “the moral failings of Western governments” (Hammond, 2002, p. 178) to offering "a more progressive notion of experts and expertise by citing community members while critiquing or pointedly ignoring dominant discourses from government and academic ‘experts’” (Heitner, 2009, p. 405). It has been tied to peace journalism (Kempf, 2007), “alternative” publications (Waisbord, 2009) and environmental journalism (Waisbord & Peruzzotti, 2009) among others. Some scholars contend that advocacy journalists can be assumed to write from a “leftist” point of view (Craig, 2004, p. 240), often as a counterweight to the “inherently conservative” notion of objectivity (Glasser, 1984, para. 3), which some argue serves as a tool to “help the powerful maintain order” (Ryan, 2009. p. 8). Many other scholars contend that any liberal bias on the part of journalists is more than offset by a conservative bias among owners. For example, Parry (2003) notes that “media owners historically have enforced their political views and other preferences by installing senior editors whose careers depend on delivering a news product that fits with the owner’s prejudices.”

#### Investigative Journalism is a form of Advocacy Journalism – it doesn’t violate the Truth BUT attaches it to a partial cause.

Givens 20 Dana Givens 10-14-2020 "Opinion: When It Comes to Advocacy Journalism, the Truth Should Come Before Emotion" <https://theclick.news/essay-when-it-comes-to-advocacy-journalism-the-truth-should-come-before-emotion/> (Sacred Heart University with a Bachelor's of Science in Marketing and Global Studies)//Elmer

(NEW YORK) — Advocacy journalists take a different kind of stance than other journalists when it comes to crafting a story. This type of writing has a different belief system attached — it is dedicated to a certain cause, where the journalist takes a direct and intentional stance. It’s a step above simply an opinion essay because the goal is to create a call to action, to call out injustice. An example of this type of journalism was a recent report from the nonprofit Human Rights Watch, regarding new evidence showing the members of the New York City police department staged a mass arrest and assault on a group of peaceful protesters in the Bronx. The organization released a report and video showing new evidence that the police department did create a plan to stage a mass arrest in Mott Haven, a part of the Bronx, after tracking down peaceful protesters in early June. This is a great example of advocacy journalism because it was tied to human rights and police brutality and demonstrates detailed investigative reporting. They were able to back up their arguments with evidence on the event in addition to getting testimonies from the people involved. We have discussed how objectivity is one of the foundations of journalism and while the organization has taken a stance in their advocacy, they presented an argument backed up by verified facts and sources. The video was able to give even more context to the details leading up to the event and what happened outside of what had previously been reported.

#### Investigative Journalism solves Corruption.

Hrvolova and Katz 21 Martina Hrvolova and Jonathan D. Katz 11-29-2021 "The Anti-Corruption Role of Free Media and Investigative Journalism" <https://www.gmfus.org/news/anti-corruption-role-free-media-and-investigative-journalism> (Resident Fellow WASHINGTON, DC OFFICE)//Elmer

Summary Global democracy is under growing threat from illiberal actors. In response to challenges including backsliding, the United States and its partners are ramping up efforts to reinvigorate and renew democracy at the U.S.-organized Summit for Democracy in December and its follow-up in 2022. Participants will focus on defending against authoritarianism, fighting corruption, and promoting respect for human rights. Media freedom and investigative journalism—vital for democracy, transparency, and accountability—have been targeted by illiberal forces worldwide, including autocrats in China and Russia. The United States, Europe, and democracy actors internationally need to prioritize media support or face consequences at home and abroad as disinformation deepens polarization, enables corruption, and advantages malign actors. Journalists and independent media are outspent and face violence and even death. They need greater support, legal assistance, training, and protection on the part of donors, governments, and multilateral bodies. The summit can be a launchpad for collaboration and coordination on this front, ensuring that freedom of media and expression serve as bulwarks against rising authoritarianism and corruption. Introduction Democratic governance, civil society, and media are increasingly undermined and threatened across the globe, including in the Western democracies. The rise of authoritarian-led countries, including China and Russia, has severely eroded democratic gains. The impact of illiberal forces and democratic backsliding has been exacerbated by the coronavirus pandemic, climate change, and growing economic inequality. Corruption, impacting billions globally, helps fuel the democratic spiral, and the trends in this regard point in the wrong direction.1 Corruption in plain sight—but often hidden from scrutiny—has too often been a common and a successful tactic used by authoritarians and their enablers on every continent to gain and maintain power, to repress populations, and to undermine democracy. Authoritarians have increasingly deployed corruption to rot democratic institutions, liberal economies, and citizens’ trust from the inside as well as to create a favorable environment for lawlessness and graft. Free media, including investigative journalists acting as watchdogs, have been at the forefront in addressing the corruption epidemic and in seeking to provide accountability—in closing- space countries as in Western democracies. In Russia, publicity around President Vladimir Putin’s seaside estate highlighted how media can work together across international boundaries to expose serious, long-term corruption in a country.2 The recent release of the Pandora Papers has reaffirmed the indispensable role of media in protecting democracy and addressing the challenges posed by corruption.3 The continuing release of investigative reports based on the Pandora Papers also shows how international collaboration protects journalists and improves their ability to report more completely on the vast international networks of corruption and their enablers across the globe.4 The world is at a historic tipping point for democracy, media, and journalism. Free media will remain an essential institution to preserve and protect democracy. Investigative journalism is playing a leading role in detecting and exposing corruption. It is critical in the current global environment that media remain free and independent. When media is undermined, threatened or weaponized, this creates an environment for autocrats and their enablers to prosper. The U.S.-organized Summit for Democracy in December 2021, the subsequent “year of action,” and the second summit in late 2022 provide a critical opportunity for democracies to commit to protect, promote, and support free, independent media and investigative journalism. The Role of Free Media and Investigative Journalism While many corrupt individuals, corporations, and governments undermine the rule of law and fund media to create propaganda, hate, and divisions among people, independent journalism is in a threatened state operationally and economically. Solutions can be found at many different levels, but the first step is to understand the context and importance of free and independent media, including investigative reporting, as a crucial actor promoting oversight and accountability. According to the Organized Crime and Corruption Reporting Project, the following four pillars are essential for addressing the nexus between authoritarianism and corruption: Introducing, adopting, and implementing impactful regulations to address corruption at home and abroad as well as to defend and enhance media freedom. Exposing corruption and its patterns by media. Acting on media findings by civil society and activists Prosecuting corruption based on leads from media, civil society, and activists and enforcing anti-corruption laws.5 Exposing corruption and its patterns by media, civil society, and activists serves as a catalyst that arms others with the information needed to drive positive change and advance democracy, transparency, and accountability. Using media revelations, civil society and activists can push law-enforcement bodies to act and advocates can press for necessary policy reform. At the same time, policymakers can point to media investigations and data releases to gather support for passing legislation and advancing reforms.6 The four pillars have not traditionally been interconnected, which must change if there is to be more impactful efforts at strengthening democracy by fighting corruption and the authoritarianism it supports. Investigative journalists, civil society, and activists have critical roles to play in documenting corruption and enforcing actions against it, but they often work in silos. By contrast, tycoons, corrupt officials, and organized criminal networks are highly coordinated across borders. Corruption is a transnational issue and must be addressed through transnational cooperation. Even a handful of people can make a significant difference if they work together and amplify each other’s voices, as shown by the recent reporting on corruption that have taken center stage at the global level following the release of the Pandora Papers and previous similar leaks. International groups of investigative journalists such as the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists, the Organized Crime and Corruption Reporting Project, and the Global Anti-Corruption Consortium are some of the prime examples of an international cooperation that leads to tangible results in bringing corruption to the attention of the public and law-enforcement bodies. While sensational stories, investigations, and leaked information exposing high-level corruption have been front-page news worldwide, follow-up action to ensure accountability and to push for lasting change, including by implementing and enforcing laws and regulations have often lagged. In democratic systems, prosecuting corruption based on leads from media, activist watchdogs, and oversight mechanisms begins with training investigators, prosecutors, judges, and other governmental actors to pursue and correctly handle complex corruption cases as well as to work with journalists, civil society, and activists on efforts in promoting transparency and public accountability. For example, the Central and Eastern European Law Institute in the Czech Republic educates legal professionals across multiple geographies through innovative training programs with a focus on providing participants with tools to promote human rights, strengthen democratic institutions, fight corruption, and support free-market economies. This includes making available lectures about how investigative journalists interact with law-enforcement bodies. The changes needed at the regulatory level are equally significant, starting with legislators and governments providing consistent resources and taking actions that advance and enforce policies preventing and addressing corruption as well as promoting media freedom. Activists and journalists often cite transparency and accountability as essential principles for building trust in democracy and shaping the information space to the advantage of democratic actors. They encourage officials, leaders, and employees in the public and private sectors to act not only in their institutions’ interest but also for the common good. Without public access to some of their essential records and information, holding them accountable is nearly impossible. And, while a lot has been done in democracies to bolster transparency and accountability, continued efforts are needed to address gaps where corruption flourishes. The extent to which journalists can assist in addressing corruption also depends on whether the media is free and independent. In addition to strengthening domestic transparency and accountability systems in line with the United Nations Convention against Corruption, there is also a need for governments to participate in various international anticorruption initiatives, to harmonize their anticorruption laws and mechanisms, and to increase enforcement activities. In particular, harmonization can remove the knowledge and resources barriers that journalists and activists encounter when engaging in preventing corruption and taking corrective actions. For example, while the establishment of registers of ultimate beneficial ownership in some jurisdictions has increased transparency about the ownership of companies, critics note the lack of their uniform adoption by more countries. The extent to which journalists can assist in addressing corruption also depends on whether the media is free and independent. Therefore, legislative frameworks must be in place more widely to protect journalists and their sources from physical attacks, unfounded lawsuits, recrimination, and victimization.7 However, there is a critical difference between the “law on the books” and the “law in action.” For example, while Europe and the Americas continue to be the most favorable continents for press freedom, they have also seen increased violence against journalists in 2021. And, throughout the world, journalists (and activists) have been killed for their role in exposing corruption.8 In President Joe Biden’s words, “freedom of expression and access to factual and accurate information provided by independent media are foundational to prosperous and secure democratic societies. But the outlook for the rights of journalists today is harrowing.”9 In addition to seeking accountability for all crimes against journalists and media workers, expanding existing efforts and introducing new measures that provide for their legal and physical security must be urgently accelerated. This includes leveraging sanction regimes and launching “wraparound” measures like relocation and placement programs. For example, strategic lawsuits against public participation (SLAPPs) are increasingly used to silence media critics in all jurisdictions. Greater access to insurance or other resources to help defend journalists against baseless defamation suits and legal intimidation is essential for outlets that in the past have been considered uninsurable or have been unable to afford insurance and defend themselves legally due to high costs. Legislative and other policy actions can also be leveraged to help stem the tide of lawsuits following an effective journalistic investigation. The recent commitment by the U.S. Agency for International Development to launch a global Defamation Defense Fund for Journalists represents a much-needed innovative approach to these challenges. The fund is intended to design an insurance system to help media address the increased number of lawsuits burdening reporters with the cost of a legal defense until they abandon their stories. Defending media in its global role in the fight against corruption starts with investing in it. Another key area for modernizing media assistance is digital security. While the promotion of a free and open Internet and the infusion of democratic values into the adoption of major new technologies, such as 5G, are already underway, the efforts to promote responsible, equitable, and safe use of artificial intelligence must be enhanced to boost the ability of democratic institutions and media to better respond and adapt to changing needs and circumstances in the digital age. What is also missing is a comprehensive mapping and strategy to address the power of new technologies as a source of autocratic wealth and investment in undemocratic media. While many journalists invest in their digital security through best practices in encryption and other types of basic information management, there is always an “arms race” between users, governments, and the developers of technologies that can be used to break even the most secure implementations of data-security protocols. Although such protocols have been developed with law enforcement in mind, policies and other controls necessary to prevent their more nefarious use have not been put in place. The introduction, harmonization, and consistent application of such rules as well as of export controls on digital weapons are necessary to protect journalists and the public more generally. Finally, defending media in its global role in the fight against corruption starts with investing in it. Russia and China alone spend billions on their internal and external propaganda media outlets. For example, Russian media outlets had declared spending over $16 million on propaganda targeting the United States alone this year up to October.10 Meanwhile, with the rise of digital media, artificial intelligence, and distorted media markets, free journalism is in a weak state economically and overall. However, official donors spent only an average $80–90 million each year on support for laws and policies that promote media freedom in 2010–2015. And international support to the media remains a tiny fraction of official development assistance, averaging just 0.3 percent in recent years.11 Besides, this funding often does not meet the requirements of the Paris agreement on aid effectiveness on core flexible long-term financing. Democracies, including the United States, the EU countries, and their partners need to adopt a stronger and more coordinated international response to the threat to the survival of free media.

#### Corruption hurts the Economy.

Chêne 14, Marie. "The impact of corruption on growth and inequality." Transparency International (2014). (Reporter at Transparency International)//Elmer

Corruption as an obstacle to economic growth At the macro level, the literature generally shows that corruption has a negative, direct impact on economic growth and development. Corruption also has an indirect effect on a country’s economic performance by affecting many factors fuelling economic growth such as investment, taxation, level, composition and effectiveness of public expenditure. Economists have long identified a number of channels through which corruption may affect economic growth (Mauro 1995; Tanzi 1997; Gupta 2000; Gyimah-Brempong 2001, among others): Corruption distorts incentives and market forces, leading to misallocation of resources. Corruption diverts talent and resources, including human resources, towards “lucrative” rent-seeking activities, such as defence, rather than productive activities. Corruption acts as an inefficient tax on business, ultimately raising production costs and reducing the profitability of investments. Corruption may also decrease the productivity of investments by reducing the quality of resources. For example, by undermining the quality and quantity of health and education services, corruption decreases a country’s human capital. Rent-seeking behaviour is also likely to create inefficiencies, fuelling waste of resources and undermining the efficiency of public expenditure. Corruption is negatively correlated with economic growth Macro level studies, using country-level data to explore cross-country variations in both governance and economic indicators, have consistently found that corruption significantly decreases economic growth and development. For example, cross-country data indicate that corruption is consistently correlated with lower growth rates, GDP per capita, economic equality, as well as lower levels of human development (Rothstein and Holmberg 2011). Similarly, a 2011 systematic review of available evidence of the effect of corruption on economic growth confirms that corruption has a direct and negative effect on growth in low income countries (Ugur and Dasgupta 2011). According to the analysis, corruption also has indirect effects through transmission channels such as investment, human capital and public finance/expenditure. While the direct and indirect effects of corruption on growth hold true for all countries under scrutiny, the review suggests that they can be mitigated by contextual factors such as the level of development and the overall quality of governance, with the effect of corruption expected to be more detrimental for countries with higher levels of per capita income and institutional quality.

#### Decline cascades – nuclear war

Maavak 21 – Mathew Maavak, PhD in Risk Foresight from the Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, External Researcher (PLATBIDAFO) at the Kazimieras Simonavicius University, Expert and Regular Commentator on Risk-Related Geostrategic Issues at the Russian International Affairs Council, “Horizon 2030: Will Emerging Risks Unravel Our Global Systems?”, Salus Journal – The Australian Journal for Law Enforcement, Security and Intelligence Professionals, Volume 9, Number 1, p. 2-8

Various scholars and institutions regard global social instability as the greatest threat facing this decade. The catalyst has been postulated to be a Second Great Depression which, in turn, will have profound implications for global security and national integrity. This paper, written from a broad systems perspective, illustrates how emerging risks are getting more complex and intertwined; blurring boundaries between the economic, environmental, geopolitical, societal and technological taxonomy used by the World Economic Forum for its annual global risk forecasts. Tight couplings in our global systems have also enabled risks accrued in one area to snowball into a full-blown crisis elsewhere. The COVID-19 pandemic and its socioeconomic fallouts exemplify this systemic chain-reaction. Onceinexorable forces of globalization are rupturing as the current global system can no longer be sustained due to poor governance and runaway wealth fractionation. The coronavirus pandemic is also enabling Big Tech to expropriate the levers of governments and mass communications worldwide. This paper concludes by highlighting how this development poses a dilemma for security professionals. Key Words: Global Systems, Emergence, VUCA, COVID-9, Social Instability, Big Tech, Great Reset INTRODUCTION The new decade is witnessing rising volatility across global systems. Pick any random “system” today and chart out its trajectory: Are our education systems becoming more robust and affordable? What about food security? Are our healthcare systems improving? Are our pension systems sound? Wherever one looks, there are dark clouds gathering on a global horizon marked by volatility, uncertainty, complexity and ambiguity (VUCA). But what exactly is a global system? Our planet itself is an autonomous and selfsustaining mega-system, marked by periodic cycles and elemental vagaries. Human activities within however are not system isolates as our banking, utility, farming, healthcare and retail sectors etc. are increasingly entwined. Risks accrued in one system may cascade into an unforeseen crisis within and/or without (Choo, Smith & McCusker, 2007). Scholars call this phenomenon “emergence”; one where the behaviour of intersecting systems is determined by complex and largely invisible interactions at the substratum (Goldstein, 1999; Holland, 1998). The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic is a case in point. While experts remain divided over the source and morphology of the virus, the contagion has ramified into a global health crisis and supply chain nightmare. It is also tilting the geopolitical balance. China is the largest exporter of intermediate products, and had generated nearly 20% of global imports in 2015 alone (Cousin, 2020). The pharmaceutical sector is particularly vulnerable. Nearly “85% of medicines in the U.S. strategic national stockpile” sources components from China (Owens, 2020). An initial run on respiratory masks has now been eclipsed by rowdy queues at supermarkets and the bankruptcy of small businesses. The entire global population – save for major pockets such as Sweden, Belarus, Taiwan and Japan – have been subjected to cyclical lockdowns and quarantines. Never before in history have humans faced such a systemic, borderless calamity. COVID-19 represents a classic emergent crisis that necessitates real-time response and adaptivity in a real-time world, particularly since the global Just-in-Time (JIT) production and delivery system serves as both an enabler and vector for transboundary risks. From a systems thinking perspective, emerging risk management should therefore address a whole spectrum of activity across the economic, environmental, geopolitical, societal and technological (EEGST) taxonomy. Every emerging threat can be slotted into this taxonomy – a reason why it is used by the World Economic Forum (WEF) for its annual global risk exercises (Maavak, 2019a). As traditional forces of globalization unravel, security professionals should take cognizance of emerging threats through a systems thinking approach. METHODOLOGY An EEGST sectional breakdown was adopted to illustrate a sampling of extreme risks facing the world for the 2020-2030 decade. The transcendental quality of emerging risks, as outlined on Figure 1, below, was primarily informed by the following pillars of systems thinking (Rickards, 2020): • Diminishing diversity (or increasing homogeneity) of actors in the global system (Boli & Thomas, 1997; Meyer, 2000; Young et al, 2006); • Interconnections in the global system (Homer-Dixon et al, 2015; Lee & Preston, 2012); • Interactions of actors, events and components in the global system (Buldyrev et al, 2010; Bashan et al, 2013; Homer-Dixon et al, 2015); and • Adaptive qualities in particular systems (Bodin & Norberg, 2005; Scheffer et al, 2012) Since scholastic material on this topic remains somewhat inchoate, this paper buttresses many of its contentions through secondary (i.e. news/institutional) sources. ECONOMY According to Professor Stanislaw Drozdz (2018) of the Polish Academy of Sciences, “a global financial crash of a previously unprecedented scale is highly probable” by the mid- 2020s. This will lead to a trickle-down meltdown, impacting all areas of human activity. The economist John Mauldin (2018) similarly warns that the “2020s might be the worst decade in US history” and may lead to a Second Great Depression. Other forecasts are equally alarming. According to the International Institute of Finance, global debt may have surpassed $255 trillion by 2020 (IIF, 2019). Yet another study revealed that global debts and liabilities amounted to a staggering $2.5 quadrillion (Ausman, 2018). The reader should note that these figures were tabulated before the COVID-19 outbreak. The IMF singles out widening income inequality as the trigger for the next Great Depression (Georgieva, 2020). The wealthiest 1% now own more than twice as much wealth as 6.9 billion people (Coffey et al, 2020) and this chasm is widening with each passing month. COVID-19 had, in fact, boosted global billionaire wealth to an unprecedented $10.2 trillion by July 2020 (UBS-PWC, 2020). Global GDP, worth $88 trillion in 2019, may have contracted by 5.2% in 2020 (World Bank, 2020). As the Greek historian Plutarch warned in the 1st century AD: “An imbalance between rich and poor is the oldest and most fatal ailment of all republics” (Mauldin, 2014). The stability of a society, as Aristotle argued even earlier, depends on a robust middle element or middle class. At the rate the global middle class is facing catastrophic debt and unemployment levels, widespread social disaffection may morph into outright anarchy (Maavak, 2012; DCDC, 2007). Economic stressors, in transcendent VUCA fashion, may also induce radical geopolitical realignments. Bullions now carry more weight than NATO’s security guarantees in Eastern Europe. After Poland repatriated 100 tons of gold from the Bank of England in 2019, Slovakia, Serbia and Hungary quickly followed suit. According to former Slovak Premier Robert Fico, this erosion in regional trust was based on historical precedents – in particular the 1938 Munich Agreement which ceded Czechoslovakia’s Sudetenland to Nazi Germany. As Fico reiterated (Dudik & Tomek, 2019): “You can hardly trust even the closest allies after the Munich Agreement… I guarantee that if something happens, we won’t see a single gram of this (offshore-held) gold. Let’s do it (repatriation) as quickly as possible.” (Parenthesis added by author). President Aleksandar Vucic of Serbia (a non-NATO nation) justified his central bank’s gold-repatriation program by hinting at economic headwinds ahead: “We see in which direction the crisis in the world is moving” (Dudik & Tomek, 2019). Indeed, with two global Titanics – the United States and China – set on a collision course with a quadrillions-denominated iceberg in the middle, and a viral outbreak on its tip, the seismic ripples will be felt far, wide and for a considerable period. A reality check is nonetheless needed here: Can additional bullions realistically circumvallate the economies of 80 million plus peoples in these Eastern European nations, worth a collective $1.8 trillion by purchasing power parity? Gold however is a potent psychological symbol as it represents national sovereignty and economic reassurance in a potentially hyperinflationary world. The portents are clear: The current global economic system will be weakened by rising nationalism and autarkic demands. Much uncertainty remains ahead. Mauldin (2018) proposes the introduction of Old Testament-style debt jubilees to facilitate gradual national recoveries. The World Economic Forum, on the other hand, has long proposed a “Great Reset” by 2030; a socialist utopia where “you’ll own nothing and you’ll be happy” (WEF, 2016). In the final analysis, COVID-19 is not the root cause of the current global economic turmoil; it is merely an accelerant to a burning house of cards that was left smouldering since the 2008 Great Recession (Maavak, 2020a). We also see how the four main pillars of systems thinking (diversity, interconnectivity, interactivity and “adaptivity”) form the mise en scene in a VUCA decade. ENVIRONMENTAL What happens to the environment when our economies implode? Think of a debt-laden workforce at sensitive nuclear and chemical plants, along with a concomitant surge in industrial accidents? Economic stressors, workforce demoralization and rampant profiteering – rather than manmade climate change – arguably pose the biggest threats to the environment. In a WEF report, Buehler et al (2017) made the following pre-COVID-19 observation: The ILO estimates that the annual cost to the global economy from accidents and work-related diseases alone is a staggering $3 trillion. Moreover, a recent report suggests the world’s 3.2 billion workers are increasingly unwell, with the vast majority facing significant economic insecurity: 77% work in part-time, temporary, “vulnerable” or unpaid jobs. Shouldn’t this phenomenon be better categorized as a societal or economic risk rather than an environmental one? In line with the systems thinking approach, however, global risks can no longer be boxed into a taxonomical silo. Frazzled workforces may precipitate another Bhopal (1984), Chernobyl (1986), Deepwater Horizon (2010) or Flint water crisis (2014). These disasters were notably not the result of manmade climate change. Neither was the Fukushima nuclear disaster (2011) nor the Indian Ocean tsunami (2004). Indeed, the combustion of a long-overlooked cargo of 2,750 tonnes of ammonium nitrate had nearly levelled the city of Beirut, Lebanon, on Aug 4 2020. The explosion left 204 dead; 7,500 injured; US$15 billion in property damages; and an estimated 300,000 people homeless (Urbina, 2020). The environmental costs have yet to be adequately tabulated. Environmental disasters are more attributable to Black Swan events, systems breakdowns and corporate greed rather than to mundane human activity. Our JIT world aggravates the cascading potential of risks (Korowicz, 2012). Production and delivery delays, caused by the COVID-19 outbreak, will eventually require industrial overcompensation. This will further stress senior executives, workers, machines and a variety of computerized systems. The trickle-down effects will likely include substandard products, contaminated food and a general lowering in health and safety standards (Maavak, 2019a). Unpaid or demoralized sanitation workers may also resort to indiscriminate waste dumping. Many cities across the United States (and elsewhere in the world) are no longer recycling wastes due to prohibitive costs in the global corona-economy (Liacko, 2021). Even in good times, strict protocols on waste disposals were routinely ignored. While Sweden championed the global climate change narrative, its clothing flagship H&M was busy covering up toxic effluences disgorged by vendors along the Citarum River in Java, Indonesia. As a result, countless children among 14 million Indonesians straddling the “world’s most polluted river” began to suffer from dermatitis, intestinal problems, developmental disorders, renal failure, chronic bronchitis and cancer (DW, 2020). It is also in cauldrons like the Citarum River where pathogens may mutate with emergent ramifications. On an equally alarming note, depressed economic conditions have traditionally provided a waste disposal boon for organized crime elements. Throughout 1980s, the Calabriabased ‘Ndrangheta mafia – in collusion with governments in Europe and North America – began to dump radioactive wastes along the coast of Somalia. Reeling from pollution and revenue loss, Somali fisherman eventually resorted to mass piracy (Knaup, 2008). The coast of Somalia is now a maritime hotspot, and exemplifies an entwined form of economic-environmental-geopolitical-societal emergence. In a VUCA world, indiscriminate waste dumping can unexpectedly morph into a Black Hawk Down incident. The laws of unintended consequences are governed by actors, interconnections, interactions and adaptations in a system under study – as outlined in the methodology section. Environmentally-devastating industrial sabotages – whether by disgruntled workers, industrial competitors, ideological maniacs or terrorist groups – cannot be discounted in a VUCA world. Immiserated societies, in stark defiance of climate change diktats, may resort to dirty coal plants and wood stoves for survival. Interlinked ecosystems, particularly water resources, may be hijacked by nationalist sentiments. The environmental fallouts of critical infrastructure (CI) breakdowns loom like a Sword of Damocles over this decade. GEOPOLITICAL The primary catalyst behind WWII was the Great Depression. Since history often repeats itself, expect familiar bogeymen to reappear in societies roiling with impoverishment and ideological clefts. Anti-Semitism – a societal risk on its own – may reach alarming proportions in the West (Reuters, 2019), possibly forcing Israel to undertake reprisal operations inside allied nations. If that happens, how will affected nations react? Will security resources be reallocated to protect certain minorities (or the Top 1%) while larger segments of society are exposed to restive forces? Balloon effects like these present a classic VUCA problematic. Contemporary geopolitical risks include a possible Iran-Israel war; US-China military confrontation over Taiwan or the South China Sea; North Korean proliferation of nuclear and missile technologies; an India-Pakistan nuclear war; an Iranian closure of the Straits of Hormuz; fundamentalist-driven implosion in the Islamic world; or a nuclear confrontation between NATO and Russia. Fears that the Jan 3 2020 assassination of Iranian Maj. Gen. Qasem Soleimani might lead to WWIII were grossly overblown. From a systems perspective, the killing of Soleimani did not fundamentally change the actor-interconnection-interaction adaptivity equation in the Middle East. Soleimani was simply a cog who got replaced

### 3

#### Desire for “Objectivity” results in a false balance in the name of media neutrality that results in climate denialism.

Mohammed 14. Omar Mohammed. October 26, 2014. Objectivity, False Equivalencies and Climate Change. <https://cronkitehhh.jmc.asu.edu/blog/2014/10/objectivity-false-equivalencies-climate-change/?fbclid=IwAR3a6UrzMhqM_Tiu8WiuWF7ReRaeL9MLKyq2wP10PAH1gLeMJvynRIGS6Ac> [Frequent Writer and Editor at Humphrey Fellows at Cronkite School of Journalism and Mass Communication – ASU]

But not quite all of them, though. Some say that their colleagues are exaggerating the problem and have branded them “alarmist.” I am referring to here is climate change, global warming and the central question of what causes them. So as a journalist, confronted with with appears to be two competing arguments, what do you do? At the core of what it means to be a reporter is to “be fair and balanced in presenting the contours of a debate.” Yes, an overwhelming majority of climate scientists believe that global warming is a real phenomenon and that it is caused by humans. In fact, a 2009 survey showed that 90% and 82% respectively believe in those conclusions. Does that therefore mean journalists should accept that a consensus has emerged and take as fact that global warming is indeed real? Aren’t we supposed to be objective in the way we cover stories and make sure that the minority view is also heard? No, actually. A journalist’s commitment should be to the truth and not adhering to false equivalencies in the name of objectivity. Of course, the truth can be an elusive idea. However, attempting to establish the truth when covering a story should be the governing principle of any journalist. When it comes to climate change, media critics have chastised the mainstream press’ ambivalence on forcefully reporting the truth of the issue. Robert S. Eshelman, writing in 2013 for Columbia Journalism Review (CJR), argues that journalists seem hypnotized by the complexity of the issue and as a result hide behind the cloak of reporting both sides of the story. He says: “[I]t’s as if journalists are stuck in time, presenting the science as something still under debate. A notion to be evaluated, tossed around. As scientific certainty grows today’s reporters, editors, and producers should cease with the false conceit about a debate.” Instead of balance, reporters should strive for accuracy, is Eshelman’s point. After all no journalist would give the argument that smoking cigarettes is not as unhealthy as it is claimed equal weight against scientists who have shown the opposite. So, why do journalists aspire to practice this concept of balance when it comes to climate change? Especially after an overwhelming majority of climate scientists have shown that climate change is real and caused by humans? Images taken in 1992 and 2005 show the loss of snow occurring on Mount Kilimanjaro in Tanzania, the highest free standing mountain in the world. Scientists say this is due to human behavior. Image via Environment and Media Part of the reason that journalists struggle with climate change may have something to do with the painful transition that the industry has endured over the last decade. With legacy revenue models decimated by the arrival of the internet, news organisations have been forced to reorient their priorities. Here is Eshelman again: “When the media industry was flush with revenue, newsrooms were well stocked with experienced, issue-specific reporters and editors. But since the early 2000s, shrinking staffs, the elimination of environmental desks, and narrower news holes has made reporting on climate change even more difficult.” Established outlets such as The New York Times, The Guardian and Reuters have seen their coverage of climate change deteriorate considerably. Alexis Sobel Fitts, also writing in CJR, points to a study that shows that in 2011, “The New York Times cut its global warming article count by 15 percent, and the Guardian slashed coverage by 21 percent that same year…Reuters, too, dropped its climate coverage by 27 percent.” While there may be some evidence that coverage has rebounded in 2013, social scientists suggest the shift is merely cosmetic. From Ms. Fitts: Max Boykoff, who since 2000 has tracked climate coverage in the top five newspapers in the United States—The Wall Street Journal, The New York Times, USA Today, the Los Angeles Times, and The Washington Post—found a drop in coverage in 2013. And Robert Brulle, a social scientist at Drexel University who monitors climate coverage on television news, said his preliminary data (measuring through the end of November 2013) found 30 stories, just a single story more than in 2012, which Brulle said was “statistically just a write off. So what effect has this “ambivalent reporting” of climate change and global warming had on public opinion? Well, not particularly positive. To wit: “According to a recent Gallup poll, only 24 percent of Americans surveyed saw climate change as an issue worth “a great deal” of concern. The issue was rated second-to-last in terms of importance, just before “race relations” on the survey. (Fifty-one percent responded that climate change was worthy of little to no worry.) And according to the most recent US National Climate Assessment, conducted in April, 64 percent of Americans surveyed believe global warming is happening, a rate that’s remained relatively steady since 2008.” [Image Ommitted] A Pew Research survey of 39 nations conducted in 2013 found that only 40% of Americans see climate change as a major threat to the U.S., compared to a median of 54% in the global survey. A Pew Research survey of 39 nations conducted in 2013 found that only 40% of Americans see climate change as a major threat to the U.S., compared to a median of 54% in the global survey. This begs the question: Have we then, as journalists, fulfilled our public service role when it comes to this issue? Are we communicating the urgency of what’s at stake? One reporter, who was asked about the issue, had this to say: “My job is to tell readers what is happening in science, to provide facts, data, and context..I do not see my job as trying to influence readers’ views, just inform.” Only time will tell if this will be enough.

#### Advocacy Journalism for Climate Change is key to momentum.

Meincke 21.Bill Meincke. October 29, 2021. Is Presenting a Solution for Climate Change Advocacy Journalism?. <https://theclick.news/is-presenting-a-solution-for-climate-change-advocacy-journalism/?fbclid=IwAR0ae9RGQtqfOwQ1DGMxY5p2rRqxJwHHdppTJ0Q9biYxJZYPXIFzeCkPbKc> [Bill is a Los Angeles based reporter for The Click and SBNation’s Southsidesox.com. He is the co-host to the podcast The Big Blurt and a producer on The Story of Our Trauma – A podcast focused on the stories of those that have suffered from PTSD. He has written for LAXSportsNation.com covering the Los Angeles Kings and the iO Comedy Network focusing on current events with a comedic touch. Bill earned a B.A. in Arts and Media Management in his hometown, Chicago, at Columbia College and is currently pursuing his masters in American Journalism at New York University.]

(LOS ANGELES) — Advocacy in journalism is apparent everywhere. Newspapers’ editorial boards endorse political candidates, support vaccine mandates, and praise police reform. Some readers may find this style of editorializing and reporting repulsive and question its integrity — but advocacy journalism, in many cases, is necessary. When it comes to the public’s safety, advocacy journalism is the most important type of journalism there is. Take this story from Mother Jones, later republished on Grist, where I first encountered it. The article — titled “Can we move our forests in time to save them?” — focuses on the author’s journey through forests in the Pacific Northwest. From the headline alone, the piece shouts its advocacy. It insinuates that climate change is a threat to our forests and that we may be responsible for their survival. Climate change is a real problem, but there are some people in the world that still fully deny its existence — two different points of view. The subtitle from the author, Laura Markham, is clear about her preference for the survival of our trees: “Trees have always migrated to survive. But now they need our help to avoid climate catastrophe.” This is a clear call to action. It immediately rejects the call for journalists to be objective and neutral. The story begins with Markham’s personal thoughts on climate change, “Our rapidly changing climate vexes me, keeps me up at night — perhaps you’ve felt this, too.” It forms an immediate connection to the reader. Now that the reader has latched onto the problem, she drops a fact that most of them will find terrifying. “​​In California, where I live, climate change helped kill nearly 62 million trees in 2016 alone, and last year, 4.2 million acres of our state burned,” Markham writes, citing the US Forest Service and the California State Government. She continues her adventure through the Oregon trees, meeting with a Forest Service scientist, addressing the rise in temperatures, the problems they cause, and painting a scary picture of the not so distant future. This is strikingly similar to the way Edward R. Murrow advocated for United States intervention during the blitz on Britain during World War II, simply by describing his observations. Markham cleanly lays out the effect climate change has had on the Pacific Northwest. She leads the audience to the conclusion that the only solution is human intervention. Murrow and Markham both painted a grim picture. A picture they both saw with their own eyes. Markham took it one step further and presented the reader with fact-based solutions to the question asked in the title, Can we move our forests in time to save them? The most important thing an advocacy journalist can do is make it clear that the conclusions drawn in the article are based in fact. Laura Markham did just that and more. As Dave Berman and the Independent Media Center wrote in “Advocacy Journalism, The Least You Can Do, and The No Confidence Movement,” “If we are ever to create meaningful change, advocacy journalism will be the single most crucial element to enable the necessary organizing. It is therefore very important that we learn how to be successful advocacy journalists.”

#### Empirically works for Climate Solutions – Journalism is key.

Watts 20 Jonathan Watts 10-9-2020 "Climate crisis: does journalism actually make a difference?" <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2020/oct/09/turning-up-the-spotlight-how-our-climate-coverage-has-made-a-difference> (Guardians Global Environment Editor)//Elmer

“Will this story make a difference?” It’s a question journalists ask themselves all the time. The answer is rarely clearcut, and there is no shortage of stories that barely make a ripple. But there have been a number of occasions in recent years on the Guardian’s environment desk when the answer has been a resounding yes. The media is part of a social nervous system, alerting the public to remote danger in the same way neurotransmitters tell the brain the tips of the fingers are being burned. We serve as amplifiers that enable weak or remote voices to reach a wide audience and centres of decision making. And, of course, we also have a role as watchdogs, holding political authority to account. These roles – of transmission, amplification and investigation – are all vital elements in any effective response to the world’s environmental breakdown. The Earth is an extraordinary piece of evolutionary engineering that has self-regulated itself for millions of years. That homeostasis is now being destabilised by human activities. Scientists tell us it is not too late to fix this, but we need to start the repair work urgently. Journalists can facilitate that. That is because we can connect the local and the global, which is an essential part of any solution. The climate crisis, collapse of natural life support systems, rise of zoonotic diseases and the pollution of air, water and soil are often first apparent in distant regions and poor communities, though the cause and ultimate consequences can be found in wealthier and more densely populated cities. As we have learned with Covid-19, unless problems are identified and dealt with early and at a local level, the health and economic costs can be horrendous as they later spread and expand across the world. The Guardian makes those connections because it has an internationalist and social perspective and is not owned by a tycoon or corporate interests. This independence sets it apart from most other media organisations, which have a narrower domestic and economic focus, or see their role as entertainers to distract readers, or echo-chambers that reinforce prejudices. Instead of putting distance between the UK and the rest of the world, we are more likely to explore what links us together, which is essential if we are going to address global environmental problems. Finding out how people are affected and fighting back at a local level was a goal of the Green Blood series on the threats posed to environmental activists and journalists who cover the mining sector. This has made a difference. Soon after the findings were published by the Guardian and its 35 partner media organisations, Guatemala’s constitutional court upheld a request from indigenous campaigners to suspend operations at one of the largest nickel mines in Central America due to the facility’s environmental impact. Similarly, reports of human rights abuses and environmental negligence at the North Mara goldmine in Tanzania prompted multinational corporations such as Apple, Nokia and Canon to review their supply chains. The refiner, MMTC-PAMP, and the mine’s owner, Barrick, have subsequently organised an inquiry into risk management practices at North Mara. The Guardian continues to scrutinise the operator’s promise to pay more heed to the concerns of the local community and environment. Similarly, the Defenders series on the killings of environmental and land activists continues to have ramifications. In the past two years, two of those profiled have won landmark lawsuits.

In South Africa, courts ruled against a proposed titanium mine that would have torn up land belonging to the Xolobeni community on the Wild Coast. In Kenya, judges awarded $12m in damages to the residents of the Owino Uhuru shantytown for deaths and health impacts from a nearby lead smelter for recycling batteries. In both cases, local activists risked their lives to campaign against powerful economic interests because they were concerned about pollution and other forms of environmental degradation. Media coverage did not decide their cases. But without the international spotlight, their courage and determination would not have received the kind of prominence that can sway opinion. A recent case in point concerned Chinese mining company plans to explore coal deposits in Zimbabwe’s Hwange national park. Local conservationists were keen to get the message out internationally because domestic reports suggested the government was ready to put economic interests above the sanctity of one of the world’s most important homes for elephants, rhinos, cheetahs, giraffes and other wildlife. It worked. Days after stories were published in the Guardian and other media, the authorities announced they would block the plan. Similarly, in Brazil, the world’s biggest meat packing company, JBS, announced in September it would axe suppliers linked to Amazon deforestation. This policy was a turnaround from its previous stance and followed a series of articles by the Guardian in collaboration with Repórter Brasil and the Bureau of Investigative Journalism about the company’s lax oversight of its supply chain. Of course, many other factors are involved in such decisions. Measuring the influence of a story is far harder than counting page views and social media shares. But it is clearly important or corporations and governments would not spend billions on public relations campaigns to avoid negative publicity. In that vein, the Guardian has taken several major steps to try to shape public opinion in favour of greater action on the climate crisis. The biggest environment reporting project of recent years was the Polluters, an old-school piece of investigative journalism that aimed to name and shame the fossil fuel companies, financial companies, public relations firms, thinktanks and politicians that have contributed the most to the climate crisis. This was a cross-disciplinary collaboration of more than 20 journalists across environment, business, investigations, data journalism, video, podcast, graphics and foreign news desks in five countries, with support from universities and NGOs. After eight months of preparation, the newspaper and website led with hard-hitting exposes every day for a week. This intense focus demonstrated the importance the Guardian places on a topic of growing public concern. It generated debate across the political spectrum and within the boardrooms of some of the world’s biggest companies, and it contributed – along with the upsurge in climate activism – to a growing number of announcements by the likes of BP, Shell and several banks and insurance companies to accelerate the shift away from carbon-intensive industries. We also know we can and should do more. As Greta Thunberg and others have pointed out, the climate and nature crises are so pressing they should be the subjects of the top headline on every news website and TV channel. There are still countless untold and under-reported stories. Scientists tell us the world needs to accelerate an energy, transport and food system transformation on a scale unprecedented in history. That is both alarming and exciting. Business as usual is not enough. Nor is journalism as usual.

#### Warming causes Extinction

Kareiva 18, Peter, and Valerie Carranza. "Existential risk due to ecosystem collapse: Nature strikes back." Futures 102 (2018): 39-50. (Ph.D. in ecology and applied mathematics from Cornell University, director of the Institute of the Environment and Sustainability at UCLA, Pritzker Distinguished Professor in Environment & Sustainability at UCLA)//Re-cut by Elmer

In summary, six of the nine proposed planetary boundaries (phosphorous, nitrogen, biodiversity, land use, atmospheric aerosol loading, and chemical pollution) are unlikely to be associated with existential risks. They all correspond to a degraded environment, but in our assessment do not represent existential risks. However, the three remaining boundaries (**climate change**, global **freshwater** cycle, **and** ocean **acidification**) do **pose existential risks**. This is **because of** intrinsic **positive feedback loops**, substantial lag times between system change and experiencing the consequences of that change, and the fact these different boundaries interact with one another in ways that yield surprises. In addition, climate, freshwater, and ocean acidification are all **directly connected to** the provision of **food and water**, and **shortages** of food and water can **create conflict** and social unrest. Climate change has a long history of disrupting civilizations and sometimes precipitating the collapse of cultures or mass emigrations (McMichael, 2017). For example, the 12th century drought in the North American Southwest is held responsible for the collapse of the Anasazi pueblo culture. More recently, the infamous potato famine of 1846–1849 and the large migration of Irish to the U.S. can be traced to a combination of factors, one of which was climate. Specifically, 1846 was an unusually warm and moist year in Ireland, providing the climatic conditions favorable to the fungus that caused the potato blight. As is so often the case, poor government had a role as well—as the British government forbade the import of grains from outside Britain (imports that could have helped to redress the ravaged potato yields). Climate change intersects with freshwater resources because it is expected to exacerbate drought and water scarcity, as well as flooding. Climate change can even impair water quality because it is associated with heavy rains that overwhelm sewage treatment facilities, or because it results in higher concentrations of pollutants in groundwater as a result of enhanced evaporation and reduced groundwater recharge. **Ample clean water** is not a luxury—it **is essential for human survival**. Consequently, cities, regions and nations that lack clean freshwater are vulnerable to social disruption and disease. Finally, ocean acidification is linked to climate change because it is driven by CO2 emissions just as global warming is. With close to 20% of the world’s protein coming from oceans (FAO, 2016), the potential for severe impacts due to acidification is obvious. Less obvious, but perhaps more insidious, is the interaction between climate change and the loss of oyster and coral reefs due to acidification. Acidification is known to interfere with oyster reef building and coral reefs. Climate change also increases storm frequency and severity. Coral reefs and oyster reefs provide protection from storm surge because they reduce wave energy (Spalding et al., 2014). If these reefs are lost due to acidification at the same time as storms become more severe and sea level rises, coastal communities will be exposed to unprecedented storm surge—and may be ravaged by recurrent storms. A key feature of the risk associated with climate change is that mean annual temperature and mean annual rainfall are not the variables of interest. Rather it is extreme episodic events that place nations and entire regions of the world at risk. These extreme events are by definition “rare” (once every hundred years), and changes in their likelihood are challenging to detect because of their rarity, but are exactly the manifestations of climate change that we must get better at anticipating (Diffenbaugh et al., 2017). Society will have a hard time responding to shorter intervals between rare extreme events because in the lifespan of an individual human, a person might experience as few as two or three extreme events. How likely is it that you would notice a change in the interval between events that are separated by decades, especially given that the interval is not regular but varies stochastically? A concrete example of this dilemma can be found in the past and expected future changes in storm-related flooding of New York City. The highly disruptive flooding of New York City associated with Hurricane Sandy represented a flood height that occurred once every 500 years in the 18th century, and that occurs now once every 25 years, but is expected to occur once every 5 years by 2050 (Garner et al., 2017). This change in frequency of extreme floods has profound implications for the measures New York City should take to protect its infrastructure and its population, yet because of the stochastic nature of such events, this shift in flood frequency is an elevated risk that will go unnoticed by most people. 4. The combination of positive feedback loops and societal inertia is fertile ground for global environmental catastrophes **Humans** are remarkably ingenious, and **have adapted** to crises **throughout** their **history**. Our doom has been repeatedly predicted, only to be averted by innovation (Ridley, 2011). **However**, the many **stories** **of** human ingenuity **successfully** **addressing** **existential risks** such as global famine or extreme air pollution **represent** environmental c**hallenges that are** largely **linear**, have immediate consequences, **and operate without positive feedbacks**. For example, the fact that food is in short supply does not increase the rate at which humans consume food—thereby increasing the shortage. Similarly, massive air pollution episodes such as the London fog of 1952 that killed 12,000 people did not make future air pollution events more likely. In fact it was just the opposite—the London fog sent such a clear message that Britain quickly enacted pollution control measures (Stradling, 2016). Food shortages, air pollution, water pollution, etc. send immediate signals to society of harm, which then trigger a negative feedback of society seeking to reduce the harm. In contrast, today’s great environmental crisis of climate change may cause some harm but there are generally long time delays between rising CO2 concentrations and damage to humans. The consequence of these delays are an absence of urgency; thus although 70% of Americans believe global warming is happening, only 40% think it will harm them (http://climatecommunication.yale.edu/visualizations-data/ycom-us-2016/). Secondly, unlike past environmental challenges, **the Earth’s climate system is rife with positive feedback loops**. In particular, as CO2 increases and the climate warms, that **very warming can cause more CO2 release** which further increases global warming, and then more CO2, and so on. Table 2 summarizes the best documented positive feedback loops for the Earth’s climate system. These feedbacks can be neatly categorized into carbon cycle, biogeochemical, biogeophysical, cloud, ice-albedo, and water vapor feedbacks. As important as it is to understand these feedbacks individually, it is even more essential to study the interactive nature of these feedbacks. Modeling studies show that when interactions among feedback loops are included, uncertainty increases dramatically and there is a heightened potential for perturbations to be magnified (e.g., Cox, Betts, Jones, Spall, & Totterdell, 2000; Hajima, Tachiiri, Ito, & Kawamiya, 2014; Knutti & Rugenstein, 2015; Rosenfeld, Sherwood, Wood, & Donner, 2014). This produces a wide range of future scenarios. Positive feedbacks in the carbon cycle involves the enhancement of future carbon contributions to the atmosphere due to some initial increase in atmospheric CO2. This happens because as CO2 accumulates, it reduces the efficiency in which oceans and terrestrial ecosystems sequester carbon, which in return feeds back to exacerbate climate change (Friedlingstein et al., 2001). Warming can also increase the rate at which organic matter decays and carbon is released into the atmosphere, thereby causing more warming (Melillo et al., 2017). Increases in food shortages and lack of water is also of major concern when biogeophysical feedback mechanisms perpetuate drought conditions. The underlying mechanism here is that losses in vegetation increases the surface albedo, which suppresses rainfall, and thus enhances future vegetation loss and more suppression of rainfall—thereby initiating or prolonging a drought (Chamey, Stone, & Quirk, 1975). To top it off, overgrazing depletes the soil, leading to augmented vegetation loss (Anderies, Janssen, & Walker, 2002). Climate change often also increases the risk of forest fires, as a result of higher temperatures and persistent drought conditions. The expectation is that **forest fires will become more frequent** and severe with climate warming and drought (Scholze, Knorr, Arnell, & Prentice, 2006), a trend for which we have already seen evidence (Allen et al., 2010). Tragically, the increased severity and risk of Southern California wildfires recently predicted by climate scientists (Jin et al., 2015), was realized in December 2017, with the largest fire in the history of California (the “Thomas fire” that burned 282,000 acres, https://www.vox.com/2017/12/27/16822180/thomas-fire-california-largest-wildfire). This **catastrophic fire** embodies the sorts of positive feedbacks and interacting factors that **could catch humanity off-guard and produce a** true **apocalyptic event.**

Record-breaking rains produced an extraordinary flush of new vegetation, that then dried out as record heat waves and dry conditions took hold, coupled with stronger than normal winds, and ignition. Of course the record-fire released CO2 into the atmosphere, thereby contributing to future warming. Out of all types of feedbacks, water vapor and the ice-albedo feedbacks are the most clearly understood mechanisms. Losses in reflective snow and ice cover drive up surface temperatures, leading to even more melting of snow and ice cover—this is known as the ice-albedo feedback (Curry, Schramm, & Ebert, 1995). As snow and ice continue to melt at a more rapid pace, millions of people may be displaced by flooding risks as a consequence of sea level rise near coastal communities (Biermann & Boas, 2010; Myers, 2002; Nicholls et al., 2011). The water vapor feedback operates when warmer atmospheric conditions strengthen the saturation vapor pressure, which creates a warming effect given water vapor’s strong greenhouse gas properties (Manabe & Wetherald, 1967). Global warming tends to increase cloud formation because warmer temperatures lead to more evaporation of water into the atmosphere, and warmer temperature also allows the atmosphere to hold more water. The key question is whether this increase in clouds associated with global warming will result in a positive feedback loop (more warming) or a negative feedback loop (less warming). For decades, scientists have sought to answer this question and understand the net role clouds play in future climate projections (Schneider et al., 2017). Clouds are complex because they both have a cooling (reflecting incoming solar radiation) and warming (absorbing incoming solar radiation) effect (Lashof, DeAngelo, Saleska, & Harte, 1997). The type of cloud, altitude, and optical properties combine to determine how these countervailing effects balance out. Although still under debate, it appears that in most circumstances the cloud feedback is likely positive (Boucher et al., 2013). For example, models and observations show that increasing greenhouse gas concentrations reduces the low-level cloud fraction in the Northeast Pacific at decadal time scales. This then has a positive feedback effect and enhances climate warming since less solar radiation is reflected by the atmosphere (Clement, Burgman, & Norris, 2009). The key lesson from the long list of potentially positive feedbacks and their interactions is that **runaway climate change,** and runaway perturbations have to be taken as a serious possibility. Table 2 is just a snapshot of the type of feedbacks that have been identified (see Supplementary material for a more thorough explanation of positive feedback loops). However, this list is not exhaustive and the possibility of undiscovered positive feedbacks **portends** even greater **existential risks**. The many environmental crises humankind has previously averted (famine, ozone depletion, London fog, water pollution, etc.) were averted because of political will based on solid scientific understanding. We cannot count on complete scientific understanding when it comes to positive feedback loops and climate change.

### 4

#### CP Text – In a Democracy, a Free Press ought to develop standards to disclose the ways they collect, report, and disseminate the news and publicly report their sources and state their values and partisan ties.

#### Transparency in media solves the perception of media bias – robust studies.

Mayer 19 Joy Mayer, 4-10-2019 (is the founder and director of Trusting News, "Transparency in journalism isn’t a new idea, but it’s more important than ever," Medium, <https://medium.com/the-engaged-journalism-lab/transparency-in-journalism-isnt-a-new-idea-but-it-s-more-important-than-ever-cfed217f0a46>) Ngong

Calls for transparency in journalism are everywhere these days. A recent high-profile request comes from the Knight Commission on Trust, Media and Democracy. In its February report, the commission made 10 recommendations for restoring trust in media and democracy. One was: “Practice radical transparency. The media should develop industrywide, voluntary standards on how to disclose the ways they collect, report and disseminate the news.” It seems like a good time to pause and acknowledge that, while transparency is trendier than ever, it certainly isn’t new. In 2014, **Craig Silverman wrote a report for the** American Press Institute dedicated to building journalistic credibility through transparency. The report addressed how journalists should explain their sourcing, offer disclosures, share their values, invite audience collaboration and correct errors. Silverman quoted The Elements of Journalism, a book by Bill Kovach and Tom Rosenstiel. He wrote: Kovach and Rosenstiel highlighted two key transparency questions journalists should ask themselves in the course of their work: “What does my audience need to know to evaluate this information for itself? And is there anything in our treatment of it that requires explanation?” These go to the heart of transparency. The **authors of The Elements of Journalism**, which was first published in 2001, also wrote: Transparency … signals the journalist’s respect for the audience. It allows the audience to judge the validity of the information, the process by which it was secured and the motives and biases of the journalist providing it. Two motivations for transparency Journalistic transparency is sometimes referring to matters of disclosure. These elements are designed to engender trust by showing that we’re willing to draw attention to matters that might influence our work. It might be appropriate, for example, to reveal that the subject of a story has also been a donor to a news organization. Or a journalist’s staff bio might reference her financial investments, her community involvement or her family’s connections to an issue of high interest. (Kara Swisher’s Recode bio is such an example.) This idea of understanding where a journalist is coming from was the topic of a **2009 post from David Weinberger** titled “Transparency is the new Objectivity.” He wrote: What we used to believe because we thought the author was objective we now believe because we can see through the author’s writings to the sources and values that brought her to that position. Transparency gives the reader information by which she can undo some of the unintended effects of the ever-present biases. Transparency brings us to reliability the way objectivity used to. In addition to disclosure, transparency can also refer to a broader kind of storytelling around journalism’s motives, values and processes. We know that news consumers do not have deep knowledge of how journalism operates (as this 2018 API study lays out clearly). And when there is a void of understanding, they are not often giving us the benefit of the doubt. We have an opportunity to answer questions like: What motivates our coverage, and why are we doing this specific story? Why did we talk to these people and refer to these documents? What work did the reporter do that isn’t visible in the finished story? What ethical decisions did we make along the way, and what policies guided those decisions? How did we we work to be fair in this story? How were we careful to remain free from influence? Here’s an example of a Trusting News training at Yle in Helsinki, where I discuss some of key ways we can build trust and transparency between newsrooms and their audiences. Making the case for transparency The Center for Media Engagement published research in February that speaks directly to this topic. It was done in collaboration with Trusting News, a project I run that empowers journalists to demonstrate credibility and actively earn trust. We worked with two newsroom partners to add behind-the-scenes information alongside a story. The information was not cumbersome to add, and the research found that it clearly increased trust. Results showed that the presence of the “explain your process” box boosted people’s perceptions of the news organization on 11 of the 12 items related to trust. These were: transparent, informative, accurate, fair, tells the whole story, reliable, credible, unbiased, trusted, has integrity, and reputable. Transparency in some forms does have its critics. In a recent piece for the **Columbia Journalism Review,** Alex Pareene explored the idea of behind-the-scenes stories. He wrote that descriptions of how journalism’s sausage gets made can be self-indulgent. They can also be really boring. (It turns out not everything about journalism is fascinating!) Separate behind-the-scenes stories are also mostly likely to reach the people who are already committed news consumers, thereby preaching to the choir.

### Advantage

#### No extinction from disease:

#### 1] Resilience and countermeasures prevent spread – distinct from burnout

Adalja 16

Amesh Adalja is an infectious-disease physician at the University of Pittsburgh, The Atlantic, June 17, 2016, “Why Hasn't Disease Wiped out the Human Race?”, https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2016/06/infectious-diseases-extinction/487514/

But when people ask me if I’m worried about infectious diseases, they’re often not asking about the threat to human lives; they’re asking about the threat to human life. With each outbreak of a headline-grabbing emerging infectious disease comes a fear of extinction itself. The fear envisions a large proportion of humans succumbing to infection, leaving no survivors or so few that the species can’t be sustained.

I’m not afraid of this apocalyptic scenario, but I do understand the impulse. Worry about the end is a quintessentially human trait. Thankfully, so is our resilience.

For most of mankind’s history, infectious diseases were the existential threat to humanity—and for good reason. They were quite successful at killing people: The 6th century’s Plague of Justinian knocked out an estimated 17 percent of the world’s population; the 14th century Black Death decimated a third of Europe; the 1918 influenza pandemic killed 5 percent of the world; malaria is estimated to have killed half of all humans who have ever lived.

Any yet, of course, humanity continued to flourish. Our species’ recent explosion in lifespan is almost exclusively the result of the control of infectious diseases through sanitation, vaccination, and antimicrobial therapies. Only in the modern era, in which many infectious diseases have been tamed in the industrial world, do people have the luxury of death from cancer, heart disease, or stroke in the 8th decade of life. Childhoods are free from watching siblings and friends die from outbreaks of typhoid, scarlet fever, smallpox, measles, and the like.

**2] Intervening actors check**

**Zakaria 9—**Editor of Newsweek, BA from Yale, PhD in pol sci, Harvard. He serves on the board of Yale University, The Council on Foreign Relations, The Trilateral Commission, and Shakespeare and Company. Named "one of the 21 most important people of the 21st Century" (Fareed, “The Capitalist Manifesto: Greed Is Good,” 13 June 2009, http://www.newsweek.com/id/201935)

Note—Laurie Garrett=science and health writer, winner of the Pulitzer, Polk, and Peabody Prize

It certainly looks like another example of crying wolf. **After bracing ourselves for a global pandemic, we've suffered** something more like **the usual seasonal influenza**. Three weeks ago the World Health Organization declared a health emergency, warning countries to "prepare for a pandemic" and said that the only question was the extent of worldwide damage. **Senior officials prophesied that millions could be infected** by the disease. **But as of last week, the WHO had confirmed only 4,800 cases** of swine flu, with 61 people having died of it. Obviously, these low numbers are a pleasant surprise, but it does make one wonder, what did we get wrong? **Why did** the **predictions of a pandemic turn out to be so exaggerated**? Some people blame an overheated media, but it would have been difficult to ignore major international health organizations and governments when they were warning of catastrophe. I think **there is a** broader **mistake in the way we look at the world.** Once we see a problem, we can describe it in great detail, extrapolating all its possible consequences. But **we** can **rarely anticipate the human response to that crisis. Take** **swine flu. The virus** **had crucial characteristics** **that led researchers to worry that it could spread far and fast**. They described—and the media reported—what would happen if it went unchecked. **But it did not go unchecked**. **In fact, swine flu was met by an extremely vigorous response at its epicenter**, **Mexico. The Mexican government reacted quickly** and massively, quarantining the infected population, testing others, providing medication to those who needed it. **The noted expert on this subject,** Laurie **Garrett, says, "**We should all stand up and scream, **'Gracias, Mexico**!' because the Mexican people and the Mexican government have sacrificed on a level that I'm not sure as Americans we would be prepared to do in the exact same circumstances. They shut down their schools. They shut down businesses, restaurants, churches, sporting events. **They** basically paralyzed their own economy. They've suffered billions of dollars in financial losses still being tallied up, and thereby **really brought transmission to a halt." Every time one of these viruses is detected**, writers and **officials bring up the Spanish influenza** epidemic **of 1918** in which millions of people died. Indeed, during the last pandemic scare, in 2005, President George W. Bush claimed that he had been reading a history of the Spanish flu to help him understand how to respond. **But the world we live in today looks nothing like 1918. Public health-care systems are far better** and more widespread than anything that existed during the First World War. **Even Mexico, a developing country, has a first-rate public-health system**—far better than anything Britain or France had in the early 20th century.

#### Scenario 1 is warming:

#### 1] Disease outbreaks will be defeated with quarantines

**Szalai 7/26** [(Jennifer Szalai - author for the NYT) “The Extradordinary History (and likely busy future) of quarantine” The New York Times. 7-26-2021]

**Quarantine can be lifesaving**; it can also be dangerous, an exercise of extraordinary power in the name of disease control, a presumption of guilt instead of innocence.

In “Until Proven Safe,” a new book about quarantine’s past and future, Geoff Manaugh and Nicola Twilley do an impressively judicious job of explaining exactly why fears of quarantine are understandable and historically justified, while also showing how in coming years “we will almost certainly find ourselves more dependent on quarantine, not less.” Quarantine has to do with risk and uncertainty, and its logic is simple: “There might be something dangerous inside you — something contagious — on the verge of breaking free.”

**While medical advances have made some diseases more diagnosable** and less deadly, newfound knowledge can also accentuate the depths of our ignorance. The more we know, the more we know how much we don’t know — not to mention that **modern life, with escalating numbers of people and goods churning** their way **around the world**, has **increased the opportunities for contagion.**

Quarantine is distinct from isolation, even if the terms are often used interchangeably. Someone is isolated when they are known to be sick; **someone is quarantined when they might be but we cannot be sure**. Manaugh, an architecture and technology blogger, and Twilley, the co-host of a podcast about the science and history of food, bring an impressively wide range of interests to bear on a subject that involves not only infectious disease but also — in their ambitious yet seamless narration — politics, agriculture, surveillance and even outer space.

#### 2] Quarantines solve climate change – COVID was responsible for the largest drop in emissions ever

**Alexander 20** [(Kurtis, a general assignment reporter for The San Francisco Chronicle, frequently writing about water, wildfire, climate and the American West. His recent work has focused on the impacts of drought, the widening rural-urban divide and state and federal environmental policy. Before joining the Chronicle, Alexander worked as a freelance writer and as a staff reporter for several media organizations, including The Fresno Bee and Bay Area News Group, writing about government, politics and the environment.) "Coronavirus has altered the global warming trajectory. But for how long?" San Francisco Chronicle, 5/20/20, https://www.sfchronicle.com/health/article/Greenhouse-gas-emissions-on-track-for-record-drop-15279312.php] TDI

The disruption caused by the coronavirus has been so profound that it’s altered the trajectory of global warming.

Not since World War II — and perhaps never before — have the emissions of heat-trapping gases dropped as much around the planet as they have during the COVID-19 outbreak.

The latest and most detailed study yet on the pandemic’s impact on climate pollution, published Tuesday and authored by the research group Global Carbon Project chaired by Stanford University’s Rob Jackson, finds that the Earth will see up to a 7% decrease in carbon dioxide this year. The dip is five times the decline in emissions in 2009, when the recession choked the world’s economy, and double what it was in 1992, after the fall of the Soviet Union.

The paper’s findings mirror other reports that have similarly found sharp drops in greenhouse gases recently. The emerging research also is in agreement that the lull will likely be short-lived and, at best, buy time before the most devastating effects of climate change take hold. The lockdown that has halted factories, energy plants and automobiles during the pandemic is already lifting, and without deliberate action, carbon-intense activities are bound to resume.

“That’s the danger here,” said Jackson, a professor of earth system science and senior fellow at Stanford Woods Institute for the Environment. “We’ve decreased emissions for the wrong reasons. Will they jump back up starting this fall, or could the virus allow us to rethink transportation and other parts of the economy?”

The answer to the question, say Jackson and others, may not be so straightforward. Greenhouse gases could rebound in some areas, and there could be lasting decreases in others.

Measuring heat-trapping gas emissions, for which carbon dioxide is a proxy, is not easy to do, especially in real time. The researchers at the Global Carbon Project analyzed daily economic activity in 69 countries from January through April and modeled the carbon pollution that likely resulted, then compared it to last year. The countries included have historically produced almost all of the world’s carbon dioxide.

The researchers found that China, the largest polluter, reduced emissions by nearly 24% on some days in mid-February. The United States, the second-largest polluter, cut emissions by nearly 32% for almost two weeks in mid-April. The European Union, including Great Britain, trimmed emissions by about 27% during the first week of April.

The dates of peak reductions varied in different parts of the globe because each locked down at a different time. The biggest cumulative drop in carbon dioxide was on April 7 and measured about 17%, according to the study.

While a variety of activity explains the declines, fewer people driving was the largest contributor worldwide. Less industrial pollution was also a big contributor.

Based on the observed drops in emissions, the researchers estimate that going forward, carbon dioxide will fall between 4% and 7% for the year worldwide, depending on how quickly countries end their lockdowns.

Jackson said the amount of the decline can be viewed as both considerable, given that it’s the largest ever seen, and humbling because it’s the minimum needed annually to put the planet on track to meet the Paris climate agreement — enough of a drop to prevent the global temperature from rising 2 degrees Celsius above preindustrial levels.

“We would need to do this every year,” he said.

The International Energy Agency recently projected an 8% dip in greenhouse gases for the year while the International Monetary Fund came up with an estimate closer to 6%. Both organizations said carbon pollution would likely rise again in 2021.

After the decline in emissions in 2009 of about 1.4%, the following year saw an increase of 5.1%.

The Global Carbon Project says there’s reason to think that at least some parts of the globe will try to prevent heat-trapping gases from bouncing back. Stimulus programs aimed at developing clean energy and new carbon-friendly ways of living adopted during the pandemic, such as working from home, could help limit emissions.

“Cities from Seattle to Milan are keeping roads closed to cars and letting them stay open to bikes and pedestrians even after the shelter-in-place,” Jackson said. “And maybe COVID-19 and stimulus funding will jump-start electric cars.”

#### 3] Shutdowns solve climate change – substantially reduce emissions, air and water pollution, directs attention to climate

**Chow 20** [(Denise, a reporter for NBC News Science focused on general science and climate change) "Coronavirus shutdowns have unintended climate benefits: cleaner air, clearer water," NBC News, 3/18/20, https://www.nbcnews.com/science/environment/coronavirus-shutdowns-have-unintended-climate-benefits-n1161921] DRD

Concentrations of nitrogen dioxide in the atmosphere over Italy also fell precipitously, as they did in China. An analysis by The Washington Post found that the most dramatic drop was observed over northern Italy.

Nitrogen dioxide can irritate the lungs, and inhaling the pollutant can increase the risk of asthma and inflammation of the lungs. Although the noxious gas isn't thought to be a major contributor to climate change, studying its concentration in the atmosphere can help scientists understand other heat-trapping greenhouse gases that do drive global warming.

Jacqueline Klopp, co-director of the Center for Sustainable Urban Development at Columbia University in New York City, said she expects to see greenhouse gas emissions plummet across the board because of the quarantine measures.

"People were in their homes and really stopped a lot of the activities that lead to greenhouse gas emissions and other pollution," she said.

Early observations have shown that extreme social-distancing measures are likely also having an effect on air pollution at the city level in the U.S.

Jordan Wildish, a project director at Earth Economics, an environmental non-profit organization based in Tacoma, Washington, developed an online dashboard to track air quality in San Francisco, New York City and the Seattle area, comparing the measurements with figures from the same time last year.

In San Francisco, which is under shelter-in-place orders to control the spread of the coronavirus, the average concentration of fine particulate matter — tiny particles in the air that are dangerous because they can be breathed deeply into the lungs — over the past five days was almost 40 percent lower than the previous year.

In New York City, there was a 28 percent drop over the same period of time, and the Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue saw a 32 percent decrease.

But experts warned that observed reductions are temporary and that as cities, countries and economies bounce back, so, too, will emissions — unless major infrastructure or societal changes are adopted.

Klopp said the pandemic could make companies and governments realize that other threats to humanity, including climate change, could be just as devastating and that it's imperative to develop protective measures.

#### 2] Solves war

#### A] Disease pandemics decrease the likelihood of war

Walt 20 (Stephen M. Walt is the Robert and Renée Belfer professor of international relations at Harvard University; “Will a Global Depression Trigger Another World War?”; Foreign Policy; May 13, 2020; https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/05/13/coronavirus-pandemic-depression-economy-world-war/; ERB)

By many measures, 2020 is looking to be the worst year that humankind has faced in many decades. We’re in the midst of a pandemic that has already claimed more than 280,000 lives, sickened millions of people, and is certain to afflict millions more before it ends. The world economy is in free fall, with unemployment rising dramatically, trade and output plummeting, and no hopeful end in sight. A plague of locusts is back for a second time in Africa, and last week we learned about murderous killer wasps threatening the bee population in the United States. Americans have a head-in-the-sand president who prescribes potentially lethal nostrums and ignores the advice of his scientific advisors. Even if all those things magically disappeared tomorrow—and they won’t—we still face the looming long-term danger from climate change. Given all that, what could possibly make things worse? Here’s one possibility: war. It is therefore worth asking whether the combination of a pandemic and a major economic depression is making war more or less likely. What does history and theory tell us about that question? For starters, we know neither plague nor depression make war impossible. World War I ended just as the 1918-1919 influenza was beginning to devastate the world, but that pandemic didn’t stop the Russian Civil War, the Russo-Polish War, or several other serious conflicts. The Great Depression that began in 1929 didn’t prevent Japan from invading Manchuria in 1931, and it helped fuel the rise of fascism in the 1930s and made World War II more likely. So if you think major war simply can’t happen during COVID-19 and the accompanying global recession, think again. But war could still be much less likely. The Massachusetts Institute of Technology’s Barry Posen has already considered the likely impact of the current pandemic on the probability of war, and he believes COVID-19 is more likely to promote peace instead. He argues that the current pandemic is affecting all the major powers adversely, which means it isn’t creating tempting windows of opportunity for unaffected states while leaving others weaker and therefore vulnerable. Instead, it is making all governments more pessimistic about their short- to medium-term prospects. Because states often go to war out of sense of overconfidence (however misplaced it sometimes turns out to be), pandemic-induced pessimism should be conducive to peace. Moreover, by its very nature war requires states to assemble lots of people in close proximity—at training camps, military bases, mobilization areas, ships at sea, etc.—and that’s not something you want to do in the middle of a pandemic. For the moment at least, beleaguered governments of all types are focusing on convincing their citizens they are doing everything in their power to protect the public from the disease. Taken together, these considerations might explain why even an impulsive and headstrong warmaker like Saudi Arabia’s Mohammed bin Salman has gotten more interested in winding down his brutal and unsuccessful military campaign in Yemen. Posen adds that COVID-19 is also likely to reduce international trade in the short to medium term. Those who believe economic interdependence is a powerful barrier to war might be alarmed by this development, but he points out that trade issues have been a source of considerable friction in recent years—especially between the United States and China—and a degree of decoupling might reduce tensions somewhat and cause the odds of war to recede. For these reasons, the pandemic itself may be conducive to peace. But what about the relationship between broader economic conditions and the likelihood of war? Might a few leaders still convince themselves that provoking a crisis and going to war could still advance either long-term national interests or their own political fortunes? Are the other paths by which a deep and sustained economic downturn might make serious global conflict more likely? One familiar argument is the so-called diversionary (or “scapegoat”) theory of war. It suggests that leaders who are worried about their popularity at home will try to divert attention from their failures by provoking a crisis with a foreign power and maybe even using force against it. Drawing on this logic, some Americans now worry that President Donald Trump will decide to attack a country like Iran or Venezuela in the run-up to the presidential election and especially if he thinks he’s likely to lose. This outcome strikes me as unlikely, even if one ignores the logical and empirical flaws in the theory itself. War is always a gamble, and should things go badly—even a little bit—it would hammer the last nail in the coffin of Trump’s declining fortunes. Moreover, none of the countries Trump might consider going after pose an imminent threat to U.S. security, and even his staunchest supporters may wonder why he is wasting time and money going after Iran or Venezuela at a moment when thousands of Americans are dying preventable deaths at home. Even a successful military action won’t put Americans back to work, create the sort of testing-and-tracing regime that competent governments around the world have been able to implement already, or hasten the development of a vaccine. The same logic is likely to guide the decisions of other world leader

s too. Another familiar folk theory is “military Keynesianism.” War generates a lot of economic demand, and it can sometimes lift depressed economies out of the doldrums and back toward prosperity and full employment. The obvious case in point here is World War II, which did help the U.S economy finally escape the quicksand of the Great Depression. Those who are convinced that great powers go to war primarily to keep Big Business (or the arms industry) happy are naturally drawn to this sort of argument, and they might worry that governments looking at bleak economic forecasts will try to restart their economies through some sort of military adventure. I doubt it. It takes a really big war to generate a significant stimulus, and it is hard to imagine any country launching a large-scale war—with all its attendant risks—at a moment when debt levels are already soaring. More importantly, there are lots of easier and more direct ways to stimulate the economy—infrastructure spending, unemployment insurance, even “helicopter payments”—and launching a war has to be one of the least efficient methods available. The threat of war usually spooks investors too, which any politician with their eye on the stock market would be loath to do. Economic downturns can encourage war in some special circumstances, especially when a war would enable a country facing severe hardships to capture something of immediate and significant value. Saddam Hussein’s decision to seize Kuwait in 1990 fits this model perfectly: The Iraqi economy was in terrible shape after its long war with Iran; unemployment was threatening Saddam’s domestic position; Kuwait’s vast oil riches were a considerable prize; and seizing the lightly armed emirate was exceedingly easy to do. Iraq also owed Kuwait a lot of money, and a hostile takeover by Baghdad would wipe those debts off the books overnight. In this case, Iraq’s parlous economic condition clearly made war more likely. Yet I cannot think of any country in similar circumstances today. Now is hardly the time for Russia to try to grab more of Ukraine—if it even wanted to—or for China to make a play for Taiwan, because the costs of doing so would clearly outweigh the economic benefits. Even conquering an oil-rich country—the sort of greedy acquisitiveness that Trump occasionally hints at—doesn’t look attractive when there’s a vast glut on the market. I might be worried if some weak and defenseless country somehow came to possess the entire global stock of a successful coronavirus vaccine, but that scenario is not even remotely possible. If one takes a longer-term perspective, however, a sustained economic depression could make war more likely by strengthening fascist or xenophobic political movements, fueling protectionism and hypernationalism, and making it more difficult for countries to reach mutually acceptable bargains with each other. The history of the 1930s shows where such trends can lead, although the economic effects of the Depression are hardly the only reason world politics took such a deadly turn in the 1930s. Nationalism, xenophobia, and authoritarian rule were making a comeback well before COVID-19 struck, but the economic misery now occurring in every corner of the world could intensify these trends and leave us in a more war-prone condition when fear of the virus has diminished. On balance, however, I do not think that even the extraordinary economic conditions we are witnessing today are going to have much impact on the likelihood of war. Why? First of all, if depressions were a powerful cause of war, there would be a lot more of the latter. To take one example, the United States has suffered 40 or more recessions since the country was founded, yet it has fought perhaps 20 interstate wars, most of them unrelated to the state of the economy. To paraphrase the economist Paul Samuelson’s famous quip about the stock market, if recessions were a powerful cause of war, they would have predicted “nine out of the last five (or fewer).” Second, states do not start wars unless they believe they will win a quick and relatively cheap victory. As John Mearsheimer showed in his classic book Conventional Deterrence, national leaders avoid war when they are convinced it will be long, bloody, costly, and uncertain. To choose war, political leaders have to convince themselves they can either win a quick, cheap, and decisive victory or achieve some limited objective at low cost. Europe went to war in 1914 with each side believing it would win a rapid and easy victory, and Nazi Germany developed the strategy of blitzkrieg in order to subdue its foes as quickly and cheaply as possible. Iraq attacked Iran in 1980 because Saddam believed the Islamic Republic was in disarray and would be easy to defeat, and George W. Bush invaded Iraq in 2003 convinced the war would be short, successful, and pay for itself. The fact that each of these leaders miscalculated badly does not alter the main point: No matter what a country’s economic condition might be, its leaders will not go to war unless they think they can do so quickly, cheaply, and with a reasonable probability of success. Third, and most important, the primary motivation for most wars is the desire for security, not economic gain. For this reason, the odds of war increase when states believe the long-term balance of power may be shifting against them, when they are convinced that adversaries are unalterably hostile and cannot be accommodated, and when they are confident they can reverse the unfavorable trends and establish a secure position if they act now. The historian A.J.P. Taylor once observed that “every war between Great Powers [between 1848 and 1918] … started as a preventive war, not as a war of conquest,” and that remains true of most wars fought since then. The bottom line: Economic conditions (i.e., a depression) may affect the broader political environment in which decisions for war or peace are made, but they are only one factor among many and rarely the most significant. Even if the COVID-19 pandemic has large, lasting, and negative effects on the world economy—as seems quite likely—it is not likely to affect the probability of war very much, especially in the short term.

#### B] Ceasefires and peace talks – COVID proves that pandemics incentivize them to avoid disease spread which caps global escalation.

Deirdre Shesgreen 20. Foreign Affairs Reporter at USA Today. 4/28/2020. “'War and disease travel together': Why the pandemic push for a global cease-fire is gaining ground.” https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/world/2020/04/28/coronavirus-un-secretary-wants-global-cease-fire-amid-pandemic/5163972002/. DOA: 9/4/2020. SIR.

When the head of the United Nations first called for a “global cease-fire” on March 23, it seemed like a quixotic quest that would fall on the deaf ears of warring guerrillas, militant terrorists and belligerent governments across the globe. But over the past month, fighters from Colombia to Ukraine have signaled a willingness to put down their weapons as the world confronts a deadly pandemic that could devastate civilian populations and armies alike. The 15-member U.N. Security Council may vote as early as this week on a resolution that demands an “immediate cessation of hostilities in all countries on its agenda” and calls for armed groups to engage in a 30-day cease-fire, according to a draft of the measure obtained by USA TODAY. Its fate is uncertain, and experts say it comes with many caveats and exceptions – including a loophole that could allow Russia to continue bombing civilians in Syria. Right now, world powers are still quibbling over several provisions. The Trump administration has objected to any language expressing support for the World Health Organization, among other provisions – disputes that could sink or stall the effort. President Donald Trump has blasted the WHO being biased toward China and accepting Beijing's statements about the coronavirus outbreak at face value. A State Department official declined to comment on the draft, citing ongoing negotiations. The official, who was not authorized to speak on the record, said the Trump administration supports the call for a global cease-fire but wants to ensure it will not hinder U.S. counterterrorism missions. If it passes, experts say its impact could be significant – albeit not sweeping – during an otherwise bleak moment of global crisis. “This is not a piece of paper that’s going to save the planet, and it’s not even going to stop some of the nasty wars that are burning out there,” said Richard Gowan, an expert on the United Nations and peacekeeping with the International Crisis Group, a nonpartisan organization that seeks to prevent conflict. “But it’s at least something which could help ease middle-sized and smaller conflicts in countries ranging from Colombia to Sudan, where we know that armed groups are actually interested in pausing violence and talking about peace during the COVID crisis.” It could also help staunch the flow of refugees in some war-ravaged countries – and thus slow the spread of COVID-19, said Barry Posen, an international professor of political science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. "War and disease travel together and are usually causative," Posen said. While a global cease-fire may sound lofty and idealistic, he said, it's also quite practical, particularly in places like Syria and Yemen, where health care is scarce and civilians are extremely vulnerable to disease. "The intrusion of COVID into that situation would make what's already a horror show into an even bigger horror show," he said. "If you can do a little something to suppress these wars at the moment, you would also be doing a little something to suppress the disease." And because these conflicts are also producing refugees, it could help limit the further spread of the illness if civilians are not forced to flee conflict zones. In this handout image released by the United Nations, U.N. Secretary-General Antonio Guterres holds a virtual press conference on April 3, 2020, at UN headquarters in New York. Guterres Friday renewed his call for a global cease-fire, urging all parties to conflict to lay down arms and allow war-torn nations to combat the coronavirus pandemic. "The worst is yet to come," Guterres said, referring to countries beset with fighting like Syria, Libya and Yemen. "The COVID-19 storm is now coming to all these theatres of conflict." The United Nation's secretary-general, , has used both lofty rhetoric and harsh reality in his pitch for the cease-fire. "There should be only one fight in our world today: our shared battle against COVID-19," he said in an April 3 news briefing on his effort. French President Emmanuel Macron has also championed the cease-fire proposal. So far, about 16 armed groups and more than 100 countries have endorsed the measure, according to an informal tally kept by U.N. officials. A few examples: In Colombia, a left-wing rebel group known as the ELN agreed to a cease-fire starting April and said it would consider reviving peace talks with the government. In Yemen, one side of that brutal war – the Saudi Arabia-led coalition – agreed to a unilateral cease-fire for at least a month, to help control the spread of coronavirus in a country already ravaged by starvation and other diseases. The Houthis, backed by Iran, have not yet signed on. In Syria, the Kurdish-led Syrian Democratic Forces agreed to a cease-fire, saying its fighters would defend themselves against attacks but not engage in offensive military action. “We hope that this humanitarian truce will help to open the door for dialogue and political solution and to put an end to the war in the world and Syria,” the SDF said in a statement.

#### Disease resilience drives overpopulation---extinction through planetary overshoot

Helen Kopnina and Haydn Washington 16 {Helen Kopnina, Institute Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology. Haydn Washington, Interdisciplinary Environmental Studies, University of New South Wales. Published in Chinese Journal of Population Resources and Environment. 4-2-2016. “Discussing why population growth is still ignored or denied.” https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/10042857.2016.1149296}//JM

1. Introduction Population growth has been propelled by a number of factors, including developments in medicine since the nineteenth century (e.g. the discovery of antibiotics); relative peace since the Second World War; and more efficient food production propelled by the Green Revolution. Antibiotics have helped to rid humanity in most parts of the world from deadly pandemics such as cholera, plague, and tuberculosis. Today, while infectious diseases such as HIV, Ebola virus, and malaria are not yet overcome, survival chances of individuals suffering these diseases have been largely reduced. Noninfectious wealthy world diseases such as cancer and diabetes may be on the rise, yet due to better medical care, they do not necessarily condemn the patients to death. Better health, peace, and abundant food are all economic development benefits certainly something that we all celebrate. In the twentieth century, medical and resource constraints have become easier to manage with the Green Revolution which has enabled humans to produce (and throw away) much more food than Malthus could have imagined. In more contemporary writing, Childe (1951) saw population growth as dependent on subsistence, perceiving foragers as severely restricted by a low carrying capacity. The adoption of farming raised the carrying capacity and so made possible a “population explosion” (Netting 1977, p. 13). The economist Ester Boserup (1965) has emphasized that population growth causes a higher carrying capacity by forcing people to use land more intensively and to adopt technological innovations that make more intensive land use possible. Yet, the negative side of population growth has also been noted. Thomas Malthus’ (1798) An Essay on the Principle of Population, is one of the best-known and most criticized classical texts on population. Malthus postulated that there are certain “checks” on population expansion, emerging “from the difficulty of subsistence,” including struggle for resources, diseases, and starvation. As land and resources are not unlimited, checks of growth must be in place to avoid Malthusian “controls.” The publication of The Population Bomb (Ehrlich 1968; for an update see Ehrlich & Ehrlich 2009) and The Limits of Growth (published in 1972, for an update see Meadows et al. 2004), linked some Malthusian ideas to the twentieth-century sustainability issues. The Population Bomb offered a model warning that technology may not be sufficient to curtail the devastating effects of increasing populations. Although they were labeled “extremists” and alarmists at the time (Ehrlich and Ehrlich (2014), today we see that their predictions for environmental damage due to excessive population growth, technological and industrial “innovations” to be right on the pulse of global concerns. Expanding population can become a threat to humanity itself, as it undermines its own resource base, ultimately leading to the reassertion of “natural” controls. A well-known anthropologist Gregory Bateson (1972) noted how when faced with challenges of altered natural conditions, we tend to focus on modifying our environment rather than ourselves. Bateson argued that these basic causes of environmental crisis lie in the combined action of (a) technological advance, (b) population increase, and (c) conventional (but wrong) ideas about the “nature of man” and his relation to the environment. While technological advance has created unintended but extremely destructive effects on the environment, population increase has exacerbated the challenges. The present way of thinking about the primacy of economic agendas has made the challenge of demographic sustainability even more urgent. As Ehrlich and Ehrlich (2014) have long pointed out, the environmental impact is population times consumption, and we cannot ignore either. During the 1972 United Nations Conference on the Human Environment (the Earth Summit), international agendas integrating population and sustainability were proposed. These international agendas challenged the fundamental fallacy infecting industrial capitalism, that unlimited growth both of population and the economy is possible on a planet of finite resources. As Bateson (1972, p. 497) has observed, the very first requirement for ecological stability is a balance between the rates of birth and death. For better or for worse, we have tampered with the death rate, especially by controlling the major epidemic diseases and the death of infants. Today, there is a growing proportional difference between the number of people on earth (over 7 billion) and the number of nonhumans, especially apex predators left in the wild. While the apex predators are normally checked by environmental constraints, this is not the case for a population of humans. It seems that “the bigger the population, the faster it grows; the more technology we have, the faster the rate of new invention; and the more we believe in our ‘power’ over an enemy environment, the more ‘power’ we seem to have and the more spiteful the environment seems to be” (Bateson 1972, p. 494). However, recently, it seems that linking population and sustainability have become controversial. Policy documents issued by the United Nation’s Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) do not seriously address population issues. At the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (also called Rio+20) in June 2012, among the problems discussed was a concern with agricultural productivity and efficiency, and the necessity to provide food for a growing population. There was practically no discussion about stabilizing and then reducing population, as if concerns with habitat destruction and biodiversity loss were somehow “unconnected” to it, when in fact they are a key driver. In fact, the focus lay on “sustainable growth,” redefined more inclusively with a special focus on the “bottom billion.” Likewise, the most recent “Degrowth” conference in Leipzig had little discussion of population as a key driver of environmental degradation. UNEP (2014) takes a somewhat contradictory attitude to population and environment. On the one hand, the report states: “A major driver of the overall increase in raw material extraction and use is population numbers. The world’s, and each country’s, material use is tightly coupled to the number of inhabitants.”

#### Disease resilience forecloses effective responses to bioweapon attacks

Grotto and Tucker, ‘6 Andrew J. Grotto, a Senior National Security Analyst at the Center for American Progress, where he specializes in U.S. strategic policy and nonproliferation, J.D. from the University of California at Berkeley (Boalt Hall), his M.P.A. from Harvard University’s John F. Kennedy School of Government, and his B.A. from the University of Kentuck, and Jonathan B. Tucker, a Senior Fellow in the Washington, D.C. office of the Center for Nonproliferation Studies (CNS), where he specializes in biological and chemical weapons issues, a B.S. in biology from Yale University and a Ph.D. in political science with a concentration in defense and arms control studies from M.I.T, June 2006, Biosecurity A Comprehensive Action Plan, Center for American Progress, <https://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/kf/BIOSECURITY_A_COMPREHENSIVE_ACTION_PLAN.PDF>, EO

The U.S. public health system is currently incapable of mounting a timely, effective response to major infectious disease threats, despite incremental improvements since 9/11. Ironically, the system is in part a victim of its own success. Some 40 years ago, public hospitals and clinical laboratories provided an effective early-warning network for detecting and containing the major epidemic threats of the time, such as polio and measles. But the sharp decline of these high-profile diseases in the United States, brought about by the widespread use of antibiotics and vaccination, led to a sense of complacency. Leaders in Congress and the executive branch mistakenly came to view infectious disease as a problem of the developing world and not as a threat to the U.S. homeland. As a result, financial support for the nation’s health departments dried up, making the current public health infrastructure ill-equipped to address the twin 21st century threats of emerging infectious diseases and bioterrorism. The rising cost and privatization of health care also contributed to the problem by eliminating incentives for private hospitals to maintain the surge capacity needed to cope with major epidemics.

Biological Weapons: the state-level threat Since antiquity, militaries have used infectious disease as a weapon. (See Box above.) Although no state has used a biological weapon in battle since the end of World War II, both the United States and the Soviet Union developed and stockpiled biological weapons during the Cold War. Prior to the 99 Persian Gulf war, Saddam Hussein’s Iraq produced and weaponized large quantities of biological warfare agents, including concentrated slurries of anthrax bacteria, botulinum toxin, and aflatoxin. Efforts to control biological arms came in the wake of the horrors of WWI. In 95, the League of Nations negotiated the Geneva Protocol, which banned the use in war of both chemical and bacteriological weapons but permitted their continued development, production, and stockpiling. It was not until November 969 that the United States, under President Richard M. Nixon, unilaterally renounced and pledged to dismantle its offensive biowarfare program, while retaining strictly defensive activities. The rationale for doing so was strategically sound. On the one hand, biological weapons had limited military utility on the battlefield because of their delayed effects and inherent unpredictability caused by the vagaries of the wind and weather. On the other hand, sophisticated biological weapons had the potential to inflict mass casualties when used on a large scale against cities. By serving as a “poor man’s atomic bomb,” such weapons could enable weaker powers to pose a strategic threat to the United States. It was therefore in the interest of the U.S. and other developed countries to delegitimate biological weapons before they spread widely. After the unilateral U.S. renunciation in 969, a United Nations disarmament forum negotiated the 97 Biological Weapons Convention (BWC), a multilateral treaty banning the development, possession, stockpiling, and transfer of “microbial or other biological agents, or toxins whatever their origin or method of production, of types and in quantities that have no justification for prophylactic, protective or other peaceful purposes.” The BWC, which entered into force in 1975, also categorically prohibits the development and production of specialized munitions and delivery systems for such agents and toxins. As of June 006, 155 countries (including the United States) have signed and ratified the treaty, and an additional 16 countries have signed but not yet ratified.7 As a result, the BWC has come to embody the international norm against the development and possession of biological weapons. Yet according to an unclassified estimate, seven countries (China, Egypt, Iran, Israel, North Korea, Russia, and Syria) are alleged to have offensive biowarfare programs at various levels of sophistication, ranging from research and development to an active stockpile.8 Of these countries, four are parties to the BWC (China, Iran, North Korea, and Russia). Such illicit programs pose a serious threat to international security. A possessor state might employ biological weapons either overtly or covertly, deadly pathogens might leak accidentally from a clandestine production facility, as occurred in 979 in the Soviet city of Sverdlovsk, or a terrorist group might steal deadly agents from a state program. (See Box, page 5.) Another dimension of the threat posed by state-sponsored biowarfare programs is the pool of specialized expertise and technology they create. Until at least 99, the former Soviet Union and then Russia possessed the world’s largest and most sophisticated BW program. This massive effort included four military microbiological institutes run by the Ministry of Defense and more than 50 research and production facilities operated by a state pharmaceutical company called Biopreparat, which operated under civilian cover but was secretly engaged in offensive BW activities. Although the Biopreparat facilities were either dismantled or converted to peaceful research in the early 990s, the Ministry of Defense’s research centers remain off-limits to Westerners and remain a focus of lingering suspicion. In addition, the Soviet biowarfare program left behind a dangerous legacy, including collections of dangerous pathogens that could be at risk of theft or diversion to other states or terrorist organizations.

#### If they’re right about the capacity for diseases to cause extinction---bioterror massively outweighs on probability

Anders **Sandberg 18**. Future of Humanity Institute, University of Oxford. 02/26/2018. “Human Extinction from Natural Hazard Events.” Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Natural Hazard Science. oxfordre.com, doi:10.1093/acrefore/9780199389407.013.293.

Viruses with longer incubation times, higher infectiousness, and case fatality rates are known: while a super-pandemic combining all these properties may be unlikely, it does not seem biologically impossible. In addition, deliberate alterations of different viruses have successfully increased transmissibility and lethality, or reduced treatability: the major biological extinction risk may be deliberately engineered pathogens rather than natural.

#### Hold the line on the 1AC Sherman – cites no scientific studies surrounding the impact of a nuclear war- it just asserts that it will be catastrophic

#### US strikes would catch Chinese nukes on the ground in a crisis – knocks out their arsenal and prevents escalation

Keir A. Lieber and Daryl G. Press 2007; Associate Professor in the Security Studies Program at Georgetown, and Associate Professor of Government at Dartmouth College Keir A. Lieber and Daryl G. Press, “US Nuclear Primacy and the Future of the Chinese Deterrent” China Security; Issue 5

Ironically, one of the clearest explanations for how the United States may use nuclear primacy in a crisis or war with China appears in an earlier article by Blair. His recent article with Chen labels our suggestion that the United States might use nuclear threats “the ze- nith of provocation” and “unthinkable.” ?? However, in the autumn 2005 issue of China Security, Blair describes exactly the crisis dynamics we envision leading to U.S. nuclear threats and perhaps even a preemptive nuclear attack. He notes that if China were to alert its strategic nuclear forces during a war with the United States over Taiwan, “the United States would likely act to beat China to the punch.” He continues, “Given constant U.S. surveillance of Chinese nuclear launch sites, any major Chinese preparations to fire peremptorily would be detected and countered by a rapid U.S. preemptive strike against the sites by U.S. conventional or nuclear forces… The United States could easily detect and react inside of the lengthy launch cycle time of Chinese forces.” Blair’s words mirror our argument and suggest the two ways that nuclear primacy may benefit the United States. First, if the Chinese were to threaten nuclear escalation in the context of a Taiwan war, the U.S. could strike first and likely destroy the Chinese force on the ground – “beat China to the punch,” as Blair puts it. Second, China’s knowledge of its vulnerability to nuclear preemption might prevent China from alerting its nuclear force – or even attacking Taiwan – in the first place.

#### We could easily wipe out China’s nuclear delivery vehicles

Charles L. Glaser August 2016; professor in the Elliott School of International Affairs and the Department of Political Science at George Washington University; he directs the Elliott School’s Institute for Security and Conflict Studies. “Forgoing U.S. Damage- Limitation against China’s Nuclear Weapons” This policy brief is based on “Should the United States Reject MAD? Damage Limitation and U.S. Nuclear Strategy toward China” which will appear in the summer 2016 issue of International Security. Belfer Center, Harvard University.

China currently deploys about 20 silo-based intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) and 25 mobile ICBMs capable of delivering warheads against cities in the United States. China is modernizing and expanding its ICBM force, which is predicted to reach 100 mobile ICBMs by 2030, and may soon deploy up to 60 submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) on its new generation of ballistic missile submarines. China’s silo-based missiles are highly vulnerable to attacks from extremely accurate U.S. nuclear missiles; China’s current-genera- tion ballistic missile submarine is also likely to be highly vulnerable to U.S. anti-submarine warfare capabilities. Consequently, for at least the next decade, China’s ability to launch retaliatory strikes will depend on the survivability of its mobile ICBMs.

#### US-China war is inevitable---they’re planning an attack now. War now prevents a devastating increase in capabilities---specifically--- they’ll get *autonomous submarines*.

Michael Snyder 18, J.D. University of Florida Law School, "Russia And China Are Developing Impressive New Weapons Systems", TTS, http://www.thetruthseeker.co.uk/?p=175056

Now let’s talk about China for a few moments. The Chinese are developing autonomous AI robotic subs that will be capable of hitting targets anywhere on the entire globe… China is developing large, smart and relatively low-cost unmanned submarines that can roam the world’s oceans to perform a wide range of missions, from reconnaissance to mine placement to even suicide attacks against enemy vessels, according to scientists involved in these artificial intelligence (AI) projects. The autonomous robotic submarines are expected to be deployed in the early 2020s. While not intended to entirely replace human-operated submarines, they will challenge the advantageous position established by Western naval powers after the second world war. The robotic subs are aimed particularly at the United States forces in strategic waters like the South China Sea and western Pacific Ocean, the researchers said. Since they do not require human crews, these robotic subs will be able to be operated at a very low cost. And this is part of China’s long-term plan to ultimately be able to win a war against the United States

. Last month, leaked Chinese documents gave us some insight into what they are planning… The documents read: “As we open up and expand our national interests beyond borders, we desperately need a comprehensive protection of our own security around the globe.” The report adds a military expansion will allow China to “more effectively create a situation, manage a crisis, contain a conflict, win a war, defend the expansion of our country’s strategic interests in an all-round fashion and realise the goals set by the party and Chairman Xi”. At this point, even the brass at the Pentagon admits that the Chinese military is training “for strikes against US and allied targets”… China is actively developing its fleet of long-range bombers and “likely” training its pilots for missions targeting the US, according to a new Pentagon report. “Over the last three years, the People’s Liberation Army (PLA) has rapidly expanded its overwater bomber operating areas, gaining experience in critical maritime regions and likely training for strikes against US and allied targets,” the report said. Of course, we don’t know everything, and the Russians and the Chinese are inevitably developing systems that will end up being a complete surprise during the next world war. For instance, some U.S. officials are speculating that a strange Russian satellite that is behaving very unusually may be some sort of a weapon… A mysterious Russian satellite displaying “very abnormal behaviour” has raised alarm in the US, according to a State Department official. “We don’t know for certain what it is and there is no way to verify it,” said assistant secretary Yleem Poblete at a conference in Switzerland on 14 August. She voiced fears that it was impossible to say if the object may be a weapon. Meanwhile, gridlock in Washington has produced a military that is deeply unprepared for a conflict between the superpowers. The following excerpt comes from a recent piece by Dr Peter Vincent Pry… • Since the Cold War, U.S. strategic bomber bases have declined from 45 to 3, making a Russian first strike much easier. • Since the Cold War, U.S. ballistic missile submarines have declined from 30-40 to 14 today, scheduled to decline to 12 in the future, enough to sustain daily patrols by only 4-6 boats to deter surprise attack. • Russia’s modern ICBMs have yield-accuracy combinations enabling them to make a surprise first-strike destroying all U.S. bombers, ICBMs and submarines at port (one-half to two-thirds of all submarines). • Russia has advanced Third Generation nuclear weapons, such as Super-EMP warheads, that could paralyze U.S. nuclear forces, including strategic C3 necessary for any surviving U.S. submarines at sea to retaliate. • Russia has at least a tenfold advantage in tactical nuclear weapons, and at least a twofold advantage in overall numbers of nuclear weapons. If we continue down this path, it is entirely possible that someday the Russians or the Chinese may conclude that a surprise first strike on the United States is possible and that a nuclear war is entirely winnable.