# 1NC TFA State Round 3

## 1

### Theory

#### Interpretation – Debaters may not read that aff theory is drop the debater, no RVIs, Competing Interps and Aff theory first.

#### Violation – Their UV

#### 1] Standards –

#### a] Infinite Abuse - They can read a theory shell that’s DTD/no RVI/CI that means their standard automatically comes before any 1NC standard since aff theory comes first, it also means it comes as the highest layer because I can’t weigh between other shells because the aff has the highest theory layer. So, if they read a shell that I violate in the 1AR I will lose because they have the highest layer, and I can’t get offense on that layer.

#### Paradigm issues –

#### Fairness – its constitutive to debate as competitive activity that requires objective evaluation. Controls the I/L to education because you don’t learn from an already skewed round.

#### DTD – a] deters future abuse b] my strat has already been skewed so it’s the only way to rectify the abuse

#### Competing interps – a] reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation b] reasonability collapses since brightlines operate on an offense-defense paradigm

#### No RVIs – a] Forces the 1NC to go all-in on Theory which kills substance education, b] Encourages Baiting since the 1AC will purposely be abusive, and c] Illogical – you shouldn’t win for not being abusive. No time skew – not unique to theory, any other 2NR collapses split the 2AR. No Reciprocity – topicality doesn’t justify an RVI, and you get things like 1AC theory and minor balances in debate are inevitable

## 2

### FW

#### Hijacking prag – it concludes death outweighs

#### 1] Death is the lack of value – deliberation necessitates existence and the ability to deliberate

Reck ’15 Reck, Andrew. “A Contextualist Thanatology: A Pragmatic Approach to Death and Dying.” Taylor & Francis, 10 Feb. 2015, www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07481187708252903?journalCode=udst19. // Lindale PP

Viewed from the modern American standpoint, life is the ground of all our values and death is a limiting condition. The approach discussed in this paper is pragmatic and hence contextualistic. Denying the value of death but accepting its reality, the author points to dying, not death, as the problematic phenomenon with which a pragmatist thanatology must deal. Focusing on the dying individual as the core context, other related contexts are recognized and examined: the medical, the religious, and the familial (including Mends as well as relatives). It is suggested that dying contains opportunities for growth-for the dying as well as for their surviving friends and relatives. In dying, the tragic sense of life may be most poignantly felt, not in the sense that life is ultimately doomed (for that is pathetic and not tragic), but in the sense that, though ending for the individual, life is ultimately valuable. The “ambivalence and the escapism of modem Western man regarding death” are well known (1, p. 317). American civilization, the epitome of modernity, accords little recognition to death as a value. At its worst the contemporary American attitude toward death adds to the anguish of the dying who not only are callously shuffled aside by the nondying but also are bereft themselves of self-understanding or favorable self-regard. Dying is considered obscene, and expensive funeral rites are indulged in to deny the reality of death. The attitude is confused; the denial of the value of death is mistaken for the denial of the reality of death. Behind the modem attitude, confused as it is, lies the truism that death is no value. Other civilizations have fostered different attitudes, according to which death is esteemed more than life. Such attitudes, so alien to the modern mind, have found expression in the Socratic definition of philosophy as the pursuit of death! and in the medieval view of life as a vale of tears. By contrast, modem man accentuates the value of life. Indeed, life is the ground of all our values. Death, then, is a limiting condition. As such it may impose upon man, as some existentialists have insisted, the need to choose, since life is temporally finite. But death creates no values, although the choices of the living may. Although death is a reality, it has the reality of a limit .that is to be avoided as long as possible. While death is inevitable for every man, it need not happen now.

#### 2] It’s intrinsic to Pragmatism – terminates the need of values from other people

Reck ’15 Reck, Andrew. “A Contextualist Thanatology: A Pragmatic Approach to Death and Dying.” Taylor & Francis, 10 Feb. 2015, www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07481187708252903?journalCode=udst19. // Lindale PP

Pragmatism is the philosophy appropriate to American civilization with its conception of life as the ground of all value. It is, in fact, the outgrowth of 19th century Lebensphilosophie shaped by Darwinian principles of biological evolution. These principles center on survival as the goal for all organic behavior. Pragmatism is the specific elaboration of the scientific theory of evolution in the fields of psychology, epistemology, and value theory. Mind is construed to be the function of organisms interacting with their environment and seeking to survive. Cognition is interpreted to occur in organisms with complex cerebral structure; it emerges only when action is blocked and seeks to solve the problem obstructing action so that the organism may resume its action. Values are naturalized, rooted in the processes of nature and of life, satisfying the desires and impulses of dynamic organisms. Within the pragmatic framework, the death of an organism signals the cessation of all activity and of all value for it. Death is absolute and irrevocable. It is the termination of all enjoyment of value for the dead. Death, however, is not mysterious. On the contrary, it is in principle thoroughly explicable, each case amenable to autopsy and medical analysis. The pragmatic attitude toward death, while denying its value, does not deny its reality. With value placed supremely on life the pragmatic philosophy stresses the development of a technology to prolong life and to avoid death as long as possible. The upshot is not that longevity is the only value, but that it is the main value. Sacrifice of life is justifiable only if other life-perhaps better life-is preserved. The case for a pragmatic approach to death and dying is most persuasive. In general and for the long run, the strategy of prolonging life and avoiding death is the best. That death is inevitable for every person does not mean that it is useless to ward off death as long as possible, because then life would be brief and brutish indeed, and the medical arts untended.

#### 3] It maximizes deliberation – a person cannot grow from deliberating with others during the process of dying

Reck ‘15

Reck, Andrew. “A Contextualist Thanatology: A Pragmatic Approach to Death and Dying.” Taylor & Francis, 10 Feb. 2015, www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07481187708252903?journalCode=udst19. // Lindale PP

The pragmatic approach to death and dying, therefore, is oriented to the preservation of life and to the promotion of the value of growth. It seeks to solve the problems that surround the dying, and it proposes to do so by means of a contextualist analysis which demarcates different kinds of thanatological problems. It calls for greater employment of psychiatry in meeting the needs of the dying. It does not deny the reality of death, but it suggests that dying contains opportunities for growth-for the dying as well as for their surviving friends and relatives. In dying, the tragic sense of life may be most poignantly felt, not in the sense that life is ultimately doomed (for that sense is pathetic and not tragic), but in the sense that, though ending for the individual, life is ultimately valuable.

#### 4] Materialism Double Bind – either a) they care about death and see it as the worst impact under their framework which means the DAs/Case turns still apply or b) they do not care about death and do not see it as the worst impact under their framework which means they justify atrocities or simply ignore them because death isn’t bad – means you should drop their framework for being morally repugnant.

#### 5] Hijack Empirics – if different people have different conceptions of morality that inevitably interconnect to find a moral truth we should preserve our ability to find that truth – means extinction comes first

MacAskill 14, [William, Oxford Philosopher and youngest tenured philosopher in the world, Normative Uncertainty, 2014]

The human race might go extinct from a number of causes: asteroids, supervolcanoes, runaway climate change, pandemics, nuclear war, and the development and use of dangerous new technologies such as synthetic biology, all pose risks (even if very small) to the continued survival of the human race.184 And different moral views give opposing answers to question of whether this would be a good or a bad thing. It might seem obvious that human extinction would be a very bad thing, both because of the loss of potential future lives, and because of the loss of the scientific and artistic progress that we would make in the future. But the issue is at least unclear. The continuation of the human race would be a mixed bag: inevitably, it would involve both upsides and downsides. And if one regards it as much more important to avoid bad things happening than to promote good things happening then one could plausibly regard human extinction as a good thing.For example, one might regard the prevention of bads as being in general more important that the promotion of goods, as defended historically by G. E. Moore,185 and more recently by Thomas Hurka.186 One could weight the prevention of suffering as being much more important that the promotion of happiness. Or one could weight the prevention of objective bads, such as war and genocide, as being much more important than the promotion of objective goods, such as scientific and artistic progress. If the human race continues its future will inevitably involve suffering as well as happiness, and objective bads as well as objective goods. So, if one weights the bads sufficiently heavily against the goods, or if one is sufficiently pessimistic about humanity’s ability to achieve good outcomes, then one will regard human extinction as a good thing.187 However, even if we believe in a moral view according to which human extinction would be a good thing, we still have strong reason to prevent near-term human extinction. To see this, we must note three points. First, we should note that the extinction of the human race is an extremely high stakes moral issue. Humanity could be around for a very long time: if humans survive as long as the median mammal species, we will last another two million years. On this estimate, the number of humans in existence in the The future, given that we don’t go extinct any time soon, would be 2×10^14. So if it is good to bring new people into existence, then it’s very good to prevent human extinction. Second, human extinction is by its nature an irreversible scenario. If we continue to exist, then we always have the option of letting ourselves go extinct in the future (or, perhaps more realistically, of considerably reducing population size). But if we go extinct, then we can’t magically bring ourselves back into existence at a later date. Third, we should expect ourselves to progress, morally, over the next few centuries, as we have progressed in the past. So we should expect that in a few centuries’ time we will have better evidence about how to evaluate human extinction than we currently have. Given these three factors, it would be better to prevent the near-term extinction of the human race, even if we thought that the extinction of the human race would actually be a very good thing. To make this concrete, I’ll give the following simple but illustrative model. Suppose that we have 0.8 credence that it is a bad thing to produce new people, and 0.2 certain that it’s a good thing to produce new people; and the degree to which it is good to produce new people, if it is good, is the same as the degree to which it is bad to produce new people, if it is bad. That is, I’m supposing, for simplicity, that we know that one new life has one unit of value; we just don’t know whether that unit is positive or negative. And let’s use our estimate of 2×10^14 people who would exist in the future, if we avoid near-term human extinction. Given our stipulated credences, the expected benefit of letting the human race go extinct now would be (.8-.2)×(2×10^14) = 1.2×(10^14). Suppose that, if we let the human race continue and did research for 300 years, we would know for certain whether or not additional people are of positive or negative value. If so, then with the credences above we should think it 80% likely that we will find out that it is a bad thing to produce new people, and 20% likely that we will find out that it’s a good thing to produce new people. So there’s an 80% chance of a loss of 3×(10^10) (because of the delay of letting the human race go extinct), the expected value of which is 2.4×(10^10). But there’s also a 20% chance of a gain of 2×(10^14), the expected value of which is 4×(10^13). That is, in expected value terms, the cost of waiting for a few hundred years is vanishingly small compared with the benefit of keeping one’s options open while one gains new information.

#### 6] Death outweighs — A] Agents can’t act if they fear for their bodily security—my framework constrains every NC and K and B] It’s the worst form of evil:

Paterson 3 – Department of Philosophy, Providence College, Rhode Island (Craig, “A Life Not Worth Living?”, Studies in Christian Ethics.

Contrary to those accounts, I would argue that it is death per se that is really the objective evil for us, not because it deprives us of a prospective future of overall good judged better than the alter- native of non-being. It cannot be about harm to a former person who has ceased to exist, for no person actually suffers from the sub-sequent non-participation. Rather, death in itself is an evil to us because it ontologically destroys the current existent subject — it is the ultimate in metaphysical lightening strikes.80 The evil of death is truly an ontological evil borne by the person who already exists, independently of calculations about better or worse possible lives. Such an evil need not be consciously experienced in order to be an evil for the kind of being a human person is. Death is an evil because of the change in kind it brings about, a change that is destructive of the type of entity that we essentially are. Anything, whether caused naturally or caused by human intervention (intentional or unintentional) that drastically interferes in the process of maintaining the person in existence is an objective evil for the person. What is crucially at stake here, and is dialectically supportive of the self-evidency of the basic good of human life, is that death is a radical interference with the current life process of the kind of being that we are. In consequence, death itself can be credibly thought of as a ‘primitive evil’ for all persons, regardless of the extent to which they are currently or prospectively capable of participating in a full array of the goods of life.81  In conclusion, concerning willed human actions, it is justifiable to state that any intentional rejection of human life itself cannot therefore be warranted since it is an expression of an ultimate disvalue for the subject, namely, the destruction of the present person; a radical ontological good that we cannot begin to weigh objectively against the travails of life in a rational manner. To deal with the sources of disvalue (pain, suffering, etc.) we should not seek to irrationally destroy the person, the very source and condition of all human possibility.82

#### That outweighs – even if they win those consequences come second, the act of dying precludes their offence on face

#### Prag is a meta-ethic, not a normative claim – just because we need deliberation to determine ethics it doesn’t mean that it is our end goal in ethics, it just means it is a step toward reaching the conclusion of the hijack

## 3

### CP

#### 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.

#### 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.

## 4

### CP

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

#### Advocating for a particular Solution suspends Objectivity in favor of Partial Campaigning.

Salvesen 18, Ingerid. "Should journalists campaign on climate change." (2018). (Ingerid Salvesen has written and produced stories for several of Norway´s biggest newspapers and media companies. Before she chose freelancing she worked, amongst others, as a foreign affairs reporter for the leading Norwegian news agency, NTB, and as a long form writer for the Magazine of Norway´s largest business daily, Dagens Næringsliv. As a journalist, she is interested in questions of environment, migration and inequality, and has increasingly been covering climate change science and politics. Together with two journalist colleagues, she started an independent foreign affairs podcast in 2016 called "Du verden!".)//Elmer

Still, it was not just climate science generally the Guardian embraced in its campaign, but a specific policy proposal – and this was met with criticism at the time. Yet Alan Rusbridger argue that it is acceptable for editorial objectivity to be suspended on matters which has such profound moral and social consequences as climate change arguably does have, and he likened it with apartheid and tobacco: “You can view this in two ways. One is that this is a moral issue, like tobacco and apartheid - you should not have your money with these companies, as they are irresponsible. Or you can argue that it is financially recklessness - these are stranded assets and if you are investing in a long-term perspective you are being irresponsible. We are not going to be neutral about that, or impartial about that – this is a campaign and here is what you can do” His latter point was one of the key arguments for running the KIITG-campaign: the perceived benefits of offering people an actionable alternative. The journalists in favour argued it would make the project stand out from normal journalism on climate change where you are mainly just offered (more of the same) information, and also it was argued it could break the feeling of hopelessness that they thought the public (and even many of the journalists themselves) were feeling when reading about climate change. “The advantages of a news organisation stepping into an advocacy role is that you provide a mechanism for taking action”, says Aron Pilhofer. “A campaign gives people agency and ownership and something that they can touch”, argued James Randerson.

#### Solution Journalism solves Climate Change and Deforestation.

Lake 17 Rebecca Lake. CONSTRUCTIVE NEWS: CAN SOLUTIONS JOURNALISM SAVE OUR FORESTS?. <https://www.un-page.org/constructive-news-can-solutions-journalism-save-our-forests?fbclid=IwAR1v5jjkjQ_CxDeUJZaMzQdDG_1mdbYfmpzqYsSFvWRYN2aszSAFAffFpq4> [UNDP Communications Consultant]

Everyday day we are bombarded with devasting news about our natural world. From the latest IPBES report which warned of ‘unprecedented’ species extinction to mass deforestation and the rise of global temperatures, the daily cycle of bad news is relentless. And the research says audiences are switching off in droves because of this. According to a recent study conducted by the Reuters Institute, nearly 50 per cent of survey respondents said they currently avoid the news media because it had a negative effect on their moods. Almost a third said they avoided news because it made them feel helpless. Can a different approach to journalism, one which presents potential solutions alongside the problems, bring readers back and ultimately inspire change? Giselle Green, Editor of Constructive Voices, says news that only conveys doom and gloom isn’t actually telling us the entire story. She is among a growing cohort of journalism practitioners calling for more solutions to be featured alongside traditional news stories. “Basically constructive journalism, sometimes referred to as solutions reporting, is all about how journalism can react to problems,” explains the former BBC journalist. “It’s rigorous reporting, it’s not just fluffy stories that make you smile. It should spark a constructive response among audiences.” Some of the world’s biggest media organizations are already experimenting with a solutions approach. This includes the Guardian’s Upside series, which aims to seek out answers, solutions, movements and initiatives to some of the biggest problems besetting the world. In this series, articles ranges from ‘A new leaf: the hardy trees reforesting the Amazon’ to global examples of where carbon taxes are actually popular. Documentary films about climate change such as the recently released 2040 — by acclaimed Australian filmmaker Damon Gameau — are also looking to inspire audiences by showing viewers what’s possible with solutions that already exist. From regenerative farming to independent community solar power grids, 2040 presents just a small handful of climate solutions that have the potential to inspire and empower audiences worldwide. Nevertheless, many journalists and media outlets remain sceptical. Some claim that the approach can devolve into biased or “feel-good” advocacy, rather than a critical examination of important social issues that hold the powerful to account. However, proponents of solutions journalism argue that while the approach doesn’t necessarily try to uncover ‘hidden information’ or scandalous wrongdoings, it can still be influential by showcasing what governments and business could and should be doing. To further explore the potential of solutions journalism in the context of climate change and deforestation, the UNDP’s Green Commodities Programme, with the Good Growth Partnership, facilitated a shared learning experience in the Peruvian Amazon for eight international journalists. The initiative began with a two-day workshop in Lima, where selected journalists had the opportunity to consider the powerful role international media plays in reporting deforestation predominately driven by agricultural commodities. Despite extensive efforts over the past decade to slow tropical deforestation, the latest findings from WRI’s Global Forest Watch report paint a grim picture. Around 12 million hectares of forest in the world's tropical regions were lost in 2018, equivalent to 30 football fields per minute. Yet, while the urgency to halt deforestation is increasingly dominating headlines, the why and the how of doing so – the solution focus — is not as well known. Throughout the workshop – which was co-hosted by the Thomson Reuters Foundation and supported by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and Partnership for Action on Green Economy (PAGE) — the journalists were encouraged to consider the solutions for key sustainability and development issues in major agricultural commodity supply chains. Led by Sara El-Khalili of the Thomson Reuters Foundation, workshop guest speakers included Giselle Green of Constructive Voices, Paul Dickinson, Founder and Executive Chair of CDP (formerly the Carbon Disclosure Project). Deep insights into sustainability issues in Peru were provided by James Leslie, UNDP-Peru’s Technical Advisor on Ecosystems and Climate Change. After attending the opening high-level session of the Good Growth Conference in Lima — where the journalists had the opportunity to interview the Ministers of Environment and Agriculture from Peru and Ecuador — the reporters journeyed into the Amazon to put what they had learned about solutions journalism into practice. For Alejandra Agudo Lazareno, a reporter for Spain’s El Pais daily newspaper, ‘solutions journalism’ isn’t entirely a new concept. “In Planeta Futuro we regularly write pieces with positive points of view. But it’s not something I usually consider in the case deforestation and commodities,” she explained. “In general, this experience has been a great opportunity to gain new knowledge from other news outlets and learn more about the ways in which humanity is trying to do the right thing for the planet,” said Alejandra whose story was inspired by the successful sustainable development strategies being implemented in Peru’s San Martin region. This immersive approach to learning conducted in the heart of one of the world’s most important ecosystems is a defining feature of the Good Growth Conference. Being in the Amazon helped conference delegates, and journalists, gain a deeper connection to their work as well as the resilience and motivation needed to sustain collective efforts for change. For Bhimanto Suwastoyo of the Palm Scribe, the Good Growth Journalism Initiativeprovided a valuable opportunity to understand the deforestation challenge from different angles and perspectives. During his time in Peru, the Indonesian journalist reported on how the small Amazonian community of Chazuta transitioned from illicit coca production (for cocaine) to sustainable cocoa. “My takeaway from the training, and the Good Growth Conference, is that nothing beats on-site learning visits to motivate solution-based journalism and that the best solutions to problems, in any field, usually involve as many stakeholders as possible working together to arrive at the solution.” “I will now approach a story by first looking at it through the lenses of a number of different perspectives,” explained Bhimanto whose publication, The Palm Scribe, aims to help the palm oil sector foster a healthier and more constructive public discourse. Eromo Egbejule, West Africa Editor of The Africa Report, used his time in the Amazon to examine new approaches to sustainable agriculture in Latin America which could be applied across the Atlantic. “One of the biggest takeaways I gained from participating in the Good Growth Journalism Initiative was being exposed to what’s already being achieved in Peru and neighbouring countries.” “I heard Costa Rica’s remarkable story. The country managed to reverse what was one of the highest deforestation rates in the world, with radical reforms backed by political willpower. It’s a lesson countries in Africa ought to learn.” Eromo detailed his findings in an article he published in the Africa Report: Lessons on political willpower from Costa Rica and Peru. Meanwhile Fabiano Maisonnave, Amazon correspondent for Folha de São Paulo, used his time at the Good Growth Conference to investigate the environmental impacts of the invasive tilapia fish species, which was introduced in Peru three decades ago. “I noticed that every restaurant in the small Amazonian community of Sauce was only serving one variety of fish [tilapia],” he explained. On the other side of the forest system, in the Brazilian state of Tocantins, officials are currently experimenting with how best to cultivate the foreign fish species which was previously banned and has already decimated native fish stocks in Peru and Bolivia. During the conference, Fabiano was able to observe an exchange of ideas between Peru’s San Martin Production Director, Raúl Belaunde, and Marcelo Soares, head of Tocantins State's environmental licensing agency in Brazil. Belaunde — who participated in and co-hosted the week-long event with the Governor — explained that the tilapia in his province is “impossible to control” and regretted his country’s decision to introduce it. “I don’t think the Tocantins representative was deterred, but at least the Peruvian government officials were able to share and recommend best practices which may help to mitigate some risks to Brazil’s Amazonian ecosystem,” explained Fabiano. Fabiano’s report quotes a number of Brazilian conservationists and regional experts who are urgently seeking more information about the risks of tilapia cultivation as they try to avoid the same fate as neighbouring Amazonian countries. For Switzerland-based journalist, Paula Dupraz-Dobias, the chance to speak with the indigenous leaders of San Martin’s Quechua community meant she was able to gain first-hand accounts and local wisdom directly from those who know the forests best. “Listening to - and reporting on - indigenous peoples may allow us to learn from their wisdom, particularly in how we can live from resources at our doorstep and better appreciate the fragility of our global environment.” she said when asked about the opportunity to visit the indigenous community of Alto Pucalpillo. “Unfortunately, very often the voices of indigenous communities are dismissed in global discussions on climate change and sustainable development goals. Hopefully our access as journalists to these communities can help project their voices - and wisdom -to a wider audience.”

#### 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.

## 5

### Theory

#### No 1AR Theory—-

#### 1~ The 2NR must overcover theory since they get 3 minute 2ar collapse on one of the layers and persuasiveness advantage of a 3 minute 2ar

#### 2~ Responses to my counter interp will be new which means 1ar theory necessitates intervention—-outweighs because it makes the decision arbitrary

#### 3~ I only have one chance to respond after it is introduced while they have two chances

#### 4~ Reject infinite abuse claims—a~ spikes solve—there are only so many theoretical issues anyway, b~ infinite abuse doesn't exist since there are a finite number of rounds, c~ if I win I can't engage in 1AR theory then you could never check infinite abuse since we can't use your shells to determine what's abusive d. Functional limits solves – I only have 7 minutes so I can’t be infinitely abusive

## Case

### 1NC – AT: Pandemics

#### Disease doesn’t cause extinction

Adalja 16 [Amesh Adalja is an infectious-disease physician at the University of Pittsburgh. Why Hasn't Disease Wiped out the Human Race? June 17, 2016. 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. So what would it take for a disease to wipe out humanity now? In Michael Crichton’s The Andromeda Strain, the canonical book in the disease-outbreak genre, an alien microbe threatens the human race with extinction, and humanity’s best minds are marshaled to combat the enemy organism. Fortunately, outside of fiction, there’s no reason to expect alien pathogens to wage war on the human race any time soon, and my analysis suggests that any real-life domestic microbe reaching an extinction level of threat probably is just as unlikely. Any apocalyptic pathogen would need to possess a very special combination of two attributes. First, it would have to be so unfamiliar that no existing therapy or vaccine could be applied to it. Second, it would need to have a high and surreptitious transmissibility before symptoms occur. The first is essential because any microbe from a known class of pathogens would, by definition, have family members that could serve as models for containment and countermeasures. The second would allow the hypothetical disease to spread without being detected by even the most astute clinicians. The three infectious diseases most likely to be considered extinction-level threats in the world today—influenza, HIV, and Ebola—don’t meet these two requirements. Influenza, for instance, despite its well-established ability to kill on a large scale, its contagiousness, and its unrivaled ability to shift and drift away from our vaccines, is still what I would call a “known unknown.” While there are many mysteries about how new flu strains emerge, from at least the time of Hippocrates, humans have been attuned to its risk. And in the modern era, a full-fledged industry of influenza preparedness exists, with effective vaccine strategies and antiviral therapies. HIV, which has killed 39 million people over several decades, is similarly limited due to several factors. Most importantly, HIV’s dependency on blood and body fluid for transmission (similar to Ebola) requires intimate human-to-human contact, which limits contagion. Highly potent antiviral therapy allows most people to live normally with the disease, and a substantial group of the population has genetic mutations that render them impervious to infection in the first place. Lastly, simple prevention strategies such as needle exchange for injection drug users and barrier contraceptives—when available—can curtail transmission risk. Ebola, for many of the same reasons as HIV as well as several others, also falls short of the mark. This is especially due to the fact that it spreads almost exclusively through people with easily recognizable symptoms, plus the taming of its once unfathomable 90 percent mortality rate by simple supportive care. Beyond those three, every other known disease falls short of what seems required to wipe out humans—which is, of course, why we’re still here. And it’s not that diseases are ineffective. On the contrary, diseases’ failure to knock us out is a testament to just how resilient humans are. Part of our evolutionary heritage is our immune system, one of the most complex on the planet, even without the benefit of vaccines or the helping hand of antimicrobial drugs. This system, when viewed at a species level, can adapt to almost any enemy imaginable. Coupled to genetic variations amongst humans—which open up the possibility for a range of advantages, from imperviousness to infection to a tendency for mild symptoms—this adaptability ensures that almost any infectious disease onslaught will leave a large proportion of the population alive to rebuild, in contrast to the fictional Hollywood versions.

#### Pandemics solve nuclear war that spills up to extinction---it’s likely now.

Barry. R. Posen 20. Ford International Professor of Political Science at MIT and Director Emeritus of the MIT Security Studies Program. 4/23/2020. “Do Pandemics Promote Peace?” <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/2020-04-23/do-pandemics-promote-peace>. DOA: 9/2/2020. SIR.

What these analysts miss is that COVID-19, the disease caused by the coronavirus, is weakening all of the great and middle powers more or less equally. None is likely to gain a meaningful advantage over the others. All will have ample reason to be pessimistic about their military capabilities and their overall readiness for war. For the duration of the pandemic, at least, and probably for years afterward, the odds of a war between major powers will go down, not up. PAX EPIDEMICA? A cursory survey of the scholarly literature on war and disease appears to confirm Blainey’s observation that pessimism is conducive to peace. Scholars have documented again and again how war creates permissive conditions for disease—in armies as well as civilians in the fought-over territories. But one seldom finds any discussion of epidemics causing wars or of wars deliberately started in the middle of widespread outbreaks of infectious disease. (The diseases that European colonists carried to the New World did weaken indigenous populations to the point that they were more vulnerable to conquest; in addition, some localized conflicts were fought during the influenza pandemic of 1919–21, but these were occasioned by major shifts in regional balances of power following the destruction of four empires in World War I.) That sickness slows the march to war is partly due to the fact that war depends on people. When people fall ill, they can’t be counted on to perform well in combat. Military medicine made enormous strides in the years leading up to World War I, prior to which armies suffered higher numbers of casualties from disease than from combat. But pandemics still threaten military units, as those onboard U.S. and French aircraft carriers, hundreds of whom tested positive for COVID-19, know well. Sailors and soldiers in the field are among the most vulnerable because they are packed together. But even airmen are at risk, since they must take refuge from air attacks in bunkers, where the virus could also spread rapidly. Ground campaigns in urban areas pose still greater dangers in pandemic times. Much recent ground combat has been in cities in poor countries with few or no public health resources, environments highly favorable to illness. Ground combat also usually produces prisoners, any of whom can be infected. A vaccine may eventually solve these problems, but an abundance of caution is likely to persist for some time after it comes into use. Major outbreaks damage national economies, which are the source of military power. The most important reason disease inhibits war is economic. Major outbreaks damage national economies, which are the source of military power. COVID-19 is a pandemic—by definition a worldwide phenomenon. All great and middle powers appear to be adversely affected, and all have reason to be pessimistic about their military prospects. Their economies are shrinking fast, and there is great uncertainty about when and how quickly they will start growing again. Even China, which has slowed the spread of the disease and begun to reopen its economy, will be hurting for years to come. It took an enormous hit to GDP in the first quarter of 2020, ending 40 years of steady growth. And its trading partners, burned by their dependence on China for much of the equipment needed to fight COVID-19, will surely scale back their imports. An export-dependent China will have to rely more on its domestic market, something it has been attempting for years with only limited success. It is little wonder, then, that the International Monetary Fund [forecasts](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Oz56lV17s9o) slower growth in China this year than at any time since the 1970s. Even after a vaccine is developed and made widely available, economic troubles may linger for years. States will emerge from this crisis with enormous debts. They will spend years paying for the bailout and stimulus packages they used to protect citizens and businesses from the economic consequences of social distancing. Drained treasuries will give them one more reason to be pessimistic about their military might. LESS TRADE, LESS FRICTION How long is the pacifying effect of pessimism likely to last? If a vaccine is developed quickly, enabling a relatively swift economic recovery, the mood may prove short-lived. But it is equally likely that the coronavirus crisis will last long enough to change the world in important ways, some of which will likely dampen the appetite for conflict for some time—perhaps up to five or ten years. After all, the world is experiencing both the biggest pandemic and the biggest economic downturn in a century. Most governments have not covered themselves with glory managing the pandemic, and even the most autocratic worry about popular support. Over the next few years, people will want evidence that their governments are working to protect them from disease and economic dislocation. Citizens will see themselves as dependent on the state, and they will be less inclined to support adventures abroad. At the same time, governments and businesses will likely try to reduce their reliance on imports of critical materials, having watched global supply chains break down during the pandemic. The result will probably be diminished trade, something liberal internationalists see as a bad thing. But for the last five years or so, trade has not helped improve relations between states but rather fueled resentment. Less trade could mean less friction between major powers, thereby reducing the intensity of their rivalries. In the Chinese context, less international trade could have positive knock-on effects. Focused on growing the domestic economy, and burdened by hefty bills from fighting the virus, Beijing could be forced to table the Belt and Road Initiative, an ambitious trade and investment project that has unnerved the foreign policy establishments of great and middle powers. The suspension of the BRI would soothe the fears of those who see it as an instrument of Chinese world domination. Interstate wars have become relatively rare since the end of World War II. The United States and the Soviet Union engaged in a four-decade Cold War, which included an intense nuclear and conventional arms race, but they never fought each other directly, even with conventional weapons. Theorists debate the reasons behind the continued rarity of great-power conflict. I am inclined to believe that the risk of escalation to a nuclear confrontation is simply too great. COVID-19 does nothing to mitigate such risks for world leaders—and a great deal to feed their reasonable pessimism about the likely outcome of even a conventional war.

#### Covid proves diseases decrease conflict

Salemi 20 Colette Salemi 10-15-2020 "Does COVID-19 raise the risk of violent conflict? Not everywhere" <https://archive.is/h591O#selection-309.0-312.0> (Colette Salemi is a PhD student in applied economics at the University of Minnesota. Her research focuses on conflict, forced displacement, environmental degradation and their intersections.)//Elmer

How we did our research We **used** the Armed Conflict Location and Event Data (**ACLED**), a **database** **that counts** the **number of conflict events daily around the world**. For 2019 and 2020, ACLED includes more than 100 countries in Africa, Asia, Latin America and Eastern Europe — and tracks three categories of violent conflict: battles, violence against civilians and explosions/remote violence. We examine trends in the number of conflict events over time. To see whether the trend changes in response to covid-19, we look at what happened after the World Health Organization declared a global pandemic (March 11) or the country declared a lockdown. [Don’t miss any of TMC’s smart analysis! Sign up here for our newsletter.] The **relationship between pandemics and conflict is theoretically unclear.** In some countries, job losses from the covid-19 pandemic mean people have fewer income-generating options — that can make participation in violence seem a more viable alternative. But if **market disruptions** and reduced global demand are **driving down** the **value of natural resources** such as oil wells, then **we** may **see less conflict** over control of such resources. We then **conducted** case **studies** based **on** our knowledge of countries with high rates of violent conflict before **covid**-19. These include countries with active civil wars (such as Syria) as well as countries with violent militia groups (such as the Philippines). Conflict during the coronavirus pandemic varies greatly **Worldwide**, **we didn’t observe an increase in violent conflict**. **If anything, conflict has decreased**, as the figure below shows. **Violent conflict** between March and August 2020 **was 23 percent lower** than violent conflict during the same period in 2019. Comparing these time periods, battles are down 20 percent and remote violence and bombings are down 40 percent. But violence against civilians — the deliberate attack of unarmed noncombatants by armed groups — continued at similar rates globally.
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#### Future pandemics 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.”