**Contact Info**

**Interpretation: Debaters must have a cite listing their contact information on the 2020-2021 NDCA LD wiki 30 minutes before their round.**

**Violation: They didn’t cite contact info**

**Standards –**

**1] Pre round prep – it would be impossible to contact you before round, since I don’t know who to or your preferred contact – destroys preround prep because you could be breaking new, or making changes to your aff and I wouldn’t even know. Outweighs, since preround prep is a gateway issue to engagement.**

**2] Clash – I could know more about your aff if I asked questions about it preround, which is key to indepth clash in round, otherwise you can get away with sneaky 1AR pivots.**

**Education - Reducing clash and prep means I will not do as well and in turn not learn as much. No one would do debate if it wasn’t educational**

**Fairness - If aff gets an advantage before the round, there is no point for the neg to debate. No one would debate if it was not fair from the start**

**3] DTD] Dropping the debater is key - sets a precedent that you have to disclose even without being told which improves debate**

**DA – News Regulation**

**Prioritization is defined by**

**Lexico** [“PRIORITIZATION English Definition and Meaning.” Lexico Dictionaries | English, Lexico Dictionaries, www.lexico.com/en/definition/prioritization.] // VS

(As) The action or process of deciding the relative importance or urgency of a thing or things.

**Regulation is defined by**

**Merriam Webster** [“Regulation Definition &amp; Meaning.” Merriam-Webster, Merriam-Webster, www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/regulation.] // VS

(As) a rule or order issued by an executive authority or regulatory agency of a government and having the force of law

**Regulation is lexically impossible with prioritization bc prioritization enforces their reorientation of objectivity through the free press while regulation enforces through an authority of power like the government**

**This kills objectivity – regulation key**

**Wordpress 20** [“('17) Is Regulation of the Press Desirable?” Essays, 7 May 2020, studentgp.wordpress.com/2018/06/01/17-is-regulation-of-the-press-desirable/.] // VS

(Introduction) The press, commonly known as the fourth estate, is an influential force in everyday life, and an ubiquitous information source. From consuming it, people get to know much more about events around the world. The first Freedom of the Press Act, a Swedish legislation, abolished the government’s role as a censor of printed matter, and allowed for the official activities of the government to be made public. This freedom of the press, of the media, essentially meant freedom of information for the masses. Yet, is regulation (in any form), desirable at the expense of this freedom, which could be argued as a basic human right? I believe it is desirable, but only to the extent that it is ultimately beneficial for the people. (R 1) Some say that regulation is not desirable, because it violates human rights. Freedom of information is part of Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, set by the United Nations (UN). Because every human has this right to access news whenever and wherever they wish to, regulation, by setting certain limitations and rules on what can or cannot be published, inherently will control the contents of the press and goes against this right. All content from the press should be made available without regulation; the ones who choose what to read or watch should be the individuals themselves, out of their own free will, and not any other party. The press (and media) is the neutral medium to transmit such information objectively, and should not be limited by regulated to only present some news only, or to be made inaccessible to the public. Hence, regulation, given that it inherently opposes human right, is undesirable. (S 1) But, while regulation may violate rights of viewers, but, if left unchecked (gone too far), the press may violate the rights of their subjects of interest/news, especially for sensationalism and hits. In this case, regulation is necessary (desirable), if done objectively and independently, to serve as a check to such journalism. The press is a business, and ultimately, for it to run it sometimes resorts to these insensitive, ruthless ways to get the news or scoops that will attract the masses, especially if left unregulated. For instance, in the incident of Princess Diana’s death in a car crash, the paparazzi who followed the car and her intoxicated and drunk chauffeur were the main causes of the tragedy. Furthermore, because she still remained a popular and influential public figure with the masses even after her death, the press took advantage of that and continued exaggerated coverage of her death and inquests into the causes and circumstances surrounding it. The British newspaper The Daily Express is one such publication that has been criticized for this. A 2006 report in The Guardian showed that the newspaper had mentioned her in numerous

recent news stories, with headlines including “Perhaps Diana should have worn seatbelt”, “Diana inquiry chief’s laptop secrets stolen”, “£250,000 a year bill to run Diana fountain” and “Diana seatbelt sabotage probe”. Hence, in this case, regulation to prevent such insensitive coverage may be desirable. (S 2) Furthermore, it is unlikely for a publication to be unbiased and objective if left to its own devices or its own self-regulation, hence, some form of external regulation is necessary. Again, in the attempt to appeal to more viewers and gain a loyal following, they may present news in an falsified, opinionated way. This makes it more interesting and leaves a greater emotional impact on their audiences, who came precisely for such content. Such press bias tends to be especially prominent when associated with politics. For instance, on the issue of climate change and global warming, the latest (fifth) IPCC (Intergovernmental panel on Climate change) assessment report states that humans are most likely responsible for global warming since 1951. 97% of peer-reviewed literature and climate scientists accept this view; only 3% do not accept this consensus position. But, a study conducted by Media Matters for America shows that in stories about this report, rather than accurately reflect this consensus, select media outlets have created a false perception of discord amongst climate scientists. Specifically, politically conservative news outlets like Fox News (69%) and the Wall Street Journal (50%) were responsible for most of the doubters, even though the presenters may have no background in climate science. In the UK coverage of the IPCC report, again, the politically conservative Times, Daily Mail, and Telegraph gave the contradicting views disproportionately large coverages. In this case, regulation to ensure that accurate, objective information is presented to the masses is needed and hence desirable. (R 2) Some argue that regulation is not desirable, especially in state-controlled media, because of corruption, governments forcefully use the press for their own advantage, and control the citizens. For instance, the 2016 World Press Freedom Index by Reporters Without Borders (RSF) showed that there has been a deep and disturbing decline in media freedom at both the global and regional levels. RSF reports that such is caused by “increasingly authoritarian tendencies of governments in countries such as Turkey and Egypt”, and “tighter government control of state-owned media”. Some governments do not hesitate to “suspend access to the Internet or even to destroy the premises, broadcast equipment or printing presses of media outlets they dislike.” These caused the infrastructure indicator to fall from 16% from 2013 to 2016. Instead of a free press that is also able to investigate on and serve as a check to the government, such hostile regulations prevent it from doing this, causing the press to end up as a tool that states can freely destroy and control for their own purposes. It is forced to suppress the truth of matters, unable to present what is truly important. Ultimately, this serves to support the state’s own authoritarian propaganda. Specifically, it kills two birds with one stone; they can then spread their own ideologies, while also keep the citizens uninformed, ensuring that power is not undermined by educated/informed citizens (who may rebel). Hence, in this light, when regulation is abused by states to control the press, information and the citizens in these unethical ways, it is undesirable, and press should remain free and independent. Advertisements REPORT THIS AD (S 3) While state-controlled press is undesirable, on the other end of the scale, if the press is left completely uncontrolled and presents everything it finds, such is also inevitably, undesirable. The press, as the fourth estate, has widespread influence on society. As such, it has a social responsibility to present what is acceptable within the boundaries of society, and hence, regulation is needed (and desirable). Specifically, to ensure that there is no showing of immoral, explicit, extremist or radical ideas that may potentially affect the public. Different people have different degrees of tolerance and reactions to such controversial news, so it should be regulated accordingly. For instance, to prevent children from seeing overly violent or explicit content, or the showing of hate speech, which may lead to unnecessarily strong public reactions or outcries. As the phrase “some things are better left unsaid” goes, while the press and journalism do have the duty to investigate, find and present events/happenings around the world, if such instances add no positive value to the public’s understanding of the world, and only incite or evoke negative emotions or reactions, then perhaps there is need for regulation to phase these news out. In these situations, regulation then becomes desirable.

**DA - Populism**

**Objectivity increases fake news**

**Napoli 21** [Philip M. Napoli, educator at the Sanford School of Public Policy at Duke University, 03-02-2021, “Back from the dead (again): The specter of the Fairness Doctrine and its lesson for social media regulation,” Wiley Online Library,

https://sci-hub.se/https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/poi3.253]/Kankee

Fairness, balance, and false equivalency Finally, it essential to address the problematic broader principle that underlies any governmental or voluntary efforts to impose fairness or balance requirements on media gatekeepers. The biggest problem with the Fairness Doctrine is what it does to our conception of journalism and to the notion of how **responsible gatekeeping** works. Over the past few years,there has been a substantial amount of criticism heaped upon the news media for engaging in “**false equivalence**”—that is, giving **equal attention** to competing claims on different sides of the political spectrum, **regardless** of the **objective** validity of the competing claims(see, e.g., Spayd, 2016). This sort of **uncritical**, **nonevaluative** approach to journalism—and to gatekeeping more broadly—simply is not the right path to cultivating an **informed** citizenry in this environment of nearly **unprecedented** political polarization and disinformation. Institutionalizing such a model allows **falsity** to be **legitimized** by being presented **alongside truth**. It creates a system where demands of fairness and balance neuter **journalists'** and other gatekeepers' ability (and responsibility)to **differentiate fact from fiction**, truth from conspiracy theories and hoaxes. Consider, for instance, recentresearch focusing on the content curation practices of Google News (Kawakami et al., 2020). This study found that “Because there are fewer right‐ leaning publications than center or left‐leaning ones,to maintain this ‘fair’ balance, hyper‐ partisan far‐right news sources of **low trust** receive **more visibility** than some news sources that are more familiar to and trusted by the public” (Kawakami et al., 2020, p. 59). Such findings help to **empirically** demonstrate the dangers of the application of Fairness Doctrine‐ like principles in the governance of digital platforms, as such approaches typically lead to the disproportionate and unwarranted (from an informed citizenry standpoint) prominence of sources that are more likely to disseminate disinformation. This critical gatekeeping function is more valuable than everin today's vast and complex information ecosystem, where distinguishing legitimate from illegitimate sources of news and information is more challenging for the end user than it has ever been; and where efforts by bad actors to manipulate social media platforms have become commonplace and increasingly sophisticated. The Trump White House's (2020) executive order contended that social media platforms should operate as “passive bulletin boards.” They have virtually never operated in this way; nor should they. Even those platforms that have marketed themselves as completely unfiltered forums for public discourse (e.g., Parler) operate under a number of explicit content curation and moderation guidelines, and, ironically, have been found to be engaging in editorial decision‐making geared toward filtering out particular political viewpoints(Lerman, 2020). Any efforts at content‐based regulation of social media platforms need to move beyond the notion of fairness—or, at the very least decouple the notion of fairness from the notion of balance. Fairness and balance are not the same thing. There is a degree of passivity, of a lack of judgment, in the notion of balance that is not present to the same degree in the notion of fairness. A news story can be fair without necessarily being balanced if, in the fair and objective judgment of the journalist, giving greater prominence to a discredited or extreme viewpoint would misinform the public. Similarly, if a digital platform is systematically and objectively applying criteria to individual posts or accounts that result in one political perspective's posts being taken down or fact‐checked more than another's, this can be seen as the platform behaving fairly. The unbalanced outcome is not a reflection of unfairness on the part of the platform. It is a reflection of the behavior of the speakers. Frustratingly, this is a position that the representatives of the various digital platforms have refrained from expressing in any of the many instances in which they have been called before Congress and grilled about their bias against conservative viewpoints. As one recent reconsideration of the Fairness Doctrine noted, contemporary concerns should focus on “greater accuracy and completeness, but… not… balance” (Vandenbergh, 2020, p. 815). As one of the growing number of critics of the notion of balance in journalism has noted, “Although appealing on the surface, balance can **easily** be **manipulated** to create a **false sense** of equivalency” (Vandenbergh, 2020, p. 815). Along these lines, some critics of the **F**airness **D**octrine noted

that it led to an emphasis on the presentation of “**extremes of controversy**” (Bolton, 1987, pp. 818–819). Neither policy nor professional practice should, in the pursuit of “fairness” or “balance,” prioritize opposing viewpoints independently of any concerns about accuracy or truthfulness. Unfortunately, many of today's advocates for “fairness” in the content curation and moderation practices of social media platforms appear concerned first and foremost with the availability of extreme viewpoints independent of whether they have any grounding in verifiable fact. This **strategic conflation** of diversity and falsity needs to be resisted. Passivity does not equal fairness; and so in this regard, what Republican policymakers are calling for is a far cry from the principles of the Fairness Doctrine which specifically extended protections to “all responsible positions on matters of sufficient importance to be afforded radio time” and to “the various positions taken by the responsible groups” (Federal Communications Commission, 1949, pp. 1250–1251, emphasis added). The term responsible seems particularly relevant to the current environment, in light of contemporary challenges related to hate speech and disinformation. The Fairness Doctrine's approach to gatekeeping did not—at least in theory—involve broadcasters serving as passive conduits; and so any current efforts to impose more “fairness” upon social media platforms that are ultimately about converting these platforms to passive or uncritically balanced conduits misrepresent what fairness should mean in regulatory approaches to media gatekeeping, as well as in the voluntary gatekeeping practices of news organizations and digital platforms. CONCLUSION

**Fake news increases populism worldwide**

**ECPS 20** [“Fake News.” ECPS, 27 Dec. 2020, www.populismstudies.org/Vocabulary/fake-news/.] // VS

Fake news (also known as junk news, pseudo-news, or hoax news) is a form of news consisting of deliberate disinformation or hoaxes spread via traditional news media or online social media. Digital news has brought back and increased the usage of fake news, or yellow journalism. The news is then often reverberated as misinformation in social media but occasionally finds its way to the mainstream media as well. Fake news is written and published usually with the intent to mislead in order to damage an agency, entity, or person, and/or gain financially or politically, often using sensationalist, dishonest, or outright fabricated headlines to increase readership. Similarly, clickbait stories and headlines earn advertising revenue from this activity. The relevance of fake news has increased in post-truth politics. For media outlets, the ability to attract viewers to their websites is necessary to generate online advertising revenue. Easy access to online advertisement revenue, increased political polarization and the popularity of social media, primarily the Facebook News Feed, have all been implicated in the spread of fake news, which competes with legitimate news stories. Hostile government actors have also been implicated in generating and propagating fake news, particularly during elections. Fake news undermines serious media coverage and makes it more difficult for journalists to cover significant news stories. An analysis by BuzzFeed found that the top 20 fake news stories about the 2016 US presidential election received more engagement on Facebook than the top 20 election stories from 19 major media outlets. The term “lying press” is at times used to cast doubt upon legitimate news from an opposing political standpoint. During and after his presidential campaign and election, Donald Trump popularized the term “fake news” in this sense, regardless of the truthfulness of the news, when he used it to describe the negative press coverage of himself. In part, as a result of Trump’s misuse, the term has come under increasing criticism, and in October 2018 the British government decided that it will no longer use the term because it is “a poorly-defined and misleading term that conflates a variety of false information, from genuine error through to foreign interference in democratic processes.” According to Greg Nielsen, fake news and populist movements that appear to hold the fate of democracy hostage are urgent concerns around the world. “The flight from liberal democracy toward oligarchy has spread out from the unexpected results of the 2016 American presidential elections bringing in a wave of reactionary populism and the beginning of a left populist counter movement. The phenomenon of fake news is often explained in terms of opposition public relations strategies and geopolitics that shift audiences toward a regime of post-truth where emotion is said to triumphs over reason, computational propaganda over common sense, or sheer power over knowledge,” wrote Nielsen. Like Nielsen, numbers of pundits assessed that ‘fake news’ has undeniably been biased in favor of populist or anti-establishment parties. As politically charged misinformation has been proliferating online, it is no wonder that many have been questioning whether the spread of fake news has affected the results of recent elections, contributing to the growth of populist party platforms. According to an article by Michele Cantarella and Nicolò Fraccaroli, in the US, Trump voters were more likely to be exposed and believe to misinformation. In the Ital(y)ian context, these findings (show) have been replicated in a recent report from the financial newspaper Il Sole 24 Ore,1 where the likelihood of believing and sharing so-called fake news was found to be higher for voters of the populist MoVimento 5 Stelle and Lega than for voters of other parties. In Italy, not only does the consumption of fake news appear to be linked with populism, but the content of the overwhelming majority of pieces of

misinformation also displays an obvious anti-establishment bias. On the other hand, the Reuters Digital News Report in 2018 showed that Turkey ranks first on the list of countries (with) where people complain about completely made-up stories. The study researched how fake news is helping facilitate the rise of populism in Turkey. “Populist politicians generally consider fake news as a valuable propaganda tool for their political interests,” wrote Harun Güney Akgül in an article and added that “There is plenty of fake news aired by pro-government media. Therefore, the Turkish government is emerging as a suspect behind the fake news cycle. The fact is that most of the fake news is published for the benefit of the government. Research shows that, paradoxically, President Recep Tayyip Erdogan is regarded as one of the most important populist politicians in the world. These two different indicators can be valuable data in revealing the relationship between fake news and populist politicians.” To Akgül, today “pool media” has become a term that symbolizes media that publishes broadcast pro-government stories. Pool media is crucial for making fake news because it is produced by the government. After that, this news is served to the pool media and most of the time and all newspaper use the same headline and text. Bots use this fake news for the next step. Bots are the accounts that are controlled en masse from a central point. According to Kerem Sözeri, this generally works with this way in Turkey; so instead of equal participation in the social media, “they amplify their owner’s agenda.” “According to various sources, the AKP has established troll troops, nearly six thousand. Finally, the fake news spreads to a broad mass of society as if they are reliable news. Fake news is used in a lot of different ways by the Turkish government. The government sometimes organizes protests to oppose social movements by producing misinformation. Turkish government is creating fake stories or misinformation with the help of social media accounts. It was discovered that lots of pro-Erdogan websites were producing fabricated news. Bosphorus Global is just an important one of such pro-Erdogan websites,” wrote Akgül. To Akgül’s article, with the new populist wave in Europe and America, people have started talking about fake news and populism as one entity. For example, “Le Monde, one of the leading French newspapers, identified and corrected 19 lies made by Marine Le Pen, the extreme-right candidate who reached the runoff of the 2017 French presidential election, during her televised debate against Emmanuel Macron”. Akgül underlined the fact that fake news is produced without ethical elements, although there was a code of ethics in media. “Principles of journalism are to ensure that citizens have access to the right information and are protected against fake news. There are hundreds of codes of conduct, charters, and statements made by media and professional groups outlining the principles, values, and obligations of the craft of journalism,” he wrote. Akgül wrote populist leaders caused polarization by playing with social values. Otherwise, polarization is very important for using fake news… They tend to create an autocratic structure with false accusations against democracy. The decline of democratic values following victories (for) of the populist leaders, e.g. Brexit campaigners, Trump’s controversial election victory and the rise of Jair Bolsonaro is a crucial power behind the populist movement… “Since the inception of social media, many populist governments have learned how to control the new public sphere and its digital ecology. Perhaps, misinformation is one of the best tools for them within social media. Brexit and Trump’s controversial election victory were a significant triumph for populist politicians… Trump and his election victory is an important example of fake news and populism. Following the 2016 election, according to a database, 115 pro-Trump fake stories were shared on Facebook a total of 30 million times and 41 pro-Clinton fake-stories have been shared a total of 7.6 million times,” said Akgül. On the other hand, right-wing populists, according to an article by Michael Hameleers, are not only attributing blame to the political elites, but increasingly vent anti-media sentiments in which the mainstream press is scapegoated for not representing the people. To his article, in an era of post-truth relativism, ‘fake news’ is increasingly politicized and used as a label to delegitimize political opponents or the press. To better understand the affinity between disinformation and populism, Hameleers conceptualizes two relationships between these concepts: i) blame attributions to the dishonest media as part of the corrupt elites that mislead the people; and ii) the expression of populist boundaries in a people-centric, anti-expert, and evidence-free way. The results of a comparative qualitative content analysis conducted by Hameleers in the US and Netherlands indicate that the political leaders Donald Trump and Geert Wilders blame legacy media in populist ways by regarding them as part of the corrupt and lying establishment. He said that “Compared to left-wing populist and mainstream politicians, these politicians are the most central players in the discursive construction of populist disinformation. Both politicians bypassed empirical evidence and expert knowledge whilst prioritizing the people’s truth and common sense at the center stage of honesty and reality. These expressions resonated with public opinion on Facebook, although citizens were more likely to frame mis- and disinformation in terms of ideological cleavages. These findings have important implications for our understanding of the role of populist discourse in a post-factual era.”

**1] Populist leaders kill global climate action – denialism, oversimplification, and cooperation failures**

**Calland 20** [(Richard, Associate Professor in Public Law, University of Cape Town) “**Countering climate denialism requires taking on right-wing populism**. Here’s how” The Conversation, February 12, 2020] MCM

In a complex world facing complex problems, it is seductive for politicians to identify a single culprit (like immigrants) or an evil force (like universal healthcare) to blame for the erosion of society, the economy, and the welfare of the masses. This is hardly ever true, but it is compelling. Take the bewilderingly complicated set of relationships between food, energy, urban infrastructure, and exponential demographic growth and change (at least in the developing world). Climate change and its effects are perhaps **the epitome of a complex issue** of interlinked social, political, and physical forces. That makes it an easy target forthis sort of denialism. So, populism ends up denying not just the science of climate change but also **the complexity of the entire issue** – which is **critical for both diagnosing the problem and determining the prognosis** and the prescription. **Populism strips issues of nuance, and** thereby **obstructs progress**. A 2019 study mapping the climate agendas of right-wing populist parties in Europe contains some revealing evidence: two thirds of right-wing populist members of the European Parliament “regularly vote against climate and energy policy measures”. Half of all votes against resolutions on climate and energy in the European Parliament come from right-wing populist party members.Of the 21 right-wing populist parties analysed, seven were found to **deny climate change**, its anthropogenic causes, and negative consequences. According to estimates based on the World Resources Institute’s global greenhouse-gas emissions data, about **30% of global emissions come from countries with populist leaders**. At the very moment when global cooperation is essential if climate action is to be effective, many of the leaders of these right-wing **populist forces are trying to dismantle** or weaken **multilateral organisations** such as the United Nations or the European Union. **These political groups threaten to derail progress on the global response to climate change**, and on new thinking about how to rewire the economy in pursuit of a more sustainable world. More hopefully, as grassroots organisations emerge as a potentially strong, countervailing force, the trick will be to effectively connect these movements to matters of global social justice. They should also be given enough coherence to be effective. Thus, again, shifting the lens for the climate crisis away from an environmental preoccupation towards human development and social justice. For example, how can Thunberg and the student strike movement in the global north connect with the 1.6 million children that are displaced in Malawi, Zimbabwe, and Mozambique from cyclones? Such connections need to be made to turn these nascent movements into powerful advocates for climate justice. Tipping the scale Regardless of whether the political will needed take transformational action to drastically reduce carbon emission and adapt economies and societies, especially in the global South, will be summoned by 2030, it is clear that by the end of this century life on earth will be very different to how it is now. It will certainly be more difficult and dangerous. This applies to everyone, but especially the poorest and most vulnerable members of a human society that is set to peak at around 9,8 billion by 2050 (up from the current 7,8bn). This is the human development challenge for sub-Saharan Africa. It’s not all doom and gloom. There are huge opportunities amid the grave threats. A first step to responding appropriately – individually and collectively – is understanding that the challenge is multi-dimensional.**Only then can a multi-dimensional strategy be executed**, acrosssectors and across national boundaries. But it is likely that**the greatest impediment to taking action** will not be technological know-how or even raising the money required. Instead it will be the lack of enough political will, given the obstructionism of right-wing **populists in power** around the globe. Hence, a political struggle will need to be won. And the fight for climate justice in the face of right-wing populist climate denialism is a titanic one. Trump-like trajectories into the “post-truth” world of climate change denial, charged by the amplifying impact of social media, **distract from and obstruct the necessary action**. Yet despite its flaws, the digital age presents a huge opportunity to impose a counter-narrative, and for recruiting new activists.

**Warming causes extinction – positive feedback loops means adaptation is impossible Ng ’19** [Yew-Kwang; May 2019; Professor of Economics at Nanyang Technology University, Fellow of the Academy of Social Sciences in Australia and Member of the Advisory Board at the Global Priorities Institute at Oxford University, Ph.D. in Economics from Sydney University; Global Policy, “Keynote: Global Extinction and Animal Welfare: Two Priorities for Effective Altruism,” vol. 10, no. 2, p. 258-266; RP]

Catastrophic climate change Though by no means certain, CCC causing **global extinction** is possible due to **interrelated factors** of **non‐linearity**, **cascading effects**, **positive feedbacks**, **multiplicative factors**, **critical thresholds** and **tipping points**(e.g. Barnosky and Hadly, 2016; Belaia et al., 2017; Buldyrev et al., 2010; Grainger, 2017; Hansen and Sato, 2012; IPCC 2014; Kareiva and Carranza, 2018; Osmond and Klausmeier, 2017; Rothman, 2017; Schuur et al., 2015; Sims and Finnoff, 2016; Van Aalst, 2006).7 A possibly **imminent** tipping point could be in the form of ‘an abrupt **ice sheet collapse** [that] could cause a **rapid** sea level rise’ (Baum et al., 2011, p. 399). There are many avenues for **positive feedback** in global warming, including: the replacement of an ice sea by a liquid ocean surface from melting reduces the reflection and **increases**the **absorption** of sunlight, leading to **faster warming**; the drying of **forests**from warming increases forest fires and the release of **more carbon**; and higher ocean temperatures may lead to the release of **methane** trapped under the ocean floor, producing **runaway** global warming. Though there are also avenues for negative feedback, the scientific consensus is for an overall net positive feedback (Roe and Baker, 2007). Thus, the Global Challenges Foundation (2017, p. 25) concludes, ‘The world is currently **completely unprepared** to envisage, and even less deal with, the consequences of CCC’. The threat of **sea‐level rising** from global warming is well known, but there are also other **likely** and more **imminent** threats to the **survivability of mankind** and other living things. For example, Sherwood and Huber (2010) emphasize the **adaptability limit** to climate change due to **heat stress** from high environmental wet‐bulb temperature. They show that ‘even **modest** global warming could … expose **large fractions** of the [world] population to **unprecedented** heat stress’ p. 9552 and that with substantial global warming, ‘the area of land rendered **uninhabitable** by heat stress would dwarf that affected by rising sea level’ p. 9555, making **extinction** much more **likely** and the relatively moderate damages estimated by most integrated assessment models **unreliably low**. While imminent extinction is very unlikely and may not come for a long time even under business as usual, the main point is that we cannot rule it out. Annan and Hargreaves (2011, pp. 434–435) may be right that there is ‘an upper 95 per cent probability limit for S [temperature increase] … to lie close to 4°C, and certainly well below 6°C’. However, probabilities of 5 per cent, 0.5 per cent, 0.05 per cent or even **0.005 per cent** of excessive warming and the resulting **extinction probabilities** cannot be ruled out and are **unacceptable**. Even if there is only a **1 per cent probability** that there is a time bomb in the airplane, you probably want to change your flight. Extinction of the **whole world** is **more important** to avoid by literally a **trillion times**.

**2] Populism threatens democracy and global security**

**Bergmann 18** Max Bergmann (senior fellow at the Center for American Progress), Carolyn Kenney, and Trevor Sutton, 11/2/2018, The Rise of Far-Right Populism Threatens Global Democracy and Security, Center for American Progress.

We’ve seen this before. Bolsonaro’s rise to power is only the latest chapter in a global resurgence of right-wing, illiberal populism. Far-right populist parties across Europe have seen a surge in public approval, making parliamentary gains in 15 of the 27 EU member countries over the past two election cycles. Far-right parties made the most significant gains in Italy, Poland, Slovenia, Slovakia, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, and Estonia, winning 5 percent more in vote shares. Additionally, the right-wing Fidesz party cemented its control over Hungarian politics with 49.3 percent of the vote shares in their April 2018 election, even though their vote share only increased by 4.4 percent from 2014 to 2018. Simultaneously, public support for democracy in many countries has declined—with the exception of Western democracies, where support has rebounded in recent years. Far-right parties and authoritarian demagogues that have succeeded in gaining power at the national level—such as in Hungary, Poland, Turkey, the Philippines, the United States, and, now, Brazil—have wasted no time in undermining democratic institutions and norms. Unsurprisingly, according to V-Dem Institute’s 2018 liberal democracy index, these countries are among those that have seen the greatest democratic backsliding in the past few years. It is entirely possible—and even expected—that right-wing populists will seek to roll back democratic norms and institutions once in power in order to entrench their authority and quash political opposition. Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan, Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán, Poland’s Law and Justice party, and even U.S. President Donald Trump have already demonstrated this.Once this degradation of democracy has been set in motion, it is a steep and

slippery slope from illiberal democracy to outright authoritarianism. President Erdogan’s wholesale purge of the civil service and judiciary and his extended rule by decree under state of emergency illustrate how this is already occurring in Turkey. The rise of openly illiberal candidates and parties in democracies and the decline in support for democracy—particularly in younger democracies—represents a major global crisis that requires sustained U.S. commitment and international cooperation to reverse. This is particularly notable when combined with the fact that there has been a disturbing increase in democratic backsliding around the world, including in the United States. This should be a huge wake-up call for liberal democratic leaders. Global and U.S. security is at risk This democratic backsliding is a threat to global security.Nondemocracies are more prone to violence and war; more likely to stoke crises and confrontation; and, in many cases, more fiercely opposed to collective global responses to shared concerns such as climate change and migration. This is especially the case for far-right, illiberal regimes, which typically thrive on xenophobic paranoia, bellicosity, and a disavowal of any form of global cooperation in favor of a blunt, country-first approach to international affairs.

**Democratic governance stops nuclear transition wars with Russia and China AND drives global technological innovation---extinction.**

**Kolodziej ’17** [Edward; May 19; Emeritus Research Professor of Political Science at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; EUC Paper Series, “Challenges to the Democratic Project for Governing Globalization,” https://www.ideals.illinois.edu/bitstream/handle/2142/96620/Kolodziej Introduction 5.19.17.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y]

The Rise of a Global Society Let me first sketch the global democratic project for global governance as a point of reference. We must first recognize that globalization has given rise to a global society for the **first time** in the evolution of the human **species**. We are now **stuck with each other**; **seven and half billion** people today — nine to **ten** by **2050**: all**super connected** and **interdependent**. In greater or lesser measure, humans are mutually dependent on each other in the pursuit of their most salient values, interests, needs, and preferences — concerns about personal, community, and national**security**, sustainable economic **growth**, protection ofthe **environment**, the equitable **distribution** of the globe’s material wealth, human **rights**, and even the validation of their personal and social identities by others. Global **warming** is a metaphor of this morphological social change in the human condition. **All** humans are **implicated** in this looming Anthropogenic-induced **disaster** — the exhausts of billions of automobiles, the methane released in fracking for natural gas, outdated U.S. coal-fired power plants and newly constructed ones in China. Even the poor farmer burning charcoal to warm his dinner is complicit. Since interdependence surrounds, ensnares, and binds us as a human society, the dilemma confronting the world’s diverse and divided populations is evident: the **expanding scope** as well asthe **deepening**, **accumulating**, and **thickening** interdependencies of globalization urge global government. Butthe Kantian ideal of universal governance is beyond the reach of the world’s disparate peoples. They are **profoundly divided** by religion, culture, language, tribal, ethnic and national loyalties as well as by class, social status, race, gender, and sexual orientation. How have the democracies responded to this dilemma? How have they attempted to reconcile the growing interdependence of the world’s disputing peoples and need for global governance? What do we mean by the governance of a human society? A working, **legitimate government** of a human society requires simultaneous responses to three competing imperatives: Order, Welfare, and Legitimacy. While the forms of these OWL imperatives have differed radically over the course of human societal evolution,these constraints remain predicable of all human societies if they are to replicate themselves and flourish over time. The OWL imperatives are no less applicable to a global society. 1.Orderrefers to a society’s investment of awesome material powerin an individual or body to arbitrate and resolve value, interest, and preference conflicts, which cannot be otherwise resolved by non-violent means — the Hobbesian problematic. 2. The Welfare imperative refers to the necessity of humans to eat, drink, clothe, and shelterthemselves and to pursue the full-range of their seemingly limitless acquisitive appetites. Responses to the Welfare imperative, like that of Order, constitute a distinct form of governing power and authority with its own decisional processes and actors principally associated either with the Welfare or the Order imperative. Hence

we have the Marxian-Adam Smith problematic. 3. Legitimacy is no less a form of governing power and authority, independent of the Order and Welfare imperatives. Either by choice, socialization, or coerced acquiescence, populations acknowledge a regime’s governing authority and their obligation to submitto its rule. Here arises the Rousseaunian problematic. The government of a human society emerges then as an evolving, precarious balance and compromise of the ceaseless struggle of these competing OWL power domains for ascendancy of one of these imperatives over the others. It is against the backdrop of these OWL imperatives — Order, Welfare, and Legitimacy — that we are brought to the democratic project for global governance. The Democratic Project For Order, open societies constructed the global democratic state and, in alliance, the democratic global-state system. Collectively these initiatives led to the creation of the United Nations, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the World Trade Organization, and the European Union to implement the democratic project’s system of global governance. The democratic global state assumed all of the functions of the Hobbesian Westphalian security state — but a lot more. The global state became a Trading, Banking, Market, and Entrepreneurial state. To these functions were added those of the Science, Technology and the Economic Growth state. How else would we be able to enjoy the **Internet**, **cell phones** and iPhones, or **miracle cures**? These are the products of the **iron triangle** of the global democratic state, academic and non-profitresearch centers, and corporations. It is a **myth** that the Market System did allthis **alone**. Fueled by increasing material wealth, the democratic global state was afforded the means to become the **Safety Net** state, providing **ed**ucation, **health**, **social security**, leisure and recreation for its population. And as the global state’s power expanded across this broad and enlarging spectrum of functions and roles, the global state was also constrained by the social compacts of the democracies to be bound by popular rule. The ironic result of the expansion of the global state’s power and social functions and its obligation to accede to popular will was a Security state and global state-system that vastly outperformed its principal authoritarian rivals in the Cold War. So much briefly is the democratic project’s response to the Order imperative. Now let’s look at the democratic project’s response to the Welfare imperative. The democracies institutionalized Adam Smith’s vision of a global Market System. The Market System trucks and barters, Smith’s understanding of what it means to be human. But it does a lot more. The Market System facilitates and fosters the free movement of people, goods and services, capital, ideas, values, scientific discoveries, and best technological practices. Created is a vibrant global civil society oblivious to state boundaries. What we now experience is De Tocqueville’s Democracy in America on global steroids. As for the imperative of Legitimacy, the social compacts of the democracies affirmed Rousseau’s conjecture that all humans are free and therefore equal. Applied to elections each citizen has one vote. Democratic regimes are also obliged to submit to the rule of law, to conduct free and fair elections, to honor majority rule while protecting minority rights, and to **promote** human rights at home and **abroad**. The Authoritarian Threat to the Democratic Project The **democratic project** for **global governance** is now at **risk**. Let’s start with the challenges posed by authoritarian regimes, with Russia and China in the lead. Both Russia and China would **rest global governance** on Big Power spheres of influence. Both would assume **hegemonic status** in theirrespective regions, asserting their versions of the **Monroe Doctrine**. Their regional hegemony would then **leverage** their claim to be global **Big Powers**. Moscow and Beijing would then have an equal say with the United States and the West in sharing and shaping global governance. **The** Russo-Chinese global **system** of Order would ascribe to Russia and China governing privileges not accorded to the states both aspire to dominate. Moscow and Beijing would enjoy **unconditional** recognition of their state **sovereignty**, territorial integrity, and non-interference in their domestic affairs, but they would reserve to themselves the right to **intervene** in the domestic and foreign affairs of the states and peoples under their tutelage in pursuit of their hegemonic interests. President Putin has announced that Russia’s **imperialism** encompassesthe **millions** of Russians living in the formerrepublics of the Soviet Union. Russia contends that Ukraine and Belarus also fall under Moscow’s purported claim to historical sovereignty over these states. Forceful re-absorption of **Crimea** and control over eastern **Ukraine** are viewed by President Putin as Russia’s historical inheritances. Self-determination is not extended to these states or to other states and peoples of the former Soviet Union. Moscow rejects their right to freely align, say, with the European Union or, god forbid, with NATO. In contrast to the democratic project, universal in its reach,the Russo-Chinese conception of a stable global order rests on more **tenuous** and **conflict-prone ethno-national foundations**. Russia’s proclaimed enemies are the United States and the European Union. Any means that undermines the unity of these entities is viewed by Moscow as a gain. The endgame is a **poly-anarchical** interstate system, potentially as **war-prone** as the Eurocentric system **before** and **after World War I**, but now populated by states with **nuclear weapons.** Global politics becomes a **zero-sum game**. Moscow has **no compunctions** about **corrupting** the **electoral processes** of democratic states, conducting threatening **military exercises** along NATO’s east border, or violating the more than 30-year old treaty to ban the deployment of Intermediate-Range **missile launchers**, capable of **firing nuclear weapons**. Nothing less than the **dissolution** of the democratic project is Moscow’s solution for global Order. China also seeks a

revision of the global Order. It declares sovereignty over the **South China Sea**. Rejected is The Hague Tribunal’s dismissal of this claim. Beijing continues to build artificial islands as military bases in the region to assertits control over these troubled waters. If it could have its way, China would decide which states and their naval vessels, notably those of the United States, would have access to the South China Sea. Where Moscow and Beijing depart sharply are in their contrasting responses to the Welfare imperative. Moscow has **no solution** other than to use its oil and gas resources asinstruments of **coercive diplomacy** and to weaken or **dismantle** existing Western **alliances** and international economic **institutions**. China can ill-afford the dismantling of the global market system. In his address to the Davos gathering in January of this year, Chinese President Xi asserted that “any attempt to cut off the flow of capital, technologies, products, industries and people between economies, and channel the waters in the ocean back into isolated lakes and creeks is simply not possible.” Adam Smith could not have said it better. Both Moscow and Beijing have been particularly assiduous to legitimate their regimes. President Putin’s case for legitimacy is much broader and deeper than a pure appeal to Russian nationalism. He stresses the spiritual and cultural unity of Russianspeaking populations spread across the states of the post-Soviet space. A central core of that unity is the Russian Orthodox Church, a key prop of the regime. Reviled is Western secularism, portrayed as corrupt and decadent, viewed by Putin as an existential threat to the Russian World. The Chinese regime, secular and atheistic, can hardly rely on religion to legitimate the regime. Beijing principally rests its legitimacy on its record of economic development and nationalism. The regime’s success in raising the economic standards of hundreds of millions of Chinese reinforces its claim to legitimacy in two ways. On the one hand, the Communist Party can rightly claim to have raised hundreds of millions of Chinese from poverty within a generation. On the other hand, the Communist Party insists that its model of economic growth, what critics scorn as crony capitalism, is superior to the unfettered, market-driven model of the West. Hence capitalism with Chinese characteristics is more effective and legitimate than the Western alternative. Where Moscow and Beijing do **converge** is in fashioning their responses to the Legitimacy imperative. They **repudiate Western liberal democracy**. Both reject criticisms of their human rights abuses as interventions into their domestic affairs. Dissidents are harassed, incarcerated, or, in some instances, assassinated. Journalists are co-opted, selfcensored, silenced, or imprisoned. Social media is state controlled. Both the Putin regime and the Chinese Communist Party monopolize the public narratives evaluating governmental policy. Transparency and accountability are hostage to governmental secrecy. Civil society has few effective avenues to criticize governmental actions. Moscow adds an ironic twist to these controls in manipulating national elections to produce an elected authoritarian regime. Whether either of these authoritarian responses to the Legitimacy imperative will survive **remains to be seen**. Beijing’s use of economic performance and nationalism to underwrite its legitimacy is a double-edged sword. If economic performance falters, then legitimacy suffers. Whether top-down nationalism will always control nationalism from the bottom-up is also problematic. In resting legitimacy on nationalism, dubious historical claims, and crypto-religious beliefs, Moscow is spared Beijing’s economic performance test. That said, there is room for skepticism that in the long-run Russians will exchange lower standards of living for corrupt rule in pursuit of an elusive Russian mission antagonistic to the West. The implosion of the Soviet Union, due in no small part to its retarded economic and technological development, suggests that the patience of the Russian people has limits. Demonstrations in March 2017 against state corruption in 82 Russian cities, led largely by Russian youth, reveal these limits. They are an ominous omen for the future of the Putin kleptocracy. Meanwhile, neither Russia nor China offers much to solve the Legitimacy imperative of global governance.