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### FW - Util

#### I value morality

#### The standard of maximizing expected well being

#### [1] Pleasure and pain are intrinsic value and disvalue

**Blum et al. 18**
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**Pleasure** is not only one of the three primary reward functions but it also **defines reward.** As homeostasis explains the functions of only a limited number of rewards, the principal reason why particular stimuli, objects, events, situations, and activities are rewarding may be due to pleasure. This applies first of all to sex and to the primary homeostatic rewards of food and liquid and extends to money, taste, beauty, social encounters and nonmaterial, internally set, and intrinsic rewards. Pleasure, as the primary effect of rewards, drives the prime reward functions of learning, approach behavior, and decision making and provides the **basis for hedonic theories** of reward function. We are attracted by most rewards and exert intense efforts to obtain them, just because they are enjoyable [10]. Pleasure is a passive reaction that derives from the experience or prediction of reward and may lead to a long-lasting state of happiness. The word happiness is difficult to define. In fact, just obtaining physical pleasure may not be enough. One key to happiness involves a network of good friends. However, it is not obvious how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to an ice cream cone, or to your team winning a sporting event. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure [14]. Pleasure as a hallmark of reward is sufficient for defining a reward, but it may not be necessary. A reward may generate positive learning and approach behavior simply because it contains substances that are essential for body function. When we are hungry, we may eat bad and unpleasant meals. A monkey who receives hundreds of small drops of water every morning in the laboratory is unlikely to feel a rush of pleasure every time it gets the 0.1 ml. Nevertheless, with these precautions in mind, we may define any stimulus, object, event, activity, or situation that has the potential to produce pleasure as a reward. In the context of reward deficiency or for disorders of addiction, homeostasis pursues pharmacological treatments: drugs to treat drug addiction, obesity, and other compulsive behaviors. The theory of allostasis suggests broader approaches - such as re-expanding the range of possible pleasures and providing opportunities to expend effort in their pursuit. [15]. It is noteworthy, the first animal studies eliciting approach behavior by electrical brain stimulation interpreted their findings as a discovery of the brain’s pleasure centers [16] which were later partly associated with midbrain dopamine neurons [17–19] despite the notorious difficulties of identifying emotions in animals. Evolutionary theories of pleasure: The love connection BO:D Charles Darwin and other biological scientists that have examined the biological evolution and its basic principles found various mechanisms that steer behavior and biological development. Besides their theory on natural selection, it was particularly the sexual selection process that gained significance in the latter context over the last century, especially when it comes to the question of what makes us “what we are,” i.e., human. However, the capacity to sexually select and evolve is not at all a human accomplishment alone or a sign of our uniqueness; yet, we humans, as it seems, are ingenious in fooling ourselves and others–when we are in love or desperately search for it. It is well established that modern biological theory conjectures that **organisms are** the **result of evolutionary competition.** In fact, Richard Dawkins stresses gene survival and propagation as the basic mechanism of life [20]. Only genes that lead to the fittest phenotype will make it. It is noteworthy that the phenotype is selected based on behavior that maximizes gene propagation. To do so, the phenotype must survive and generate offspring, and be better at it than its competitors. Thus, the ultimate, distal function of rewards is to increase evolutionary fitness by ensuring the survival of the organism and reproduction. It is agreed that learning, approach, economic decisions, and positive emotions are the proximal functions through which phenotypes obtain other necessary nutrients for survival, mating, and care for offspring. Behavioral reward functions have evolved to help individuals to survive and propagate their genes. Apparently, people need to live well and long enough to reproduce. Most would agree that homo-sapiens do so by ingesting the substances that make their bodies function properly. For this reason, foods and drinks are rewards. Additional rewards, including those used for economic exchanges, ensure sufficient palatable food and drink supply. Mating and gene propagation is supported by powerful sexual attraction. Additional properties, like body form, augment the chance to mate and nourish and defend offspring and are therefore also rewards. Care for offspring until they can reproduce themselves helps gene propagation and is rewarding; otherwise, many believe mating is useless. According to David E Comings, as any small edge will ultimately result in evolutionary advantage [21], additional reward mechanisms like novelty seeking and exploration widen the spectrum of available rewards and thus enhance the chance for survival, reproduction, and ultimate gene propagation. These functions may help us to obtain the benefits of distant rewards that are determined by our own interests and not immediately available in the environment. Thus the distal reward function in gene propagation and evolutionary fitness defines the proximal reward functions that we see in everyday behavior. That is why foods, drinks, mates, and offspring are rewarding. There have been theories linking pleasure as a required component of health benefits salutogenesis, (salugenesis). In essence, under these terms, pleasure is described as a state or feeling of happiness and satisfaction resulting from an experience that one enjoys. Regarding pleasure, it is a double-edged sword, on the one hand, it promotes positive feelings (like mindfulness) and even better cognition, possibly through the release of dopamine [22]. But on the other hand, pleasure simultaneously encourages addiction and other negative behaviors, i.e., motivational toxicity. It is a complex neurobiological phenomenon, relying on reward circuitry or limbic activity. It is important to realize that through the “Brain Reward Cascade” (BRC) endorphin and endogenous morphinergic mechanisms may play a role [23]. While natural rewards are essential for survival and appetitive motivation leading to beneficial biological behaviors like eating, sex, and reproduction, crucial social interactions seem to further facilitate the positive effects exerted by pleasurable experiences. Indeed, experimentation with addictive drugs is capable of directly acting on reward pathways and causing deterioration of these systems promoting hypodopaminergia [24]. Most would agree that pleasurable activities can stimulate personal growth and may help to induce healthy behavioral changes, including stress management [25]. The work of Esch and Stefano [26] concerning the link between compassion and love implicate the brain reward system, and pleasure induction suggests that social contact in general, i.e., love, attachment, and compassion, can be highly effective in stress reduction, survival, and overall health. Understanding the role of neurotransmission and pleasurable states both positive and negative have been adequately studied over many decades [26–37], but comparative anatomical and neurobiological function between animals and homo sapiens appear to be required and seem to be in an infancy stage. Finding happiness is different between apes and humans As stated earlier in this expert opinion one key to happiness involves a network of good friends [38]. However, it is not entirely clear exactly how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to a sugar rush, winning a sports event or even sky diving, all of which augment dopamine release at the reward brain site. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure. Remarkably, there are pathways for ordinary liking and pleasure, which are limited in scope as described above in this commentary. However, there are **many brain regions**, often termed hot and cold spots, that significantly **modulate** (increase or decrease) our **pleasure or** even **produce the opposite** of pleasure— that is disgust and fear [39]. One specific region of the nucleus accumbens is organized like a computer keyboard, with particular stimulus triggers in rows— producing an increase and decrease of pleasure and disgust. Moreover, the cortex has unique roles in the cognitive evaluation of our feelings of pleasure [40]. Importantly, the interplay of these multiple triggers and the higher brain centers in the prefrontal cortex are very intricate and are just being uncovered. Desire and reward centers It is surprising that many different sources of pleasure activate the same circuits between the mesocorticolimbic regions (Figure 1). Reward and desire are two aspects pleasure induction and have a very widespread, large circuit. Some part of this circuit distinguishes between desire and dread. The so-called pleasure circuitry called “REWARD” involves a well-known dopamine pathway in the mesolimbic system that can influence both pleasure and motivation. In simplest terms, the well-established mesolimbic system is a dopamine circuit for reward. It starts in the ventral tegmental area (VTA) of the midbrain and travels to the nucleus accumbens (Figure 2). It is the cornerstone target to all addictions. The VTA is encompassed with neurons using glutamate, GABA, and dopamine. The nucleus accumbens (NAc) is located within the ventral striatum and is divided into two sub-regions—the motor and limbic regions associated with its core and shell, respectively. The NAc has spiny neurons that receive dopamine from the VTA and glutamate (a dopamine driver) from the hippocampus, amygdala and medial prefrontal cortex. Subsequently, the NAc projects GABA signals to an area termed the ventral pallidum (VP). The region is a relay station in the limbic loop of the basal ganglia, critical for motivation, behavior, emotions and the “Feel Good” response. This defined system of the brain is involved in all addictions –substance, and non –substance related. In 1995, our laboratory coined the term “Reward Deficiency Syndrome” (RDS) to describe genetic and epigenetic induced hypodopaminergia in the “Brain Reward Cascade” that contribute to addiction and compulsive behaviors [3,6,41]. Furthermore, ordinary “liking” of something, or pure pleasure, is represented by small regions mainly in the limbic system (old reptilian part of the brain). These may be part of larger neural circuits. In Latin, hedus is the term for “sweet”; and in Greek, hodone is the term for “pleasure.” Thus, the word Hedonic is now referring to various subcomponents of pleasure: some associated with purely sensory and others with more complex emotions involving morals, aesthetics, and social interactions. The capacity to have pleasure is part of being healthy and may even extend life, especially if linked to optimism as a dopaminergic response [42]. Psychiatric illness often includes symptoms of an abnormal inability to experience pleasure, referred to as anhedonia. A negative feeling state is called dysphoria, which can consist of many emotions such as pain, depression, anxiety, fear, and disgust. Previously many scientists used animal research to uncover the complex mechanisms of pleasure, liking, motivation and even emotions like panic and fear, as discussed above [43]. However, as a significant amount of related research about the specific brain regions of pleasure/reward circuitry has been derived from invasive studies of animals, these cannot be directly compared with subjective states experienced by humans. In an attempt to resolve the controversy regarding the causal contributions of mesolimbic dopamine systems to reward, we have previously evaluated the three-main competing explanatory categories: “liking,” “learning,” and “wanting” [3]. That is, dopamine may mediate (a) liking: the hedonic impact of reward, (b) learning: learned predictions about rewarding effects, or (c) wanting: the pursuit of rewards by attributing incentive salience to reward-related stimuli [44]. We have evaluated these hypotheses, especially as they relate to the RDS, and we find that the incentive salience or “wanting” hypothesis of dopaminergic functioning is supported by a majority of the scientific evidence. Various neuroimaging studies have shown that anticipated behaviors such as sex and gaming, delicious foods and drugs of abuse all affect brain regions associated with reward networks, and may not be unidirectional. Drugs of abuse enhance dopamine signaling which sensitizes mesolimbic brain mechanisms that apparently evolved explicitly to attribute incentive salience to various rewards [45]. Addictive substances are voluntarily self-administered, and they enhance (directly or indirectly) dopaminergic synaptic function in the NAc. This activation of the brain reward networks (producing the ecstatic “high” that users seek). Although these circuits were initially thought to encode a set point of hedonic tone, it is now being considered to be far more complicated in function, also encoding attention, reward expectancy, disconfirmation of reward expectancy, and incentive motivation [46]. The argument about addiction as a disease may be confused with a predisposition to substance and nonsubstance rewards relative to the extreme effect of drugs of abuse on brain neurochemistry. The former sets up an individual to be at high risk through both genetic polymorphisms in reward genes as well as harmful epigenetic insult. Some Psychologists, even with all the data, still infer that addiction is not a disease [47]. Elevated stress levels, together with polymorphisms (genetic variations) of various dopaminergic genes and the genes related to other neurotransmitters (and their genetic variants), and may have an additive effect on vulnerability to various addictions [48]. In this regard, Vanyukov, et al. [48] suggested based on review that whereas the gateway hypothesis does not specify mechanistic connections between “stages,” and does not extend to the risks for addictions the concept of common liability to addictions may be more parsimonious. The latter theory is grounded in genetic theory and supported by data identifying common sources of variation in the risk for specific addictions (e.g., RDS). This commonality has identifiable neurobiological substrate and plausible evolutionary explanations. Over many years the controversy of dopamine involvement in especially “pleasure” has led to confusion concerning separating motivation from actual pleasure (wanting versus liking) [49]. We take the position that animal studies cannot provide real clinical information as described by self-reports in humans. As mentioned earlier and in the abstract, on November 23rd, 2017, evidence for our concerns was discovered [50] In essence, although nonhuman primate brains are similar to our own, the disparity between other primates and those of human cognitive abilities tells us that surface similarity is not the whole story. Sousa et al. [50] small case found various differentially expressed genes, to associate with pleasure related systems. Furthermore, the dopaminergic interneurons located in the human neocortex were absent from the neocortex of nonhuman African apes. Such differences in neuronal transcriptional programs may underlie a variety of neurodevelopmental disorders. In simpler terms, the system controls the production of dopamine, a chemical messenger that plays a significant role in pleasure and rewards. The senior author, Dr. Nenad Sestan from Yale, stated: “Humans have evolved a dopamine system that is different than the one in chimpanzees.” This may explain why the behavior of humans is so unique from that of non-human primates, even though our brains are so surprisingly similar, Sestan said: “It might also shed light on why people are vulnerable to mental disorders such as autism (possibly even addiction).” Remarkably, this research finding emerged from an extensive, multicenter collaboration to compare the brains across several species. These researchers examined 247 specimens of neural tissue from six humans, five chimpanzees, and five macaque monkeys. Moreover, these investigators analyzed which genes were turned on or off in 16 regions of the brain. While the differences among species were subtle, **there was** a **remarkable contrast in** the **neocortices**, specifically in an area of the brain that is much more developed in humans than in chimpanzees. In fact, these researchers found that a gene called tyrosine hydroxylase (TH) for the enzyme, responsible for the production of dopamine, was expressed in the neocortex of humans, but not chimpanzees. As discussed earlier, dopamine is best known for its essential role within the brain’s reward system; the very system that responds to everything from sex, to gambling, to food, and to addictive drugs. However, dopamine also assists in regulating emotional responses, memory, and movement. Notably, abnormal dopamine levels have been linked to disorders including Parkinson’s, schizophrenia and spectrum disorders such as autism and addiction or RDS. Nora Volkow, the director of NIDA, pointed out that one alluring possibility is that the neurotransmitter dopamine plays a substantial role in humans’ ability to pursue various rewards that are perhaps months or even years away in the future. This same idea has been suggested by Dr. Robert Sapolsky, a professor of biology and neurology at Stanford University. Dr. Sapolsky cited evidence that dopamine levels rise dramatically in humans when we anticipate potential rewards that are uncertain and even far off in our futures, such as retirement or even the possible alterlife. This may explain what often motivates people to work for things that have no apparent short-term benefit [51]. In similar work, Volkow and Bale [52] proposed a model in which dopamine can favor NOW processes through phasic signaling in reward circuits or LATER processes through tonic signaling in control circuits. Specifically, they suggest that through its modulation of the orbitofrontal cortex, which processes salience attribution, dopamine also enables shilting from NOW to LATER, while its modulation of the insula, which processes interoceptive information, influences the probability of selecting NOW versus LATER actions based on an individual’s physiological state. This hypothesis further supports the concept that disruptions along these circuits contribute to diverse pathologies, including obesity and addiction or RDS.

#### [2] Actor Spec— States must use util. Any other standard dooms the moral theory

**Goodin 90.** Robert Goodin 90, [professor of philosophy at the Australian National University college of arts and social sciences], “The Utilitarian Response,” pgs 141-142 //RS

My larger argument turns on the proposition that there is something special about the situation of public officials that makes utilitarianism more probable for them than private individuals. Before proceeding with the large argument, I must therefore say what it is that makes it so special about public officials and their situations that make it both more necessary and more desirable for them to adopt a more credible form of utilitarianism. Consider, first, the argument from necessity. Public officials are obliged to make their choices under uncertainty, and uncertainty of a very special sort at that. All choices – public and private alike – are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course. But in the nature of things, private individuals will usually have more complete information on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. Public officials, in contrast, are relatively poorly informed as to the effects that their choices will have on individuals, one by one. What they typically do know are generalities: averages and aggregates. They know what will happen most often to most people as a result of their various possible choices, but that is all. That is enough to allow public policy-makers to use the utilitarian calculus – assuming they want to use it at all – to choose general rules or conduct.

(might take out)

#### [3] Extinction First –

**[a] Forecloses future improvement – we can never improve society because our impact is irreversible**

**[b] Turns suffering – mass death causes suffering because people can’t get access to resources and basic necessities**

**[c] Moral uncertainty – if we’re unsure about which interpretation of the world is true – we ought to preserve the world to keep debating about it**

### Plan

#### Resolved: In a democracy, objectivity ought to be prioritized over advocacy.

#### Definitionally objective news rejects fake news

**Kovach and Rosenstiel., 1** (Bill Kovach and Tom Rosenstiel., Bill Kovach, a 1989 Nieman Fellow, was curator of the Nieman Foundation from 1989 to 2000. He is the co-author of “The Elements of Journalism.”, Tom Rosenstiel is executive director of the American Press Institute and co-author of “The Elements of Journalism.”, 6-15-2001, accessed on 2-19-2022, Nieman Reports, "The Essence of Journalism Is a Discipline of Verification | Nieman Reports", https://niemanreports.org/articles/the-essence-of-journalism-is-a-discipline-of-verification/)

“In the end, the discipline of verification is what separates journalism from entertainment, propaganda, fiction, or art…. Journalism alone is focused first on getting what happened down right…. Perhaps because the discipline of verification is so personal and so haphazardly communicated, it is also part of one of the great confusions of journalism— the concept of objectivity. The original meaning of this idea is now thoroughly misunderstood, and by and large lost. When the concept originally evolved, it was not meant to imply that journalists were free of bias. Quite the contrary…. Objectivity called for journalists to develop a consistent method of testing information—a transparent approach to evidence—precisely so that personal and cultural biases would not undermine the accuracy of their work…. In the original concept, in other words, the method is objective, not the journalist. The key was in the discipline of the craft, not the aim. The point has some important implications. One is that the impartial voice employed by many news organizations, that familiar, supposedly neutral style of newswriting, is not a fundamental principle of journalism. Rather, it is an often helpful device news organizations use to highlight that they are trying to produce something obtained by objective methods. The second implication is that this neutral voice, without a discipline of verification, creates a veneer covering something hollow. Journalists who select sources to express what is really their own point of view, and then use the neutral voice to make it seem objective, are engaged in a form of deception. This damages the credibility of the whole profession by making it seem unprincipled, dishonest, and biased. This is an important caution in an age when the standards of the press are so in doubt…. A more conscious discipline of verification is the best antidote to the old journalism of verification being overrun by a new journalism of assertion, and it would provide citizens with a basis for relying on journalistic accounts. 1.Never add anything that was not there. 2.Never deceive the audience. 3.Be transparent about your methods and motives. 4.Rely on your own original reporting. 5.Exercise humility. …we began to see a core set of concepts that form the foundation of the discipline of verification…. The willingness of the journalist to be transparent about what he or she has done is at the heart of establishing that the journalist is concerned with the truth…. Too much journalism fails to say anything about methods, motives, and sources.”

### Adv 1 – Democracy

#### Democracy is on a global decline and is set to collapse

**Zeleb 22** [Zeleb.es is a south American site made to spread news across the world. This ranges from political to social to environmental news., 02 – 20 – 2022, “Democracy is in decline worldwide per the Global Democracy Index” MSN, https://www.msn.com/en-us/news/world/democracy-is-in-decline-worldwide-per-the-global-democracy-index/ss-AAU147j]//SP

Less than half of the world lives in a democracy Global democracy is in decline, and less than half of the world's population lives under a form of democratic government. These are the results of the latest edition of the Democracy Index from the Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU). A survey done in 167 countries The Democracy Index is an annual survey that ranks the level of democracy in 167 countries. Per The Economist, the Democracy Index uses a ranking system that measures five elements: electoral process and pluralism, the functioning of government, political participation, democratic political culture, and civil liberties. A priviledged 6.4% The latest edition of this study has found that only 6.4% of the world's population lives in a country with full democracy and a shocking 1/3 of the world lives under authoritarian rule. A less democratic world In 2020, 49.4% of the world population was considered to be living in a democracy of some kind or another. However, the number went down to just 45.7% in 2021. Threats to democracy Several threats to democracy were found by the EIU's report for 2022 and the coming years. The report claims that "the biggest challenge to the Western model of democracy over the coming years will come from China."

#### Lack of Objectivity cripples global democracy: ***fake news* and *government distrust***

**DROI 21** [The Directorate-General for External Policies of the Union is responsible for organising the work of Parliament's committees and interparliamentary delegations in the field of external – that is, beyond the EU – policies, April 2021, “The Impact of Disinformation on democratic processes and human rights in the world” European Parliament DROI Subcommitee, [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2021/653635/EXPO\_STU(2021)653635\_EN.pdf]//SP](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2021/653635/EXPO_STU(2021)653635_EN.pdf%5d//SP)

Disinformation has an impact on the basic health and credibility of democratic processes. This has become the core of recent positions taken by international organisations, such as Resolution 2326 (2020) of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) expressing concern ‘about the scale of information pollution in a digitally connected and increasingly polarised world, the spread of disinformation campaigns aimed at shaping public opinion, trends of foreign electoral interference and manipulation’ 59. Information and shared narratives are a precondition for good quality democratic public discourse. In this context, the European Parliament views disinformation as an ‘increasing systematic pressure’ on European societies and their electoral stability60. The European Commission’s strategy Shaping Europe’s Digital Future61 considers that ‘disinformation erodes trust in institutions along with digital and traditional media and harms our democracies by hampering the ability of citizens to take informed decisions’. It also warns that disinformation is set to polarise democratic societies by creating or deepening tensions and undermining democratic pillars such as electoral systems. There are a number of ways in which disinformation weakens democratic institutions. These include the use of social media to channel disinformation in coordinated ways so as to undermine institutions’ credibility. As trust in mainstream media has plummeted62, alternative news ecosystems have flourished. Online platforms’ business model pushes content that generates clicks and this has increased polarisation. This favours the creation of more homogeneous audiences, undercuts tolerance for alternative views63. Figure 2 below suggests that around 80 % of people believe that disinformation has negative impacts in their own countries’ politics, in other countries’ politics and in political discussions among families and friends, which increases polarisation. Surveys also show that disinformation can sow distrust in different pillars of democratic institutions, including public institutions such as governments, parliaments and courts or their processes, public figures, as well as journalists and free media64. For example, a survey undertaken by Ipsos Public Affairs and Centre for International Governance Innovation (CIGI) reports that, due to the spread of disinformation, many citizens have less trust in media (40 %) and government (22 %)65

**Democracy *solves* climate change but we need an *increase* in pace of action**

**Casas-Zamora 21** [Dr. Kevin Casas-Zamora is the Secretary-General of the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA), with over 25 years of experience in democratic governance as a researcher, analyst, educator, consultant and public official. Here he discusses the role that democracy plays in mitigating climate change. 06/29/2021 Why democracy is the key ingredient to battling climate change” <https://www.euronews.com/green/2021/06/29/why-democracy-is-the-key-ingredient-to-battling-climate-change> ] //aaditg

The recent court rulings tell us a lot, not just about the powerful assets that democracy can deploy in the struggle against climate change, but also the long-term robustness of the case for democracy as a political system. Democracies are under pressure from populism, disinformation, inequality and voter frustration, according to the Global State of Democracy report from the intergovernmental organisation International (IDEA). They are also afflicted by a crisis of self-confidence. Fairly or not, the current pandemic has helped cement a narrative portraying liberal democracies as lumbering and too divided to cope with big challenges, while extolling the presumed ability of authoritarian systems to act decisively. Andre Penner/AP2011 Deforestation in the Brazilian AmazonAndre Penner/AP2011 ‘Extremists and populists on the rise’: Why the EU needs a green prosecutor What are the vices to democracy? This narrative is not concocted out of thin air. Democracies do suffer from vices when it comes to slow-burning crises like global warming. Voters and politicians have short attention spans. **Balances** of power **mean reforms can be held hostage to obstinate US Senators or oil lobbyists.** Science can play second fiddle to voters if it entails higher taxes - France’s yellow vest protests, sparked by fuel price rises, are a case in point. And yet, despite all this, the facts are clear - **9 out of the 10 top performers in the 2021 Climate Change Performance Index are democracies.** Sweden tops the list of 57 countries. China is 30th. The reasons for this are not hard to fathom. **Democracies allow for the free flow of information that enables policy makers to debate and find solutions, and for civil society to mobilise**. It is no coincidence that youth campaigner Greta Thunberg helped spark a global movement from a lone street demonstration in Sweden, one of the world’s top performing democracies. It is no coincidence that youth campaigner Greta Thunberg helped spark a global movement from a lone street demonstration in Sweden, one of the world’s top performing democracies. Democracies are more effective against climate change for the same reasons that they don’t experience famines, as Nobel Laureate Indian economist **Amartya Sen suggested long ago - because in allowing freedom of expression, a vibrant civil society, regular elections and the workings of checks and balances, they increase the likelihood that crises will be met and destructive policies corrected.** Democracy is not simply elections - it is the often chaotic workings of myriad institutions and groups as well as a culture of open debate, where climate reform is nudged along by courts, free media, parliaments, and public protests. Democracy’s most powerful weapon against the challenges of this century is its ability to self-correct. And then there is the capacity of democratic systems to forge the social consensus required for long-term transformations to be sustainable. We know this story - participatory decision-making may be slower than executive decrees, but almost always yields outcomes that are more legitimate and accepted by society, and hence more durable. Canva Democracy is a key ingredient to fighting climate changeCanva This is vital for climate change. Decarbonisation is not something governments do by fiat, though act they must - it is something societies as a whole must do by conviction. Consumer habits will need to change, from reducing air travel to adjusting diets. Trillions of dollars will have to be invested in transforming the sources of energy that fuel economies. New social contracts will have to be devised so that the burden of these fiscal bills can be equitably shared. **There is no guarantee that democracies will succeed in building the consensus needed to save our species, but their odds are better than those of any other political arrangement.** Could decarbonising our cities be the answer to climate change? Kids are disappointed in grownups’ ‘un-green’ ways: Here are their plans for a cleaner future Democratic governance could slow down climate change This is, however, the key question – while it is clear that **the attributes of democracy are potentially superior to deal with climate change, it is much less clear that they will be actually deployed with the celerity required**. This is, precisely, what courts are doing in Germany and elsewhere - they are moving forward the deadlines that political systems and societies must meet if our species is to avoid disaster. Those deadlines are tight – a few decades, at most. But courts alone won’t do the trick. **Democratic governments, parliaments, and political leaders must also dramatically increase the pace of their actions.** This is why it is so vital to connect the discussion of climate change with debates on the quality of democratic governance. We must distill, disseminate, and design the institutions and practices that are more likely to allow democracies to build consensus, distribute burdens and make decisions effectively to meet the climate crisis. **Experimenting with new forms of political deliberation**, like citizens’ assemblies, enlarging the representation of young people by lowering the voting age and adopting some of the bargaining practices between industries, workers and governments that **have been** so **instrumental** in **building consensus** in Northern Europe - this is the stuff democratic governance agendas should be made of in the climate crisis era.

#### Global Democracy key to sustaining world peace

**Cordenillo 18** [Raul Cordenillo’s work focused on enhancing International IDEA's profile as the primary actor for effective and sustainable democracy building by maximising the potential of its knowledge resources, policy initiatives and reform assistance programmes. He represented the voice of International IDEA in local and international media and other communication networks and oversees the work of the communications team (communications, publications and the library)., 09 – 21 – 2018, “Democracy and Peace – symbiotic and mutually reinforcing” IDEA International, [https://www.idea.int/news-media/news/democracy-and-peace-%E2%80%93-symbiotic-and-mutually-reinforcing]//SP](https://www.idea.int/news-media/news/democracy-and-peace-%E2%80%93-symbiotic-and-mutually-reinforcing%5d//SP)

As we commemorate the [International Day of Peace](https://internationaldayofpeace.org/) on 21 September, it is only apt to reflect on how our work and day-to-day activities help promote and sustain peace in our communities and beyond our respective countries’ borders. Just as International IDEA supports sustainable democracy worldwide, we also champion peace and conflict prevention. The relationship between democracy and peace is perhaps one of the more researched topics in political science. Is democracy good for peace? Or is it peace that leads to democracy? One of the foremost theories on this is the Theory of Democratic Peace, originally conceived by Immanuel Kant. The theory suggests that the more democratic two regimes are, the less likely they will engage in conflict. Dan Reiter, in his article “[Is Democracy a Cause of Peace](http://politics.oxfordre.com/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228637-e-287)”, looks more closely into this relationship by addressing critics of the theory who argue that the “observed correlation between democracy and peace does not mean that democracy causes peace”. Reiter concludes firstly, that there is enough evidence to show that democracy does cause peace at least between democracies and secondly, several factors (including democracy) cause peace and that the causality among the factors of democracy and peace is likely to be bidirectional. The Theory of Democratic Peace when related to International IDEA’s [Global State of Democracy](https://www.idea.int/gsod/) publication, which put forward that from 1975-2015 democracy has advanced with most electoral democracies established during this period surviving, can help explain why there is more peace and lesser conflict. This is further qualified in [Inclusive Peace – or not peace at all](https://www.idea.int/news-media/news/inclusive-peace-%E2%80%93-or-no-peace-all), which advances that within countries, inclusive governance and adherence to fundamental rights can help a great deal in overcoming challenges to peace and parting ways with a violent past. This is also empirically supported by “[Conflict Trends and Conflict Drivers: An Empirical Assessment of Historical Conflict Patterns and Future Conflict Projections](https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR1063.html)” by Szayna, Thomas, et al., which highlights that overall levels of conflict have been declining in the past two decades. On the one hand, inter-state violence has decreased the most, both in incidence and intensity of armed conflict. On the other hand, while intra-state conflict and low intensity violence are declining, they are doing so in a slower pace. International IDEA’s commitment to peace is clearly expressed in the [video message](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FaDeNHlYihE) from our Secretary-General. In the message, Yves Leterme also highlights the prominence of intra-state conflicts and puts forward pointers to help mitigate it. To nurture and protect peace, International IDEA helps to enable and equip democratic actors and institutions with the knowledge, frameworks and tools for dialogue, engagement and peacebuilding. In [Helmets are not enough: What West Africa today tells us about the realities of conflict prevention](https://www.idea.int/news-media/news/helmets-are-not-enough-what-west-africa-today-tells-us-about-realities-conflict), we zero in on organized crime and how its corruptive influence can undermine democracy. One foremost lesson is that by identifying the areas that are most vulnerable to the influence of organized crime and political corruption, it is possible to prioritize conflict preventive actions that strengthen governance and democracy. The [IntegriTAS Threat Assessment System](https://www.idea.int/data-tools/tools/integritas-threat-assessment-system) can precisely help government and Civil Society do this. In Substate constitutions in Myanmar, we look closely at how sub-state constitutions can be used as an effective framework for sustainable peace in a country that is divided by ethnic and territorial conflict. Informed by the policy paper, [Substate Constitutions in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Settings](https://www.idea.int/news-media/news/substate-constitutions-and-peace-negotiations), International IDEA’s office in Myanmar hopes to help set the tone and establish a framework for constructive engagement for all stakeholders. In [Planting elections in barren soil? Timing and sequencing of elections after violent conflict](https://www.idea.int/news-media/news/planting-elections-barren-soil-timing-and-sequencing-elections-after-violent), we are presented the dilemmas that democracy support organizations face when invited to assist a country that has recently undergone a conflict. While it is clear that trusted and capable electoral management and electoral justice institutions are necessary for the conduct of peaceful and credible elections, how does one know that a post-conflict country is ready to take the next step by holding elections? Finally, in [Enhancing the peacebuilding role of political parties and parliament in Haiti](https://www.idea.int/news-media/news/enhancing-peacebuilding-role-political-parties-and-parliament-haiti), we present our work on enhancing the role of democratic actors and institutions in addressing the political divide in order to shape and sustain a culture of accountability for the country. Other than just meeting the demands for integrity, accountability and responsiveness to democratic institutions, political parties and parliaments are ultimately expected to be a stronger bridge for political stability and peace.

Might need to take out war impact depending on judge

**The alternative to democracy is violent civil wars, ethnic cleansing, and genocide---the best research confirms**

**Cortright 13**, David Cortright is the director of Policy Studies at the Kroc Institute for Peace Studies at the University of Notre Dame, Chair of the Board of Directors of the Fourth Freedom Forum, and author of 17 books, Kristen Wall is a Researcher and Analyst at the Kroc Institute, Conor Seyle is Associate Director of One Earth Future, Governance, Democracy, and Peace How State Capacity and Regime Type Influence the Prospects of War and Peace, http://oneearthfuture.org/sites/oneearthfuture.org/files//documents/publications/Cortright-Seyle-Wall-Paper.pdf

The classic statement of **Kantian peace** theory applies to interstate conflict and focuses on dyadic relations between states. This **leaves out the most common form of armed violence in the world today, civil conflicts and one-sided violence within states. In recent years, researchers** have **found evidence** that the **democratic peace** phenomenon **applies within states as well as between them**. Regime type matters not only externally but internally. **Mature democratic governments** are not only less likely to wage war on each other, they also **experience fewer armed uprisings and major civil wars and are more reluctant to use armed violence against** their own **citizens. As the studies** below **indicate**, the **evidence of a democratic peace phenomenon within states is strong and compelling**. Walter observes a direct relationship between levels of democracy and the likelihood of internal armed conflict. In her examination of the problem of war recurrence, she finds that **countries characterized by open political systems and economic well-being—i.e., developed democracies— have a much lower probability of renewed civil war than autocratic countries with low levels of economic development**.91 Walter measures the degree of political openness and democratic ‘voice’ by using Polity and Freedom House indicators. High scores on these indices correlate directly with a reduced risk of civil war. She notes**, as other scholars have observed**, that **major civil wars do not occur in mature democratic states.** She concludes: It may be that **liberal democracies are really the only types of regimes that can truly insulate themselves from violent internal challenges**. This suggests that **citizens who are able to express their preferences about alternative policies and leaders, who are guaranteed civil liberties in their daily lives and in acts of political participation, are less likely to become soldiers. Offering citizens a real outlet for** their **concerns and having** a **government** that is **open to democratic change considerably reduces the likelihood of** a **civil war**.92 **Civil conflicts within mature democracies are not only less frequent but also less lethal.** Bethany **Lacina assesses the severity of civil conflicts by measuring casualty levels according to several variables: regime type, state capacity, ethnic and religious diversity, and the impact of foreign military intervention. She finds** that the **political characteristics of a regime correlate significantly with differing casualty levels and are the strongest predictor of conflict severity. Democratic governments experience much lower casualty levels during civil conflict than autocratic states**. Lacina’s analysis finds that civil wars occurring within democratic states have less than half the battle deaths of conflicts in non-democracies.93 **State-sponsored violence against civilians is also less likely to occur in democracies than in autocracies**. In his important book, Death by Government, Rudolph **Rummel assembles mind numbing data and numerous examples demonstrating the myriad ways governments kill** their **citizens**—directly **through genocide and mass terror and indirectly through starvation and repression. He finds a stark contrast between the behavior of autocracies and democracies. Autocratic governments readily “slaughter their people by the tens of millions; in contrast**, many **democracies can barely bring themselves to execute even serial murderers**.”94 **Through statistical analysis, Rummel shows** that **genocidal killing is directly associated with the absence of democracy**, holding constant other variables such as regime type, ethnic diversity, economic development level, population density, and culture.95 The **lack of democracy is the most significant indicator of the likelihood of mass repression again the civilian population**. As Rummel documents the appalling litany of governments murdering their own people, he is unequivocal about what he considers the necessary remedy—“The solution is democracy. The course of action is to foster freedom.”95 Barbara **Harff’s** **research** on genocidal violence **comes to similar conclusions. She examines 126 cases of internal war and regime collapse between** 1955 and 1997 **to identify** the **factors that led to genocidal violence in 35 of these cases. Her results match the findings of other studies. Autocratic regimes facing state failure are three and a half times more likely to experience genocidal violence than democratic regimes facing such failure**.97 She finds that **genocidal violence is more likely in regimes that advocate exclusionary ideologies, an approach that is rare in mature democratic states**. Harff observes that the **lowest levels of mass killing occur in states with a high degree of economic interdependence, which is characteristic of mature democratic regimes**.98 Her conclusion is that states are less likely to employ genocidal violence when they have inclusive democratic systems and trade extensively with other countries. As Steven Pinker notes, these findings fit well with the Kantian triad of democracy, cosmopolitanism and trade— “another trifecta” for liberal peace theory.99

**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 of the **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 as the **deepening**, **accumulating**, and **thickening** interdependencies of globalization urge global government. But the 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. Order refers to a society’s investment of awesome material power in 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 shelter themselves 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 submit to 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-profit research centers, and corporations. It is a **myth** that the Market System did all this **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 their respective 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** encompasses the **millions** of Russians living in the former republics 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 assert its 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 as instruments 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.

### Adv 2 – Climate

#### Climate change is a public health emergency according to WHO definitions

Harmer 20 [Andrew Harmer, lecturer in Global Health Policy in the Global Health and Innovation Unit, Centre for Primary Care and Public Health at the University of London with a PhD in International Relations from the University of Southampton, 3-30-2020, "WHO should declare climate change a public health emergency," BMJ, https://www.bmj.com/content/368/bmj.m797]/Kankee

One way to stimulate action is for the World Health Organization to declare climate change a public health emergency of international concern. Several voices have already called for this step. At the opening plenary of the World Health Assembly in Geneva in May 2019, the editor of the Lancet, Richard Horton, urged member states and WHO secretariat to “declare a planetary emergency.”4 A couple of days later, during a side event on air pollution, climate change, oceans, and health sponsored by the Swedish government, the minister of health for the Seychelles, Jean Paul Adam, argued forcefully that: “we have to recognise that climate change is a public health emergency at the international level.” We examine how WHO could and should use the authority it derives from its constitution and the International Health Regulations to declare climate change an international public health emergency. WHO’s authority to act on climate change WHO’s constitution defines health as “a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity.” Climate change threatens each of the elements in that definition. It also authorises WHO “to foster the ability to live harmoniously in a changing total environment,” and the planet is now experiencing total environmental change.5 Furthermore, the constitution allows WHO’s executive board “to take emergency measures within the functions and financial resources of the Organisation to deal with events requiring immediate action... and undertake studies and research the urgency [of those events]” (article 28, i).6 The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change reported in 2018 that we could have as few as 11 years in which to prevent the world from warming beyond 1.5°C, a temperature threshold that, if breached, will have serious consequences for global health.7 The International Health Regulations incorporate a multihazard perspective on health emergencies that enables WHO to assist countries to: “prepare for and respond to a wide range of public health events” resulting from conflict, technological hazard, and natural disasters.8 However, the regulations use a very narrow definition of a health emergency. Specifically, a public health emergency of international concern is “an extraordinary event which is determined ... to constitute a public health risk to other States through the international spread of disease and to potentially require a coordinated international response,”9 where event “means a manifestation of disease or an occurrence that creates a potential for disease.”9 In practice, therefore, public health emergencies have been declared only for infectious disease outbreaks, such as the recent outbreak of covid-19.10 More than a risk factor Under current WHO definitions climate change does not constitute an event appropriate for consideration as a public health emergency. Furthermore, WHO’s emergency response framework describes climate change as a “risk factor” that can trigger health emergencies rather than an emergency in its own right.11 We argue that climate change can no longer be understood merely as a risk factor. It is a totalising event that will, according to WHO’s quantitative risk assessment, cause an additional 250 000 deaths between 2030 and 2050.12 This figure is an underestimate because of the limited number of health conditions reviewed—malaria, heat exposure in elderly people, diarrhoea, and childhood undernutrition. Food insecurity, for example, could account for a further 529 000 adult deaths by 2050.13 In terms of mortality, climate change will directly and indirectly lead to a higher number of deaths than all of the previous public health emergencies combined (box 1). Non-communicable diseases such as cancer and cardiovascular stroke also cause considerable mortality, but despite the increase in global burden, non-communicable diseases are unlikely to have the same escalation rate and health impact as climate change will have on the global population. There is clearly a need for an internationally coordinated response to infectious diseases outbreaks, and we fully support the mandate of WHO to declare public health emergencies for such events. However, given the high mortality that will result from climate change, the impact it will have on health systems, and the need to mitigate its effects immediately, we argue that climate change warrants similar treatment.Even within WHO’s restricted definition of a health emergency, we argue that climate change satisfies the conditions of a public health emergency of international concern. Increasing heat and precipitation alter the range of disease vectors, increasing it in some locations while decreasing it in others. Climate change thus induces “a potential for disease” by increasing the conditions suitable for disease transmission. The number of people newly at risk of potential viral transmission by the mosquito species Aedes aegypti and A albopictus will approach one billion within this century.20 This includes dengue virus, for which global vectorial capacity is increasing “in step” with global carbon dioxide emissions, and yellow fever; both these diseases are mentioned in annex 2 of the International Health Regulations as having the potential to constitute an international public health emergency.21 Country borders offer little defence against the global expansion and redistribution of disease, so climate change requires a coordinated international response. Triggering an emergency The International Health Regulations set out the five stages that the director general must consider before declaring a public health emergency of international concern (box 2). The first step is to assess information from member states on events detected by their national surveillance system. In the context of climate change, this information has already been provided in the form of “country profiles” for 45 countries (including six small island states) and will be monitored closely by WHO.22 With that information, the director general would seek the advice of the emergency committee, consult scientific evidence, and assess the risk of climate change to human health. Various disease specific, climate induced events could trigger an international public health emergency. Article 13 of the International Health Regulations puts the responsibility for the response on member states but, in consultation, WHO may offer further assistance, “including an assessment of the severity of the international risk and the adequacy of control measures.” In the case of increased Aedes transmitted viruses, an adequate control measure would begin with the implementation of a rapid zero emissions strategy, with the aim of limiting global warming to 1.5°C, and grounded in principles of climate justice and rights. Though not sufficient, as noted above it could protect one billion people from infection. Wider definition

#### Climate change is increasing and at its tipping point

**Cho 21** [Renee Cho, “How Close Are We to Climate Tipping Points?” State of the Planet, 10 Nov. 2021, news.climate.columbia.edu/2021/11/11/how-close-are-we-to-climate-tipping-points/.] // VS

As world leaders gather at the United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP26) in Glasgow, Scotland, to take bolder action against climate change, human activity has already warmed the planet 1.1°C above pre-industrial levels. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has warned that exceeding 2°C of warming could have catastrophic consequences and that we need to keep global warming to 1.5°C. The world is currently on track to surpass both of those limits. Under the most optimistic scenario, if all 140 countries that have announced net zero targets or are considering them actually reach these goals, as well as their more ambitious 2030 commitments under the Paris Agreement, warming could be limited to 1.8°C by 2100. But will overshooting 1.5°C push us over climate tipping points, triggering irreversible and abrupt changes? The IPCC’s latest report warned of that possibility, and UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres recently said, “…time is running out. Irreversible climate tipping points lie alarmingly close.” What are the tipping points? And how close are they? A tipping point is the point at which small changes become significant enough to cause a larger, more critical change that can be abrupt, irreversible, and lead to cascading effects. The concept of tipping points was introduced by the IPCC 20 years ago, but then it was thought they would only occur if global warming reached 5°C. Recent IPCC assessments, however, suggested that tipping points could be reached between 1°C and 2°C of warming. Here are the major climate tipping points (include). Greenland ice sheet The Greenland ice sheet contains enough water to raise global sea levels by over 20 feet and its melting is accelerating. From 1992 to 2018, it lost close to four trillion tons of ice. While its disintegration is not likely to be abrupt, there could come a point beyond which its eventual collapse is irreversible for millennia. A new study found that ice-sheet height and melting rates in the Jakobshavn basin, one of the fastest melting basins in Greenland, are destabilizing the ice sheet. Most of the melting occurs on the ice surface because of warming temperatures, but as the height of the ice sheet is reduced, the surface is exposed to warmer air at lower altitudes, which further speeds melting. In addition, less snowfall leaves the ice surface darker so it absorbs more of the sun’s heat and warms faster. Scientists are not sure if a tipping point has been passed but the study found that there would likely be more melting in the near future. In other research, scientists speculated that the critical temperature range at which the Greenland ice sheet would go into irreversible disintegration is between 0.8°C and 3.2°C of warming above pre-industrial levels. The West Antarctic Ice Sheet (WAIS) The WAIS is vulnerable to collapse (right now) because it sits on bedrock below sea level and is affected by the ocean’s warming. A 2018 study found that the WAIS went from ice loss of almost 58.5 billion tons a year between 1992 and 1997 to 175 billion tons from 2012 to 2017. The Thwaites Glacier on West Antarctica’s Amundsen Sea has lost a trillion tons of ice since the early 2000s, and some scientists believe it could be headed for an irreversible collapse, which could threaten a large part of the WAIS and raise global sea levels by two feet or more. The Pine Island glacier, also on the Amundsen Sea, is thinning rapidly as well. A new study found that current policies, heading for almost 3°C of warming, would result in an abrupt hastening of Antarctic ice loss after 2060, while other research suggests that the tipping point for the WAIS lies between 1.5°C and 2.0°C of warming. Another new study found that if the WAIS melted, it could raise sea levels three feet more than previous projections of 10.5 feet; Antarctica as a whole contains enough ice to raise global sea levels by over 200 feet. Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation (AMOC) The AMOC is one of the main global ocean currents and is critical to regulating climate. Cold salty water, which is dense and heavy, sinks deep into the ocean in the North Atlantic, and moves along the bottom until it rises to the surface near the equator, usually in the Pacific and Indian Oceans. Heat from the sun then warms the water, and evaporation leaves the water saltier. The warm salty water travels up the coast via the Gulf Stream, warming the U.S. East Coast and Western Europe. Once the water releases its heat and reaches the North Atlantic, it becomes cold and dense again, and the cycle, which can take water 1,000 years to complete, continues. But as glaciers and ice sheets melt, they add fresh, less dense water to the North Atlantic, which prevents the water from sinking and impedes circulation. This may be why AMOC has slowed 15 percent since the 1950s. A recent study found that the AMOC is in its weakest state in 1,000 years. Moreover, the latest climate models project that continued global warming could weaken the AMOC by 34 to 45 percent by 2100. If the AMOC shuts down, it would cause significant cooling along the east coast of the U.S. and Western Europe. This, in turn, would alter rainfall patterns, make sea levels rise, cause more drying, and reduce agriculture in the U.K. It could also potentially set off other tipping points. And even if global warming is reversed, once shut down, the AMOC would not switch back on for a long time. Scientists believe this occurred during the last ice age when a glacial lake burst and poured freshwater into the Atlantic. As the AMOC shut down, the Northern Hemisphere entered a cold spell that lasted 1,000 years. While there are still many uncertainties, some studies suggest that the AMOC’s tipping point could be reached between 3°C and 5.5°C of warming. Amazon rainforest The Amazon rainforest, the world’s largest tropical rainforest, stores 200 billion tons of carbon—equal to about five years of global carbon emissions from the burning of fossil fuels—and is home to millions of species of plants and wildlife. The moisture from the Amazon’s rainfall returns to the atmosphere from the soil through evaporation and from plants through transpiration. This self-sustaining process creates clouds and more rainfall. Because of logging, ranching, mining, agriculture, and fires, the Amazon has lost about 17 percent of its tree cover and at the current rate of deforestation, could reach a loss of 27 percent by 2030. The policies of Brazil’s pro-development president, Jair Bolsonaro, have led to widespread clear-cutting and the rate of deforestation in Brazil is the highest since 2008. If 20-25 percent of the Amazon were deforested, its tipping point (close) could be crossed, according to one study. Fewer trees would mean less evapotranspiration, and without enough rainfall to sustain itself, the Amazon could start to die back. In other words, parts of the rainforest could transition into a savannah, a drier ecosystem characterized by grasslands and few trees. In the process, it would potentially release 90 gigatons of CO2, exacerbating climate change. Crossing this tipping point would also result in the loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services, affect global weather patterns, and threaten the lives of 30 million people, many Indigenous, who depend on the rainforest to survive. One study found that dieback would occur if we reach 3°C of warming. The Amazon is already feeling the effects of climate change, as over the last century, temperatures in the region have increased 1°C to 1.5°C. The Amazon is experiencing longer and hotter dry seasons that make it more vulnerable to wildfires, reduced evapotranspiration in response to higher levels of CO2, and there are now more drought-tolerant tree species. Scientists are unsure whether the Amazon has a single overall tipping point, or when exactly it might be reached, and the ecosystem has some ability to adapt to changing conditions. But fires and drought could cause local changes that spread drying conditions to other regions because of an overall reduction of moisture. Twenty-eight percent of the eastern part of the Amazon is already losing more carbon than it is absorbing due to deforestation. And some climate models predict that by 2035, the Amazon will be a permanent source of carbon. Thawing permafrost Permafrost is ground that remains frozen for two or more consecutive years and is composed of rock, soil, sediments, and ice. Some permafrost has been frozen for tens or hundreds of thousands of years. It is found in northern hemisphere lands without glaciers, including parts of Siberia, Alaska, northern Canada and Tibet. In the Southern Hemisphere, there is permafrost in parts of Patagonia, Antarctica and the Southern Alps of New Zealand. Fourteen hundred billion tons of carbon are thought to be frozen in the Arctic’s permafrost, which is twice as much carbon as is currently in the atmosphere. But the Arctic is warming two times faster than the rest of the planet—it has already warmed 2°C above pre-industrial levels. As it warms and thaws the permafrost, microbes come out of hibernation and break down the organic carbon in the soil, releasing CO2 and methane, which then trigger even more warming and melting. The 2019 Arctic Report Card from NOAA found that the Arctic’s thawing permafrost could be releasing 300 to 600 million tons of carbon per year into the atmosphere. Methane stored in ice-like formations called hydrates are also found in permafrost in ocean sediments. This methane may be released as hydrates are thawed by warming seawater. Scientists recently discovered methane leaking from a giant ancient reservoir of methane below the permafrost of the Laptev Sea in the East Siberian Arctic Ocean. Scientists don’t know exactly how much carbon could ultimately be released by thawing permafrost or when. According to one report, 2°C of warming could mean the loss of 40 percent of the world’s permafrost. ENSO El Niño and La Niña are the warm and cool, naturally occurring weather patterns across the tropical Pacific—the El Niño-Southern Oscillation, or ENSO. Every two to seven years, the pattern alternates, bringing disruptions in temperature and precipitation. El Niño causes impacts around the world, such as more drought in India, Indonesia and Brazil, and flooding in Peru. As the ocean warms, it could push ENSO past a tipping point, which would make El Niño events more severe and frequent and could increase drought in the Amazon. Tipping point interactions A recent study of the WAIS, the Greenland ice sheet, the AMOC, ENSO, and the Amazon rainforest tipping points found that they could interact with one another before temperatures reach 2°C. This interaction would enable tipping to occur at lower thresholds than previously expected. The risk analysis found that a cascade could potentially begin with the melting of the ice sheets because their critical thresholds are lower. For example, as the Greenland ice sheet releases fresh water into the North Atlantic, the AMOC could slow. This would result in less heat being transported towards the north. As the North got colder, it could potentially help stabilize the Greenland ice sheet. However, it would also result in warmer water in the Southern Ocean and this could lead to more drought in some parts of the Amazon while others get more rainfall. Changes in the AMOC could also trigger changes in ENSO, leading to a more permanent El Niño state, whose impacts could lower the critical threshold for Amazon dieback. The scientists say that these changes would occur over long time scales, and that the limits of computing power make it impossible to represent each climate system’s tipping point or their interactions exactly. Can we avoid the climate tipping points? Seventy-three percent of people in G20 countries think Earth is close to climate tipping points, according to a Global Commons Alliance poll. And much research indicates that if we do not curb our carbon emissions immediately to keep global warming below 2°C, we are headed for irreversible and catastrophic conditions. But some experts are more sanguine. Robin Bell, a polar scientist at Columbia University’s Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, who specializes in ice sheet dynamics, doesn’t believe the ice sheets are at a tipping point yet. “The most recent science is suggesting that maybe some of the runaway mechanisms we were worried about, might not occur,” she said. “For example, in terms of the WAIS, pressure on the giant river of ice could keep it from flowing. It means either we just need to keep icebergs in the way, or maybe it’s something we can think about engineering. It’s not that we have to hold the whole thing back, we just have to put a little pressure on it, and it will possibly not collapse—the ice sheet may not be as bad as we thought and maybe we have some time to get our act together.” Bell worries more about the social tipping points than the physical ones. Will they occur fast enough to forestall climate tipping points? Social tipping points are the points where many members of society quickly and dramatically change their behavior or thinking. A 2020 study proposed six social tipping points that could help stabilize Earth’s climate: removing fossil-fuel subsidies and incentivizing decentralized energy generation, building carbon-neutral cities, divesting from assets linked to fossil fuels, clarifying the moral implications of fossil fuels, expanding climate education and engagement, and making greenhouse gas emissions transparent. ”The real question is: Is there the social will to act?” Bell said. “And it appears that the social will is emerging. We really are starting to have serious conversations. People from the individual scale to the government scale are taking action, and that’s what needs to happen.” Steve Cohen, senior vice dean of Columbia University’s School of Professional Studies and a professor in the Practice of Public Affairs at Columbia’s School of International and Public Affairs, places his hope in technology. “The most important driver of change in the modern world has been technology,” he said. “And it’s a pretty simple equation: technological change leads to economic change, leads to social and cultural change, which leads to political change.” Technological change can be difficult to predict but can sometimes lead to rapid changes, said Cohen, citing the ubiquitous and indispensable smart phone as a prime example. “The phone is the most important thing you take when you leave the house because it’s a portable computer that you bring around with you. Would anybody have predicted that 25 years ago?” He also puts great hope in young people. “If you look at polling data, young people by a huge margin understand the climate issue. And it cuts across ideology, cuts across everything. It you’re under 30, you know, there’s a climate crisis.” The pledges countries make in Glasgow at COP26 and the policies they implement afterwards will ultimately determine how close the world will come to climate tipping points. Greta Thunberg, the 18-year-old Swedish climate activist with millions of young followers, went to Glasgow to join a climate strike and put pressure on politicians to get them to make real commitments to curb climate change. “We know that change is possible because we can look back in history and see that there have been massive changes in society that have been unprecedented,” Thunberg said. “If we felt like there wasn’t any hope, we wouldn’t be activists.”

#### Fake news *decimates* climate goals – assumes thumpers and adaptation

IANS ’21 [Indo-Asian News Service or IANS is a private Indian news agency, “Fake news is stopping us from achieving climate goals, claim scientists”, 03-23-2021, https://www.freepressjournal.in/science/fake-news-is-stopping-us-from-achieving-climate-goals-claim-scientists]//pranav

London: While technologies such as Artificial Intelligence (AI) could help the world deal with dangerous climate and environmental change, fake news on social media about global warming and biodiversity loss has emerged as a barrier in the climate change mitigation efforts, a group of scientists has warned. The report, published in Ambio, a journal of the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, concludes that inequality and environmental challenges are deeply linked. Reducing inequality will increase trust within societies. Trust is essential for governments to make long-term decisions, the report argues. Social media and access to reliable knowledge is also highlighted as a barrier to progress. "As the pressure of human activities accelerates on Earth, so too does the hope that technologies such as artificial intelligence will be able to help us deal with dangerous climate and environmental change," said Co-author Victor Galaz, Deputy Director of the Stockholm Resilience Centre. "That will only happen however, if we act forcefully in ways that redirects the direction of technological change towards planetary stewardship and responsible innovation." Human actions are threatening the resilience and stability of Earth's biosphere -- the wafer-thin veil around Earth where life thrives, according to the report published for the first Nobel Prize Summit, a digital gathering to be held in April to discuss the state of the planet in the wake of the Covid-19 pandemic. "In a single human lifetime, largely since the 1950s, we have grossly simplified the biosphere, a system that has evolved over 3.8 billion years. Now just a few plants and animals dominate the land and oceans," said lead author Carl Folke, Director of the Beijer Institute of Ecological Economics and Chair of the Stockholm Resilience Centre at Stockholm University. "Our actions are making the biosphere more fragile, less resilient and more prone to shocks than before."

#### Fake news *weakens* perception of climate change – misinformation *uniquely* targets climate science.

Drummond & Woods ’20 [Interview of Caitlin Drummond with questions asked by Taylor Woods, Caitlin Drummond - assistant professor at ASU's​ ​School of Human Evolution and Social Change​, teaching courses within the school’s environmental social science program, “Study finds brief exposure to 'fake news' can affect beliefs on climate change”, 08-31-2020, https://news.asu.edu/20200831-study-finds-brief-exposure-fake-news-can-affect-beliefs-climate-change]//pranav

Question: What is the overall goal of this research?

Answer: Our research sought to better understand how exposure to fake news that casts doubt on the existence of climate change might influence people's subsequent beliefs. People’s beliefs, such as whether or not they believe in climate change or whether or not they trust scientists, are important to the decisions they make around climate change. Q: What is fake news? A: Fake news is false information that doesn't occur through the same journalistic processes as regular news but mimics regular news. It can be difficult to identify fake news because online, it's relatively easy to mimic the formatting and the style associated with real news. Q: What did you find in this study? A: People who are exposed to fake news about climate change report slightly lower levels of belief in climate change and slightly weaker perceptions of the scientific consensus on changes in our climate. But overall, those effects are small. What seems to be the bigger driver of people's belief in climate change is their political ideology, which has been widely studied before. Q: How did your team conduct this research? A: We recruited a nationally representative sample of people to take an online survey, and each participant was randomly assigned to a different experimental condition. Some people were assigned to read fake news headlines about pop culture topics, and that was our control group. The other people were randomly assigned to see fake news on climate change. The second part of the experiment included questions about a participant’s beliefs, values and attitudes on different sociocultural issues. Among those were questions about whether or not someone believed in climate change. Q: Are there implications for future research? A: This study suggests to me that there is a lot more work to be done to better understand how exposure to misinformation actually affects people's decision-making.​ ​In terms of fake news specifically about climate change, there's been a lot of concern that exposure to fake news, and holding scientifically inaccurate beliefs regarding climate change, might lead people to not support climate policy or make decisions that are not in the best interests of the climate. Q: Is climate change more of a “target” for fake news than other political topics? A: There has been a concerted effort to promote misinformation on climate change by a variety of different parties. But I think it’s important to separate overall trust in science as a whole from trust in subgroups of scientists, like climate scientists, who have been the target of misinformation and disinformation campaigns. There are specific controversial areas of science, but there are also many other areas of science where we see a healthier relationship between the public and scientists.

#### Objectivity solves – checks back against misinformation and lets awareness spillover into action.

Biddlestone & van der Linden ’21 [Mikey Biddlestone - Postdoctoral Research Associate, Social Decision-Making Lab, University of Cambridge, Sander van der Linden - Professor of Social Psychology in Society and Director, Cambridge Social Decision-Making Lab, University of Cambridge, “Climate change misinformation fools too many people – but there are ways to combat it”, 10-28-2021, https://theconversation.com/climate-change-misinformation-fools-too-many-people-but-there-are-ways-to-combat-it-170658]//pranav

Despite widespread awareness of the problems caused by fake news, many people we surveyed didn’t recognise their own role in this process. While large majorities worried about the effects of climate change misinformation and said that they didn’t share it themselves, 24% reported hardly ever fact-checking the information they read. This could suggest the public aren’t sure which sources are reliable, making them more vulnerable to the very misinformation they see as damaging to the cause of tackling climate change. Clearly, more can be done to educate people on how to distinguish real from fake climate change information. One way to do this is through a process called inoculation, or prebunking. Just as vaccines train cells to detect foreign invaders, research has shown that stories which pre-emptively refute short extracts of misinformation can help readers develop mental antibodies that allow them to detect misinformation on their own in the future. Recent work has even used games to help people detect the larger strategies that are used to spread misinformation about climate change. Although social media companies such as Facebook have started to debunk climate myths on their platform, politicians and social media outlets appear to have an untrustworthy reputation. This was not the case for sources with perceived expertise on the topic, such as scientists. We therefore recommend that the trust held towards experts should be harnessed, by more frequently disseminating their views on social media and in traditional media outlets. In our survey, only 21% of people understood that between 90% and 100% of climate scientists have concluded that humans are causing climate change (99% according to a recent paper). Decades-long campaigns by fossil fuel companies have sought to cast doubt on the scientific consensus. Media messages should therefore continue to communicate the overwhelming scientific consensus on climate change. Through years of research on the topic, we have identified several ingredients for trustworthy science communication. These include prebunking myths and falsehoods, reliably informing people (don’t persuade), offering balance but not false balance (highlight the weight of evidence or scientific consensus), verifying the quality of the underlying evidence, and explaining sources of uncertainty. If communicators want to earn people’s trust, they need to start by displaying trustworthy behaviour.

#### Warming is incremental— any climate reform is key to *saving millions.* It’s Try or Die for the aff.

Wallace-Wells 19, David. [David Wallace-Wells is an American journalist known for his writings on climate change. He wrote the 2017 essay "The Uninhabitable Earth", which he later expanded into the 2019 book The Uninhabitable Earth.“The Cautious Case for Climate Optimism (From a Climate Alarmist).” Intelligencer, February 4, 2019. [http://nymag.com/intelligencer/2019/02/book-excerpt-the-uninhabitable-earth-david-wallace-wells.html.]//](http://nymag.com/intelligencer/2019/02/book-excerpt-the-uninhabitable-earth-david-wallace-wells.html.%5d//)

It’s not too late. In fact, it never will be. Whatever you may have read over the past year — as extreme weather brought a global heat wave and unprecedented wildfires burned through 1.6 million California acres and newspaper headlines declared, “Climate Change Is Here” — global warming is not binary. It is not a matter of “yes” or “no,” not a question of “fucked” or “not.” Instead, it is a problem that gets worse over time the longer we produce greenhouse gas, and can be made better if we choose to stop. Which means that no matter how hot it gets, no matter how fully climate change transforms the planet and the way we live on it, it will always be the case that the next decade could contain more warming, and more suffering, or less warming and less suffering. Just how much is up to us, and always will be. A century and a half after the greenhouse effect was first identified, and a few decades since climate denial and misinformation began muddying our sense of what scientists do know, we are left with a set of predictions that can appear falsifiable — about global temperatures and sea-level rise and even hurricane frequency and wildfire volume. And there are, it is true, feedback loops in the climate system that we do not yet perfectly understand and dynamic processes that remain mysterious. But to the extent that we live today under clouds of uncertainty about the future of climate change, those clouds are, overwhelmingly, not projections of collective ignorance about the natural world but of blindness about the human one, and they can be dispersed by human action. The question of how bad things will get is not, actually, a test of the science; it is a bet on human activity. How much will we do to forestall disaster and how quickly? These are the disconcerting, contradictory lessons of global warming, which counsels both human humility and human grandiosity, each drawn from the same perception of peril. There’s a name for those who hold the fate of the world in their hands, as we do — gods. But for the moment, at least, many of us seem inclined to run from that responsibility rather than embrace it. Or even admit we see it, though it sits in front of us as plainly as a steering wheel. That climate change is all-enveloping means that it targets us all and that we must all share in the responsibility so we do not all share in the suffering — at least not share in so suffocatingly much of it.Since I first began writing about climate a few years ago, I’ve been asked often whether I see any reason for optimism. The thing is, I am optimistic. But optimism is always a matter of perspective, and mine is this: No one wants to believe disaster is coming, but those who look, do. At about two degrees Celsius of warming, just one degree north of where we are today, some of the planet’s ice sheets are expected to begin their collapse, eventually bringing, over centuries, perhaps as much as 50 feet of sea-level rise. In the meantime, major cities in the equatorial band of the planet will become unlivable. There will be, it has been estimated, 32 times as many extreme heat waves in India, and even in the northern latitudes, heat waves will kill thousands each summer. Given only conventional methods of decarbonization (replacing dirty-energy sources like coal and oil with clean ones like wind and solar), this is probably our best-case scenario. It is also what is called — so often nowadays the phrase numbs the lips — “catastrophic warming.” A representative from the Marshall Islands spoke for many of the world’s island nations when he used another word to describe the meaning of two degrees: genocide. You do not need to contemplate worst-case scenarios to be alarmed; this best-case scenario is alarming enough. Two degrees would be terrible, but it’s better than three, at which point Southern Europe would be in permanent drought, African droughts would last five years on average, and the areas burned annually by wildfires in the United States could quadruple, or worse, from last year’s million-plus acres. And three degrees is much better than four, at which point six natural disasters could strike a single community simultaneously; the number of climate refugees, already in the millions, could grow tenfold, or 20-fold, or more; and, globally, damages from warming could reach $600 trillion — about double all the wealth that exists in the world today. We are on track for more warming still — just above four degrees by 2100, the U.N. estimates. So if optimism is always a matter of perspective, the possibility of four degrees shapes mine. It is unlikely, I think, that we reach four degrees this century. But this is what it would take to stay under two: a comprehensively decarbonized economy, a perfectly renewable energy system, a reimagined system of agriculture, perhaps even a planet without meat-eaters. We also need overhauls of the world’s transportation systems and infrastructure. Every year the average American emits enough carbon to melt 10,000 tons of ice in the Antarctic ice sheets — enough to add 10,000 cubic meters of water to the ocean. Every minute, we each add five gallons. If the task of reversing all that seems incomprehensibly big, it is. The scale of the technological transformation required dwarfs every technological revolution ever engineered in human history, including electricity and telecommunications and even the invention of agriculture 10,000 years ago. By definition, it dwarfs them, because it contains all of them — every single sector needs to be rebuilt from the foundation, since every single one breathes on carbon like it’s a ventilator. In October, the U.N.’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change warned that the world has only a dozen years to halve its carbon emissions to safely avoid two degrees of warming and all those “catastrophic” impacts. Is it possible? The short answer is, technically speaking, maybe — though just maybe. But speaking practically, and politically, is another matter.

**Warming causes extinction & turns every impact – no adaptation & each degree is worse**

**Krosofsky ’21** [Andrew, Green Matters Journalist, “How Global Warming May Eventually Lead to Global Extinction”, Green Matters, 03-11-2021, https://www.greenmatters.com/p/will-global-warming-cause-extinction]//pranav

Eventually, yes. **Global warming will invariably result in the mass extinction of millions of different species,** humankind included. In fact, **the Center for Biological Diversity says that global warming is currently the greatest threat to life on this planet**. **Global warming causes a number of detrimental effects on the environment that many species won’t be able to handle long-term**. Extreme weather patterns are shifting climates across the globe, eliminating habitats and altering the landscape. **As a result, food and fresh water sources are being drastically reduced**. Then, of course, **there are the rising global temperatures themselves, which many species are physically unable to contend with**. Formerly frozen arctic and antarctic regions are melting, increasing sea levels and temperatures. Eventually, **these effects will create a perfect storm of extinction conditions**. The melting glaciers of the arctic and the searing, **unmanageable heat indexes being seen along the Equator are just the tip of the iceberg, so to speak.** **The species that live in these climate zones have already been affected by the changes caused by global warming.** Take polar bears for example, whose habitats and food sources have been so greatly diminished that they have been forced to range further and further south. **Increased carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere and oceans have already led to ocean acidification**. **This has caused many species of crustaceans to either adapt or perish and has led to the mass bleaching of more than 50 percent of Australia’s Great Barrier Reef**, according to National Geographic. According to the Center for Biological Diversity, the current trajectory of global warming predicts that more than 30 percent of Earth’s plant and animal species will face extinction by 2050. By the end of the century, that number could be as high as 70 percent. We won’t try and sugarcoat things, humanity’s own prospects aren’t looking that great either. According to The Conversation, **our species has just under a decade left to get our CO₂ emissions under control. If we don’t cut those emissions by half before 2030, temperatures will rise to potentially catastrophic levels. It may only seem like a degree or so, but the worldwide ramifications are immense.** The human species is resilient. We will survive for a while longer, even if these grim global warming predictions come to pass, **but it will mean less food, less water, and increased hardship across the world — especially in low-income areas and developing countries. This increase will also mean more pandemics, devastating storms, and uncontrollable wildfires**.