## 1AC Shit

### Advocacy

I advocate just governments ought to require employers pay a living wage.

I am willing to specify in cross-ex.

Living wage is indexed to cost of living.

LWAC 6 Living Wage Action Coalition (a coalition for action on living wage). “Campus Living Wage Resources: What’s a Living Wage?” May 1st, 2006. http://www.livingwageaction.org/resources\_lw.htm

What's a Living Wage? A living wage is a decent wage. It affords the earner and her or his family the most basic costs of living without need for government support or poverty programs. With a living wage an individual can take pride in her work and enjoy the decency of a life beyond poverty, beyond an endless cycle of working and sleeping, beyond the ditch of poverty wages. A living wage is a complete consideration of the cost of living. **Wages vary according to location, as costs of living vary.** A living wage in rural Louisiana is around $9.33, while in Washington, DC it's closer to $15 an hour. (learn how to calculate a living wage here: Living Wage 101) **A living wage** as opposed to the federal poverty line, **takes into account** the many **necessary factors in calculating** the **actual costs in a specific geographic area**. Both the Economic Policy Institute’s “Basic Family Budget” and Wider Opportunities for Women’s “Self Sufficiency Standard” use thorough research into the seven components of the cost of living to arrive at similar minimum incomes. You would do best to read the two organizations’ own descriptions and detail of their data and approach, but both are summarized here.

### Adv 1 = Income Inequality

Raise in minimum wage is key addressing wage inequality-multiple statistical analyses confirm.

Gindling and Terrell 4 T.H. Gindling (University of Maryland, Baltimore County) and Katherine Terrell (University of Michigan, CEPR, WDI and IZA Bonn) “Minimum Wages, Inequality and Globalization” IZA DP No. 1160 May 2004 <http://repec.iza.org/dp1160.pdf> JW 2/22/15

The results of the estimates of equation (2) are also reported in Table 4. In the equation estimated using data on workers without higher education, the coefficient β1 is positive (0.432) and significant. In the equation estimated with data on workers with higher education, the coefficient β 1 is also positive (0.817) and significant. These results provide evidence in support of the hypothesis that the reduction in the inequality of minimum wages for workers with and without higher education caused a reduction in the inequality of actual wages for each of these categories workers. In the equation estimated using data on both workers without and without higher education, the coefficient β 1 is positive (0.245) but not significant The literature on the impact of minimum wages on inequality has generally analyzed the impact of changes in the “minimum minimum wage” (rather than the dispersion of minimum wages) on wage inequality. The argument generally made is that an increase in the minimum minimum wage will increase the wages of the lowest-paid workers, and therefore reduce the inequality of wages by truncating the left tail of the distribution. To test this hypothesis, we estimate an equation similar to equation (2), but that includes the log of real minimum minimum wage (lnMinMWit) as an independent variable rather than the standard deviation of the log of minimum wages: 0 1 it γtYRt μit T t 1 SD Wit ln MinMW Σ + = (ln ) = β + A negative and significant coefficient on the real minimum minimum wage variable would provide evidence in support of the hypothesis that an increase in the minimum minimum wage reduces inequality in actual wages. We estimate this equation with data on all workers and less educated workers and present the results in Table 4. In both cases, the coefficient on the real minimum minimum wage is positive and insignificant. These findings allows us to reject the hypothesis that an increase in the minimum minimum wage causes a reduction in inequality in actual wages in Costa Rica. Finally, to examine the relative impacts of changes in the dispersion and the levels of minimum wages, we estimate an equation that includes both the standard deviation of the log of the minimum wage and the real value of the minimum minimum wage as independent variables: (ln ) 0 1 (ln ) 2 it γtYRt μit . T t 1 SD Wit SD MWit ln MinMW Σ + = = β + β + β + (4) coefficients confirm our previous results. That is, they provide evidence that changes in the dispersion of minimum wages are positively and significantly correlated with the changes in the dispersion of the wages of workers without higher education, while changes in the real minimum minimum wage do not have statistically significant effects on the dispersion of wages. This finding is important since many studies use the level of the minimum wage as an explanatory factor in their analysis of the rising skilled to unskilled wage ratio over time (e.g., Bell, 1997 and Cortez, 2001). Whereas the minimum wage can increase the average wage, it is not clear that it should reduce dispersion. And when only one minimum wage is used in cases when there are multiple minimum wage (as in the case of studies of Mexico, e.g. Bell, 1997), then it is not surprising that there are no significant results. In Table 4, we present the coefficient estimates of β1 and β2 from estimating equations (4) using data for all workers and for less educated workers, separately. These estimated In summary, we show that Costa Rica experienced rising wage inequality in the 1990s, during the period it opened its economy to global forces. We know from Robbins and Gindling (1999) that the rise in the relative wages of more skilled workers in Costa Rica could be attributed in part to rising demand for more skilled workers due to trade liberalization. Work by Gindling and Trejos (2003) finds a number of other factors that can also help explain rising earnings inequality (including changes in the levels or supply of education) but notes there is a large part of the change in inequality that they cannot explain with such variables as education, gender, region, hours worked or job characteristics. In this paper, we test whether minimum wage legislation is part of the missing story. Our examination of Costa Rica’s complex minimum wage structure and its dynamics suggested three hypotheses: (1) The increase in the gap between the minimum wages of workers with and without higher education cause the gap between the actual wages of workers with and without higher education to increase (and therefore cause an increase in wage inequality); (2) The reduction in the inequality of minimum wages for workers without higher education cause a reduction in the inequality of actual wages for these workers; and (3) The reduction in the inequality of minimum wages for workers with higher education cause a reduction in the inequality of actual wages for these workers. We find that the evidence supports [this] each of these three hypotheses. The level of minimum MW was not found to be important in affecting the dispersion of wages. It was expected that the minimum minimum would truncate the left tale of the earnings distribution and as such lower inequality. However, in a complex system such as that in Costa Rica (or Mexico and Argentina), it is not clear the either the minimum MW or the average MW should affect the distribution since there are a multitude of wages that can affect the distribution at higher levels. Nevertheless, since many studies have used this variable in trying to explain changes in earnings inequality, we thought it worthwhile testing for it as well. In sum, the structure of minimum wages matters, and we found it contributes to wage inequality in Costa Rica. This suggests that countries with an interest in mitigating inequality arising from trade liberalization have the levers to do so with a multiple minimum wage policy. In Costa Rica, the reduction in the inequality of legal minimum wages from 1987 to 1992 contributed to a decline in actual wage inequality, mitigating the disequalizing impact of the trade liberalization (found by Robbins and Gindling, 1999). However, when the addition of legal minimum wages for university-educated workers in 1993 increased the gap between the minimum wages of worker with and without higher education, changes in the structure of minimum wages contributed to an increase in wage inequality.

International living wage is key and improves the economy.

Shirkosh 5 Mehdi Shirkosh (University of Western Sydney) “The Case for an International Minimum Wage in the Context of Free Trade.” MPRA Paper No. 2463 January 2005 http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/2463/1/MPRA\_paper\_2463.pdf

The approach taken in this study is that an “international wage standard” is necessary for an increasingly globalised economy. Minimum wage standards have been established in the industrial countries from the late nineteenth century but few theorists have examined this measure as a global solution for unemployment, poverty and economic recession. **An international solution is important** in a world **where national economies are increasingly becoming** more **interdependent**, making it more difficult to maintain a welfare state in the framework of the national state. The hypothesis in this study is that **labour standards** (rights) **need to be integrated into the globalisation process via an international minimum** wage implemented through international organisations and free trade agreements. In effect this will bring the benefits of Keynesian theories on effective demand to the global economy. In other words, **an increase in minimum wages** around the world **will modify the income gap** **and increase consumption**, increase health and education of the masses across the globe **and**, thus, **their productivity**. In other words, **increased effective demand will reduce overcapacity and economic recession in the global economy**. The focus of the thesis is on the determination of wage standards in the world economy, looking primarily at the minimum wage standards in the developing countries as a minimum wage standard is clearly related to minimum wages in these low wage countries. The thesis will propose that the world economy (both industrial and third world countries) would benefit from **a global wage standard** as this **would increase** the masses’ **income and** therefore world aggregate **demand**, **which would in turn increase world production and growth.** The argument of the thesis is developed on the basis of the labour theory of value and the Keynesian theory of effective demand. Key alternate approaches to the determination of wages under capitalism will be discussed. The experiences of NAFTA (the North American Free Trade Agreement) will then be used to test two of these approaches (Heckscher-Ohlin theory and unequal exchange theory) against recent historical evidence.

Your country specific disads don’t apply.

Shirkosh 5 Mehdi Shirkosh (University of Western Sydney) “The Case for an International Minimum Wage in the Context of Free Trade.” MPRA Paper No. 2463 January 2005 <http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/2463/1/MPRA_paper_2463.pdf> JW

A common factor throughout most studies on minimum wages is a focus on the elasticity of supply and the effect that minimum wages have on other factors like employment and growth. The fact is that much research is based on data limited in time and to the experience of one country. It is possible that an increase in minimum wages in an individual country will increase prices and worsen competitiveness of that country in the international environment (at least in the short term). However, while an increase in minimum wages at the international level may change the relative prices and competitiveness of a particular country, international prices and global effective demand will be affected as well. Therefore discussion on the value of labour, effective demand and the development history of the international labour force is necessary to understand the forces which determine minimum wages across the globe. Although the total effect of changing minimum wages would be difficult to measure in quantitative terms, the experience of countries which have entered regional economic agreements on trade (with and without supportive labour standards and minimum wages) can be used to estimate the influence of free trade on income and poverty.

### Warming

Scenario A is warming. Warming is anthropogenic and on the rise. The newest evidence confirms.

**Freedman 15** Andrew Freedman (Masters in Climate and Society from Columbia University, and a Masters in Law and Diplomacy from The Fletcher School at Tufts University). “Study unearths impacts of our growing carbon emissions — and it's not pretty.” Mashable. February 25th, 2015. http://mashable.com/2015/02/25/greenhouse-effect-surface-data/

**Scientists** have directly **confirmed** what they have long assumed to be true: **Increasing** amounts of **g**reen**h**ouse **g**ase**s** in the atmosphere, such as carbon dioxide, **are trapping heat** from escaping back into space **and** are thereby **causing** global **warming**. The observations of what is known as radiative forcing were made over the course of 11 years between 2000 and 2010 from two locations in North America, in Oklahoma and the North Slope of Alaska. Highly specialized instruments in both locations were used to measure thermal infrared energy fluctuations and analyze the source of such changes. SEE ALSO: The white-hot beauty of Iceland in 11 stunning photos **The study**, published Wednesday in the advance online edition of the journal Nature, explores the Earth's energy account balance. It **found that over time, the planet is running a surplus of energy** at the surface, **causing global** air and ocean **temperatures to increase** with a wide variety of mostly negative impacts. Before this study, scientists already knew that the energy balance was tilted in the direction of a growing surplus, but they lacked precise measurements at the surface. **The researchers were** also **able to trace this** energy **surplus mainly to manmade emissions of carbon dioxide and** other greenhouse gases through the **burning of fossil fuels** such as coal and oil, as well as forest fires. The research provides observational evidence that the increased heating of the atmosphere during the period was due in large part to the increase in carbon dioxide concentrations at the time. The study found that the 22 parts per million increase in carbon dioxide during this period caused the amount of energy absorbed at the Earth's surface to increase by about two-tenths of a Watt per square meter per decade. "We see, for the first time in the field, the amplification of the greenhouse effect because there's more carbon dioxide in the atmosphere to absorb what the Earth emits in response to incoming solar radiation," Daniel Feldman, a scientist in Berkeley Lab's Earth Sciences Division and lead author of the study, said in a press release. "Numerous studies show rising atmospheric carbon dioxide concentrations, but our study provides the critical link between those concentrations and the addition of energy to the system, or the greenhouse effect," Feldman added. Earth's energy surplus is growing **The study's findings confirm longtime predictions as well as observations** of a manmade enhancement of the greenhouse effect, and also help to reinforce the results of many climate models that are predicated in part on accurately simulating the effects of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere.

Income inequality causes warming-2 internal links.

1. Work Hours. Income inequality makes it difficult to work less; that causes GHG emissions. Wage increases solve.

**Cha 13** Mijin Cha (staff writer). “How Income Inequality Contributes to Climate Change.” Demos. February 8th, 2013. http://www.demos.org/blog/how-income-inequality-contributes-climate-change

Here’s another reason why **income inequality is** so destructive—it’s ruining our planet and **increasing** the severity of **climate change**. A new paper from the Center on Economic and Policy Research looks at a novel way to slow climate change: reduce the hours that we work. For reasons that are not entirely understood, **shorter work hours are linked with lower g**reen**h**ouse **g**as **emissions**. By just reducing the annual work hours by 0.5 percent for the rest of the century, one-quarter to one-half of global warming not locked in -- i.e. the warming that will already occur due to the 1990 levels of greenhouse gases already in the atmosphere -- would be eliminated. Unfortunately, the **high** level of income **inequality makes reducing work hours** very **difficult** in the U.S. Between 1973-2007, nearly two-thirds of all income gains went to just the top 1 percent of households. This very small minority of households could have their work hours reduced and absorb the accompanying decrease in pay. The vast majority of households, however, are working more hours and increasing productivity, but seeing a reduction in take home pay. As my colleague Joe Hines detailed, workers are increasing hours and output, but seeing their pay fall. **With** this level of **economic insecurity, workers cannot afford to work less**, even if it is better for the climate. ﻿ Americans already work many more hours more per year than western European countries. In 2005, Western European work hours per person were roughly 50 percent less than the U.S. The average German worker works 20 percent less per year than the average American. The greenhouse gas emissions per capita in America is nearly twice that of Germany. Again, the reasons for this relationship is not entirely clear but reduced work hours increases **leisure time**, which **gives people more time to cook, versus eating out, or walk, instead of drive**, and other sustainable practices. **Working less could** also **decrease commuting time and carbon footprint**. Unfortunately, only a few households can currently afford to work less and have more free time. **Increasing wages for the average worker is** not only good for our economy, it’s **good for our planet.**

2. Business compliance. Income inequality kills business compliance with international environmental agreements-those are uniquely key to solve warming.

**Wilkinson and Pickett 10** Richard Wilkinson (Professor Emeritus of Social Epidemiology at the University of Nottingham, retired in 2008) and Kate Pickett (Professor of Epidemiology in the Department of Health Sciences at the University of York and was a National Institute for Health Research Career Scientist from 2007-2012). “The impact of income inequalities on sustainable development in London.” Greater London Authority, March 2010.

**More Equal Societies are Greener** As well as helping to reduce consumerism, strengthening community life and enabling societies to respond more cohesively to crises, evidence shows that greater equality also leads people to treat environmental issues more seriously. **Because community life is stronger and people trust each other more** in more equal societies, they also seem to be more public spirited and more willing to work together towards shared objectives. The conflict between self and society is perhaps less stark and **people are more likely to do things** they feel are **for** the **public benefit**. Support for environmental policies is a sensitive indicator of the balance between feeling that life is about the pursuit of self-interests in opposition to the wider society, and the pursuit of common interests. Based on **data from the World Economic Forum**, Figure 25 **shows that business leaders in more equal countries regard complying with international environmental agreements as more important** than do their counterparts in less equal societies. **Believing that it is important to comply with international** environmental **agreements is** of course **essential if the world is to respond adequately to** the challenge of **climate change**.

Warming causes extinction from Earth exploding.

**Chalko 4** Dr. Tom J. Chalko, MSc, PhD (Head of Geophysics Division, Scientific E Research P/L, Mt Best, Australia). “No second chance? Can Earth explode as a result of Global Warming?” NU Journal of Discovery. Revised October 30th, 2004. http://nujournal.net/core.pdf

**Consequences of** global **warming are** far more **serious** than previously imagined. **The REAL danger** for our entire civilization **comes** not from slow climate changes, but **from overheating of the planetary interior. Life** on Earth **is possible** only **because of** the **efficient cooling of the** planetary **interior** - a process that is **limited primarily by the atmosphere**. This cooling is responsible for a thermal balance between the heat from the core reactor, the heat from the Sun and the radiation of heat into space, so that the average temperature on Earth’s surface is about 13 degrees Celsius. This article examines the possibility of **overheating and** the **“meltdown” of the solid planetary core due to** the atmospheric pollution trapping progressively more solar heat (**the** so-called **greenhouse effect**) and reducing the cooling rate of the planetary interior. The most serious consequence of such a ”meltdown” could be centrifugal segregation of unstable isotopes in the molten part of the spinning planetary core. Such segregation **can “enrich”** the **nuclear fuel in the core** to the point of **creating conditions for** a chain reaction and a **gigantic atomic explosion**. Will Earth become another ”asteroid belt” in the Solar system? It is common knowledge (experiencing seasons) that solar heat is the dominant factor that determines temperatures on the surface of Earth. Under the polar ice however, the contribution of solar heat is minimal and this is where the increasing contribution of the heat from the planetary interior can be seen best. Rising polar ocean temperatures and melting polar ice caps should therefore be the first symptoms of overheating of the inner core reactor. While politicians and businessmen debate the need for reducing greenhouse emissions and take pride to evade accepting any responsibility, the process of overheating the inner core reactor has already begun - polar oceans have become warmer and polar caps have begun to melt. Do we have enough imagination, intelligence and integrity to comprehend the danger before the situation becomes irreversible? **There will be NO SECOND CHANCE...**

### Food Security

Scenario B is food security.

Income inequality causes famine and societal collapse. We’re close to the brink-policy actions must be taken.

**Motesharrei et al 14** Safa Motesharrei and Eugenia Kalnay (University of Maryland researchers) and Jorge Rivas (University of Minnesota researcher). “Human and nature dynamics (HANDY): Modeling inequality and use of resources in the collapse or sustainability of societies.” Science Direct. May 2014. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800914000615

The scenarios most closely reflecting the reality of our world today are found in the third group of experiments (see the scenarios for an unequal society in Section 5.3), where we introduced economic stratification. Under such conditions, we find that collapse is difficult to avoid, which helps to explain why **economic stratification is** one of the elements **recurrently found in** past **collapsed societies**. Importantly, in the first of these unequal society scenarios, 5.3.1, the solution appears to be on a sustainable path for quite a long time, but even using an optimal depletion rate (δ\*) and starting with a very small number of Elites, the **Elites eventually consume too much, resulting in** a **famine among Commoners that** eventually **causes** the **collapse of society**. It is important to note that this Type-L **collapse is due to** an **inequality-induced famine that causes** a **loss of workers**, rather than a collapse of Nature. Despite appearing initially to be the same as the sustainable optimal solution obtained in the absence of Elites, economic stratification changes the final result: Elites' consumption keeps growing until the society collapses. The Mayan collapse – in which population never recovered even though nature did recover – is an example of a Type-L collapse, whereas the collapses in the Easter Island and the Fertile Crescent – where nature was depleted – are examples of a Type-N collapse. In scenario 5.3.2, with a larger depletion rate, the decline of the Commoners occurs faster, while the Elites are still thriving, but eventually the Commoners collapse completely, followed by the Elites. It is important to note that in both of these scenarios, the **Elites – due to their wealth – do not suffer** the **detrimental effects of** the **environmental collapse until** much **later than** the **Commoners. This** buffer of wealth **allows Elites to continue “business as usual” despite** the **impending catastrophe**. It is likely that this is an important mechanism that would help explain how historical collapses were allowed to occur by elites who appear to be oblivious to the catastrophic trajectory (most clearly apparent in the Roman and Mayan cases). This buffer effect is further reinforced by the long, apparently sustainable trajectory prior to the beginning of the collapse. While some members of society might raise the alarm that the system is moving towards an impending collapse and therefore advocate structural changes to society in order to avoid it, **Elites and their supporters**, who opposed making these changes, **could point to the** long **sustainable trajectory “so far” in support of doing nothing**. The final two scenarios in this set of experiments, 5.3.3 and 5.3.4, are designed to indicate the kinds of policies needed to avoid this catastrophic outcome. They show that, in the context of economic stratification, **inequality must be greatly reduced** and population growth must be maintained below critical levels in order **to avoid** a **societal collapse** (Daly, 2008).

Famine-induced societal collapse causes resource conflicts-outweighs other war impacts on probability.

**Vidal 12** John Vidal (the Guardian's environment editor) “UN warns of looming worldwide food crisis in 2013” The Guardian October 13th 2012 http://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2012/oct/14/un-global-food-crisis-warning

"We've not been producing as much as we are consuming. That is why stocks are being run down. Supplies are now very tight across the world and reserves are at a very low level, leaving no room for unexpected events next year," said Abdolreza Abbassian, a senior economist with the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO). **With** food **consumption exceeding the amount grown for** six of **the past 11 years, countries have run down reserves** from an average of 107 days of consumption 10 years ago to under 74 days recently. **Prices of** main food crops such as **wheat** and maize **are now close to those that sparked riots in 25 countries in** 20**08**. FAO figures released this week suggest that 870 million people are malnourished and the food crisis is growing in the Middle East and Africa. Wheat production this year is expected to be 5.2% below 2011, with yields of most other crops, except rice, also falling, says the UN. The figures come as one of the world's leading environmentalists issued a warning that the global food supply system could collapse at any point, leaving hundreds of millions more people hungry, sparking widespread riots and bringing down governments. In a shocking new assessment of the prospects of meeting food needs, Lester Brown, president of the Earth policy research centre in Washington, says that the climate is no longer reliable and the demands for food are growing so fast that a breakdown is inevitable, unless urgent action is taken. "**Food shortages undermined** earlier **civilisations**. We are on the same path. **Each country is now fending for itself**. The world is living one year to the next," he writes in a new book. According to Brown, **we are seeing the start of a food supply breakdown with a dash** by speculators **to "grab" millions of** square **miles of** cheap **farmland**, the **doubling** of international **food prices** in a decade, and the dramatic rundown of countries' food reserves. This year, for the sixth time in 11 years, the world will consume more food than it produces, largely because of extreme weather in the US and other major food-exporting countries. Oxfam last week said that the price of key staples, including wheat and rice, may double in the next 20 years, threatening disastrous consequences for poor people who spend a large proportion of their income on food. In 2012, according to the FAO, food prices are already at close to record levels, having risen 1.4% in September following an increase of 6% in July. "We are entering a new era of rising food prices and spreading hunger. Food supplies are tightening everywhere and land is becoming the most sought-after commodity as the world shifts from an age of food abundance to one of scarcity," says Brown. "The geopolitics of food is fast overshadowing the geopolitics of oil." His warnings come as the UN and world governments reported that extreme heat and drought in the US and other major food-exporting countries had hit harvests badly and sent prices spiralling. "The situation we are in is not temporary. These things will happen all the time. Climate is in a state of flux and there is no normal any more. "We are beginning a new chapter. We will see food unrest in many more places. "**Armed aggression is no longer the principal threat to our future**. The overriding threats to this century are climate change, population growth, spreading water shortages and rising food prices," Brown says.

Communal conflicts are 100% probable.

Brinkman and Hendrix 11 Henk-Jan Brinkman (Chief, Policy, Planning and Application in the Peacebuilding Support Office of the United Nations.) and Cullen S. Hendrix (Assistant Professor, The College of William & Mary, and Fellow, Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law, University of Texas at Austin) “Food Insecurity and Violent Conflict: Causes, Consequences, and Addressing the Challenges” World Food Programme Occasional Paper n° 24 July 2011 <http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/newsroom/wfp238358.pdf> JW 2/21/15

Civil conflict is the prevalent type of armed conflict in the world today (Harbom and Wallersteen, 2010). It is almost exclusively a phenomenon of countries with low levels of economic development and high levels of food insecurity. Sixty-five percent of the world’s food-insecure people live in seven countries: India, China, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Bangladesh, Indonesia, Pakistan and Ethiopia (FAO, 2010), of which all but China have experienced civil conflict in the past decade, with DRC, Ethiopia, India and Pakistan currently embroiled in civil conflicts. Pinstrup-Andersen and Shimokawa (2008) find that poor health and nutrition [is] are associated with greater probability of civil conflict, though their findings are based on small sample sizes. Countries with lower per capita caloric intake are more prone to experience civil conflict, even accounting for their levels of economic development (Sobek and Boehmer, 2009). This relationship is stronger in those states where primary commodities make up a large proportion of their export profile. Some of the countries most plagued by conflict in the past 20 years are commodity-rich countries characterized by widespread hunger, such as Angola, DRC, Papua New Guinea and Sierra Leone. The mixture of hunger – which creates grievances – and the availability of valuable commodities – which can provide opportunities for rebel funding – is a volatile combination.

Food insecurity causes inter-state wars.

Brinkman and Hendrix 11 Henk-Jan Brinkman (Chief, Policy, Planning and Application in the Peacebuilding Support Office of the United Nations.) and Cullen S. Hendrix (Assistant Professor, The College of William & Mary, and Fellow, Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law, University of Texas at Austin) “Food Insecurity and Violent Conflict: Causes, Consequences, and Addressing the Challenges” World Food Programme Occasional Paper n° 24 July 2011 <http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/newsroom/wfp238358.pdf> JW 2/21/15

The links between food insecurity and interstate war are less direct. While countries often go to war over territory, previous research has not focused directly on access to food or productive agricultural land as a major driver of conflict (Hensel, 2000). However, wars have been waged to reduce demographic pressures arising from the scarcity of arable land, the clearest examples being the move to acquire Lebensraum (“living space”) that motivated Nazi Germany’s aggression toward Poland and Eastern Europe (Hillgruber, 1981) and Japan’s invasion of China and Indochina (Natsios and Doley, 2009). Water, for drinking and for agriculture, is also a cause of conflict (Klare, 2002). Countries that share river basins are more likely to go to war than are other countries that border one another (Toset et al., 2000; Gleditsch et al., 2006). This relationship is strongest in countries with low levels of economic development. Institutions that manage conflicts over water and monitor and enforce agreements can significantly reduce the risk of war (Postel and Wolf, 2001). Jared Diamond (1997) has argued that for centuries military power was built on agricultural production. Zhang et al. (2007) show that long-term fluctuations in the prevalence of war followed cycles of temperature change over the period 1400–1900 CE, with more war during periods of relatively cooler temperatures and thus lower agricultural productivity and greater competition for resources. Similar findings linking cooler periods with more war have been established for Europe between 1000 and 1750 CE (Tol and Wagner, 2008).

Food wars go nuclear.

**Cribb 14** Julian, “Human extinction: it is possible?” Sydney Morning Herald, Published: April 2, 2014, p. http://www.smh.com.au/comment/human-extinction-it-is-possible-20140402-zqpln.html

However our own behaviour is liable to be a far more immediate determinant of human survival or extinction. Above two degrees – which we have already locked in – the world’s **food harvest is going to become increasingly unreliable**, as the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change warned this week. **That means** mid-century **famines in** places like **India, China, the Middle East and Africa**. But what scientists cannot predict is how humans living in the tropics and subtropics will respond to this form of stress. So let us turn to the strategic and military think tanks, who like to explore such scenarios, instead. The Age of Consequences study by the US Centre for Strategic and International Studies says that under a 2.6 degree rise “nations around the world will be overwhelmed by the scale of change and pernicious challenges, such as pandemic disease. The **internal cohesion** of nations **will be under** great **stress**…as a result of a dramatic rise in migration and changes in agricultural patterns and water availability. The flooding of coastal communities around the world… has the potential to challenge regional and even national identities. **Armed conflict** between nations **over resources**… **is likely and nuclear war is possible**. The social consequences range from increased religious fervour to outright chaos.” Of five degrees – which the world is on course for by 2100 if present carbon emissions continue – it simply says the consequences are "inconceivable". **Eighteen nations** currently **have nuclear weapons** technology or access to it, **raising the stakes on nuclear conflict** to the highest level since the end of the Cold War. At the same time, with more than 4 billion people living in the world’s most vulnerable regions, scope for refugee tsunamis and pandemic disease is also large. It is on the basis of scenarios such as these that scientists like Peter Schellnhuber – **science advisor to German President** Angela Merkel – and Canadian author Gwynne Dyer have **warned of the** potential **loss of most of the human population in the conflicts, famines and pandemics** spinning out of climate impacts. Whether that adds up to extinction or not rather depends on how many of the world’s 20,000 nukes are let off in the process. These issues all involve assumptions about human, national and religious behaviour and are thus beyond the remit of scientific bodies like the IPCC, which can only hint at what they truly think will happen. So you are not getting the full picture from them.

### Environment

Scenario B is environmental collapse.

Empirics prove inequality kills social cohesion. This undermines collective action for the common interest

**Wilkinson and Pickett 10** Richard Wilkinson (Professor Emeritus of Social Epidemiology at the University of Nottingham, retired in 2008) and Kate Pickett (Professor of Epidemiology in the Department of Health Sciences at the University of York and was a National Institute for Health Research Career Scientist from 2007-2012). “The impact of income inequalities on sustainable development in London.” Greater London Authority, March 2010.

The development of internationally comparable measures of income inequality in different countries means that it is now possible to compare more and less equal societies and identify the effects of inequality on social life. It is not simply that greater equality reduces the intensity of status competition and the pressure to consume. The **statistical evidence** also **shows that** the **quality of social relations is better in more equal societies. People are more likely to feel they can trust others, community life is stronger, and levels of violence are lower**. Figure 8 shows that there are very big differences in the proportion of people who feel they can trust others. **In** the **more unequal countries** only **10 or 15 percent say they trust others, where**as **in** the **more equal societies this rises to 60-70 percent**. This relationship between greater trust and greater equality has been shown a number of times in different settings including among the 50 states of the USA.13 14 in Britain the richest 20 per cent are over 7 times as rich as the poorest 20 per cent Figure 8. People Are More Likely To Trust Each Other In More Equal Societies Concern has grown over recent years at the apparent decline in community life in many societies. Researchers such as Robert Putnam, a political scientist at Harvard, have combined different indicators of people’s involvement in local community life to make up indexes of ‘social capital’. Typically they have included variables such as the proportion of the population who are members of voluntary associations of any kind (such as gardening clubs, sports clubs, charities or choirs), whether people read a local newspaper or vote in local elections. They usually show a strong tendency for community life to be weaker both in more deprived areas and in more unequal societies. **In a study of Italy, Putnam mentions** a **close association between** his measures of **social capital and income inequality across 20 regions**.15 I**n the United States, similarly, he shows a close association** between income inequality and social capital across the 50 states.16 In both cases, social capital is substantially weaker where inequality is greater. In his study of the USA he also draws attention to how trends in social capital follow trends in income inequality. He says: “Social capital and economic inequality moved in tandem through most of the twentieth century. In terms of the distribution of wealth and income, America in the 1950s and 1960s was more egalitarian than it had been in more than a century. ...those same decades were also the high point of social connectedness and civic engagement. Record highs in equality and social capital coincided. “Conversely, the last third of the twentieth century was a time of growing inequality and eroding social capital. By the end of the twentieth century the gap between rich and poor in the US had been increasing for nearly three decades, the longest sustained increase in inequality for at least a century. The timing of the two trends is striking: somewhere around 1965-70 America reversed course and started becoming both less just economically and less well connected socially and politically.” (Putnam RD (2000), Bowling Alone: the collapse and revival of American community. NY: Simon and Schuster. p.359.) Although the deteriorating quality of social relations associated with widening income differences is central to the effects of inequality on social functioning, it is doubly relevant here because **social divisions reduce** a **society’s ability to act in the common interest**. Putnam first developed his measures of social capital as part of the research he was doing in Italy to find out why there were such big differences in how well regional governments functioned. Some were very much more efficient and better organised than others despite all having been set up in 1970 with the same level of funding per head of population. What Putnam found was that local governments did best (on a number of objective assessments of performance) in regions where there were high levels of involvement in community life and badly in regions with low levels.

Inequality-induced decline in social cohesion makes it harder to solve environmental issues. Even small changes can make a big difference.

**Stiglitz 13** Joseph Stiglitz (Nobel laureate economist). “Inequality and Environmental Policy.” Resources 182. 2013. http://www.rff.org/Publications/Resources/Pages/182-Inequality-and-Environmental-Policy.aspx

Partha **Dasgupta**, whom I’ve worked with a great deal, has **emphasized the environment-inequality nexus** in the context of development. It is the destitute who turn to the forest for their energy, but in doing so, they destroy their own future wellbeing. This behavior is individually rational, perhaps, but collectively irrational. The interesting thing is that in societies with a reasonable degree of social cohesion, social-control mechanisms may, and often do, actually work. But **inequality tends to undermine social cohesion**. The importance of social cohesion was evident **in** a recent visit to **Bhutan**, the Himalayan country that has made its national objective Gross National Happiness (GNH), rather than the more traditional GDP. At the start, **everybody was allowed to cut** down **three trees a year. I asked, “How do you enforce this?” The Bhutanese answered, “Nobody would disobey.”** A few years later, the limit was reduced to two trees, and the Bhutanese people adapted to that. The point is that **in societies with** a **high** degree of social **cohesion, people can work together and solve** some of these **problems** better than they can in societies with less social cohesion and more inequality. **When** the tide of **inequality becomes too great,** what economists call **“social capital” tends to break down**. Let me make a few observations about this. First, it turns out that small interventions can have very big effects. That’s important for those of us who are involved in policy because, quite often, we can’t solve the big problems. **We can’t persuade our government to adopt a carbon price, but we can make a big difference even with** some **small interventions**. An example on a national scale that is relevant in many developing countries is the adoption of more efficient cook stoves. These are cook stoves that use less energy, so that the people who use them have to cut down fewer forests. It also means they are exposed to less indoor air pollution, which is a major source of health problems in developing countries, for lungs and eyes.

Environmental collapse causes extinction.

Mittermeier et al 11 Russell Mittermeier (Ph.D. from Harvard in Biological Anthropology, Adjunct Professor at the State University of New York at Stony Brook), Will R. Turner, Frank W. Larsen, Thomas M. Brooks, and Claude Gascon, Global Biodiversity Conservation: The Critical Role of Hotspots, Chapter 1 2011

Extinction is the gravest consequence of the biodiversity crisis, since it is irreversible. Human activities have elevated the rate of species extinctions to a thousand or more times the natural background rate (Pimm et al. 1995). What are the consequences of this loss? Most obvious among them may be the lost opportunity for future resource use. Scientists have discovered a mere fraction of Earth’s species (perhaps fewer than 10%, or even 1%) and understood the biology of even fewer (Novotny et al. 2002). As species vanish, so too does the health security of every human. Earth’s species are a vast genetic storehouse that may harbor a cure for cancer, malaria, or the next new pathogen – cures waiting to be discovered. Compounds initially derived from wild species account for more than half of all commercial medicines – even more in developing nations (Chivian and Bernstein 2008). Natural forms, processes, and ecosystems provide blueprints and inspiration for a growing array of new materials, energy sources, hi-tech devices, and other innovations (Benyus 2009). The current loss of species has been compared to burning down the world’s libraries without knowing the content of 90% or more of the books. With loss of species, we lose the ultimate source of our crops and the genes we use to improve agricultural resilience, the inspiration for manufactured products, and the basis of the structure and function of the ecosystems that support humans and all life on Earth (McNeely et al. 2009). Above and beyond material welfare and livelihoods, biodiversity contributes to security, resiliency, and freedom of choices and actions (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment 2005). Less tangible, but no less important, are the cultural, spiritual, and moral costs inflicted by species extinctions. All societies value species for their own sake, and wild plants and animals are integral to the fabric of all the world’s cultures (Wilson 1984).

Property rights and strict libertarianism devolve to protecting the environment and reducing warming.

Bruenig 11 Matt Bruenig “Environmentalism poses a problem for libertarian ideology” December 21st 2011 <http://mattbruenig.com/2011/12/21/environmentalism-poses-a-problem-for-libertarian-ideology/> JW 3/3/15

So I want to explain more clearly just how much environmentalists stick in the side of libertarian ideology. First, consider what libertarians of the sort Monbiot criticizes are really about philosophically: they favor a procedural justice account of the world based heavily on property rights. This is the newest face of libertarianism. Gone is the appeal to utility and desert. The modern libertarians try to prop up their political ideas almost solely through a rigid formalism of property rights. I have written before about the problem with the procedural accounts of property rights, but here I want to just accept the libertarian property rights premise. Somehow individuals can grab up pieces of the world and exclude those pieces from everyone else forever. Once those individuals become owners of their respective property, nobody else can touch that property or do anything whatsoever to that property without their consent. Coming onto my property without my consent is a form of trespass under this picture. Doing anything to my property — whether it be painting it, dumping stuff on it, or causing some other harm to it — is totally off limits. So environmentalists point out that carbon emissions are warming the planet, one consequence of which is that harm will be done to the property of others. Most environmentalists — being the leftists that they generally are — do not make too much of the property rights issues, but one certainly could. Coal plants release particulates into the air which land on other people’s property. But no permission is ever granted for that. Coal plants do not contract with every nearby property owner to allow for them to deposit small amounts of particulate matter on their neighbors’ land. They are guilty of a form of property trespass. Beyond that, all sorts of industrial processes have environmental externalities that put things into the air or the water that ultimately make their way into the bodies of others. This is a rights-infringing activity under the procedure-focused libertarian account. The act of some industry is causing pieces of matter to land on me and enter into my body. But I never contracted with them to allow them to do so. The air and the atmosphere is an especially problematic issue for libertarians. Who owns those things? Libertarians might try to argue that you own the air above your land, but air — or the matter that it is made up of — does not stay above your land; it moves around the world. Any matter released into the air is sure to find itself to someone else’s property, causing a violation. The atmosphere might seem like something nobody owns and therefore something anybody can dump things into. But with climate change, we know that greenhouse gas emissions are causing the world to warm, the consequences of which will include damage to the property of others all over the world. Yet again though, greenhouse gas emitters have not contracted with every single property owner in the world, making their emissions a violation of a very strict libertarian property rights ideology. The short of is that environmentalists totally smash open the idea that property rights theories can really account for who is permitted to do what with the land that they own. Almost all uses of land will entail some infringement on some other piece of land that is owned by someone else. So how can that ever be permitted? No story about freedom and property rights can ever justify the pollution of the air or the burning of fuels because those things affect the freedom and property rights of others. Those actions ultimately cause damage to surrounding property and people without getting any consent from those affected. They are the ethical equivalent — for honest libertarians — of punching someone in the face or breaking someone else’s window.

Maintaining the environment is a prerequisite to freedom.

**Ataner 12** Attila Ataner (B.A., J.D.). “Kant on Freedom, Property Rights, and Environmental Protection.” Thesis submitted to McMaster University to partially fill a requirement for a masters degree in the arts. October 2o12.

[Brackets in original.] My second line of argument in rejecting the claim that unowned lands are freely destructible, i.e., the view that our freedoms over and against the natural environment are unlimited, is as follows. Given, as we have seen above, Kant’s claims pertaining to humanity’s possession of the earth ab initio being an “original possession in common” or an “original community of land in general”, I deny that the natural environment can ever be thought of as truly res nullius, or, more appropriately, that land can be terra nullius in some absolute sense. This claim, while I cannot fully develop it here, rests simply on Kant’s general conception of land, which has unusual, often overlooked, implications within his overall framework. Briefly put, as we have seen, Kant claims that **our possession in common of the finite** surface of the **earth is a** (**material**) **precondition of** (the possibility of) our collective coexistence under Right, or, relatedly, that the unity of all places on the earth’s finite surface is a condition of the possibility of **a united will among a plurality of unavoidably interacting persons**. (For, as we have already noted, **if** the surface of **the earth were infinite and unbounded, we would not necessarily come into contact** with each other**; hence, the united will**, the sole condition pursuant to which rightful relations among all can be established, **would carry no normative necessity**. As Edwards puts it succinctly, if somewhat obscurely, **Kant’s “idea of original community [of land]** is a conceptual representation that **picks out the objective correlate of** the idea of **universal will**.”) The upshot of Kant’s line of reasoning, essentially, is that, as a collective, we inhabit the surface of the earth (and, by extension, the natural environment) in a manner parallel to the way in which we inhabit our bodies as individuals: in order to exist as free persons, we have to subsist as individuals in finite bodies; **in order to** co-exist as free persons under conditions of Right dictated by a united will (the only possible way in which we can **co-exist as mutually free persons**, mediated by the dictates of practical reason in its external aspect and the idea of the social contract, etc.), **we have to subsist collectively within a finite** (confined) **space**, namely upon the spherical surface the earth that unites all lands upon it. In either case, freedom as such can only have reality under certain material, empirical (pre)conditions. But, if the integrity of our finite bodies is necessary to our individual freedom, then we have to also admit that the integrity of the finite surface of the earth (and by extension, the natural environment) is essential to our collective co-existence as free persons. For, imagine **if each of us were free to destroy some bit of the finite** surface of the **earth**; in that case, **it would**, in principle, **be permissible to destroy all** surfaces **of the earth.** However, **if we**, through collective cumulative action, **were to destroy the earth’s (finite) surface, we would have** nothing, **no space**, **to subsist** up**on**, either collectively or individually. As such, it is hardly coherent to say that the destruction of portions of the surface of the earth must be permissible under laws of freedom; and, the incoherence of the destruction of land (as a matter of Right) in this regard is exactly parallel to the incoherence of suicide (as a matter of Virtue)

### Util FW

The standard is maximizing life.

1. Actor specificity-key to the text of the resolution which is the basis for all burdens-the resolution is a question of government action for which there is no act/omission distinction.

Sunstein Cass Sunstein and Adrian Vermuele, “Is Capital Punishment Morally Required? The Relevance of Life‐Life Tradeoffs,” Chicago Public Law & Legal Theory Working Paper No. 85 (March 2005), p. 17.

The most fundamental point is that unlike individuals, **governments always** and necessarily **face a choice between** or among **possible policies for regulating third parties. The distinction between acts and omissions may not be intelligible in this context,** and even if it is, the distinction does not make a morally relevant difference. Most generally, government is in the business of creating permissions and prohibitions. When it explicitly or implicitly authorizes private action, it is not omitting to do anything or refusing to act. **Moreover, the distinction between authorized and unauthorized private action** – for example, private killing – **becomes obscure when government** formally **forbids private action but chooses a** set of **policy** instruments **that do[es] not** adequately or **fully discourage it.**

Impacts: A. life comes first-its instrumental in pursuing all other values so means based frameworks collapse to the aff. B. no skep or presumption-governments are always forced to take some action so deflationary arguments have no impact, B. no generic util indicts-policymakers can act in cases of uncertainty-they still have a general idea.

2. Moral uncertainty means we should preserve life to find ethical truth in the future.

Bostrom Nick Bostrom, 2001 prof of Philosophy, Oxford University Journal of Evolution and Technology, Vol. 9, March 2002. First version: 2001 March, JStor

These reflections on moral uncertainty suggest[s] an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk. Let me elaborate. Our present understanding of axiology might well be confused. We may not now know—at least not in concrete detail—what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. If we are indeed profoundly uncertain about our ultimate aims, then we should recognize that there is a great option value in preserving—and ideally improving—our ability to recognize value and to steer the future accordingly. Ensuring that there will be a future version of humanity with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely is plausibly the best way available to us to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value.

3. Empiricism. Morality must be based in empirical facts to avoid infinite regress.

Richards Robert, “A Defense of Evolutionary Ethics,” *Biology and Philosophy*, (1986) 265-293

This brief discussion of justification of ethical principles indicates how the concept of justification must, I believe, be employed. "To justify" means "**to demonstrate that a proposition** or system of propositions **conforms to a set of** acceptable **rules**, a set of acceptable factual propositions, or a set of acceptable practices. The order of justification is from rules to empirical propositions about beliefs and practices. That is, if **rules serving as** inference principles or the rules serving **as premises** (e.g., the Golden Rule) **of a justifying argument are themselves put to the test, then they must** be shown to **conform [to]** either to still **more general rules or** to **empirical propositions** about common beliefs and practices. **Barring an infinite regress, this procedure must end in** what are regarded as acceptable beliefs or **practices**. Aristotle, for instance, justified the forms of syllogistic reasoning by showing that they made explicit the patterns employed in argument by rational men. Kant justified the categorical imperative and the postulates of practical reason by demonstrating, to his satisfaction, that they were the necessary conditions of common moral experience: that is, he justified normative principles by showing that their application to particular cases reproduced the common moral conclusions of 18th century German burgers and Pietists. If this is an accurate rendering of the concept of justification, then the justification of first moral principles and inference rules must ultimately lead to an appeal to the beliefs and practices of [people], **which** of course **is an empirical appeal.** So **moral principles** ultimately **can be justified only by facts.**

The only morally accessible empirical facts are pain and pleasure-we can’t escape the fundamental fact that pleasure feels good and pain feels bad.

Sinhababu Neil (National University of Singapore) "The Epistemic Argument for Hedonism" http://philpapers.org/archive/SINTEA-3

One can form a variety of beliefs **using phenomenal introspection**. For example, one can believe that one is having sound experiences of particular noises and visual experiences of different shades of color. When looking at a lemon and considering the phenomenal states that are yellow experiences, one can form some beliefs about their intrinsic features – for example, that they are bright experiences. And **when considering experiences of pleasure, one can make** some **judgments about their intrinsic features** – for example, that they are good experiences. Just as one can look inward at one's experience of lemon yellow and appreciate its brightness, **one can look inward at one's experience of pleasure and appreciate its goodness.** When I consider **[in] a situation of increasing pleasure, I can form the belief that things are better than they were before**, in the same way I form the belief that there is more brightness in my visual field as lemon yellow replaces black. And when I suddenly experience pain, I can form the belief that things are worse in my experience than they were before. **"Pleasure"** here **refers to the hedonic tone of experience**. Having pleasure consists in one's experience having this hedonic tone. Without descending into metaphor, it is hard to give a further account of what pleasure is like than to say that when one has it, one feels good. As Aaron Smuts writes in defending the view of pleasure as hedonic tone, “to 'feel good' is about as close to an experiential primitive as we get.” Some philosophers, like Fred Feldman, see pleasure as fundamentally an attitude rather than a hedonic tone. But as long **as hedonic tones** – good and bad feelings – **are real components of experience, phenomenal introspection will reveal pleasure's goodness.** Opponents of the hedonic tone account of pleasure usually concede that hedonic tones exist, as Feldman seems to in discussing “sensory pleasures,” which he thinks his view helps us understand. Even on his view of pleasure, phenomenal introspection can produce the belief that some hedonic tones are good while others are bad. **There are many different kinds of pleasant experiences [like]**. There are **sensory pleasures,** like the pleasure of tasting delicious food, receiving a massage, or resting your tired limbs in a soft bed after a hard day. There are the **pleasures of seeing** that **our desires** are **satisfied**, like the **pleasure of winning a game, getting a promotion, or seeing a friend succeed**. These experiences differ in many ways, just as the experiences we have when looking at lemons and the sky on a sunny day differ. It is easy to see the appeal of Feldman's view that pleasures “have just about nothing in common phenomenologically” (79). **But** just as our experiences in looking at lemons and the sky on a sunny day have brightness in common, **pleasant experiences all have “a certain common quality – feeling good,” as Roger Crisp argues** (109). As the analogy with brightness suggests, hedonic tone is phenomenologically very thin, and usually mixed with a variety of other experiences. **Pleasure of any kind feels good, and displeasure of any kind feels bad**. These feelings may or may not have bodily location or be combined with other sensory states like warmth or pressure. “Pleasure” and “displeasure” mean these thin phenomenal states of feeling good and feeling bad. As Joseph Mendola writes, “the pleasantness of physical pleasure is a kind of hedonic value, a single homogenous sensory property, differing merely in intensity as well as in extent and duration, which is yet a kind of goodness” (442).

### Parameters

Ethical frameworks must be theoretically legitimate-this is a topicality concern.

Overing 13 Bob Overing (TOC 2012 Finalist) “Head to Head: Theoretically Justified Frameworks” November 11th 2013 NSD Update <http://nsdupdate.com/2013/11/11/head-to-head-theoretically-justified-frameworks/> JW 2/20/15

Framework itself is only a subset of a theoretical category we already accept: topicality. It’s about defining the terms for the debate. Debaters have been reading T-Ought for years, but recently John Scoggin and I forwarded a version of the argument we called ‘parameters,’ which makes two claims: 1) any moral framework is an interpretation of the word ought or a similar evaluative term such as morally permissible in the resolution, and 2) any interpretation of a word in the resolution is subject to debate only on theoretical grounds. 1) is obviously true. The use of specific moral terms in the resolution is the only reason the types of frameworks in LD are necessary. If the resolution were “The sky is blue,” ethics would have nothing to do with it. 2) should be intuitive too. When we debate about words in the resolution, we do not appeal to the “truth” of our interpretation; rather, we make arguments about predictable limits or neg ground. Think how ridiculous it would be if the neg ran T-compulsory voting on the September-October 2013 topic, and the aff simply asserted, “but my understanding of compulsory voting is just true.” Such a line of argument would be out of place and insufficient. Before debate occurs, one must prove [their] his/her interpretation of the resolution is appropriate for debate in the first place. This burden has been a part of debate theory for decades and should not be discarded.

My framework defines ought as maximizing life. Prefer this definition:

1. Ground. Every single impact functions under util, whereas other ethics usually flow to one side exclusively. Equal ground access is key to fairness because we both need arguments to win.

2. Topic lit. Most of the articles in minimum wage literature are utilitarian.

Wilhelm 14 William Wilhelm “What Price Dignity?: The ethical side of the minimum wage” May 9th 2014 Hamilton County Business Magazine http://hamiltoncountybusiness.com/price-dignity-ethical-side-minimum-wage/

The minimum wage debate primarily presents arguments based on economic consequences: lost jobs versus reduced poverty, increased consumer spending, reduced government aid, reduced income inequality, and reduced job turnover. This cost-benefit approach focuses on consequences and choosing the action that will produce the greatest good and the least harm for the greatest number of people. While this approach is helpful, it suffers from the weaknesses of fallible measurement and debatable valuations. In other words, how does one measure the harm of half a million lost low-wage jobs versus the benefit of reduced poverty? How does one accurately calculate an incremental value that a higher minimum wage will add to reduced employee turnover?

Topic lit is key because it determines what arguments we can make and how we engage in the topic. Fairness is a voter since debate is a competitive activity-no debater ought to have a structural advantage.

### EM

Use an epistemically modest method of framework evaluation-that’s probability of the moral theory multiplied by the action’s value under the theory if it were true-3 reasons.

1. An ethically modest method of evaluation is most consistent with real world decision making.

Overing and Bistagne 14 Bob Overing (TOC finalist 2012) and Adam Bistagne (triple-major in Philosophy, Economics and Mathematics, coach for Loyola) “Ethical Modesty Part 1” Premier Debate Today August 31st 2014 <http://premierdebatetoday.com/2014/08/31/moral-modesty-part-1-by-bob-overing-and-adam-bistagne/>

First, ethical modesty seems consistent with everyday decision-making. The following example is taken from the dissertation of Andrew Sepielli, now a professor at the University of Toronto: Suppose that I am deciding whether to drink a cup of coffee. I have a degree of belief of .2 that the coffee is mixed with a deadly poison, and a degree of belief of .8 that it’s perfectly safe. If I act on the hypothesis in which I have the highest credence, I’ll drink the coffee. But this seems like a bad call. A good chance of coffee isn’t worth such a significant risk of death – at least, not if I assign commonsensical values to coffee and death, respectively.[1] It’s hard to argue that confidence gets it right here. We should think similarly when deliberating about normative theories. Employing some social-contract theory, we might think that the United States government should take only Constitutional action; however, some Constitutional violation might be permissible to protect a large city from a terrorist attack even if we care less about utilitarian reasons.

2. Letting the aff weigh the plan is key to structural reciprocity.

Overing and Bistagne 2 Bob Overing (TOC finalist 2012) and Adam Bistagne (triple-major in Philosophy, Economics and Mathematics, coach for Loyola) “Ethical Modesty Part 1” Premier Debate Today August 31st 2014 <http://premierdebatetoday.com/2014/08/31/moral-modesty-part-1-by-bob-overing-and-adam-bistagne/>

That’s all well and good but why should we adopt it in debate? Ethical modesty might remedy a lot of the fairness concerns with frameworks. Necessary/insufficient burdens, skepticism, and unturnable cases lose their force when the criterion is no longer all-or-nothing. Those arguments create reciprocity problems precisely because they exclude the opponent’s offense. Under a frame of ethical modesty, they would not be exclusive; the aff can weigh its offense. Status quo LD framework debate incentivizes finding frameworks that heavily favor one side such that winning the criterion is sufficient to vote. More reasonable, inclusive frameworks are crowded out in favor of more unfair ones. For instance, a deontological framework is a predictable, reasonable framework, but ethical confidence makes it much more likely to create structural unfairness. If the neg defends a narrow conception of deontology, a strong act/omission distinction, that perfect duties strictly precede imperfect duties, and that any risk of a violation of the standard is sufficient to negate, aff offense under the neg framework is effectively impossible. These arguments alone are not problematic, however. If the aff can weigh the advantages of the plan even when the framework debate favors the neg, then the aff still has options. Modesty makes the strength of the aff impacts matter at the end of the day. Perhaps such a method of evaluation will help the time-pressured 1AR beat back neg layering strategies without resorting to theory arguments.

3. Modesty causes innovative framework debates.

Overing and Bistagne 3 Bob Overing (TOC finalist 2012) and Adam Bistagne (triple-major in Philosophy, Economics and Mathematics, coach for Loyola) “Ethical Modesty Part 1” Premier Debate Today August 31st 2014 <http://premierdebatetoday.com/2014/08/31/moral-modesty-part-1-by-bob-overing-and-adam-bistagne/>

Ethical modesty might also encourage LDers to make multiple kinds of moral arguments in a given round. For instance, instead of defending utilitarianism to the death, a debater might also forward rights-based or contract-based reasons. This model would be a less dogmatic form of framework debating that largely reflects how applied philosophy is done. When thinking about abortion, drone strikes, or physician-assisted suicide, a comprehensive analysis would include justification from a variety of moral perspectives. Additionally, with more frameworks in any given debate, the cost to introducing an ethical principle would be much lower since a debater would have others to fall back on. If a framework can be ‘kicked’ at little strategic loss, debaters might be more willing to ditch their tired framework backfiles in favor of more innovative strategies. Ethical modesty might inject some life into deont vs. util debates that have largely characterized even the best framework debates in LD for some time.

Education is a voter since it’s the portable purpose of debate. Fairness is a voter since debate is a competitive activity so no debater ought to have an advantage.

### Underview

First, neg abuse outweighs aff abuse-neg won 66% of outrounds at VBT proving you have the advantage.

Second, T is an RVI for the aff if I win a counter interp-the nature of T makes it a NIB since it’s a layer before theory and the neg doesn’t have to be topical so I can’t turn it-outweighs other disads to the RVI since it’s intrinsic the structure of theory and not a side effect or substantive abuse.

Third, the role of the ballot is to evaluate the aff policy action. Acting like policymakers is educational.

Shaw PEDAGOGY IN INTERNATIONAL STUDIES Using Role-Play Scenarios in the IR Classroom: An Examination of Exercises on Peacekeeping Operations and Foreign Policy Decision Making CAROLYN M. SHAW Wichita State University 2004

The use of role-playing in the classroom provides an alternative method for presenting course materials in contrast to lecturing. Although some materials can be conveyed well through an oral presentation, many concepts in international relations only become less abstract when the student can apply them directly or experience them personally (Preston, 2000). ‘‘To the extent that they engage in constructing new knowledge or reconstructing given information, rather than simply memorizing it, they gain a deeper understanding’’ (King, 1994:16). Merryfield and Remy (1995:8) similarly note that ‘‘students master content not only by being exposed to information through readings and lectures...but also by engaging in a reflective process in which they make the information their own by evaluating and using it.’’ Since class trips abroad are beyond the scope of most courses, simulations can be used to place students in a unique international context or position which they would otherwise be unable to experience, and give them the opportunity to gain a deeper understanding of the material. One challenge that instructors face is the trade-off in terms of coverage of material and the time it takes to conduct an active learning exercise. Such exercises usually take more time than covering the same materials in lecture format (Boyer et al., 2000:4). The key to using role-playing effectively without sacrificing too much content is to plan the exercise carefully to provide interactive examples of the course materials. Frequently this can be done in coordination with a preparatory lecture. The concepts can be introduced prior to the exercise, and then participation in the exercise provides the students with concrete examples of more abstract theories and ideas presented in the lecture. For example, when learning about the bureaucratic politics model of foreign policy decision making, students are often frustrated that the government actors involved cannot simply ‘‘reach a consensual agreement and do what’s best for our country.’’ By actually taking on the roles of the different agencies involved in foreign policy making, students begin to understand the underlying conflicts between these actors and the challenge of clearly defining what is in our ‘‘national interest.’’

# f/l start here

## LINK DEBATE

### My ev is sick!!!

Prefer Gindling and Terrel 4: A. probability-it says specifically wage increases solve inequality whereas you rely on a separate internal link. B. comes to conclusions about *all* countries not just the US so its specific to the aff advocacy

### A2 Mobility

No uniqueness-the poor are in poverty right now and your evidence doesn’t say they are currently mobile.

No link. Living wage boosts wages of all low-wage workers. Ripple effect means there’s still a wage scale, so people will still have ability and incentive to move up the ladder.

Recent research proves higher wages improve social mobility and that inequality hurts the poor despite mobility rates

--New survey of research for Oxfam America

--Low wages mean workers can’t invest in education or job training

--Low wages cause poor health and family instability which are additional barriers

--Low wages hinder affordability of childcare; workers have to choose between caring for kids and working

--Income inequality means people inherit wealth while the poor fall behind

**Yarrow 4-9** writes[[1]](#footnote-1)

**Low wages** for workers **today** are **likely** to **predict low wages** for those same workers **tomorrow** (and for many years after), as a **new** survey of **research** for Oxfam America by Shawn Fremstad, a Senior Fellow at the Center for American Progress, **reveals**.  **Poverty**-level **wages** not only mean that workers live in poverty; they also have a host of other negative effects that **relegate** these **workers to a lifetime stuck in America’s** growing **low-wage economy**. With more than 4 in 10 children who start life at the bottom of the income distribution staying at the bottom in adulthood, it is clear that America’s once-vaunted reputation for rags-to-riches mobility is no longer so deserved. Republicans and Democrats both recognize that upward social mobility is too low and has fallen behind that of most Western European countries. While more has been written about the flagging American Dream of inter-generational mobility (whether children are able to do better than their parents), intra-generational mobility (whether individuals ascend the socio-economic ladder in their own lifetimes) is also sparse. **Low-wage workers are in jobs that are insecure and make it** virtually **impossible for them to invest in education or training**, or to buy a car, to get to a better job. In addition, studies have found that **low-wages have** particularly **harmful effects on** families, children, and workers’ **health, which**, in turn, **are additional barriers to** workers **getting better jobs**. Much research suggests that workers in low-wage careers are less likely to marry and more likely to divorce and experience family instability. Single parents generally have lower living standards than two-parent households, and this hits single mothers especially hard. Eliminating the gender pay gap would cut the poverty rate in half for working single mothers, according to the Institute for Women’s Policy Research, and—not surprisingly—**higher wages generally lead to more stable families. Low wages make child care unaffordable**, causing enormous strains on families and single parents. For working parents who are paid poverty-level wages, 30 percent of their income goes to child care, the Census Bureau reports. For “near poor” workers—those paid between the poverty line and double that level—child care consumes about 20 percent of income. **Higher wages**, together with more generous public subsidies or tax credits for low-income families, make child care more affordable, significantly **reduc**ing **the** impossible **“choice”** that many low-wage workers have to make **between caring for** their **children and working**. Low wages are unhealthy. While arduous work and unsafe working conditions take their own toll, low-wage workers are less likely to get decent health care simply because they cannot afford it. J. Paul Leigh, a University of California-Davis epidemiologist also found a strong relationship between low wages and increased obesity and hypertension, particularly among women and workers under age 44. Low wages are associated with increased stress, low self-esteem, and a greater tendency to engage in unhealthy behaviors like smoking. The health effects of low wages become a vicious cycle, in which poor health hinders employment and income growth. By contrast, higher wages and better health give workers a greater chance of getting promotions, education and training, and consequently, the ability to achieve upward mobility. While Fremstad focuses on intra-generational mobility, considerable, better-known research on inter-generational mobility has found that upward mobility is less attainable in the United States than in other developed countries due to advantages conferred by parents’ relative well-being and reinforced by policies that hinder children’s opportunities for advancement. Robert Putnam, the Harvard political scientist and author of the influential book, Bowling Alone (2000), writes in his new book, Our Kids: The American Dream in Crisis: “**As** income **inequality expands, kids from** more **privileged backgrounds start and** probably **finish** further and further **ahead** of their less privileged peers, **even if** the rate of socioeconomic **mobility is unchanged**.” **Raising** the **minimum wage** is not the only solution to America’s low-wage economy and low social mobility, but it **could set in motion** a virtuous cycle of **stronger families**, children who are better cared for, **and healthier workers**—thus helping hard-working Americans get and keep still better-paying jobs.

### A2 Poorly Targeted

Living wage isn’t poorly targeted—their evidence is oversimplistic

**Bernstein and Parrott 14** write[[2]](#footnote-2)

Some **critics** also **argue that** the **minimum wage is poorly targeted**, meaning that many people who benefit from a minimum-wage increase do not live in low-income households. This argument is typically made in conjunction with claims that there are large downsides to raising the minimum wage and that those “costs” are not worth absorbing because the beneficiaries do not really need the extra earnings. **E**conomic **P**olicy **I**nstitute **figures** on the workers whom the FMWA would affect **contradict this simplistic picture:**[16] About 17 million workers would receive a wage boost; 8 million children live in families with an affected worker. The majority of beneficiaries are women (58 percent). Most are adults (84 percent are over age 20; 47 percent are over 30). Most are non-Hispanic whites (57 percent), but African Americans and Hispanics are over-represented among those affected by the proposed increase: these groups make up 11 percent and 16 percent of the total workforce, respectively, but represent 16 percent and 21 percent of workers who would see their wages rise under the FMWA. Just under half (47 percent) of affected workers work full-time (35+ hours per week); another 36 percent work 20-34 hours per week. Some **54 percent of** the benefits of **the increase would flow to the bottom third of the workforce, with family income below $40,000**. Some **25 percent** of the benefits **would flow to the bottom 10 percent** of the workforce, **with family income below $20,000**.[17] **The average affected worker brings home half of** the **family earnings**. In addition, the low-wage workforce has gotten older and better educated over time. One study found that the share of low-wage workers (those earning less than $10 an hour in 2011 dollars) who are aged 16-24 fell from 47 percent in 1979 to 36 percent in 2011, while the share aged 25-64 rose from 48 percent to 60 percent.[18] The share of low-wage workers who were high-school dropouts fell from 40 percent to 20 percent during this period, while the share with at least some college rose from 25 percent to 43 percent. Clearly, the beneficiaries of a minimum-wage increase are older and better educated than the beneficiaries of an increase several decades ago. The claim that the minimum wage is largely a teenagers’ issue is not supported by these demographic trends.

Living wage primarily benefits poor and low-income families. Empirics go aff.

**Fairris et al 5** David Fairris (department of econ @ UC Riverside), David Runsten (North American Integration and Development Center @ UCLA), Carolina Briones and Jessica Goodheart (Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy). “Examining the Evidence: The Impact of the Los Angeles Living Wage Ordinance on Workers and Businesses.” http://www.irle.ucla.edu/publications/documents/LivingWage\_fullreport.pdf

Given their characteristics, living wage workers are likely to be low-income. More than 70 percent have a high school education or less. Only 4 percent are teenagers, compared to 14 percent of low-wage workers in the county. The average affected worker has been in the labor force for 19 years, and nearly 90 percent are working full time. Living wage workers are more likely than other low-wage workers to be female (nearly 60 percent), to be African-American (30 percent), and to be single parents (16 percent). Indeed, nearly 45 percent of living wage workers surveyed said they use a government assistance program or claimed the Earned Income Tax Credit, even while earning the living wage. **We used data on low-wage workers in L.A County** to estimate poverty levels and lowincome status for living wage workers. **Only fifteen percent** of low-wage workers in the county are in severe poverty, **fall**ing **below** the **federal poverty guidelines**. Most people below the poverty guidelines are not working, so it is not surprising that the living wage does not primarily affect this group. **Using** the standard of **200 percent of** the **poverty guidelines as a more realistic measure** of poverty status**, 43 percent** of low-wage workers **are poor. These workers meet** the **income eligibility criteria for various government** antipoverty **programs.** Finally, **the majority of workers**, or 69%, can be considered lowincome. They **fall below a self-reliance standard** for Los Angeles County, **and would likely have difficulty making ends meet** without sharing housing or relying on government assistance or informal childcare. The remaining 31% of low-wage workers are not low-income. Compared to low-wage workers in the county, living wage workers are likely to have lower family incomes because they are less likely to be teenagers, and more likely to be female, African-American, and single mothers. The **income gains from** the **living wage, then, predominantly affect poor and low-income families**, who can likely use the extra income to help meet the high cost of living in Los Angeles.

Even if it’s poorly targeted, living wage creates a ripple effect that boosts wages of all low-wage workers.

**Harris and Kearney 14** Benjamin H. Harris (Policy Director of The Hamilton Project, Fellow in Economic Studies at Brookings, and Deputy Director of the Retirement Security Project at Brookings) and Melissa S. Kearney (Kearney is the Director of the Hamilton Project; a Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution; and a Professor in the Department of Economics at the University of Maryland, where she has been on the faculty since 2006. She is a Research Associate at the National Bureau of Economic Research and a Faculty Affiliate of the Lab for Economic Opportunities. Kearney's research focuses on issues of social policy, poverty, and inequality). “The “Ripple Effect” of a Minimum Wage Increase on American Workers.” Brookings Institution. 10 January 2014. http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/up-front/posts/2014/01/10-ripple-effect-of-increasing-the-minimum-wage-kearney-harris

In this month’s Hamilton Project economic analysis, we consider the likely magnitude of the effects of a minimum wage increase on the number and share of workers affected. **Considering that near-minimum wage workers would also be affected, we find that an increase could raise the wages of** up to **35 million workers**—that’s 29.4 percent of the workforce. For the purpose of this analysis, we set aside the important issue of potential employment effects, which is another crucial element in the debate about an optimal minimum wage policy. We also continue to explore the nation’s “jobs gap,” or the number of jobs needed to return to pre-recession employment levels. The Ripple Effects of Minimum Wage Policy Although relatively few workers report wages exactly equal to (or below) the minimum wage, a much larger share of workers in the United States earns wages near the minimum wage. This holds true in the states that comply with the federal minimum wage, in addition to those states that have instituted their own higher minimum wage levels. An **increase in** the **minimum wage tends to have a “ripple effect”** on other workers earning wages near that threshold. This ripple effect occurs when a raise in the minimum wage increases the wage received by workers earning slightly above the minimum wage. **This effect** of the statutory minimum wage on wages paid at the low end of the wage distribution more generally **is well recognized in the academic literature.** Based on this recognition, we quantify the number of workers potentially affected by minimum wage policy using the assumption that workers earning up to 150 percent of the minimum wage would see a wage increase from a higher minimum wage. We hasten to note that a complete analysis of the net effects of a minimum wage increase would also have to account for potential negative employment effects. Our main goal of this empirical exercise is to dispel the notion that the minimum wage is not a relevant policy lever, which is based on the faulty premise that only a small number of workers would be affected. Using data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, combined with information on the binding minimum wage in each state, we are able to calculate these shares. **Just 2.6 percent of workers are paid** exactly **the minimum wage, but 29**.4 **percent** of workers **are paid wages** that are **below** or equal to **150 percent of the minimum wage** in their state. Furthermore, **the hours worked by this group represent nearly one-quarter**—24.7 percent—**of hours worked, which indicates that** a large share of **the impacted group is working close to full time** hours.

## food

### impact add-on-brown 11

Food scarcity risks global wars

**Brown 11** writes[[3]](#footnote-3)

IN THIS ERA OF TIGHTENING world food supplies, the ability to grow **food is fast becoming a** new **form of geopolitical leverage**, and **countries are scrambling to secure their** own **parochial interests** at the expense of the common good. The first signs of trouble came in 2007, when farmers began having difficulty keeping up with the growth in global demand for grain. Grain and soybean prices started to climb, tripling by mid-2008. In response, many exporting countries tried to control the rise of domestic food prices by restricting exports. Among them were Russia and Argentina, two leading wheat exporters. Vietnam, the No. 2 rice exporter, banned exports entirely for several months in early 2008. So did several other smaller exporters of grain. With exporting countries restricting exports in 2007 and 2008, importing countries panicked. No longer able to rely on the market to supply the grain they needed, several countries took the novel step of trying to negotiate long-term grain-supply agreements with exporting countries. The Philippines, for instance, negotiated a three-year agreement with Vietnam for 1.5 million tons of rice per year. A delegation of Yemenis traveled to Australia with a similar goal in mind, but had no luck. In a seller’s market, exporters were reluctant to make long-term commitments. **Fearing they might not be able to buy needed grain** from the market**,** some of the **more affluent countries**, led by Saudi Arabia, South Korea, and China, **took the** unusual **step in** 20**08 of buying** or leasing **land in other countries** on which to grow grain for themselves. Most of these land acquisitions are in Africa, where some governments lease cropland for less than $1 per acre per year. Among the principal destinations were Ethiopia and Sudan, countries where millions of people are being sustained with food from the U.N. World Food Program. That the governments of these two countries are willing to sell land to foreign interests when their own people are hungry is a sad commentary on their leadership. By the end of 2009, hundreds of land acquisition deals had been negotiated, some of them exceeding a million acres. A 2010 World Bank analysis of these “land grabs” reported that a total of nearly 140 million acres were involved — an area that exceeds the cropland devoted to corn and wheat combined in the United States. Such acquisitions also typically involve water rights, meaning that land grabs potentially affect all downstream countries as well. Any water extracted from the upper Nile River basin to irrigate crops in Ethiopia or Sudan, for instance, will now not reach Egypt, upending the delicate water politics of the Nile by adding new countries with which Egypt must negotiate. The potential for conflict — and not just over water — is high. Many of the land deals have been made in secret, and in most cases, the land involved was already in use by villagers when it was sold or leased. Often those already farming the land were neither consulted about nor even informed of the new arrangements. And because there typically are no formal land titles in many developing-country villages, the farmers who lost their land have had little backing to bring their cases to court. Reporter John Vidal, writing in Britain’s Observer, quotes Nyikaw Ochalla from Ethiopia’s Gambella region: “The **foreign companies are arriving in large numbers**, depriving people of land they have used for centuries. There is no consultation with the indigenous population. The deals are done secretly. The only thing the local people see is people coming with lots of tractors to invade their lands.” **Local hostility** toward such land grabs **is the rule**, not the exception. In 2007, as food prices were starting to rise, China signed an agreement with the Philippines to lease 2.5 million acres of land slated for food crops that would be shipped home. Once word leaked, the public outcry — much of it from Filipino farmers — forced Manila to suspend the agreement. A similar uproar rocked Madagascar, where a South Korean firm, Daewoo Logistics, had pursued rights to more than 3 million acres of land. Word of the deal helped stoke a political furor that toppled the government and forced cancellation of the agreement. Indeed, **few things are more likely to fuel insurgencies than taking land** from people. Agricultural equipment is easily sabotaged. If ripe fields of grain are torched, they burn quickly. Not only are these deals risky, but foreign investors producing food in a country full of hungry people face another political question of how to get the grain out. Will villagers permit trucks laden with grain headed for port cities to proceed when they themselves may be on the verge of starvation? The **potential for political instability** in countries where villagers have lost their land and their livelihoods **is high. Conflicts could** easily **develop between investor and host countries**. These acquisitions represent a potential investment in agriculture in developing countries of an estimated $50 billion. But it could take many years to realize any substantial production gains. The public infrastructure for modern market-oriented agriculture does not yet exist in most of Africa. In some countries it will take years just to build the roads and ports needed to bring in agricultural inputs such as fertilizer and to export farm products. Beyond that, modern agriculture requires its own infrastructure: machine sheds, grain-drying equipment, silos, fertilizer storage sheds, fuel storage facilities, equipment repair and maintenance services, well-drilling equipment, irrigation pumps, and energy to power the pumps. Overall, development of the land acquired to date appears to be moving very slowly. So how much will all this expand world food output? We don’t know, but the World Bank analysis indicates that only 37 percent of the projects will be devoted to food crops. Most of the land bought up so far will be used to produce biofuels and other industrial crops. Even if some of these projects do eventually boost land productivity, who will benefit? If virtually all the inputs — the farm equipment, the fertilizer, the pesticides, the seeds — are brought in from abroad and if all the output is shipped out of the country, it will contribute little to the host country’s economy. At best, locals may find work as farm laborers, but in highly mechanized operations, the jobs will be few. At worst, impoverished countries like Mozambique and Sudan will be left with less land and water with which to feed their already hungry populations. Thus far the land grabs have contributed more to stirring unrest than to expanding food production. And this rich country-poor country divide could grow even more pronounced — and soon. This January, a new stage in the scramble among importing countries to secure food began to unfold when South Korea, which imports 70 percent of its grain, announced that it was creating a new public-private entity that will be responsible for acquiring part of this grain. With an initial office in Chicago, the plan is to bypass the large international trading firms by buying grain directly from U.S. farmers. As the Koreans acquire their own grain elevators, they may well sign multiyear delivery contracts with farmers, agreeing to buy specified quantities of wheat, corn, or soybeans at a fixed price. Other importers will not stand idly by as South Korea tries to tie up a portion of the U.S. grain harvest even before it gets to market. The enterprising Koreans may soon be joined by China, Japan, Saudi Arabia, and other leading importers. Although South Korea’s initial focus is the United States, far and away the world’s largest grain exporter, it may later consider brokering deals with Canada, Australia, Argentina, and other major exporters. This is happening just as China may be on the verge of entering the U.S. market as a potentially massive importer of grain. With China’s 1.4 billion increasingly affluent consumers starting to compete with U.S. consumers for the U.S. grain harvest, cheap food, seen by many as an American birthright, may be coming to an end. **No one knows where** this **intensifying competition for food** supplies **will go, but the world seems to be moving away from** the **international cooperation** that evolved over several decades following World War II to an every-country-for-itself philosophy. **Food nationalism** may help secure food supplies for individual affluent countries, but it **does little to enhance** world **food security**. Indeed, the low-income countries that host land grabs or import grain will likely see their food situation deteriorate. AFTER THE CARNAGE of two world wars and the economic missteps that led to the Great Depression, countries joined together in 1945 to create the United Nations, finally realizing that in the modern world we cannot live in isolation, tempting though that might be. The International Monetary Fund was created to help manage the monetary system and promote economic stability and progress. Within the U.N. system, specialized agencies from the World Health Organization to the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) play major roles in the world today. All this has fostered international cooperation. But while the FAO collects and analyzes global agricultural data and provides technical assistance, there is no organized effort to ensure the adequacy of world food supplies. Indeed, most international negotiations on agricultural trade until recently focused on access to markets, with **the U**nited **S**tates**, Canada, Australia, and Argentina** persistently **press**ing **Europe and Japan to open their** highly protected **ag**ricultural **markets**. But in the first decade of this century, **access to supplies has emerged as the overriding issue** as the world transitions from an era of food surpluses to a new politics of food scarcity. At the same time, the U.S. food aid program that once worked to fend off famine wherever it threatened has largely been replaced by the U.N. World Food Program (WFP), where the United States is the leading donor. The WFP now has food-assistance operations in some 70 countries and an annual budget of $4 billion. There is little international coordination otherwise. French President Nicolas Sarkozy — the reigning president of the G-20 — is proposing to deal with rising food prices by curbing speculation in commodity markets. Useful though this may be, it treats the symptoms of growing food insecurity, not the causes, such as population growth and climate change. The world now needs to focus not only on agricultural policy, but on a structure that integrates it with energy, population, and water policies, each of which directly affects food security. But that is not happening. Instead, as land and water become scarcer, as the Earth’s temperature rises, and **as world food security deteriorates, a dangerous geopolitics** of food scarcity **is emerging**. Land grabbing, water grabbing, and buying grain directly from farmers in exporting countries are now integral parts of a global power struggle for food security. With grain stocks low and climate volatility increasing, the risks are also increasing. **We are** now **so close to the edge that a breakdown in the food system could come at any time**. Consider, for example, what would have happened if the 2010 heat wave that was centered in Moscow had instead been centered in Chicago. In round numbers, the 40 percent drop in Russia’s hoped-for harvest of roughly 100 million tons cost the world 40 million tons of grain, but a 40 percent drop in the far larger U.S. grain harvest of 400 million tons would have cost 160 million tons. The world’s carryover stocks of grain (the amount in the bin when the new harvest begins) would have dropped to just 52 days of consumption. This level would have been not only the lowest on record, but also well below the 62-day carryover that set the stage for the 2007-2008 tripling of world grain prices.

### NASA study probable

My evidence is a study from NASA which proves most other warnings of collapse are false-this impact is most likely and historically verified.

Ahmed 14 Nafeez Ahmed (bestselling author, investigative journalist and international security scholar. He is executive director of the Institute for Policy Research & Development) “Nasa-funded study: industrial civilisation headed for 'irreversible collapse'?” The Guardian March 14th 2014 <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/earth-insight/2014/mar/14/nasa-civilisation-irreversible-collapse-study-scientists> JW 2/21/15

A new study partly-sponsored by Nasa's Goddard Space Flight Center has highlighted the prospect that global industrial civilisation could collapse in coming decades due to unsustainable resource exploitation and increasingly unequal wealth distribution. Noting that warnings of 'collapse' are often seen to be fringe or controversial, the study attempts to make sense of compelling historical data showing that "the process of rise-and-collapse is actually a recurrent cycle found throughout history." Cases of severe civilisational disruption due to "precipitous collapse - often lasting centuries - have been quite common."

### Empirics confirm

Empirics confirm.

**Moyers 10** Bill Moyers (American journalist and liberal political commentator. He served as White House Press Secretary in the Johnson administration from 1965 to 1967. He also worked as a network TV news commentator for ten years). “Bill Moyers: “Welcome to the Plutocracy!”” Prepared for the Howard Zinn lecture series at Boston University. Truth-out. November 3rd, 2010. http://truth-out.org/archive/component/k2/item/92657:bill-moyers-welcome-to-the-plutocracy

You would think the rich might care, if not from empathy, then from reading history. Ultimately **gross inequality can be fatal to civilization**. In his book Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed, the Pulitzer Prize-winning anthropologist Jared Diamond writes about how governing elites throughout history isolate and delude themselves until it is too late. He reminds us that the **change people inflict on their environment is one of the main factors in** the **decline of earlier societies**. For example: the **Mayan natives** on the Yucatan peninsula who **suffered as their forest disappeared**, their soil eroded, **and** their **water** supply **deteriorated**. Chronic warfare further exhausted dwindling resources. **Although Mayan kings could see their forests vanishing** and their hills eroding, **they were able to insulate themselves** from the rest of society. **By extracting wealth from commoners, they could remain well-fed** while everyone else was slowly starving. **Realizing too late that they could not reverse their deteriorating environment, they became casualties of their own privilege**. Any society contains a built-in blueprint for failure, Diamond warns, if elites insulate themselves from the consequences of their decisions, separated from the common life of the country.

### A2 collapse inevitable

Not inevitable.

Ahmed 14 Nafeez Ahmed (bestselling author, investigative journalist and international security scholar. He is executive director of the Institute for Policy Research & Development) “Nasa-funded study: industrial civilisation headed for 'irreversible collapse'?” The Guardian March 14th 2014 <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/earth-insight/2014/mar/14/nasa-civilisation-irreversible-collapse-study-scientists> JW 2/21/15

However, the scientists point out that the worst-case scenarios are by no means inevitable, and suggest that appropriate policy and structural changes could avoid collapse, if not pave the way toward a more stable civilisation.

## Warming

### AT Adaptation

naw

Reilly 14 John Reilly (co-director of the MIT Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change) “Why We Can’t Just Adapt to Climate Change” MIT Technology Review April 3rd 2014 http://www.technologyreview.com/view/526116/why-we-cant-just-adapt-to-climate-change/

That is where a measure of wealth brings some resilience—I have those options, others do not. The report “quantifies” in some sense by establishing an element of “relative risk,” concluding that the poor and marginalized in society are more vulnerable because they do not have the means to adapt. Beyond this, it is not clear that climate prediction is at a high enough level to offer information that I can use to take concrete actions for most day-to-day decisions and investments. What the report does provide is some documentation of adaptation in action—what different regions, cities, sectors, and groups are doing to adapt—concluding that there is a growing body of experience from which to learn. However, perhaps the greatest truth in the report is in the following statement: “Adaptation is place and context specific, with no single approach for reducing risks appropriate across all settings (high confidence). Effective risk reduction and adaptation strategies consider the dynamics of vulnerability and exposure and their linkages with socioeconomic processes, sustainable development, and climate change.” Hence, while it’s possible to learn from others’ adaptation experiences, in the end, the specifics of climate change in my place, given my circumstances, and the socio-economic environment in which I live will present me with very different climate outcomes and opportunities to adapt than you will have where you live. This fact alone raises the cost of adaptation, because to some degree each recipe needs to be invented anew. What worked in the past likely won’t work in the future—or at least, not as well. And we need to process a lot of highly uncertain climate projections in developing the new recipe. The report also concludes, not surprisingly, that risks increase and extend to more people, places, and things if the global temperature rise is three degrees Celsius or greater than if there is only a one-degree rise. Overall, the report provides, in my judgment, a compelling case for more serious mitigation efforts—the topic of the next IPCC report, to come out later this month.

### AT CO2 Ag

Benefits are short-term – can’t act as a sufficient negative feedback and warming kills other resources needed to sustain agriculture.

Mann 4 Michael E, PHD in Geology and Geophysics from Yale, member of the Penn State University faculty, holding joint positions in the Departments of Meteorology and Geosciences, and the Earth and Environmental Systems Institute (EESI). He is also director of the Penn State Earth System Science Center (ESSC), "CO2 Fertilization," <http://www.realclimate.org/index.php/archives/2004/11/co_2-fertilization/>

**It has** sometimes **been argued** that the **earth’s biosphere** (in large part, the terrestrial biosphere) may **have the capacity to sequestor** much of the increased carbon dioxide (**CO2**) in the atmosphere associated with human fossil fuel burning. **This** effect **is known as “CO2 fertilization**” because, in the envisioned scenario, higher ambient CO2 concentrations in the atmosphere literally “fertilize” plant growth. Because plants in turn, in the process of photosynthesis, convert CO2 into oxygen, it is thus sometimes argued that such “co2 fertilization” could potentially provide a strong negative feedback on changing CO2 concentrations. **Recent experiments and model calculations**, however, **suggest** that **this is unlikely** to be the case. A set of controlled experiments known as FACE (“Free Air CO2 Enrichment”) **experiments have been performed in which ambient CO2 levels are elevated in forest stands and changes in various measures of productivity are made over several years**. Experiments of this sort that have been done at Duke Forest indicate (in agreement with models), that **any** elevation of **productivity is likely to be short-lived and is unlikely to significantly offset any gradual, long-term increases in co2 due to human activity. This is due in part to the fact that other conditions** (e.g. availability of nutrients such as Nitrogen and Phosphorus) **appear to quickly become limiting, even when carbon availability is removed as a constraint on plant growth when ambient CO2 concentrations are sufficiently increased**. A few simple calculations indicate that any hypothesized co2 fertilization response is unlikely to offset a significant fraction of projected increases in atmospheric co2 concentration over the next century. At present, **about 600 billion tons of carbon are tied up in the above-ground vegetation. About 2-3 times this much is tied up in roots and below ground carbon, which is a more difficult carbon pool to augment. By comparison, scenarios for fossil fuel emissions for the 21st century range** from about 600 billion tons (if we can keep total global emissions at current levels) **to over 2500 billion tons** if the world increases its reliance on combustion of coal as economic growth and population increase dramatically. **These numbers** clearly **indicate** that **sequestering** a significant fraction of projected emissions in vegetation **is likely to be very difficult**, especially as forests are cleared to make way for agriculture and communities. While there are possibilities of storage in wells and deep in the ocean, **stabilizing the atmospheric CO2 concentration would require gathering up the equivalent of 1 to 2 times the world’s existing above ground vegetation and putting it down abandoned oil wells or deep in the ocean**. While CO2 fertilization could help to increase above ground vegetation a bit, storing more than a few tens of percent of the existing carbon would be quite surprising, and this is likely to be more like a few percent of global carbon emissions projected for the 21st century.

CO2 is net worse for food.

Gillis 11 Justin Gillis June 4, 2011 is an assistant business editor at The New York Times, in charge of the paper's coverage of food, agriculture and energy. He joined the Times last year after a dozen years as an editor and reporter at The Washington Post, and before that, a dozen years at The Miami Herald. A Warming Planet Struggles to Feed Itself <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/05/science/earth/05harvest.html?pagewanted=1&_r=1>

Now, **the latest scientific research suggests that a** previously discounted **factor is helping to destabilize the food system:** [climate change](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/science/topics/globalwarming/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier)**. Many** of the **failed harvests of the past decade were a consequence of weather disasters**, like floods in the United States, drought in Australia and blistering heat waves in Europe and Russia. **Scientists believe some**, though not all, of those **events were caused or worsened by human-induced global warming. Temperatures are rising rapidly during the growing season in some of the most important agricultural countries**, and a paper published several weeks ago found that this had shaved several percentage points off potential yields, adding to the price gyrations. For nearly two decades, **scientists had predicted that climate change would be relatively manageable for agriculture,** suggesting that even under worst-case assumptions, it would probably take until 2080 for [**food prices**](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/f/food_prices/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier) to double. In part, **they** **were counting on** a counterintuitive ace in the hole: that **rising carbon dioxide levels**, the primary contributor to global warming, **would act as a powerful plant fertilizer and offset many of the ill effects of climate change**. Until a few years ago, these assumptions went largely unchallenged. But lately, **the destabilization of the food system and the soaring prices have rattled many leading scientists**. “The success of agriculture has been astounding,” said [Cynthia Rosenzweig](http://www.giss.nasa.gov/staff/crosenzweig.html), a researcher at NASA who helped pioneer the study of climate change and agriculture. “But I think **there’s starting to be premonitions that it may not continue forever**.” A scramble is on to figure out whether climate science has been too sanguine about the risks. **Some researchers**, analyzing computer forecasts that are used to advise governments on future crop prospects, are **point**ing **out** what they consider to be **gaping holes. These include a failure to consider the effects of extreme weather**, like the floods and the heat waves that are increasing as the earth warms. A rising unease about the future of the world’s food supply came through during interviews this year with more than 50 agricultural experts working in nine countries. These experts say **that in coming decades, farmers need to withstand whatever climate shocks come their way while roughly doubling the amount of food they produce to meet rising demand. And they need to do it while reducing the considerable environmental damage caused by the business of agriculture.**

### AT Ice Age

Alt causes to ice age.

World Net Daily, ’07 (World Net Daily, September 29, 2007, “Study finds CO2 didn't end ice age.”,

http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE\_ID=57895)//CC

A new peer-reviewed scientific study counters a major premise of global warming theory, concluding carbon dioxide did not end the last ice ageThe study, led by University of Southern California geologist Lowell Stott, concluded deep-sea temperatures rose 1,300 years before the rise in atmospheric CO2, which would rule out the greenhouse gas as the main agent of the meltdown. "There has been this continual reference to the correspondence between CO2 and climate change as reflected in ice core records as justification for the role of CO2 in climate change," said Stott. "You can no longer argue that CO2 alone caused the end of the ice ages."Another new study published in Science refutes the "Hockey Stick" temperature graph, used by man-made global warming theorists such as former Vice President Al Gore to argue for a recent spike in average global temperature after centuries of relative stability. Stott's new study suggests the rise in greenhouse gas likely was a result of warming. It may have accelerated the meltdown, he says, but was not its main cause. He cautioned that the study does not discount the role of CO2.

Even the worst ice age won’t cause extinction—technology solves.

Jaworowski 4 Zbigniew (Chairman of the Scientific Council of the Central Laboratory for Radiological Protection in Warsaw) “Solar Cycles, Not CO2, Determine Climate” http://www.21stcenturysciencetech.com/Articles%202004/Winter2003-4/global\_warming.pdf

However **lets assume** that Budyko has been right and **that everything, to the very ocean bottom, will be frozen. Will mankind survive this?** I **think yes, it would**. The present technology of **nuclear power**, based on the nuclear fission of uranium and thorium, **would secure heat and electricity supplies for 5 billion people for about 10,000 years**. At the same time, the **stock of hydrogen in the ocean for future fusion-based reactors would suffice for 6 billion years. Our cities, industrial plants, food-producing greenhouses, our livestock, and also zoos and botanical gardens turned into greenhouses, could be heated virtually forever, and we could survive, together with many other organisms, on a planet that had turned into a gigantic glacier.** I think, however, that **such a "passive" solution would not fit the genius of our future descendants, and they would learn how to restore a warm climate** for ourselves and for everything that lives on Earth.

Ice age won’t happen.

IBTimes 12 IBTIMES, an international business news corporation, January 9th 2012“Next Ice Age in 1,500 years prevented by carbon dioxide emissions.” http://www.ibtimes.com/articles/279016/20120109/next-ice-age-years-carbon-emissions.htm

**The next ice age, due in the next 1,500 years, won't arrive** because of high levels of carbon dioxide greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, scientists reported Monday. **Researchers already discovered evidence of at least five Ice Ages on Earth and** around 3,500, the world will be due for another round of chilling and frozen wastelands. However, because of greenhouse gases that already exist in the atmosphere, **another Ice Age likely won't happen.** The research appeared in the Monday edition of the journal Nature Geoscience. "**At current levels of CO2, even if emissions stopped now we'd** probably **have a long interglacial duration** determined by whatever long-term processes could kick in and bring [atmospheric] CO2 down," Luke Skinner, lead author and professor at Cambridge University told BBC News. The study also included researchers from University College London, Bergen University in Norway and the University of Florida. The study concluded that **for an Ice Age to occur, concentrations of carbon dioxide would have to fall to 240 parts per million** - a 40 percent reduction of the 390 ppm in the current atmosphere.

### AT Idso

Idso is paid by right-wing hacks and his PhD is a sham.

Davies 14Kert, Director of the Climate Investigations Center, former Research Director at Greenpeace, former Science Policy Director at Ozone Action and researcher at the Environmental Working Group, holds degrees in Environmental Studies from Hampshire College and the University of Montana, “Heartland Institute NIPCC Climate Denier Craig Idso: “Climate Change Is Good For You”,” April 8th 2014 http://www.desmogblog.com/2014/04/08/heartland-institute-nipcc-craig-idso-climate-change-good-you

Heartland Institute on the other hand, in its NIPCC “Climate Change Reconsidered II: the Biological Impacts” document, will say that climate change is good for the world, will have a net benefit for both plants and human health. This is the latest line run by right wing think tanks like Heartland, the coal industry’s ACCCE coalition, Peabody Coal, the American Legislative Exchange Council, and echoed across the blogosphere by climate deniers. This set of messaging and all 'reports' to back this line, all appear to be coming from one organization, the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, and specifically from its chairman and former president, Craig Idso, one of the NIPCC’s lead authors, who has been arguing the same “C02 is beneficial” line for nearly 20 years, along with his father, Sherwood Idso. Background Craig Idso, his father Sherwood B. Idso, and brother Keith Idso, founded Arizona-based organization in 1998. The Center's claimed mission is to “separate reality from rhetoric in the emotionally-charged debate that swirls around the subject of carbon dioxide and global change.” Its main publication is CO2 Science, a weekly magazine that features articles questioning the science verifying man-made climate change and its impacts. In 2012, **leaked documents from the Heartland Institute revealed that they were paying** Craig **Idso $11,600 a month** for his NIPCC work. We do not know how much Idso has been paid since that time, or prior. The organization’s total funding peaked in 2009 at $1.5 million a year. Funders have included ExxonMobil (total, $100,000 since 1998), Donors Trust, Sarah Scaife Foundation and a number of other right wing funders. See Conservative Transparency for a recent (but not full) breakdown. The Center's IRS 990’s are here at Citizen Audit. Publications produced by Craig Idso, with members of C02Science,org: In 2011 he and Sherwood wrote a book entitled “The Many Benefits of Atmospheric CO2 Enrichment”. Idso has produced a series of video documentaries espousing his theory of C02’s beneficial effect on plant life. Keith and Sherwood Idso wrote a paper in 1992 about how C02 benefits plant life, referenced in the NIPCC’s Summary for Policymakers. After founding the organisation, Idso got his PhD in geography at Arizona State University under the tutelage of one of the very early climate deniers employed by the fossil fuel industry, Robert C Balling Jr. More resources at DeSmogBlog: Craig Idso; Sherwood Idso Idso, the Greening Earth Society and the Western Fuels Association Robert Balling, Idso's mentor, was one of the leading scientists paid by the Greening Earth Society, the climate science-denying front group created by the Western Fuels Association, one of the first and earliest coal industry groups funding the denial of climate change. But the coal industry's line was not 'climate denial' but 'climate change is good for you'. The Western Fuels Association is a cooperative of utilities and power companies supplying coal from the Powder River Basin in the western U.S.

### AT Not Real

Only 0.01% of scientists think warming is not real- 99.99% of scientists are on my side.

Jogalekar 14 Ashutosh “About that consensus on global warming: The Curious Wavefunction, Scientific American Blog Network” Scientific American Global January 10th 2014 from <http://blogs.scientificamerican.com/the-curious-wavefunction/2014/01/10/about-that-consensus-on-global-warming-9136-agree-one-disagrees/>

**It’s worth noting how many authors agree with the basic fact of global warming – more than nine thousand. And that’s just in a single year**. Now I understand as well as anyone else that consensus does not imply truth but I find it odd how there aren’t even a handful of scientists who deny global warming presumably because the global warming mafia threatens to throttle them if they do. **It’s not like we are seeing a 70-30% split, or even a 90-10% split. No, the split is more like 99.99-0.01%.** Isn’t it remarkable that **among the legions of scientists working around the world**, many with tenured positions, secure reputations and largely nothing to lose, **not even a hundred out of ten thousand come forward to deny the phenomenon in the scientific literature**? **Should it be that hard for them to publish papers if the evidence is really good enough**? Even detractors of the peer review system would disagree that the system is that broken; after all, studies challenging consensus are quite common in other disciplines. So are contrarian climate scientists around the world so utterly terrified of their colleagues and world opinion that they would not dare to hazard a contrarian explanation at all, especially if it were based on sound science? The belief stretches your imagination to new lengths.

### AT Slow

Warming is fast.

Griffiths 13 [Sarah, Science and Tech Reporter for Mail Online, citing Stanford climatology studies, “Global warming is happening is '10 times faster than at any time in the Earth's history', climate experts claim,” http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-2383472/Global-warming-happening-10-times-faster-time-Earths-history-climate-experts-claim.html]

American scientists claim the planet is undergoing one of the largest changes in climate in the past 65 million years. Climatologists at Stanford Woods Institute for the Environment have warned the likely rate of change over the next century will be at least 10 times quicker than any climate shift since the dinosaurs. became extinct. If the trend continues at its current rapid pace, it will place significant stress on terrestrial ecosystems around the world, and many species will need to make behavioral, evolutionary or geographic adaptations to survive, they said. The findings come from a review of climate research by Earth system science expert Noah Diffenbaugh and Chris Field, a professor of environmental Earth system science and the director of the Department of Global Ecology at the Institution. The work is part of a special report on climate change in the current issue of Science. However, the research is part of a much bigger picture and other scientists have recently claimed that global warming has 'paused' for the time being. The professors in this latest study reviewed scientific literature on aspects of climate change that can affect ecosystems, and investigated how recent observations and projections for the next century compare to past events in Earth's history. For instance, the planet experienced a sharp rise in temperature by 5 degree Celsius 20,000 years ago, as Earth emerged from the last ice age. This is a change comparable to the high-end of the projections for warming over the 20th and 21st centuries, according to the reserachers. The geologic record shows that, 20,000 years ago, as the ice sheet that covered much of North America receded northward, plants and animals recolonised areas that had been under ice. As the climate continued to warm, those plants and animals moved northward, to cooler climes. Professor Diffenbaugh said: 'We know from past changes that ecosystems have responded to a few degrees of global temperature change over thousands of years. 'But the unprecedented trajectory that we're on now is forcing that change to occur over decades. 'That's orders of magnitude faster, and we're already seeing that some species are challenged by that rate of change.' Some of the strongest evidence for how the global climate system responds to high levels of carbon dioxide comes from paleoclimate studies. 55 million years ago, carbon dioxide in the atmosphere was elevated to a level comparable to today, the scientists said. The Arctic Ocean did not have ice in the summer and nearby land was warm enough to support alligators and palm trees. 'There are two key differences for ecosystems in the coming decades compared with the geologic past,' Professor Diffenbaugh said. 'One is the rapid pace of modern climate change. 'The other is that today there are multiple human stressors that were not present 55 million years ago, such as urbanisation and air and water pollution.' The professors also examined results from two-dozen climate models to describe possible climate outcomes from present day to the end of the century. In general, extreme weather events, such as heat waves and heavy rainfall, are expected to become more severe and more frequent. For example, the researchers said that, with continued emissions of greenhouse gases at the high end of the scenarios, annual temperatures over North America, Europe and East Asia will increase by two to four degrees Celsius between 2046 and 2065.

### AT SO2 Screw

T-Large amounts of SO2 causes extinction.

Ward 9 Peter Ward, Ph.D. from Colombia University and natural scientist for more than 40 years, 02/11/2009, tetontectonics.org, http://www.tetontectonics.org/Climate/Ward2009SulfurDioxide.pdf

Most paleontologists conclude that mass extinctions are not instantaneous; they tend to occur over at least thousands of years. While a meteorite may have complicated the extinction around 65.5 Ma, it is now clear that radiation did not kill the dinosaurs and that large percentages of animals could have survived a large impact by sheltering. **Mass extinctions typically involve runaway greenhouse warming, major changes of acidity of air and water**, dramatic increases in light carbon isotopes, and anoxia over hundreds to tens of thousands of years. Given that **massive increases in SO2 appear to have caused mass extinctions in the past and that there has been a signiﬁcant increase in SO2 gases since 1925, we should not be too surprised to discover that we are currently in the midst of a major mass extinction**. In 2005, more than 1360 scientists under the auspices of the United Nations, completed the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. This was followed by the Global Biodiversity Outlook 2 under the Convention on Biological Diversity, a legally binding global treaty created in 1992 with nearly universal participation of countries. Among their conclusions are: 1. “15 out of 24 ecosystem services are in decline including the ability to provide fresh water and the ability of the atmosphere to cleanse itself of pollutants.” 2. “Trends among 3000 wild populations of species show a consistent decline in average species abundance of about 40% between 1970 and 2000.” 3. “Between 12% and 52% of species within well-studied higher taxa are threatened with extinction.” 4. “The global demand for resources exceeds the biological capacity of the Earth to renew these resources by some 20%.” 5. “Humans are currently responsible for the sixth major extinction event in the history of the earth, and the greatest since the dinosaurs disappeared, 65 million years ago.”

Sulfate models are uncertain and susceptible to author manipulation.

Smith et al. 11 (S. J., Joint Global Change Research Institute, Paciﬁc Northwest National Laboratory, “Anthropogenic sulfur dioxide emissions: 1850–2005.”)

The uncertainty methodology used here uses a relatively simple procedure whereby conﬁdence intervals, based largely on¶ the authors’ judgment, but also informed by analysis of inventory differences, are applied to broad emissions sectors¶ and regions. The relatively small resulting global uncertainty¶ that results indicates that a more complex global uncertainty¶ analysis may not be warranted. Regional uncertainty can be¶ far higher than global uncertainty, however, and more detailed analysis of high-emitting regions, and the countries of¶ the Former Soviet Union in particular, may be useful to better bound current and past environmental impacts of sulfur¶ dioxide emissions.¶ Because the simple methodology used here does not incorporate correlations between uncertainty assumptions in¶ different regions and sectors (parameters that can be difﬁcult to estimate in any event), a systemic uncertainty component was added. Systematic errors and biases are difﬁcult¶ to quantify, but are particularly important for emissions such¶ as sulfur dioxide, where most input values are only weakly¶ correlated between regions, which results in relatively small¶ global uncertainties as random errors tend to statistically cancel across regions.¶ When comparing data sets, it should be noted that most¶ of these estimates rely on similar, if not identical, data sets¶ for historical fossil fuel use and for historical emissions from¶ Europe and the United States. Errors or biases in these data,¶ such as the apparent underestimate of SO2 emissions from¶ petroleum products in the United States prior to 1980, are¶ likely to be common to most of these estimates.¶ As shown by an analysis of inventory values from the¶ USA (§S.14), however, signiﬁcant changes can occur over¶ time in national inventory values. Substantial changes have¶ also occurred for inventory estimates for Europe (e.g., see¶ Konovalov et al., 2008 for NOx emissions). Analysis of the¶ sources of such changes would be valuable for both improving both inventory methodologies and uncertainty estimates.

### AT Too Late

Some warming is inevitable, but acting now is key to mitigate effects.

Dizard 14[Wilson, citing a UN report, Digital News Producer,7-8-14, “Act Now: Experts Say Climate Change May Not Be Inevitable”, <http://theterramarproject.org/thedailycatch/act-now-experts-say-climate-change-may-inevitable/>, Accessed 7-9-14, CX]

**Significant climate change may not be inevitable if governments take swift and decisive action now to reduce greenhouse gases**, according to a report released Tuesday that rolls back some of the bleaker and more pessimistic assessments of recent climate negotiations. The report, prepared for the **United Nations** by **experts from leading research institutes from 15 countries, challenge**s **the idea that the world can’t avoid breaching a 2 degrees Celsius rise in global average temperature** — many climate scientists have warned that an increase of 3 to 4 C is now inevitable. Moreover, they suggest defeatism on the 2 C limit target would contribute to dithering by heavily industrialized countries most responsible for climate change — the United States, China, India, major European economies and rising economic powers like Brazil and South Africa. “We do not subscribe to the view held by some that the 2 C limit is impossible to achieve and that it should be weakened or dropped altogether,” the authors of the report from the Deep Decarbonization Pathways Project (DDPP) wrote. Since the start of the industrial revolution two hundred years ago, the Earth’s atmosphere has seen a dramatic spike in carbon dioxide released by burning coal, oil and methane. As the gases trap solar radiation, the planet has already warmed about a degree over the last century, and **scientists say the effects are already being felt and can be seen in melting glaciers, rising sea levels and droughts — problems which are forecast to become far worse if nothing is done to reduce carbon output**.

# t & theory

### A2 T-Aims

Implementation is textual.

Debois 14 Danny Debois (TOC champ) “General Background” Victory Briefs: January/February 2015 Topic December 15th 2014

The third interpretation, and in my view, the most plausible one, is the view that the resolution uses a generic term, and as such, is asking what are the requirements of ideal just governments. By analogy, what action would governments we conceptualize under the original position take? The aff wouldn’t be able to fiat the actions of any particular government, but rather, would fiat that living wage legislation is a requirement of just governments. This doesn’t mean that there’s “no implementation,” but rather, that implementation is an effect, rather than being directly tied to the topic. In other words, the aff fiats that “Just governments” will require employers pay a living wage, which is an abstract mandate, but the effect of this is that real-world governments that aspire to be just will implement living wage laws. The aff could garner offense from a specific government by saying “this is a country that aspires to be just, and this is what would happen if they implemented living wage legislation,” but the advocacy wouldn’t be limited to that one country.

## A2 Country Spec

### C/I

Counter interp: the aff does not need to specify a single country. Prefer:

1. Textuality. The phrase “ought to require” has no temporal features and accords with common usage.

Nebel 14 (debate coach his students have won the TOC, NDCA, Glenbrooks, Bronx, Emory, TFA State, and the Harvard Round Robin. As a debater, he won six octos-bid championships and was top speaker at the TOC and ten other major tournaments) “Jake Nebel on Specifying “Just Governments”” VBriefly December 19th 2014 http://vbriefly.com/2014/12/19/jake-nebel-on-specifying-just-governments/

To my ear, the generic reading is correct. I think the best evidence for this is simply the undistorted judgments of ordinary speakers. **No** competent **speaker of English would**, without distorting influence or additional evidence of generalizability, **endorse an inference from a plan involving two just governments to the resolution**. Suppose Sally, an American citizen, believes that the U.S. and Canada should require employers to pay a living wage, but that no other government (just or unjust, actual or possible) should. She would not represent her view by asserting, “Just governments ought to require that employers pay a living wage.” She would deny this claim and hold that the U.S. and Canada are exceptions. One might object that Sally would endorse this assertion if she believed that the U.S. and Canada are the only just governments. Maybe she would, but that is explained by the generic reading, because she would then be making a generalization about (what she believes to be) just governments. And the onus would be on the affirmative, when specifying particular governments, to add such a premise. Moreover, many linguists would add that Sally could not regard it is as mere accident that these governments are just and that they ought to require employers to pay a living wage: the resolution requires there to be some explanatory connection between the justness of governments and the living wage requirement (see Carlson 2005). Some speakers might balk at the generic reading of the resolution. How, they might think, could anyone assent to such a sweeping claim about what just governments ought to do? It seems to depend heavily on the details of each country. I can easily get into this frame of mind. But, equipped with this frame of mind, it’s not as if I would assent to, “Just governments ought to require that employers pay a living wage,” and expect my audience to pick up on the existential reading. I would instead either deny the resolution or suspend judgment about it. This means that **the anti-generalization view is not evidence of an eligible** existential **interpretation**; rather, **it’s a reason not to affirm** the resolution. One more argument for affirmatives to answer! Consider an analogy. Suppose I say, “Dogs are ugly.” You might think it’s silly to say of dogs in general that they are ugly: how could one support such a generalization about the aesthetics of dogs? So you’ll reject my statement. You won’t reinterpret it to mean that *some* dogs are ugly and agree with it. I’m sure that many readers will be skeptical of directly appealing to how we ordinarily speak and think. Let me mention a more theoretical explanation of why the resolution is generic. Carlson (1977) suggests that **the reading of bare plurals depends on the predicate** of the sentence. He distinguishes between highly **temporary *stage-level* predicates like “being here”** or “being available,” **and** more **intrinsic *individual-level* predicates like “having four legs”** or “being altruistic.” He calls the former **stage-level**because they **express properties of temporary**stages of **things**: for example, *sitting* is a property of the present stage of Jake. One might argue that **“ought to require” is** an **individual-level** predicate: if **just governments have an obligation** to require that employers pay a living wage, **that is not just a fleeting property of temporary government-stages.** I mention this argument just as an illustration of how one might support the intuition with a theory, but I do not endorse the argument. We can turn next to a less direct argument for the generic reading of “just governments.” But this argument may carry more weight in a T debate.

Since “just governments” is a generic bare plural, specification is not allowed.

Nebel 2 (debate coach his students have won the TOC, NDCA, Glenbrooks, Bronx, Emory, TFA State, and the Harvard Round Robin. As a debater, he won six octos-bid championships and was top speaker at the TOC and ten other major tournaments) “Jake Nebel on Specifying “Just Governments”” VBriefly December 19th 2014 http://vbriefly.com/2014/12/19/jake-nebel-on-specifying-just-governments/

Some noun phrases include articles like “the,” demonstratives like “these,” possessives like “my,” or quantifiers like “some” or “all.” These words are called determiners. ***Bare* plurals,** including**“just governments,” lack** determiners. There’s no **article, demonstrative, possessive, or quantifier** in front of the noun to tell you how many or which governments are being discussed.We use bare plurals for two main purposes. Consider some examples:**1) Debaters are here. 2) Debaters are smart. In (1), “debaters” seems equivalent to “some debaters.”** It is true just in case there is more than one debater around. If I enter a restaurant and utter (1), I speak truly if there are a couple of debaters at a table. This is **an *existential* use of the bare plural**, because it just says that there exist things of the relevant class (debaters) that meet the relevant description (being here). **In (2),** though, “**debaters” seems to refer to debaters in general. This use of the bare plural is *generic*.** Some say that generics refer to kinds of things, rather than particular members of their kinds, or that they refer to typical cases. There is a large literature on understanding generics. Here my aim is not to figure out the truth conditions for the generic reading of the resolution; I shall simply work with our pre-theoretical grip on the contrast between sentences like (1) and (2).This distinction bears importantly on the resolution. **If “just governments” is a generic bare plural,** then **the debate is about**whether**just governments in general** ought to require that employers pay a living wage. If it is an existential bare plural, then the debate is about whether some just governments—i.e., more than one—ought to require that employers pay a living wage. Only the second interpretation allows one to affirm by specifying a few governments.

Textual accuracy is a voter which outweighs everything.

A. Jurisdiction-you cast your ballot to endorse one side of the resolution, but if the aff is defending something that isn’t the res it is literally impossible to vote for them-that outweighs fairness and education since its specific to your role as a judge and a side constraint on those kinds of claims.

B. Precision is a precondition on T-even if your interp is more fair or educational, mine is the most accurate, otherwise we’d just debate organ donation.

2. Research burdens. There are hundreds of countries that could implement a living wage, having to be prepared to debate the specifics of each one forces debaters to prep 100s of case negs that may never be run which gives the aff a structural prep advantage. Turns education because you can’t engage the aff if you can’t predict it.

3. Ground. Spec lets the aff pick the best plan that has tangential topicality which gives them best quality ground so easier access to the ballot-turns education since you have to go for generics and case is irrelevant.

### AT Advocacy Shift

1. T-plans allow more shift since you can change implementation, enforcement and funding mechanisms-whole res is net preferable since if I defend everything there is literally nothing for me to shift out of.

2. 2NR theory solves-if I do shift then read an actual shell and win on it-that’s better for you since its more convincing to the judge when there is actual abuse to back it up.

3. You have no jurisdiction to vote on potential abuse-that would mean you could drop people just because they could have done something really unfair which is infinitely regressive since there is always a potential to cheat.

### AT Real World Education

1. T-not all of us will be policymakers that discuss specific plans but *all* of us will need to know about generic current events-so my advocacy of whole res is key to discussing issues in their context.

2. T-lots of people like to travel around the world so defending general principle is more useful since we need to know about other countries.

3. T-dumb spec debates ensure *zero* real world education-it’s better to just allow me to read a sub-optimal aff and have some education.

### AT Textuality

T-defending the whole resolution is most textual because it doesn’t exclude or modify any part of the resolution like a plan would.

C/A Nebel

1. Andrew Yarrow (senior research advisor for Oxfam America, also a historian, former New York Times reporter, and public policy professional who has taught U.S. history at American University). “How Low Wages Hurt Families and Perpetuate Poverty.” Coalition on Human Needs. April 9th, 2015. http://www.chn.org/2015/04/09/how-low-wages-hurt-families-and-perpetuate-poverty/#.VS7Qf\_nF-So [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Jared Bernstein (Senior Fellow at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. From 2009 to 2011, Bernstein was the Chief Economist and Economic Adviser to Vice President Joe Biden, executive director of the White House Task Force on the Middle Class, and a member of President Obama’s economic team) and Sharon Parrott (re-joined the Center in November 2012 after serving as Secretary Sebelius’ Counselor for Human Services Policy at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) from August 2009 until November 2012). “Proposal to Strengthen Minimum Wage Would Help Low-Wage Workers, With Little Impact on Employment.” Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. January 7th, 2014. http://www.cbpp.org/cms/?fa=view&id=4075 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Lester Brown (earned masters degrees in agricultural economics from the University of Maryland and in public administration from Harvard University. In 1964, he became an adviser to Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman on foreign agricultural policy. In 1966, the Secretary appointed him Administrator of the department's International Agricultural Development Service. In early 1969, he left government to help establish the Overseas Development Council. He’s authored or co-authored more than 50 books. He is the recipient of many prizes and awards, including 25 honorary degrees, a MacArthur Fellowship, the 1987 United Nations' Environment Prize, the 1989 World Wide Fund for Nature Gold Medal, and the 1994 Blue Planet Prize for his "exceptional contributions to solving global environmental problems." In 2012, he was inducted into the Earth Hall of Fame Kyoto). “The New Geopolitics of Food.” Foreign Policy. April 25th, 2011. http://foreignpolicy.com/2011/04/25/the-new-geopolitics-of-food/ [↑](#footnote-ref-3)