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### Climate Change

#### Put away your timeframe arguments, every attempt to ignore climate change now just screws over the poor and turns all structural violence impacts in the aff

**Bullard 15[[1]](#footnote-1)**

Climate change has been linked to increased frequency and intensity of destructive weather events, such as floods and hurricanes. **But the effects of a warming planet on crops may pose an even greater danger, especially for the world’s poor**, according to the World Bank. “Agriculture is one of the most important economic sectors in many poor countries,” says a report from the institution. “Unfortunately, it is also one of the most sensitive to climate change given its dependence on weather conditions, both directly and through climate-dependent stressors (pests, epidemics, and sea level rise).” The report focuses on developing economies and doesn’t include North America, Australia, or a handful of other areas. It sets up two scenarios to project the effects of climate change. The “prosperity scenario” is optimistic: It predicts strong economic growth, fewer people living in poverty, and improvements in basic services. The “poverty scenario” isn’t as hopeful: It **predicts the number of impoverished people will grow [an extra 100 million] from the current 702 million to around 900 million by 2030 without factoring in climate change. When climate change is part of the equation, more than a billion people will be in poverty. Most of that additional 100 million, the report says, will become poor due to rising food prices**. By 2030, effects of climate change on agriculture key to driving people into poverty Number of people in extreme poverty, in millions. Higher food prices can be devastating for the poor. Think about your own budget: How much do you spend on groceries relative to your entire paycheck, your rent or mortgage, or your phone bill? **If you’re poor, you spend a higher percentage of your total income on food. In some regions, the poorest residents use more than 60 percent of their income to buy food while for the wealthiest, it’s less than 10 percent.** Poor households spend more of their budget on food Percent of household budget spent on food. Food prices would increase the most in these regions. To remedy this, the World Bank recommends preparing for climate change by “developing early warning systems and flood protection, and introducing heat-resistant crops.” There are health risks beyond malnutrition. **Disease rates are expected to rise.** World leaders are now meeting in Paris to negotiate plans to curb CO2 emissions in an effort to limit the global temperature increase to 2 degrees Celsius. **The World Bank report says a small rise in temperatures “could increase the number of people at risk for malaria by up to 5 percent, or more than 150 million more people affected. Diarrhea would be more prevalent, and increased water scarcity would have an effect on water quality and hygiene.” In poor countries, half of all health expenditures [and] are paid out-of-pocket. Like rising food costs, these diseases would disproportionately affect people with lower incomes who pay more out of pocket for healthcare.** Think of it this way: When you pay for medical treatment, how much do you pay in cash? Those in poorer countries pay more than half of their medical bills, while those in richer countries pay less than a quarter, with private insurance, government aid, and other forms of assistance paying for the rest. These estimates are all based on the most pessimistic model for climate change. If action is taken immediately, some of the effects might be curbed, but the potential for climate change to cause financial ruin or push the world’s poor deeper into poverty remains. What’s more, the poorest countries are the least responsible for the carbon emissions that are warming the planet and putting their residents at risk. In the chart below, the circles relate to overall emissions, the vertical axis represents pollution per capita, and the horizontal axis is gross domestic product. The poorest countries not only emit the least CO2 per capita, they also contribute the least total emissions on a global scale. But that presents another problem as these countries try to lift their residents out of poverty, and it’s adding to the complexities of the Paris climate talks. Poorest countries emit the least CO2, but affected by it the most\*. This report from the BBC outlines the issue using India as an example. India’s relatively low per capita pollution is partially the result of its widespread poverty. If poor residents are brought out of poverty, per capita emissions might increase, thereby raising India’s share of global emissions. So countries with sizeable poor populations need two things to come out of the Paris talks. First, they need support for environmentally-sustainable growth around the world. Second, they need wealthier countries to commit to larger cuts in emissions, so there can be room for growth elsewhere. And that’s why the World Bank, in its report, argues that climate change and poverty reduction can’t be separated as issues, or treated locally. The world needs to resolve both.

### Economic Decline

#### Economic downturn also leads to multiple scenarios for nuclear war, terrorism, and extinction without the AC

**Harris and Burrows 09[[2]](#footnote-2)**

Increased Potential for Global Conflict Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample Revisiting the Future opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. **Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be drawn from that period include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which the potential for greater conflict could grow would seem to be even more apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change would be steadier.** In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. **Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groups inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacks and newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn.** The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. **Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about [nukes] a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own nuclear ambitions.** It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. **Episodes of low intensity conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an unintended escalation and broader conflict [with] if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack.** The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus on preemption rather than defense, potentially leading to escalating crises. 36 Types of conflict that the world continues to experience, such as over resources, could reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this could result in interstate conflicts if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources, for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in a more dog-eat-dog world.

### U.S. Hegemony

#### When the U.S. doesn’t reduce its deficit we lose international power that allows global conflicts to occur

**Khalilzad 11[[3]](#footnote-3)**

**Without** faster economic growth and **actions to reduce deficits**, publicly held national debt is projected to reach dangerous proportions. If interest rates were to rise significantly, **annual interest payments** — which already are **larger than the defense budget** — would **crowd out other spending** or require substantial tax increases that would undercut economic growth. Even worse, if unanticipated events trigger what economists call a “sudden stop” in credit markets for U.S. debt, the United States would be unable to roll over its outstanding obligations, precipitating a sovereign-debt crisis that would almost certainly compel a radical retrenchment of the United States internationally. Such scenarios would reshape the international order. It was the economic devastation of Britain and France during World War II, as well as the rise of other powers, that led both countries to relinquish their empires. In the late 1960s, British leaders concluded that they lacked the economic capacity to maintain a presence “east of Suez.” Soviet economic weakness, which crystallized under Gorbachev, contributed to their decisions to withdraw from Afghanistan, abandon Communist regimes in Eastern Europe, and allow the Soviet Union to fragment. **If the** U.S. **debt problem goes critical, the U**nited **S**tates **would be compelled to retrench, reducing its military spending and shedding international commitments**. We face this domestic challenge **while other major powers are experiencing rapid economic growth.** Even though **countries such as China, India, and Brazil have** profound political, social, demographic, and economic problems, their **economies** are **growing faster than ours, and this could alter the global distribution of power.** These trends could in the long term produce a multi-polar world. If U.S. policymakers fail to act and other powers continue to grow, it is not a question of whether but when a new international order will emerge. **The closing of the gap** between the United States and its rivals **could intensify** geopolitical **competition among major powers**, increase incentives for local powers to play major powers against one another, **and undercut our will to preclude or respond to international crises** because of the higher risk of escalation. The stakes are high. In modern history, **the longest period of peace** among the great powers **has been the era of U.S. leadership.** By contrast, multi-polar systems have been unstable, with their competitive dynamics resulting in frequent crises and major wars among the great powers. **Failures of multi-polar international systems produced both world wars.** American retrenchment could have devastating consequences. Without an American security blanket, regional powers could rearm in an attempt to balance against emerging threats. Under this scenario, **there would be a heightened possibility of** arms races, miscalculation, or other **crises spiraling into all-out conflict.** Alternatively, **in seeking to accommodate** the **stronger powers, weaker powers may shift their geopolitical posture away from the U**nited **S**tates**.** Either way, hostile states would be emboldened to make aggressive moves in their regions. As rival powers rise, **Asia** in particular **is likely to emerge as** a zone of **great-power competition.** Beijing’s economic rise has enabled a dramatic military buildup focused on acquisitions of naval, cruise, and ballistic missiles, long-range stealth aircraft, and anti-satellite capabilities. China’s strategic modernization is aimed, ultimately, at denying the United States access to the seas around China. Even as cooperative economic ties in the region have grown, **China’s expansive territorial claims** — and provocative statements and actions following crises in Korea and incidents at sea — **have roiled its relations** with South Korea, Japan, India, and Southeast **Asian states.** Still, **the U**nited **S**tates **is the most significant barrier facing Chinese hegemony and aggression.**

### Terrorism

#### Nuclear terrorism causes nuke war, leading to extinction based on multiple scenarios

**Sid-Ahmed 04[[4]](#footnote-4)**

**A nuclear attack by terrorists will be much more critical than Hiroshima and Nagazaki, even if -- and this is far from certain -- the weapons used are less harmful than those used then, Japan, at the time, with no knowledge of nuclear technology, had no choice but to capitulate.** Today, the technology is a secret for nobody. So far, except for the two bombs dropped on Japan, nuclear weapons have been used only to threaten. Now we are at a stage where they can be detonated. This completely changes the rules of the game. We have reached a point where anticipatory measures can determine the course of events. **Allegations of a terrorist connection can be used to justify anticipatory measures, including the invasion of a sovereign state like Iraq.** As it turned out, these allegations, as well as the allegation that Saddam was harbouring WMD, proved to be unfounded. What would be the consequences of a nuclear attack by terrorists? **Even if it fails, it would further exacerbate the negative features of the new and frightening world in which we are now living. Societies would close in on themselves, police measures would be stepped up at the expense of human rights, tensions between civilisations and religions would rise and ethnic conflicts would proliferate. It would also speed up the arms race and develop the awareness that a different type of world order is imperative if humankind is to survive. But the still more critical scenario is if the attack succeeds. This could lead to a third world war, from which no one will emerge victorious.** Unlike a conventional war which ends when one side triumphs over another, this war will be without winners and losers. **When nuclear pollution infects the whole planet, we will all be losers.**
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