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### Plan Change is too Small

#### 1. School lunch changes are too small – must change the culture

Haskins, senior fellow at Brookings, 05

(Ron Haskins, The School Lunch Lobby, 2005 / VOL. 5, NO. 3, <http://educationnext.org/the-school-lunch-lobby/>)

The school-lunch reauthorization bill enacted by Congress last year contained a host of measures to improve nutrition, such as encouraging the Department of Agriculture to make more fresh fruits and vegetables available to local schools, creating an initiative to encourage partnerships between schools and local produce farms, and increasing the availability of whole grains in school meals. Of course, **Congress and school administrators must face the fact that students will not necessarily make the food choices that are best for their health.** Children will choose a salad over a juicy cheeseburger about as often as they choose educational TV over MTV. It is hard to argue with any of these good food initiatives, but **expectations about how much school food programs can contribute to increasing the consumption of nutritious foods and reducing the national problem with childhood obesity should be modest.** **There are** after all, **around 120,000 elementary and secondary schools** in the United States, **and more than 90 percent of them participate in the school-lunch program. Trying to move all these facilities** in the same direction **is a huge undertaking**. **What’s more, even if school food met every guideline for fat**, saturated fat, **and sugar, the** **impact on children’s weight would probably be modest because children’s consumption** of food **at home and in fast-food pens would continue unabated.** By the time they reach middle and late childhood, students seem determined to maximize consumption of their two favorite food groups: fat and sugar. **Children’s preference** for foods that **are bound to make them fatter is established outside the school system.** Unless we are prepared to remove all unhealthy foods from the schools–to minimize consumption of sugars and fats–there are obvious limits to the strategy of giving kids food choices. Schools can and should fight to improve the consumption of nutritious foods, and even to change students’ eating habits, but **unless the nation’s food culture, food advertising, and patterns of food consumption at home and in fast-food restaurants undergo massive change, the schools will be waging** **little more than a rear-guard action**. Even so, given the level of federal spending on the school food programs, it is reasonable to expect both Congress and the Department of Agriculture to put pressure on schools to aggressively implement wellness policies that minimize the consumption of fat and sugar on school property. To do so, schools may well be forced to reduce some food choices that have minimal nutritional value. **Expect** **school lunch to continue moving inexorably along its well-traveled path of slow change** and modest improvement while relying on its friends inside and outside Congress to fight off big shocks and spending cuts. At this very moment, as in 1981 and 1995, Washington is gearing up to make serious cuts in social programs to balance the budget. Will school lunch, and that 20 cents per meal middle-class subsidy, be on the menu? Fat chance.

### Regulations aren’t follow-too expensive

#### 2. School lunch regulations aren’t followed – too expensive

Fox News 1 – 25 – 17

(Republicans look to scrap Michelle Obama school lunch plan, <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2017/01/25/republicans-look-to-scrap-michelle-obama-school-lunch-plan.html>)

**Since 2012,** the U.S. Department of **Agriculture has implemented the requirement** – tied to the 2010 law – **that schools include either a fruit or vegetable for lunches** subsidized by the federal government. However**, a report** published in August 2015 by researchers at the University of Vermont **found** even **though students added more fruits and vegetables to their plates, “children consumed fewer** [fruits and vegetables] **and wasted more** during the school year immediately following implementation of the USDA rule.” Titled “Impact of the National School Lunch Program on Fruit and Vegetable Selection,” the report noted that average waste increased from a quarter cup to more than one-third of a cup per tray. Observing students at two northeastern elementary schools during more than 20 visits to each, researchers took photos of students’ trays after they chose their items, as they were exiting the lunch line and again as they went by the garbage cans. The study's conclusions comport with widespread complaints from school officials and parents that the program encourages food waste. It also has drawn criticism for cost, implementation difficulties and unpopularity with students. Further, **since the restrictions** on calories, fat, sugar, sodium, whole grains, fruits and vegetables went into effect, **it is estimated that over 1.2 million students have stopped eating school lunches**, according to EAGnews.org. **School systems also dropped out of the program because it led** in some cases **to compliance costs exceeding the** amount of federal **subsidies received.**

### Food Justice Movements Strong

#### Food justice movements are strong and solving now – they are combatting race and economic injustices in food distribution

Smith, Truthout News Analyst, 16

(Rory Smith, The Future of the Food Justice Movement, May 07, 2016, <http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/35915-the-future-of-the-food-justice-movement>)

**The food justice movement** -- a loose but expansive conglomeration of organizations working to create a more just food system in the United States -- **has accomplished a great deal over the last 30 years**. But can it manage to converge in its diversity and create a countermovement potent enough to transform the current food regime? Or is it too shallow and too spread, destined to disappear in its disjointedness. Things may seem a little out of sorts when one in six Americans -- residents of the most affluent country on the planet -- don't have enough to eat, and when the percentage of hungry people in the United States has gone up 57 percent since the late 1990s. **Sprinkle in that little detail about how Black and Latino neighborhoods are often left practically devoid of fresh produce** but flooded with fast food restaurants (something that contributes to high rates of obesity, diabetes and thyroid disease), **and you might start to question one or two things**. Toss in the fact that many of the 2 million farm laborers who produce US consumers' fruits and vegetables are not only subjected to brutal labor conditions but also can't afford to consume the very same food they pick, and you might really start to wonder. And when you top off this gallimaufry with one more slight detail -- that there are 1 billion people around the world suffering from malnourishment, a number that hasn't changed significantly since the 1970s -- the inequity of the current food regime becomes pretty clear. **It was the food justice movement that first recognized this reality,** and it has spent the last 30 years challenging and redressing these inequalities. The Black Panthers' Free Breakfast for School Children Program, Cesar Chavez and the United Farm Workers, and the family farming caucuses that swept the United States during the 1980s were early proponents of food justice. And while these original players have been all but subsumed by the passage of time, they have been replaced by hundreds of thousands of farmworkers, urban and rural farmers, activists, consumers and academics who are all working to institute a fairer and more just food system. **This effort is what** Eric **Holt-Giménez, the executive director of Food First, calls "converging in our diversity," and it is the linchpin of creating a just food system**: a system that stresses the right of communities everywhere to produce, distribute and have equal access to healthy food, irrespective of class, gender or ethnicity. Just when that Rust Cohle-like pessimism seems to have obtruded on our collective consciousness -- foregrounded by our failure to engineer any overhaul of the US financial system and scientists' incredulous predictions on global warming -- **the food justice movement could be that slow-cooked countermovement that we have all been waiting for. Everyone has some kind of a relationship with food**. It is the cornerstone of culture and life, as well as of the capitalist system. If any revolution is going to be successful, this seems like a good place for it to start.

### Food Justice Movements Strong

**(\_\_)**

#### (\_\_)Strong food justice movements now – gathering around issues of race & injustice

Smith, Truthout News Analyst, 16

(Rory Smith, The Future of the Food Justice Movement, May 07, 2016, <http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/35915-the-future-of-the-food-justice-movement>)

The Coalition of Immokalee Workers and the establishment of a Fair Foods label are revolutionary first steps in transforming labor practices in US agriculture. But **both within US cities** -- **especially within Black and Latino neighborhoods** -- **as well as outside cities** (most Native American reservations are deemed food deserts, having very little access to healthy food), **issues of food insecurity and racial injustice remain severely problematic**. It was with these structural inequalities in mind that Will Allen, later a recipient of a MacArthur "genius grant," founded **Growing Power** in 1993. Established with the idea that sustainable and community-based food systems could be utilized to dismantle racism and food insecurity on the North Side of Milwaukee, the organization has proliferated over the last 20 years, spreading not only through Milwaukee but also into Madison and Chicago. **The organization** -- employing locals to administer and coordinate each program -- **utilizes a series of overlapping and multidisciplinary strategies**, **including the establishment of urban gardens, farmers' markets, youth training, leadership building and food policy councils to support local residents in becoming food secure and also offer trainings** on the relevant business and farming skills to empower them economically. "**It's about improving the economic conditions of people so they can do what they want with their resources," said** Erika **Allen**, the Chicago and national projects director of Growing Power. "If you're able to grow food, sell it and supplement your income, you then have the ability to enjoy other enrichment experiences with your family. **This was what the civil rights movement was about: It was about equal rights and access on a constitutional level to what our counterparts had access to."**

### School Lunches can’t solve poverty

#### Poverty and racism exist for lots of reasons – school lunches isn’t enough – need major changes

Layton, Covers national education for the Washington Post, 15 (Lyndsey Layton, Majority of U.S. public school students are in poverty, January 16, 2015, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/majority-of-us-public-school-students-are-in-poverty/2015/01/15/df7171d0-9ce9-11e4-a7ee-526210d665b4_story.html?utm_term=.9964a392f895>)

For the first time in at least 50 years, **a majority of U.S. public school students come from low-income families,** according to a new analysis of 2013 federal data, a statistic that has profound implications for the nation. The Southern Education Foundation reports that **51 percent of students in pre-kindergarten** through 12th grade in the 2012-2013 school year **were eligible for** the federal program that provides **free and reduced-p**rice **lunches**. The lunch program is a rough proxy for poverty, but **the explosion** in the number of needy children in the nation’s public classrooms **is a recent phenomenon** that has been gaining attention among educators, public officials and researchers. “We’ve all known this was the trend, that we would get to a majority, but it’s here sooner rather than later,” said Michael A. Rebell of the Campaign for Educational Equity at Teachers College at Columbia University, noting that **the poverty rate has been increasing** even as the economy has improved. “**A lot of people at the top are doing much better, but the people at the bottom are not doing better at all.** Those are the people who have the most children and send their children to public school.” The shift to a majority-poor student population means that **in public schools, a growing number of children start kindergarten already trailing their more privileged peers and rarely, if ever, catch up**. **They are less likely to have support at home, are less frequently exposed to enriching activities outside of school, and are more likely to drop out and never attend college**. It also means that education policy, funding decisions and classroom instruction must adapt to the needy children who arrive at school each day. “When they first come in my door in the morning, the first thing I do is an inventory of immediate needs: Did you eat? Are you clean? A big part of my job is making them feel safe,” said Sonya Romero-Smith, a veteran teacher at Lew Wallace Elementary School in Albuquerque. Fourteen of her 18 kindergartners are eligible for free lunches. She helps them clean up with bathroom wipes and toothbrushes, and she stocks a drawer with clean socks, underwear, pants and shoes. Romero-Smith, 40, who has been a teacher for 19 years, became a foster mother in November to two girls, sisters who attend her school. They had been homeless, their father living on the streets and their mother in jail, she said. When she brought the girls home, she was shocked by the disarray of their young lives. “Getting rid of bedbugs, that took us a while. Night terrors, that took a little while. Hoarding food, flushing a toilet and washing hands, it took us a little while,” she said. “You spend some time with little ones like this and it’s gut wrenching. . . . These kids aren’t thinking, ‘Am I going to take a test today?’ They’re thinking, ‘Am I going to be okay?’ ” The job of teacher has expanded to “counselor, therapist, doctor, parent, attorney,” she said. **Schools**, already **under intense pressure to deliver better test results** and meet more rigorous standards, **face the doubly difficult task of trying to raise the achievement of poor children** so that they approach the same level as their more affluent peers. “This is a watershed moment when you look at that map,” said Kent McGuire, president of the Southern Education Foundation, the nation’s oldest education philanthropy, referring to a large swath of the country filled with high-poverty schools. “The fact is, **we’ve had growing inequality in the country for many years,”** he said. “**It didn’t happen overnight, but it’s steadily been happening.** Government used to be a source of leadership and innovation around issues of economic prosperity and upward

**Evidence continues**

**Evidence continues**

mobility. Now we’re a country disinclined to invest in our young people.” The data show poor students spread across the country, but the highest rates are concentrated in Southern and Western states. In 21 states, at least half the public school children were eligible for free and reduced-price lunches — ranging from Mississippi, where more than 70 percent of students were from low-income families, to Illinois, where one of every two students was low-income. Carey Wright, Mississippi’s state superintendent of education, said **quality preschool is the key** to helping poor children. “That’s huge,” she said. “These children can learn at the highest levels, but you have to provide for them. You can’t assume they have books at home, or they visit the library or go on vacations. You have to think about what you’re doing across the state and ensuring they’re getting what other children get.” Darren Walker, president of the Ford Foundation, was born in a charity hospital in 1959 to a single mother. Federal programs helped shrink the obstacles he faced, first by providing him with Head Start, the early-childhood education program, and later, Pell grants to help pay tuition at the University of Texas, he said. The country needs to make that same commitment today to help poor children, he said. “Even at 8 or 9 years old, I knew that America wanted me to succeed,” he said. “What we know is that the mobility escalator has simply stopped for some Americans. I was able to ride that mobility escalator in part because there were so many people, and parts of our society, cheering me on.” “**We need to fix the escalator**,” he said. “**We fix it by recommitting ourselves to the idea of public education.** We have the capacity. The question is, do we have the will?” **The new report raises questions among educators and officials about whether states and the federal government are devoting enough money — and using it effectively — to meet the complex needs of poor children.** The Obama administration wants Congress to add $1 billion to the $14.4 billion it spends annually to help states educate poor children. It also wants Congress to fund preschool for those from low-income families. Collectively, the states and the federal government spend about $500 billion annually on primary and secondary schools, about $79 billion of it from Washington. **The amount spent on each student can vary wildly from state to state**. States with high student-poverty rates tend to spend less per student: Of the 27 states with the highest percentages of student poverty, all but five spent less than the national average of $10,938 per student. Republicans in Congress have been wary of new spending programs, arguing that more money is not necessarily the answer and that federal dollars could be more effective if redundant programs were streamlined and more power was given to states. Many Republicans also think that the government ought to give tax dollars to low-income families to use as vouchers for private-school tuition, believing that is a better alternative to public schools. GOP leaders in Congress have rebuffed President Obama’s calls to fund preschool for low-income families, although a number of Republican and Democratic governors have initiated state programs in the past several years. The report comes as Congress begins debate about rewriting the country’s main federal education law, first passed as part of President Lyndon B. Johnson’s “War on Poverty” and designed to help states educate poor children. The most recent version of the law, known as No Child Left Behind, has emphasized accountability and outcomes, measuring whether schools met benchmarks and sanctioning them when they fell short. That federal focus on results, as opposed to need, is wrong­headed, Rebell said. “**We have to think about how to give these kids a meaningful education**,” he said. “**We have to give them quality teachers, small class sizes**, **up-to-date equipment.** But in addition, if we’re serious, **we have to do things that overcome the damages­ of poverty**. We have to meet their health needs, **their mental health needs, after-school programs, summer programs, parent engagement, early-childhood services.** These are the so-called wraparound services. Some people think of them as add-ons. They’re not. **They’re imperative**.”

### School lunches can’t solve Poverty

####  (\_\_)Can’t fix poverty – and economic mobility is still possible.

Tanner, Senior Fellow and director of research on social programs at Cato, 16 (Michael D., “Five Myths about Economic Inequality in America,” *Cato Institute*, September 7, <https://www.cato.org/publications/policy-analysis/five-myths-about-economic-inequality-america>)

Traditionally, we have tried to reduce inequality by taxing the rich and redistributing that money to the poor. And, as noted above, we have achieved some success. But we may well have reached a point of diminishing returns from such policies. **Despite the U**nited **S**tates **spending roughly a trillion dollars each year on anti-poverty programs at all levels of government, by the official poverty measure we have** done little **to reduce poverty**.85 Even by using more accurate alternative poverty measures, gains leveled out during the 1970s, apart from the latter part of the 1990s when the booming economy and the reform of the welfare system produced significant reductions in poverty. **Additional increases in spending have** yielded few gains. **Thus, while redistribution may have reduced overall inequality, it has done far less to help lift people out of poverty**.

**And even in terms of attacking inequality, redistribution may have** reached the limits **of its ability to make a difference**. **A new study from** the Brookings Institution, for example, **suggests that further increasing taxes on the wealthy, accompanied by increased transfers to the poor, would have relatively** little effect on inequality. This study by William Gale, Melissa Kearney, and Peter Orszag looked at what outcome could be expected if the top tax rate was raised to 50 percent from its current 39.6 percent, and all additional revenue raised was redistributed to households in the lowest quintile of current incomes. **To bias the study in favor of redistribution, the authors assume no change in behavior from the wealthy in an effort to reduce their exposure to the higher tax rate**. The tax hike, therefore, would raise $96 billion in additional revenue, which would allow additional redistribution of $2,650 to each household in the bottom quintile—an amount that would not significantly reduce inequality. The authors conclude, “**That such a sizable increase in the top personal income tax rate leads to a strikingly limited reduction in income inequality speaks to the limitations of this particular approach to addressing the broader challenge**.”86 Indeed, **many advocates of increased taxes for the wealthy seem to concede that their efforts would do little to reduce poverty**. Rather, **they would reduce inequality from the top down**. Piketty, for example, argues for a globally imposed wealth tax and a U.S. income tax rate of 80 percent on incomes over $500,000 per year.87 He acknowledges this tax “would not bring the government much in the way of revenue,” but that it would “distribute the fruits of growth more widely while imposing reasonable limits on economically useless (or even harmful) behavior.”88 Other critics of inequality seem equally concerned with punishing the rich. Hillary Clinton, for instance, argues that fighting inequality requires a “toppling” of the one percent.89 But **the** ultimate losers **of such policies are likely to be** the poor. Piketty’s plan might indeed lead to a society that would be more equal, but it would also likely be a society where everyone is far poorer.

**Economic** growth**, after all,** depends **on people who are ambitious, skilled risk-takers**. **We need such people to be ever-striving for more in order to fuel economic growth**. **That means they must be** rewarded **for their efforts, their skills, their ambitions, and their** risks. **Such rewards inevitably lead to greater inequality**. But as Nobel Economics Prize-winning economist Gary Becker pointed out, “**It would be** hard to motivate **the vast majority of individuals to exert much effort, including creative effort, if everyone had the same earnings, status, prestige, and other types of rewards**.”90 To be sure, since the 1970s the relationship between economic growth and poverty reduction has been uneven at best. But **we are unlikely to see significant reductions in poverty without strong economic growth**. Punishing the segment of society that most contributes to such growth therefore seems a poor policy for serious poverty reduction.

### Organic farms growing now

#### Organic farms growing already.

#### Feedstuffs, 4/20/2017. (“Number of certified organic farms up 13%,” http://www.feedstuffs.com/news/number-certified-organic-farms-13)

**The** U.S. **Department of Agriculture announced new data indicating that the organic industry continues to expand domestically and globally**, with 24,650 certified organic operations in the U.S. and 37,032 around the world. **The 2016 count of U.S. certified organic farms and businesses reflects a 13% increase between the end of 2015 and 2016, continuing the trend of double-digit growth in the organic sector**. The number of certified operations has increased since the count began in 2002, and **this is the highest growth rate since 2008**. Organic certification is an “opt-in” voluntary standard that is managed through a public/private partnership. USDA accredits and oversees approximately 80 businesses and state governments that directly certify organic farms and businesses. USDA provides a number of educational resources to help organic producers access this growing market. These include interactive videos that help candidate farmers understand how to get and maintain organic certification and fact sheets that explain the value proposition of organic certification and outline the standards in a clear manner. The complete list of certified organic farms and business is available through the Organic Integrity Database of certified operations maintained by USDA-accredited certifying agents. Launched in 2015, the database discourages fraud by providing more accurate and timely information about operations certified to use the USDA organic seal. The database also supports supply chain connections between buyers and sellers of organic goods. Laura Batcha, chief executive officer and executive director of **the Organic Trade Assn**., said the group "**is thrilled and not surprised to see the strong growth in the number of certified organic operations in the United States and worldwide." Organic certifiers reported record numbers of new applicants in 2016**, the association added.

#### Consumer demand is strong and growing.

Vegetable Growers News, 10/21/2016.(“New York’s organic farms see growth,” <http://vegetablegrowersnews.com/news/new-yorks-organic-farms-see-growth/>)

**Consumer interest in organic products has grown in recent years, as reflected by rising sales nationwide** – with a 56 percent increase in New York from 2008 through 2014. The number and total acreage of organic farms in New York also rose over that period, despite nationwide declines. According to the USDA, organic production involves food or other agricultural goods that are produced through approved methods including cultural, biological, and mechanical practices that promote ecological balance and conserve biodiversity. Organic production includes farms and ranches as well as food production and handling facilities. **USDA promotes organic farming as a means to reduce erosion and pollution and improve soil health**. As of July 1, 2016, there were nearly 22,500 certified organic operations, including farms and other facilities, nationwide. Of these, over 1,400 were located in New York, ranking the State third in the nation. Organic farming **In 2014, the United States as a whole had nearly 14,100 organic farms, covering approximately 3.7 million acres of land nationwide. Both numbers were down modestly from 2008. This decline was primarily due to a smaller number of farms that are exempt from certification** (farms that comply with USDA organic standards and have less than $5,000 in gross annual organic sales). **While the number of exempt farms fell, certified organic farms increased by over 1,700 during the period.** **Despite the drop in the number of organic farms nationwide, sales of organic products increased significantly, from $3.2 billion in 2008 to $5.5 billion in 2014**. Sales of organics rose again, by an estimated 12 percent, in 2015, according to USDA. **While organic sales remain a relatively small segment of total agricultural sales, the Department reports that it expects continued growth, with indicators including the fact that “top food retailers … have expanded their organic food offerings in recent years, and have announced initiatives which could further boost demand.”**

### Large Farms Inevitable

**Farm subsidies make large farms inevitable.**

**Brucker,** senior policy associate with the Center for Rural Affairs in Nebraska**, 16** (Traci Bruckner, May 2016. “Agricultural Subsidies and Farm Consolidation,” The American Journal of Economics and Sociology, 75.3, 623–648)

**Although agricultural subsidies were begun during the New Deal to provide enough income to enable farmers to continue operating, their net effect has been to raise the price of farmland and to squeeze many owner-operated farms out of existence, leaving mostly large-scale operations that are often tied to agribusiness**. **Numerous efforts have been made, with limited success, to mitigate this problem** by limiting the subsidy to small or mid-size farm operations. **The 2014 farm bill**, adopted by the U.S. Congress, **made the situation worse. Rather than imposing stricter limits on subsidies to the largest farms, the legislation removed existing limits, ended direct payments, and increased subsidies for insurance against crop losses and income risk**. **The new law not only provides a windfall to owners of very large farms, it also encourages plowing of fragile soils, since the risks of crop failure are now borne primarily by taxpayers**. The article concludes by offering recommendations about how to correct these problems.

### Answer To: Extinction Impact

#### Adaptation and intervening actors check the risks of warming. Won’t cause extinction.

**Farquhar** et al., Project Manager at FHI responsible for external relations, M.A in Physics and Philosophy from the University of Oxford, **17** (Sebastian FARQUHAR, “Existential Risk: Diplomacy and Governance,” *Future of Humanity Institute*, University of Oxford, Global Priorities Project 2017, https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Existential-Risks-2017-01-23.pdf)

**The** most likely **levels of global warming are** very unlikely **to cause human extinction**.15 The **existential risks** of climate change instead **stem from tail risk climate change – the low probability of extreme** levels of **warming** – and interaction with other sources of risk. It is impossible to say with confidence at what point global warming would become severe enough to pose an existential threat. **Research has suggested that warming of 11-12°C would render** most of **the planet uninhabitable**,16 and would completely devastate agriculture.17 This would pose an extreme threat to human civilisation as we know it.18 Warming of around 7°C or more could potentially produce conflict and instability on such a scale that the indirect effects could be an existential risk, although it is extremely uncertain how likely such scenarios are.19 Moreover, **the** timescales **over which such changes might happen could mean that humanity is able to** adapt **enough to** avoid extinction **in even very extreme scenarios**. The probability of these levels of warming depends on eventual greenhouse gas concentrations. According to some experts, **unless** strong **action is taken** soon by major emitters, **it is likely that we will pursue a medium-high emissions pathway**.20 If we do, the chance of extreme warming is highly uncertain but appears non-negligible. Current concentrations of greenhouse gases are higher than they have been for hundreds of thousands of years,21 which means that there are significant unknown unknowns about how the climate system will respond. Particularly concerning is the risk of positive feedback loops, such as the release of vast amounts of methane from melting of the arctic permafrost, which would cause rapid and disastrous warming.22 The economists Gernot Wagner and Martin Weitzman have used IPCC figures (which do not include modelling of feedback loops such as those from melting permafrost) to estimate that if we continue to pursue a medium-high emissions pathway, the probability of eventual warming of 6°C is around 10%,23 and of 10°C is around 3%.24 These estimates are of course highly uncertain.

**It is likely that the world will take action against climate change once it begins to impose large costs on human society, long before there is warming of 10°C**. Unfortunately, there is significant inertia in the climate system: there is a 25 to 50 year lag between CO2 emissions and eventual warming,25 and it is expected that 40% of the peak concentration of CO2 will remain in the atmosphere 1,000 years after the peak is reached.26 Consequently, it is impossible to reduce temperatures quickly by reducing CO2 emissions. **If the world does start to face costly warming, the international community will** therefore **face strong incentives to find** other **ways to reduce global temperatures**.

### Answer To: Extinction Impact

**(\_\_)**

#### (\_\_)We’ll adapt---checks the impact of thresholds.

**Brown**, Senior Research Fellow at the Stockholm Environment Institute (York University) and a Senior Research Scientist at the James Hutton Institute, **15**

(Iain Brown, “Comparative Risk Assessment to Inform Adaptation Priorities for the Natural Environment: Observations from the First UK Climate Change Risk Assessment,” *Climate*, Vol. 3, No. 4, p. 937-963, Emory Libraries)

The **CCRA** process particularly **highlighted** the added **benefits of integrated responses to climate change through “ecosystem-based** adaptation**” that** can also **enhance** natural resilience **to** buffer **undesirable** and uncertain **change**. This included fundamental recognition of ecological adaptation as a natural process that often provides an under-recognised complement for human adaptation processes, but also that in socio-ecological systems people have a key role in facilitating ecological adaptation. **Actions to counter current sensitivities by enhancing natural adaptive capacity and resilience** therefore **provide “no-regrets” measures that will** reduce risksregardless of uncertainties **in the rate of climate change and level of exposure** [109]. **The key response** that will enhance this capacity **is to reduce existing pressures**, thereby significantly reducing **the likelihood of crossing key thresholds that would lead to irreversible and severely damaging consequences** [110].