### Warming

#### 2 C can still be achieved

ANI, 12/17/12 [“Action by 2020 key to keep global warming below 2 degrees”, <http://zeenews.india.com/news/eco-news/action-by-2020-key-to-keep-global-warming-below-2-degrees_817302.html>]

Washington: Limiting climate change to target levels will become much more difficult to achieve, and more expensive, if action is not taken soon, a new analysis has revealed. The study from IIASA, ETH Zurich, and NCAR explores technological, policy, and social changes that would need to take place in the near term in order to keep global average temperature from rising above 2 degree C, a target supported by more than 190 countries as a global limit to avoid dangerous climate change. This study for the first time comprehensively quantifies the costs and risks of greenhouse gas emissions surpassing critical thresholds by 2020. The findings of the study are particularly important given the failure of the recent climate negotiations in Doha to decide to increase mitigation action before 2020. The researchers revealed that the 2 degree C target could still be reached even if greenhouse gas emissions are not reduced before 2020, but only at very high cost, with higher climate risks, and under exceedingly optimistic assumptions about future technologies. The more emissions are reduced in the near term, the more options will be available in the long run and, by extension, the cheaper it will be to reach international climate targets. “We wanted to know what needs to be done by 2020 in order to be able to keep global warming below two degrees Celsius for the entire twenty-first century,” said Joeri Rogelj, lead author of the paper and researcher at ETH Zurich. The team of researchers analyzed a large array of potential scenarios for limiting global temperature rise to 2 degree C above preindustrial levels, a target set by international climate agreements. Projections based on current national emissions pledges suggest that global carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) emissions will reach 55 gigatons (billion metric tons, Gt) or more per year in 2020, up from approximately 50 Gt today. At such levels, it would still be possible to reach the 2 degree C target in the long term, though it would be more difficult and expensive than if near-term emissions were lower.

### Price

#### Surpluses will be zero in winter

**Greun 10/29** (Abby Greun, SNL Financial, 29 October 2012, “Natural gas price to rise as producers match demand better,” Lexis)//CC

More than 629 Bcf of surplus has been shed in the past six months, and with fewer injections over the summer, inventory surplus is now about 269 Bcf over the rolling five-year average, Weixel said. "We are anticipating over the next four weeks we are not going to inject nearly as much gas as we did last year and that surplus is going to go down to about 15 Bcf, basically to around zero as we head into winter," Weixel said.

### Politics

#### Environmental lobbies can’t stop Obama – strong signal key

**Broder and Krauss, 5/23** political and business correspondents covering energy (John M. Broder and Clifford Krauss, The New York Times, 23 May 2012, “New and Frozen Frontier Awaits Offshore Drilling,” http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/24/science/earth/shell-arctic-ocean-drilling-stands-to-open-new-oil-frontier.html?pagewanted=1&\_r=1&hp)//CC

Environmental groups, though opposed, recognized the president’s commitment to Shell’s plan, and never formed a broad alliance with North Slope residents, many of whom resented intervention by organizations based mostly outside of Alaska. National environmental groups focused instead on more promising targets, like defeating the Keystone XL pipeline from Canada and retiring coal-fired power plants. Shell’s permits came in a rush. Interior approved exploration in both seas by last December. Response plans were endorsed in February and March of this year. The E.P.A.’s appeals board cleared the final air permits at the end of March — just as the whaling season got under way. NOAA came through with a marine mammal permit in early May. Ms. Zichal said there was no explicit or implied order from the White House to approve the permits. The message was, in her words, “If you’re comfortable with it, we’re comfortable with it.” But senior people at the agencies had a different reading of the signals, particularly the executive order requiring them to work together more closely. They believed their mission was to do whatever they could — responsibly and within the law — to remove barriers to drilling. “We can’t stop it,” said one senior agency official who had qualms about Arctic drilling but understood the president’s wishes. “We can only make it less bad.” Shell is awaiting its final drilling permits from the Interior Department. Its two ships are in Seattle, undergoing final modifications and inspections.

#  at: war turns warming

**Nuke war has a cooling effect—doesn’t turn warming**

Rhett Butler, Mongabay, “Nuclear war could cause global cooling (i.e. block global warming),” 12/11/2006, http://news.mongabay.com/2006/1211-nuclear.html

Nuclear war would disrupt global climate for at least a decade according to new research presented Dec. 11 at the annual meeting of American Geophysical Union in San Francisco. The research, based on findings from historic volcano eruptions, found that a small-scale, regional nuclear war could produce millions of tons of "soot" particles that could block solar radiation, in effect, **cooling the planet**. "We examined the climatic effects of the smoke produced in a regional conflict in the subtropics between two opposing nations, each using 50 Hiroshima-size nuclear weapons to attack the other's most populated urban areas," said Alan Robock, a professor in the department of environmental sciences at Rutgers University. "A cooling of several degrees would occur over large areas of North America and Eurasia, including most of the grain-growing regions. As in the case with earlier nuclear winter calculations, large climatic effects would occur in regions far removed from the target areas or the countries involved in the conflict." The team, also including scientists from the University of Colorado at Boulder (CU-Boulder) and UCLA, say the global impact of nuclear would be akin to climate disruptions caused by volcanic eruptions which cool the planet by releasing tons of particulate matter into the atmosphere. They cite the 1815 eruption of Tambora in Indonesia as an example. "The 1815 eruption of Tambora in Indonesia — the largest in the last 500 years — was followed by killing frosts throughout New England in 1816, during what has become known as 'the year without a summer,'" said a statement from Rutgers. "The weather in Europe was reported to be so cold and wet that the harvest failed and people starved. This historical event, according to Robock, perhaps foreshadows the kind of climate disruptions that would follow a regional nuclear conflict." "With the exchange of 100 15-kiloton weapons as posed in this scenario, the estimated quantities of smoke generated could lead to global climate anomalies exceeding any changes experienced in recorded history," Robock said. "And that's just 0.03 percent of the total explosive power of the current world nuclear arsenal." The climate effects of particulate matter are of increasing interest to climate scientists. Some researchers have postulated that a similar release of sulfate aerosols into the atmosphere could be used in a worst-case scenario to **block global warming**.

**The environment is resilient – nuclear testing on atolls didn’t collapse any ecosystems**

Cook 10 (Nigel B. PhD Computer Programming, BA Physics, “How weapons and war effects exaggerations for disarmament forced Britain to collaborate with evil racist thugs at Munich in 1938, in the name of peace” http://glasstone.blogspot.com/2010/03/lifeboat-analogy-to-civil-defence.html 3/1/10)

Stonier cites in his bibliography, but chooses to ignore completely in his text (without explanation) the rapid recovery and lack of insect plagues on Bogombogo Island (codenamed "Belle Island" by America) at the North-West of Eniwetok Atoll in the North Pacific, which was selected for detailed ecological studies following two high yield nuclear weapons tests: Dr Ralph F. Palumbo, Radioactivity and Recovery of the Land Plants at Eniwetok Atoll, 1954-1957, University of Washington report UWFL-66, July 1960 (PDF linked here), see the recovery photos linked here. Bogombogo/Belle Island was 2.55 statute miles (4.10 km) from the centre of Elugelab Island, ground zero of the 10.4 megatons IVY-MIKE thermonuclear weapon test of November 1, 1952, and the 1.69 megatons 80% fission CASTLE-NECTAR test was detonated at the same spot on a barge over the IVY-MIKE crater on May 14, 1954. It received heavy blast and thermal damage, water wave flooding, and fallout radiation including extensive beta and gamma irradiation of plants (gamma of over 850 R/hr at 2 hours after *IVY-MIKE* according to page 34 of of report WT-615, which - from the mean fallout arrival time and peak dose rate time measured under the cloud - suggests an infinite dose of over 8,000 R, and then another 400 R to 6 months after CASTLE-NECTAR and beta doses near contaminated surfaces are about ten times larger, see Stonier p. 143). Dr Palumbo states in his article "Recovery of the Land Plants at Eniwetok Atoll Following a Nuclear Detonation" (Radiation Botany, vol. 1, 1962, pp. 182-9): "The Mike detonation of 1952 had removed most of the plants and top soil from Belle Island, resulting in the depletion of some of the elements essential for plant growth. In spite of these deficiencies regrowth of the plants at Belle Island was rapid. ... A photograph of Belle Island taken [on May 22, 1954] eight days following the Nectar detonation shows the extent of the damage sustained by the plants. From the air the island looked brown and desolate. On closer inspection it was found that most of the plants had been scorched by the heat wave and many of them had been blown over or broken by the blast. ... Recovery of the plants was rapid. ... On the eighth day green buds, 1-3 mm in length, were observed on the stems of Scaevola and Messerschmidia plants. On the thirty-fifth day the shoot leaves were 7-15 cm long, covering much of the old stems and giving the plants a green and healthy appearance. By this time many of the other plants had formed new leaves and three species (Portulaca, Triumfetta, and Messerschmidia) had produced new flowers and fruits. The island now had lost its scorched appearance; from the air it looked green rather than brown as it had one month earlier. "In August, three months after the detonation, the plants were growing well and some species, such as Boerhaavia, had produced new flowers. The leaves of most of the species had grown to maximum size, and the branches had grown almost to the pre-Nectar dimensions."

**The biosphere would be fine**

LFTR 09 (Lifeboat Foundation Technology Research, “dedicated to encouraging scientific advancements while helping humanity survive existential risks” Brian Wang, Director of Research. Sander Olson, Interviews and other articles. Phil Wolff, Communications and social technologist. Alvin Wang. Computer, technology, social networking, and social media expert. Ect.

“The Science of Nuclear War Effects and Battlestar Galactica” http://nextbigfuture.com/2009/02/nuclear-war-effects-and-battlestar.html)

Radioactive Fallout Would Not Be the Main Problem After 2000 Years Expending the current level (of) or even the highest nuclear arsenals that we have ever had would do nothing to the long term survival of the biosphere based on radiation and fallout. The world is too big. The stuff settles out and the most dangerous stuff has a short life. The long life stuff is long lived because it is giving off low energy level of radiation. That is why the long term debate about nuclear war is about altering the climate or ozone in a lasting way. Plenty of atmospheric big nuclear tests have been done and the biosphere can take it. Killing a biosphere with nukes would take lot more nukes and radiation would not be the main and lasting problem ever after 2000 years.