**T**

**First, we meet- A) plan in a vacuum is topical.**

**Second, counter-interpretation- a restriction is a regulatory constraint**

**Farlex, ’12** (Farlex collection, Princeton University, 2012, WordNet 3.0, Print)//CC

restriction - an act of limiting or restricting (as by regulation)

**Third, aff interp outweighs because a) predibility and education- NEPA is THE central production restriction.**

**USDI, USDA, DOE 2008**

[“Inventory of Onshore Federal Oil and Natural Gas Resources and Restrictions to Their Development”, <http://www.blm.gov/pgdata/etc/medialib/blm/wo/MINERALS__REALTY__AND_RESOURCE_PROTECTION_/energy/0.Par.68195.File.dat/EPCA2008lo_1.pdf> //wyo-tjc]

**Additional statutory and discretionary requirements beyond lease stipulations** impact Federal land access for oil and gas development. Many of these impacts were not quantified because GIS data do not exist, or they are issues that are not amenable to quantitative analysis. Many of **these requirements can be considered restrictions on drilling because they have effects similar to stipulations on oil and gas development activities**. **These issues can directly or indirectly impact Federal land accessibility for oil and gas development**. Tables 4-1 through 4-16 present office-specific issues that were recorded from discussions with BLM and FS staff during field visits. Average APD processing time was calculated for each office using input from the offices supplemented by an analysis of BLM’s Automated Fluid Minerals Support System (AFMSS).47 4.1 **Issues Directly Impacting Access The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969**. The NEPA is the nation’s central environmental statute. It requires Federal agencies to consider environmental impacts before an action is taken. The NEPA process is intended to help public officials make better decisions based on an understanding of their environmental consequences. **The NEPA is embedded into the fabric of Federal land management decision-making and has become the most important procedural public land management statute because it requires agencies to comply with its processes in all situations where major actions are contemplated.** When an activity or action is proposed on Federal lands, an interdisciplinary review of the environmental effects of the proposal is conducted and made available to citizens and public officials. The review can take one of four forms: • a categorical exclusion (CX) • documentation of NEPA adequacy (DNA) • an environmental assessment (EA) • an environmental impact statement (EIS) The NEPA process can impact oil and gas development in terms of cost and time delays. Typically an EIS or EA is drafted in consultation with the cooperating agencies, presented for public comment, and reviewed by multiple agencies. A simple EIS can take 24 to 36 months to complete, while those with more complex issues may require three to six years to complete. The land use planning process as a whole takes in excess of 36 months, particularly if there is oil and gas involved. The NEPA documents analyze alternatives to the proposed action and must include a “no action” alternative. Impacts are classified as direct, indirect, and cumulative, and include the evaluation of economic impacts to counties and states to be considered, as well as impacts on resources. When considering oil and gas leasing, the BLM has identified the need to obtain additional data on such issues as air quality and clean water as a part of the cumulative impact analysis required by the NEPA and land use planning processes. This has been cited as an overarching issue that affects oil and gas lease parcel nominations. This lack of data can result in leasing delays when existing documents are deemed inadequate. The net result is that potential applicants are often aware of the problem and make decisions not to develop in areas that will be or could be held up by the NEPA process. With respect to the NEPA process itself, concern was expressed by some government officials that individual documents provide “piecemeal” information and that better environmental decisions could be made based on larger scale studies that look at the “bigger picture.” For example, wildlife habitat fragmentation is better characterized when it is examined in the context of larger rather than smaller areas. Delays can increase costs for oil and gas operations because, rather than waiting for the Federal agency to complete the work, operators frequently pay a third-party contractor to perform the necessary work. Section 366 of Energy Policy Act of 2005 (EPAct 2005) sets a deadline for the consideration of applications for permits. The permit must be issued within 30 days (if NEPA and other legal requirements have been met), or defer the decision and provide a notice to the applicant.

**B) topic specific- DOI outweighs their legal interp because of energy context, expertise and government predictability.**

**C)No neg offense bc Limits explosion inevitable – restrictions are broader**

**Hoekman 2**

Bernard Hoekman and Petros C. Mavroidis (World Bank Development Research Group) October 2002 **“**Economic Development, Competition Policy, and the World Trade Organization” http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2002/11/22/000094946\_02111404425138/Rendered/PDF/multi0page.pdf

Under the "effects" doctrine (or subjective territoriality), countries may take action¶ against foreign practices that have negative effects in their markets. Cartels are an¶ example. The WTO may be relevant in this connection through GATT Art. XI, which¶ states: "no prohibition or restriction ... shall be instituted or maintained ... on the exportation or sale for export". Export cartels are a restriction on exportation. As with national treatment, the threshold issue is whether the export cartel can be attributed to government behavior. On this, a GATT panel (Japan - Semiconductors) argued that a "but for" test should be used, i.e., to what extent the observed behavior would have taken place absent government involvement. Unfortunately the precise degree of government involvement was not specified and thus it is doubtful whether mere 'tolerance' of a cartel suffices. Arguably, however, even passive behavior could be caught by Art. XI, given that the term "restriction" invites a wider reading than the terms "law", "regulation" or "requirement" figuring in Art. I1.4. A legislative (rule making) initiative could usefully clarify this gray area.

**D) Specific to OCS development**

**Hagerty 10**

[Curry L. Hagerty, Specialist in Energy and Natural Resources Policy Outer Continental Shelf Moratoria on Oil and Gas Development, CRS Reports, June 15, 2010, p. <http://crs.ncseonline.org/nle/crsreports/10Jul/R41132.pdf> //wyo-tjc]

Policy makers seeking to reach a compromise to resolve environmental concerns have focused on a range of proposals, including proposals to substitute a combination of other measures as a replacement for moratoria. Such efforts have tended to reach an impasse, however, as advocates remain largely divided on what environmental precautions would constitute adequate protection for the marine and coastal environments. **Advocates opposed to OCS** oil and gas **development** often **associate oil and gas** consumption **with** harmful greenhouse gas emissions and other global **climate change** concerns. **From this perspective, only permanently restricting** the **offshore development** of conventional energy sources **would protect against these risks** to the domestic and global environment. **This** perception **complicates efforts to reach a compromise involving a combination of possible restrictions designed to tailor OCS development** activities. Advocates in support of conventional OCS development view environmental risk on a different scale and largely reject global climate change as a basis for defining the risk. These advocates claim that **compliance with current environmental laws and regulations can be an adequate substitute for moratoria**, and that new technologies are emerging to manage harmful greenhouse gas emissions and other global climate change concerns. Improvements in offshore technology are broadly viewed by the Obama Administration as potential measures to bridge the impasse over environmental risk in shaping OCS policy.17

**Fourth, prefer the affirmative-**

**a)competing interps stacks the deck for the negative and the race to overlimit destroys the value of debate by eliminating unique energy education in favor of the SMRs topic which is unsustainable**

**b) IF there is no REAL difference between the interps you vote aff because Debate is still possible EVEN IF the aff makes it slightly more difficult. The most perfect interp is impossible to find and hard debate is good.**

# Grid

#### No shortage – there’s seven times the neodymium needed to solve

Jacobson,12

Stanford Atmosphere/Energy Program and Salerno, AWEA Industry Data and Analysis Director, 9-14-12 Mark, Civil and Environmental Engineering Professor, and Elizabeth, “Wind Power Plentiful, Study Says,” NPR, [www.npr.org/2012/09/14/161156783/wind-power-plentiful-study-says](http://www.npr.org/2012/09/14/161156783/wind-power-plentiful-study-says), accessed 12/12/12,WYO/JF  
A lot of interesting tweets coming in wondering about do we have the resources to build all those wind turbines, Mark? I mean... JACOBSON: In fact we looked at the materials needed, and so for example for wind turbines, you need a rare earth element called neodymium, and there's actually about seven times more neodymium resources available that we know of worldwide than you would need to produce four million large wind turbines. And there's plenty of steel and concrete, as well. So the resources are not limits. SALERNO: Let me add that there was actually a study that was done. I mean, this is a great question, something we've asked, as well. There was a study done back in 2008, actually under the Bush administration, looking at what would it take for us to do 20 percent of our generation from wind in the United States. And it looked at the technical needs, the steel, concrete, all of the different component parts, the transmission, the human resources, all the skilled labor. And it looked at all of those elements and said yes, it is not only technically possible, but it economically makes sense for this country. And it was a technical study, not necessarily a goal, but it was something that we looked at, and we've decided that we can get there. We can get to 20 percent, and if you look at where we're at today in the U.S., we're actually on track to get to 20 percent by 2030.

#### New wind turbine designs don’t require REM’s

Jonathan Benson September 22, 2011

staff writer “Advanced wind turbine design eliminates need for environmentally-harmful rare earth metals, generates electricity at $0.04 per kWh”  
<http://www.naturalnews.com/033647_wind_turbines_rare_earth_metals.html#ixzz2Bp0AH8aH>  
According to a recent report by Green Tech Media, the budding technology does not require the use of expensive, environmentally-damaging rare earth metals typically imported from China, and it also generates electricity at a lower cost than traditional coal-burning plants are able to do. Most [wind turbines](http://www.naturalnews.com/033647_wind_turbines_rare_earth_metals.html) in use today rely on complicated gearboxes that run at high temperatures, that wear out easily, and that are difficult and expensive to maintain. They also require the use of dysprosium, an expensive, rare-earth metal obtained from China, a country whose track record of environmental friendliness leaves much to be desired In other words, the lofty price of dysprosium, which can run as high as $2,000 per kilo (2.2 pounds), combined with the frequent need to maintain and replace a slew of intricate turbine parts, has made current wind energy production technologies inadequate and unable to compete in the energy market apart from government subsidization. The PMG design, however, eliminates the gear-driven system, which BWP describes as "a bunch of very high precision, high quality steel parts in a gear box," with a direct drive system that is "basically one big moving part." And since this single part relies on neodymium, which is one-twentieth the price of dysprosium, and mined in California using an environmentally-friendly extraction process, its potential to replace current wind [energy](http://www.naturalnews.com/energy.html) technologies is essentially a given.

**CP**

**Conditionality is bad:**

**Time Skew: allows them to neutralize large chunks of 2ac time, hurting 1AR strat. The 2AC matters most because it puts out all the arguments that the aff can go.**

**Decrease Education: multiple worlds cause muddled debates that preclude consistency of education.**

**Voting issue: for ground, fairness, and education.**

#### First, perm do both

#### Second, perm do the counterplan:

#### The CP is only a possible means of interpreting the plan

Thaler 12

[Jeffrey, University of Maine's first Visiting Professor of Energy Policy, Law & Ethics, and Assistant University Counsel for environmental, energy and sustainability projects, “Fiddling as the world burns: How climate change urgently requires a paradigm shift in the permitting of renewable energy projects”, Environmental Law, Volume 42, Issue 4, Forthcoming, p. <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2148122> //wyo-tjc]

As discussed in the preceding subsection, some of the recommended reform--such as using life cycle assessments to compare the impacts of different energy sources, expediting and coordinating regulatory reviews, and use of rebuttable presumptions--to the extent they are not undertaken legislatively, could be initiated through some combination of Executive Orders, rulemaking, and inter-agency Memorandums of Understanding. An area of reform that would require action specifically by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and key regulatory agencies has to do with the categorical exclusion process under NEPA.

#### It’s acceptable within the range of “should”

GAO 8 (Government Accounting Office, Exposure Draft of Proposed Changes to the International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing, http://www.gao.gov/govaud/cl\_iia080331.pdf)

The second sentence of the “must” definition used in the exposure draft instructions is more aligned with the definition of “should” as used by other standards setters, including GAO. The definition of “should” as used by GAO, which is intended to be consistent with the definition used by the AICPA and the PCAOB, indicates a presumptively mandatory requirement and contains the following language: “…in rare circumstances, auditors and audit organizations may depart from a presumptively mandatory requirement provided they document their justification for the departure and how the alternative procedures performed in the circumstances were sufficient to achieve the objectives of the presumptively mandatory requirement.” We suggest that the IIA move the second sentence of the “must” definition to the “should” definition. The definition of “must” needs to be clear that “must” indicates an unconditional requirement and that another procedure cannot substitute for a “must.” Also, we suggest adding language to the definition of “should” to indicate that substituting another procedure for a “should” requirement is allowed only if the auditors document their justification for the departure from the “should” and how the alternative procedures performed in the circumstances were sufficient to achieve the objectives of the “should” requirement. The IIA should review every “must” requirement in the Standards to determine whether there are acceptable alternatives to the procedure; if so, “should” is the appropriate word.

#### Third, solvency deficit- the CP creates uncertainty, especially among investors

**Anthony 92** (Robert A., Foundation Professor of Law – George Mason University School of Law, “Interpretive Rules, Policy Statements, Guidances, Manuals, And The Like -- Should Federal Agencies Use Them To Bind The Public?”, Duke Law Journal, June, 41 Duke L.J. 1311, Lexis)

Except to the extent that they interpret specific statutory or regulatory language, then, nonlegislative rules likepolicy statements, guidances, manuals andmemoranda should not be used to bind the public. [9](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=fc7e1839e2556e16ee93313f0611456a&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=3f31cdbadbb71426f380a61d4c037ecb#n9) While these nonlegislative rules by definition cannot *legally* bind, agencies often inappropriately issue them with the intent or effect of imposing a practical binding norm upon the regulated or benefited public. Such use of nonlegislative policy documents is the capital problem addressed by this Article. Thus, under the taxonomy of the APA, [10](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=fc7e1839e2556e16ee93313f0611456a&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=3f31cdbadbb71426f380a61d4c037ecb#n10) a rulemaking action that the agency wishes to make binding upon affected persons must be either a legislative rule (which binds legally) or an interpretive rule (which may bind practically). All other substantive rulemaking documents -- such as policy statements, guidances, manuals, circulars, memoranda, bulletins, and the like -- are in APA terminology "policy statements," [11](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=fc7e1839e2556e16ee93313f0611456a&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=3f31cdbadbb71426f380a61d4c037ecb#n11) which the agency is not entitled to make binding, either as a legal matter or as a practical matter. These issuances will sometimes be referred to as "nonlegislative policy documents" or "policy documents." This Article accordingly will advance the general recommendation, based on the APA, that agencies observe legislative rulemaking procedures for any action in the nature of rulemaking that is intended to impose mandatory obligations or standards upon private parties, or that has that effect. To the extent that agency pronouncements interpret specific statutory or regulatory language, this general recommendation does not apply. But the Article will separately recommend that interpretations that substantially enlarge the jurisdiction exercised by the agency, or substantially change the obligations or entitlements of private parties, should nevertheless be promulgated by legislative rulemaking procedures as a matter of sound agency practice. [12](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=fc7e1839e2556e16ee93313f0611456a&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=3f31cdbadbb71426f380a61d4c037ecb#n12) [\*1316] The use of legislative rulemaking procedures is not the only cure to be prescribed for the misuse of nonlegislative documents described herein. An agency has the option of issuing its policies in the form of policy statements that are genuinely nonbinding, thereby bringing them within the "policy statement" exemption from the APA's rulemaking requirements. [13](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=fc7e1839e2556e16ee93313f0611456a&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=3f31cdbadbb71426f380a61d4c037ecb#n13) When it chooses this course of action the agency should observe an alternate process, by which it can assure that its documents are not binding and therefore will not be invalidated on the ground that they were not promulgated by the use of legislative rulemaking procedures. To achieve these outcomes, the agency should stand ready to entertain challenges to the policy in particular proceedings to which the document may apply, and should observe a disciplined system for maintaining an "open mind" when passing upon such challenges. [14](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=fc7e1839e2556e16ee93313f0611456a&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=3f31cdbadbb71426f380a61d4c037ecb#n14) Finally, the Article recommends procedures through which an agency, whenever it intends a rule to be legislative, should announce that intention and inform the public about the statutory authorities and procedures by which it has acted. Although the subject is complex and evidence is laborious to assemble, it is manifest that nonobservance of APA rulemaking requirements is widespread. Several agencies rely in major part upon nonlegislative issuances to propagate new and changed elements in their regulatory or benefit programs. [15](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=fc7e1839e2556e16ee93313f0611456a&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=3f31cdbadbb71426f380a61d4c037ecb#n15) This Article examines a number of agency attempts to make nonlegislative policy documents bind the public. [16](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=fc7e1839e2556e16ee93313f0611456a&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=3f31cdbadbb71426f380a61d4c037ecb#n16) Frequently such rules are not challenged in court, because the affected private parties cannot afford the cost or the delay of litigation, or because for other practical [\*1317] reasons they must accept a needed agency approval or benefit on whatever terms the agency sets. [17](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=fc7e1839e2556e16ee93313f0611456a&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=3f31cdbadbb71426f380a61d4c037ecb#n17) The use of nonlegislative policy documents generally serves the important function of informing staff and the public about agency positions, and in the great majority of instances is proper and indeed very valuable. But the misuse of such documents -- to bind, where legislative rules should have been used -- carries great costs. Affected members of the public are likely to be confused or misled about the reach and legal quality of the standards the agency has imposed. One consequence of this uncertainty can be that affected persons are unaware that the agency intends to give its nonlegislative issuance binding effect. Probably more often, though, the private parties realize all too clearly that the agency will insist upon strict compliance, but conclude that there is little they can do to resist. In either case, the uncertainty can breed costly waste of effort among private parties trying to puzzle out how far they are bound or otherwise affected by the informal agency document. [18](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=fc7e1839e2556e16ee93313f0611456a&csvc=le&cform=&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAA&_md5=3f31cdbadbb71426f380a61d4c037ecb#n18)

#### Fifth, Non-binding aspect of the CP ensures opposition groups will challenge in court and roll-back

Raso 2010

[Connor N. J.D., Yale Law School expected 2010; Ph.D., Stanford University Department of Political Science expected 2010 “Note: Strategic or Sincere? Analyzing Agency Use of Guidance Documents” The Yale Law Journal January, 119 Yale L.J. 782]

Guidance documents are more difficult to enforce because they are nonbinding. 113 Agencies obtain voluntary compliance much more easily in certain contexts. Some agencies, such as the FDA and FCC, hold gatekeeping power over private parties. This power gives regulated entities a strong incentive to cooperate with the agency. Such parties are therefore generally extremely receptive to guidance documents. For instance, a television station seeking FCC renewal of its license has its entire business at stake. 114 Therefore, the station's first inclination is to accommodate FCC requests, including those expressed in the form of guidance documents. Similarly, a company manufacturing medical devices has strong incentives to accommodate FDA requests. 115 [\*804] On the other hand, a regulated party has a much greater incentive to resist complying with a guidance document issued by an agency threatening only a fine or an inspection. For instance, the EPA may issue a guidance document detailing requirements for power plants to install new pollution abatement equipment. The power plant operator has little incentive to refrain from challenging the guidance document's legality, as even a failed court challenge forestalls an unfavorable change to the status quo.

#### Sixth, process CPs are cheating

#### interpretation: A legitimate counterplan cannot present a world that results in the affirmatives original mandate.

#### Key to education: process doesn’t test the merit of the proposition of the plan which trades off with testing the merit of arguments in favor of arcane policy research that doesn’t’ affect most students.

#### E) Reject the team- the counterplan forces the aff to overcommit on theory to get even which trades off with substance in other places in the debate. Rejecting the argument as a theory model incentivizes shot-gun 1ncs that are uneducational and always skew the debate towards the neg.

**Failure to move forward on OSW guts American credibility on climate leadership**

**Kimmell and Stalenhoef 11**

[Kenneth, general counsel to the Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs, was responsible for overseeing the state permitting of the Cape Wind project, and now serves as the Commissioner of the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection, and Dawn, environmental law attorney and Counsel for the Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities, Golden Gate University Environmental Law Journal, “The Cape Wind Offshore Wind Energy Project: A Case Study of the Difficult Transition to Renewable Energy”, p**.** asp//wyo-tjc]

If completed, the Cape Wind offshore wind energy project would be one of the largest offshore wind farms in the world. **The project is** also **one of the most significant** greenhouse gas (**GHG) reduction measures in our nation. It would reduce GHG emissions** by an estimated 730,000 tons per year, which is **the equivalent of taking 175,000 cars off the road each year**.2 **Due to its size, novelty, and** colorful **permitting history, the project has become a symbol of the United States’ resolve to take action to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions** and its dependence on fossil fuels. **However, if the project is not constructed**, either because of the aesthetic concerns of tenacious beachfront property owners who oppose the project or because of its large up-front costs, **the world may well begin to question the United States’ commitment to doing its part to avert climate change**.

**Empirics**

**Dodds 00**

(Donald, M.S. P.E., President of North Pacific Research, 2000, <http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:X8s-Gaf_5r0J:northpacificresearch.com/downloads/The_myth_of_biodiversity.doc+the+planet+was+microbial+and+not+diverse.+Thus,+the+first+unexplainable+fact+is+that+the+earth+existed+for+3.5+billion+years&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us>) LL

Biodiversity is a corner stone of the environmental movement. But **there is no proof that biodiversity is important to the environment.** Something without basis in scientific fact is called a Myth. Lets examine biodiversity through out the history of the earth. **The earth has been a around for about 4 billion years. Life did not develop until about 500 million years late**r. Thus **for the first 500 million years bio diversity was zero. The planet somehow survived this lack of biodiversity**. For the next 3 billion years, the only life on the planet was microbial and not diverse. Thus, the first unexplainable fact is that **the earth existed for 3.5 billion years, 87.5% of its existence, without biodiversity**. Somewhere around 500 million years ago life began to diversify and multiple celled species appeared. Because these species were partially composed of sold material they left better geologic records, and the number of species and genera could be cataloged and counted. The number of genera on the planet is a indication of the biodiversity of the planet. Figure 1 is a plot of the number of genera on the planet over the last 550 million years. The little black line outside of the left edge of the graph is 10 million years. Notice the left end of this graph. **Biodiversity has never been higher than it is today.**

**K**

## FW

**First, F/W: Our interpretation is the ballot is a yes/no referendum on the aff’s plan-**

**RTP:**

**Fairness- should be able to weigh the aff’s impact against the k.**

**a:Predictibility- prevents negs from linking generically**

**b. skews the debate into an abstract direction that prevents focus on the implications of plan action**

**Governmental policy focus key to education-**

**Crist 4** (Eileen, Professor at Virginia Tech in the Department of Science and Technology, “Against the social construction of nature and wilderness”, Environmental Ethics 26;1, p 13-6, http://www.sts.vt.edu/faculty/crist/againstsocialconstruction.pdf)

Yet, constructivist analyses of "nature" favor remaining in the comfort zone of **zestless agnosticism** and **noncommittal meta-discourse**. As David Kidner suggests, this intellectual stance may function as a mechanism against facing the devastation of the biosphere—an undertaking long underway but gathering momentum with the imminent bottlenecking of a triumphant global consumerism and unprecedented population levels. Human-driven extinction—in the ballpark of Wilson's estimated 27,000 species per year—is so unthinkable a fact that choosing to ignore it may well be the psychologically risk-free option.

**Nevertheless, this is the opportune historical moment for intellectuals in the humanities and social sciences to join forces with** conservation **scientists** in order **to** help **create the consciousness shift and policy changes to stop this irreversible destruction. Given this outlook, how students** in the human sciences **are trained to regard scientific knowledge, and what kind of messages percolate to the public from the academy about the nature of scientific findings, matter immensely**. The "agnostic stance" of constructivism toward "scientific claims" about the environment—a stance supposedly mandatory for discerning how scientific knowledge is "socially assembled"[32]—is, to borrow a legendary one-liner, **striving to interpret the world at an hour that is pressingly calling us to change it.**

#### Predictions based on existential magnitude must be considered, there is no coming back from it, and there have been no previous examples to base predictions off of, and waiting to be reactive to situations is worse

Nick Bostrom, 02

Professor, Faculty of Philosophy, Oxford [University](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html) [www.nickbostrom.com](http://www.nickbostrom.com/) [Published in the Journal of Evolution and Technology, Vol. 9, No. 1 (2002). (First version: 2001)], accessed 1/16/13,WYO/JF

Existential risks are distinct from global endurable risks. Examples of the latter kind include: threats to the biodiversity of Earth’s ecosphere, moderate global warming, global economic recessions (even major ones), and possibly stifling cultural or religious eras such as the “dark ages”, even if they encompass the whole global community, provided they are transitory (though see the section on “Shrieks” below). To say that a particular global risk is endurable is evidently not to say that it is acceptable or not very serious. A world war fought with conventional weapons or a Nazi-style Reich lasting for a decade would be extremely horrible events even though they would fall under the rubric of endurable global risks since humanity could eventually recover. (On the other hand, they could be a local terminal risk for many individuals and for persecuted ethnic groups.) I shall use the following definition of existential risks: Existential risk – One where an adverse outcome would either annihilate Earth-originating intelligent life or permanently and drastically curtail its potential. An existential risk is one where humankind as a whole is imperiled. Existential disasters have major adverse consequences for the course of human civilization for all time to come. 2 The unique challenge of existential risks Risks in this sixth category are a recent phenomenon. This is part of the reason why it is useful to distinguish them from other risks. We have not evolved mechanisms, either biologically or culturally, for managing such risks. Our intuitions and coping strategies have been shaped by our long experience with risks such as dangerous animals, hostile individuals or tribes, poisonous foods, automobile accidents, Chernobyl, Bhopal, volcano eruptions, earthquakes, draughts, World War I, World War II, epidemics of influenza, smallpox, black plague, and AIDS. These types of disasters have occurred many times and our cultural attitudes towards risk have been shaped by trial-and-error in managing such hazards. But tragic as such events are to the people immediately affected, in the big picture of things – from the perspective of humankind as a whole – even the worst of these catastrophes are mere ripples on the surface of the great sea of life. They haven’t significantly affected the total amount of human suffering or happiness or determined the long-term fate of our species. With the exception of a species-destroying comet or asteroid impact (an extremely rare occurrence), there were probably no significant existential risks in human history until the mid-twentieth century, and certainly none that it was within our power to do something about. The first manmade existential risk was the inaugural detonation of an atomic bomb. At the time, there was some concern that the explosion might start a runaway chain-reaction by “igniting” the atmosphere. Although we now know that such an outcome was physically impossible, it qualifies as an existential risk that was present at the time. For there to be a risk, given the knowledge and understanding available, it suffices that there is some subjective probability of an adverse outcome, even if it later turns out that objectively there was no chance of something bad happening. If we don’t know whether something is objectively risky or not, then it is risky in the subjective sense. The subjective sense is of course what we must base our decisions on.[[2]](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html" \l "_ftn2" \o ") At any given time we must use our best current subjective estimate of what the objective risk factors are.[[3]](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html" \l "_ftn3" \o ") A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[[4]](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html" \l "_ftn4" \o ") Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently. Such a war might however be a local terminal risk for the cities most likely to be targeted. Unfortunately, we shall see that nuclear Armageddon and comet or asteroid strikes are mere preludes to the existential risks that we will encounter in the 21st century. The special nature of the challenges posed by existential risks is illustrated by the following points: · Our approach to existential risks cannot be one of trial-and-error. There is no opportunity to learn from errors. The reactive approach – see what happens, limit damages, and learn from experience – is unworkable. Rather, we must take a proactive approach. This requires foresight to anticipate new types of threats and a willingness to take decisive preventive action and to bear the costs (moral and economic) of such actions. · We cannot necessarily rely on the institutions, moral norms, social attitudes or national security policies that developed from our experience with managing other sorts of risks. Existential risks are a different kind of beast. We might find it hard to take them as seriously as we should simply because we have never yet witnessed such disasters.[[5]](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html" \l "_ftn5" \o ") Our collective fear-response is likely ill calibrated to the magnitude of threat. · Reductions in existential risks are global public goods [13] and may therefore be undersupplied by the market [14]. Existential risks are a menace for everybody and may require acting on the international plane. Respect for national sovereignty is not a legitimate excuse for failing to take countermeasures against a major existential risk. · If we take into account the welfare of future generations, the harm done by existential risks is multiplied by another factor, the size of which depends on whether and how much we discount future benefits [15,16]. In view of its undeniable importance, it is surprising how little systematic work has been done in this area. Part of the explanation may be that many of the gravest risks stem (as we shall see) from anticipated future technologies that we have only recently begun to understand. Another part of the explanation may be the unavoidably interdisciplinary and speculative nature of the subject. And in part the neglect may also be attributable to an aversion against thinking seriously about a depressing topic. The point, however, is not to wallow in gloom and doom but simply to take a sober look at what could go wrong so we can create responsible strategies for improving our chances of survival. In order to do that, we need to know where to focus our efforts.

## Neolib

**Neolib’s inevitable and movements are getting smothered out of existence—no alternative economic system**

**Jones 11**—Owen, Masters at Oxford, named one of the Daily Telegraph's 'Top 100 Most Influential People on the Left' for 2011, author of "Chavs: The Demonization of the Working Class", The Independent, UK, "Owen Jones: Protest without politics will change nothing", 2011, www.independent.co.uk/opinion/commentators/owen-jones-protest-without-politics-will-change-nothing-2373612.html

My first experience of police kettling was aged 16. It was May Day 2001, and the anti-globalisation movement was at its peak. The turn-of-the-century anti-capitalist movement feels largely forgotten today, but it was a big deal at the time. To a left-wing teenager growing up in an age of unchallenged neo-liberal triumphalism, just to have "anti-capitalism" flash up in the headlines was thrilling. Thousands of apparently unstoppable protesters chased the world's rulers from IMF to World Bank summits – from Seattle to Prague to Genoa – and the authorities were rattled. Today, as protesters in nearly a thousand cities across the world follow the example set by the Occupy Wall Street protests, it's worth pondering what happened to the anti-globalisation movement. Its activists did not lack passion or determination. But they did lack a coherent alternative to the neo-liberal project. With no clear political direction, the movement was easily swept away by the jingoism and turmoil that followed 9/11, just two months after Genoa. Don't get me wrong: the Occupy movement is a glimmer of sanity amid today's economic madness. By descending on the West's financial epicentres, it reminds us of how a crisis caused by the banks (a sentence that needs to be repeated until it becomes a cliché) has been cynically transformed into a crisis of public spending. The founding statement of Occupy London puts it succinctly: "We refuse to pay for the banks' crisis." The Occupiers direct their fire at the top 1 per cent, and rightly so – as US billionaire Warren Buffett confessed: "There's class warfare, all right, but it's my class, the rich class, that's making war, and we're winning." The Occupy movement has provoked fury from senior US Republicans such as Presidential contender Herman Cain who – predictably – labelled it "anti-American". They're right to be worried: those camping outside banks threaten to refocus attention on the real villains, and to act as a catalyst for wider dissent. But a **coherent alternative to the tottering global economic order remains,** it seems, **as distant as ever. Neo-liberalism crashes around, half-dead, with no-one to administer the killer blow.** There's always a presumption that a crisis of capitalism is good news for the left. Yet in the Great Depression, fascism consumed much of Europe. The economic crisis of the 1970s did lead to a resurgence of radicalism on both left and right. But, spearheaded by Thatcherism and Reaganism, the New Right definitively crushed its opposition in the 1980s.This time round, there doesn't even seem to be an alternative for the right to defeat. That's not the fault of the protesters. In truth, the left has never recovered from being virtually **smothered out of existence**. It was the victim of a perfect storm: the rise of the New Right; neo-liberal globalisation; and the repeated defeats suffered by the trade union movement. But, above all, it was the aftermath of the collapse of Communism that did for the left. As US neo-conservative Midge Decter triumphantly put it: "It's time to say: We've won. Goodbye." From the British Labour Party to the African National Congress, left-wing movements across the world hurtled to the right in an almost synchronised fashion. It was as though the left wing of the global political spectrum had been sliced off. That's why, **although we live in an age of revolt, there remains no left to give it direction and purpose.**

#### Incentives-based environmental action key to policy effectiveness

Economist 5 (The Economist, April 21, “Rescuing environmentalism”, http://www.economist.com/node/3888006)

“THE environmental movement's foundational concepts, its method for framing legislative proposals, and its very institutions are outmoded. Today environmentalism is just another special interest.” Those damning words come not from any industry lobby or right-wing think-tank. They are drawn from “The Death of Environmentalism”, an influential essay published recently by two greens with impeccable credentials. They claim that environmental groups are politically adrift and dreadfully out of touch. They are right. In America, greens have suffered a string of defeats on high-profile issues. They are losing the battle to prevent oil drilling in Alaska's wild lands, and have failed to spark the public's imagination over global warming. Even the stridently ungreen George Bush has failed to galvanise the environmental movement. The solution, argue many elders of the sect, is to step back from day-to-day politics and policies and “energise” ordinary punters with talk of global-warming calamities and a radical “vision of the future commensurate with the magnitude of the crisis”. Europe's green groups, while politically stronger, are also starting to lose their way intellectually. Consider, for example, their invocation of the woolly “precautionary principle” to demonise any complex technology (next-generation nuclear plants, say, or genetically modified crops) that they do not like the look of. A more sensible green analysis of nuclear power would weigh its (very high) economic costs and (fairly low) safety risks against the important benefit of generating electricity with no greenhouse-gas emissions**.** Small victories and bigger defeats The coming into force of the UN's Kyoto protocol on climate change might seem a victory for Europe's greens, but it actually masks a larger failure. The most promising aspect of the treaty—its innovative use of market-based instruments such as carbon-emissions trading—was resisted tooth and nail by Europe's greens. With courageous exceptions, American green groups also remain deeply suspicious of market forces. If environmental groups continue to reject pragmatic solutions and instead drift toward Utopian (or dystopian) visions of the future, they will lose the battle of ideas. And that would be a pity, for the world would benefit from having a thoughtful green movement. It would also be ironic, because far-reaching advances are already under way in the management of the world's natural resources—changes that add up to a different kind of green revolution. This could yet save the greens (as well as doing the planet a world of good). “Mandate, regulate, litigate.” That has been the green mantra. And it explains the world's top-down, command-and-control approach to environmental policymaking. Slowly, this is changing. Yesterday's failed hopes, today's heavy costs and tomorrow's demanding ambitions have been driving public policy quietly towards market-based approaches. One example lies in the assignment of property rights over “commons”, such as fisheries, that are abused because they belong at once to everyone and no one. Where tradable fishing quotas have been issued, the result has been a drop in over-fishing. Emissions trading is also taking off. America led the way with its sulphur-dioxide trading scheme, and today the EU is pioneering carbon-dioxide trading with the (albeit still controversial) goal of slowing down climate change. These, however, are obvious targets. What is really intriguing are efforts to value previously ignored “ecological services”, both basic ones such as water filtration and flood prevention, and luxuries such as preserving wildlife. At the same time, advances in environmental science are making those valuation studies more accurate. Market mechanisms can then be employed to achieve these goals at the lowest cost. Today, countries from Panama to Papua New Guinea are investigating ways to price nature in this way (see article). Rachel Carson meets Adam Smith If this new green revolution is to succeed, however, three things must happen. The most important is that prices must be set correctly. The best way to do this is through liquid markets, as in the case of emissions trading. Here, politics merely sets the goal. How that goal is achieved is up to the traders. A proper price, however, requires proper information. So the second goal must be to provide it. The tendency to regard the environment as a “free good” must be tempered with an understanding of what it does for humanity and how. Thanks to the recent Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and the World Bank's annual “Little Green Data Book” (released this week), that is happening. More work is needed, but thanks to technologies such as satellite observation, computing and the internet, green accounting is getting cheaper and easier. Which leads naturally to the third goal, the embrace of cost-benefit analysis. At this, greens roll their eyes, complaining that it reduces nature to dollars and cents. In one sense, they are right. Some things in nature are irreplaceable—literally priceless. Even so, it is essential to consider trade-offs when analysing almost all green problems. The marginal cost of removing the last 5% of a given pollutant is often far higher than removing the first 5% or even 50%: for public policy to ignore such facts would be inexcusable. If governments invest seriously in green data acquisition and co-ordination, they will no longer be flying blind. And by advocating data-based, analytically rigorous policies rather than pious appeals to “save the planet”, the green movement could overcome the scepticism of the ordinary voter. It might even move from the fringes of politics to the middle ground where most voters reside. Whether the big environmental groups join or not, the next green revolution is already under way. Rachel Carson, the crusading journalist who inspired greens in the 1950s and 60s, is joining hands with Adam Smith, the hero of free-marketeers. The world may yet leapfrog from the dark ages of clumsy, costly, command-and-control regulations to an enlightened age of informed, innovative, incentive-based greenery.

#### Can’t win root cause knowledge claims

Peters 12 (Michael A, Professor of education at the University of Waikato in New Zealand and Professor emeritus at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, June 10, "Greening the Knowledge Economy: A Critique of Neoliberalism", <http://truth-out.org/news/item/9642-greening-the-knowledge-economy-a-critique-of-neoliberalism)>, accessed 10/31/12,WYO/JF

The neoliberal reading is also sometimes associated with the growth of sign economies and financialization of the global economy.[[1]](http://truth-out.org/news/item/9642-greening-the-knowledge-economy-a-critique-of-neoliberalism)#a) Yet the neoliberal reading is only one reading, and it does not analyze or identify the notion of knowledge as a global public good that demands government intervention designed to protect and enhance the public domain. The neoliberal reading does not take into account or try to explain the fundamental differences between the traditional industrial economy and the knowledge economy, except by reference to pure rationality assumptions that do not sit well or apply within networked environments or merging distributive knowledge and learning ecologies. In these "ecological" environments, none of the elements of homo economicus focusing on individuality, rationality and self-interest obviously apply. The neoliberal reading does not understand how knowledge or information as commodities behave differently from other commodities. Neither does it recognize the parallel discourse of the "knowledge society" which begins in the sociological literature on postindustrialism in the early 1960s that is often directed at concerns about new forms of stratification, universal access to knowledge, and the role and significance of knowledge workers and institutions. Third, the neoliberal reading is stuck temporally in the 1990s and does not take account of the movement toward various forms of the open economy signified in the learning economy, the open science economy (Peters, 2009) or even the creative economy (Peters et al, 2009, UN 2010).

#### Securitization doesn’t result in war except when heg isn’t there to check it.

Gartzke 12—Erik Gartzke, University of California, San Diego, Could climate change precipitate peace?, Journal of Peace Research 49(1) 177–192, http://www.openbriefing.org/docs/JPRclimateconflict.pdf

Violent conflict occurs wherever human beings inhabit the globe. Disputes require some mechanism for resolution, whether this involves force or persuasion. When the stakes are high, the temptation to resort to violence as the final arbiter must remain strong. State monopolies on force do not refute, but instead reflect the logic of political competition. Of course, the fact that politics involves violence does not make all politics violent. The **possibility of punishment** or coercion is itself available to **deter** or **compel,** and therefore often prevents the exercise of force. Common conjecture about the eventuality of conflict ‘shadows’ political discourse, often making behavioral violence redundant. Political actors can anticipate when another actor is incentivized to violence and can choose to avoid provocation (Leeds & Davis, 1997). Alternately, ignorance, indifference or an inability to act can result in political violence. Scholars must thus view context, motive, and information to determine whether certain situations make force more or less likely.

#### Rejection of securitization causes the state to become more interventionist—turns the K

Tara **McCormack, ’10**, is Lecturer in International Politics at the University of Leicester and has a PhD in International Relations from the University of Westminster. 2010, (Critique, Security and Power: The political limits to emancipatory approaches, page 127-129)

The following section will briefly raise some questions about the rejection of the old security framework as it has been taken up by the most powerful institutions and states. Here we can begin to see the political limits to critical and emancipatory frameworks. In an international system which is marked by great power inequalities between states, the rejection of the old narrow national interest-based security framework by major international institutions, and the adoption of ostensibly emancipatory policies and policy rhetoric, has the consequence of problematising weak or unstable states and allowing international institutions or major states a more interventionary role, yet without establishing mechanisms by which the citizens of states being intervened in might have any control over the agents or agencies of their emancipation. Whatever the problems associated with the pluralist security framework there were at least formal and clear demarcations. This has the consequence of entrenching international power inequalities and allowing for a shift towards a hierarchical international order in which the citizens in weak or unstable states may arguably have even less freedom or power than before. Radical critics of contemporary security policies, such as human security and humanitarian intervention, argue that we see an assertion of Western power and the creation of liberal subjectivities in the developing world. For example, see Mark Duffield’s important and insightful contribution to the ongoing debates about contemporary international security and development. Duffield attempts to provide a coherent empirical engagement with, and theoretical explanation of, these shifts. Whilst these shifts, away from a focus on state security, and the so-called merging of security and development are often portrayed as positive and progressive shifts that have come about because of the end of the Cold War, Duffield argues convincingly that these shifts are highly problematic and unprogressive. For example, the rejection of sovereignty as formal international equality and a presumption of nonintervention has eroded the division between the international and domestic spheres and led to an international environment in which Western NGOs and powerful states have a major role in the governance of third world states. Whilst for supporters of humanitarian intervention this is a good development, Duffield points out the depoliticising implications, drawing on examples in Mozambique and Afghanistan. Duffield also draws out the problems of the retreat from modernisation that is represented by sustainable development. The Western world has moved away from the development policies of the Cold War, which aimed to develop third world states industrially. Duffield describes this in terms of a new division of human life into uninsured and insured life. Whilst we in the West are ‘insured’ – that is we no longer have to be entirely self-reliant, we have welfare systems, a modern division of labour and so on – sustainable development aims to teach populations in poor states how to survive in the absence of any of this. Third world populations must be taught to be self-reliant, they will remain uninsured. Self-reliance of course means the condemnation of millions to a barbarous life of inhuman bare survival. Ironically, although sustainable development is celebrated by many on the left today, by leaving people to fend for themselves rather than developing a society wide system which can support people, sustainable development actually leads to a less human and humane system than that developed in modern capitalist states. Duffield also describes how many of these problematic shifts are embodied in the contemporary concept of human security. For Duffield, we can understand these shifts in terms of Foucauldian biopolitical framework, which can be understood as a regulatory power that seeks to support life through intervening in the biological, social and economic processes that constitute a human population (2007: 16). Sustainable development and human security are for Duffield technologies of security which aim to *create* self-managing and self-reliant subjectivities in the third world, which can then survive in a situation of serious underdevelopment (or being uninsured as Duffield terms it) without causing security problems for the developed world. For Duffield this is all driven by a neoliberal project which seeks to control and manage uninsured populations globally. Radical critic Costas Douzinas (2007) also criticises new forms of cosmopolitanism such as human rights and interventions for human rights as a triumph of American hegemony. Whilst we are in agreement with critics such as Douzinas and Duffield that these new security frameworks cannot be empowering, and ultimately lead to more power for powerful states, we need to understand why these frameworks have the effect that they do. We can understand that these frameworks have political limitations without having to look for a specific plan on the part of current powerful states. In new security frameworks such as human security we can see the political limits of the framework proposed by critical and emancipatory theoretical approaches.

**Collapse causes Resource hording – turns mindset shift**

**Monbiot, 09**

[George Monbiot, columnist for The Guardian, has held visiting fellowships or professorships at the universities of Oxford (environmental policy), Bristol (philosophy), Keele (politics), Oxford Brookes (planning), and East London environmental science, August 17, 2009, “Is there any point in fighting to stave off industrial apocalypse?,” online: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cif-green/2009/aug/17/environment-climate-change>, \\wyo-bb]

**From the second and third observations**, this follows: **instead of gathering as free collectives of happy householders, survivors of** this **collapse** will be **subject** **to** the **will of people seeking to monopolise** **remaining resources**. This will is likely to be **imposed through violence**. **Political accountability** will be a **distant memory**. The **chances of conserving any resource** in these circumstances **are** approximately **zero**. The **human and ecological consequences** of the first global **collapse are likely to persist for** **many** **generations**, perhaps **for our species' remaining time on earth.** **To imagine** that **good could come of** the involuntary **failure of industrial civilisation is** also **to succumb to denial**. The answer to your question – what will we learn from this collapse? – is nothing.

**Elites will backlash at the revolution, resulting in extinction**

**Dasmann, 89**

Raymond F. Dasmann, PhD in Zoology, professor emeritus of ecology at UC-Santa Cruz, 1989, The Ends of the Earth, edited by Donald Worster and Alfred W. Crosby, p. 288

There is really little doubt that there is a growing awareness of the necessity for modifying human ways to ensure the survival of the natural world on which the future of the human race depends. There is a rapidly growing biosphere consciousness, which is reaching the higher levels of many governments and has often found its expression at the level of the United Nations. One regrets that it is less evident in the United States government than it has been in the past, but it is certainly expressed among many members of the Congress, and one can expect future changes in the national leadership which will reflect the growing public awareness. The real question is whether or not the human race can modify its ways of behavior rapidly enough, because the majority continues to pursue pathways that lead toward the ecological impoverishment of the planet. The increase in awareness does not keep pace with the rate of destruction of tropical forests, the spread of deserts, the erosion of agricultural soils, the depletion of wildlife, or the growing pollution of the atmosphere and hydrosphere. **Those who exercise the greatest political and military power still threaten a war that can bring the whole edifice built by civilization crashing down into the wreckage of the biosphere, while in the meanwhile dozens of little wars forestall efforts to achieve sustainable ways of life. There is also a reasonable fear that if the power and influence of those who work for conservation of nature, sustainable development** based on social justice and equity, and a more reasonable approach to human use of the biosphere, **begins to reach a critical mass there will be attempts at massive repression by those who feel threatened by such changes. In other terms, if we begin to approach the hundredth monkey level, the “international power structure” will declare an open season on monkeys. If that happens then the real question will be whether anyone will be left to write the environmental history of our times.**

**Economic growth solves proliferation**

**Burrows and Windram 94**

(William & Robert, Critical Mass, p. 491-492)

**Economics is** in many respects **proliferation’s catalyst.** As we have noted, **economic desperation drives** Russia and some of the former Warsaw Pact **nations to peddle weapons and technology**. The possibility of considerable profits or at least balanced international payments also prompts Third World countries like China, Brazil, and Israel to do the same. Economics, as well as such related issues as overpopulation, drive proliferation just as surely as do purely political motives. Unfortunately, that subject is beyond the scope of this book. Suffice it to say that, all things being equal, well-of, **relatively secure societies like today’s Japan are less likely to buy or sell superweapon technology than those that are insecure, needy, or desperate. Ultimately, solving economic problems**, especially as they are driven by population pressure, **is the surest way to defuse proliferation and enhance true national security.**

**And, prolif causes extinction from arms races and miscalculations**

**Utgoff 2**

(Deputy Director of the Strategy Forces, and Resources Division of the Institute for Defense Analyses, Victor, “Proliferation, Missile Defence, and American Ambitions,” Survival, Volume 44, Number 2, Summer)

In sum, widespread **proliferation** is likely to lead to an occasional shoot-out with nuclear weapons, and that such **shoot-outs will have a substantial probability of escalating to the maximum destruction possible** with the weapons at hand. Unless nuclear proliferation is stopped, **we are headed toward a world** that will mirror the American Wild West of the, late 1800s. **With most,** if not all, **nations wearing nuclear 'six-shooters' on their hips**, the world may even be a more polite place than it is today, but **every once in a while we will all gather on a hill to bury the bodies of dead cities or even whole nations.**

**ECONOMIC COLLAPSE CAUSES QUICK WARMING**

**Lovelock 06**

 (Inventor: Gaia theory, fellow Royal Society, fellow Green College: Oxford) 2006

[James, The Revenge of Gaia p. 56-57, loghry]

 Recently the BBC broadcast in their Horizon series of science programmes an account of 'global dimming'; in it climate scientists, among them V. Ramanathan and Peter Cox, voiced their concern that we have already, in a sense, passed the point of no return in global heating. The science behind this programme appeared in a Nature article in 2005 which included as an author the distinguished German scientist, M. O. Andreae. **Industrial civilization has released into the atmosphere, in addition to greenhouse gases, a huge quantity of aerosol particles, and these tiny floating motes reflect incoming sunlight back to space and cause global cooling**. On large areas of the Earth's surface **the aerosol haze reflects sunlight back to space sufficiently to offset global warming. By themselves they cause a global cooling of 2 to 3°C**. Back in the 1960s, when we knew much less about the Earth and its atmosphere, a few scientists even speculated that continued economic growth would increase the density of the aerosol and lead to global cooling and even precipitate the next glaciation. The present extent of aerosol cooling is real and seriously worrying. It may have allowed us to continue our business as usual, not noticing how much we had changed the Earth nor realizing that we would have to pay back the borrowed time. **Aerosol particles stay only a brief time in the atmosphere: within weeks they settle to the ground. This means that any large economic downturn**, or a planned reduction in fossil-fuel usage, or unwise legislation to stop sulphur emissions, as the Europeans are now enacting to stop acid rain, **will allow the immediate expression of greenhouse warming**. It has been suggested that part of the excessive heat of the 2003 summer in Europe was caused by the European Union's efforts to remove the aerosol which is the source of acid rain. Peter Cox reminded us that because the aerosol was not fully included, climate modellers may have underestimated the sensitivity of their models to greenhouse gas abundance and failed to notice that we may already be beyond the point of no return.

**Free market growth key to space exploration—profit incentive boosts innovation and creativity**

**Garmong, 2005**

[Robert, Ph.D. in philosophy, was a writer for the Ayn Rand Institute from 2003 to 2004, “Privatize Space Exploration.” 7-22-2005, Online, <http://capitalismmagazine.com/2005/07/privatize-space-exploration>] /Wyo-MB

Nor would it be difficult to spur **the private exploration of space–it’s been happening, quietly, for years. The free market works to produce whatever there is demand for**, just as it now does with traditional aircraft**. Commercial satellite launches are now routine**, and could easily be fully privatized. The X Prize, which SpaceShipOne won, offered incentives for private groups to break out of the Earth’s atmosphere. But all this private exploration is hobbled by the crucial absence of a system of property rights in space. **Imagine the incentive to a profit-minded business if,** for instance, **it were granted the right to any stellar body it reached and exploited.** We often hear that the most ambitious projects can only be undertaken by government, but in fact the opposite is true**. The more ambitious a project is, the more it demands to be broken into achievable, profit-making steps–and freed from the unavoidable politicizing of government-controlled science. If space development is to be transformed** from an expensive national bauble whose central purpose is to assert national pride to a practical industry**, it will only be by unleashing the creative force of free and rational minds.** The creative minds that allowed SpaceShipOne to soar to triumph have made the first private steps toward the stars. Before them are enormous technical difficulties, the solution of which will require even more heroic determination than that which tamed the seas and the continents. **To solve them, America must unleash its best minds, as only the free market can do.**

**Space solves multiple existential threats –key to survival**

**Pelton 03**

(Joseph, Director of the Space and Advanced Communications Research institute at George Washington University and Executive Director of the Arthur C. Clarke Foundation, “COMMENTARY: Why Space? The Top 10 Reasons”, September 23, http://www.space.com/news/commentary\_top10\_030912.html)

Actually the **lack of a space program could get us all killed**. I dont mean you or me or my wife or children. I mean that Homo sapiens as a species are actually endangered. Surprising to some, a **well conceived space program may well be our only hope for long-term survival**. The right or wrong decisions about space research and exploration may be key to the futures of our grandchildren or great-grandchildren or those that follow. Arthur C. Clarke, the author and screenplay writer for 2001: A Space Odyssey, put the issue rather starkly some years back when he said: **The dinosaurs are not around today because they did not have a space program**. He was, of course, **referring to the** fact that we now know a **quite largish meteor crashed into the earth, released poisonous** Iridium **chemicals into our atmosphere and created a killer cloud** above the Earth **that blocked out the sun for a prolonged period of time. This could have been foreseen and averted with a** sufficiently advanced **space program**. But this is only one example of how space programs, such as NASAs Spaceguard program, help protect our fragile planet. **Without a space program we would not know about the large ozone hole in our atmosphere**, the **hazards of solar radiation**, **the path of** killer **hurricanes or** many other **environmental dangers**. But this is only a fraction of the ways that space programs are crucial to our future. He Continues… Protection against catastrophic planetary accidents: It is easy to assume that an erratic meteor or comet will not bring destruction to the Earth because the probabilities are low. The truth is we are bombarded from space daily. **The dangers are greatest not from a cataclysmic collision, but from not knowing enough about solar storms, cosmic radiation and the ozone layer. An enhanced Spaceguard Program is actually a prudent course that could save our species in time.**