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## AT: PDCP

Interpretation: The affirmative should have to specify their agent in the 1ac.

#### “Government” is all three branches

Black’s Law 90 (Dictionary, p. 695)

“[*Government*] In the United States, government consists of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches in addition to administrative agencies. In a broader sense, includes the federal government and all its agencies and bureaus, state and county governments, and city and township governments.”

Reasons to prefer-

Education-Real world policymaking depends on comparing/contrasting the benefits of various actors carrying out certain programs within government

Fairness-had the chance to specify your agent in the 1ac, can’t predict what they’ll shift to in the 2ac, they’ll just shift to whatever actor we choose, eliminates cp competition

VI- deny them the perm

# 1nc

### 1NC – AT: Warming Advantage

#### 1st, Nuke Power doesn’t solve warming:

#### A. Nuke power doesn’t meaningfully solve emissions—way too long timeframe, and high carbon abatement costs make it a bad option

Sokolski, 2010

[Henry, executive director of the Nonproliferation Policy Education Center, "The high and hidden costs of nuclear power." Policy Review 162 (2010): 53+. Academic OneFile. Web. 5 June 2012] /Wyo-MB

Another assertion nuclear power supporters frequently make is that once carbon is no longer free, their zero carbon emission power plants will be the clear, clean-energy victor. Yet nuclear power may already have priced itself out of the running in any carbon abatement competition. Factoring in industry construction, operation, and decommissioning costs, the total cost of abating one ton of carbon by substituting a new nuclear power plant for a modern coal-fired generator has been pegged by nuclear power critics at $120 or more. (3) This figure, which includes the costs of public subsidies, assumes fairly low capital construction costs (roughly one half of the industry's latest high-end cost projections). If one uses high-end projections, the cost for each ton of carbon abated approaches $200. Certainly there are much cheaper and quicker ways to reduce carbon emissions (see Figure 2). Just how rapidly nuclear power can abate carbon emissions is also a significant issue. Certainly, if one is interested in abating carbon in the quickest, least expensive fashion, building expensive nuclear plants that take up to a decade to bring on line will not be an appealing option. That's why in North and South America and the Middle East, the building of natural gas burning generators is currently an attractive, near-term option. Advanced gas-fired power plants can halve carbon emissions as compared to coal-fired plants, can serve as base or peak power generators, and can be brought on line in 18 to 30 months rather than the years upon years needed to build large reactors. Advanced gas-fired generator construction costs, moreover, are a fraction of those projected for nuclear power. (5)

#### B

#### C. Too many plants would have to be produced to solve warming—can Interdependence, the spread of democracy, technological advances, and the unthinkable nature of nuclear war are not deterrents against great power conflict-this thinking reflects a trend that denies the warfare and violence that have continued despite such conditions

Kagan 2012

[Robert Kagan, Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution, The World America Made, 2012 uwyo//amp]

What gave such weight to all the arguments for a new and permanent peace was the fact that by the first decade of the twentieth century, there had been no war between great powers for almost four decades.47 To those who recalled the nearly constant great-power warfare of previous centuries, this was an astonishingly long era of peace. Instead of viewing it as an interlude, people naturally came to see it as a permanent condition. Something had changed fundamentally. Humankind had evolved and reached a new plateau. We now know this judgment, which seemed so sensible at the time, was mistaken. The outbreak of World War I, the most deadly and destructive war in history, a mere four years after Angell's best seller, revealed a failure of imagination on the part of an entire generation. They simply were not able to imagine that national leaders would behave irrationally, that they would sacrifice economic interests, even bankrupt their treasuries, out of a combination of ambition and fear, that they would view territory as a worthy object of war, that they would use all the horrible weapons at their disposal without a second thought—in violation of international agreements whose ink had barely dried—and that in all this they would have behind them the enthusiastic support of their people stirred by a very un-cosmopolitan nationalist pride. Today we suffer from a similar lack of imagination. Once again the conventional wisdom is that great-power conflict is "literally unthinkable." Even the arguments are the same: economic interdependence, globalization, the irrelevance of territory, the spread of democracy, the unthinkable destructiveness of war in the nuclear age, the belief that nations and peoples have become "socialized" to favor peace over war, that they value life more and feel greater empathy for others—all these have made great-power war irrational and therefore impossible. And, adding force to these arguments, once again, is the long peace we have enjoyed, the remarkable six decades without great-power conflict. Yet we have less excuse than our forebears to believe that humankind has reached a new level of enlightenment. The optimists of the early twentieth century had not witnessed two world wars, the genocides, and the other horrors of our supposedly advanced era. They had not witnessed the rise of Nazism and fascism. We have seen it all and, in historical terms, quite recently. It was just seven decades ago that the United States was at war with imperial Japan, Nazi Germany, and fascist Italy. It was just thirty-five years ago that Henry Kissinger asked Americans to accommodate themselves to the perma nent reality of Soviet power, with its thousands of nuclear warheads aimed at American and European cities and thousands of American warheads aimed at Russia. The twentieth century was the bloodiest in all history, and we are but a dozen years into the twenty-first. It is premature for us to conclude, after ten thousand years of war, that a few decades and some technological innovations would change the nature of man and the nature of international relations.

#### ’t realistically solve

Hiltzik, 2011

[Michael, LA times, “A nuclear renaissance in U.S. was unlikely even before Japan disaster.” 3-23-11, Online, http://articles.latimes.com/2011/mar/23/business/la-fi-hiltzik-20110323] /Wyo-MB

In recent years, nuclear energy has been promoted as a "green," or at least greenish, alternative to coal power and other fossil-fueled generation. That's been a potent selling point as concern has mounted over the latter's effect on climate change by the production of greenhouse gases. Nuclear power is burdened by its own environmental issues, including the dangers of radioactive release into the atmosphere, but the production of carbon dioxide isn't among them.¶ Yet the technology's potential as a weapon against global warming has been as oversold, just as its virtues as safe, clean and "too cheap to meter" were during its infancy in the 1950s. To realistically make a dent in climate change, nuclear plant construction would have to take off at such a rate that it would "pose serious concerns" for the availability of construction materials, properly trained builders and operating technicians, and safety and security oversight, as a report by the Council on Foreign Relations observed in 2007.

#### 2nd, Nuke Power causes warming:

#### A. Nuke power contributes to warming from the release of energy

Skorodin, 2010

[Morton, Contributor to global research, “Nuclear Energy Causes Global Warming.” 7-23-10, Online, http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=20231] /Wyo-MB

Once you release all that energy from Uranium, as in a nuclear reactor, it is here forever, except for some fraction that radiates out into outer space as “long-wave radiation.” The rest goes into the air, waterways, glaciers, dirt and rocks as waste heat, also called thermal [heat] pollution, increasing the temperature, thereby bringing about global warming.¶ ¶ Is nuclear the only the only source of energy that releases waste heat?¶ ¶ No. Coal, oil and natural gas [hydrocarbons, so-called “fossil fuels”] also release waste heat when burned.¶ ¶ Why is this fact not included in the title of this article?¶ ¶ Because many people already know that use of hydrocarbons causes global warming. Also, many believe that nuclear power does not cause global warming and that it may actually solve the global warming problem. Nothing could be further from the truth, because it produces heat and, therefore, thermal pollution.

#### No Impacts -

#### Warming impacts won’t take hold for several centuries and in order to kill off the planet they would have to occur within one lifespan

Lomborg 8

[Director of the Copenhagen Consensus Center and adjunct professor at the Copenhagen Business School

Bjorn, “Warming warnings get overheated”, The Guardian, 8/15, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/15/carbonemissions.climatechange>]

These alarmist predictions are becoming quite bizarre, and could be dismissed as sociological oddities, if it weren’t for the fact that they get such big play in the media. Oliver Tickell, for instance, writes that a global warming causing a 4C temperature increase by the end of the century would be a “catastrophe” and the beginning of the “extinction” of the human race. This is simply silly. His evidence? That 4C would mean that all the ice on the planet would melt, bringing the long-term sea level rise to 70-80m, flooding everything we hold dear, seeing billions of people die. Clearly, Tickell has maxed out the campaigners’ scare potential (because there is no more ice to melt, this is the scariest he could ever conjure). But he is wrong. Let us just remember that the UN climate panel, the IPCC, expects a temperature rise by the end of the century between 1.8 and 6.0C. Within this range, the IPCC predicts that, by the end of the century, sea levels will rise 18-59 centimetres – Tickell is simply exaggerating by a factor of up to 400. Tickell will undoubtedly claim that he was talking about what could happen many, many millennia from now. But this is disingenuous. First, the 4C temperature rise is predicted on a century scale – this is what we talk about and can plan for. Second, although sea-level rise will continue for many centuries to come, the models unanimously show that Greenland’s ice shelf will be reduced, but Antarctic ice will increase even more (because of increased precipitation in Antarctica) for the next three centuries. What will happen beyond that clearly depends much more on emissions in future centuries. Given that CO2 stays in the atmosphere about a century, what happens with the temperature, say, six centuries from now mainly depends on emissions five centuries from now (where it seems unlikely non-carbon emitting technology such as solar panels will not have become economically competitive). Third, Tickell tells us how the 80m sea-level rise would wipe out all the world’s coastal infrastructure and much of the world’s farmland – “undoubtedly” causing billions to die. But to cause billions to die, it would require the surge to occur within a single human lifespan. This sort of scare tactic is insidiously wrong and misleading, mimicking a firebrand preacher who claims the earth is coming to an end and we need to repent. While it is probably true that the sun will burn up the earth in 4-5bn years’ time, it does give a slightly different perspective on the need for immediate repenting. Tickell’s claim that 4C will be the beginning of our extinction is again many times beyond wrong and misleading, and, of course, made with no data to back it up. Let us just take a look at the realistic impact of such a 4C temperature rise. For the Copenhagen Consensus, one of the lead economists of the IPCC, Professor Gary Yohe, did a survey of all the problems and all the benefits accruing from a temperature rise over this century of about approximately 4C. And yes, there will, of course, also be benefits: as temperatures rise, more people will die from heat, but fewer from cold; agricultural yields will decline in the tropics, but increase in the temperate zones, etc. The model evaluates the impacts on agriculture, forestry, energy, water, unmanaged ecosystems, coastal zones, heat and cold deaths and disease. The bottom line is that benefits from global warming right now outweigh the costs (the benefit is about 0.25% of global GDP). Global warming will continue to be a net benefit until about 2070, when the damages will begin to outweigh the benefits, reaching a total damage cost equivalent to about 3.5% of GDP by 2300. This is simply not the end of humanity. If anything, global warming is a net benefit now; and even in three centuries, it will not be a challenge to our civilisation. Further, the IPCC expects the average person on earth to be 1,700% richer by the end of this century.

# \*\*\*A2 Warming

#### No runaway warming-CO2 PROVIDES AN INSURANCE POLICY AGAINST ABRUPT CLIMATE CHANGE

CO2 Science Magazine 03

(Center for the study of carbon dioxide and global exchange [www.co2science.org](http://www.co2science.org), “Rapid Climate Changes” Reviewed 22 January 2003
<http://www.co2science.org/journal/2003/v6n4c1.htm> WYO/jr)

Although much is made of the role of models in studying "the complex interplay between Dansgaard-Oeschger warm phases and Heinrich cold events," Bard correctly reports that "at present, models coupling the atmosphere, ocean, and ice sheets are still unable to correctly simulate that variability on all scales in both time and space," which suggests we do not fully understand the dynamics of these rapid climate changes.  Indeed, he forcefully notes that "all the studies so far carried out fail to answer the crucial question: How close are we to the next bifurcation [which could cause a rapid change-of-state in earth's climate system]?"  In this regard, he also notes that "an intense debate continues in the modeling community about the reality of such instabilities under warm conditions [our italics]," which is a particularly important point, seeing that all dramatic warming and cooling events have been observed in either full glacial or transitional periods between glacials and interglacials.

This latter real-world fact clearly suggests we are unlikely to experience any dramatic warming or cooling surprises, as long as the earth does not beginning drifting towards glacial conditions, which is but another reason to not be concerned about the ongoing rise in the air's CO2 content.  Indeed, it suggests that more CO2 in the atmosphere and its potential for modest warming are actually to be preferred as a preventive measure or "insurance policy" against unexpected abrupt climate changes.  Interglacial warmth seems to inoculate the planet against climatic instabilities, allowing only the mild millennial-scale climatic oscillation that alternately brings the earth slightly warmer and cooler conditions typical of the Medieval Warm Period and Little Ice Age.  Hence, and in light of the fact that the four preceding interglacials were able to tolerate temperatures fully 2°C *warmer* than those of the current interglacial ([Petit *et al*., 1999](http://www.co2science.org/journal/1999/v2n12c1.htm)), without any adverse climatic consequences, humanity would probably be wise to not surrender the atmospheric CO2 insurance policy we worked so hard to put in place over the course of the Industrial Revolution.

#### Ocean acidification doesn’t prevent shell growth-alt causes put the ocean more at risk

Goreham 2012

[Steve Goreham, a speaker, author, and researcher on environmental issues as well as an engineer and business executive, December 12, 2012, PBS News Hour spreads false Ocean Acidification alarm, <http://polymontana.com/pbs-news-hour-spreads-false-ocean-acidification-alarm/>, uwyo//amp]

But PBS wrongly told viewers that reef degradation was due to warmer ocean temperatures and “ocean acidification,” both allegedly caused by human carbon dioxide emissions. Sreenivasan concluded with, “Time that maybe is running out for coral reefs in Florida and elsewhere.” Scientists, environmental groups, and the United Nations promote the fear of ocean acidification. According to claims, man-made emissions of carbon dioxide are absorbed by the oceans and converted into carbonic acid, thereby changing the chemical balance of the oceans. The basic concept of acidification is correct, but hugely exaggerated. The PBS segment is wrong in several ways. First, while today’s temperatures are the warmest in the last 400 years, oceans were warmer still during the Medieval Warm Period ten centuries ago. Peer-reviewed studies found that both the Gulf of Mexico and nearby Sargasso Sea were warmer about 1000 AD than at present. These warm temperatures were due to natural climatic changes o f Earth―not man-made emissions. Caribbean reefs adapted to these warm seas to remain with us today. Second, the segment paints a misleading picture of carbon dioxide entering the oceans, without providing perspective for the viewer. Sreenivasan interviews scientist Chris Landon who states, “And it’s enough railroad cars stacked end to end to wrap around the earth seven times. That’s how much carbon is going into the ocean every single year.” This sounds alarming, unless you know that the oceans absorb and release about 90 times that amount of CO2 every year from the atmosphere naturally. In addition, carbon dioxide is absorbed by vast deposits of limestone rock in the ocean floor, removing it from sea water. Third, the oceans are alkaline, not acidic. We’re discussing a reduction in alkalinity. Solutions are measured as acidic or alkaline (basic) on a logarithmic 14-point scale, called the pH Scale. Battery acid has a pH of about one, while the base lye has a pH as high as thirteen. Milk is slightly acidic, as are most of the foods we eat. Measured in the open ocean, sea water is alkaline, with a pH of about 8.2. According to computer models, doubling of atmospheric CO2 would decrease ocean pH to about 7.9, still basic, but less so. The concern is that this change would destroy the coral reefs by dissolving the carbonate shells and skeletons of reef creatures. Sreenivasan states, “Acidification acts a lot like osteoporosis does in humans. But in marine animals, it makes their shells and skeletons brittle. The more acidic the water, the harder it is for corals to grow their skeletons.” But, empirical evidence does not show it harder for today’s marine animals to grow their shells. A study of corals at the Great Barrier Reef shows that shell calcium growth rates today are about 25 percent higher than 300‒400 years ago when both ocean temperatures and levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide were lower. Scientists still know little about the alkalinity of today’s ocean or the oceans of past centuries. Ocean pH varies by depth, becoming less basic as one goes deeper. It varies by latitude from the equator to the poles. It varies by location, such as the open ocean, coral reef, or kelp bed. But the PBS segment ignores this uncertainty and implies that the rate of change in ocean pH is alarming. Dr. Langdon states, “What’s really and completely unique about what’s going on now is the rate of change. And that’s what is so difficult for organisms.” However, evidence shows that a high rate of change in ocean alkalinity is natural. A 2011 study by the Scripps Institution of Oceanography found large variations in ocean pH by day, week, and month. Changes in some locations were as high as 0.35 units over the course of a day, higher than computer models are predicting for the next century. Scuba divers know that reef creatures already experience acidic conditions near CO2 vents in the ocean floor. These vents bubble CO2 gas amidst coral reefs and grassy ocean pastures in millions of locations. Fish and reefs appear to be doing quite well near these CO2 vents. The coral reefs in the Caribbean and other seas may be endangered due overfishing, chemical pollution, and human abuse. But let’s not blame reef degradation on misguided fears about global warming.

#### No impact to biodiversity loss – Ecosystems are resilient

Sedjo, 00

Roger A Sedjo 2k, Sr. Fellow, Resources for the Future, Conserving Nature’s Biodiversity: insights from biology, ethics & economics, eds. Van Kooten, Bulte and Sinclair, p 114

As a critical input into the existence of humans and of life on earth, biodiversity obviously has a very high value (at least to humans). But, as with other resource questions, including public goods, biodiversity is not an either/or question, but rather a question of “how much.” Thus, we may argue as to how much biodiversity is desirable or is required for human life (threshold) and how much is desirable (insurance) and at what price, just as societies argue over the appropriate amount and cost of national defense. As discussed by Simpson, the value of water is small even though it is essential to human life, while diamonds are inessential but valuable to humans. The reason has to do with relative abundance and scarcity, with market value pertaining to the marginal unit. This water-diamond paradox can be applied to biodiversity. Although biological diversity is essential, a single species has only limited value, since the global system will continue to function without that species. Similarly, the value of a piece of biodiversity (e.g., 10 ha of tropical forest) is small to negligible since its contribution to the functioning of the global biodiversity is negligible. The global ecosystem can function with “somewhat more” or “somewhat less” biodiversity, since there have been larger amounts in times past and some losses in recent times. Therefore, in the absence of evidence to indicate that small habitat losses threaten the functioning of the global life support system, the value of these marginal habitats is negligible. The “value question” is that of how valuable to the life support function are species at the margin. While this, in principle, is an empirical question, in practice it is probably unknowable. However, thus far, biodiversity losses appear to have had little or no effect on the functioning of the earth’s life support system, presumably due to the resiliency of the system, which perhaps is due to the redundancy found in the system. Through most of its existence, earth has had far less biological diversity. Thus, as in the water-diamond paradox, the value of the marginal unit of biodiversity appears to be very small.

#### THE MODELS USED TO PREDICT THE LOSS OF AGRICULTURE THAT YOU CITE, DO NOT HAVE AN ADEQUATE MEASUREMENT OF MOISTURE – THIS THROWS OFF ANY PREDICTIONS ABOUT LOSSES IN AGRICULTURE

MICHAELS 2004

[Patrick J. Michaels, past president of the American Association of State Climatologists, “Meltdown” CATO Institute 2004 17-18// UW ef + scanner bitch]

Even so, that is where the climate models fall down-in the `aggregate" weather and its consequences. As one example of many. consider the finding of University of Delaware climatologist David Legates, who has demonstrated that the aggregate precipitation produced by GCMs can easily be off by 50 percent, depending upon location. That GCM precipitation is then used as input to a model for vegetation change, but it is in error. Further, the relationship between precipitation and vegetation is not all that clear-some equally wet and warm environments have radically different vegetaEon, depending upon other factors, including soil, drainage, and seasonality of precipitation. The multiplying mess becomes obvious: Because each of these interacting processes is only partially understood, the mathematics for each depends on the choice of the modeling team. As a result, different GCMs produce different patterns, rates, and distributions of warming resulting from human alteration of the atmosphere.

#### No Extinction from disease

Posner 05

[Richard Posner Judge on the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. “Catastrophe: the dozen most significant catastrophic risks and what we can do about them.” http://goliath.ecnext.com/coms2/gi\_0199-4150331/Catastrophe-the-dozen-most-significant.html#abstract]

Yet the **fact that Homo sapiens has managed to survive every disease to assail it in the 200,000 years or so of its existence is a source of genuine comfort**, at least if the focus is on extinction events. **There have been enormously destructive plagues, such as the Black Death, smallpox, and now AIDS, but none has come close to destroying the entire human race**. There is a biological reason. **Natural selection favors germs of limited lethality; they are fitter in an evolutionary sense because their genes are more likely to be spread if the germs do not kill their hosts too quickly. The AIDS virus is an example of a lethal virus**, wholly natural, that by lying dormant yet infectious in its host for years maximizes its spread. **Yet there is no danger that AIDS will destroy the entire human race. The likelihood of a natural pandemic that would cause the extinction of the human race is probably even less today than in the past** (except in prehistoric times, when people lived in small, scattered bands, which would have limited the spread of disease), despite wider human contacts that make it more difficult to localize an infectious disease. **The reason is improvements in medical science.** But the comfort is a small one. Pandemics can still impose enormous losses and resist prevention and cure: the lesson of the AIDS pandemic. And there is always a lust time.

## No War

#### 1. MULTIPLE RESULTS OF NUCLEAR WAR ENSURE PLANETARY EXTINCTION

Badash 2001

[Lawrence, professor of history of science at UC Santa Barbara, “Nuclear Winter: Scientists in the Political Arena,” Physics in Perspective 3, 2001, 92//uwyo-ajl]

Ehrlich and Pavlov emphasized the certainty of the biological and medical consequences, given the dire climatic conditions. There were so many overlapping effects, each one individually capable of massive trauma to plants or animals, that their sum was indeed ‘‘overkill.’’ Toxic smog, ultraviolet-B, lack of photosynthesis, high levels of radioactivity, absence of liquid water, infection, disease, a sudden decrease in the oxygen content of the air (from burning of forests), starvation, and other disturbances to the social and environmental fabric would offer little hope to those who survived the war’s immediate effects.60 Ehrlich compared the certainty of the biological consequences of nuclear war to confidence in predicting the medical consequences of firing a double-barreled shotgun into one’s mouth.61

#### 2. NUCLEAR WAR RISKS ECO-SPHERE COLLAPSE AND EXTINCTION

Schell ‘82

[Jonathan, journalist, *The Fate of the Earth*, 1982]

To say that human extinction is a certainty would, of course, be a misrepresentation – just as it would be a misrepresentation to say that extinction can be ruled out. To begin with, we know tha ta holocaust may not occur at all. If one does occur, the adversaries may not use all their weapons. If they do use all their weapons, the global effects, in the ozone and elsewhere, may be moderate. And if the effects are not moderate but extreme, the ecosphere may prove resilient enough to withstand them without breaking down catastrophically. These are all substantial reasons for supposing that manking will not be extinguished in a nuclear holocaust, or even that extinction in a holocaust is unlikely, and they tend to calm our fear and to reduce our sense of urgency. Yet at the same time, we are compelled to admit that there may be a holocaust, that the adversaries may use all their weapons, that, the global effects, including effects of which we are as yet unaware, may be severe, that the ecosphere may suffer catastrophic breakdown, and that our species may be extinguished. We are left with uncertainty, and are forced to make our decisions in a state of uncertainty. If we wish to act to save our own species, we have to muster our resolve in spite of our awareness that the life of the species may not now in fact be jeopardized. On the other hand, if we wish to ignore the peril, we have to admit that we do so in the knowledge that the species may be in danger ofimminent self-destruction. When the existence of nuclear weapons was made known, thoughtful people everywhere in the world realized that if the great powers entered into a nuclear-arms race the human species would sooner or later face the possiblity of extinction. They also realized that in the absence of internaitonal agreements preventing it an arms race would probably occur. They knew that the path of nuclear armament was a dead end for mankind. The discovery of the energy in mass – of “the basic power of the universe” – and of a means by which man could realease the energy alterned the relationship between man and the source of his life, on earth. In the shadow of this power, the earth became small and the life of the human species doubtful. IN that sense, the question of human extinction has been on thepolitical agenda of the world ever since the first nuclear weapon was detonated, and there was no need for the world to build up its present tremendous arsenals before starting to worry about it. At just what point the species crossed, or will have crossed, the boundary between merely having the technical knowledge to destroy itself and actually having the arsenals at hand, ready to be used at any second, is not precisely knowable. But it is clear at present, with some twenty thousand megatons of nuclear explosive power in existence and with more being added every day, we have entered into the zone of uncertainty, which is to say the zone of extinction. But the mere risk of extinction has a significance that is categorically different from and immeasurably greater than, that of any othe risk, and as we make our decisions we have to take that signficance into account. Up to now, every risk has been contained within the frame of life, extinction would shatter that frame. It represents not the defeat of some purpose but an abyss in which all human purposs would be drowned for all time. We have no right to place the possiblity of this limitless, eternal defeat on the same footing as risks that we run in the ordinary conduct of our affairs in our particular transient moment of human history. To employ a mathematica analogy, we can say that although the risk of extinction may be fractional, the take is, humanly speaking infinite and a fraction of infinity is still infinity. In other words, once we learned the holocaust might lead to extinction we have no right to gamble, because if we lose, the game will be over, and neither we nor anyone else will ever get another chance. Therefore, although scientifically speaking, there is all the difference in the world between the mere possibility that a holocaust will bring about extinction and of the certainty of it, morally they are the same, and we have no chocie but to address the issue of nuclear weapons as though we knew for a certainty that their use would put an end to our speices. In weighing the fate of the earth and, with it, our own fate, we stand before a mystery, and in tampering with the earth we tamper with a  mystery. We are in a deep ignorance. Our ignorance should dispose us to wonder, our wonder should make us humble, our humility should inspire us to reverence and caution, and our reverence and caution should lead us to act without delay to withdraw the threat we now pose to the earth and ourselves.

#### Great power conflict is possible – resource conflicts, environmental crises and rising powers could spark global war

Dyer, 6

Gwynne Dyer is a London-based independent journalist, 'Has the world really changed since 9/11?,' September 7, http://www.straight.com/has-the-world-really-changed-since-9-11

Without 9/11 there would still be a “terrorist threat”, of course, because there is always some terrorism. It's rarely a big enough threat to justify expanding police powers, let alone launching a “global war” against it, but the fluke success of the 9/11 attacks (which has not been duplicated once in the subsequent five years) created the illusion that terrorism was a major problem. Various special interests climbed aboard the bandwagon, and off we all went. That is a pity, because without 9/11 there would have been no governments justifying torture in the name of fighting terrorism, no “special renditions”, no camps like GuantÃ¡namo. Tens of thousands of people killed in the various invasions of the past five years would still be alive, and western countries with large Muslim minorities would not now face a potential terrorist backlash at home from their own disaffected young Muslims. The United States would not be seen by most of the world as a rogue state. But that's as far as the damage goes. Current U.S. policy and the hostility it arouses elsewhere in the world are both transient things. The Sunni Muslim extremists””they would call themselves Salafis””who were responsible for 9/11 have not seized power in a single country since then, despite the boost they were given by the flailing U.S. response to that attack. The world is actually much the same as it would have been if 9/11 had never happened. Economically, 9/11 and its aftermath have had almost no discernible long-term impact: even the soaring price of oil is mostly due to rising demand in Asia, not to military events in the Middle East. The lack of decisive action on climate change is largely due to Bush policies that were already in place before 9/11. And, strategically, the relations between the great powers have not yet been gravely damaged by the U.S. response to 9/11. There may even be a hidden benefit in the concept of a “war on terror”. It is a profoundly dishonest concept, since it is actually directed mainly against Muslim groups that have grievances against the great powers: Chechens against Russia, Uyghurs against China, Kashmiri Muslims and their Pakistani cousins against India, and practically everybody in the Arab world against the U.S. and Britain. The terrorists' methods are reprehensible but their grievances are often real. However, the determination of the great powers to oppose not only their methods but their goals is also real. That gives them a common enemy and a shared strategy. The main risk at this point in history is that the great powers will drift back into some kind of alliance confrontation. Key resources are getting scarcer, the climate is changing MARKED, and the rise of China and India means that the pecking order of the great powers is due to change again in the relatively near future. Any strategic analyst worth his salt, given those preconditions, could draw you up a dozen different scenarios of disaster by lunchtime.

#### Great power wars are possible – specific scenarios, especially regional conflicts, could spark WWIII

Bosco, 6

David, senior editor at Foreign Policy magazine, 'Could This Be the Start of World War III?,' July 23, http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/sunday/commentary/la-op-bosco23jul23,0,6188365.story?coll=la-sunday-commentary

The understanding that small but violent acts can spark global conflagration is etched into the world's consciousness. The reverberations from Princip's shots in the summer of 1914 ultimately took the lives of more than 10 million people, shattered four empires and dragged more than two dozen countries into war. This hot summer, as the world watches the violence in the Middle East, the awareness of peace's fragility is particularly acute. The bloodshed in Lebanon appears to be part of a broader upsurge in unrest. Iraq is suffering through one of its bloodiest months since the U.S.-led invasion in 2003. Taliban militants are burning schools and attacking villages in southern Afghanistan as the United States and NATO struggle to defend that country's fragile government. Nuclear-armed India is still cleaning up the wreckage from a large terrorist attack in which it suspects militants from rival Pakistan. The world is awash in weapons, North Korea and Iran are developing nuclear capabilities, and long-range missile technology is spreading like a virus. Some see the start of a global conflict. "We're in the early stages of what I would describe as the Third World War," former House Speaker Newt Gingrich said last week. Certain religious websites are abuzz with talk of Armageddon. There may be as much hyperbole as prophecy in the forecasts for world war. But it's not hard to conjure ways that today's hot spots could ignite. Consider the following scenarios: • Targeting Iran: As Israeli troops seek out and destroy Hezbollah forces in southern Lebanon, intelligence officials spot a shipment of longer-range Iranian missiles heading for Lebanon. The Israeli government decides to strike the convoy and Iranian nuclear facilities simultaneously. After Iran has recovered from the shock, Revolutionary Guards surging across the border into Iraq, bent on striking Israel's American allies. Governments in Syria, Jordan, Egypt and Saudi Arabia face violent street protests demanding retribution against Israel — and they eventually yield, triggering a major regional war. • Missiles away: With the world's eyes on the Middle East, North Korea's Kim Jong Il decides to continue the fireworks show he began earlier this month. But this time his brinksmanship pushes events over the brink. A missile designed to fall into the sea near Japan goes astray and hits Tokyo, killing a dozen civilians. Incensed, the United States, Japan's treaty ally, bombs North Korean missile and nuclear sites. North Korean artillery batteries fire on Seoul, and South Korean and U.S. troops respond. Meanwhile, Chinese troops cross the border from the north to stem the flow of desperate refugees just as U.S. troops advance from the south. Suddenly, the world's superpower and the newest great power are nose to nose. • Loose nukes: Al Qaeda has had Pakistani President Pervez Musharraf in its sights for years, and the organization finally gets its man. Pakistan descends into chaos as militants roam the streets and the army struggles to restore order. India decides to exploit the vacuum and punish the Kashmir-based militants it blames for the recent Mumbai railway bombings. Meanwhile, U.S. special operations forces sent to secure Pakistani nuclear facilities face off against an angry mob. • The empire strikes back: Pressure for democratic reform erupts in autocratic Belarus. As protesters mass outside the parliament in Minsk, president Alexander Lukashenko requests Russian support. After protesters are beaten and killed, they appeal for help, and neighboring Poland — a NATO member with bitter memories of Soviet repression — launches a humanitarian mission to shelter the regime's opponents. Polish and Russian troops clash, and a confrontation with NATO looms. As in the run-up to other wars, there is today more than enough tinder lying around to spark a great power conflict. The critical question is how effective the major powers have become at managing regional conflicts andpreventing them from escalating. After two world wars and the decades-long Cold War, what has the world learned about managing conflict? The end of the Cold War had the salutary effect of dialing down many regional conflicts. In the 1960s and 1970s, every crisis in the Middle East had the potential to draw in the superpowers in defense of their respective client states. The rest of the world was also part of the Cold War chessboard. Compare the almost invisible U.N. peacekeeping mission in Congo today to the deeply controversial mission there in the early 1960s. (The Soviets were convinced that the U.N. mission was supporting a U.S. puppet, and Russian diplomats stormed out of several Security Council meetings in protest.) From Angola to Afghanistan, nearly every Cold War conflict was a proxy war. Now, many local crises can be handed off to the humanitarians or simply ignored. But the end of the bipolar world has a downside. In the old days, the two competing superpowers sometimes reined in bellicose client states out of fear that regional conflicts would escalate. Which of the major powers today can claim to have such influence over Tehran or Pyongyang?

# Warming false

#### SMRs can’t solve warming – they take too long

Makhijani 10

[ARJUN MAKHIJANI, electrical and nuclear engineer who is President of the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research MICHELE BOYD, former director of the Safe Energy Program at Physicians for Social Responsibility, Small Modular Reactors No Solution for the Cost, Safety, and Waste Problems of Nuclear Power,”http://www.psr.org/nuclear-bailout/resources/small-modular-reactors-no.pdf, September, \\wyo-bb]

Not a climate solution Efficiency and most renewable technologies are already cheaper than new large reactors. The long time—a decade or more—that it will take to certify SMRs will do little or nothing to help with the global warming problem and will actually complicate current efforts underway. For example, the current schedule for commercializing the above-ground sodium cooled reactor in Japan extends to 2050, making it irrelevant to addressing the climate problem. Relying on assurances that SMRs will be cheap is contrary to the experience about economies of scale and is likely to waste time and money, while creating new safety and proliferation risks, as well as new waste disposal problems.

#### Warming not real/anthropogenic- IPCC predictions fail and rely on faulty computer models – even if they win that the earth is warming, the rate is too slow to trigger their impacts

Bast & Taylor ‘11

[Joseph and James, CEO of the Heartland Institute, author of Rebuilding America’s Schools, Why We Spend Too Much on Health Care, Eco-Sanity: A Common-Sense Guide to Environmentalism, Education & Capitalism, Climate Change Reconsidered, and The Patriot’s Toolbox, and managing editor of Environment & Climate News, Senior Fellow for The Heartland Institute, bachelor degree from Dartmouth College and law degree from the Syracuse University College of Law, “Global Warming: Not a Crisis,” The Heartland Institute, 8.2.11., http://heartland.org/ideas/global-warming-not-crisis) //wyo-hdm]

How Much Warming? NASA satellite data recorded since 1979 allow us to check the accuracy of claims that the past three decades have been warming at an alarming rate. The data show a warming rate of 0.123 degrees C per decade. This is considerably less than what land-based temperature stations report during the same time period, and which are relied on by the IPCC (Christy, 2009). If the Earth’s temperature continues to rise at the rate of the past three decades, the planet would see only 1.23 degrees C warming over the course of an entire century. Most climate scientists, even “skeptics,” acknowledge that rising CO2 concentrations in the atmosphere would, all other things held constant, cause some small amount of warming. Alarmists claim that small amount will trigger increases in the amount of moisture in the atmosphere, which in turn will cause further warming. But other scientists have found no evidence of rising levels of moisture in those areas of the atmosphere where the models claim it should be found. Without this “amplification,” there is no global warming crisis (Singer, 2011). While the global climate warmed slightly during the 1980s and 1990s, it has not warmed at all since 2000, and there is some evidence that a cooling trend has begun (Taylor, 2007). This contradicts the predictions of the IPCC and poses a challenge to the theory that CO2 concentrations play a major role in global temperature trends. It confirms the views of many less-politicized climate scientists who acknowledge that the global climate is always warming or cooling (Michaels, 2005; Christy, 2006). The scientific community’s lack of certainty about future climate trends is rooted in the shortcomings of computer models. These models are the centerpiece of the IPCC’‘s reports, yet it is widely recognized that they fail to account for changes in precipitation, water vapor, and clouds that are likely to occur in a warmer world. It is a case of “garbage in, garbage out.” If we cannot predict how much warming will occur, how can we claim that continued human emissions of greenhouse gases is harmful?

#### More evidence:

####  historic warming trends occurred without CO2 emissions- roman era proves

Waugh ‘12

[Rob, Columnist Archive for MailOnline, “Tree-rings prove climate was WARMER in Roman and Medieval times than it is now - and world has been cooling for 2,000 years”, 11.7.12., Mail Online, <<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-2171973/Tree-ring-study-proves-climate-WARMER-Roman-Medieval-times-modern-industrial-age.html>> //wyo-hdm]

Rings in fossilised pine trees have proven that the world was much warmer than previously thought - and the earth has been slowly COOLING for 2,000 years. Measurements stretching back to 138BC prove that the Earth is slowly cooling due to changes in the distance between the Earth and the sun. The finding may force scientists to rethink current theories of the impact of global warming. It is the first time that researchers have been able to accurately measure trends in global temperature over the last two millennia. Over that time, the world has been getting cooler - and previous estimates, used as the basis for current climate science, are wrong. Their findings demonstrate that this trend involves a cooling of -0.3°C per millennium due to gradual changes to the position of the sun and an increase in the distance between the Earth and the sun. ‘This figure we calculated may not seem particularly significant,’ says Esper, ‘however, it is also not negligible when compared to global warming, which up to now has been less than 1°C. 'Our results suggest that the large-scale climate reconstruction shown by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) likely underestimate this long-term cooling trend over the past few millennia.’ The finding was based on semi-fossilised tree rings found in Finnish MARKEDlapland. Professor Dr. Jan Esper's group at the Institute of Geography at JGU used tree-ring density measurements from sub-fossil pine trees originating from Finnish Lapland to produce a reconstruction reaching back to 138 BC. In so doing, the researchers have been able for the first time to precisely demonstrate that the long-term trend over the past two millennia has been towards climatic cooling. ‘We found that previous estimates of historical temperatures during the Roman era and the Middle Ages were too low,’ says Esper. ‘Such findings are also significant with regard to climate policy, as they will influence the way today's climate changes are seen in context of historical warm periods.’ The annual growth rings in trees are the most important witnesses over the past 1,000 to 2,000 years as they indicate how warm and cool past climate conditions were.

### 2NC- No ! Ocean Acid

#### No impact- incorrect models disprove the impact and the ocean has become for less alkaline before- the ocean and Earth survived

Ball 2011

[Dr. Tim Ball, Ph.D. (Doctor of Science), Queen Mary College, University of London (England), 1982, May 10, 2011, Analysis of Alarmism: Ocean Acidification, http://drtimball.com/2011/analysis-of-alarmism-ocean-acidification/, uwyo//amp]

The claim of ocean acidification is based on estimates and computer models; these use the very questionable pre-industrial atmospheric level of CO2 to calculate an increase of about 0.1 pH units. Of course, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) attributes the CO2 increase to human production, which is wrong because the global carbon cycle is very vague about sources, storage and length of time in each condition. For example, the error in the estimate of CO2 from the oceans each year is greater than the total human contribution. The idea that a 0.1 pH unit increase is significant is ludicrous when the estimate has a range of 0.3 units. There is a subtle but important point here, because words are part of the scare component. Even if you accept the claimed change it, is not acidification; it is proper to say the solution is becoming less alkaline, but that doesn’t sound threatening. More problematic is the validity of the measures Although pH in seawater has been measured for many decades, a reliable long-term trend of ocean water pH cannot be established due to data quality issues, in particular the lack of strict and stable calibration procedures and standards. Moreover, seawater pH is very sensitive to temperature, and temperature is not always recorded or measured at sufficient accuracy to constrain the pH measurement. Even if CO2 increases to 560 ppm by 2050 as the IPCC predict, it would only result in a 0.2 unit reduction of pH. This is still within the error of the estimate of global average. What is the Real Threat? So what is threatened by this reduced alkalinity? Most marine life, if you read all the stories; but scare stories need one issue people view positively. Coral fits the bill well because the underwater scenes of color and diversity of life mesmerize us all. According to the experts, ocean acidification may render most regions of the ocean inhospitable to coral reefs by 2050, if atmospheric CO2 levels continue to increase. It could lead to substantial changes in commercial fish stocks, threatening food security for millions of people as well as the multi-billion dollar fishing industry. Scares require dramatic change beyond any previously recorded: Ocean acidification is more rapid than ever in the history of the earth and if you look at the pCO2 (partial pressure of carbon dioxide) levels we have reached now, you have to go back 35 million years in time to find the equivalents. Scares also require an impending critical point beyond which remedial action is useless. This so-called “tipping point” is currently estimated to allow a drop of about 0.2 pH units, a value that could be reached in as near as 30 years. It is no surprise the author of these outrageous and incorrect remarks is chair of the EuroCLIMATE program Scientific Committee. A plot of CO2 levels over the last 600 million years shows current levels are very low at 385 ppm. Figure 1: Average global temperature The only period in 600 million years when CO2 levels were equal to the present was over 300 million years ago. Since that time CO2 levels averaged 1000 to 1200 ppm or 3 to 4 times current levelsMARKED. How did the plant and animal life survive those levels? It makes a mockery of the claim that even a doubling of atmospheric CO2 is a problem. More recent measures of pH levels show how current levels and claimed changes are well within natural variability. Here is a reconstruction of pH levels for the South China Seas by Liu et al (2009) that illustrates the point.

# No War

## #2 Ext: Nuclear War Kills Ecosystem

## 1 Ext: Nuclear War = Extinction

#### FIRST, EXTEND THE BADASH 2001 EVIDENCE. NUCLEAR WAR CAUSES SO MUCH OVERLAPPING SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL TRAUMA, INCLUDING SMOG, UV-B, RADIATION, DROUGHT, DISEASE, OXYGEN DEPLETION, AND STARVATION THAT EXINCTION IS INEVITABLE.

IF WE WIN A CHANCE OF ANY TWO FEATURES OCCURRING, YOU VOTE ON THAT RISK BECAUSE WE’RE ALL DEAD BEFORE THEY GET A MINDET SHIFT

#### SECOND, NUCLEAR WAR GUARANTEES EXTINCTION [5 REASONS]

1. ESCALATION
2. BLAST
3. THERMAL PULSE
4. FALLOUT
5. TEMPERATURE DROP

ELIAS (PhD, Engineering @ U.C. Berkeley) 1990

[George Henry, Breakout Into Space: Mission for a Generation, Morrow & Co, New York 33-4//mac-tjc]

We are inexorably drawn to the conclusion that this generation or the next few ones may be the last to enjoy the riches of the world. Once the mass killing of a nuclear holocaust has begun, it is hard to imagine what force could hold the world back from all-out destruction. We will die either because of the blast, the thermal pulse, or the lingering radiation. Fallout will also kill the rest of life. Mammals, birds, and trees will be among the first to die. Some of the most vicious species of insects will survive, because they have very high tolerances for radiation. The remnants of humanity not destroyed by the blast, the heat, or the radiation will not survive the prolonged drop in global temperatures. Scientists are convinced that a deadly "nuclear winter" will result from the huge dust clouds a nuclear war will throw into the atmosphere. Mankind will become extinct.

#### FIRST, EXTEND THE SCHELL ’82 EVIDENCE. NUCLEAR WAR DESTROYS ENOUGH LINKAGES TO CAUSE ECOSYSTEM COLLAPSE. THAT OUTWEIGHS ANY OTHER IMPACT BECAUSE IT SHATTERS THE FRAME OF MORAL REFERENCE

#### SECOND, THIS MEANS WE HAVE FASTER INROADS TO ANY ECOCIDE OFFENSE AND YOU VOTE ON A RISK OF OUR EXTERNAL OFFENSE

#### THIRD, NUCLEAR WAR WOULD DESTROY GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY

Greene et al ‘85

[Owen, Expert on Security issues, Director of Bradford U. Centre for Int’l Coop and Security, Arms Consultant to UN and EU, Ian Percival, Phys Prof, & Irene Ridge, Biologist, *Nuclear Winter: The Evidence and the Risks,* New York: Polity Press, 1985, 92-3//uwyo-ajl]

Food supplies energy, which all living things need just to stay alive, let alone grow. So if the flow of energy from the providers (plants) to the consumers (animals) is suddenly decreased, animals starve. Beefsteak comes from cows that eat grass; lions eat herbivores such as zebras that eat grass; and even sperm whales feed on krill that consume marine algal plants. All these food chains depend ultimately on the growing plant and human food chains are no different. This is why the chapter begins by examingin the effects of a nuclear winter on plant growth.

Plant survival can depend just as strongly on animals as the other way around. Plants need a fertile soil in order to grow, and soil animals, sucha as earthworms, play a vital role in maintaining fertility; seed must be set in order to produce a new generation, and many flowers depend on insects for pollination. The interactions are many, complex and delicate, easily upset by quite small changes in the environment and, therefore, very vulnerable to the massive disruption that nuclear war and nuclear winter would cause. Later in the chapter we try to assess what the effects of this disruption might be.

# GPWs possible

#### Interdependence, the spread of democracy, technological advances, and the unthinkable nature of nuclear war are not deterrents against great power conflict-this thinking reflects a trend that denies the warfare and violence that have continued despite such conditions

Kagan 2012

[Robert Kagan, Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution, The World America Made, 2012 uwyo//amp]

What gave such weight to all the arguments for a new and permanent peace was the fact that by the first decade of the twentieth century, there had been no war between great powers for almost four decades.47 To those who recalled the nearly constant great-power warfare of previous centuries, this was an astonishingly long era of peace. Instead of viewing it as an interlude, people naturally came to see it as a permanent condition. Something had changed fundamentally. Humankind had evolved and reached a new plateau. We now know this judgment, which seemed so sensible at the time, was mistaken. The outbreak of World War I, the most deadly and destructive war in history, a mere four years after Angell's best seller, revealed a failure of imagination on the part of an entire generation. They simply were not able to imagine that national leaders would behave irrationally, ….that they would sacrifice economic interests, even bankrupt their treasuries, out of a combination of ambition and fear, that they would view territory as a worthy object of war, that they would use all the horrible weapons at their disposal without a second thought—in violation of international agreements whose ink had barely dried—and that in all this they would have behind them the enthusiastic support of their people stirred by a very un-cosmopolitan nationalist pride. Today we suffer from a similar lack of imagination. Once again the conventional wisdom is that great-power conflict is "literally unthinkable." Even the arguments are the same: economic interdependence, globalization, the irrelevance of territory, the spread of democracy, the unthinkable destructiveness of war in the nuclear age, the belief that nations and peoples have become "socialized" to favor peace over war, that they value life more and feel greater empathy for others—all these have made great-power war irrational and therefore impossible. And, adding force to these arguments, once again, is the long peace we have enjoyed, the remarkable six decades without great-power conflict. Yet we have less excuse than our forebears to believe that humankind has reached a new level of enlightenment. The optimists of the early twentieth century had not witnessed two world wars, the genocides, and the other horrors of our supposedly advanced era. They had not witnessed the rise of Nazism and fascism. We have seen it all and, in historical terms, quite recently. It was just seven decades ago that the United States was at war with imperial Japan, Nazi Germany, and fascist Italy. It was just thirty-five years ago that Henry Kissinger asked Americans to accommodate themselves to the perma nent reality of Soviet power, with its thousands of nuclear warheads aimed at American and European cities and thousands of American warheads aimed at Russia. The twentieth century was the bloodiest in all history, and we are but a dozen years into the twenty-first. It is premature for us to conclude, after ten thousand years of war, that a few decades and some technological innovations would change the nature of man and the nature of international relations.