#### Experts agree multiple scenarios for global war in the future

#### Chernoivanova 11 (RIA Novosti commentator Alina Chernoivanova citing Moscow State Institute of International Relations, 28/04/2011, http://en.rian.ru/analysis/20110428/163758009.html)

The Caucasus, the Middle East, Central Asia, Asia-Pacific – these regions command the attention of military experts and diplomats. Where are the geopolitical fault lines in today’s world, and where can we expect military conflict tomorrow? How likely is a third world war, and will it be a nuclear war? How can we prevent the destruction of civilization? These were among the questions addressed by experts at the round table discussion “Military Concepts and Challenges of the 21st Century,” organized by the magazine Mezhdunarodnaya Zhizn (International Affairs), and held at the Moscow State Institute of International Relations on April 26. Classifying wars Before one can talk about the likelihood of armed conflict, one should define what armed conflict consists of in today’s world. The average person thinks war is tanks and airplanes. But wars come in all shapes and sizes. At the round table, First Vice President of the Academy of Geopolitical Problems Konstantin Sivkov said that armed conflicts are classified by Russia’s Institute of Military-Strategic Studies according to causes, geography, duration and the number of troops involved. At the low end of the classification system are border conflicts that last from a week to a month, requiring about 10,000-50,000 troops. Next come armed conflicts involving about 100,000 and lasting from a month to several years. This is followed by local wars, which involve at least one million troops (incidentally, this is the projected size of the Russian armed forces after the reform process) and last from several months to several years. A regional war involves 5-6 million people. The Great Patriotic War (i.e. the Eastern Front of WWII) falls into this category. Finally, at the other extreme of the classification system is the world war. “In terms of its structure, a world war can involve a number of regional and local wars and armed conflicts, or simply local wars and armed conflicts in a considerable portion of the world’s territory,” Sivkov explained. Future hot spots Based on a similar taxonomy of armed conflicts and existing disputes in the world, military experts predict probable threats. It is important to emphasize that this is just a long-term forecast. There are no predictions about exact dates or any guarantees that these events will come to pass. “Existing disputes show that there is potential for war,” Sivkov said. In his opinion, there is a fifty-fifty chance of a local war in the Middle East (the military operation in Libya being a vivid example). Experts cannot rule out that the United States will opt for a military strike against Iran, although most likely it would not initiate the war but rather would be part of a NATO peacekeeping force operating in highly probable conflicts between Iran and Israel or Iran and Saudi Arabia. “In any event there will be a showdown between Iran and the United States sooner or later,” said Grigory Tishchenko, head of the defense policy department at the Russian Institute of Strategic Studies. Armed conflicts could break out in Central Asia, drawing in Russia, who will act in support of its allies in the region. Head of the Military Forecast Center Anatoly Tsyganok believes that “a conflict over water is possible in the region in the next three to five years.” Tishchenko noted that “a change in the region’s leaders” is just around the corner. “It is quite possible that this process will not be peaceful, all the more so since Central Asian countries already find themselves in a conflict over the Fergana Valley, which is the region’s only bread basket,” he explained, adding that “the Afghan conflict could also spread to Central Asia.” Speaking about Russia’s neighbors, Tishchenko noted that the situation in Transdnestria could escalate. “It is difficult to predict the consequences of the current Romanization of Moldova. For instance, the EU is already willing to introduce its peacekeepers in Transdnestria but its troops have not yet proven themselves anywhere. It is very hard to say whether they will cope with a possible escalation in Transdnestria,” he explained. Armed conflict is also likely in the Caucasus. “No doubt, Nagorno-Karabakh may become a bone of contention,” Tishchenko said. “Azerbaijan is actively developing its foreign policy concepts and building up troops. Armenia, where we have a military base, is acting in the same manner.” Tsyganok added: “The most interesting aspect to this is that Russia has no dispute with either Azerbaijan or Armenia, and we don’t have a clue as to what we will do if tensions in Nagorno-Karabakh spill over.” Sivkov believes that an armed conflict or local war is also likely in Asia-Pacific, in particular between Cambodia and Thailand. In his opinion, similar local conflicts in different parts of the world are the result of a changing world and the formation of a new world order. “There is no case in history of a new world order taking shape without a war,” Sivkov said. “A new world order came into being twice – in the early 20th century as a result of WWI and in mid-century as a result of WWII,” he explained. Is war inevitable? With time, humanity has learned how to resolve conflicts more or less peacefully. But a conflict-free world is a utopia. Disputes between countries are inevitable, just as they are between people. Now experts identify three types of disputes or divisions that can provoke armed conflicts at different levels. First there are internal divisions within a state, which are primarily caused by two factors. The first is socio-economic in nature (divisions between the upper and lower classes over the distribution of material wealth). This division becomes acute when the incomes of the wealthiest 10% exceed those of the poorest 10% by more than 15 times over,” Sivkov said, adding that in Russia this threshold has long been passed. The other factor is ethnic, cultural and religious tensions, which can be found in Russia and other countries, particularly in the United States. Then there are regional disputes, for instance the territorial disputes between Russia and China, China and India, Russia and Japan, India and Pakistan. There are internal divisions in the Arab world, between Iran and the Arabs and between North and South America. Such disputes could easily boil over into regional conflicts. Finally, there are global divisions, first among them being the division between the scale of production and consumption and the Earth’s resources that are left at the disposal of humanity, which puts at stake the entire direction of civilization’s development,” Sivkov said. He believes that this division is antagonistic because it can only be resolved by one of two options – either by restricting consumption or by changing the social system. The second division is caused by the disproportionate distribution of production capacity and raw materials. “Some countries have high tech production, whereas others are rich in raw materials. The inadequate exchange between them is enriching some and impoverishing others,” Sivkov explained. “There are two ways of resolving it – either leave some countries in a subordinate position or establish a fair distribution of revenue, which will impoverish other countries without changing their social system.” The third global division that is playing an increasing role is between “the immorality of the free market and the spiritual values of traditional civilizations – Muslim, Orthodox Christianity and others,” Sivkov said. “This division gives rise to that volatile mass of future militants and suicide bombers. The current market is incompatible with the spiritual values of traditional civilizations. And the new globalized world is trying to decide whom to join – the free market or the traditional civilizations,” Sivkov said. Finally, there is the division between the “financial bubble” and the real economy. “This division played a significant role in Hitler’s rise to power in 1933. This is why Henry Ford kept a small bust of Hitler on his desk,” Sivkov said. “This is the division between financial and industrial capital, and to resolve it one form of capital must be subordinate to the other.” Third global reality None of the experts at the round table believe that any of the world powers is likely to launch a premeditated aggressive war, including a nuclear attack. Fortunately, not only civilized countries but the rest of the world understands the consequences of such a war. However, a new world war could start uncontrollably, as a “natural escalation of local or regional conflicts into large-scale hostilities,” Sivkov said, adding that the likelihood of such a war is low. The use of weapons of mass destruction would be the final stage of such a global war. If unleashed, a new world war would have catastrophic consequences. In his time, Winston Churchill cautioned that “the Stone Age may return on the gleaming wings of science.” Now experts are more specific. They maintain that a new world war could last from 6-7 to 25-30 years and involve more than 100 million people on both sides. The aggregate human losses could exceed several hundred million. Experts emphasize that the forecast of probable armed conflicts is important not so much as a means of preparing national armies for hostilities. Militaries have long ceased initiating wars. Only politicians or “captains of the economy,” as Sivkov put it, are capable of preventing the unavoidable divisions in the world from escalating into a world war.

#### Yes Escalation despite deterrence – multiple warrants overcome

Moore 5 (Carol, has written for small publications including various LP state newsletters and LPNEWS, Liberty magazine, GNOMES, Lumpiness catalog, Laissez-faire Review, In Context, The Peacemaker, The NonViolent Activist, The Green Letter, Freedom Network News, Association of Libertarian Feminists News, etc., also wrote introductions to reprints of books by Karl Hess and Clearance Arrow, was the editor of the newsletter DECENTRALIZE! (1985-90) and of “Free Spirit,” found in NY Times, NY Post, Los Angeles Times, Washington City Paper and Washington Post, “SIX ESCALATION SCENARIOS SPIRALING TO WORLD NUCLEAR WAR” http://www.carolmoore.net/nuclearwar/alternatescenarios.html#scenario2)

A world nuclear war is one that involves most or all nuclear powers releasing a large proportion of their nuclear weapons at targets in nuclear, and perhaps non-nuclear, states. Such a war could be initiated accidentally, aggressively or pre-emptively and could continue and spread through these means or by retaliation by a party attacked by nuclear weapons. While some speak of "limited nuclear war," it is likely that any nuclear war will quickly escalate and spiral out of control because of the "use them or loose them" strategy. If you don't use all your nuclear weapons you are likely to have them destroyed by the enemy's nuclear weapons. Such a war could start through a reaction to terrorist attacks, or through the need to protect against overwhelming military opposition, or through the use of small battle field tactical nuclear weapons meant to destroy hardened targets. It might quickly move on to the use of strategic nuclear weapons delivered by short-range or inter-continental missile or long-range bomber. These could deliver high altitude bursts whose electromagnetic pulse knocks out electrical circuits for hundreds of square miles. Or they could deliver nuclear bombs to destroys nuclear and/or non-nuclear military facilities, nuclear power plants, important industrial sites and cities. Or it could skip all those steps and start through the accidental or reckless use of strategic weapons. Below are seven scenarios by which world nuclear war could come about. While these are some of the major scenarios and combination of attacks and retaliations, they are hardly exhaustive. U.S., Russian and other nuclear nations' weapons strategizers deal with these scenarios every day but rarely let mere citizens in on their grizzly thinking. Citizens must end their denial and become aware of such scenarios. GENERAL SCENARIOS Accidental: Since the United States and Russia have "launch on warning" systems that send off rockets before it is confirmed a nuclear attack is underway, any tensions between them can lead to massive nuclear war within thirty minutes of a warning -- no matter how false the warning may be. Aggressive: One or more nations decides to use weapons against nuclear or non-nuclear nations in order to promote an economic, political or military goal, as part of an ongoing war or as a first strike nuclear attack. (The state , of course, may claim it is a pre-emptive, retaliatory or even accidental attack.) Pre-emptive: One or more nations believes (correctly or incorrectly) or claims to believe that another nuclear nation is about to use nuclear weapons against its nuclear, military, industrial or civilian targets and pre-emptively attacks that nation. May result from political or military "brinkmanship." Retaliatory: Use of nuclear weapons in response to a nuclear attack -- or even a conventional, chemical or biological attack by a non-nuclear nation. ASSUMPTIONS OF THESE SCENARIOS There is a whole body of knowledge and assumptions that is taken into account when putting together scenarios like the below. My bottom line assumption is that any nuclear exchange has an excellent chance of resulting in a series of escalations that will spiral out of control, setting off a round of exchanges among various enemies under a "use it or lose it" philosophy, as well as among the treaty allies of the relevant nuclear powers and their allies. This continues until most of the planets' 20,000 odd nuclear weapons are exhausted. In making "limited nuclear war" calculations all nations should assume "whatever can go wrong, will go wrong." Unfortunately, too many strategizers assume they can conduct limited strikes and keep them limited. Related assumptions include: \*\* Any nuclear attack on a primary Russian target like Moscow, St. Petersburg, or nuclear command headquarters, by any nation or group, known or unknown, could lead to a commander turning on "The Dead Hand" strategy and/or prompt one or more of Russia’s semi-autonomous military field commanders to retaliate against U.S. and European nuclear targets. Attacks on secondary targets or nuclear detonations very close to Russian soil also might lead to some sort of nuclear escalation. \*\* Any nuclear attack on US and/or European sites by any nation or group, known or unknown, probably will result in massive US and/or European retaliation against the known or assumed perpetrators or their known or assumed allies. \*\* It is likely that the U.S., Russia, China, Israel, India and Pakistan will use some of their weapons to attack other nuclear and non-nuclear nations which might threaten them after they have been devastated by nuclear war. \*\* Any nuclear attack on Israel by terrorists, or Pakistan, Russia or China will result in Israel’s surviving land, air and submarine carried or based missiles being used against Arab and Muslim capitals. A particularly devastating attack (including with chemical or biological weapons) might result in possibly in a full scale "Samson Option" attack on European and Russian targets. The latter of course would result in Russian retaliation against the United States, perhaps its punishment for not having done enough to protect Israel. \*\* Any nation's use of nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear nation will be only somewhat less inflammatory than using them against a nuclear nation, especially if that nation has many treaty allies. It will ratchet all nuclear nations alert systems and lead to unforeseeable consequences that could easily spiral to world nuclear war.

#### There will be a domino effect – culminates in extinction regardless of nuclear winter

Hirsch 5 (Jorge, Professor of Physics who writes extensively on nuclear issues, Nov 21, 2005, “Can a Nuclear Strike on Iran Be Prevented?” http://www.antiwar.com/orig/hirsch.php?articleid=8089)

However, even in the best-case scenario, the long-term consequences are dire. The nuclear threshold will have been crossed by a nuclear superpower against a non-nuclear country. Many more countries will rush to get their own nuclear weapons as a deterrent. With no taboo against the use of nuclear weapons, they will certainly be used again. Nuclear conflicts will occur within the next 10 to 20 years, and will escalate until much of the world is destroyed. Let us remember that the destructive power of existing nuclear arsenals is approximately one million times that of the Hiroshima bomb, enough to erase Earth's population many times over.

#### Nuclear war and following winter

SGR 3 (Scientists for Global Responsibility, Newsletter, “Does anybody remember the Nuclear Winter?” July 27, 2003, http://www.sgr.org.uk/climate/NuclearWinter\_NL27.htm)

Obviously, when a nuclear bomb hits a target, it causes a massive amount of devastation, with the heat, blast and radiation killing tens or hundreds of thousands of people instantly and causing huge damage to infrastructure. But in addition to this, a nuclear explosion throws up massive amounts of dust and smoke. For example, a large nuclear bomb bursting at ground level would throw up about a million tonnes of dust. As a consequence of a nuclear war, then, the dust and the smoke produced would block out a large fraction of the sunlight and the sun's heat from the earth's surface, so it would quickly become be dark and cold - temperatures would drop by something in the region of 10-20ºC - many places would feel like they were in an arctic winter. It would take months for the sunlight to get back to near normal. The drop in light and temperature would quickly kill crops and other plant and animal life while humans, already suffering from the direct effects of the war, would be vulnerable to malnutrition and disease on a massive scale. In the case of an (e.g.) accidental nuclear exchange between the USA and Russia, the main effects would be felt in the northern hemisphere, as the dust and smoke would quickly circulate across this area. But even in this case, it would soon affect the tropics - where crops and other plant/ animal life are especially sensitive to cold. Hence, even in these areas there would be major problems

**Forced inbreeding after the war**

**Bochkov in ‘84**

(Academician, Member of the Medical Academy of Sciences and Director of the Institute of Genetics at the USSR Academy of Sciences, “The Cold and the Dark: The World After Nuclear War”, p. 141-142)

Academician Bochkov: When we talk about the ecological and biological consequences of a nuclear war, we are of course focusing on humankind. Thus, in thinking about the possibilities of human survival after a nuclear catastrophe, we should not be afraid to reach the conclusion that the conditions that would prevail would not allow the survival of human beings as a species. We should proceed from the assumption that man has adapted to his environment during a long evolutionary process and has paid the price of natural selection. Only over the past few thousand years has he adapted his environment to his needs and has created, so to speak, an artificial environment to provide food, shelter, and other necessities. Without this, modem man cannot survive. Compared to the dramatic improvements made in the technological environment, biological nature has not changed in the recent past. In the statements of Dr. Ehrlich and Academician Bayev, we have heard about the many constraints there would be on the possibility of man's survival after a nuclear catastrophe. Because we also have to look at the more long-range future, I would like to point out that most long-term effects of a nuclear war will be genetic. If islands of humanity—or as Dr. Ehrlich has said, groups of people on islands somewhere in the ocean—should survive, what will they face in terms of genetic consequences? If the population drops sharply, the question then arises of the critical numbers of a population that would be necessary to ensure its reproduction. On the one hand there will be minimum numbers of human beings; on the other hand, because of the small numbers, there will be isolation. There will definitely be inbreeding, and lethal mutations will come to the fore as a result of this, because of fetal and neonatal exposure to radiation and because of exposure to fallout. New mutations will arise and genes and chromosomes will be damaged as a result of the radiation, so there will be an additional genetic load to bear. There will be natural aberrations and death at birth, so that the burden of hereditary illnesses will be only part of a large load. This undoubtedly will be conducive to the elimination of humanity

#### And, Substantial evidence and studies prove that the aviation industry is not key to the economy

CPRE, 03 (CPRE, is a coalition of [England's](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/England%27s) major regional cities: [Birmingham](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Birmingham) -[West Midlands](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/West_Midlands_(region)) [Bristol](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bristol) - [South West England](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/South_West_England) [Leeds](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Leeds) -[Yorkshire and the Humber](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yorkshire_and_the_Humber) [Liverpool](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liverpool) -[North West England](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/North_West_England) [Manchester](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Manchester) -[North West England](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/North_West_England) [Newcastle](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Newcastle_upon_Tyne) -[North East England](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/North_East_England) [Nottingham](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nottingham) -[East Midlands](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/East_Midlands) [Sheffield](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sheffield) -[Yorkshire and the Humber](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yorkshire_and_the_Humber)., “The Economics of Aviation: a North West England perspective”, <http://www.areco.org/Economics%20of%20Aviation.pdf>, April 2003) mcclellan

The industry also claims that its own activities generate or support large numbers of jobs in other sectors of the economy. This claim is based on a flawed methodology (the multiplier effect) which routinely double counts jobs in other sectors and has no place in a rigorous evaluation of the economic benefits of aviation. Aviation has a number of well documented adverse environmental consequences. This report provides detailed evidence that, in addition to environmental disbenefits, aviation is very poor value for money. The debate about the future of aviation would be a much more open and transparent debate if economic realities were factored in and economic assertions factored out. There is a statistical correlation between increased traffic flows and economic growth, but this does not necessarily mean that there is a causal link whereby improved transport facilities necessarily lead to more economic activity. The increased levels of travel could be a consequence of economic growth rather than the other way round. The SACTRA report concludes that although there are theoretical reasons why improved transport infrastructure could lead to more economic activity, the empirical evidence for this is weak. In particular, they conclude that in a mature economy with well developed transport systems such as the UK, any contribution to economic growth from improved transport is likely to be modest. The aviation industry is heavily subsidised (van de Pol 1998) and given the high level of labour productivity in the industry it can be strongly argued that jobs could be created more cost effectively in other ways. Jacobs (1996) quotes estimates of job creation numbers and costs from energy conservation, investment in public transport and recycling. The cost per job created is much lower than the figure for creating jobs through investment in new airport capacity, Meeting predicted demand by expanding infrastructure (such as Heathrow Terminal 5) will absorb large amounts of resources which could arguably be better used in other ways. Removal of the subsidies and investment of the resources gained in more sustainable employment would have both economic and environmental advantages. Examples of subsidy in the European Union include 17.5 billion Euros per annum because there is no taxation on aviation fuel, 6.5 billion Euros because tickets are zero rated for VAT purposes and direct subsidies such as 3.4 billion Euros to Air France in 1994 and 2.11 billion Euros to Olympic Airways in the same year (Whitelegg, 2001).

**NextGen can’t solve congestion – empirics prove increased demand from air carriers**

**Barkowski 12** [Justin T. Barkowski is graduated from Pepperdine University School of Law and was admitted to the Bar. Mr. Barkowski received the Ronald Sorenson Award and, prior to attending Pepperdine, he graduated from the University of California, Berkeley, where he studied economics. Mr. Barkowski is an instrumentrated private pilot and is active in the firm’s business litigation and insurance law practices. “Managing Air Traffic Congestion Through the Next Generation Air Transportation System: Satellite Based Technology, Trajectories, and - Privatization?” <http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1039&context=plr>, 2-2-2012]

With or without an ATC commercialization debate, the airlines and the new Secretary of Transportation, Ray LaHood, strongly believe that NextGen is the key to solving congestion. 223 One author even argues that "airside capacity shortages and suboptimal usage/management of airspace" is the underlying cause of air traffic congestion. 224 While these concerns undoubtedly need to be addressed through NextGen, **there is a severe problem when airspace capacity increases but corresponding airport resources and infrastructure do not. This will be the case in high-density areas where any room for expansion is nearly impossible**. 225 **Even the JPDO is skeptical that NextGen is a "cure-for-all**," stating that where "airport infrastructure [development] cannot be accomplished using existing resources," the airports will have to implement "market-based mechanisms such as peak period pricing to ease congestion" in times of high demand. 226 **Merely increasing the availability of landing and takeoffs at a highdensity airport may not have the desired cure-for-all effect** that industry participants might expect. For example, **in 2004 American and United Airlines agreed** with the FAA **to** voluntarily **reduce the number of scheduled flights out of** Chicago **O'Hare** by 12.5% **in order to help fight congestion**. 227 In ef fect, this increased the number of potential flights out of that airport during the agreed upon times through its voluntary reduction, just as NextGen would do. However**, the opening up of more space simply resulted in other airlines adding "flights while the hub carriers cut their schedules," providing no relief to the airport congestion problem**. 228 **NextGen essentially creates this increased capacity without any supplemental FAA policies to address how this extra space in the system will be allocated to air carriers that are continuously demanding more flights than the system can handle**. 229 To prevent air traffic congestion from resulting after the implementation of NextGen, like it had in Chicago, **effective demand-management policies are** therefore **critically in need**. Given the historical struggles, 230 this may be difficult to accomplish. NextGen is not the sole answer for air traffic congestion at the increasing number of high-density airports. When airports cannot develop infrastructure, or when demand exceeds the marginal increases in capacity, the FAA needs allocation policies to arrange the airports' limited ground facilities and take-off and landing slots. 23 1 Commentators tend to analyze airport demand-management solutions by only looking at either the FAA or the publicly-owned airport's perspective. 232 A straight-forward and thorough analysis must examine functions of both actors in order to propose effective solutions.

Airline industry is super resilient

FAA, 12  
FAA, You know what it is, 3-7-12, [“FAA Aerospace Forecast Fiscal Years 2012-2032,” <http://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/apl/aviation_forecasts/aerospace_forecasts/2012-2032/>]

Since the beginning of the century, the commercial air carrier industry has suffered several major shocks that have led to reduced demand for air travel. These shocks include the terror attacks of September 11, skyrocketing prices for fuel, debt restructuring in Europe and the United States (U.S.), and a global recession. To manage this period of extreme volatility, air carriers have fine-tuned their business models with the aim of minimizing financial losses by lowering operating costs, eliminating unprofitable routes and grounding older, less fuel efficient aircraft. To increase operating revenues, carriers have initiated new services that customers are willing to purchase. Carriers have also started charging separately for services that were historically bundled in the price of a ticket. The capacity discipline exhibited by carriers and their focus on additional revenue streams bolstered the industry to profitability in 2011 for the second consecutive year. Going into the next decade, there is cautious optimism that the industry has been transformed from that of a boom-to-bust cycle to one of sustainable profits.