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\*\*Acid Rain\*\*

Acid Rain Low

Acid rain down now

Environment & Climate 98 (News Staff, May 1, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/article/13856/The\_Index\_of\_Leading\_Environmental\_Indicators\_Key\_Findings.html, JM)

Perception: Air quality is worsening as pollution levels rise and pose a serious threat to human health. Reality: Since 1980, there has been an overall improvement in air quality by more than 40 percent. Ambient levels of all air pollutants targeted by regulations have declined since the 1970s. (Ambient levels are the actual concentrations of a substance in the air, as opposed to emissions, which are estimates of the amount of substances generated by human activity.) The air in most metropolitan areas is improving. Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) and Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) combine in sunlight to form ozone, the major component of urban smog. Between 1975 and 1995, ambient levels of NOx in the U.S. declined by 37.3 percent, and ambient levels of ozone decreased by 25.7 percent between 1976 and 1995. Acid rain is not a threat. It has no observable effect on human health, nor has it damaged North American crops. Sulfur dioxide is the principal component of acid rain. Ambient levels of SO2 decreased 60.7 percent between 1975 and 1995; emissions have decreased 41.2 percent since 1970. Levels of carbon monoxide and particulate matter (PM) are falling. Ambient levels of carbon monoxide (CO), caused mostly by car emissions, fell 67.3 percent between 1975 and 1995. Ambient levels of PM, more commonly known as dust and soot, have decreased 22 percent since 1988.

Acid rain is low – objective studies

Krug 91 (Edward C., Soil Scientist, *Imprimis* 20, 7, July, JM)

Every day, millions of dismayed Americans read the news that acid rain is creating an aquatic "silent spring" in the northeastern United States...Thousands of lakes are dead with thousands more soon to die....Acid rain is wiping out our forests. The perception of mounting environmental devastation has created an overwhelming sense of urgency. The feeling is, "For heaven's sake stop talking about it and do something before we kill every, thing!" The trouble is, none of this news of impending environmental disaster is true. Political activists from the Sierra Club, the National Audubon Society, and other organizations have worked diligently to create the pub, lie perception that it is. Some scientists have helped to fuel the names of panic, In 1980, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) claimed that acid rain had increased the average acidity of northeastern lakes a hundredfold over the last 40 years. In 1981, the National Research Council claimed that the number of acidified lakes would double by 1990. But National Acid Precipitation Assessment Program (NAPAP) scientists assigned to research the "problem" realized that the publicly accepted claims of disaster were unsubstantiated. There was simply no scientific assessment of acid rain's effects on which to base claims of disaster, or any claims at all, for that matter, Accordingly, NAPAP spent hundreds of millions of dollars to develop the first census of acid rain's state-of-the-environment. This is what we found for lakes: 1. There are only 240 critically acidic (pH ≤ 5.0) lakes out of over 7,000 northeastern lakes; not the thousands claimed. 2. The average lake is as acidic as it was prior to the industrial Era (some lakes have become more acidic, some have become less acidic over time); not a hundred times more acidic as claimed. 3. Only 35,000 of 200,000,000 acres of eastern lakes are critically acidic. 4. Most of this acidic water is in Florida. Yet the rain in Florida is among the least acidic rain in the eastern U.S.- three times less acidic than in the Adirondacks. 5. The amount of acidic water is not changing with time; thousands of additional lakes are not becoming acidic as claimed. 6. The old Clean Air Act is working: SO, (the principal pollutant that creates acid rain) has been halved-20 million tons rather than 40 million tons per year. The new revisions will make no difference in the amount of acid rain 30-40 years from now. 7. All of the acidic lakes in the northeastern U.S, can be limed for $500,000 a year compared to billions of dollars for an elaborate government acid rain program.

Sources predicting acid rain en masse are biased

Krug 91 (Edward C., Soil Scientist, *Imprimis* 20, 7, July, JM)

Yet in major media sources such as Newsweek and the New York Times political activists passed off as "environmental experts" continue to claim that NAPAP has made no progress at all. They say that NAPAP was a waste of time: it has only proven that acid rain is the "crisis" it was "known to be" prior to the inception of NAPAP a decade ago. In the few cases where responsible scientists manage to report some of the real facts, it is claimed that NAPAP's results are politically tainted-underrepresenting the effects of acid rain. It was in this atmosphere that Congress passed a new Clean Air Act in 1990 in large part to allay manufactured fears of acid rain. What Congress is trying to cover up is the fact that this new legislation will cost our nation, conservatively, $40 billion a year.

Acid Rain High

Acid rain high – insufficient regulation

Denton 6-21 (Buck, Staff, The Conservation Report, http://conservationreport.com/2010/06/21/acid-rain-is-increasing/, JM)

Emissions of sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides from utilities contribute to the problem of acid rain. However, emissions trading or cap and trade, a market-based regulatory program, which is also “a program within the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments,” was successful in reducing these pollutants. As a result, the Acid Rain Program was successful in reducing acid rain. However, an increase in other types of anthropogenic activities is contributing to the problem of acid rain. For example, industrial agriculture operations, such as concentrated animal feeding operations, or CAFOs, also contribute to acid rain. Other factors for the return of acid rain include agricultural nitrogen runoff and more vehicles, which are displacing the gains made from the introduction of the catalytic converter. More from Scientific American: The acid rain scourge of the ’70s and ’80s that killed trees and fish and even dissolved parts of statues on Washington, D.C.’s National Mall is back. But unlike the first round, in which sulfur emissions from power plants mixed with rain to create sulfuric acid, the current problem stems primarily from nitrogen emissions mixed with rain to create nitric acid.

Acid rain high – nitric acid unrestricted

Denton 6-21 (Buck, Staff, The Conservation Report, http://conservationreport.com/2010/06/21/acid-rain-is-increasing/, JM)

Sulfur emissions from power plants were one of the primary motivations for the U.S.’s Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, which set reduction targets for both sulfur dioxide (SO2) and nitrogen oxides (NOx). However, whereas sulfur dioxide emissions decreased almost 70 percent from 1990 to 2008, emissions of one NOx—nitrogen dioxide (NO2)—went down only 35 percent for that same period, and amendment targets have yet to be made, according to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). “This comes as scientists have grown increasingly aware of the consequences of the remaining nitric acid deposition,” Schlesinger says. . . . Nitric acid rain is derived primarily from power plant, car and truck emissions as well as from gases released by fertilizer use. Part of the problem dates back to WWI, when two German scientists invented the Haber–Bosch process, which took nonreactive nitrogen from the air (N2) and converted it into reactive, usable ammonia (NH3). Most of the nitrogen harvested via this process has been used in fertilizers, and the runoff from farms has created dead zones in Chesapeake Bay and at the mouths of the Columbia and Mississippi rivers. Some efforts have been made to regulate the agricultural nitrogen runoff, but atmospheric emissions of agricultural ammonia remain virtually unrestricted.

Acid rain high – ozone guardians causing it

Whitty 10 (Julia, Environmental Correspondent, Mother Jones, March 3, http://motherjones.com/blue-marble/2010/03/ozone-solution-worsens-warming-acid-rain, JM)

We already knew that the hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs) used to replace ozone-destroying chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) are proving to be a super greenhouse gas—4,500 times more potent than carbon dioxide. Nevertheless, we're still using them in everything from spray cans to refrigerators to air-conditioners. Now a new paper in Journal of Physical Chemistry finds that HCFCs may also be increasing acid rain. Computer models show HCFCs break down in the upper atmosphere to form oxalic acid, one culprit in acid rain. The researchers suggest the new computer model could help determine whether replacements for the replacements are as environmentally friendly as they appear before manufacturers spend billions of dollars marketing them.

Acid Rain – No Impact – Lakes

Acid rain doesn’t affect lakes

Logomasini 99 (Angela, PhD, December 1, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/article/12937/Dixy\_Lee\_Ray\_Symposium\_CO2\_Levels\_Too\_Much\_of\_a\_Good\_Thing.html, JM)

Presenting another view from Congress was House Majority Whip Tom Delay's staffer, Tom Pyle. Noting that the world's climate is a very complex thing, Pyle emphasized that scientists really do not understand the interaction among the many factors that contribute to climate. This lack of understanding makes the computer models on which global warming theory is based highly controversial. Skepticism of such models is healthy, says Pyle, because similar models have cost us dearly in the past. In the late 1950s, for example, modelers said sulfur dioxide (SO2) released by utilities was reacting with oxygen (O2), producing sulfuric acid that entered lakes directly or by rain and snow--the so-called acid rain phenomenon. The model predicted an environmental disaster. Congress provided funding to study the issue, spending $500 million and two decades to find out that, except for a few lakes in the Upper Adirondacks, no lakes in the Northeast were affected. Even though scientists considered the models reliable, their predictions were wrong. Climate models can't even predict the next season's weather, let alone long-term global warming, noted Pyle. Were global warming models correct, we should have experienced an increase in global temperatures in the 1970s . . . but temperatures fell. Unfortunately, Pyle notes, the politicians base their policymaking on doom-and-gloom predictions, and rarely retract things they've done once the predictions turn out wrong.

Lake acidity is due to natural causes

Lehr 7 (Jay, PhD, Science Director @ The Heartland Institute, February 1, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/article/20522/Acid\_Rain\_Nitrogen\_Scares\_Debunked.html, JM)

Perhaps the best example of the contributions of scientists to a large, complex issue is the National Acid Precipitation Assessment Project (NAPAP). This project entailed hundreds of scientists working in small groups over a period of 10 years at a cost of $550 million. The NAPAP findings were submitted to Congress in 1990. Because the study's findings minimized the impact of acid rain caused by humans, Congress and the media completely ignored them. The NAPAP study found that among thousands of U.S. lakes, only 4 percent were somewhat acidic. One-quarter of those were acidic due to natural causes, leaving only 3 percent somewhat influenced by human activities. The study found many of the Adirondack lakes were acidic when explorers first entered the region, and likely contained few fish at the time. Logging the virgin forests prior to 1900 reduced the regional lake acidity. Acidity then rebounded with the decline of logging.

Acidic lakes are easily corrected – no other impacts

Lehr 7 (Jay, PhD, Science Director @ The Heartland Institute, February 1, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/article/20522/Acid\_Rain\_Nitrogen\_Scares\_Debunked.html, JM)

Perhaps the best news in the NAPAP report was that whatever the cause, overly acidic lakes can be easily and inexpensively corrected by the addition of lime. Attempting to reduce regional water acidity by targeting smokestack emissions through the Clean Air Act costs at least 1,000 times more than applying lime to the small proportion of lakes where the problem exists. Furthermore, the report minimized the effect of acid rain on the erosion of buildings and statues, and found no basis for alleged widespread health effects. All of this was completely ignored by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), environmental activist groups, and the news media. Ignoring the findings of the $550 million, 10-year NAPAP study is among the most egregious and costly errors ever made by Congress and EPA.

Acid Rain – No Impact – Crops

Acid rain has no negative effects on crop growth

Lehr 7 (Jay, PhD, Science Director @ The Heartland Institute, February 1, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/article/20522/Acid\_Rain\_Nitrogen\_Scares\_Debunked.html, JM)

At the 1968 meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, environmental activist Barry Commoner said the concentration of nitrates was rising dramatically in Midwestern rivers, that the cause was nitrogen fertilizer, and that the result was a threat to human health and the integrity of natural ecosystems. To address Commoner's claims, the Illinois Pollution Control Board held 10 hearings in 1970 and 1971 to determine whether constraints should be imposed on farm application of nitrogen fertilizers and animal manure in order to limit the content of nutrients in surface waters. It is important to remember that nitrogen fertilizer had been responsible for much of the phenomenal increases in yields of corn, sorghum, and small grains used directly in human food and as livestock feed to produce beef, pork, lamb, chicken, and turkey. Constraints on the use of nitrogen fertilizer would have reduced the supply and raised the price of many food products.

Acid rain doesn’t damage plants

Kasun 3 (Jacqueline, Economist, January 9, <http://www.juntosociety.com/guest/sperlazzo/bs_opm1010903.html>, JM)

In fact, air and water pollution levels have been highest in the centrally-planned economies of Eastern Europe and China, where population growth is low or negative. Legendary air pollution in Poland and Russia has occurred in areas with thinly-settled populations. In the United States, air pollution is declining significantly. The federal government's National Acid Precipitation Assessment Program recently reported "no widespread forest or crop damage in the United States" related to acid rain.

Acid Rain – Impact Turn – Deforestation

Acid rain is key to solve deforestation

Krug 91 (Edward C., Soil Scientist, *Imprimis* 20, 7, July, JM)

This is what was found for forests: i. "Forest decline is extensive in many unpolluted areas of the world, whereas trees in highly polluted areas (i.e. metropolitan areas) are largely unaffected." 2. The nitrogen in acid rain is fertilizing 300,000,000 acres of eastern forest. Such fertilization may have a negative' effect for about 0.1 percent of the forest. Enhanced growth by nitrogen fertilization may result in increased winter damage for 3,000,000 acres of high altitude spruce-fir forest. It is only common sense to conclude, therefore, that an expensive crash program to further accelerate the current rate of reduction of acid rain is not justified.

\*\*Air Pollution\*\*

Air Pollution Low

Panicked reports are wrong – the air is improving

Artz 6-13 (Kenneth, Reporter @ The Heartland Institute, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/article/30147/Nations\_Air\_Quality\_Continues\_to\_Improve.html, JM)

According to the report, ozone levels registered the strongest improvement. All metro areas in the 25 cities most polluted by ozone showed improvement over last year’s report. Particulates also registered impressive reductions. All but two of the 25 cities most affected by particle pollution (sometimes called soot) improved over last year’s report. The State of the Air 2011 report examines ozone and particulate pollution at official monitoring sites across the United States in 2007, 2008, and 2009. The report uses the most current quality-assured nationwide data available for these analyses. Joel Schwartz, a Senior Consultant with Blue Sky Consulting Group of Sacramento, California, said the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and environmental activist groups nevertheless continue to frighten people into believing national air quality is worsening. “The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has made the claim that air pollution at current levels kills tens of thousands of Americans every year. EPA makes a wild claim like that because, first, they believe it, but secondly because they must keep up the perception that there’s a serious problem that must be solved. If there wasn’t a serious problem, then EPA wouldn’t be able to justify the enormous budget and resources the organization commands,” said Schwartz. “Of course, the EPA’s story is all wrong. We have cleaner air now than 1970 when the Clean Air Act was established. In fact, the air in 1970 was cleaner than it was in the 1930s,” Schwartz observed. “Obviously, at high enough levels air pollution can kill people. But the evidence shows that the air we breathe today is nowhere near that level, nor has it been for a very long time. In fact, the air is getting cleaner,” said Schwartz.

Air pollution is declining – other studies are biased

Schwartz 7 (Joel, Senior Scientist @ Reason Foundation’s Environmental Program, July 1, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimatenews.org/article/21605/American\_Lung\_Associations\_2007\_Report\_Distorts\_Air\_Quality\_Facts.html, JM)

Conveniently, ALA provides a fictional "explanation" of the fictional rise in PM2.5: "power plants are likely the source of much of the increase in particle pollution in the eastern United States, driven by increased electricity production during the period." Note how ALA is careful never to claim explicitly that power plant pollution increased, but merely that electricity production increased. The reader is led to assume that more electricity production means more power plant air pollution and therefore higher PM2.5 levels. Actually, power plant sulfur dioxide (SO2) emissions--the source of the sulfate component of PM2.5--remained unchanged during the year when ALA claimed they were increasing. The figure accompanying this article compares average PM2.5 levels and power plant SO2 emissions for the eastern half of the United States since 1994. (National PM2.5 monitoring didn't begin until 1999.) Note the unique jump in PM2.5 in 2005, with steady declines both before and after. Also note that under existing law SO2 emissions must decline another 70 percent over the next several years, ensuring far more PM2.5 improvement in the future.

Legislation is improving the air

WAMC News 7-8 (Staff, http://www.publicbroadcasting.net/wamc/news.newsmain/article/ 0/0/1825213/North.CountryAdirondacks.News/Environmental.Groups.Praise.New.Air.Pollution.Rules, JM)

Environmental groups say new air pollution rules approved by the Obama Administration will help plants and wildlife in the Catskills, Adirondacks and other northeastern mountains recover from decades of acid rain. WAMC North Country Bureau Chief Pat Bradley reports... The Environmental Protection Agency on Thursday finalized rules governing air pollution from power plants that drifts across state lines. Adirondack Council Spokesman John Sheehan says the new cross state air pollution rule will stop acid rain emissions from other states. "We think that this will essentially bring to an end the continuing damage from acid rain in the Adirondack," said Sheehan. "That is a milestone we've been trying to reach since 1975." The new rule cuts sulfur dioxide by 73% and nitrogen oxides by 54% from 2005 levels by 2014.

Air Pollution High

Air pollution high – fine particles affecting everyone

Brugge & Zamore 1-25 (Doug & Wig, Staff, New York Daily News, http://articles.nydailynews.com/2011-01-25/news/27096629\_1\_air-scientific-advisory-committee-fine-particulate-matter-air-pollution, JM)

All the above is true. The pollutant is fine particulate matter - extremely tiny solids and liquids suspended in the air - that we inhale with every breath. While a very low level of fine particulate matter exists naturally, the vast bulk of this pollutant comes from combustion of coal and fuel in our motor vehicles. All of us are exposed, some to more, some to less, every day in the air all around us. Exposures are usually particularly high in Southern California, as well as the coal burning states and urban metropolitan areas in the East. The EPA is considering revising its fine particulate matter standards to lower the acceptable annual average level from 15 to perhaps 12 micrograms per cubic meter of air. Even such a small change could save many tens of thousands of lives a year. The decision whether or not to revise the fine particulate matter standards and by how much, rests with EPA staff, EPA's Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee and EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson. Despite the extremely high stakes associated with this review and the considerable potential impact on our health, public awareness and participation have been low. One of us has often been the only volunteer testifying at EPA's science review meetings. While the public has remained largely silent, industry has been working hard to limit the revisions on the grounds that the proposed changes would be bad for business.

Air quality low – EPA regulations prove

Fears & Elperin 7-8 (Darryl & Juliet, Staff, Washington Post, <http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2011/07/08/epa_to_impose_new_cross_state_air_pollution_rules/>, JM)

The Environmental Protection Agency said yesterday it finalized rules that compel 28 states and the District of Columbia to curb air pollution that travels across states by wind and weather, the first in a series of federal restrictions aimed at improving the air Americans breathe. The Cross State Air Pollution Rule, which replaces a President George W. Bush-era regulation thrown out by federal courts in 2008, targets coal-fired power plants mainly in the eastern United States. The measure, along with a proposal aimed at cutting summertime smog in the Midwest, will cost the utility industry roughly $2.4 billion in pollution control upgrades over several years. EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson called the rule “another long overdue step to protect the air we breathe and that our children breathe.’’ Jackson predicted that the rule will prevent up to 34,000 premature deaths annually and result in fewer hospital visits and work sick days, she said, generating $280 billion in benefits “that far outweigh the cost of complying with the rule.’’ A federal judge vacated the Bush administration’s Clean Air Interstate Rule for several reasons, questioning whether the emissions trading system it established would do enough to bring all states into compliance. Frank O’Donnell, who directs the advocacy group Clean Air Watch, said the measures are “a good first step in cleaning up the air’’ but are less significant than upcoming guidelines for acceptable smog and soot levels.

Recent fireworks displays have increased air pollution

Sun-Star 6-30 (Staff, “Valley Air District Warns of Health Impact From Fireworks,” http://www.mercedsunstar.com/2011/06/30/1952151/valley-air-district-officials.html, JM)

As the Fourth of July approaches, Valley Air District officials urge residents to consider the effect of fireworks on their neighbors’ health and the Valley’s economy. During fireworks displays, dangerous particulate matter (PM) increases, pumping large quantities of airborne material, including soot, ash and liquids, into the Valley’s air, the district said in a news release. This type of pollution causes serious health effects, including respiratory disease, bronchitis and cardiac illness. PM is especially harmful to people with existing respiratory or cardiac illness, elderly people and children, according to the release. Elevated levels of PM also jeopardize the air basin’s progress in meeting federal health-based standards, which creates economic burdens for the Valley. the news release continued. “Fireworks use is harmful to public health. And it also carries potential economic fallout as an obstacle to attaining health-based standards,” said Seyed Sadredin, the District’s executive director and air pollution control officer. In summer, the Valley’s air can be already stressed by ozone (smog). Fireworks emissions add to the level of pollution in the air, the news release said.

Air Pollution – A2: Particulates

Air pollution is at safe levels and declining

Green & Schwarz 2 (Kenneth & Joel, Chief & Senior Scientists @ Reason Foundation’s Environmental Program, May 1, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/article/398/Air\_pollution\_risk\_exaggerated.html, JM)

The Pope study authors contend the study provides “the strongest evidence to date that long-term exposure to fine-particulate air pollution common to many metropolitan areas is an important risk factor for cardiopulmonary mortality.” Media reports on the study were uncritical in repeating the study’s findings, giving short shrift to its many limitations. But even if we take the results at face value, the study greatly exaggerates actual risks, and does a poor job of placing the risk of particulate air pollution into the context of other risks people face. The study’s authors may well have mistakenly attributed to air pollution health risks that are actually caused by other factors. But even ignoring that concern, the study found a relatively small risk from particulates. For example, the study found reducing particulate levels by 60 percent would reduce the risk of dying during a 16-year period by about 6 percent. A six foot, 215 pound, non-smoking man can achieve the same risk reduction by losing about five pounds; he can get three times the risk reduction by losing about 20 pounds. The Pope study also found most of the health benefits from reducing airborne particulate levels accrue from reducing particulates down to a concentration in air of about 18 micrograms per cubic meter (mcg/m3). Reductions below this level provided little or no additional health benefit. But according to the Pope study’s pollution measures, all but 2 of 51 metropolitan areas were already below 18 mcg/m3 as of 1999-2000. National fine-particulate monitoring data also show few areas of the country now have particulate levels above 18 mcg/m3. Thus, even if the small additional health risk reported by the Pope study is real, few people are exposed to it. Ongoing reductions in particulate levels also mean future particulate levels will be even lower, further reducing risk. For example, total particulate emissions dropped 75 percent between 1940 and 1997, while per-capita emissions dropped more than 85 percent. Total particulate levels in air declined about 50 percent between 1960 and 1990, while coarse plus fine particulates declined 19 percent between 1991 and 2000. The health hazards discussed in the Pope study occur only after many years of exposure to elevated particulate levels. Continuing declines in particulate pollution suggest that remaining risks will not persist for long enough to damage health in the future.

Particulate matter low

Schwartz 4 (Joel, Senior Scientist @ Reason Foundation’s Environmental Program, September 1, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/article/15559/EPA\_Policy\_Ignores\_Declines\_in\_US\_Air\_Pollution.html, JM)

Particulate levels in the United States are lower than at any time since the industrial revolution. Particulate matter in the air has declined more than 80 percent since the early 1900s. PM2.5 is down 40 percent over the past 20 years and 10 percent in the past four years, according to EPA statistics. In 1980, about 80 percent of the nation exceeded the PM2.5 standard now in place. Today, that rate is down to 18 percent. EPA has two PM2.5 standards--a 24-hour standard for short-term PM2.5 levels and an annual-average standard. Virtually the entire nation--99.6 percent of the monitoring sites--already attains the 24-hour standard, in most cases with plenty of room to spare. Non-attainment is limited almost solely to annual-average PM2.5 levels. Of the few non-attainment locations, 60 percent could reach compliance with PM2.5 reductions of less than 10 percent, and another 23 percent of locations would need 10 to 20 percent reductions.

Diesel emissions down – California proves

Schaffer 8 (Frederick A., MD, Diesel Technology Forum, July 11, http://www.heartland.org/custom/semod\_policybot/pdf/24453.pdf, JM)

Declining statewide PM emission levels are at apparent variance with the sharply downward trend of diesel emissions in California, attributable to clean diesel technology and the development of ultra low-sulfur diesel fuel. According to the draft staff report, in fact, since 1999, annual average PM 2.5 levels have decreased 30% statewide, the statewide average PM concentration has declined to new low levels, and PM 2.5 exposures are much reduced from earlier levels. Research sponsored by the Diesel Technology Forum and conducted by Sierra research substantiates this trend in PM emissions. Our research reviewed the emissions inventory data from CARB taking in consideration all adopted diesel -- related regulations and their published benefits, and found that brake and tire wear will be the primary sources of fine particles in Southern California air as early as next year, with diesel PM falling to a less significant level of the overall statewide inventory. We incorporate by reference and submit this report SR2005-02-01 “The Contribution of Diesel Engines to Emissions of ROG, NOx, and PM2.5 in California: Past, Present and Future” with these comments and encourage its review and incorporation into your decision-making process.

Air Pollution – No Impact – Flawed Models

Impact studies are flawed – confounding

Green & Schwarz 2 (Kenneth & Joel, Chief & Senior Scientists @ Reason Foundation’s Environmental Program, May 1, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/article/398/Air\_pollution\_risk\_exaggerated.html, JM)

It is thus difficult to tell in an ecologic study whether observed health outcomes are the result of pollution exposure ... or other differences between people who live in high- and low-pollution areas. For example, if it turned out that people in high-pollution areas are more likely to drink or smoke, there’s a danger of inadvertently confusing an effect of alcohol consumption or smoking with an effect of pollution. This problem is known as confounding. Other confounders include diet, exercise frequency, income, marital status, “body-mass index” (BMI, a measure of obesity), and educational attainment. The Pope study researchers accounted for most of these confounders in their analysis. But the factors were assessed only when people entered the study in 1982 and not afterward. If any of these factors changed after 1982, and if the changes were correlated with pollution levels, then the study results would suffer from uncontrolled confounding. For example, if people in areas with higher pollution were also likely to get fatter between 1982 and 2000 when compared with people in lower pollution areas, researchers could mistake an effect of body weight for an effect of air pollution. Similar concerns apply to other confounders, such as diet and smoking. For example, if the prevalence of smoking decreased more slowly in higher pollution areas during the last 20 years, then smoking might have actually been responsible for effects the Pope study attributes to air pollution. Because the risks of smoking and obesity are so much larger than the risks the Pope study estimated for fine particulates, even a small difference in smoking and obesity trends between areas with differing pollution levels could swamp the claimed effect of differences in air pollution. For example, the Pope study found that a 70 percent increase in the concentration of fine, airborne particle levels increases risk of dying prematurely by 6 percent. But for a six foot, 200-pound, non-smoking man, gaining just 15 pounds increases the risk of an early death by 17 percent. Two other findings in the Pope study suggest the authors’ efforts to control for confounding were incomplete. First, the study found particulate exposure increases the risk of lung cancer for men, but not for women. Second, the association of air pollution and either cancer or cardiopulmonary mortality held only for people with a high school education or less. There are also other potentially confounding factors the Pope study did not assess at all, including income and wealth, and physical activity levels. These factors also have a strong relationship to health and could have changed over time in ways that could cause misattribution of health effects to air pollution when they were actually due to other factors.

Impact studies flawed – assumptions

Green & Schwarz 2 (Kenneth & Joel, Chief & Senior Scientists @ Reason Foundation’s Environmental Program, May 1, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/article/398/Air\_pollution\_risk\_exaggerated.html, JM)

While it is very important to determine whether low-level exposure to airborne particles poses a risk to human health, such research must be based on sound assumptions in order to provide valid information about health risks. Nevertheless, the Pope study authors made a number of questionable assumptions that should have steered them away from claiming to have generated the “strongest evidence to date” regarding the relationship between airborne particles and human health. Regarding exposure, the study’s authors assumed that everyone within a zip code was exposed to the same level of particulate pollution, though evidence shows such exposure can vary widely. Not only does exposure vary from place to place in concentration, but it also varies in the chemical composition of the particles. The authors also assumed people told the truth on the initial questionnaires regarding how much they smoked and drank. But survey researchers have observed people tend to under-report those behaviors. Thus, if the authors used survey responses to account for smoking and drinking, they could be underestimating that risk in their study population. The authors also assumed health-related behaviors did not change after the entrance survey in 1982. For example, the authors assumed that persons who were nonsmokers when they entered the study never took up smoking. Similarly, they assumed that people who filled out surveys in 1982, and later died in the same area where they originally lived, had stayed there throughout. This problem also applies to other health-related factors, such as change in weight and diet after entering the study.

Air Pollution – No Impact – Flawed Models

The effects of air pollution are exaggerated

Schwartz 4 (Joel, Senior Scientist @ Reason Foundation’s Environmental Program, September 1, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/article/15559/EPA\_Policy\_Ignores\_Declines\_in\_US\_Air\_Pollution.html, JM)

In addition, there is evidence that EPA and activists have greatly exaggerated the health effects of current PM2.5 levels. EPA's annual PM2.5 standard is based mainly on a 1995 American Cancer Society (ACS) PM study, which reported an association between PM2.5 and mortality. Some features of the study, however, suggest PM is unlikely to be the agent responsible. According to the ACS results, PM increased mortality for men, but not women, and for those with no more than a high school degree but not for those with at least some college. The ACS study also reported increased mortality among former smokers but not among those who currently smoke or never smoked, and among those who said they were moderately active but not among the very active or the sedentary. Such biologically implausible variations in the ostensible effects of low-level PM suggest the association between PM and mortality is spurious and does not represent a genuine cause-and-effect relationship. Claims about low-level PM and health suffer from other biological plausibility problems. For example, coal-fired power plants contribute some 25 to 50 percent of the total PM2.5 in the eastern half of the United States, in the form of sulfates formed as a result of SO2 emissions. But toxicology studies with human volunteers suggest sulfates are not toxic, even at exposures many times greater than today's peak levels, and even in people with respiratory diseases. Scientists use ammonium sulfate, the main form of sulfate PM in the air in the eastern United States, as an inert control factor--that is, a substance not expected to have any health effects--in studies of the health effects of acidic aerosols, and magnesium sulfate is used therapeutically to reduce airway constriction in asthmatics. Nitrate PM, which makes up 25 to 50 percent of PM in the western U.S., has been shown to have no deleterious health effects in controlled studies. EPA attributes about 90 percent of the benefits of all air pollution regulation to lives saved due to PM reductions. But if PM at current levels is not killing people, then almost all of the benefits EPA claims for clean-air regulation are bogus.

Figures for people affected are exaggerated

Schwartz 4 (Joel, Senior Scientist @ Reason Foundation’s Environmental Program, September 1, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/article/15559/EPA\_Policy\_Ignores\_Declines\_in\_US\_Air\_Pollution.html, JM)

EPA also has exaggerated the number of people living in areas that violate the PM2.5 standard. Instead of the 100 million reported in news stories, the true figure is more like 45 million. The overestimate is attributable to two factors. First, EPA included many counties not because their own air quality violated the PM2.5 standard, but because the agency believes they contribute to violations in other counties. That makes sense for regulatory policy, but not as a means of determining PM exposure. Second, counties that monitor PM levels at more than one location sometimes violate the standard in one area but comply in another, yet EPA counts all people in the county as living in areas that violate the standard.

Air pollution has a minimal effect on health

Schwartz 7 (Joel, Senior Scientist @ Reason Foundation’s Environmental Program, July 1, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimatenews.org/article/21605/American\_Lung\_Associations\_2007\_Report\_Distorts\_Air\_Quality\_Facts.html, JM)

National polls routinely show most Americans believe air quality has been steady or declining. In reality, the nation's air quality has been steadily improving for decades and has never been better. The public believes otherwise because most of the information they receive on the environment comes from environmental activist groups and government regulators--interest groups who need to keep us scared in order to maintain their powers and budgets. No matter how clean the air is, they continue to find ways to make it seem we've made little progress and that things will only worsen without aggressive new regulatory programs. Even without the activists' exaggerations, millions of Americans do live in areas that violate one or more federal air pollution health standards. But that's not actually a cause for concern, either. In the next issue of Environment & Climate News, I'll show how the air pollution fear industry not only exaggerates pollution levels but also exaggerates the harm from any given level of pollution. In reality, the underlying health research shows our air is already safe to breathe and our current, historically low air pollution is at worst a minor factor in people's health.

Air Pollution – No Impact – Flawed Models

Mortality predictions have been confounded

Moolgavkar 8 (Suresh H., PhD, May 22, http://www.heartland.org/custom/semod\_policybot/pdf/24453.pdf, JM)

In view of the inconsistencies reported in the studies based on the ACS cohort, how can any of the coefficients be used to derive reliable quantitative estimates of the impact of fine PM on mortality? The discussion above suggests strongly that, even if the association between ambient fine PM and mortality is real in these long-term studies, the magnitude of the association has been greatly exaggerated, as a result of either inadequate control of confounding, use of inappropriate statistical models, and consideration of only contemporaneous levels of air pollution, as I have discussed above. If the reported positive associations between fine PM and mortality in these re-analyses are due to uncontrolled confounding, what are the possible confounders? Two strong candidates are changing smoking habits and changing life-style factors. We know that there have been profound changes in life-style and smoking habits over the period of this study. Healthier life-styles – eating better, exercising more, smoking less – are more likely to have been adopted in the more affluent, better-educated communities, which are also exposed to lower pollution concentrations. Thus, the reported association between either fine PM or SO2 and mortality may simply reflect the impact of changing life-style factors, including changes in smoking habits, on mortality. In particular, smoking is such a strong risk factor for mortality that controlling changing habits well enough to assure absence of residual confounding is extremely difficult. The strong effect modification by level of education in the Krewski re-analyses suggests that socioeconomic and related factors, such as changes in smoking habits and life-style, need very careful control in these studies.

**Air Pollution – No Impact – Death**

Death from pollution is a relic of the past

Dunn 8 (John D., Civilian Faculty, Carl R. Darnall Army Medical Center, June 23, http://www.heartland.org/custom/semod\_policybot/pdf/24453.pdf, JM)

It appears that these studies are mischievous and deceptive and they will panic politicians to do more to hurt the California economy for no real benefit to the citizens of California. S-137 People do not die of air pollution in America. The bad old days of London and Pittsburg dirty air are gone. Modern medicine would have saved those folks too because the last 50 years have completely changed our ability to treat respiratory illness. Air quality in California, the rest of America is benign and getting better all the time. CARB refuses to tell the truth on that, instead focusing on the negative. The days of the killer smog and soot in America are gone. This panic mongering has to stop and physicians in public health research have a professional duty to shut up the chicken littles. Regulatory and economic burdens of new CARB regimes of air quality controls, chasing after small particles and diesel exhaust, will jeopardize the economic well being of the state of California and its residents. It is well known in public health epidemiology that poverty is an independent predictor of premature deaths. Will CARB be responsible for those deaths created by lost jobs and other economic hardships? Those will be real deaths, not the desk top toxin deaths predicted by the CARB.

Pollutants don’t cause death – designated substances are nontoxic

Schwartz 7 (Joel, Senior Scientist @ Reason Foundation’s Environmental Program, October 1, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/article/21984/The\_American\_Lung\_Associations\_Fear\_Campaign.html, JM)

The most serious claim leveled against air pollution is that it prematurely kills tens of thousands of Americans each year, even at today's record-low levels. But here too, the real-world evidence says otherwise. Even air pollution at levels many times greater than Americans ever breathe doesn't kill laboratory animals. Researchers can't, of course, do laboratory studies on people to see if air pollution kills them. But they can look for more mild health effects in human volunteers. Such studies provide little support for claims of serious harm. Two major forms of PM2.5--sulfates and nitrates--are simply nontoxic. In fact, ammonium sulfate, the main form of particulate matter from coal-fired power plants, is used as an "inert control"--that is, a substance without any health effects--in human studies of harm from acidic particles. Inhaler medications to reduce airway constriction are delivered in the form of sulfate aerosols. The lack of toxicity of power plant particulate matter is particularly ironic. In a slew of reports with scary titles like Death, Disease, and Dirty Power and Power to Kill, environmentalists have been running a vicious multi-year campaign against inexpensive coal-fired electricity, based on the false claim that power plant pollution is deadly.

**Air Pollution – No Impact – Death**

Effects of air pollution treatable and negligible

Dunn 6 (John D., Staff, Heartland Institute, December 1, http://www.heartland.org/healthpolicy-news.org/article/20258/EPA\_Makes\_Mistakes\_in\_Proposed\_Air\_Quality\_Standards.html, JM)

Toxic air pollution existed in the past and still may occasionally occur in some places on the planet as a local phenomenon, as particulate and other noxious air pollution in industrial areas, from various sources. However, trends in U.S. air pollution in the past 30 years, as reported and confirmed by EPA, have all been positive and are attributable to changes in industrial processes, regulatory efforts, and cleaner use of petroleum and coal. People today do not go out into the streets of America, and then choke and die. The days of the people of London and Pittsburgh wearing dark clothes to mask the effect of soot and smoke are long gone. Any study or discussion of air pollution is focused on a moving, improving problem. The death and illness rates during smog and air pollution catastrophe periods in the past were also affected by less-effective medical management and heavier cigarette smoking. In addition, airway diseases, the main deleterious health effect of any air pollution, were less treatable before the 1970s, and pulmonary medicine has changed dramatically for the better since then.

Air pollution is not verifiably harmful

Dunn 6 (John D., Staff, Heartland Institute, December 1, http://www.heartland.org/healthpolicy-news.org/article/20258/EPA\_Makes\_Mistakes\_in\_Proposed\_Air\_Quality\_Standards.html, JM)

The main epidemiological and toxicological flaws of the EPA health effects studies and recent policymaking are as follows: 1. The Dockery 1993 and Pope 1995 studies did not show valid evidence of death effects, since they showed a death effects relative risk below 1.1, a negligible relative risk that is 10 percent of the minimum relative risk all epidemiologists consider necessary for proof of causation. A 200 percent or 300 percent change in death effect is generally regarded as the lower limit to establish causality. There is a greater relative risk of whole milk causing lung cancer than the relative risk EPA has shown for air pollution. 2. This relative risk problem cannot be overcome by EPA and health effects researchers emphasizing the misleading use of the term statistical significance, which is not a proof test. A finding can be statistically significant and reliable but absolutely wrong. 3. The health effects research used by EPA has consistently ignored the concept of threshold for toxicity. Toxicology science recognizes the idea of threshold of effect and the maxim that the dose makes the toxin. EPA consistently ignores this principle in projecting exceedingly small doses as having a potentially toxic effect. 4. The studies cited by EPA fail to show actual causality or even epidemiological proof, but instead rely on "associations" between various diseases and bad air (in historical instances, no less, not contemporary America). Associations are not proof, however. They are simply observations of clusters of events that may or may not mean something and are subject to the influence of confounding factors. For example, ice cream consumption and drowning or boating accidents are associated by season, but ice cream eating doesn't cause water accidents. 5. The "precautionary principle" used by EPA as stand-alone policy justification is nothing more than a dressed-up version of anxiety, cannot pass muster for admissible scientific evidence in federal court, and fails to include risk/benefit analysis. 6. EPA has a mandate to act only on the basis of acceptable scientific evidence of health effects, and is obligated to avoid speculative "precautionary principle" approaches to regulatory policy. 7. Under no valid scientific analysis can EPA use the methodologies or the results of its "supporting" studies to justify more burdensome air pollution regulations. In fact, there is strong evidence for rescinding the last round of National Ambient Air Quality Standards. 8. Nonetheless, EPA and its health effects researchers have made public announcements proclaiming that thousands are dying in America due to air pollution, when the studies do not show any proof of death effect at all. 9. Based on the information reviewed in this critique, it is clear EPA should revisit its old regulations; forgo new, more onerous, and more expensive regulatory interventions; and suspend its rulemaking regarding air pollution until it can find valid and reliable science on health effects.

Air Pollution – No Impact – Animals

No connection between air pollution and animal health

Catcott 3 (E. J., PhD, “Effects of Air Pollution on Animals,” February 26, http://whqlibdoc.who.int/monograph/WHO\_MONO\_46\_(p221).pdf, JM)

Reports concerning the effects of air pollution on the health of animals have four general sources, Reports of animal injury and death have followed investigations of the air pollution disasters at Donora, London, and Poza Rica. Extensive studies of air-borne fluorides and their relation to animal health are available. Observations of the effects of air-borne radioactive substances on animals provide a third source. Finally, the reports of artificial exposure of laboratory animals have enlarged our understanding of the effects of various air pollutants on animals. It must be conceded that the present information concerning this subject is quite inadequate. The reports of animal morbidity and mortality which followed major air pollution episodes should be regarded critically. The investigations of these acute and intense exposures to air pollution have been done retrospectively. It is significant that the owners' reports of injury to animals could not be corroborated by professional observers at the Donora disaster. The high rate of animal mortality which allegedly occurred at Poza Rica is generally in contradiction to the information concerning the relative susceptibility to air pollutants of animal species which have been studied experimentally. The synergistic roles of physiological and of external environmental influences on reactions to air pollution indicate that the interactions of many factors may be necessary to produce critical situations. Genetic attributes of the individual animal as well as the species may define specific parameters of physiology and nutrition within the animal, whereas meteorology and type source of air pollution define exposures. The association of animals and atmosphere may be the final requirement for specific biological effects.

Air Pollution – No Impact – Asthma

Dust mites cause asthma, not pollution

Environment & Climate 97 (News Staff, June 1, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/article/14209/Air\_Pollution\_and\_Asthma\_Look\_Again.html, JM)

The disturbing spread of asthma in Europe and the U.S. over the last several decades has prompted many observers to see a link between this chronic and debilitating disease and high levels of air pollution. But there is mounting evidence that no such correlation exists. Comparisons have been made between the prevalence of asthma and allergy in highly polluted Leipzig in the former East Germany and clean, green Munich in the West. Surprisingly, asthma and allergies are less prevalent in dingy Leipzig than in the sparkling Bavarian capital. Comparisons between environmentally correct Sweden and polluted Poland show the same phenomenon. Writing in a recent issue of Science, William O.C.M. Cookson and Miriam F. Moffatt explain this by observing that for asthmatics, the problem is indoors (and in their genetic makeup), not outdoors. "For asthmatics the most important source of allergens is the house dust mite," they note. "These mites thrive in warm, moist conditions and are ubiquitous in human bedding."

Air pollution has no connection to respiratory problems

Schwartz 7 (Joel, Senior Scientist @ Reason Foundation’s Environmental Program, October 1, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/article/21984/The\_American\_Lung\_Associations\_Fear\_Campaign.html, JM)

That's not the only evidence that belies claims that air pollution causes asthma. Every air pollutant we measure has been dropping for decades, even as the prevalence of asthma has risen. International data also show air pollution isn't causing asthma. The prevalence of asthma is greatest in wealthy countries with low air pollution, while highly polluted developing and ex-Soviet Union countries have low asthma prevalence. The former East Germany is Exhibit A. Before the fall of the Berlin Wall, eastern Germany had awful air pollution and low asthma. After reunification, eastern Germans adopted Western lifestyles. Air pollution dropped, and asthma rose to West German levels. Ozone Not Causing Asthma The Children's Health Study came up with other surprising results. For example, the most polluted areas in the CHS exceeded the federal eight-hour ozone standard more than 100 days per year during the eight years of the study. But these relatively high ozone levels had no effect on children's lung growth or capacity. Growing up in an area with average PM2.5 levels twice as high as the federal standard was associated with only a 1 to 2 percent reduction in lung capacity. And even the most polluted areas of the country no longer come anywhere close to twice the federal standard. Air pollution can exacerbate pre-existing respiratory conditions, but the effect is tiny at worst. Both federal and California regulators estimate that eliminating all human-caused ozone in the United States (somewhere around one-quarter to one-half of ozone is natural or transported from other countries) would prevent no more than 1 to 2 percent of all asthma emergency room visits and respiratory hospital admissions.

Air Pollution – No Impact – Inflammation

No inflammation from air pollution

Huess 8 (John, Staff, Air Resources Board, May 22, http://www.heartland.org/custom/semod\_policybot/pdf/24453.pdf, JM)

One of the methods used to study ambient PM in a semi-controlled way is to expose humans or animals to ambient air particles that have been concentrated by a factor of 6 to 12. In studies with concentrated ambient air particles (CAPS), no consistent pattern of inflammatory changes has emerged. Some of these studies are referred to in Table 7 of the Pope and Dockery review as having somewhat mixed results, but with small increases in neutrophils and fibrinogen consistent with mild inflammatory responses to PM. The few statistically significant changes that have been reported in these studies are small, transient, and within the normal physiologic range. It is not clear if these changes are small but real changes that are not consistent because of the varying composition of the PM or if they are changes within the normal range solely due to chance. The synopsis of a recent HEI report on CAPS, diesel exhaust exposures and inflammation notes that “a consistent pattern of inflammation after exposure to a variety of PM mixtures in many studies has not emerged to date.” The synopsis notes for example that “many markers of inflammation were studied but few changed; of those that changed, the magnitude of the change was modest.” It was also noted that “because so few markers of inflammation changed in the current studies, it is possible that these changes occurred by chance.” Thus, with exposures to elevated concentrations of concentrated ambient particles there are, at the most, small transient changes that are within the normal physiologic range and not of clinical significance. Such changes are not likely able to explain the epidemiologic associations. In another recent CAPS paper, Kodavanti et al. 31 report on a series of short-term exposures of two strains of rats, one of which was bred to be spontaneously hypertensive. Six one-day exposure studies of the two strains of rats exposed to PM2.5 between 1138 and 1765 µg/m 3 found no biological effects compared to filtered air controls. Seven two-day exposure studies with PM2.5 between 144 and 2758 µg/m 3 reported small changes in a number of biochemical markers. However, the authors concluded that no biological effects correlated with CAPS mass. Rather, the authors concluded that the biological effects appeared to depend on chemical composition. This study adds additional support to the conclusion from a great deal of toxicological data that it is PM composition not PM mass that determines any PM health effect.

\*\*Biodiversity\*\*

Extinction Now

Extinctions are already occurring by the thousands

Leakey & Lewin 95 (Richard & Roger, Renowned paleoanthropologist & environmentalist, PhD, “The Sixth Extinction,” <http://www.well.com/~davidu/sixthextinction.html>, JM)

Centinela had a unique flora, but it wasn't unique in being an ecological island. Countless such ridges exist along the whole length of the Andes, most of which, too, must have developed species not found elsewhere. What made the Centinela habitat notorious was that a botanical survey had been carried out prior to its destruction. Each time an ecological island is cleared, species will vanish in a virtual instant, an event ecologists now term a Centinelan extinction. There are two points to be emphasized here. The first is that whenever ecologists are able to survey a habitat before and after disturbance, species loss is almost always seen, often a catastrophic one. However, in the vast majority of instances, habitat destruction occurs in areas that have not been surveyed for their flora and fauna, so it is more than likely that countless species become extinct before ecologists even know of their existence. How is one to document this, except by extrapolation? The second is that, like the plants on Centinela, many species have very limited ranges, particularly in the tropics, so destruction of habitat often results in the instant destruction of species. As I indicated earlier, this implies that the 50 percent figure predicted for eventual species loss is more likely to be an underestimate than an overestimate. The list of "anecdotal" evidence is long: half the freshwater fish of peninsular Malaysia, ten bird species of Cebu in the Philippines, half the forty-one tree snails in Oahu, forty-four of the sixty-eight shallow-water mussels of the Tennessee River shoals, and so on. The evidence may be anecdotal in the sense of its not being the result of a systematic survey, but it is compelling nonetheless. In an attempt to be quantitative with the known extinction data, and thereby come up with an assessment of whether or not we face a biological crisis of our own making, Stuart Pimm and two of his colleagues analyzed some of the best known and most closely documented cases. These include freshwater mussels and freshwater fish in North America, mammals in Australia, plants in South Africa, and amphibians worldwide. "What causes extinction?" Pimm and the others ask rhetorically. "Our reading of the five case studies is that species introductions and physical habitat alteration are the highest-ranking factors." I won't go into the details of the recorded extinctions, because they can be found in Pimm's publication; instead, I'll concentrate on the conclusions that flow from the analysis of them. If the observed levels of extinction known in these cases is typical for similar species worldwide, then current extinction is running at a rate some thousand to ten-thousand higher than background extinction. Skeptics may argue that these examples represent particularly high levels of extinction, and are therefore not representative. Even if this is the case, say Pimm and his colleagues, and these known extinctions are the only ones in these groups of species worldwide, which is highly improbable, then the rate is still two-hundred to a thousand higher than background. This qualifies as a mass extinction. The authors point out that none of the cases is from areas where human densities are particularly high, illustrating that the hand of death is effective at a distance. How much more effective would it be, then, in the midst of high concentrations of humanity? Pimm asks what we are to conclude from this and other studies: "Those who suggest that high extinction rates are a fabrication seem curiously ignorant of the facts or, perhaps, willfully ignorant.

Extinction inevitable in small populations

Leakey & Lewin 95 (Richard & Roger, Renowned paleoanthropologist & environmentalist, PhD, “The Sixth Extinction,” <http://www.well.com/~davidu/sixthextinction.html>, JM)

The point of the story is that once the heath hen population was reduced to small numbers, its eventual extinction was virtually assured. As I've stated several times, a small population is vulnerable to normal fluctuations in its numbers, the consequence of disease and disasters. A population of a thousand individuals can weather a population drop of a hundred; such a fluctuation spells the end for a population that starts with only a hundred individuals. In the case of the heath hen, even when hunting and habitat alteration were halted, its survival was precarious in the extreme. A proper assessment of the impact of human activity on current biodiversity therefore must take into account populations that have become so small, victims to stochastic fluctuations or are trending in that direction. This is precisely what Stuart Pimm did in describing the prospects of the Hawaiian birds. Only eleven are assured of survival well into the next century. Populations of the remaining 124 species have already been reduced, in some cases perilously so. Yet a simple species accounting notes that 135 species exist: no extinction to report. Simberloff describes the predicament graphically: "Many populations, including the last populations of some species, might be superficially healthy but among the living dead." I believe that the "anecdotal" accounts of extinctions worldwide that ecologists are currently telling us about are but the merest hint of a catastrophic reality that is unfolding silently and, for the most part, away from our sight. Given the absolute impossibility of documenting the demise of every species whose fate is sealed by human activity, we need to be acutely sensitive to these faint echoes on the wind, because they carry an important message. Dominant as no other species has been in the history of life on Earth, Homo sapiens is in the throes of causing a major biological crisis, a mass extinction, the sixth such event to have occurred in the past half billion years. And we, Homo sapiens, may also be among the living dead.

No Extinction Now

Humans can adjust to and prevent mass extinctions

Shaw 98 (Jane, Staff, Heartland Institute, November 1, <http://www.heartland.org/full/13594/Phony_DeathofSpecies_Arguments_Wont_Die.html>, JM)

Quammen’s skill with words obscures figures that don’t add up. Reviewing claims that species are being rapidly extinguished, he cites the work of Norman Myers, one of the first people to claim that hundreds of thousands of species were in danger, and extinctions accelerating. Myers recorded a total of 75 species known to have been lost between 1600 and 1900, and another 75 lost between 1900 and 1979. Regrettable as those are, Quammen goes on to say that this figure of 75 species lost between 1900 and 1970 represents “a rate well above the rate of known losses during the Cretaceous extinction.” The Cretaceous extinction millions of years ago, he told us earlier, wiped out 76 percent of all species. How 75 species today can represent over 76 percent of all identified species (1.4 million as of 1991, according to Paul Ehrlich and E.O. Wilson), I do not know. My guess is that this is some kind of proofreader’s error, but it suggests that the article is unreliable. Even forgetting such a ludicrous claim, the article is one-sided. Quammen states that the “consensus among conscientious biologists is that we’re headed into another mass extinction.” Yet even the person chosen as the centerpiece of his article, University of Chicago biologist David Jablonski, doesn’t explicitly take that position in the article. Interviewed because of his “willingness to discuss the notion that a sixth [mass extinction] is in progress now,” Jablonski is clearly worried about the proliferation of “weedy species,” but he also thinks that human beings may adjust and change the trend. To support the “chorus of consensus” that we are headed toward a mass extinction, Quammen cites three studies. All are predictions of future extinctions (not descriptions of current ones) based on studies of habitat loss. The predictions reflect the theory known as “island biogeography,” which relates the size of habitat loss to the number of species lost. Yet one prominent scientist, Lawrence B. Slobodkin (writing in the scientific journal Nature) has called this theory “useless for explaining or predicting actual cases.” No one denies that loss of habitat can extinguish species, or that tropical deforestation is troubling. However, well established evidence that Quammen chooses to ignore suggests that the loss of species is smaller than his article proclaims. In their book “Noah’s Choice,” Charles Mann and Mark Plummer reviewed the evidence of actual, known extinctions. They pointed out that when Puerto Rico was nearly completely stripped of forest, only seven of the island’s 60 species of birds disappeared. And they reported that during the 19th Century, when the United States forest was extensively logged east of the Mississippi and around the Great Lakes, only five birds went extinct. A 1992 book published by the World Conservation Union, “Tropical Deforestation and Species Extinction,” concluded: “Despite extensive inquiries, we have been unable to obtain conclusive evidence to support the suggestion that massive extinctions have taken place in recent times as [Norman] Myers and others have suggested.” What Quammen fails to recognize is that humans don’t just harm their environment, they protect it and restore it. Quammen sees land conversion as a process that always leads toward biological impoverishment. Land begins as “wildlands,” he explains, and moves in a downward spiral toward the “degraded” state, which he describes as “abused beyond value to anybody.”

No mass extinctions – their models are conjectural

Simon 5 (Julian L., Adjunct Scholar @ Cato Institute, August 3, <http://www.juliansimon.com/writings/Articles/SPECIES4.txt>, JM)

The recommendations that leading biologists and ecologists base on non-facts are staggering. Wilson and Stanford's Paul Ehrlich actually ask that governments act "to reduce the scale of human activities." More specifically, they want us "to cease `developing' any more relatively undisturbed land" because "every new shopping center built in the California chaparral...every swamp converted into a rice paddy or shrimp farm means less biodiversity." Science magazine applauds those calls for major governmental policy changes. The proposals -- brakes on progress -- are what the movers and shakers of the Rio summit hope to impose on the nations of the world. This is no small potatoes. Yet a fair reading of the available data suggests a rate of extinction not even one-thousandth as great as the one the doomsayers scare us with. The proximate source of all the scary forecasts is a 1979 book, The Sinking Ark, by Norman Myers. Myers gives two statistics: the estimated extinction rate of known species of animals between the years 1600 and 1900 was about one every four years. And the estimated rate from 1900 to the present was about one a year. Myers gives no sources for his two estimates, but let us assume they are valid. Mr. Myers then departs spectacularly from that modest evidence. He goes on to say that some scientists have "hazarded a guess" that the extinction rate "could now have reached" 100 species per year. Next, the pure conjecture about an upper limit of present species extinction is increased and used by Mr. Myers and Mr. Lovejoy as the basis for the "projections" quoted everywhere. Mr. Lovejoy -- after converting what was an estimated upper limit into a present best estimate -- says that government inaction is "likely to lead" to the extinction of between 14 and 20 percent of all species before the year 2000. That comes to about 40,000 species lost per year, or about one million from 1980 to 2000. In brief, this extinction rate, which is a thousand times greater than the present rate, is nothing but pure guesswork. Yet it is widely published and understood as a scientific state-ment.

No Extinction Now

No mass extinctions – preventive mechanisms

Simon 5 (Julian L., Adjunct Scholar @ Cato Institute, August 3, <http://www.juliansimon.com/writings/Articles/SPECIES4.txt>, JM)

We are delighted that this species of truth, which we thought was dead, is stirring into life. Bill Clinton should heed the astonishing reversal in scientific assessment. Three additional observations are worth keeping in mind. First, it is now practicable to put samples of endangered species into "banks" that can preserve their genetic possibilities for future generations. Second, genetic recombination techniques now enable biologists to create new variations of species. Finally, it is not easy to extinguish an important species even when we try, as the experience of fighting smallpox and the Medfly revealed. All these factors reduce the danger of extinctions. I do not suggest that we should ignore possible dangers to species. Species constitute a valuable endowment, and we should guard their survival just as we guard our other physical and social assets. But we should strive for a clear and unbiased view of the gains and losses to help judge how much time and money to spend guarding our biological assets.

No reason to believe in unknown extinctions

Simon 5 (Julian L., Adjunct Scholar @ Cato Institute, August 5,http://www.juliansimon.com/writings/Ultimate\_Resource/TCHAR31.txt, JM)

Yet one more difficulty is that the conservation biologists have the disconcerting propensity to offer metaphors rather than data in discussions of these matters. For example, in response to the fact that some extinctions are unknown, as indeed the species themselves are unknown, one ecologist (Thomas Lovejoy) supposedly likened species extinction to a library being burned before the books had even been cataloged, and therefore there may still be loss even though we don't know what it is. But such a metaphor can be entirely misleading. The example may hold for the library in Alexandria that burned 2000 years ago; there were irreparable losses because we have never found other copies of the books. But a better analogy for species extinction may be a newsstand burning down when we have every reason to believe that there are other copies of the publications on the stand in many other places. Obviously the only way to distinguish which is the appropriate analogy is by empirical study.

Reports of imminent extinction are exaggerated and conjectural

Simon 5 (Julian L., Adjunct Scholar @ Cato Institute, August 4, <http://www.juliansimon.com/writings/Norton/NORTON03.txt>, JM)

We may extract these key points from the above summary quotation: (l) The estimated extinction rate of known species is about one every four years between the years from l600 to l900. (2) The estimated rate is about one a year from l900 to the present. (3) Some scientists (in Myers's words) have "hazarded a guess" that the extinction rate "could now have reached" l00 species per year. That is, this number is simply conjecture; it is not even a counter-point estimate but rather an upper bound. The source given for the "some scientists" statement is a staff- written news report. (It should be noted that the subject of this guess is different than the subject of the estimates in (l) and (2), because the former includes mainly or exclusively birds or mammals whereas the latter includes all species. While this difference implies that (l) and (2) may be too low a basis for estimating the present extinction rate of all species, it also implies that there is even less statistical basis for estimating the extinction rate for species other than birds and mammals than it might otherwise seem.) (4) This guessed upper limit in (3) is then increased and used by Myers, and then by Lovejoy, as the basis for the "projections" quoted above. In Global 2000 the language became "are likely to lead" to the extinction of between l4% and 20% of all species before the year 2000. (U.S., l980, II, p. 328) So an upper limit for the present that is pure guesswork has become the basis of a forecast for the future which has been published in newspapers to be read by tens or hundreds of millions of people and understood as a scientifictatement.

Extinction – No Impact – Resilience

The environment is resilient

Easterbrook 96 (Gregg, sr editor, The New Republic, former fellow at the Brookings Institute, A Movement on the Earth, p. 25, JM)

 "Fragile environment" has become a welded phrase of the modern lexicon, like "aging hippie" or "fugitive financier." But the notion of a fragile environment is profoundly wrong. Individual animals, plants, and people are distressingly fragile. The environment that contains them is close to indestructible. The living environment of Earth has survived ice ages; bombardments of cosmic radiation more deadly than atomic fallout; solar radiation more powerful than the worst-case projection for ozone depletion; thousand-year periods of intense volcanism releasing global air pollution far worse than that made by any factory; reversals of the planet's magnetic poles; the rearrangement of continents; transformation of plains into mountain ranges and of seas into plains; fluctuations of ocean currents and the jet stream; 300-foot vacillations in sea levels; shortening and lengthening of the seasons caused by shifts in the planetary axis; collisions of asteroids and comets bearing far more force than man's nuclear arsenals; and the years without summer that followed these impacts. Yet hearts beat on, and petals unfold still. Were the environment fragile it would have expired many eons before the advent of the industrial affronts of the dreaming ape. Human assaults on the environment, though mischievous, are pinpricks compared to forces of the magnitude nature is accustomed to resisting.

Extinction – No Impact

**Biodiversity doesn’t affect the Earth’s survival**

Dodds 0 (Donald, M.S. P.E., President of North Pacific Research, 2000, http://northpacificresearch.com/downloads/The\_myth\_of\_biodiversity.doc, JM)

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 throughout 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 later. 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.

Biodiversity loss has negligible impact

Sedjo 0 (Roger, Sr. Fellow, Resources for the Future, *Conserving Nature’s Biodiversity: insights from biology, ethics and economics*, eds. Van Kooten, Bulte and Sinclair, 2000, p. 114, JM)

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.

Redundancy takes out the impact – no unique species

Maser 99 (Chris, governmental consultant, *Ecological diversity in sustainable development: the vital and forgotten dimension,* May 4, p. 55, JM)

Redundancy, as stated earlier, means that more than one species can perform similar functions. It is a type of ecological insurance policy, which strengthens the ability of the system to retain the integrity of its basic relationships. The insurance of redundancy means that the loss of a species or two is not likely to result in such severe functional disruptions of the ecosystem so as to cause its collapse because other species can make up for the functional loss. But there comes a point, a threshold, when the loss of one or two more species may in fact lip the balance and cause the system to begin an irreversible change. That change may signal a decline in quality or productivity of the very things for which we humans valued the system in the first place. An example might be the loss of indigenous perennial grasses in the Great Basin of the American West due to overgrazing by domestic livestock coupled with the suppression of fire. This combination allowed the takeover of such exotic annuals as cheatgrass brome, which effectively excluded indigenous perennial grasses and thereby created a virtual monoculture of little value as habitat for wildlife or for grazing livestock compared with the habitat diversity and quality of the forage inherent in the indigenous grassland.

Extinction – No Impact

Biodiversity has no effect on ecosystems

Warrick 97 (Joby, Washington Post, Aug 29, Lexis, JM)

Ecologists have long maintained that diversity is one of nature's greatest strengths, but new research suggests that diversity alone does not guarantee strong ecosystems. In findings that could intensify the debate over endangered species and habitat conservation, three new studies suggest a greater abundance of plant and animal varieties doesn't always translate to better ecological health. At least equally important, the research found, are the types of species and how they function together. "Having a long list of Latin names isn't always better than a shorter list of Latin names," said Stanford University biologist Peter Vitousek, co-author of one of the studies published in the journal Science. Separate experiments in California, Minnesota and Sweden, found that diversity often had little bearing on the performance of ecosystems -- at least as measured by the growth and health of native plants. In fact, the communities with the greatest biological richness were often the poorest when it came to productivity and the cycling of nutrients. One study compared plant life on 50 remote islands in northern Sweden that are prone to frequent wildfires from lightning strikes. Scientist David Wardle of Land care Research in Lincoln, New Zealand, and colleagues at the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, found that islands dominated by a few species of plants recovered more quickly than nearby islands with greater biological diversity. Similar findings were reported by University of Minnesota researchers who studied savannah grasses, and by Stanford's Vitousek and colleague David Hooper, who concluded that functional characteristics of plant species were more important than the number of varieties in determining how ecosystems performed. British plant ecologist J.P. Grime, in a commentary summarizing the research, said there is as yet no "convincing evidence that species diversity and ecosystem function are consistently and causally related." "It could be argued," he added, "that the tide is turning against the notion of high biodiversity as a controller of ecosystem function and insurance against ecological collapse."

Extinction – AT: Niche Theory

Niches don’t disappear, they change

Herberd & Moyle 86 (Bruce & Peter B., PhD, Professor of Fish Biology @ UCalifornia Davis, *The American Naturalist* 128, 5, p. 751-760, November, JM)

Species niches are unique to each species and are based on the genetic background of the species. Because of developmental differences, the same NOTES AND COMMENTS 753 species may occupy different niches in different communities. Since each niche is unique and is determined by the genetic background of the population and the habitat and community it is in, these sorts of niches cannot be vacant. The number of species niches in a community will always equal the number of species. This hierarchy of definitions of niches emphasizes that empty niches are not possible (species niches), are not known (primary niches), or are arbitrarily defined (intermediate niches). Much of the conflict and confusion in discussions of niches (either vacant or filled) seems to revolve around a failure to acknowledge these different levels used in defining niches.

No vacant niches – separate habitats solve

Herberd & Moyle 86 (Bruce & Peter B., PhD, Professor of Fish Biology @ UCalifornia Davis, *The American Naturalist* 128, 5, p. 751-760, November, JM)

The use of the term vacant niche is potentially limiting in its effect on ecological studies. Price, citing Rohde (1978), reported that monogenean infestations of fish gills are more prevalent in tropical waters than in temperate seas. From this he concluded that "in temperate seas the vast majority of ecological niches [for monogenean trematodes] remain vacant" (1984, p. 514). We believe that a more productive approach would be to investigate the ecological questions raised by this observation: how sustainable parasite loads may be influenced by productivity in a region, how different families of fish might be differentially susceptible to or tolerant of gill parasites, or how the more patchy habitats in tropical seas influence the infection rates in hosts confined to particular habitats. Similarly, Lawton (1984) attributed the different patterns of bracken use by herbivores in different areas to vacant niches. However, the competing theory that the different areas provide different microhabitats is richer (Slobodkin 1986) since a greater number of predictions can be tested (e.g., stem borers may not prosper in a windswept environment, or leafminers may be restricted by the maximum leaf temperature). All these questions may be phrased to include vacant niches, but the only way to test this hypothesis would involve introducing the "missing" species. This test is illegal in most western countries, and, as we hope to show below, the results are difficult to interpret. Studies of the reasons why resources are used one way in one environment and a different way in another seem to be much more tractable.

Extinction – AT: Ethics

Extinction is natural – our ultimate obligation is to conform to nature

Michael 5 (Mark A., Professor of Philosophy at Austin Peay State University, *Ethics and the Environment* 10, 1, MUSE, JM)

This argument features a claim that is often used with great effect to show that we need not be troubled by the sorts of activities that environmentalists claim we ought to avoid. Its effectiveness lies in its appeal to an idea that environmentalists seemingly would want to accept, which I will refer to as the principle of acting naturally, and which holds that humans ought to act naturally, to follow nature, to do what comes naturally. If we care about nature, after all, how could we do better than to act in accord with nature or to follow it? But while the principle sounds innocuous, it has implications which fly in the face of what environmentalists [End Page 50] typically think we ought to be doing, when it is combined with other empirical claims that also appear to be part of an environmental world view. Suppose we adopt the thesis from evolutionary biology that the behavior of species within an ecosystem is a part of the evolutionary give and take which often leads, ultimately, to the demise of a species. This sometimes involves direct competition for resources and habitat, although more often than not there is some triggering event which modifies an ecosystem, thereby altering the nature of the interspecies interactions, whether competitive or otherwise, which had previously held sway. The crucial point here is that extinction is often a completely natural, normal, and expected byproduct of interspecific interactions; when an ecosystem undergoes a disturbance as the result of some climatic or other sort of change, the presence and behavior of those species which share the ecosystem is almost always a contributing factor when one of its member species becomes extinct. It is a basic tenet of a naturalistic outlook that humans are every bit as natural as any other species. We are the result of the same processes that produced all other species, and we are subject to the same laws of nature that govern their life histories. Thus, whatever we wind up doing, however we wind up behaving as a species, our actions and their consequences are no more unnatural than the behavior of any other species. Additionally, we humans have shown ourselves to be rather proficient competitors, at least so far. We excel at capturing resources, filling our ecological niche and expanding our range, driving many species to extinction in the process. But our driving other species to extinction is perfectly natural. We just do what other species do, only much more efficiently. In some sense it would be unnatural for us to rein in our activities to an extent that our behavior had no effects or exerted no ecological pressures at all on other species. That is one of the things species do; they causally interact with and have an impact on the life histories of other species. If then what we ought to be doing is following nature or acting in accordance with nature, then our activities are neither morally untoward nor objectionable, even if they result in the extinction of species and a significant reduction of overall biodiversity. Thus environmentalists should not be worried about extinction of any sort, about the destruction of the rain forest, or indeed about any of the things that environmentalists get so worked up about, if the principle of acting naturally is correct.

Extinction – AT: Ethics

Ethical claims about humans’ relation to nature are irrelevant

Michael 5 (Mark A., Professor of Philosophy at Austin Peay State University, *Ethics and the Environment* 10, 1, MUSE, JM)

Thus, 'nature' is understood as whatever has not been intentionally altered by humans. This account has the virtue of being purely descriptive without entailing that driving species to extinction is natural. In fact if we combine this account with the principle that we ought to act naturally, we get the desired conclusion—we ought not to drive species to extinction, because it is unnatural. On the other hand, this account of the natural gives rise to some puzzles. First, it follows from this account that humans never do or can act naturally, at least where an action is understood as some behavior caused by an intention. Of course we can behave naturally, as when we sneeze or our hearts beat. But nothing that we do intentionally can ever be natural. The only way to act naturally is to forbear from interfering with or diverting nature. Humans would then have to adopt a kind of moral quietism with respect to the non-human realm if we are to act naturally. But then we might wonder whether the intentional activities of other, non-human beings would also be unnatural. That is, is what makes something unnatural on this account just that it is intentional? That appears to be a distinction without a difference; why would the behavior of other species be unnatural just because it was intentional? [End Page 55] How exactly does intentionality connect with the idea of naturalness, given that intentional action is based in the circuitry of the brain, and so is just a sophisticated biological process? This raises the suspicion that intentionality is really only a stand-in for what is really thought to be the difference between natural and unnatural actions, namely that the latter are those actions performed by humans. This suspicion gains in credibility when it is noted that if humans intentionally forbear from causally affecting or diverting non-human processes, we would not be said to be acting unnaturally on this account. Humans might think about damming a river but then reject the idea and thus intentionally not do so. Since forbearing to dam the river is intentional, why doesn't that constitute acting unnaturally? So it appears that what is crucial to this account is not whether the act was intentional but rather whether it was performed by a human. But why then separate out one species in this regard?4 There was once a ready answer to this. Humans are different because we have immaterial souls and so are discontinuous with that part of the creation that is purely material. But if human beings are continuous with the rest of nature then the claim that intentional human actions are unnatural just insofar and inasmuch as they are performed by humans is a tail unattached to any theoretical body. Given the current account of our species based in evolutionary theory, there are plenty of differences between ourselves and other species; our genetic code is different, our morphology is different, our capacities are different. But none of those provide a basis for saying our species or its behavior is unnatural. All these puzzles are the result of taking the concept of the natural out of its original setting and forcing it to bear some theoretical weight in the context of our current understanding of biology and ecology. So, for example, the distinction between the kind of behavior that will or will not lead to the health of an individual or species makes sense in the contemporary context. The distinction between natural and unnatural behavior does not.

We cannot attribute intrinsic value to species

Van der Tuuk 99 (M.E., Prof. of Philosophy, *Recognizing the Intrinsic Value of Animals*, http://intrinsicvalueofanimals.wordpress.com/, JM)

The concept of intrinsic value can be regarded as an intellectual instrument in the struggle against anthropocentrism (Musschenga 1994). Nevertheless, several views on the meaning of intrinsic value can be distinguished. The emphasis on intrinsic value results from the intensification of the way animals are being used and instrumentalized, especially during the last decades. Most advocates of the intrinsic value of animals will use it as the conceptual opposite to instrumental value, i.e. the economical value an animal has for us (its usefulness). “The animal is of value for its own sake; it is not a mere thing.” The difficult question then is, whether or not these values, in order to be called “intrinsic“, must exist independent of the one who does the valuing. On the one hand it is claimed that, as we are the ones that attribute value to animals, this value does not exist “out there“, and therefore, intrinsic value is not the proper term. The value of the animal, whether instrumental, moral, aesthetical, or other, is always an attributed one. On the other hand, however, it is claimed that man is not the measure of all things, and that the most crucial aspect of intrinsic value consists precisely in the fact that it is not an attributed value, but an objective one, something belonging to the animal itself. According to G.E. Moore, intrinsic value refers to the value things would have if they existed by themselves, in absolute isolation. It is a value that depends on the non-relational properties of something (rarity, for example, would be a relational property (Moore 1903/1952, p. 187; cf. Musschenga 1994). And Tom Regan likewise states that “the presence of inherent value in a natural object is independent of any awareness, interest, or appreciation of it by any conscious being” (cited in for example Bracke 1990, p. 46, Achterberg & Zweers 1986, p. 128). Otherwise, they argue, anthropocentrism would not be overcome.

Extinction – AT: Ethics

Turn – extinction is better than the conditions that precede it

Reily 5 (John J., PhD, July 9, http://www.johnreilly.info/teotw.htm, JM)

By far the most valuable and readable part of "The End of the World" is its treatment of the ethics of human survival. Even if the human race's near-term extinction is much less than 50% likely, survival could still require an affirmative decision on the part of human leaders to ensure that the human race has a long future. Leslie makes a good case that the predominant theories of ethics today offer no rational grounds for such a decision. John Rawls's "A Theory of Justice" comes in for particular attack. Rawls's confining ethical imperatives to "fairness," says Leslie, creates no particular imperative to improve people's overall well-being, it simply requires that they be treated equally. More to the point, it does not imply that, all things being equal, large populations might be better than small populations, or even better than zero population. Favorable contemplation of the latter possibility is not confined to "deep ecologists," by the way. There are ethicists who argue that, since there will inevitably be unhappy people in any human population, it would be better if there were no such populations. As my grammar school principal used to say, it's just a few who spoil it for all the rest. A decision to preserve the human race could be sharp and dramatic, like whether to launch a nuclear war, or reply to a first strike with a second. It could involve immediate costs for a long-term payoff, like instituting economic restructuring to minimize the artificial Greenhouse Effect. On the other hand, it could be something as mundane as demographic policy. Leslie points out that the human race would become extinct by AD 2400 if it had Germany's birthrate. It is not inconceivable that, in the next century, the world will have such a rate. I will not disguise from the reader that this book is a bit of a mess. The doomsday scenarios are piled on without much attention to order or plausibility. I myself might have voted to end the world, if I had had to read one more illustration of Bayes's Rule using an urn and lottery. Still, it is rare to come across a book that makes such far-reaching connections. For instance, the question of whether we should ensure the existence of possibly less-than-blissful human societies in the future is shown to bear on the question of how a good God could have created a less-than-perfect world. Also, I don't think I have ever seen a more intriguing argument against Hume's theory of ethics than the one Leslie outlines.

Species – Impact Inevitable

Extinctions are cyclic – the impact is inevitable

Dodds 0 (Donald, M.S. P.E., President of North Pacific Research, 2000, http://northpacificresearch.com/downloads/The\_myth\_of\_biodiversity.doc, JM)

Now notice that only once in the last 500 million years did life ever exceed 1500 genera, and that was in the middle of the Cretaceous Period around 100 million years ago, when the dinosaurs exploded on the planet. Obviously, biodiversity has a bad side. The direct result of this explosion in biodiversity was the extinction of the dinosaurs that followed 45 million years later at the KT boundary. It is interesting to note, that at the end of the extinction the number of genera had returned to the 1500 level almost exactly. Presently biodiversity is at an all time high and has again far exceeded the 1500 genera level. Are we overdue for another extinction? A closer look at the KT extinction 65 million years ago reveals at least three things. First the 1500 genera that remained had passed the test of environmental compatibility and remained on the planet. This was not an accident. Second, these extinctions freed niches for occupation by better-adapted species. The remaining genera now faced an environment with hundreds of thousands of vacant niches. Third, it only took about 15 million years to refill all of those niches and completely replaced the dinosaurs, with new and better species. In this context, a better species is by definition one that is more successful in dealing with a changing environment.

Loss of biodiversity is inevitable – interference makes it worse

Dodds 0 (Donald, M.S. P.E., President of North Pacific Research, 2000, http://northpacificresearch.com/downloads/The\_myth\_of\_biodiversity.doc, JM)

What is suggested by geologic history is that the world has more biodiversity than it ever had and that it maybe overdue for another major extinction. Unfortunately, today many scientists have too narrow a view. They are highly specialized. They have no time for geologic history. This appears to be a problem of inadequate education not ignorance. What is abundantly clear is that artificially enforcing rigid biodiversity works against the laws of nature, and will cause irreparable damage to the evolution of life on this planet and maybe beyond. The world and the human species may be better served if we stop trying to prevent change, and begin trying to understand change and positioning the human species to that it survives the inevitable change of evolution. If history is to be believed, the planet has 3 times more biodiversity than it had 65 million years ago. Trying to sustain that level is futile and may be dangerous. The next major extinction, change in biodiversity, is as inevitable as climate change. We cannot stop either from occurring, but we can position the human species to survive those changes.

Turn – Speciation

Extinctions create room for new species

Simon 5 (Julian L., Adjunct Scholar @ Cato Institute, August 5, http://www.juliansimon.com/writings/Ultimate\_Resource/TCHAR31.txt, JM)

In the case of species extinction, as with many other public issues, there is a tendency to focus only upon the bad effects, and to exclude from consideration possible good effects of human activities. For example, Lugo notes that "Because humans have facilitated immigration [of species] and created new environments, exotic species have successfully become established in the Caribbean islands. This has resulted in a general increase in the total inventories of bird and tree species." In tropical Puerto Rico where "human activity reduced the area of primary forests by 99%", as great a reduction as could be imagined, "seven bird species...became extinct after 500 years of human pressure...and...exotic [newly resident] species enlarged the species pool. More land birds have been present on the Island in the 1980s (97 species) than were present in pre- Colombian time (60 species)." Perhaps conservation biologists make mention of the extinctions but not of the newly-resident species because, as Lugo notes, "there is a clear aversion to exotic [newly resident] species by preservationists and biologists (in cases such as predatory mammals and pests, with good reason!)." This aversion to transplanted species may derive from the belief that humankind is somehow artificial and not "natural." Consider the language of Myers, who has played as important a role as any person in raising the alarm about species extinction: "[W]hereas past extinctions have occurred by virtue of natural processes, today the virtually exclusive cause is man." One should distinguish, of course, between the extinction of an indigenous species found nowhere else, and its replacement with a species found elsewhere. But it should be noted that new arrivals from elsewhere often mutate into entire new species. Furthermore, species thought to be lost in one place often pop up years or decades later in the same or another place - even relatively vulnerable species such as the Allocebus lemur of Madagascar where much of the rain forest has been cut; the lemur had not been seen since 1964, but a primalogist went out to find one and did. Another example: The capitate milkvitch flower was found near the city of Afula in Israel in 1993 after not having been seen since 1942.

Extinctions increase biodiversity

Dodds 0 (Donald, M.S. P.E., President of North Pacific Research, 2000, http://northpacificresearch.com/downloads/The\_myth\_of\_biodiversity.doc, JM)

Notice next that at least ten times biodiversity fell rapidly; none of these extreme reductions in biodiversity were caused by humans. Around 250 million years ago the number of genera was reduce 85 percent from about 1200 to around 200, by any definition a significant reduction in biodiversity. Now notice that after this extinction a steep and rapid rise of biodiversity. In fact, if you look closely at the curve, you will find that every mass-extinction was followed by a massive increase in biodiversity. Why was that? Do you suppose it had anything to do with the number environmental niches available for exploitation? If you do, you are right. Extinctions are necessary for creation. Each time a mass extinction occurs the world is filled with new and better-adapted species. That is the way evolution works, its called survival of the fittest. Those species that could not adapted to the changing world conditions simply disappeared and better species evolved. How efficient is that? Those that could adapt to change continued to thrive. For example, the cockroach and the shark have been around well over 300 million years. There is a pair to draw to, two successful species that any creator would be proud to produce. To date these creatures have successful survived six extinctions, without the aid of humans or the EPA.

\*\*Defo\*\*

Deforestation Low

Deforestation low now

DailyMail 6-6 (Science & Tech, http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-1394692/Forget-deforestation-The-worlds-woodland-getting-denser-change-help-combat-climate-change.html, JM)

For years exponents of climate change theories have used images of deforestation to support their cause. However, the density of forests and woodland across much of the world is actually increasing, according to a respected scientific study. The change, which is being dubbed the ‘Great Reversal’, could be crucial in reducing atmospheric carbon, which is linked to climate change. In countries from Finland to Malaysia, the thickening has taken place so quickly that it has reversed the carbon losses caused by deforestation between 1990 and 2010. In Britain, forest density has increased by 10.8 per cent from 2000 to 2010 and by 6.6 per cent across the whole of Europe. Even South America and Africa, which have suffered deforestation because of logging and farming, have recorded increases in forest density of 0.8 per cent and 1.1 per cent respectively. Dubbed the planet's lungs, forests act as huge carbon sinks that absorb carbon dioxide from the atmosphere as they grow.

Forests haven’t been in decline for almost a century

Kasun 3 (Jacqueline, Economist, January 9, <http://www.juntosociety.com/guest/sperlazzo/bs_opm1010903.html>, JM)

This is an important matter because forests are an essential part of the world's environment and, therefore, humanity's well-being. The Psalmists spoke in awe of the cedars of Lebanon. Today we know that trees inhale carbon dioxide and exhale oxygen, which means that they are a first line of defense against air pollution and the specter of global warming. The world forested area, estimated by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN (FAO), currently amounts to four billion hectares, covering 30% of the land surface of the earth. Few people realize this is the same figure as in the 1950s. . In the United States, vast forests cover a third of the land, according to the US Forest Service. That's equivalent to two-thirds of the amount of land that was forested when the Europeans arrived in the 1600s. This acreage has not declined since 1920. In fact, annual forest growth today is more than 3-1/2 times what it was in 1920. Two-thirds of the nation's forests are classed as timberland, capable of producing at least 20 cubic feet per acre of industrial wood annually. Another fact: Trees are growing 33% faster than they are being cut.

Deforestation up – law enforcement

AP 5-7 (Staff, “Amazon Deforestation Falls by 44%,” http://english.pravda.ru/science/earth/05-07-2011/118394-amazon\_deforestation-0/, JM)

Deforestation in the Amazon fell 44% during the month of May compared to April this year. The data, released last Thursday (30) Deforestation Detection in Real Time, came from the National Institute for Space Research (INPE), which measures the clearcut and forest degradation in real time. The deforested area, captured by satellites that monitor the bioma, fell by more than 200 km ², which indicates a downward trend. The decrease from 477.2 km ² to 267.9 km ², is explained by the Brazilian Environment Ministry as a result of the harsh measures adopted in March and April by the Crisis Office. Formed in March, after the announcement of increase in deforestation, the task force integrated by the Brazilian Institute of Environment and Natural Resources (IBAMA), the Federal Police, Federal Highway Police, National Security Force and the Army intensified its actions in both combating illegal logging, and in patrolling the highways where illegal timber is transported. Alerts - The number of alerts issued to guide the inspections by IBAMA doubled, indicating that the satellites were able to more accurately capture the images of deforestation in the Amazon. The more open time allowed better visualization. From January to June this year 500 square kilometers in area were scrutinised and more than 30 truckloads of illegal logs were seized.

Deforestation Low

Deforestation down – palm oil markets

Butler 6-16 (Rhett, Staff, Reuters, Palm Oil Plantations Could Help Preserve the Amazon, http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/06/16/idUS56388147020110616, JM)

Yet even as Brazilian and international firms gear up for a major expansion of palm oil cultivation in the Amazon, there is a conspicuous lack of hand wringing by environmentalists. The reason: done right, oil palm could emerge as a key component in the effort to save the Amazon rainforest. Responsible production there could even force changes in Indonesia and Malaysia, both of which have been widely criticized for their poor records on protecting tropical forests. Palm oil could ultimately benefit the Amazon for a number of reasons. Planted on the degraded pasture land that abounds in the Brazilian Amazon, oil palm could generate more jobs and higher incomes for locals than the dominant form of land use in the region: low intensity cattle ranching. Rather than destroying more rainforest for still-more cattle pasture, local farmers could go into the oil palm business and benefit from its higher returns. "At current prices, it can provide a Brazilian smallholder a ticket to the middle class," said Tim Killeen, a senior research fellow and Amazon expert at Conservation International. "Anybody can do the math: 200 kilos of meat per hectare versus 4 tons of oil per hectare. Plantations create jobs, but a smallholder model creates a middle class." Replacing cattle pasture with palm oil plantations also offers significant environmental benefits, as palm trees - though not nearly as valuable ecologically as rainforest - at least sequester carbon and evapotranspirate moisture, which is important to the hydrological cycle of rainforests. Oil palm expansion in Brazil also could put pressure on Indonesia and Malaysia to clean up their acts. Brazil's stricter environmental laws mean that, should the country begin to produce large amounts of sustainably produced palm oil, it would place Southeast Asian producers at a disadvantage if they hope to sell to European and American corporations, which are increasingly concerned about buying palm oil associated with forest destruction. Oil palm is among the most productive and profitable tropical crops. A 25-acre plantation can yield palm oil worth more than $7,000 a year for a planter, far in excess of ranching or farming. But its profitability has spurred unbridled expansion in Indonesia and Malaysia, where more than half of oil palm expansion since 1990 has occurred at the expense of tropical forests. Asian production also has fouled rivers and released billions of tons of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. Producers there have at times run roughshod over traditional forest users, resulting in social conflict. Accordingly, the industry is increasingly battered by criticism from human rights groups and environmentalists. So why would palm oil in the Amazon be different? Little oil palm is now grown in Brazil - only 350 square miles. In the Brazilian Amazon today, cattle ranching is the big driver of deforestation. Cattle pasture occupies more than 70 percent of deforested land in the Amazon, obliterating forest and resulting in a near-complete loss of stored carbon and a loss of wildlife. The loss of vegetation reduces transpiration, affecting local rainfall. Where large areas of rainforest have been converted for cattle pasture, it becomes drier and more susceptible to drought and fires, which sometimes spread into adjacent forest areas. Cattle themselves cause problems, compacting the soil, damaging local waterways, and worsening erosion. Meanwhile processing their hides pollutes rivers and streams with toxic chemicals. In short, cattle ranching, as traditionally produced in the Amazon, is often a menace to the environment. Palm oil is a much different agricultural product. First and foremost, the oil palm is a tree, meaning that it absorbs carbon dioxide and releases water vapor as it grows. The result is that oil palm stores six to seven times the amount of carbon as cattle pasture. Daniel Nepstad, a scientist who co-founded the Amazon Environmental Research Institute (IPAM), said that large-scale expansion of oil palm plantations into pasture "would help mitigate regional climate change, exemplified by the severe droughts of 2010 and 2005, by re-establishing year-round evapotranspiration in an important region of the eastern Amazon."

Deforestation High

Deforestation up – encouraging legislation

Nielsen 7-5 (Stephen, Staff, Bloomberg News, http://climate-connections.org/2011/07/05/amazon-deforestation-rates-double-as-farmers-anticipate-pardons/, JM)

Deforestation rates in the Amazon, the world’s biggest rain forest, more than doubled in May as Brazilian farmers become more confident they’ll be granted amnesty for illegal logging. Almost 268 square kilometers (66,200 acres) of protected rain forest were cut down in May, up from 110 square kilometers a year ago, the National Institute for Space Research said in an e-mailed statement. Brazil lawmakers are considering a bill that alters its forestry code and would forgive farmers who illegally cleared trees. The possibility that the government may ease these restrictions is encouraging more logging, said Marcio Astrini, coordinator of forest campaigns for Greenpeace International’s Brazil unit. That would hamper international efforts to fight global warming by protecting trees that absorb greenhouse gases. “Brazil’s been reducing its deforestation for the last five years and this bill comes along and now it shoots up,” Astrini said yesterday by phone. “There is only one reason why deforestation is increasing: it’s called the forestry code,” which may be changing. The bill was approved by Brazil’s lower house May 24 by a 410-63 vote. The Senate has not yet voted on it and President Dilma Rousseff has vowed to veto the legislation if it does pass. If the bill is approved in its current form, farmers won’t have to replant trees that were illegally cut prior to July 2008, an estimated 30 million hectares (74 million acres), according to a study by government research agency Instituto de Pesquisa Economica Aplicada. That’s about the size of the Philippines. Under Brazil’s current forestry code, penalties for illegal logging include fines and a requirement to replant trees.

**Deforestation High**

Deforestation is happening – herbicidal agents

Messenger 7-5 (Stephen, Staff, Treehugger, http://www.treehugger.com/files/2011/07/vietnam-era-weapon-being-used-to-clear-the-amazon.php, JM)

Of all the despicable things I thought possible going on around the Amazonian Rainforrest,  using an extremely powerful chemical agent on the forest would’ve never crossed not even the darkest region of my conscious. It’s indeed petrifying what the human mind can conjure up for profit. [Agent Orange](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Agent_Orange) is the chemical in question, and is one of the herbicides and defoliants used by the U.S. military as part of its herbicidal warfare program, Operation Ranch Hand, during the Vietnam War. It provides a quick and easy deployment from the air via an helicopter, and the surface deforested can amount to entire hectares on a single flight. It also doesn’t draw as much attention as a chainsaw or tractor. This is why some ranchers decided to use the method. Brazil’s environmental agency IBAMA detected through an aerial survey, from a few weeks back, 440 acres of rainforest that had been sprayed with the compound – poisoning thousands of trees and an untold number of animals, potentially for generations. The agency began the surveying operation after satellite imagery showed trees in the Amazonian forest ash-colored and defoliated by toxic chemicals. Curiously enough, last week, IBAMA found approximately [four tons of Agent Orange](http://www.ibama.gov.br/archives/16102) hidden in the forest awaiting dispension. If released, the chemicals could have potentially decimated some 7,500 acres of rainforest, killing all the wildlife that resides there and contaminating groundwater. In this case, the individual responsible was identified and now faces fines nearing $1.3 million. The method in question seems to have sprung out again, since the last case involving it was reported in 1999. Officials however claim that the method might have been more thoroughly used, but has remained undetected so far. More such cases are predicted to appear now with intensification in environmental crime hunt in Brazil.

Deforestation is high – the trend is reversing

Vaidyanathan 7-1 (Gayathri, Staff, Nature.com, <http://blogs.nature.com/news/2011/07/deforestation_rises_in_the_ama.html>, JM)

For the third month in a row, Brazil’s early-warning system for monitoring deforestation in the Amazon has found higher-than-usual levels of cleared forest area (see the original report, in Portuguese). The LANDSAT satellite data, from Brazil’s National Institute for Space Research's DETER program, shows a total clearing of 267.9 square kilometers in May, a 144% increase on the 109.6 square kilometers cleared in May last year. For March and April 2011, about 593.0 square kilometers of forest area were cleared, according to DETER. This is five times the corresponding clearing in 2010. Deforestation in the Amazon has been declining since 2004, but recent months have suggested a reversal, although month-to-moth figures tend to vary. The deforestation rates between August 2010 and July 2011 – the year covered by the programme – are yet to be released. The rise in deforestation in recent months may be due to proposed changes in Brazil’s Forest Law under consideration by the Congress. The amendments reduce the amount of privately-owned land that must be maintained as forest by small landholders from 80% to 50%. It requires landholders to register how much of their land is forested, as well as providing amnesty from fines for forest cleared before 2008. The bill is widely expected to pass, and landowners may be increasing their clearing in order to seek some sort of amnesty for older cuts once the law comes into effect. The environmental blog Ecopolity opines the deforestation could also be due to rising commodity prices, with the 81% of the deforestation between March and April this year in the Mato Grosso, where most of Brazil’s soybean and beef producers are based. Soybean prices rose from US$ 5.50/bushel in 2006 to US$ 13.60/bushel, reports Ecopolity. And the market has shifted from eco-minded American and European consumers to Asian and Eastern European buyers who ask few questions.

Deforestation is rising

Mongabay.com 7-2 (Staff, http://news.mongabay.com/2011/0702-month-in-review-jun11.html, JM)

Brazil approved the controversial Belo Monte dam, a hydroelectric project that will generate 11 megawatts peak power production by blocking the Xingu River, one of the Amazon's largest tributaries. Belo Monte will inundate some 40,000 hectares of rainforest and displace more than 16,000 people. The project is expected to exacerbate deforestation in surrounding areas. Also in Brazil, satellite data confirmed an increase in deforestation over last year. Analysis by INPE and Imazon both showed a marked rise in forest clearing and degradation. The news came as a poll commissioned by environmental groups showed that the majority of Brazilians do not support efforts to weaken the country's forest code.

Deforestation – No Impact – Resilience

Forests are resilient – no access to deep parts

Rothbard and Rucker 97 (David Rothbard and Craig Rucker, Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow, “The rainforest issue: Myths and facts” CFACT Briefing Paper #102, JM)

Lacher also discusses the second factor which is that deforestation rates are not fixed. He notes that most of the deforestation in the Amazon has taken place "along peripheral areas" of the basin and has not been in the heart of the rainforest. He contends there are not roads and other ways to get into the deeper interior -- "no way to get in, so it's not going to happen." [Dr. Nigel Smith says the national integration highways "remain but a hairline fracture across a sea of forest" and says there is a trend towards use of second growth, or improving existing pasture, rather than clearing mature forest -- noting that second growth communities are often closer to the roads and old enough to generate sufficient ash for fertilizing crops]. Lacher calls the conjecture about the rainforest on the verge of disappearing "unwarranted speculation." He further talks about how "ill-conceived deceived development schemes" attracted poor people to try and settle in the rainforest, that they were "encouraged to move in," but that they were not adequately backed up with technology transfer, etc. (Phone interview, 11/96)

Forests resilient – hunter-gatherers prove

Rothbard and Rucker 97 (David Rothbard and Craig Rucker, Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow, “The rainforest issue: Myths and facts” CFACT Briefing Paper #102, JM)

Dr. Nigel Smith, a professor of geography at the University of Florida is a leading expert on the issue of the Brazilian rainforest and in his landmark paper, "Human-Induced Landscape Changes in Amazonia and Implications for Development," he begins by saying "One of the most persistent myths about Amazonia is that it has long been a wilderness, virtually untouched by humans until relatively recently. Amazonian forests are often portrayed as sparsely settled or essentially empty until modern times." As a result, he claims "The perception of Amazonia as raw, untamed nature awaiting modern development with few precedents has led to some inappropriate policy decisions." Smith further notes that while such ideas "widely disseminated in the media and among decision-makers in sociopolitical life have created the impression that Amazonia is essentially a `clean- slate'...this latest wave of clearing is taking place on landscapes that have often been through several slash-and-burn cycles in the distant past." Hunters and gatherers, he says, entered Amazonia from various directions at different times and undertook many activities in the rainforest. They "burned grassland and scrub to flush game and kill small animals, thereby creating more open habitats," and created landscape changes that became more pronounced when "large scale farming came on the scene. Maize has been cultivated in the Ecuadorian Amazon for at least 6,000 years and root-crop farming began long before that, particularly with cassava (manioc), sweet potato, and the New World yam. By the time the Europeans arrived, many parts of the Amazon basin were being farmed, and settlement was particularly dense along silt-laden rivers." "Estimates of human populations in Amazonia around A.D. 1500 range from one to almost seven million...[and] substantial parts of Amazonia must have been cleared at some time of contact to support several million people." This has been backed up as "pioneer highways and accompanying settlements have exposed numerous black earth sites with pottery on a wide variety of soil types suggesting that sizeable and sedentary populations once occupied `pristine' upland forests." Smith goes so far as to state, "In spite of the development push that began in the 1960's, it seems unlikely that the area cleared today is any larger than it was in 1500...the area of forest is probably greater now than when the Europeans arrived." (Smith, pp.231-245)

Forests resilient – regrowth

Rothbard and Rucker 97 (David Rothbard and Craig Rucker, Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow, “The rainforest issue: Myths and facts” CFACT Briefing Paper #102, JM)

Thus, just by simple logic, this means that the idea that once rainforest is gone, it is gone forever is obviously a myth. If people have been in the forests for centuries, clearing huge areas for agriculture and other purposes, and now it's hard to even find evidence of their civilization, the rainforest obviously grows back quite well. Travel to Mexico, for instance, and see ancient Mayan ruins that have only recently been discovered because entire cities have been swallowed up by the reforested jungle, and this will be more than clear. In fact, at Dartmouth University, Thomas Lovejoy was recently giving a lecture and showing pictures of Amazon land that had been deforested only four to five years before. The regrowth in these areas was "verdant and vigorous; the canopy had ascended to a height of nearly 25 feet. In order to study an `island' of rainforest, it must remain isolated, surrounded by cleared land. So when asked if the second growth interfered with his project, Lovejoy jokingly admitted, `Well we have a chain saw.'" (Dartmouth Review, p.8) Nigel Smith points out that "a pattern of waxing and waning of forest cover is not unique to Amazonia. The forests of New England in the United States, for example, are more extensive now than they were during the time of the colonies. The oak forests of southern England, severely cut back in Roman times, had largely returned by the time Henry VIII assumed the throne, only to be felled again for iron smelting, building materials, and agriculture." (Smith, p. 238-239)

Deforestation – No Impact – Generally

No impact to deforestation – doesn’t affect “pure” forests

Rothbard and Rucker 97 (David Rothbard and Craig Rucker, Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow, “The rainforest issue: Myths and facts” CFACT Briefing Paper #102, JM) Another important fact, according to Sedjo and Clawson, relates to a study done by the Food and Agriculture Organization and U.N. Environmental Programme by J.P. Lanly. Lanly is Forest Coordinator for the UNEP/FAO Tropical Resources Assessment Project and his study "indicates that [of the roughly 7 million acres worldwide per year] the undisturbed or "virgin" broadleaved closed forests have a far lower rate of deforestation than the total, being only 0.27 percent annually as compared with 2.06 percent annually for logged over secondary forest. This figure indicates that deforestation pressure on the more pristine and generally more genetically diverse tropical forests is quite low." Further, "these findings are in sharp contrast to the conventional view that the tropical forests are `disappearing at an alarming rate' and suggest that concerns over the imminent loss of some of the most important residences of the world's diverse genetic base, based on rates of tropical deforestation, are probably grossly exaggerated." (Simon, Rational Readings, p.746) Sedjo and Clawson also said "While the local effects of rapid deforestation may be severe, the evidence does not support the view that either the world or the tropics are experiencing rapid aggregate deforestation. Furthermore, the evidence shows that current rates of deforestation are quite modest in much of the world's virgin tropical forests, for example those of the Amazon; and therefore they are probably in little danger of wholesale destruction in the foreseeable future." (Eco-Sanity, p.90)

Cloud changes check the impact

Bala et al. 7 (G. Bala, K. Caldeira, M. Wickett, T. J. Phillips, D. B. Lobell, C. Delire, and A. Mirin, “Combined climate and carbon-cycle effects of large-scale deforestation,” http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1871823/, JM)

Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, In the tropics, however, increases in surface albedo (Fig. 4A and Table 1) do not produce as much cooling, largely due to the changes in clouds. The removal of forests also decreases evapotranspiration (Fig. 4B), resulting in a decrease of clouds (Fig. 4C). Thus, the replacement of tropical forests with grasslands and shrublands brightens the surface, but the decrease of clouds tends to darken the planet. These effects nearly cancel each other so that the planetary albedo at the top of the atmosphere (Fig. 4D) changes little over tropical regions. This observation suggests that cloud feedbacks initiated by evapotranspiration changes play a major role in determining the overall climatic impact of deforestation in the tropics.

Deforestation doesn’t affect pristine forests

Bast et al 94 (Joseph L., President, Heartland Institute, Peter Hill, Richard C. Rue, *Eco-Sanity*, p. 83, JM)

Roger A., Sedjo and Marion Clawson of Resources for the Future, writing in 1984, estimated that the rate of tropical deforestation during the second half of the 1970s was 1.3 million hectares per year’ - just 0.58 percent of the area of tropical forests worldwide. In 1992, the United Nations’ Food and Agriculture Organization estimated that the annual rate of tropical deforestation was approximately 17 million hectares-still less than 1 percent of the area of tropical forests worldwide. Importantly, even these small numbers overstate the deforestation problem. As Sedjo and Clawson reported, “undisturbed or ‘virgin’ broadleaved closed forests have a, lower rate of deforestation than the total, being only 0.27 percent annually as compared with 2.06 percent annually for logged-over secondary forests.” They concluded: This figure indicates that deforestation pressure on the more pristine and generally more genetically diverse tropical forests is quite low. These findings are in sharp contrast to the conventional view that the tropical forests “are disappearing at alarming rates,” and suggest that concerns over the imminent loss of some of the most important residences of the world’s diverse genetic base, based on rates of tropical deforestation, are probably grossly exaggerated.

Deforestation – No Impact – Species

Forests aren’t uniquely key to biodiversity

Rothbard and Rucker 97 (David Rothbard and Craig Rucker, Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow, “The rainforest issue: Myths and facts” CFACT Briefing Paper #102, JM)

Norman Myers himself says "Unfortunately, we live in a world without sufficient scientists, funding, and above all, time to undertake a conclusive check." And in 1989 he wrote, "Regrettably, we have no way of knowing the actual current rate of extinction in tropical forests, nor can we even make an accurate guess." (Scarcity, pp. 77 and 40) So as is the case with many of the current alleged global environmental "crises," the predictions about species loss are not based on any real-world observations but rather, guesses and speculations that depend on questionable mathematical models. Myers himself "offered no basis for his prediction other than to call it a `reasonable working figure'... [And] Wilson cites as the basis of his prediction a mathematical equation known as the species-area curve that relates the size of an island to the number of species found on it. An island 10 square miles in area, for example, is typically found to have half as many species as a similar island of 100 square miles. Wilson argues that tropical forests obey exactly the same rule as their size is reduced. By plugging into the formula the rate at which tropical forests are being cut down throughout the world -- Wilson puts it at 2 percent per year -- he obtains the figure of 50,000 species lost each year. (U.S. News, p.82) Under this theory of island biogeography, "The rule that is followed for teaching purposes," Wilson says, "is that for every 90% loss in area, the number of species that can live indefinitely there is cut by one-half." (Science, p. 737)

Deforestation doesn’t cause mass extinctions

Rothbard and Rucker 97 (David Rothbard and Craig Rucker, Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow, “The rainforest issue: Myths and facts” CFACT Briefing Paper #102, JM)

But even with high estimates of rainforest loss, there are still problems with the "island biogeography" theory. To begin with, it requires two highly questionable assumptions. First is that islands and habitats are analogous. But they are quite different. Islands are surrounded by water which is hostile to most land species. Terrestrial habitat surrounded by land, which can be much more accommodating to migrating species. "In an address before the National Forum on Biodiversity in 1986, Dr. Ariel Lugo pointed out that according to the only available study of the rate of increase in tropical secondary forests, almost half of the 11.3 million hectares of virgin tropical forest cut annually were turned not into wasteland -- the equivalent of water in biogeographical calculations -- but secondary forest." Thus many species were able to survive quite well. (Science, p.737) In fact, Brian Groombridge who edited the most recent edition of the IUCN's Red List of Threatened Animals points out that "around 75 percent of recorded extinctions...have occurred on islands; almost all bird and mollusc extinctions have been on islands...very few extinctions have been recorded in continental tropical forest habitat where mass extinction events have been predicted to be underway." (Stephen Edwards, "The True State of the Planet," p.218)

No extinction from deforestation

Rothbard and Rucker 97 (David Rothbard and Craig Rucker, Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow, “The rainforest issue: Myths and facts” CFACT Briefing Paper #102, JM)

"There's a finite number of species within any community type," Kangas says. "As you continue to move out, the numbers level off." So further increase in area does not produce concomitant increase in diversity, and as a result, habitats on upper, flatter part of curve can be reduced without substantial immediate species loss. (Science, p.738) Although Wilson claims his species-area curve has been "established by hundreds of independent studies," the criticisms of it are born out in real-world observations. "In the eastern United States, for example, during the first 300 years of European settlement, woodlands were broken up into fragments, none large than 1 to 2 percent of the original vast forest, but only three forest birds became extinct -- the carolina parakeet, the passenger pigeon, and the ivory-billed woodpecker. Moreover, habitat loss probably did not play the major role in their demise: The parakeet and the pigeon were hunted to death. (U.S. News, p. 82) “Look down at the eastern United States the next time you fly over it, " says U. of Oklahoma zoologist Dr. Michael Mares. "It used to be solid forest all the way to the Mississippi. Now it's patches of isolated forest, exactly what we fear will happen to the tropics. But we didn't have a massive die-off." (Science, p. 738) "Similarly, the Atlantic coastal forests of Brazil have been cut to about 12 percent of their original size, yet a team of Brazilian zoologists that combed the forests could not confirm a single case of extinction. Instead, they rediscovered several birds and six species of butterfly considered extinct 20 years ago. And a survey by the Flora Meso-Americana project found increased abundance of some species considered threatened. "`Despite extensive inquiries, we have been unable to obtain conclusive evidence to support the suggestion that massive extinctions have taken place in recent times,'" writes Vernon Heywood, a former chief scientist of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources." (U.S. News, pp. 82-86)

Deforestation – Turn – Biodiversity

Secondary forests support a greater spectrum of life

Rothbard and Rucker 97 (David Rothbard and Craig Rucker, Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow, “The rainforest issue: Myths and facts” CFACT Briefing Paper #102, JM)

As for whether the activities of people can only be a detriment to the natural order, Dr. Michael Mares, in a phone interview, asserted that "pristine habitat being disturbed can actually increase the number of species found in that area." Lugo notes that secondary forest can "constitute a landscape with greater species richness than found in a landscape dominated only by climax forests." (Lugo, p. 67) And Smith says that through "widespread interaction with the forest and intimate knowledge of its resources...indigenous groups have enriched the forest...with various useful plants, particularly fruit and nut trees" and created what some refer to as "cultural forests" within the Amazon. "In summary," Lugo states, "strong evidence can be assembled to document the resiliency of the functional attributes of some types of tropical ecosystems (including their ability to maintain species richness)...We cannot tell the needy of the tropical world that they must cease and desist in their struggle for survival to prevent a catastrophe who dimensions, consequences, or mitigating conditions we cannot define with any certainty...I know of no technical reason why sensible land management in tropical areas cannot lead to the success that is usually associated with temperate zones [in the developed world]."

Deforestation – No Impact – Oxygen

Deforestation doesn’t threaten oxygen

(Wallace S., PhD, “Et tu, O2?” http://www.columbia.edu/cu/21stC/issue-2.1/broecker.htm, JM)

An oft-heard warning with regard to our planet's future is that by cutting back tropical forests we put our supply of oxygen gas at risk. Many good reasons exist for placing deforestation near the top of our list of environmental sins, but fortunately the fate of the Earth's O2 supply does not hang in the balance. Simply put, our atmosphere is endowed with such an enormous reserve of this gas that even if we were to burn all our fossil fuel reserves, all our trees, and all the organic matter stored in soils, we would use up only a few percent of the available O2. No matter how foolishly we treat our environmental heritage, we simply don't have the capacity to put more than a small dent in our O2 supply. Furthermore, the Earth's forests do not play a dominant role in maintaining O2 reserves, because they consume just as much of this gas as they produce. In the tropics, ants, termites, bacteria, and fungi eat nearly the entire photosynthetic O2 product. Only a tiny fraction of the organic matter they produce accumulates in swamps and soils or is carried down the rivers for burial on the sea floor.

Excessive plants decrease oxygen supply

Broecker 96 (Wallace S., PhD, “Et tu, O2?” http://www.columbia.edu/cu/21stC/issue-2.1/broecker.htm, JM)

One difference is that while the Earth's plants produce through photosynthesis an amount of O2 equal to that of the atmosphere in about 2,000 years, those in Bio2 complete this task in only one year. Hence, the Earth's oxygen supply is far better buffered against change than Bio2's. Another difference is that the Earth's ecosystems have over the eons achieved a balance between photosynthetic production and respiratory consumption of O2; the tendency for the atmospheric O2 reserve to change is quite small. By contrast, the designers of Bio2 so generously stocked its soils with humus that the hungry bacteria were able to outcompete its fledgling plants. Each day roughly 30 percent more O2 was lost to respiration than was gained from photosynthesis. Taken together with its low storage capacity, this imbalance caused the O2 content of Bio2's air to drop at an alarming rate. Torn between the desires to maintain a matter-sealed environment and to protect the health of the Biospherians, the managers had to yield to the health needs and pipe in replacement oxygen.

Deforestation – No Impact – Warming

Deforestation doesn’t cause climate change

Pearce 10 (Fred, Staff, NewScientist, December 8, http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn19817-deforestation-not-so-important-for-climate-change.html, JM)

Climate negotiations were dealt a bombshell at the weekend when ecologists reported that carbon emissions from the destruction of tropical forests are probably only half previous estimates. If we are emitting less carbon dioxide from deforestation that's got to be good news, surely. The trouble is the findings seriously question the only success so far of the UN negotiations on curbing climate change under way in Cancún, Mexico. If cutting down trees emits far less CO2 than we thought, where's the incentive to stop chopping? This is a dismaying thought when negotiators feel they are close to a deal on compensating tropical countries for curbing deforestation. Four years ago, the UN's Intergovernmental panel on Climate Change estimated that deforestation was responsible for up to 20 per cent of CO2 emissions. A more recent study by Richard Houghton of Woods Hole Research Center in Falmouth, Massachusetts, revised that down to 15 per cent for the period 2000 to 2005. Both estimates relied on national declarations of forest loss made to the UN, coupled with simple estimates to convert that loss into carbon emissions. But now ecologists at Winrock International, a respected US consultancy based in Arlington, Virginia, whose work was funded by the World Bank and the Norwegian government, says a more detailed analysis puts the figure for 2000 to 2005 at around 8 per cent, with a possible range between 5 and 12 per cent. Nancy Harris of Winrock said in Cancun that the estimate was "the lowest reported to date". The analysis, which has yet to be formally published, used more than 3 million data points from a laser-radar satellite measurement technique known as lidar and 4000 carbon inventories from forest plots on the ground. Harris said it did not include forest regrowth after deforested land had been abandoned by farmers, which could reduce the figure further.

\*\*Oceans\*\*

Oceans Low

Oceans face coming extinctions

Hance 6-20 (Jeremy, Staff, mongabay.com, <http://news.mongabay.com/2011/0620-hance_marine_extinction.html>, JM)

Multiple and converging human impacts on the world's oceans are putting marine species at risk of a mass extinction not seen for millions of years, according to a panel of oceanic experts. The bleak assessment finds that the world's oceans are in a significantly worse state than has been widely recognized, although past reports of this nature have hardly been uplifting. The panel, organized by the International Program on the State of the Ocean (IPSO), found that overfishing, pollution, and climate change are synergistically pummeling oceanic ecosystems in ways not seen during human history. Still, the scientists believe that there is time to turn things around if society recognizes the need to change. "The findings are shocking," Alex Rogers, IPSO's scientific director and professor of conservation biology at Oxford University, said in a press release. "As we considered the cumulative effect of what humankind does to the oceans, the implications became far worse than we had individually realized. We've sat in one forum and spoken to each other about what we're seeing, and we've ended up with a picture showing that almost right across the board we're seeing changes that are happening faster than we'd thought, or in ways that we didn't expect to see for hundreds of years."

Ocean life in peril – CO2

Hance 6-20 (Jeremy, Staff, mongabay.com, <http://news.mongabay.com/2011/0620-hance_marine_extinction.html>, JM)

Carbon dioxide, emitted by human activities, is entering the ocean at a rate not seen since the last marine mass extinction around 55 million years ago. Increased carbon sequestered in the oceans leads to acidification (lower pH levels), which is imperiling the world's coral reefs, threatening algae species, and may doom iconic animals, like the clownfish. The full impacts of acidification are not yet known, but 55 million years ago half of marine species vanished. In addition, climate change is melting Arctic sea ice and Greenland faster than anticipated, risking not only rising sea levels, but the possibility of methane release from underwater deposits.

Oceans down – overfishing, dead zones, and trash

Hance 6-20 (Jeremy, Staff, mongabay.com, <http://news.mongabay.com/2011/0620-hance_marine_extinction.html>, JM)

Marine dead zones are also on the rise. In 2008 over 400 dead zones were identified globally, but recent research has found that such zones—where dissolved oxygen has fallen to such low levels that most marine species can no longer survive—are doubling every decade. Dead zones are caused by agricultural runoff, especially nitrogen-rich fertilizers, as well as the burning of fossil fuels. Overfishing has already plundered the oceans of many key marine species. Some target fish and bycatch species (those killed unintentionally) have fallen by 90 percent report researchers. Following the collapse of target fish populations, industrial fisheries simply move onto other species until they too are decimated. Now, both the Arctic and the Antarctic are being eyed by industrial fisheries. The Arctic, which is becoming increasingly assailable due to melting sea ice from climate change, is also a recent target of oil and gas companies. New research is also showing human trash in marine ecosystems to be more nefarious than expected. Tiny plastic particles are absorbing chemicals, such as flame retardants and synthetic musks, which are then then consumed by marine life. These chemicals have been found as far abroad as the polar seas. Other research has found that plastic decompose in the oceans much faster than expected, releasing potentially toxic substances. All of these impacts, and others, are not allowing marine ecosystems time to recover, but instead are creating synergistic effects that are putting ocean ecosystems at grave risk.

Oceans Low

Ocean life waning – tuna

Science.com 7-7 (Staff, “Increased protection urgently needed for tunas,” <http://www.physorg.com/news/2011-07-urgently-tunas.html>, JM)

The results show that the situation is particularly serious for tunas. Five of the eight species of tuna are in the threatened or Near Threatened IUCN Red List Categories. These include: Southern Bluefin (Thunnus maccoyii), Critically Endangered; Atlantic Bluefin (T. thynnus), Endangered; Bigeye (T. obesus), Vulnerable; Yellowfin (T. albacares), Near Threatened; and Albacore (T. alalunga), Near Threatened. This new information will be invaluable in helping governments make decisions which will safeguard the future of these species, many of which are of extremely high economic value, and is a timely input for the 3rd Joint Meeting of the Tuna RFMOs (Regional Fisheries Management Organizations) being held in La Jolla, California, July 11-15. "This is the first time that fishery scientists, ichthyologists and conservationists have come together to jointly produce an assessment of the threats facing a commercially important group of fishes," says Dr Bruce B. Collette, Chair of the IUCN Species Survival Commission's (SSC) Tuna and Billfish Specialist Group, Senior Scientist of the U.S National Marine Fisheries Service, and lead author of the paper. There is growing concern that in spite of the healthy status of several epipelagic fish stocks (those living near the surface), some scombrid and billfish species are being heavily overfished, and there is a lack of resolve to protect against overexploitation driven by high prices. Many populations are exploited by multinational fisheries whose regulation, from a political perspective, is exceedingly difficult. "All three bluefin tuna species are susceptible to collapse under continued excessive fishing pressure. The Southern Bluefin has already essentially crashed, with little hope of recovery," says Dr Kent Carpenter, Professor at Old Dominion University, manager of IUCN's Marine Biodiversity Unit and an author of the paper. "If no changes are made to current fishing practices, the western Atlantic Bluefin stocks are at risk of collapse as they are showing little sign that the population is rebuilding following a significant reduction in the 1970s."

Ocean health low – scientists say

Detroitnews 6-21 (Staff, <http://www.detnews.com/article/20110621/NATION/106210351/1020/NATION/Scientists-issue-dire-warning-on-ocean-health>, JM)

The health of the world's oceans is declining much faster than originally thought — under siege from pollution, overfishing and other man-made problems all at once — scientists say in a new report. The mix of interacting ingredients is in place for a mass extinction in the world's oceans, said a report by a top panel of scientists that will be presented today to the United Nations. "Things seem to be going wrong on several different levels," said Carl Lundin, director of global marine programs at the International Union for Conservation of Nature, which helped produce the report with the International Programme on the State of the Ocean. The conclusions follow an international meeting this spring in England to discuss the fate of the world's oceans.

Multiple factors are disrupting ocean life

Walsh 4-14 (Bryan, Staff, TimeScience, “A Scary Report Card on the World’s Oceans,” [http://www.time.com/time/health/article/0,8599,1982015,00.html](http://www.time.com/time/health/article/0%2C8599%2C1982015%2C00.html), JM)

But human-related injury to the oceans is rife. We have fished out an estimated 90% of the major commercial fish species that swim the high seas, including the giant and endangered blue fin tuna. The trawlers carrying out that destruction are raking the ocean floor, turning parts of the once vibrant continental shelf into so much mud. Climate change is warming the oceans, disrupting the fundamental structure of the marine food pyramid and destroying coral reefs. Meanwhile, increased concentrations of CO2 in the atmosphere are making the seas acidic, which threatens to kill off species in large numbers. "The ocean is becoming a desert," says Jeremy Jackson, the director of the Center for Marine Biodiversity and Conservation at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography.

Oceans Low

Ocean degradation is at an all-time high

Walsh 6-21 (Bryan, Staff, TimeScience, “A Scary Report Card on the World’s Oceans,” http://www.time.com/time/health/article/0,8599,2078840,00.html, JM)

But while news of Earth's impending doom can sometimes seem exaggerated, there's one environmental disaster that never gets the coverage it really deserves: the state of the oceans. Most people know that wild fisheries are dwindling, and we might know that low-oxygen aquatic dead zones are blooming around the planet's most crowded coasts. But the oceans appear to be undergoing fundamental changes — many of them for the worse — that we can barely understand, in part because we barely understand that vast blue territory that covers 70% of the globe. (Watch "Saving Our Oceans: Sylvia Earle.") That's the conclusion of a surprising new report issued by the International Programme on the State of the Ocean (IPSO), a global panel of marine experts that met this year at Oxford University to examine the latest science on ocean health. That health, they found, is not good. According to the authors, we are "at high risk for entering a phase of extinction of marine species unprecedented in human history." It's not just about overfishing or marine pollution or even climate change. It's all of those destructive factors working cumulatively and occurring much more rapidly than scientists had expected. "The findings are shocking," says Alex Rogers, the scientific director of IPSO. "We are looking at consequences for humankind that will impact in our lifetime, and worse, our children's and generations beyond that." What's particularly scary is that while we can be sure we're changing the oceans, it's not so easy to measure the extent of the damage or predict how it will unfold, simply because observations are harder to make underwater than they are on land. (Human beings have explored just 5% of the total volume of the oceans so far.) It's not just a matter of taking bluefin tuna and other valuable species out of the oceans through industrial fishing. The more worrying changes are happening on a chemical level. The oceans have already absorbed more than 80% of the additional heat added to the climate system and about 33% of the carbon dioxide we've emitted into the atmosphere. That's slowed down climate change on land, but it's changing the pH levels of the water in ways that could have a bigger impact on sea life than a thousand factory-fishing boats. (See TIME's special report "Saving Our Oceans.") Why is the rate of carbon being absorbed by the oceans so disturbing for marine scientists? Let's put it this way: the rate of carbon absorption right now is far greater than the rate seen some 55 million years ago. That was when the last globally significant extinction of marine species took place, when 50% of some groups of deep-sea animals were wiped out. We can try to restrict fishing, and we can work to protect sensitive coral reefs and other habitats for marine life. But if we can't figure out a way to curb global carbon emissions, we may alter the oceans beyond their ability to heal themselves — at least in ways that will support marine life as we know it. Despite the scary IPSO reports — and scores of others like it that have been published in the past — the oceans seem likely to continue to get less attention than they need and deserve. Maybe that's because we're fundamentally land-based creatures. Anyone can see a clear-cut rain forest and know that something was lost, but on the surface, a living sea and a dead one look much the same. We used to think the oceans were far too vast for mere humans to affect — but we should know that's not the case any longer. Earth is often tougher than we think, but if we don't do something, we really do risk irrevocably altering the blue in our blue planet.

Oceans approaching mass extinction now

AlJazeera 6-21 (Staff, http://english.aljazeera.net/news/americas/2011/06/20116216141857396.html, JM)

Pollution, global warming and other man-made problems are pushing the world's oceans to the brink of a mass extinction of marine life unprecedented in tens of millions of years, a consortium of scientists has warned. Dying coral reefs, biodiversity ravaged by invasive species, expanding open-water "dead zones," toxic algae blooms, and the massive depletion of big fish stocks are all accelerating, according to the report, which is due to be presented at the United Nations on Tuesday. "We now face losing marine species and entire marine ecosystems, such as coral reefs, within a single generation,'' the report said. Sponsored by the International Programme on the State of the Ocean (IPSO), the review of recent science found that ocean health has declined further, faster and to a far greater extent than dire forecasts only a few years ago. These symptoms, moreover, could be the harbinger of wider environmental disruptions, scientists said. All five mass extinctions of life on Earth - reaching back more than 500 million years - were preceded by many of the same conditions now afflicting the ocean environment. The rate at which carbon is being absorbed by the ocean is already far greater than at the time of the last globally significant extinctions, which wiped out up to 50 per cent of some deep-sea animals, the report said. Overfishing has also reduced some commercial fish stocks by more than 90 per cent, it said.

Oceans Low

Ocean health is rapidly declining

Song 6-29 (Lisa, Staff, SolveClimate News, http://solveclimatenews.com/news/20110628/ipso-oceans-acidification-coral-reefs-pollution-fisheries, JM)

The impacts of climate change — acidifying oceans, coral bleaching and habitat loss — are the biggest cause of decline in ocean health, and the hardest to solve, some researchers told SolveClimate News in interviews. Global warming will "swamp everything," said Tony Pitcher, a professor of fisheries from the University of British Columbia who attended the meeting. "The effects are all around … If we don't do something quickly, the oceans in 50 years won't look like they do today." The workshop brought together 27 scientists from six countries and represents the first time in at least a decade when experts from separate fields — geochemists, geophysicists, pollution experts, fishery biologists and climate change scientists — gathered to share their assessment of the oceans. "These people don't usually talk to each other very much so getting them together ... was quite a special occasion," said Pitcher. But the scene was far from celebratory. "In each kind of science, the experts were reporting that somewhere in the world the worst-case scenario was already present," he told SolveClimate News.

Climate change is degrading oceans

Song 6-29 (Lisa, Staff, SolveClimate News, http://solveclimatenews.com/news/20110628/ipso-oceans-acidification-coral-reefs-pollution-fisheries, JM)

Climate change is the oceans' greatest threat, said Daniel Pauly, a fisheries professor from the University of British Columbia who also attended the seminar. As oceans heat up, there is less mixing of warm water near the sea surface and colder water near the bottom, he told SolveClimate News. That decreases the amount of available oxygen in the water column; less oxygen means less life overall. Oxygen depletion, acidification and warmer temperatures are "a deadly mixture," Pauly said, and is almost certain to exacerbate other risks. Coral reefs are particularly vulnerable, said Alex Rogers, lead author of the IPSO report and professor of conservation biology at the University of Oxford.

Oceans High

The ocean is doing fine – regulatory mechanisms

Hoffman 10 (Doug L., PhD, July 11, http://www.theresilientearth.com/?q=content/ocean-co2-storage-revised, JM)

Here is a previously unsuspected mechanism that can explain how nature keeps Earth's ecology in balance, despite the presence of human CO2 emissions. The microbial carbon pump, perhaps in concert with the “jelly pump” discovered by Lebrato and Jones in 2006, is busy compensating for the relatively small amount of carbon human activity releases each year. It is a natural regulation mechanism that science did not know existed and still does not fully understand, meaning that how Earth's ecology and climate interact must be revised. As Steven Wilhelm, a microbiologist at the University of Tennessee, notes, “We are just at the dawn of developing this understanding.” Carbon is essential to life on Earth, and the carbon cycle helps regulate both life and climate. Nature has many hidden mechanisms that help manage carbon and CO2—mechanisms that were unknown when the commotion over anthropogenic global warming erupted decades ago and other mechanisms as yet undiscovered. Predictions that the ocean will soon lose its capacity to absorb CO2 were made in ignorance and have been shown to be wrong. What new discoveries the young and incomplete field of climate science will make in the future is anyone's guess. One thing is certain, those who would cry doom and predict the death of the ocean at human hands will have to invent new hazards to frighten the public. This is “settled science” like quicksand is solid ground.

No Impact – Oceans Resilient

Forests check ocean damage

Swanson 9 (Kent, Master’s in Community @ Regional Planning, http://www.practicalenvironmentalist.com/gardening/10-steps-to-a-healthy-ocean-protecting-our-oceans-from-pollution.htm, JM)

[Biosystems are nature’s utilities](http://www.bagheera.com/inthewild/classroom/class_extinction_why.htm) – they desalinate water, absorb carbon, liberate nutrients from the ground, and provide other services free of charge. The plants and animals that make up these systems are often treated as commodities, but killing the goose that lays golden eggs will only put food on the table for a day. Protecting biosystems can pay dividends for years to come. Forests are an essential buffer for the oceans. Old growth trees neutralize the pH of rain and absorb harmful chemicals before they reach the ocean. Trees that grow in estuaries and along riverways are especially important, but those areas also face increased development pressure and they are easy for loggers to access. Shoreline habitat is being destroyed to build [giant shrimp farms](http://www.gourmet.com/magazine/2000s/2007/03/shrimp) and resort hotels. Luckily, there are now sustainable forestry and aquaculture options available. [Sustainable logging](http://www.spi-ind.com/html/forests_sustainable.cfm) allows limited harvesting of resources without destroying the natural processes that we benefit from. The next time you buy lumber or land, do some research and check for [certifications of sustainability](http://www.enn.com/top_stories/article/9445).

Marine life is resilient – rapid reproduction

ITOPF 10 (The International Tanker Owners Federation Limited, February 10, http://www.itopf.com/marine-spills/effects/recovery/, JM)

Marine organisms have varying degrees of natural resilience to changes in their habitats. The natural adaptations of populations of animals and plants to cope with environmental stress, combined with their breeding strategies, provide important mechanisms for coping with the daily and seasonal fluctuations in their habitats and for recovering from predation and other stochastic events. Some natural phenomena can be highly destructive. The short-term power of hurricanes and tsunamis can easily be appreciated, as can the damage they cause. The cyclical El Niño phenomenon has major long-term consequences for marine organisms, seabirds and marine mammals throughout the entire Pacific Ocean. Organisms suffer under such onslaughts, but after what is often severe disruption and widespread mortality, the marine populations re-establish themselves over a period of time and this process constitutes natural recovery. An important reproductive strategy for many marine organisms is the production of vast numbers of eggs and larvae which are released into the plankton and are widely distributed by currents. This mechanism has evolved to take maximum advantage of available space and resources in marine habitats and to deal with e.g. predation. In some cases, only one or two individuals in a million actually survive through to adulthood. A less common reproductive strategy that is generally restricted to long-lived species that do not reach sexual maturity for many years is to produce relatively few, well-developed, offspring. These species are better adapted to stable habitats and environments and as a result, their populations are likely to take much longer to recover from the pressures of localised mortality e.g. the effects of an oil spill. Whilst there may be considerable debate over what constitutes recovery, there is a widespread acceptance that natural variability in systems makes getting back to the exact pre-spill condition unlikely, and most current definitions of recovery focus on the re-establishment of a community of plants and animals which are characteristic of the habitat and are functioning normally in terms of biodiversity and productivity.

No Impact – Oceans Resilient

The ocean is resilient – absorbs changes

RedOrbit 8 (Staff, November 24, http://www.redorbit.com/news/science/1602528/southern\_ocean\_resilient\_against\_global\_warming/, JM)

A recent study has found that the Southern Ocean has proved more resilient to global warming than previously thought and remains a major store of mankind's planet-warming carbon dioxide. Oceans act as a brake on climate change by absorbing large portions of the extra CO2 released by mankind through burning fossil fuels or deforestation and experts say the Southern Ocean is the largest of these "carbon sinks." Researchers in the past have suggested the vast ocean between Australia and Antarctica was losing its potency because climate change had affected its currents and increased powerful westerly winds. The analysis between ship-based measurements of the ocean since the 1960s and more recent data from hundreds of robotic floats shows the Southern Ocean has maintained its ability to soak up excess carbon despite changes to currents and wind speeds. "It's a positive thing. It's one thing it looks like we don't have to worry about as much as we thought," said Steve Rintoul of the Center for Australian Weather and Climate Research, part of a team researchers that also included scientists from the Institute for Marine Research at the University of Kiel in Germany. The new data as well as previous studies showed the Southern Ocean was becoming warmer, and also fresher, Rintoul said. The study was published this week in Nature Geoscience. The data on salinity and temperature allowed the team to measure the density of seawater and how that density changed from one place to another in relation to how fast water was moving between two places. "By looking at the density we could say something about the way the major currents were or were not changing. "And this was the surprise. We found that the currents had not changed. They had shifted their position, they'd shifted closer to Antarctica but not become stronger or weaker."

Oceans can easily survive acidification

Ridley 10 (Matt, Doctor of Philosophy in Zoology, June 15, http://www.thegwpf.org/the-observatory/1106-matt-ridley-threat-from-ocean-acidification-greatly-exaggerated.html, JM)

Lest my critics still accuse me of cherry-picking studies, let me refer them also to the results of Hendrikset al. (2010, Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science 86:157). Far from being a cherry-picked study, this is a massive meta-analysis. The authors observed that `warnings that ocean acidification is a major threat to marine biodiversity are largely based on the analysis of predicted changes in ocean chemical fields’ rather than empirical data. So they constructed a database of 372 studies in which the responses of 44 different marine species to ocean acidification induced by equilibrating seawater with CO2-enriched air had been actually measured. They found that only a minority of studies demonstrated `significant responses to acidification’ and there was no significant mean effect even in these studies. They concluded that the world's marine biota are `more resistant to ocean acidification than suggested by pessimistic predictions identifying ocean acidification as a major threat to marine biodiversity’ and that ocean acidification `may not be the widespread problem conjured into the 21st century…Biological processes can provide homeostasis against changes in pH in bulk waters of the range predicted during the 21st century.’ This important paper alone contradicts Hoegh-Gudlberg’s assertion that `the vast bulk of scientific evidence shows that calcifiers… are being heavily impacted already’. In conclusion, I rest my case. My five critics have not only failed to contradict, but have explicitly confirmed the truth of every single one of my factual statements. We differ only in how we interpret the facts. It is hardly surprising that my opinion is not shared by five scientists whose research grants depend on funding agencies being persuaded that there will be a severe and rapid impact of carbon dioxide emissions on coral reefs in coming decades. I merely report accurately that the latest empirical and theoretical research suggests that the likely impact has been exaggerated.

**No Impact – Oceans – CO2**

CO2 doesn’t damage marine growth

Taylor 10 (James R., Senior Fellow @ The Heartland Institute, January 18, <http://www.heartland.org/publications/environment%20climate/article/26815/Ocean_Acidification_Scare_Pushed_at_Copenhagen.html>, JM)

In a 2008 study published in Biogeosciences, scientists subjected marine organisms to varying concentrations of CO2, including abrupt changes of CO2 concentration. The ecosystems were “surprisingly resilient” to changes in atmospheric CO2, and “the ecosystem composition, bacterial and phytoplankton abundances and productivity, grazing rates and total grazer abundance and reproduction were not significantly affected by CO2-induced effects.” In a 2009 study published in Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, scientists reported, “Sea star growth and feeding rates increased with water temperature from 5ºC to 21ºC. A doubling of current [CO2] also increased growth rates both with and without a concurrent temperature increase from 12ºC to 15ºC.”

CO2 is harmless – promotes growth and fish can adapt

Taylor 10 (James R., Senior Fellow @ The Heartland Institute, January 18, <http://www.heartland.org/publications/environment%20climate/article/26815/Ocean_Acidification_Scare_Pushed_at_Copenhagen.html>, JM)

“Far too many predictions of CO2-induced catastrophes are treated by alarmists as sure to occur, when real-world observations show these doomsday scenarios to be highly unlikely or even virtual impossibilities,” said Craig Idso, Ph.D., author of the 2009 book CO2, Global Warming and Coral Reefs. “The phenomenon of CO2-induced ocean acidification appears to be no different. “What we observe in nature is not supported by theoretical projections, because numerous studies have shown that the net impact of twentieth century increases in atmospheric CO2 and temperature has not been anywhere near as catastrophically disruptive to Earth’s marine organisms as climate alarmists suggest it should have been. And every month more and more research confirms that marine life will likely successfully adapt to, or even benefit from, the modest increase in atmospheric CO2 and temperature projected to occur in the future,” Idso explained. “As for why this is the way marine organisms respond, no one knows for certain, but it is probably because calcification is a biologically driven process that can overcome physical-chemical limitations which in the absence of life would appear to be insurmountable,” Idso said. “We have got to realize that rising atmospheric CO2 concentrations are not the bane of the biosphere but an invaluable boon to the planet’s many life forms, marine life included.”

**No Impact –** Oceans – CO2 Good Turn

CO2 assists marine life growth

Taylor 10 (James R., Senior Fellow @ The Heartland Institute, January 18, <http://www.heartland.org/publications/environment%20climate/article/26815/Ocean_Acidification_Scare_Pushed_at_Copenhagen.html>, JM)

Numerous recent scientific studies show higher carbon dioxide levels in the world’s oceans have the same beneficial effect on marine life as higher levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide have on terrestrial plant life. In a 2005 study published in the Journal of Geophysical Research, scientists examined trends in chlorophyll concentrations, critical building blocks in the oceanic food chain. The French and American scientists reported “an overall increase of the world ocean average chlorophyll concentration by about 22 percent” during the prior two decades of increasing carbon dioxide concentrations. In a 2006 study published in Global Change Biology, scientists observed higher CO2 levels are correlated with better growth conditions for oceanic life. The highest CO2 concentrations produced “higher growth rates and biomass yields” than the lower CO2 conditions. Higher CO2 levels may well fuel “subsequent primary production, phytoplankton blooms, and sustaining oceanic food-webs,” the study concluded.

CO2 absorption is key to marine life

Hoffman 10 (Doug L., PhD, July 11, http://www.theresilientearth.com/?q=content/ocean-co2-storage-revised, JM)

The ocean is Earth's largest single sink for CO2 outside of the planet's crust itself. Simple sea creatures depend on carbon dissolved in the ocean's water for their existence, and their actions create a biological carbon “pump” that removes vast quantities of CO2 from the atmosphere. Large amounts are suspended in the water column as dissolved organic carbon (DOC), and each year the ocean's biological pump deposits some 300 million tons of carbon in the deep ocean sink. New findings have revealed that massive amounts of carbon are converted into “inedible” forms of organic carbon that remain out of circulation for thousands of years, effectively sequestering the carbon by removing it from the ocean food chain. According to Jiao Nianzhi, a microbial ecologist here at Xiamen University, the amount stored is tremendous: “It's really huge. It's comparable to all the carbon dioxide in the air.” On average, the world's oceans absorb 2% more carbon than they emit each year, forming an important sink in the overall carbon cycle. CO2 is absorbed by the ocean in a number of ways. Some dissolves into the water column, forming carbonic acid (H2CO3) while more enters the seas through the food chain. Green, photosynthesizing plankton converts as much as 60 gigatons of carbon per year into organic carbon—roughly the same amount fixed by land plants and almost 10 times the amount emitted by human activity. But this form of carbon is only stored for a short period of time.

**\*\*Overpop\*\***

Overpop High

Population growth is a threat now

PR Newswire 7-8 (United Business Media, Staff, http://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/world-population-day-on-july-11-acknowledges-our-most-serious-problem-125206299.html, JM)

While world population has soared almost 40 percent since the first World Population Day, the United States has grown almost as rapidly, increasing about 30 percent, from 242 million in 1987 to almost 312 million today. "Continuing growth of the human population is the most serious environmental problem for our planet and for our nation. The consequences of that growth are all around us—loss of open space, air and water pollution, and never-ending sprawl. Habitat loss due to population growth is by far the greatest threat to wildlife. We simply must face up to this paramount issue," stated DeYoung, who served on the President's Commission on Population Growth and the American Future in 1970. Since 1986, CAPS has worked to protect the environment and improve the quality of life by promoting replacement-level fertility and replacement-level immigration in order to achieve a stable population.

Growth high – predictions increasing

Worldometers 5-3 (Worldometers.com, source of world statistics, http://www.worldometers.info/population/, JM)

The United Nations released the "2010 Revision of the World Population Prospects" in which they raised their previous estimated global demographic estimates. As a consequence, Worldometers algorithm was updated to reflect the latest data and rate of change projections. World population, according to the UN (which we follow more closely compared to the US Census Bureau, which has a lower estimate), will reach 7 Billion on October 31, 2011. The world population counter displayed on Worldometers is based on analysis of data from two major sources: the United Nations and the U.S. Census Bureau. The United Nations Population Division of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs every two years calculates, updates, and publishes estimates of total population in its World Population Prospects series. These population estimates and projections provide the standard and consistent set of population figures that are used throughout the United Nations system. The World Population Prospect: the 2010 Revision provides the most recent data available (released on May 3, 2011). Estimates and projected world population and country specific populations are given from 1950 through 2050. Data underlying the population estimates are national and sub national census data and data on births, deaths, and migrants available from national sources and publications, as well as from questionnaires. For all countries, census and registration data are evaluated and, if necessary, adjusted for incompleteness by the Population Division as part of its preparations of the official United Nations population estimates and projections.

Exponential growth happening now

Wibecan 6-28 (Ken, Journalist, Press Republican, http://pressrepublican.com/0200\_opinion/x1317142854/Growing-population-stresses-resources, JM)

It was 34 years ago when world population was only half of what it is today. There were only 3.3 billion humans around; now there are 6.7 billion. I noticed the change a few years ago when I visited New York City for the first time since I left in 1966. I was surprised to see midtown Manhattan packed with more people than I had remembered, going about their business as if they didn't notice the crowds. 125th Street was swarming with a sidewalk-to-curb mass of humanity. The sensible way to proceed was to fall in with the pace the crowd was setting rather than try to weave your way through it. Since things happen with exponential speed these days, world population will not take another 34 years to double and even less time to double again. All those billions of people (figure more than 54 billion humans trying to survive on this planet before the end of this century) will create immense, even impossible demands on our water resources and the distribution of food, goods and services.

Overpop Low

Birth rates low – we’re just experiencing the lag

Lekgotla 10 (Staff, July 23, http://lekgotlamedianews.co.za/web/2010/07/dont-blame-the-babies/¸JM)

The disaster du jour was the threat of overpopulation. So, it was with interest that I read a column recently on the environmentalist website, Grist, which referred to overpopulation as a “green myth” and “dangerous nonsense”. The author, Fred Pearce, also remembers “being scared” by “the population bomb… 40 years ago as a schoolkid”, but notes that, since then, the total fertility rate for the planet’s average woman has dropped by more than half. This, he says, “is a stunning change” but not one we often hear about because “it doesn’t fit the doomsday agenda”. What fascinates me about this admission is that I said the same thing fifteen years ago when I wrote Exploding Population Myths for publication by The Free Market Foundation. Pearce says that there is a lag in birth rates and that “the huge numbers of young women born during the baby boom years… remain fertile.” But as they age birth rates are going to drop at an even faster pace. Pearce is correct. In addition he says, as I argued in 1995, much of the world’s population increase isn’t the result of high birth rates but because there has been a huge decline in death rates. One environmentalist of the day, in a scathing report on my book, admitted that death rates may well be down, but condemned me because I didn’t have a solution to “the problem”. I admit I didn’t, and I still don’t. I have trouble seeing lower death rates as a problem. Robert Walker, of the doomsday-oriented Population Institute, has attacked Pearce’s essay by, among other things, suggesting that hunger is the result of too many babies being born. In a television debate, after the launch of Exploding Population Myths, I said that many of the problems attributed to population growth were caused by “bureaucrats not babies, by politicians not people.” My term was not meant to imply that politicians are not people, but that political controls resulted in the problems attributed to population growth. Since 1995, there have been several compelling cases to illustrate this

Overpop Low

Growth down – economic incentives gone

D’Agostino 8 (Joseph A., Freelance Journalist, Washington Times, July 27, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2008/jul/27/taking-on-the-overpopulation-myth/>, JM)

The world’s population growth rate maxed out in 1965 and has been in sharp decline. ”The unprecedented fall in fertility rates that began in postwar Europe has, in the decades since, spread to every corner of the globe, affecting China, India, the Middle East, Africa and Latin America,” says Mr. Mosher. “The latest forecasts by the United Nations show the number of people in the world shrinking by midcentury, that is, before today’s young adults reach retirement age.” The birthrate of Europe taken as a whole, from Ireland to Russia, is only 1.5 children per woman in her lifetime, far below the minimal replacement rate of 2.1. Latin America’s is down to 2.4 and dropping fast. China’s is 1.7. South Korea’s is a mere 1.1. The United States is the only developed country at or above replacement rate; we’re right at 2.1. It used to be that folks relied on their children to help them on the farm or in their businesses, and especially in their old age. Economic incentives encouraged childbearing. But now socialism has taken over that role of families. “As [demographer] Phillip Longman has remarked, the modern nanny state has created a strange new world in which the most ‘successful’ individuals in material terms are the most ‘unfit’ in biological terms,” Mr. Mosher writes.”In all previous ages of human history wealth and children went hand-in-hand.”

Fertility rates are down

Craven 6-13 (S. Michael, President, Center for Christ & Culture, http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2008/jul/27/taking-on-the-overpopulation-myth/, JM)

Perhaps one of the most persistent and pervasive myths that have shaped the thinking of many people and, subsequently, public policy is the myth that the world’s population is spiraling out of control and that it will ultimately lead to catastrophic shortages of the essential resources necessary to sustain life. This whole concept of “overpopulation” can be traced to Thomas Malthus, the British scholar and Anglican clergyman (albeit a very misguided one) who, without any specific knowledge other than his own speculations, predicted in 1789 that the planet’s rapid increase in population would soon outstrip the planet’s ability to produce food, resulting in massive worldwide starvation. Malthus’s predicted famine never materialized, of course; he could not have predicted the industrial revolution or the enormous impact subsequent technological innovations would have on our ability to produce food. Recall that today our federal government actually pays farmers not to grow crops due to the abundance of food produced on considerably less farmland than existed just a century ago. Even the United Nations, historically a rabid advocate of population control, has conceded that the world’s current infrastructure is capable of supporting a worldwide population of more than 9 billion people. Furthermore, according to the most recent estimates, the planet’s population will most likely continue to climb from its current level until 2050, when it will peak at 9 billion; other predictions have the world’s population peaking at 7.5 billion in 2040. In either case, global population levels will begin a sharp decline sometime during the middle of the twenty-first century. Present fertility rates actually indicate a massive underpopulation crisis is coming, particularly among Western nations.

Fertility rates low

Eby 10 (Margaret, Staff, Salon, “The Coming Population Crash: The Overpopulation Myth, April 19, http://www.salon.com/books/feature/2010/04/19/population\_crash\_ext2010, JM)

When Paul Ehrlich wrote his famous book ["The Population Bomb"], women were having an average around the world of five or six children; now they’re having an average of 2.6. Fertility rates around the world have halved. That’s not just true in Europe and North America; they’re way below replacement levels in most of East Asia now. Not just China but Japan, Korea, Vietnam and Burma have replacement rates of fertility or below. Around the world, fertility rates have been coming down really sharply. So the population bomb as we’ve conceived it before really isn’t there. There’s still population growth going on, but that’s going to stabilize.

Overpop Low

Birth rates are lower than ever

Pearce 10 (Fred, Staff, Prospect, March 8, <http://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/2010/03/the-overpopulation-myth/>, JM)

Many of today’s most-respected thinkers, from Stephen Hawking to David Attenborough, argue that our efforts to fight climate change and other environmental perils will all fail unless we “do something” about population growth. In the Universe in a Nutshell, Hawking declares that, “in the last 200 years, population growth has become exponential… The world population doubles every forty years.” But this is nonsense. For a start, there is no exponential growth. In fact, population growth is slowing. For more than three decades now, the average number of babies being born to women in most of the world has been in decline. Globally, women today have half as many babies as their mothers did, mostly out of choice. They are doing it for their own good, the good of their families, and, if it helps the planet too, then so much the better. Here are the numbers. Forty years ago, the average woman had between five and six kids. Now she has 2.6. This is getting close to the replacement level which, allowing for girls who don’t make it to adulthood, is around 2.3. As I show in my new book, Peoplequake, half the world already has a fertility rate below the long-term replacement level. That includes all of Europe, much of the Caribbean and the far east from Japan to Vietnam and Thailand, Australia, Canada, Sri Lanka, Turkey, Algeria, Kazakhstan, and Tunisia.

Current population growth will taper off

Pearce 10 (Fred, Staff, Prospect, March 8, <http://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/2010/03/the-overpopulation-myth/>, JM)

That doesn’t mean population growth has ceased. The world’s population is still rising by 70m a year. This is because there is a time lag: the huge numbers of young women born during the earlier baby boom may only have had two children each. That is still a lot of children. But within a generation, the world’s population will almost certainly be stable, and is very likely to be falling by mid-century. In the US they are calling my new book “The Coming Population Crash.”

Overpopulation is down now

Ruse 96 (Austin, President, Catholic Family & Human Rights Institute, http://www.usccb.org/prolife/programs/rlp/03ruse.shtml, JM)

It turns out the war on fertility was not necessary and what we have achieved in artificially lowering it is a problem the world has never seen. At this point more than 80 countries have achieved what is known as below replacement fertility, the point at which women are having so few children, generally thought to be below 2.1 children per woman, that countries are no longer replacing themselves. The UN predicts that every nation on earth, with the exception of a few African nations, will reach below replacement fertility within the next twenty years. And this is a very serious problem. What this means is a rapidly aging population that turns the demographic pyramid on its head. Societies are meant to have lots of young people supporting an ever-shrinking number of old people. Below replacement fertility has meant in many countries there are more old people than young people. Fifteen years ago Japan reached a global first; it reached the point where it had more people over 65 than under 15. This is a recipe for economic disaster and intergenerational warfare over levels of government taxation and spending for social services for the elderly. The UN now acknowledges this. In recent years, the UN Population Division (official UN statistical analysts) has sounded the alarm about below replacement fertility. A year ago, it hosted an expert meeting at which demographers from all over the world concluded they did not know how low fertility can go. The UN now believes the world population will top out at roughly 8 billion people in 2050 and then begin to decline.  The population controllers continue to make their case, however. They still say the world will soon starve, and that we will soon run out of natural resources, and that the planet is running out of room. Anyone can test the theory, however. Next time you are in an airplane flying virtually anywhere in the world, even in the very populous United States, look down from on high and what you will see is a remarkably empty planet straining to be made a garden by more of us.

Overpop Low – Cyclical

Fertility is cyclical and solves itself

Ruse 96 (Austin, President, Catholic Family & Human Rights Institute, http://www.usccb.org/prolife/programs/rlp/03ruse.shtml, JM)

Though not revealed to the general public until the late 1990s, it was becoming obvious to demographic experts by the time of the Cairo Conference on Population and Development in 1994, that fertility rates were plummeting rapidly all over the world. I will address the facts in a minute but first will point out the switch in terminology, which exists to the present day. First, they determined that the top down approach and the phrase "population control" were no longer tenable. Second, they already knew or suspected that fertility rates were plummeting and they feared that policy makers would conclude that population control was no longer necessary. Third, they wanted fertility rates and, therefore, population control to continue to decline. Their solution to these sticky problems was to cloak the old theory of overpopulation in the language of human rights, the political argument par excellence of the late 20th century. Enter the phrase "reproductive rights." The thinking went that if everyone demanded and received their "reproductive rights," as defined by the UN, then fertility rates would continue to decline. So, under the guidance and support of UNFPA, the United Nations began the international call for reproductive rights at the Cairo Conference on Population and Development in 1994.  Here we have entered the latest but certainly not the last phase of the war against the concept of people. It started in Malthusianism, continued in eugenics, switched to the population explosion and has ended up, at least for now, in the fight for reproductive rights. And here we enter briefly the dichotomy in their movement, that between the feminists and the population controllers. Actually the split is not all that great. Some feminists, though not many, have considered population control as an assault against women. Some of them, though very few, spoke out against the Chinese one-child policy. And none of them spoke out against coercion in Peru. But at least theoretically there is a dichotomy between those who believe that women's rights lie in the advancement of abortion yet who still criticize coercion in family planning and those who believe so strongly in the necessity of population control that women's rights may be trampled as a consequence. This final phase of the anti-people movement uses the language of women's rights in the service of population control. Let me finish with how I began. The theory that the world is so awash in people that it will eventually die is false and it always has been. We will not run out of food, natural resources, or room. The theory is completely and dangerously false. The world now produces more food on less land than ever before. The world is awash in food. The problem is getting it to the hungry. Starvation occurs in the world today not from lack of food but generally as a result of bad policies or the use of starvation as a tool of war. Also, the cost of natural resources is now lower than forty years ago. Price is always a marker for availability: lower prices mean greater availability. Why are natural resources more plentiful? Simply because of our ingenuity. Mankind is better at getting natural resources out of the ground, whatever they are, and we are more efficient in their use.  Still, the population continues to grow. How can that be? For a very good reason. According to Harvard's Nicholas Eberstadt, it is not that people "reproduce like bunnies" rather that they "no longer die like flies." The most startling revolution in the most revolutionary 20th century was one of health. Where a century ago, almost any disease could kill someone in a matter of days, these diseases are now routinely cured. Where once someone could hope to live into the 60s, they now routinely live well into the 70s, 80s, and even 90s. The fact is that the much feared fertility rate began declining in the West more than 150 years ago, long before the advent of UN-style family planning and population control. In fact, France reached what is called the demographic transition in the 19th century. The fact of nature is that fertility rates decline naturally when populations move from the farm to the city and from agricultural subsistence to the industrial age. They decline also as women move toward education and postpone marriage, also aspects of modernization.

Overpop – No Impact – Tech Solves

Population growth solves itself through innovation

Mulligan 9 (Casey B., Prof. of Economics @ UChicago, September 23, http://economix.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/09/23/the-more-the-merrier-population-growth-promotes-innovation/, JM)

A recent study reiterated the conclusion that population growth ought to be controlled in order to combat global warming, and other world problems. I beg to differ. The authors of studies like these have exaggerated the benefits of population control, because they ignore some of the significant economic benefits of large populations. Stuart Isett for The New York Times Rush hour in a Shanghai subway. The director-general of Unicef has been quoted as saying, “Family planning could bring more benefits to more people at less cost than any other single technology now available to the human race.” And one of the benefits of reduced population, it is claimed, is reduced carbon emissions and therefore mitigation of climate change. This statement takes technology for granted, yet technology itself depends on population. Especially important among the sources of technical progress — discoveries — are trial and error, and incentives. Reasonable people can disagree about the relative importance of these two, but both are stimulated by population. The more people on earth, the greater the chance that one of them has an idea of how to improve alternative energies, or to mitigate the climate effects of carbon emissions. It takes only one person to have an idea that can benefit many. Plus, the more people on earth, the larger are the markets for new innovations. Thus, even if the brilliant innovators would be born regardless of population control, their incentives to devote effort toward finding new discoveries and bringing them to the marketplace depend on the size of that marketplace. And it’s clear that incentives matter for innovative activity: That’s why we have a patent system that helps innovators obtain financial rewards for their inventions. Not surprisingly, research has shown that market size stimulates innovative activity, as in the case of pharmaceutical research that is especially intense for conditions that have more victims. It may take a long time for population growth to either give birth to an inventor brilliant enough, or motivate enough incentives, to have an impact on the climate. But that’s not a reason to turn to population control, because it also takes a long time for population control’s impact to be noticeable. Although the calculations are inherently uncertain, the value of the additional innovation stimulated by additional population may be significant. In my academic work I have calculated that the value, to the entire marketplace through this channel, of an additional person may be on the same order of magnitude of the value that person places on his own life. For example, a person who can earn $2 million in his own lifetime may, by his presence in the worldwide marketplace, stimulate innovative activity that is worth a few hundred thousand dollars. The role of technical change has been repeatedly underestimated. For example, someone a century ago who claimed that the earth could have enough food to support nine billion people (population control advocates now think that the earth’s population can easily get there) would have been considered crazy. But with today’s technology it is easy to see how many billions can be fed. Some of the important solutions to climate change will also come from technological progress.

Overpop – No Impact – Tech Solves

Technology will adapt us to population growth

Sommerfield 99 (Julia, Staff, MSNBC, October 12, http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/3072069/ns/us\_news-only\_on\_msnbc\_com/t/will-technology-save-us-overpopulation/, JM)

But economists say that as technologies get more advanced and shortages more apparent, new technologies will become more cost-efficient and within the reach of Third World nations. “As soon as a resource becomes truly scarce, it becomes economical to try to replace it,” said Jerry Taylor, director of natural resource studies at the Cato Institute. “Fusion, fission, wind power, solar power and fuel cells are all alternative energy sources that aren’t economic yet because we aren’t experiencing a shortage of fossil fuels. There has to be economic incentive. Marketplace actors figure out the cheapest way to give people what they want. And when it becomes cheaper to use solar power or wind power, we will do so.” Some environmentalists are particularly critical of the future of agricultural technologies. The Worldwatch Institute cites evidence that crop yields per person have been dropping in recent years, suggesting the “Green Revolution” is over. Predictably, some agriculture experts disagree. “The ‘Green Revolution’ has not run its course. Agricultural production continues to go up and it is nowhere near the ceiling,” said Paul Waggoner, former director of the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station. He says that the data Worldwatch is citing represents not agricultural shortages but simply the fact that cereal production is not going up as fast as it has in the past because there is a surplus - and so there is less incentive to grow more agriculture supplies. Dennis Avery, director of Global Food Issues for the Hudson Institute, adds that new farm technologies are also helping the environment. “Without these new technologies, increasing population would mean deforestation, soil erosion and loss of wildlife habitat because we would need to expand agricultural land into these areas,” he said.

Technology alleviates the impact

Bloom & Freeman 86 (David & Richard B., Prof. of Economics @ Harvard, Herbert Ascherman Chair of Economics @ Harvard, *Population and Development Review* 12, 3, p. 381-414, JM)

In our view, if modern technology is applied to less developed countries at the same rate as in the past two decades, which presumably requires both human and physical capital investments of enormous absolute magnitudes (though of comparable relative magnitudes to the past), Malthusian disasters will not result from forecasted population growth, and moderate growth of income per capita is likely. On the basis of past history, the middle-income developing countries are likely to perform better than the low-income countries, some of which may need considerable help if they are to absorb increased population while shifting labor to more productive sectors and raising output per worker.

Overpop – No Impact – War

Overpopulation doesn’t lead to war or starvation, and causes technological growth

Lekgotla 10 (Staff, March 28, http://lekgotlamedianews.co.za/web/2010/03/overpopulation-in-fact-more-africans-means-more-innovation-and-growth/, JM)

Entrepreneur, philanthropist and visionary Mo Ibrahim believe Africa’s increasing population will serve as a blessing, not a curse, when it comes to the rising numbers of people on the continent. Numerous economists agree. With an increased population come greater number of consumers, producers and innovative minds. While the common response by many to population increases is concern, particularly over the availability of resources such as food and fresh water, a variety of experts believe there is no overpopulation threat to the continent. On the contrary many, like Kathleen Kasun in the US, say Africa’s threat is not an increase in the number of her people, but rather the levels of freedom the continent’s children can enjoy. In her widely cited work, The Myths of Overpopulation, Kasun notes that as it is, Africa is the world’s least population continent. Starvation and hunger have been caused by failed economic policy and governments that undermine liberty, as opposed to the notion that there is a need to reduce the number of Africans in order to help Africa. Indian-born Nobel Prize winner Amartya Sen famously pointed out that no democracy has ever experienced a famine, a sure indicator of the relationship between free institutions and national wellbeing. Kasun notes that problems commonly blamed on “overpopulation” are the result of bad economic policy. “For example, Western journalists blamed the Ethiopian famine on “overpopulation,” but that was simply not true. The Ethiopian government caused it by confiscating the food stocks of traders and farmers and exporting them to buy arms. That country’s leftist regime, not its population, caused the tragedy.” “In fact, Africa, beset with problems often blamed on “overpopulation,” has only one-fifth the population density of Europe, and has an unexploited food-raising potential that could feed twice the present population of the world, according to estimates by Roger Revelle of Harvard and the University of San Diego. Economists writing for the International Monetary Fund in 1994 said that African economic problems result from excessive government spending, high taxes on farmers, inflation, restrictions on trade, too much government ownership, and overregulation of private economic activity. There was no mention of overpopulation.” Kasun adds that as the “most war-torn continent on earth (Africa) is also one of the least densely populated, with about half as many people per square mile as in the world as a whole.”

Population growth is unrelated to war or warming

Brockway 9 (Sandi, Freelance Writer, January 25, http://www.transitiontownsca.org/profiles/blogs/10-reasons-to-rethink, JM)

Population growth is not the driving force behind environmental degradation. Blaming environmental degradation on overpopulation lets the real culprits off the hook. The richest fifth of the world's people consume 66 times as many resources as the poorest fifth. The U.S., with a low fertility rate, is the largest emitter of greenhouse gases responsible for global warming. 5. Population pressure is not a root cause of political insecurity and conflict. Especially since 9/11, conflict in the Middle East has been linked to a 'youth bulge' of too many young men whose numbers supposedly make them prone to violence. Blaming population pressure for instability takes the onus off powerful actors and political choices.

Alt cause – politics

Lekgotla 10 (Staff, July 23, http://lekgotlamedianews.co.za/web/2010/07/dont-blame-the-babies/¸JM)

One, Zimbabwe, a country that was a food exporter until Mugabe began attacking farmers, and redistributing land mostly to his generals and favoured political allies. Food production plummeted so that by 2008 Zimbabwe had record low levels of grain production and now, even after good rains, is estimated to have 2.8 million people in need of food assistance, according to the UN’s World Food Programme. Two, Vietnam. Twenty years ago, the father of the overpopulation hype, Paul Ehrlich, predicted that Vietnam, “once a rich food exporting nation”, was facing crisis. A crisis he attributed to babies and not to the socialist bureaucrats who controlled food production. Even while Ehrlich was writing about a looming disaster in Vietnam, the politicians were changing their policies. They were deregulating and allowing markets to function, so, by the time Ehrlich’s prediction was put into print, Vietnam was exporting 1.2 metric tonnes of food. By 2008, the BBC was reporting that Vietnam, the world’s second largest rice producer, along with exporters India and Egypt, was cutting production because rice prices were too low. Three, China. After being in the grip of a socialist-induced famine during the late 50s and early 60s, today, after economic liberalisation, there is record prosperity and a food surplus. This doesn’t mean a food crisis may not be looming. Cheered on by the same people lamenting overpopulation, rich nations are subsidising the conversion of food into fuel. But, as professors C. Ford Runge and Benjamin Senauer wrote in Foreign Affairs, the use of ethanol to fill one 25-gallon tank in a vehicle “requires over 450 pounds of corn [204kg]—which contains enough calories to feed one person for a year.” Runge and Senauer say that food prices are increasing “because of demand for biofuels” and the number of “food-insecure people” will increase by 16 million. Political intervention is creating the very disaster that the environmentalists claim they wish to avoid. So, again it is the bureaucrats, not babies, who are to blame. I repeat, it is politicians, not the people, who are at fault.

Overpop – No Impact – War

No war – Africa disproves

Kasun 3 (Jacqueline, Economist, January 9, <http://www.juntosociety.com/guest/sperlazzo/bs_opm1010903.html>, JM)

Myth 10: Overpopulation causes war and revolution. The most war–torn continent on earth Africa is also one of the least densely populated, with about half as many people per square mile as in the world as a whole. Bad governments, propped up by ineptly and unjustly managed foreign aid, are more probably the root of strife. The worldwide movement which promotes population control is not small or weak. It is a powerful alliance of United Nations agencies, national governments, foundations and "nongovernmental organizations." It commands many billions of dollars in resources. Its members include family planning agencies, radical leftist environmental organizations such as the Sierra Club and the World Wildlife Fund, development planners, international financial institutions such as the World Bank, foreign relations agencies such as the U.S. Agency for International Development, and "research" organizations such as Worldwatch Institute. Its ideology increasingly dominates school and college instructional programs and textbook publishing. Ultimately, however, its power rests on public ignorance in countries such as the United States. For the billions of people who inhabit God's creation, and for the billions more He intends it for, it's up to us to find out the truth about "overpopulation," and to share it with as many people as will listen.

**Overpop – No Impact – Food**

Food production outstrips population growth

Peron 99 (Jim, Staff, Heartland Institute, “Exploding Population Myths,” October 20, <http://oldfraser.lexi.net/publications/critical_issues/1995/exploding/#the>, JM)

Measuring food production per capita actually isn’t a bad way of determining overpopulation. The problem for the overpopulation panic-mongers is that if we use this definition, the “problem of overpopulation” has been decreasing each year even though the world has more and more people. How can this be? Simply because there are two factors in the equation: the number of people, and the available food supply. If the world population is growing each year but the food supply is growing at a faster rate, then each year there will be more and more food per person. Under these circumstances we would have to say that each year the world is less overpopulated despite the increasing number of people. And the fact is that world food production has regularly-and consistently grown at a faster rate than world population. That is the reason we don’t worry about overpopulation in Maryland or England: though they have high population densities, both can feed their people without much difficulty.

India disproves the impact

Peron 99 (Jim, Staff, Heartland Institute, “Exploding Population Myths,” October 20, <http://oldfraser.lexi.net/publications/critical_issues/1995/exploding/#the>, JM)

Nations where famine was common just a few years ago have now become food exporters. Only a few decades ago, for example, India was considered overpopulated and doomed to mass starvation; Paul Ehrlich wrote in 1968, “I have yet to meet anyone familiar with the situation who thinks India will be self-sufficient in food by 197 1, if ever.“18 Yet India today exports food, and mass starvation is not very likely there anymore. Ehrlich must have noted this himself, since in 1971 he quietly deleted this comment from his book In 1981 Julian Simon, the bane of the overpopulation advocates, pointed out in the Atlantic Monthly : Net food grain availability-the amount available for human consumption- in kilograms per capita per year has been rising in India since at least 1950- 51. Throughout the 1970s food production increased at a faster rate than population. Why has India’s food supply improved so dramatically? The cause is not an agronomic miracle but an expectable economic event. Most price controls on food were lifted, and price supports were substituted for controls. Indian farmers had a greater incentive to produce more, so they did. They increased production by planting more crops a year, on more land, and 7 Exploding Population Myths by improving the land they had. They also introduced higher-yield strains and improved fertilizers. 19

Food production can easily keep up with growth

Peron 99 (Jim, Staff, Heartland Institute, “Exploding Population Myths,” October 20, <http://oldfraser.lexi.net/publications/critical_issues/1995/exploding/#the>, JM)

The fact is that the world is easily capable of sustaining populations far in excess of current population figures even without developing any new farming methods or technologies. Roger Revelle, former director of the Harvard Center for Population Studies, estimated that the world could easily provide an adequate diet for 40 billion people. And his estimate assumed that the average yield per acre would be about one half what is currently produced in the United States. More surprisingly, he also argued that less-developed countries are capable of feeding 18 billion people and that Africa alone could produce enough food for 10 billion people.22 In other words, Africa could feed the world twice over if its people were free to farm without state interference and socialist planning. ’ The former director of the Agricultural Economic Institute at Oxford University, Colin Clark, has estimated that if the world’s farmers were to use the best methods of farming available, an American diet could be provided for 35.1 billion people. If a Japanese-style diet were provided, this number would be trebled.23 The United Nations Population Fund has in essence acknowledged that famine is not very likely in the near future. A report by the UNPF ...dismisses fears of an overall global shortage of food of the kind much voiced by the Club of Rome school of forecasters some 20 years ago, pointing out that during the past 10 years, the world’s food production has increased by 24%, outpacing the rate of population growth.

**Overpop – No Impact – Food**

Population won’t strain food production

Peron 99 (Jim, Staff, Heartland Institute, “Exploding Population Myths,” October 20, <http://oldfraser.lexi.net/publications/critical_issues/1995/exploding/#the>, JM)

According to the Food and Agriculture Organization, world food supplies exceed requirements in all world areas, amounting to a surplus approaching 50% in 1990 in the developed countries, and 17% in the developing regions. "Globally, food supplies have more than doubled in the last 40 years ... between 1962 and 1991, average daily per caput food supplies increased more than 15% ... at a global level, there is probably no obstacle to food production rising to meet demand," according to FAO documents prepared for the 1996 World Food Summit. The FAO also reported that less than a third as many people had less than 2100 calories per person per day in 1990-92 as had been the case in 1969-71. . At present, farmers use less than half of the world's arable land. The conversion of land to urban and built-up uses to accommodate a larger population will absorb less than 2% of the world's land, and "is not likely to seriously diminish the supply of land for agricultural production," according to Paul Waggoner, writing for the Council for Agricultural Science and Technology in 1994.

Overpop – No Impact – Minerals

Mineral production increasing despite population

Peron 99 (Jim, Staff, Heartland Institute, “Exploding Population Myths,” October 20, <http://oldfraser.lexi.net/publications/critical_issues/1995/exploding/#the>, JM)

It has become so clear that mineral resources aren't being depleted that even some environmental groups have conceded the fact. The World Resource Institute estimates that the average price of all metals and minerals actually fell 40 percent between 1970 and 1988. Ronald Bailey, Eco-Scam (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993), p. 67.Note And as any economist can tell you, the best indicator of scarcity is price. The amount of labour it takes to purchase the vast majority of goods and services today is less than it was 20, 50, or 100 years ago. In other words, virtually everything we need for our existence is becoming less and less scarce each year! Even the leading doomster, Paul Ehrlich, was forced to concede that his predictions were in error when he accepted a bet with Julian Simon. Ehrlich has continually attacked Simon and demeaned him as a serious scholar, referring to his views as "examples of the sort of blunders... economists of his ilk commit when they attempt to deal with problems of pollution, resources and environment." Julian Simon, Population Matters, p. 369.Note In the midst of a heated exchange of papers between the two Simon flung down the gauntlet. He wrote: I'll put my money where my mouth is. This is a public offer to stake $10,000, in separate transactions of $1,000 or $100 each, on my belief that the cost of non-government-controlled raw materials (including grain and oil) will not rise in the long run. If you will pay me the current market price of $1000 or $100 worth of any standard mineral or other extractive product you name, and specify any date more than a year away, I will contract to pay you the then-current market price of the material. How about it, doomsayers and catastrophists? First come, first served. Ibid, pp. 365-366.Note Ehrlich promptly responded that he would "accept Simon's astonishing offer before other greedy people jump in." Ibid, pp. 371-372.Note When the contract was drawn up, it differed from Simon's original version only in a few details. Ronald Bailey reports: In October 1980, Ehrlich and Simon drew up a futures contract obligating Simon to sell Ehrlich the same quantities which could be purchased for $1,000 of five metals (copper, chrome, nickel, tin, and tungsten) ten years later at 1980 prices. If the combined prices rose above $1,000, Simon would pay the difference. If they fell below $1,000, Ehrlich would pay Simon. Ehrlich mailed Simon a check for $576.07 in October 1990. Simply put, the combined real prices of the metals selected by Ehrlich fell by more than 50 percent during the 1980s, confirming cornucopian claims that the supply of resources is becoming more abundant, not more scarce.

Resource supplies resilient

Peron 99 (Jim, Staff, Heartland Institute, “Exploding Population Myths,” October 20, <http://oldfraser.lexi.net/publications/critical_issues/1995/exploding/#the>, JM)

Figures like these are dramatic testimony to the underestimations that are continually made about the natural resources available for our use. In some cases, environmentalists deliberately underestimate resources in order to promote their own public policy agendas. Kahn gives an interesting example of this when he discusses aluminium reserves as stated in The Limits to Growth. According to Limits, the world had only 33 to 49 years of aluminium resources left--and remember, it was written in 1974, which means that the world should be running out sometime between 2007 and 2023. Kahn writes: Except for silicon (a semimetal), aluminum is the most abundant metal in the earth's crust, which contains about 8 percent aluminum, or roughly 2 million trillion tons. Can that much metal (or even .0001 percent of it) be used up in 49 years, the high side of Meadows' estimate? The resolution of the apparent confusion lies in Meadows' footnotes, where he explains that he has counted only the aluminum in known reserves of bauxite. In other words, if we ignore every possible source of aluminum except known high-grade bauxite deposits, we will come up with this number. Or will we? No, not even then. For even though he states in a footnote that unless otherwise specified he will use data from the 1973 U.S. Geological Survey document U.S. Mineral Resources, in the case of aluminum there is another footnote explaining that he has taken the estimate from the earlier U.S. Bureau of Mines report Mineral Facts and Problems, 1970, which happened to use a 1965 estimate that was less than half the one given in the 1973 document. Moreover, the later volume unambiguously asserts in a summary statement that "the nation has virtually inexhaustible potential resources of aluminous materials other than bauxite," and it proceeds to describe 10 of them, a single of which contains more aluminum than Meadows' estimate for total known world reserves plus potential future reserves. Kahn, The Next 200 Years, p. 90.Note Kahn points out similar distortions regarding other metals such as iron. Meadows contended that the world iron supply would not last beyond the year 2128. Yet iron, like aluminium, is one of the most plentiful metals in the earth's crust.

Overpop – No Impact – Climate

Disproportionate pollution quantities disprove the impact

Leufstedt 9 (Simon, Freelance Writer, July 14, http://www.green-blog.org/2009/07/14/overpopulation-is-not-the-problem-%E2%80%93-overconsumption-by-the-rich-few-is/, JM)

I often hear people saying that overpopulation is the main problem to our environmental and ecological problems. Some people even claim that it’s responsible for global warming. I also agreed with this idea before. But after reading more about the subject over the years I have changed my mind. The rich countries in the “North”, i.e. the West, have a “rapidly decreasing” population which is “expected to decline over the next forty years.” Developing countries such as India, China and most of Africa on the other hand is where we will see future population numbers increasing. And yes. It seems so easy to blame countries with an overwhelming rising population for being responsible for wrecking our planet, climate and environment. Because surely more people must mean more pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. Right? Not really. The West is responsible for about 80% of the worlds CO2 increase. An average person living in Great Britain will in only 11 days emit as much CO2 as an average person in Bangladesh will during a whole year. And just a single power plant in West Yorkshire in Great Britain will produce more CO2 every year than all the 139 million people combined living in Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania, Malawi, Zambia and Mozambique.

Overpop – No Impact – Climate

Consumption is the problem, not growth

Eby 10 (Margaret, Staff, Salon, “The Coming Population Crash: The Overpopulation Myth, April 19, http://www.salon.com/books/feature/2010/04/19/population\_crash\_ext2010, JM)

Global environmental problems are not, and will not, be mainly a problem of overbreeding Indians or Africans. First, their birthrates are coming down fast, with Indian women, for instance, having fewer than three children on average today; and even African women have falling fertility. And secondly, because overbreeding -- in the sense of women having more than replacement levels of children -- is almost entirely in countries with a very low per-capita footprint on the planet. For instance, the carbon emissions of one American is the same as that of 20 Indians, 30 Pakistanis, 40 Nigerians and 250 Ethiopians. If, as economists suggest, the world economy will grow by 400 percent by 2050, then no more than a tenth of that will be a result of population growth. The issue is consumption, and that puts the onus right back on the conspicuous consumers to do something about their economic systems, not least before more developing countries follow the same model.

Alt cause – consumption

Pearce 10 (Fred, Staff, Prospect, March 8, <http://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/2010/03/the-overpopulation-myth/>, JM)

In fact, rising consumption today far outstrips the rising headcount as a threat to the planet. And most of the extra consumption has been in rich countries that have long since given up adding substantial numbers to their population, while most of the remaining population growth is in countries with a very small impact on the planet. By almost any measure you choose, a small proportion of the world’s people take the majority of the world’s resources and produce the majority of its pollution. Let’s look at carbon dioxide emissions: the biggest current concern because of climate change. The world’s richest half billion people—that’s about 7 per cent of the global population—are responsible for half of the world’s carbon dioxide emissions. Meanwhile, the poorest 50 per cent of the population are responsible for just 7 per cent of emissions. Virtually all of the extra 2bn or so people expected on this planet in the coming 30 or 40 years will be in this poor half of the world. Stopping that, even if it were possible, would have only a minimal effect on global emissions, or other global threat

Warming from population empirically denied

Kasun 3 (Jacqueline, Economist, January 9, <http://www.juntosociety.com/guest/sperlazzo/bs_opm1010903.html>, JM)

The message that is most likely to arouse the fervor of young people is that overpopulation is destroying the environment and the biosphere. On this point, the first thing to keep in mind is that some of the most beautiful parts of the world, with the highest environmental quality, are in densely populated countries such as western Germany, which has more than 600 persons per square mile, and the Netherlands, which has almost 1200 persons per square mile, compared with 330 in China. Several myths promote the belief that we are engulfed in an environmental catastrophe. For instance, Vice-President Al Gore and some scientists say population growth is causing global warming. But there is much disagreement in the scientific community about this. Seventy-nine scientists issued the "Leipzig Declaration" in 1995 saying "...There does not exist today a general scientific consensus about ... greenhouse warming ...." Additionally, the satellite readings of global temperature, available on the NASA Web site at www.nasa.com, do not show a warming trend. And further, respected climatologists such as Hugh Ellsaesser, Richard S. Lindzen and Robert C. Balling vigorously dispute the notion of a global warming danger.

Population is not connected to air pollution

Kasun 3 (Jacqueline, Economist, January 9, <http://www.juntosociety.com/guest/sperlazzo/bs_opm1010903.html>, JM)

In fact, air and water pollution levels have been highest in the centrally-planned economies of Eastern Europe and China, where population growth is low or negative. Legendary air pollution in Poland and Russia has occurred in areas with thinly-settled populations. In the United States, air pollution is declining significantly. The federal government's National Acid Precipitation Assessment Program recently reported "no widespread forest or crop damage in the United States" related to acid rain.

Overpop – No Impact – Poverty

Poverty has no connection to population

Kasun 3 (Jacqueline, Economist, January 9, <http://www.juntosociety.com/guest/sperlazzo/bs_opm1010903.html>, JM)

In reality, problems commonly blamed on "overpopulation" are the result of bad economic policy. For example, Western journalists blamed the Ethiopian famine on "overpopulation," but that was simply not true. The Ethiopian government caused it by confiscating the food stocks of traders and farmers and exporting them to buy arms. That country's leftist regime, not its population, caused the tragedy. In fact, Africa, beset with problems often blamed on "overpopulation," has only one-fifth the population density of Europe, and has an unexploited food-raising potential that could feed twice the present population of the world, according to estimates by Roger Revelle of Harvard and the University of San Diego. Economists writing for the International Monetary Fund in 1994 said that African economic problems result from excessive government spending, high taxes on farmers, inflation, restrictions on trade, too much government ownership, and overregulation of private economic activity. There was no mention of overpopulation. . The government of the Philippines relies on foreign aid to control population growth, but protects monopolies which buy farmers' outputs at artificially low prices, and sell them inputs at artificially high prices, causing widespread poverty. Advocates of population control blame "overpopulation" for poverty in Bangladesh. But the government dominates the buying and processing of jute, the major cash crop, so that farmers receive less for their efforts than they would in a free market. Impoverished farmers flee to the city, but the government owns 40% of industry and regulates the rest with price controls, high taxes and unpublished rules administered by a huge, corrupt, foreign-aid dependent bureaucracy. Jobs are hard to find and poverty is rampant. This crowding leads to problems such as sporadic or inefficient food distribution, but this problem is caused -- as in Ethiopia -- by that country's flawed domestic policies. . It is often claimed that poverty in China is the result of "overpopulation." But Taiwan, with a population density five times as great as mainland China's, produces many times as much per capita. The Republic of Korea, with a population density 3.6 times as great as China's, has a per capita output almost 16 times as great. The Malaysian government abandoned population control in 1984, ushering in remarkable economic growth under free market reforms, while Ecuador, Uruguay, Bulgaria and other countries complained at the International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo that though they had reduced their population growth, they still had deteriorating economies.

Overpop Good – Growth

Overpopulation causes economic growth – markets

Fengler 10 (Wolfgang, Lead Economist in the Nairobi Office of the World Bank, April 15, http://blogs.worldbank.org/africacan/can-rapid-population-growth-be-good-for-economic-development, JM)

Third, population growth and urbanization go together, and economic development is closely correlated with urbanization. Rich countries are urban countries. No country has ever reached high income levels with low urbanization. Population growth increases density and, together with rural-urban migration, creates higher urban agglomeration. And this is critical for achieving sustained growth because large urban centers allow for innovation and increase economies of scale. Companies can produce goods in larger numbers and more cheaply, serving a larger number of low-income customers. Kenya has companies which have been benefitting from increasing population growth and density in targeting the large numbers of lower and lower-middle income groups – the “bottom of the pyramid”. Their business model is viable because they can serve a multi-million customer base, which has increased by 25% over the last 10 years and which continues to grow rapidly. Are we thus ahead of golden age of development in Africa? It is possible but there is no guarantee. This will depend on many other factors as well. As the last decades have shown larger population and increased population density are no guarantee of success. However, it seems that the current pattern of population growth is not the main constraint to Africa’s development anymore and can even be a positive force.

Population growth key to prevent stagnation

WorkPermit 6 (workpermit.com, July 10, http://www.workpermit.com/news/2006\_07\_10/australia/needs\_more\_migrants.htm, JM)

Australia must increase its migrant intake to stop the economy from stagnating in coming years, a leading business information company says. IBISWorld said that without more migration to offset the nation's aging population and low natural birthrate, the economy would suffer and key industries would lack sufficient staff. The comments follow a recent increase in the number of migrants coming into the country. Migrant numbers rose by 10 percent to more than 120,000 in June last year. The company's Australian general manager, Jason Baker, said although Australia had the highest foreign-born population of any country in the developed world, it was increasingly likely the nation would need more migrants. He said even a recent increase in the fertility rate still left it below the replacement level. Without migration, the economy would groan under the weight of fewer and fewer taxpayers having to cover the cost of an increasing number of retirees, he said. "By the 2030s, net overseas migration will be the only form of population growth in Australia, as our aging population and low fertility rate will see the number of deaths each year overtake the number of babies born," he added. "If our population growth doesn't increase the economy may stagnate, with a declining workforce causing labor shortages and wage hikes. "If that happens, we'd expect government policy to allow higher immigration levels." IBISWorld, which tracks economic and business trends, said Australian industries in particular would suffer if migration did not increase." He said 32 per cent of people in manufacturing were born overseas, while migrants made up 30 per cent of workers in the property and business services area.

Population growth increases the labor supply

Bloom & Freeman 86 (David & Richard B., Prof. of Economics @ Harvard, Herbert Ascherman Chair of Economics @ Harvard, *Population and Development Review* 12, 3, p. 381-414, JM)

Generally speaking, the labor supply forthcoming from any population depends on the size of the population, broken down into various sex and age groups, and the participation rates for each of those groups. Whereas population size by age and sex is directly determined by the history of fertility, mortality, and migration patterns, participation rates tend to be more economically and culturally determined. For example, labor force participation is nearly universal for prime-aged males in less developed economies, whereas its incidence is considerably lower for younger and older men. Participation rates for these latter groups also exhibit considerable variability over time and across countries. In addition, although it is well known that published labor force participation rates for women are poor indicators of their economic activity levels (especially in countries where women work predominantly in agriculture), these rates tend to vary widely across countries and over time and to be lower at each age than corresponding rates for men. Nevertheless, labor force participation rates are themselves influenced by the same fertility, mortality, and migration patterns that determine population size. Thus, in discussing the effects of population growth on labor supply, we will seek to distinguish between pure "accounting" effects and other effects that are fundamentally "behavioral" in nature. We would like to make three main points about the interrelationship between population growth (and changes in population growth) and labor supply: (1) population growth will affect labor supply with a lag whose length depends on the reasons underlying the growth; in particular, an acceleration of population growth due to an increase in net inmigration or a decline in mortality will have a different impact on the labor force than an acceleration of population growth that results from an increase in fertility; (2) fertility and mortality levels are important determinants of labor supply, independent of their relation to each other; and (3) fertility increase and mortality decline are likely to have an immediate effect on labor supply through their "behavioral" effects on labor force participation rate.

\*\*Ozone\*\*

Ozone Hole Low

The ozone hole is shrinking

AGBM 7 (Sept. 26, Australian Government Bureau of Meteorology, http://www.bom.gov.au/announcements /media\_releases/ho/20070926.shtml, JM)

The Antarctic ozone hole is back and although it’s almost as big as previous years, the long term outlook for a return to better ozone levels remains good. Over the past ten years the destruction of ozone has resulted in large ozone holes appearing over the Antarctic each spring with almost all growing to an area of more than 25 million square kilometres (about three times the size of Australia). This year, the Bureau of Meteorology reports that the hole has already reached that size but has not grown as large as the record 28 million square kilometre holes that developed during 2000, 2003 and 2006. Ozone holes develop during spring because sunlight returning to the polar regions trigger chemical reactions that have remained dormant during the darkness of winter. The size and depth of the hole is determined by factors including the concentrations of ozone-depleting chemicals such as Chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), as well as the temperature of the lower stratosphere. It is also influenced by broad scale atmospheric circulation patterns which vary significantly from year to year. Though recent Antarctic ozone holes have been very large, measurements show that the concentrations of ozone-depleting substances in the lower atmosphere, such as CFCs, have peaked and are now slowly declining. In its most recent assessment of ozone depletion, compiled last year, the World Meteorological Organization stated that ozone levels are expected to return to pre-ozone-hole conditions between 2060 and 2075.

The ozone hole isn’t growing

ABC News 5 (Nov. 10, <http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2005/11/10/1502996.htm>, CSIRO=Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation , JM)

The ozone hole over Antarctica is the fourth largest on record, but scientists are encouraged that it is no longer growing. This year, the hole is about three-and-a-half times the size of Australia. The CSIRO's Paul Fraser says the amount of ozone-depleting chemicals in the stratosphere has dropped. He says this means it is unlikely the hole will ever get bigger than it was in 2003 - the worst year on record. "We hope within the next five years to start to see a slow recovery," he said. "I think we're in that period between when it's getting worse and when it should start to improve." He says clear signs of a recovery are expected in the next five to 10 years, with a complete recovery not expected for another 50. "Ozone loss over Antarctica is still at a maximum and we haven't yet seen signs of ozone recovery," he said. "I suppose the good bit of news is that the ozone depletion isn't getting worse."

Ozone hole down – pollutants

BBC News 0 (“Ozone hole 'set to shrink,'” December 3, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/1050495.stm>, JM)

An international group of scientists is predicting that the hole in the ozone layer over Antarctica will shrink and close within 50 years. It says a ban on the chemicals that thin the Earth's protective film of gas is showing signs of success and the ozone layer should soon start to repair itself - as long as countries stick to the ban. The forecast was made following a conference in Buenos Aires, Argentina, where 300 climate scientists scrutinised new data. But the experts warn that governments must tackle the wider issue of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, if any real progress on ozone is to be achieved. The prediction is based on evidence that levels of chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) in the lower atmosphere are falling. CFCs break down ozone, the three-atomed oxygen molecule, which shields the surface of the planet from harmful rays. An international ban on CFCs, once widely used in aerosols, has been in place since 1987, when the Montreal Protocol was introduced. Scientists studied fresh data at the Stratospheric Processes and their Role in Climate (SPARC) Second General Assembly in Buenos Aires.

Ozone Hole Low

The ozone hole hasn’t increased in over a decade

Lieberman 3 (Ben, senior policy analyst for CEI, October 1, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/article/12892/Ozone\_Depletions\_Lessons\_for\_Global\_Warming.html, JM)

The Newchurch study concludes ozone depletion in the uppermost portion of the stratosphere is still occurring, but at a rate somewhat slower than was taking place before 1997. While this trend may be due to the Montreal Protocol, as Newchurch and his colleagues assert, more significant ozone trends unreported by Newchurch lead to a very different conclusion. The overall news on global ozone levels has been surprisingly good since the early 1990s. According to the World Meteorological Organization’s comprehensive Scientific Assessment of Ozone Depletion: 1998, “since 1991, the linear [downward] trend observed during the 1980s has not continued, but rather total column ozone has been almost constant at midlatitudes in both hemispheres since the recovery from the 1991 Mt. Pinatubo eruption.” A 2002 update of the WMO report concluded, “global mean total column ozone for the period 1997-2001 was approximately 3 percent below the pre-1980 average values,” considerably less severe than the 5 percent depletion observed in the early 1990s. The ozone layer has not returned to the historical average level (which itself is an estimate and may be incorrect), but it has been considerably less damaged over the past decade than had been predicted. This trend largely predates any declines in stratospheric concentrations of the compounds banned by the Montreal Protocol. In 1998, the WMO determined “the peak had not occurred” for the chlorine-containing molecules believed to attack the ozone layer. Only in 2002 did WMO report, “observations in the stratosphere indicated that the total chlorine abundance is at or near a peak.” “Ozone depleting chemicals are still increasing slowly in the stratosphere but ozone is no longer depleting--not since 1992,” notes Dr. S. Fred Singer, president of the Science and Environmental Policy Project and longtime critic of ozone alarmism. According to Singer and others, no cause and effect has been established between the past decade’s improvements in the ozone layer and the Montreal Protocol. The natural variability of atmospheric ozone concentrations is much greater and considerably less well understood than originally thought. Singer and others suggest the role of man-made compounds is more modest than earlier believed, especially in relation to this natural variability.

Ozone Hole Low

The ozone hole is shrinking

Earth Times 10 (Staff, December 2, http://www.earthtimes.org/articles/news/356353,antarctic-ozone-layer-shrinking.html, JM)

The hole in the Antarctic ozone layer, blamed for global warming in the southern hemisphere, is shrinking and at its smallest for five years, New Zealand's National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research (NIWA) said Friday. Atmospheric scientist Stephen Wood said it indicated that international initiatives, such as the 1987 Montreal Protocol, which phased out chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) and other ozone-depleting substances, may be working. Wood said land and satellite calculations showed the Antarctic ozone hole reached a maximum of about 22 million square kilometres and an ozone mass deficit of approximately 27 million tons this year. Last year, it was 24 million square kilometres and 35 million tons. The largest ozone hole ever recorded was in 2000, when it reached 29 million square kilometres with a 43 million ton deficit. Although reluctant to say the ozone hole was recovering permanently, Wood said, "However, we have now had a few years in succession with less severe holes. That is an indication we may be beginning to see a recovery." Continued monitoring would enable scientists to assess whether it was the start of a sustained, long-term, recovery, he said. The Antarctic ozone hole forms in August and September every year and remains until breaking up in November or December.

Ozone is being replenished

Wolchover 5-16 (Natalie, Physicist, http://www.lifeslittlemysteries.com/good-news-life-earth-ozone-hole-shrinking-1693/, JM)

For the first time, scientists have found convincing evidence that the gargantuan hole carved in the ozone layer by man-made chemicals is steadily shrinking. That mean a policy enacted 22 years ago called the Montreal Protocol is working: The 1989 ban on the use of chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) — toxic chemicals used in air conditioners and solvents that eat away at ozone molecules — has helped the Earth to regain some of its lost protective ozone. The "ozone hole" is not really a hole, but rather a region above Antarctica where the ozone layer — the 15-mile-thick blanket of O3 molecules that acts as our planet's natural sunscreen — is very, very thin. That the ozone above Antarctica is thickening again is universally good news for life on Earth. The ozone layer absorbs as much as 99 percent of the sun's dangerous high-frequency ultraviolet light, making Earth habitable. [Read: Is Ozone Good or Bad?] Atmospheric scientists previously observed that levels of ozone-depleting CFCs were falling in the stratosphere (the level of atmosphere between 5 and 30 miles up in the sky) above Antarctica. Because that's where the ozone hole is, they suspected that the drop in CFCs might correspond to a thickening of ozone, but until now, couldn't prove it. The average ozone levels were observed to fluctuate dramatically from one spring to the next, so that little could be said about the hole's average size. Now a team of environmental scientists led by Murry Salby at Macquarie University in Sydney, Australia, have identified the cause of the annual fluctuations in ozone. By removing the fluctuations from the data, they produced a baseline of systematic change in Antarctic ozone levels. As detailed in the new issue of the journal Geophysical Research Letters, the team's calculations reveal that the ozone hole is 15 percent smaller than it was at its maximum in the 1990s.

Ozone Hole High

Ozone is being depleted – new gaps developing

EurActiv.com 3-28 (EU News Agency, Staff, http://www.euractiv.com/en/climate-environment/developing-ozone-hole-approaches-europe-news-503504, JM)

The fast-thinning Arctic ozone layer was first detected by an international network of over 30 ozone sounding stations spread across the Arctic and sub-Arctic, and coordinated by the Alfred Wegener Institute for Polar and Marine Research. The institute's latest predictions, based on data collated from the European Centre for Medium Range Weather Forecasts, are that it will affect parts of Scandinavia and Eastern Europe on 30 March and 31 March. "The ozone loss is still going on at high rates and we don't see an end to that for at least 10-14 days," Markus Rex, an atmospheric scientist at the Alfred Wegener Institute, told EurActiv. "The degree of ozone loss in the Arctic is clearly larger than in any winter so far," he added. Polar station measurements showed that around half of the ozone had been destroyed at some latitudes, he said, and the Arctic was on track for a record loss of ozone, which protects earth from ultra-violet (UV) radiation. Data is still being collated and a collection of atmospheric scientists from around the world plan to release a statement on the phenomenon at a conference in Vienna on 4 April. But it was "absolutely possible" that the thinning parts of the ozone layer could turn into an "ozone hole," Rex said.

Severe ozone loss happening now

EurActiv.com 3-28 (EU News Agency, Staff, http://www.euractiv.com/en/climate-environment/developing-ozone-hole-approaches-europe-news-503504, JM)

Another scientist who had signed the Alfred Wegener Institute's statement, Hugue de Backer of Belgium's Royal Meteorological Institute, said that this would only happen, if quantities of ozone fell below 200 Dobson units (the standard measure of atmospheric ozone concentrations). "The levels above central Siberia now are about 250 Dobson units, which is quite low," he told EurActiv. Ultra-violet radiation (UV) exposure from the depleted ozone layer is less dangerous than that found in the tropics, but scientists still advised caution. "People should be vigilant but they shouldn't be worried," Gier Braathen, a senior scientific officer at the World Meteorological Organisation, told EurActiv. "You can protect yourself by keeping informed, putting on a wide-brimmed hat and sun screen, and not spending too many hours outdoors." A "severe depletion" of ozone was taking place, he said, because "this is among the most severe winters we have seen". But it was still too soon to say if it would be the worst ever, he counseled.

Ozone decreasing now

British Antarctic Survey 7-8 (“Situation at 2011 July 8,” http://www.antarctica.ac.uk/met/jds/ozone/index.html, JM)

Ozone depletion is now taking place over Antarctica. Minimum values within the polar vortex are below 220 DU. The circumpolar ozone belt outside the vortex is intensifying, with some areas above 400 DU. The lower stratospheric temperature is nearing its winter minimum, with much of the Antarctic ozone layer below the polar stratospheric cloud formation temperature. This temperature a little below the normal for this time of year. There was substantial Arctic ozone depletion over the northern winter in 2011. The summer circulation pattern is now established. See the final situation report for last year for information on the 2010 - 2011 season. Notes: The Antarctic ozone hole is usually largest in early September and deepest in late September to early October. September 16 is world ozone day, and in 2009 the final UN Member State to ratify the Montreal Protocol signed up. 2007 was the International Year of the Ozone Layer. Prior to the formation of ozone holes, Antarctic ozone values were normally at their lowest in the autumn (ie March).

Ozone Hole High

Record ozone losses happening now

WMO 4-5 (World Meteorological Organization, Staff, http://www.theozonehole.com/arctic2001loss.htm, JM)

Depletion of the ozone layer- the shield that protects life on Earth from harmful levels of ultraviolet rays - has reached an unprecedented level over the Arctic this spring because of the continuing presence of ozone-depleting substances in the atmosphere and a very cold winter in the stratosphere. The stratosphere is the second major layer of the Earth’s atmosphere, just above the troposphere. The record loss is despite an international agreement which has been very successful in cutting production and consumption of ozone destroying chemicals. Because of the long atmospheric lifetimes of these compounds it will take several decades before their concentrations are back down to pre-1980 levels, the target agreed in the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer. Observations from the ground and from balloons over the Arctic region as well as from satellites show that the Arctic region has suffered an ozone column loss of about 40% from the beginning of the winter to late March. The highest ozone loss previously recorded was about 30% over the entire winter. In Antarctica the so-called ozone hole is an annually recurring winter/spring phenomenon due to the existence of extremely low temperatures in the stratosphere. In the Arctic the meteorological conditions vary much more from one year to the next and the temperatures are always warmer than over Antarctica. Hence, some Arctic winters experience almost no ozone loss, whereas cold stratospheric temperatures in the Arctic lasting beyond the polar night can occasionally lead to substantial ozone loss. Even though this Arctic winter was warmer than average at ground level, it was colder in the stratosphere than for a normal Arctic winter.

Ozone Hole – Turn – Warming

Repairing the ozone hole causes warming

Banhoo 10 (Sindya N., Staff, New York Times, January 25, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/26/science/earth/26ozone.html, JM)

That the hole in Earth’s ozone layer is slowly mending is considerekjd a big victory for environmental policy makers. But in a new report, scientists say there is a downside: its repair may contribute to global warming. It turns out that the hole led to the formation of moist, brighter-than-usual clouds that shielded the Antarctic region from the warming induced by greenhouse gas emissions over the last two decades, scientists write in Wednesday’s issue of Geophysical Research Letters. “The recovery of the hole will reverse that,” said Ken Carslaw, a professor of atmospheric science at the University of Leeds and a co-author of the paper. “Essentially, it will accelerate warming in certain parts of the Southern Hemisphere.” The hole in the layer, discovered above Antarctica in the mid-1980s, caused wide alarm because ozone plays a crucial role in protecting life on Earth from harmful ultraviolet radiation. The hole was largely attributed to the human use of chlorofluorocarbons, chemical compounds found in refrigerants and aerosol cans that dissipate ozone. Under an international protocol adopted in 1987, many countries phased out the compounds, helping the ozone to start reconstituting itself over the Antarctic. For their research, the authors of the new study relied on meteorological data recorded between 1980 and 2000, including global wind speeds recorded by the European Center for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts. The data show that the hole in the ozone layer generated high-speed winds that caused sea salt to be swept up into the atmosphere to form moist clouds. The clouds reflect more of the sun’s powerful rays and help fend off warming in the Antarctic atmosphere, the scientists write.

Ozone Hole – Not Anthropogenic

The ozone hole is caused primarily by nature

Singer 10 (S. Fred, Ph.D., president science and environment policy projects, November 30, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/article/28896/The\_OzoneCFC\_Debacle\_Hasty\_Action\_Shaky\_Science.html, JM)

It is generally agreed that natural sources of tropospheric chlorine (volcanoes, ocean spray, etc.) are four to five orders of magnitude larger than man-made sources (9). But it is what gets into the stratosphere that counts. The debate has degenerated into arguing about how much chlorine is rained out in the lower atmosphere (10) rather than measuring whether stratospheric chlorine is actually increasing.  Contrary to the claims of some skeptics, CFCs do indeed reach the stratosphere; the secular increase of fluorine, in the form of HF, as reported by Belgian researcher R. Zander, may be sufficient proof (11,12). But as late as 1987, Zander found no long-term increase in HCl, suggesting that stratospheric chlorine comes mostly from natural sources, which are not expected to increase over time. The situation changed in 1991, however, when NASA scientist C. Rinsland published data showing HCl increasing at about half the rate of HF, suggesting both natural and man-made sources (13). Yet the Montreal Protocol to freeze CFC production and roll it back to lower levels was signed in 1987, at a time when published work still indicated little, if any, contribution from CFCs.

No ozone depletion – flawed studies

Singer 10 (S. Fred, Ph.D., president science and environment policy projects, November 30, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/article/28896/The\_OzoneCFC\_Debacle\_Hasty\_Action\_Shaky\_Science.html, JM)

The question of global ozone depletion has been bedeviled by doubts about the quality of the data. Readings from Dobson ground observatories can be contaminated by long-term trends in SO2 pollution of the lower atmosphere. DeMuer and DeBacker have demonstrated that the Dobson ozone meter can misinterpret the downward trend of SO2 pollution, giving rise to a "fictitious" ozone trend (19). (Their finding was confirmed by a task group, chaired by Robert T. Watson, in a Joint Workshop of the IPCC and the International Ozone Assessment Panel in May 1993). Another, quite separate problem is produced by the extreme noisiness of the ozone record. To establish the existence of a small, long-term trend it is necessary to eliminate the large natural variations, especially also those correlated with the 11-yr sunspot cycle. This is an impossible task given the shortness of the record and the virtual absence of data on long-term variations of the solar far-UV radiation that produces ozone in the upper atmosphere. The analysis fails a simple test: The "trend" is found to depend strongly on the choice of time interval (20). An additional problem in identifying a man-made trend arises from long-term trends in sunspot number, and therefore long-term ozone trends of natural origin (21). Thus, the issue of whether the global ozone layer shows a steadily depleting trend is still controversial. Satellite data on global ozone content are not subject to interference from low-altitude pollution, but long-term calibration drift presents a problem; the TOMS data from satellites appear to have a calibration drift due to nonlinearities in the photomultiplier (22). In any case, the shortness of the record, 1979 to present, makes the solar-cycle correction problematic (23).

Ozone depletion is rapidly undone, caused by nature, and harmless

Davis 0 (Robert E., PhD, December 1, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/article/9587/Ozone\_hole\_Much\_ado\_about\_nada.html, JM)

Then, the World Meteorological Organization, which measures ozone depletion slightly differently, spun its own ozone yarn, declaring that the end of September’s depletion was the worst on record. But once again, as is unfortunately common with most environmental news, this is much ado about nada. First, the size, shape, and amount of ozone depletion are significantly affected by the weather. The Antarctic stratosphere was cold this past winter (global warming?), which resulted in more depletion than normal. That minor factoid was buried in the last paragraph of CNN’s coverage of this nonstory. As NOAA’s Hoffman explained, “year-to-year fluctuations in the geographical size of the ozone hole and the timing of the ozone production are believed to be related to meteorological factors such as temperature and winds, rather than further increases in ozone-destroying chemicals in the atmosphere.” Second, if these levels of ultraviolet radiation seen in Punta Arenas were truly harmful, most of the world’s population would be in grave danger. Most of us, on a regular basis, are exposed to solar radiation far more intense than that seen in southern Chile. An index of global ultraviolet light levels, assuming cloud-free and unpolluted skies, was constructed for October 11, the same day as the 175 Dobson Units reading in Punta Arenas. The UV index there of around 9 is much lower than UV levels across more than half of the planet. Most places receive more intense solar rays than Punta Arenas does. Third, the expanded ozone hole is short-lived. By November, as Antarctica warms, the vortex of winds that effectively isolate Antarctica from the rest of the planet weakens, and high ozone levels over the rest of the hemisphere quickly fill the so-called hole. That process only serves to highlight the climatological uniqueness of the situation over Antarctica.

Ozone Hole – Not Anthropogenic

Ozone thinning isn’t caused by humans

Environment & Climate 99 (News Staff, March 1, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/article/13345/Media\_Ignores\_the\_Hole\_Ozone\_Story.html, JM)

Not all climate scientists accept the argument that human emissions of greenhouse gases are responsible for a thinning of the Earth's ozone layer. But the skeptics’ views are consistently ignored by a news media that apparently does. In an article titled "Gaping Hole in Ozone Reporting," writers for the Free Market Project note that "the networks for years have engaged in one-sided reporting on global warming, ignoring those climate scientists who point out, for instance, that most of the Earth’s warming over the past hundred years occurred prior to the 1940s, while most greenhouse gas emissions have occurred since the 1940s." The article appeared in the October issue of MediaNomics, a monthly newsletter of the Media Research Center in Alexandria, Virginia. The publication highlights reports by NBC and CBS, on September 10 and October 6, respectively, in which "neither (reporter) bothered to interview a climate scientist skeptical of such ozone theories.” "Every year at about the same time, there is a predictable press release issued by the World Meteorological Organization quoting its ozone scientist, Rumen Bojkov, with some alarmist pronouncement," climate scientist S. Fred Singer told the Media Research Center. "The truth of the matter is that the hole, a temporary thinning of the layer, has pretty well stabilized within the last decade, and now fluctuates according to the climate, from day-to-day and from year-to-year," Singer said. "There has been no report published showing an increasing trend in solar ultraviolet radiation on the ground. And that’s the only thing that counts if we’re talking about the effects of ozone changes."

Ozone depletion isn’t caused by humans

Maduro 2 (Rogielo, Co-author, *The Holes in the Ozone Scare*, January, http://www.mitosyfraudes.org/Ingles/Crista.html, JM)

They discovered that changes in the ozone layer were directly caused by the horizontal and vertical movement of air masses (that is, wind dynamics). A close analysis of the data also demonstrated that chemistry played no role in the thickness of the ozone layer over these stations. The authors discuss the implications of their work in detail: Intensive investigations on irregular variations of the total ozone during the last years point out many phenomena as possible sources. Influences related to homogeneous and heterogeneous chemistry, volcanic activity, solar proton events, and other forms of solar activity are documented ... The main cause, however, may be influences from meteorological conditions, and these relations have got much less attention. The role of horizontal advection and vertical motion as a significant source for ozone column variations has been studied more than 40 years ... Recently Rabbe and Larsen [(3)](http://www.mitosyfraudes.org/Ingles/Crista.html#8link) have indicated dynamic processes in the atmosphere as a main reason of ozone variations and ozone "miniholes." They show that ascending motion of the air is accompanied by dilution of the ozone layer, and vice versa, descending motion of the air causes enhanced density of the ozone layer. The causes of ascending and descending motions are often winds blowing across mountain ranges. Such vertical air movements will cause adiabatic expansion and compression with cooling and warming in time scales down to a few hours. Chemical processes can also contribute to ozone variations, but here the time scales are days. On the other hand, ozone variations with periods in the order of 10 days, and seasonal variations as well can also be explained by dynamic meteorological reasoning. After a detailed analysis of the Russian data, Henriksen and Roldugin conclude with a sharp reminder to the promoters of the ozone depletion fraud that they cannot arbitrarily exclude factors other than chemistry from their models: The question of so-called "ozone depletion" has to be investigated from the point of view of long-term variation of general circulation in the atmosphere. Models of "the depletion," as summarized in [the World Meteorological Organization's] WMO Report, must realize that the meteorological conditions have significant effects on the ozone layer, being the main cause of seasonal as well as most of the shorter and apparently arbitrary density and thermal variations.

Their evidence is biased by chemical companies

Kasun 3 (Jacqueline, Economist, January 9, <http://www.juntosociety.com/guest/sperlazzo/bs_opm1010903.html>, JM)

Like global warming, the cause and significance of the so-called ozone "hole" is a matter of intense scientific dispute, although the United States and other nations have agreed to reductions in the use of chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), which were alleged to have caused it. S. Fred Singer, an atmospheric physicist who participated in the earliest ozone measurements, calls the ozone scare a "misuse of science." In fact, many think the chief function of the CFC ban has been to help big chemical companies establish highly profitable new monopolies on the CFC substitutes which they developed.

Ozone Hole – No Impact – Oceans

The ozone hole doesn’t disrupt marine life

Bowles 0 (Claire, Staff, *NewScientist,* February 15, http://news.bio-medicine.org/biology-news-2/Plankton-are-not-affected-by-ozone-depletion-11907-1/, JM)

The ozone hole above Antarctica may not be damaging life in the ocean below after all. If Californian researchers are right, then increased ultraviolet radiation is having scarcely any effect on the growth of marine plankton, the base of the ocean's food chain. The team, led by Kevin Arrigo of Stanford University in Palo Alto, has created computer models of phytoplankton growth over a year in the southern hemisphere before and after the ozone hole appeared in the 1980s. They included such factors as the position of the ozone hole, cloud cover, and UV-B strength, the type of ultraviolet radiation that increases as atmospheric ozone declines. To find out what increased UV-B did to phytoplankton, the researchers compared two models: one based on data from 1992, a year with a yawning ozone hole and the other with the same parameters except for the ozone levels, which were taken from 1978, a year of "normal" conditions before the hole appeared. Over the southern hemisphere ecosystem as a whole, they found that primary phytoplankton production decreased by only about 1 per cent in 1992, which is significantly lower than other estimates. Arrigo's work does not discount the results of a number of studies showing that increased UV-B can stunt phytoplankton growth by 10 per cent or more in localised areas or in the laboratory (New Scientist, 8 August 1998, p 24). The difference is that his study looked at the big picture of UV-B for the whole ocean. In previous studies, researchers scaled up measurements of plankton growth beneath the hole and elsewhere to calculate an overall effect for the whole Southern Ocean. But although they knew that factors such as cloud cover were important, they are difficult to include in such calculations. "On a cloudy day under a deep hole, there's still not nearly as much UV flux as on a clear day with no hole," says Arrigo.

No effect on marine life – adaptations

Parson 8 (Robert, Professor of Chemistry and Biochemistry, August 22, http://stason.org/TULARC/science-engineering/ozone-depletion-uv/13-What-effects-does-increased-UV-have-on-marine-life.html, JM)

What effects does increased UV have on marine life? Again, generally harmful but hard to quantify. Seawater is surprisingly transparent to UV-B. In clear waters radiation at 315 nm is attenuated by only 14% per meter depth. [Jerlov]. Many marine creatures live in surface waters, and they have evolved a variety of methods to cope with UV: some simply swim to lower depths, some develop protective coatings, while some work at night to repair the damage done during the day. Often these natural mechanisms are triggered by visible light intensities, in which case they might not protect against an increase in the ratio of UV to visible light. Also, if a photosynthesizing organism protects itself by staying at lower depths, it will get less visible light and produce less oxygen. An increase in UV-B can thus affect an ecosystem without necessarily killing off individual organisms. Many experiments have been carried out to determine the response of various marine creatures to UV radiation; as with land plants the effects vary a great deal from one species to another, and it is not possible to draw general conclusions at this stage. [Holm-Hansen et al.] We can assume that organisms that live in tropical waters are safe, since there is little or no ozone depletion there, and that organisms that are capable of living in the tropics are probably safe from ozone depletion at high latitudes since background UV intensities at high latitudes are always low. (One must be careful with the second inference if the organism's natural defenses are stimulated by visible light.) The problems arise with organisms that have adapted to the naturally low UV levels of polar regions.

The ozone hole has no provable effect on marine life

Parson 8 (Robert, Professor of Chemistry and Biochemistry, August 22, http://stason.org/TULARC/science-engineering/ozone-depletion-uv/13-What-effects-does-increased-UV-have-on-marine-life.html, JM)

The cumulative effects on the marine community are not known. The ozone hole first became large enough to expose marine life to large UV increases in 1987, and [Smith et al.] carried out their survey in 1990. Ecological consequences - the displacement of UV-sensitive species by UV-tolerant ones - are likely to be more important than a decline in overall productivity, although they are poorly understood at present. [McMinn et al.] have examined the relative abundance of four common phytoplankton species in sediment cores from the fjords of the Vestfold hills on the Antarctic coast. They conclude that compositional changes over the past 20 years (which should include effects due to the ozone hole) cannot be distinguished from long-term natural fluctuations. Apparently thick coastal ice protects the phytoplankton in these regions from the effects of increased UVB; moreover, these phytoplankton bloom after the seasonal hole has closed. McMinn et al. emphasize that these conditions do not apply to ice-edge and sea-ice communities.

Ozone Hole – No Impact – Oceans

Crucial food chains and the vast majority of oceans are unaffected

ABC 0 (Feb. 17, “Oceans resistant to ozone hole?”, http://www.abc.net.au/science/articles/2000/02/17/101184.htm, JM)

The food basket of the Southern Oceans - its plankton population - may not have been dealt such a severe blow by soaring ultraviolet (UV-B) light levels as previously thought. In recent years the ocean has been bombarded with high levels of UV light getting in through the hole in the ozone layer, which normally shields our planet from damaging UV rays. Now Californian researchers reporting in New Scientist magazine have modelled what would have happened to phytoplankton levels before and after the hole appeared. The "before" picture was based on data from 1978, when there was no hole to speak of, and "after" taken from 1992 when the ozone hole was near as large as it has been. Phytoplankton is crucial to sustaining all ocean life. It is the first link in the food chain, turning energy from the sun into a primary food source through photosynthesis. The Californian team, led by Kevin Arrigo of Stanford University, modeled phytoplankton growth using a computer. He took into account the position of the ozone hole, cloud cover, and UV-B strength. When phytoplankton growth was compared between 1978 and 1992, the researchers found that over the southern hemisphere ecosystem as a whole, primary phytoplankton production decreased by only about one per cent, which is significantly lower than other estimates. Previous studies had shown that higher UV-B levels can stunt phytoplankton growth by 10 per cent or more in localised areas or in the laboratory (New Scientist, 8 August 1998). The difference is that his study looked at the big picture of UV-B for the whole ocean. Arrigo suggests that cloud cover may be an important factor. "On a cloudy day under a deep hole, there's still not nearly as much UV flux as on a clear day with no hole." It may also be that around 80 per cent of the southern hemisphere's ozone hole is over ice most of the time, so only a small part of the ocean is exposed to the impact of ozone depletion.

Ozone Hole – No Impact – Skin Cancer

Ozone depletion won’t increase UV radiation

Singer 10 (S. Fred, Ph.D., president science and environment policy projects, November 30, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/article/28896/The\_OzoneCFC\_Debacle\_Hasty\_Action\_Shaky\_Science.html, JM)

The major public concern about a possible depletion of ozone comes from the fear that solar UV-B (280-320 nm) radiation reaching the surface will increase, typically by 10%. Yet UV-B intensity increases naturally by about 5000% between pole and equator; there is less ozone traversed when the sun is closer to the zenith (32). Hence a 10% increase at mid-latitudes translates into moving 60 miles (100 km) to the south, hardly a source for health concerns.  There has been, of course, a determined search for a secular increase in UV-B to match the presumed depletion of ozone. But no such trends had been observed (33) until publication in November 1993 of a startling increasing trend, between 1989 and 1993, over Toronto, Canada (34). Close examination, however, revealed that this "smoking gun" was mostly smoke. The authors confused a short-lived increase at the end of their record with a long-term trend (35).

Ozone depletion doesn’t cause skin cancer

Singer 10 (S. Fred, Ph.D., president science and environment policy projects, November 30, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/article/28896/The\_OzoneCFC\_Debacle\_Hasty\_Action\_Shaky\_Science.html, JM)

The driving force behind the policy to phase out CFCs has always been the fear of skin cancer, particularly malignant melanoma. The EPA has predicted 3 million additional skin cancer deaths by the year 2075 as a result of ozone depletion (36,37). But unlike basal and squamous cell skin cancers, which are easily cured growths caused by long-term exposure to UV-B, melanoma does not show the same characteristic increase towards lower latitudes (38) (Surprisingly, European data on melanoma incidence show a reverse latitude effect). It is clear therefore that the rising incidence of melanoma over the past 50 years cannot be due to any changes in the ozone layer. Non-melanoma (basal cell and squamous cell) skin cancers are clearly linked to chronic exposures to UV-B, as judged from the increasing incidence towards lower latitudes; melanoma exhibits a different epidemiology and often occurs on areas of the body not chronically exposed to the sun. Yet the clear link to solar exposure suggests that changes in lifestyle leading to greater exposure to the sun may be the main cause of melanoma. A breakthrough in our understanding of the mechanism of melanoma induction came with the experiments of Dr. Richard Setlow and colleagues at the Brookhaven National Laboratory. To measure the action spectrum of UV radiation for melanoma induction, they exposed hybrids of the fish genus Xiphophorus to specific wavelengths in the UV-A and UV-B range. The animals had been back-cross bred to have only one tumor-suppressor gene; inactivation of this gene in a melanoblast or melanocyte then permits the melanoma to develop (39).. The experimenters found that the action spectrum (sensitivity per quantum) was reasonably flat across the UV-B and UV-A regions. Because of the much greater number of UV-A photons, they conclude that 90%-95% of melanomas are caused by UV-A (40). But UV-A is not absorbed by ozone at all, and therefore melanoma rates would not be affected by changes in stratospheric ozone. This important finding undercuts one of the main reasons for the Montreal Protocol and all subsequent regulations (41).

Ozone Hole – No Impact – Skin Cancer

UV radiation is harmless and unrelated to ozone

Maduro 2 (Rogielo, Co-author, *The Holes in the Ozone Scare*, January, http://www.mitosyfraudes.org/Ingles/Crista.html, JM)

How has such a technical matter as stratospheric chemistry come to dominate headlines around the world and mobilize politicians to impose a ban that will cost their nations over $5 trillion over the next few years? The answer is fear of increased numbers of deaths from skin cancer as more ultravioiet radiation hits the Earth, supposedly the result of ozone depletion. If it were not for the mass hysteria that has been created over the alleged dangers of an increase in skin cancer rates, there would be no ban on CFCs today, and newspapers would not even bother to cover the issue. For example, during the same four- to six-week period that the so-called ozone hole appears over Antarctica, a nitrogen oxide (NOx) hole also develops over the same area. Both the so-called ozone hole and nitrogen oxide hole are created in Antarctica by the same natural phenomena, but mentioning this and other unusual phenomena over Antarctica would raise too many questions in people's minds about the extraordinary chemistry that takes place at the end of the polar winter in Antarctica, and would lead people to question the ozone scare. So, the NOx hole is never mentioned. Let's look at the UV/cancer theory. First, the scare stories about UV and ozone depletion are based on increases in UV that are minuscule, compared with the natural variations in UV-B that are determined by one's altitude and distance from the Equator. Second, there is no evidence that levels of UV-B have increased at the surface of the Earth, despite the claims of worldwide ozone depletion. And third, biological research now indicates that it is not UV-B that causes the malignant types of skin cancer, but UV-A, which is not screened out by the ozone layer. The ozone depletion theory predicts that there will be a 10 to 20 percent increase in the level of UV-B radiation at the surface as a result of ozone depletion. This might seem like a large increase, unless one knows something about the geometry of the Sun and the Earth. UV-B varies by 5,000 percent from the Equator to the Poles. It also varies with altitude. This is the result of simple geometry: There is more sunlight exposure at the Equator and the atmosphere is thinner in the mountains, so more UV-B gets through. In midlatitudes such as that of the United States, a 1 percent increase in UV-B is the equivalent of moving 6 miles south (closer to the Equator). Thus, the alleged increase in UV radiation, according to the theory, would be the equivalent of what a person would receive if he were to move 60 to 120 miles south – the equivalent of moving from New York City to Philadelphia. Actual instrumental measurements of ultraviolet radiation at the surface show that there has been no increase in UV levels, despite widespread claims of ozone depletion in northern latitudes. Just as with the ozone layer, the levels of UV radiation go through tremendous seasonal fluctuations. The amount of incoming UV radiation is modulated by several factors, including the angle of the Sun at that particular time of the year (lowest in winter), incoming solar radiation, sun spots, thickness of the ozone layer, meteorological conditions (cloud cover, and so on) and pollution. Accurately determining the amount of UV radiation requires long-term readings over an extensive network. Curiously enough, while tens of billions of dollars have been spent on "ozone research" almost no money has been spent on UV readings at the surface. The most extensive study to date of UV-B radiation at the surface is that conducted by Joseph Scotto and his collaborators at the National Cancer Institute. The study, published in the Feb. 12, 1988, issue of Science,[(6)](http://www.mitosyfraudes.org/Ingles/Crista.html#11link) presented evidence that the amount of UV-B reaching ground level stations across the United States had not increased, but in fact, had decreased between 1974 and 1985. Instead of rejoicing at the results, the promoters of the ozone depletion scare saw to it that the network of observing stations was shut down, by cutting its funding (less than $500,000 out of more than $1.75 billion in research funds to study "climate change"). One of the recent attempts to contradict the Scotto study was an article by J.B. Kerr and C.T. McElroy, published in Science magazine in 1993, claiming an upward trend in UV radiation over Toronto. [(7)](http://www.mitosyfraudes.org/Ingles/Crista.html#12link) The results were front-page news internationally, but when it was soon demonstrated by other scientists that the so-called trend was based on faulty statistical manipulation [(8)](http://www.mitosyfraudes.org/Ingles/Crista.html#13link) this reverse got little publicity. The entire "rise" in UV was based on readings taken during the last 3 days of five years of measurements! A correct statistical analysis showed that the trend in UV was zero (that is to say, the amount of UV had neither increased nor decreased over the five-year period). Interestingly enough, the Canadian study had been rejected for publication by Nature. At the time the Canadian paper was submitted to Science, F. Sherwood Rowland was the president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, publisher of Science. According to knowledgeable sources, Rowland rammed through the publication of the paper despite its obvious errors.

\*\*Water Pollution\*\*

Water Pollution High

No clean water in rural areas

Logomasini 0 (Angela, PhD, May 1, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/article/9795/Safe\_drinking\_water\_law\_25\_years\_old\_Cause\_to\_celebrate.html, JM)

Rather than pay the price for regulated water, nearly a million rural Americans access water from untreated sources, such as lakes and streams or Mother Nature’s periodic rains. Another 15 million Americans access water from private wells. Non-piped water (particularly well water) is often, but not always, safe. A recent EPA survey found chloroform bacteria in 78 percent of the drinking water samples taken from U.S. households that rely on surface water. Forty-one percent of 5,500 drinking water wells contained coliform bacteria, and 27 percent contained E. coli. Piped drinking water could greatly improve water quality for many of these homes, but prohibitively high costs associated with SDWA regulations make that goal unattainable for many. Many communities have, in fact, disconnected from systems or have broken them into smaller units to avoid expensive federal regulation. In addition to making piped water prohibitively expensive for some, 1996 revisions to the SDWA are actually designed to deny piped water to rural communities. One provision of the law directs EPA to draft guidances to help states establish appropriate legal mechanisms to “ensure capacity.” “Capacity” here is the EPA equivalent of “ability to comply” with the 86 SDWA regulations. In recent testimony before a congressional committee, one drinking water official touted the success of the new policy, noting EPA had approved five state programs aimed at preventing the formation of new “non-viable” water systems; 36 additional state programs are “on track.” The upshot for rural America: If you can’t afford caviar, starve.

Water Pollution High – Soil Erosion

Soil erosion is increasing

Valentin 7 (Christian, Soil Scientist, “Soil Erosion Network,” October 4, http://soilerosion.net/sen/, JM)

Soil erosion is a very widespread phenomenon, and is usually irreversible. Once the nutrient-rich surface soil has been lost, the ability to sustain plant growth is severely reduced, and increased runoff from the more impermeable subsoil results in a decrease in plant-available water. Furthermore, erosion brings various associated "off-site" problems, including reduced water quality from increased sediment loads and poorer air quality due to dust. The severity, frequency and extent of erosion will be altered by changes in rainfall amount and intensity, and by changes in wind. Global change will thus amplify many current problems of soil erosion, and as certain soil thresholds are exceeded, potentially new and different problems could arise. It is therefore crucial to understand the potential impacts of global change on soils to allow the developments in predictive capability necessary to improve their management in the future. The GCTE Soil Erosion Network is dedicated to this goal, and forms a key component of GCTE's soil research.

Soil erosion pollutes water

Alabama Policy Institute Staff 5 (May 30, <http://www.heartland.org/custom/semod_policybot/pdf/17268.pdf>, JM)

Soil erosion reduces agricultural productivity, and the sediment from erosion degrades water quality. The EPA regards soil erosion as an important environmental problem, though experts disagree on the severity of the issue. Because the rate and severity of erosion depends on local conditions and soil types, it is hard to make national generalizations. The title of a 1987 report from the USDA is instructive: "Soil Erosion: Dramatic in Places, But Not a Serious Threat to Productivity." 59 Government policy aims to reduce soil erosion to "tolerable levels" (known as T-values) by 2010, and to zero by 2025. Tvalues from cropland are designed to be the maximum amount of erosion that will indefinitely support agricultural productivity. Tvalues range from one to five tons per acre per year, depending on soil type and location. NRI figures show soil erosion is occurring at the low end of the T-values on two-thirds of the cropland acreage in the United States. Only about one percent of cropland is experiencing a high rate of soil erosion.

Water Pollution High

Water pollution at record levels

Dotinga & Reinberg 6-29 (Randy & Steven, Staff, Healthday, http://health.usnews.com/health-news/managing-your-healthcare/environment/articles/2011/06/29/pollution-took-heavy-toll-at-us-beaches-in-2010, JM)

As the summer gets into full swin g, a new report Wednesday warns that water pollution can make a day at the beach no day at the beach. Last year was one of the worst in two decades for pollution-related beach closures and warnings, partly due to the Gulf of Mexico oil spill and rainy weather, according to the report from the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), an environmental activist group. Going to the beach is "a summer rite of passage, but, unfortunately, it can also make you sick," David Beckman, director of the council's Water Program told a morning press conference Wednesday. "America's beaches have long suffered from pollution, including bacteria-laden human and animal waste," he added. "The biggest known source of this contamination is polluted stormwater runoff."

Water pollution high – sewage overflow unchecked

EPA 7-8 (“EPA Releases New Report on Sewage Pollution in New York and New Jersey,” http://yosemite.epa.gov/opa/admpress.nsf/0/34fa6322de1ddeaf852578c70053c1f2?OpenDocument, JM)

Many of the sewer systems in New York State and New Jersey and some in Puerto Rico are combined systems that carry sewage from homes and businesses as well as rainwater collected from street drains. When they overflow during heavy rains, the rainwater mixes with sewage and results in raw sewage being directly discharged into water bodies. These discharges are called combined sewer overflows and can pose serious environmental and public health risks. “Clean water is vital to people’s health and our economy and is a priority for the EPA,” said EPA Regional Administrator Judith Enck. “We’ve seen improvements in water quality since the passage of the Clean Water Act forty years ago, but there is much more to be done to protect our rivers, harbors, lakes and streams. EPA’s new report provides important information on the laws that protect our waterways and the actions that can be taken to reduce water pollution.”

Water Pollution Low

Water quality high – South Africa proves

McKenzie 6-30 (Jean, Staff, Engineering News, http://www.engineeringnews.co.za/article/drinking-water-quality-improving-but-wastewater-treatment-still-a-concern-2011-06-30, JM)

South Africa’s drinking water quality improved over the last three years, but the quality of wastewater treatment services went down, Water and Environmental Affairs Minister Edna Molewa said on Thursday. “We can now see a positive trend in the way drinking water quality is being managed,” she said, announcing the results of the ‘Green Drop’ and ‘Blue Drop’ certification programme. The Blue Drop programme for drinking water quality management and the Green Drop programme for wastewater quality management were instituted in 2008 by the Department of Water Affairs (DWA) as an incentive-based form of regulation to encourage municipalities to achieve excellence in the areas of water and wastewater quality management. Molewa said that 914 water supply systems in 162 municipalities were assessed in 2011, compared with 787 systems in 153 municipalities in 2009, showing a marked improvement in submissions by municipalities. Of the systems assessed, 59% achieved Blue Drop scores of over 50% in 2011, compared with 47% of the systems having achieved this result in 2010. On a provincial level, the report showed that all provinces increased their Blue Drop scores in 2011, when compared with the results of the very first assessment in 2009.

Water Pollution Low

Water pollution down – point sources addressed

Alabama Policy Institute Staff 5 (May 30, <http://www.heartland.org/custom/semod_policybot/pdf/17268.pdf>, JM)

Initially, water pollution control targeted point sources with the intent of reducing these sources to zero. For the most part, wastewater treatment plants have eliminated serious point source pollution using primary, secondary, and tertiary treatments. Primary wastewater treatment removes solid waste mechanically, secondary treatment breaks down organic material, and tertiary treatment removes additional contaminants. By 1992, "all sewage generated in the United States [had been] treated before discharge." 37 By 1993, the amount of organic wastes in national waters had declined by 46 percent, discharge of toxic organic wastes from point sources had declined 99 percent, and toxic metals from point sources had declined by 98 percent. 38 With most point source pollution under control, the focus throughout the 1990s has been non-point sources, which the EPA claims "are clearly the leading reason for impediment in surface waters." 39

Water pollution low – Alabama proves

Alabama Policy Institute Staff 5 (May 30, <http://www.heartland.org/custom/semod_policybot/pdf/17268.pdf>, JM)

According to ADEM, Alabamians draw approximately 850 million gallons of drinking water from ground and surface sources each day. Before reaching household taps, it passes through 607 community treatment plants and 104 noncommunity plants. In 2004, 100 percent of these systems met turbidity requirements, 97 percent met trihalomethane standards. One hundred percent also met standards for haloacetic acid, inorganic and radiological drinking water standards. 45 All community and non-transient, non-community water system sources continued to be monitored for volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and synthetic organic chemicals (SOCs). More than 98 percent of the community systems and 100 percent of the non-transient, non-community systems required to monitor in 2003 were in full compliance with VOC and SOC monitoring requirements. 46

Water is getting cleaner

Environment & Climate 98 (News Staff, May 1, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/article/13856/The\_Index\_of\_Leading\_Environmental\_Indicators\_Key\_Findings.html, JM)

Perception: Pollution is causing water quality to deteriorate, threatening human health. Reality: Water quality, though difficult to measure, is improving. Industrial pollution is dropping. “Point source” or industrial pollution has decreased over the past decade. Organic wastes have fallen by 46 percent, toxic organics by 99 percent, and toxic metals by 98 percent. Rivers and streams are cleaner. Measures of phosphates, fecal coliform, and dissolved oxygen exceeding local standards in rivers and streams decreased between 1974 and 1994. The Great Lakes are getting cleaner. In the Great Lakes, pesticides and contaminants such as DDE, DDT, PCBs, and HCBs have fallen considerably since the 1970s.

Water Access High

Warming is making water abundant

Taylor 4-28 (James, Senior Fellow, Heartland Institute, <http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/article/29846/Climate_Change_Improving_World_Water_Supply.html>, JM)

The Obama Interior Department has issued a paper claiming global warming will harm water supplies in the western United States. The Obama administration claiming global warming is or will be a bad thing is no more newsworthy than Obama administration claiming higher taxes and more federal spending is a good thing. Nevertheless, the news media is running amok with the administration’s paper, citing it as more “proof” that global warming is a horrible crisis. The news media is conveniently failing to report a few simple facts in its breathless claims that global warming is threatening western U.S. water supplies. First, global precipitation has increased since the planet began mildly warming at the end of the Little Ice Age, approximately 150 years ago. Second, global soil moisture has improved as the planet has warmed. Third, deserts have been shrinking as the planet has warmed. Fourth, much of the western U.S., and particularly the southwestern U.S., has been a relatively dry region since long before the planet began to warm. A warming planet has certainly had an impact on precipitation, soil moisture, and water supplies. In contradiction to the self-serving claims of the Obama administration, however, those impacts have been, on the balance, positive. All the self-serving administration reports or rigged computer simulations in the world can’t change that simple fact.

Water Access Low

Water access low – prohibitive costs

Logomasini 0 (Angela, PhD, May 1, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/article/9795/Safe\_drinking\_water\_law\_25\_years\_old\_Cause\_to\_celebrate.html, JM)

The 1996 rewrite of the SDWA was supposed to provide financial support for communities struggling to comply with the regulations--but communities without piped water aren’t eligible for SDWA funds. The law provides compliance assistance only to existing public water supply systems. Moreover, the assistance funds are nowhere near sufficient to cover the costs of compliance, let alone numerous other costs facing water providers. A 1997 EPA survey found that public water systems need more than $12 billion in the immediate future and $138 billion by year 2015 for upgrades and repairs to meet safe drinking water regulations. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, rural America will need to spend $3.5 billion. Federal grants will never be sufficient to enable communities to bear such burdens. Paying the price for compliance often means sacrificing other important needs. In one study, consumer advocate Scott Rubin found that basic expenses (food, shelter, utilities, and health care) exceeded the annual income of many rural dwellers. Raising the cost of drinking water in those communities meant sacrificing other basic necessities, such as vaccinations, noted Rubin. Ariton, Alabama, was forced to shut down one of its wells to free up funds to help cover the cost of SDWA monitoring requirements, jeopardizing the town's water supply for fire emergencies. To keep up with the continuing cost of compliance, the community was considering cuts in spending on fire department equipment, ambulance service equipment, and its planned sewage system. In Maine, one community with just 26 piped water customers spent $350,000–nearly $13,500 per customer--to meet just one SDWA rule, according to the state’s Rural Water Association. Another Maine community with 700 water customers spent $7.3 million to meet various mandates.

Water Pollution – No Impact

Water pollutants aren’t deadly

Logomasini 0 (Angela, PhD, May 1, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/article/9795/Safe\_drinking\_water\_law\_25\_years\_old\_Cause\_to\_celebrate.html, JM)

As if the high cost of compliance weren’t bad enough, public water officials have long complained that many of the expensive SDWA mandates provide few, if any, health benefits. For example, the law requires local water officials to monitor for contaminants highly unlikely to exist in a public water system. Such monitoring can cost as much as $6,000 per sample, and the law mandates monitoring several times a year for numerous chemicals. Environmentalists claim that even at very low levels these chemicals can cause cancer. But regulations aimed at eliminating mere traces of chemicals are not likely to save lives. In 1981, scientists Sir Richard Doll and Richard Peto noted that, “with the possible exception of asbestos in a few water supplies, we know of no established human carcinogen that is ever present in sufficient quantities in large U.S. water supplies to account for any material percentage of the total risk of cancer.” Ironically, many consider the SDWA to be one of the better environmental laws on the books. Many Republican members of Congress frequently praise the 1996 revisions to the law. The millions of Americans who may never see piped water thanks to that “reform” may beg to differ.

No impact – fixable, no health effects

Cheplick 9 (Thomas, Staff, Heartland Institute, April 1, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/article/24918/CDC\_Cant\_Link\_Human\_Health\_to\_Great\_Lakes\_Water\_Pollution.html, JM)

In 2001, a joint commission of the U.S. and Canadian governments asked the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) for assistance in evaluating the public health implications of environmental contamination in 33 Great Lakes Areas of Concern. The Areas of Concern are defined as “ecologically degraded geographic regions that require remediation.” The report, “ATSDR Studies on Chemical Releases in the Great Lakes Region,” affirms the existence of pollution in the Great Lakes but observes many of the areas in question have been remediated, while others are in the process of remediation. In addition, the best available data show no link to human health harms, the report concludes. “Current data do not allow us to draw firm conclusions about relationships between critical pollutants in the Great Lakes region and potential health effect,” states the report. “Data that are routinely collected (such as information on cancer and birth defects) are not well matched to exposure data in time or by location and therefore cannot help to assess whether the identified environmental exposures have adverse health effects,” the report explains.

No impact – cautionary studies incomplete

Cheplick 9 (Thomas, Staff, Heartland Institute, April 1, http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/article/24918/CDC\_Cant\_Link\_Human\_Health\_to\_Great\_Lakes\_Water\_Pollution.html, JM)

Earlier drafts of the report were leaked to the press in 2007, before the study was finished. Environmental activists seized on the incomplete information to assert a link between Great Lakes pollutants and human health problems. Lead author Howard Frumkin, who is director of the National Center for Environmental Health at ATSDR, emphasized the care taken to ensure the most accurate possible results in the final report, officially released in December 2008. “First, good science matters,” wrote Frumkin in the Director’s Preface of the report. “Earlier drafts did not clearly assemble and analyze the available data; as a consequence, the data as presented could have led to incorrect conclusions. “[The final report] aims to be accurate, informative, and useful to health professionals, decision-makers, and the public,” Frumkin added. Professor Thomas Derr of Smith College, the author of an environmental ethics book, believes the entire episode of a leaked draft health report containing incomplete data and unsupported conclusions should serve as a warning to the public regarding leaked information. “The story still sounds rather cautionary, emphasizing inconclusive evidence,” Derr said. “But there’s an important point in it. Health scares ungrounded in solid evidence come along pretty regularly, getting their traction from the few that are real—for example, the recent peanut butter salmonella scare.” The mere presence of some pollutants does not equate to human health harms, Derr added. “There’s an old saying among scientists in relevant fields: ‘The dose makes the poison.’ Salt in mega-doses can kill you, but is essential in smaller doses,” Derr explained. “In fact, there’s research [showing] small amounts of substances that would be toxic in bigger doses may have a reaction something like vaccines in smaller doses, and stimulate the body’s resistance. “In the long run I think the natural evidence will cause a slow and maybe embarrassing retreat from these scares,” Derr predicted.

\*\*AIDS\*\*

AIDS – No Impact – Extinction

AIDS impacts limited- no extinction

Bostrom 2 (Nick, prof of philosophy @ Oxford, http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html, KF)

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.

No AIDS extinction- no global infection

Yu 9 (Victoria, Dartmouth science dept, 5/22, http://dujs.dartmouth.edu/spring-2009/human-extinction-the-uncertainty-of-our-fate, KF)

Some surveyed students mentioned AIDS as a potential pandemic-causing virus. It is true that scientists have been unable thus far to find a sustainable cure for AIDS, mainly due to HIV’s rapid and constant evolution. Specifically, two factors account for the virus’s abnormally high mutation rate: 1. HIV’s use of reverse transcriptase, which does not have a proof-reading mechanism, and 2. the lack of an error-correction mechanism in HIV DNA polymerase (8). Luckily, though, there are certain characteristics of HIV that make it a poor candidate for a large-scale global infection: HIV can lie dormant in the human body for years without manifesting itself, and AIDS itself does not kill directly, but rather through the weakening of the immune system.

AIDS – No Impact – Virulence

HIV is becoming less virulent

AIDSmeds.com 9 (5/14, http://www.aidsmeds.com/articles/hiv\_virulence\_mutation\_1667\_16622.shtml, KF)

HIV is not becoming more virulent over time, according to a French study published online May 6 in AIDS and reported by aidsmap. These results contrast with those of a U.S. study first reported at a conference in October 2008 and published earlier this month in The Journal of Infectious Diseases. Given HIV’s ability to rapidly mutate, and the fact that viruses can evolve to become more or less virulent over time, it has always been a concern that HIV could become more dangerous as time passes. A recent study reported by Nancy Crum-Cianflone, MD, of the University of California in San Diego (UCSD) and her colleagues suggested this was occurring, at least in the United States. According to her group’s reports, the average CD4 cell counts among people newly infected with HIV have consistently dropped over the years, indicating HIV is becoming more virulent and leading to more rapid disease progression. To explore this further, Pénélope Troude, MD, from the Institut National de la Santé et de la Recherche Médicale (INSERM) in Le Kremlin-Bicêtre, France, and her colleagues examined the medical records of 903 HIV-positive patients in the PRIMO Cohort study. The patients were all enrolled within six months of becoming infected between 1997 and 2006. Most of them were male and Caucasian, averaging 35 years of age. Because factors such as sex, age, race and HIV subtype can all influence CD4 count and viral load after infection, Troude and her colleagues controlled for these factors in their analysis. Troude’s team found that the average CD4 count, viral load and HIV DNA levels after infection remained stable during the nine years of analysis, provided that they controlled for changes in factors known to affect these levels. For instance, women tend to have higher CD4 counts and lower viral loads than men after infection. Because the proportion of men increased over time in the study, it would have seemed that both of these measures were becoming worse as the years passed if sex had not been taken into account.

New strains weaker

Daily News Central 5 (Health News provides news geared toward health consumers, Health News, “HIV Virus May Be Evolving to Less Deadly Form”, September, http://health.dailynewscentral.com/content/view/1716/0, KF)

New evidence suggests that the AIDS virus, HIV, may be weakening. Scientists in Belgium compared samples of HIV-1, the most dangerous strain of the virus, from the 1980s and 2002. Laboratory tests showed that the older viruses were significantly "fitter." They multiplied more easily and were better able to resist anti-retroviral drugs. The findings appear to contradict recent trends which indicate a growth in HIV drug resistance. But they support theories which suggest that viruses sometimes evolve to become less virulent in order to safeguard their survival.

AIDS losing virulence

Daily News Central 5 (Health News provides news geared toward health consumers, Health News, “HIV Virus May Be Evolving to Less Deadly Form”, September, http://health.dailynewscentral.com/content/view/1716/0, KF)

The researchers wrote in the journal AIDS: "These findings suggest that HIV-1 replicative fitness may have decreased in the human population since the start of the pandemic." Symbiotic Existence Previous models simulating the spread of infective agents have suggested that many lethal viruses and bacteria may evolve away their virulence, even to the point of "symbiotic existence" where they actually benefit the host. If a virus is too deadly, it risks working against itself by killing off many of its potential hosts. Becoming less prolific may also help to shield a virus from the host's immune system.

AIDS – No Impact – Exaggerated

Threat exaggerated- profit motive

PlusNews 10 (AIDS news network, 8/18, http://www.plusnews.org/Report.aspx?ReportID=90210, KF)

The threat of HIV and AIDS was being "exaggerated" by profit-hungry pharmaceutical companies and condom makers, and male circumcision was no more effective at preventing HIV infection than a post-coital bath, said Prince Mangaliso, who chairs the Liqoqo, a powerful body of royal councillors that advises King Mswati.

AIDS numbers overstated- political reasons

Malan 3 (Rian, 12/13, http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1042504/posts, KF)

We all know, thanks to Mark Twain, that statistics are often the lowest form of lie, but when it comes to HIV/Aids, we suspend all scepticism. Why? Aids is the most political disease ever. We have been fighting about it since the day it was identified. The key battleground is public perception, and the most deadly weapon is the estimate. When the virus first emerged, I was living in America, where HIV incidence was estimated to be doubling every year or so. Every time I turned on the TV, Madonna popped up to warn me that ‘Aids is an equal-opportunity killer’, poised to break out of the drug and gay subcultures and slaughter heterosexuals. In 1985, a science journal estimated that 1.7 million Americans were already infected, with ‘three to five million’ soon likely to follow suit. Oprah Winfrey told the nation that by 1990 ‘one in five heterosexuals will be dead of Aids’. We now know that these estimates were vastly and indeed deliberately exaggerated, but they achieved the desired end: Aids was catapulted to the top of the West’s spending agenda, and the estimators turned their attention elsewhere. India’s epidemic was likened to ‘a volcano waiting to explode’. Africa faced ‘a tidal wave of death’. By 1992 they were estimating that ‘Aids could clear the whole planet’. Who were they, these estimators? For the most part, they worked in Geneva for WHO or UNAIDS, using a computer simulator called Epimodel. Every year, all over Africa, blood would be taken from a small sample of pregnant women and screened for signs of HIV infection. The results would be programmed into Epimodel, which transmuted them into estimates. If so many women were infected, it followed that a similar proportion of their husbands and lovers must be infected, too. These numbers would be extrapolated out into the general population, enabling the computer modellers to arrive at seemingly precise tallies of the doomed, the dying and the orphans left behind.

African death tolls exaggerated

Malan 3 (Rian, 12/13, http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1042504/posts, KF)

It was an article from The Spectator describing the bizarre sex practices that contribute to HIV’s rampage across the continent. ‘One in five of us here in Zambia is HIV positive,’ said the report. ‘In 1993 our neighbour Botswana had an estimated population of 1.4 million. Today that figure is under a million and heading downwards. Doom merchants predict that Botswana may soon become the first nation in modern times literally to die out. This is Aids in Africa.’ Really? Botswana has just concluded a census that shows population growing at about 2.7 per cent a year, in spite of what is usually described as the worst Aids problem on the planet. Total population has risen to 1.7 million in just a decade. If anything, Botswana is experiencing a minor population explosion. There is similar bad news for the doomsayers in Tanzania’s new census, which shows population growing at 2.9 per cent a year. Professional pessimists will be particularly discomforted by developments in the swamplands west of Lake Victoria, where HIV first emerged, and where the depopulated villages of popular mythology are supposedly located. Here, in the district of Kagera, population grew at 2.7 per cent a year before 1988, only to accelerate to 3.1 per cent even as the Aids epidemic was supposedly peaking. Uganda’s latest census tells a broadly similar story, as does South Africa’s.

AIDS – No Impact – Exaggerated

Epidemic slowing- UN stats

Limbaugh 7 (Rush, radio host and activist, 11/20, http://www.rushlimbaugh.com/home/daily/site\_112007/content/01125116.guest.html, KF)

RUSH: I touched on this next story briefly early on. I'm going to spend just a little more time on it. From the Washington Post Foreign Service today, a new report to show UN overestimated AIDS epidemic. Now, why would they do that? Why would the UN overestimate the AIDS epidemic? Can anybody say money? Same reason Ted Danson overestimated the death of the oceans. Can anybody ask the same question about global warming? Why would the UN be overestimating the destruction from global warming? "The United Nations' top AIDS scientists plan to acknowledge this week that they have long overestimated both the size and the course of the epidemic, which they now believe has been slowing for nearly a decade, according to U.N. documents prepared for the announcement. AIDS remains a devastating public health crisis in the most heavily affected areas of sub-Saharan Africa. But the far-reaching revisions amount to at least a partial acknowledgment of criticisms long leveled by outside researchers who disputed the U.N. portrayal of an ever-expanding global epidemic."

No epidemic- UN exaggerated numbers

Timberg 7 (Craig, Washington Post foreign service, 11/20, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/11/19/AR2007111900978\_pf.html, KF)

JOHANNESBURG, Nov. 19 -- The United Nations' top AIDS scientists plan to acknowledge this week that they have long overestimated both the size and the course of the epidemic, which they now believe has been slowing for nearly a decade, according to U.N. documents prepared for the announcement. AIDS remains a devastating public health crisis in the most heavily affected areas of sub-Saharan Africa. But the far-reaching revisions amount to at least a partial acknowledgment of criticisms long leveled by outside researchers who disputed the U.N. portrayal of an ever-expanding global epidemic. The latest estimates, due to be released publicly Tuesday, put the number of annual new HIV infections at 2.5 million, a cut of more than 40 percent from last year's estimate, documents show. The worldwide total of people infected with HIV -- estimated a year ago at nearly 40 million and rising -- now will be reported as 33 million. Having millions fewer people with a lethal contagious disease is good news. Some researchers, however, contend that persistent overestimates in the widely quoted U.N. reports have long skewed funding decisions and obscured potential lessons about how to slow the spread of HIV. Critics have also said that U.N. officials overstated the extent of the epidemic to help gather political and financial support for combating AIDS.

AIDS just a scare- multiple interest groups

Coleman 7 (Vernon, doctor & author, http://www.vernoncoleman.com/aboutaids.htm, KF)

And that was the truth. Gay pressure groups (working to make sure that AIDS did not become established as a `gay' disease') were responsible for the initial development of the `plague' myth. And that AIDS was then turned into a major scare through the efforts of insurance companies (eager to find an excuse to put up premiums), drug companies (keen to sell new products), doctors (keen to help drug companies), researchers (eager to get their hands on the vast amounts of money being raised by volunteers), religious groups (desperate to exploit an opportunity to suppress sexual activity outside marriage) and politicians (eager, as always, to leap on an opportunity to frighten the voters - since when voters are frightened it is much easier to introduce new, repressive legislation).

AIDS – No Airborne

Airborne AIDS impossible -- genetics

Coston 9 (Michael, editor of Avian Flu Diary & former paramedic, 5/26, http://afludiary.blogspot.com/2009/05/spreading-faster-than-influenza-virus.html, KF)

The chance that two viruses will recombine (or reassort) to produce a new (chimeric) virus diminishes rapidly as sequence similarity declines. All of which makes it almost impossible for the H1N1 virus and HIV to `combine into a super airborne AIDS virus’. These viruses are genetically very different, with the HIV virus being a Lentivirus from the family Retroviridae and influenza coming from the family Orthomyxoviridae. Their mating and producing an offspring is about as likely as the successful mating of an elephant and a giraffe. If the HIV and influenza viruses were capable of reassortment with one-another, they’ve had millions of opportunities to do so over the past 30 years with seasonal flu (H1N1 & H3N2), and they haven’t.

Not airborne

HIV/AIDS care 5 (http://www.hivaidscare.com/hivfaq.php?acode=na, KF)

No. This is because HIV is not an airborne, water-borne or food-borne virus. HIV can be passed from one person to another only when people exchange blood or sexual fluids (like semen or vaginal secretions). HIV cannot survive for very long outside of the human body. So you can't get HIV by having ordinary social contact with an infected person.

Not airborne – science proves

Good Health 11 (7/9, http://www.ourgoodhealth.org/hiv-aids/not-transmission.php, KF)

There are numerous myths about the transmission of AIDS. Many of these myths persisted for years after scientists proved AIDS could not be transferred in these ways. The first myth buster is you cannot get the virus by breathing the same air as an AIDS patient. It is not an airborne virus. You can only get the infection by coming into direct contact with body fluids of a patient who has the HIV virus. You also cannot get AIDS from food or water. Again, it is only transferred by sexual contact or contact with body fluids of an individual who has HIV or AIDS.

Not even spread by sneezing

AIDS resource 9 (8/22, http://www.aidsresource.com/faqs.html#HIV\_not, KF)

How is HIV NOT transmitted? \* Through casual contact, such as sharing glasses, holding hands or shaking hands \* Through normal work place environments \* Through eating in restaurants, insect bites, coughs or sneezes, perspiration, telephones or toilets \* It is not an airborne virus How contagious is AIDS? Unlike most transmissible diseases (colds, flus, measles, etc.), AIDS is not transmitted through sneezing, coughing, eating or drinking from common utensils, or merely being around an infected person. Casual contact with HIV infected persons does not place others at risk. AIDS is not transmitted through air, food, or water, or by touching any object handled, touched, or breathed on by a person with an HIV/AIDS infection.

Airborne bird flu more dangerous

MartinFrost 8 (dedicated to exposing corruption, 9/7, http://www.martinfrost.ws/htmlfiles/bird\_flu10.html, KF)

The lethal strain of bird flu poses a greater challenge to the world than any infectious disease, including AIDS, and has cost 300 million farmers over $10 billion in its spread through poultry around the world, the World Health Organisation said yesterday. Scientists also are increasingly worried that the H5N1 strain could mutate into a form easily passed between humans, triggering a global pandemic. It already is unprecedented as an animal illness in its rapid expansion.

AIDS – No Airborne

Not airborne – only body fluids spread

Cochran & Mays 89 (Susan D. & Vickie M., Cal State, http://www.stat.ucla.edu/~cochran/PDF/WomenAIDSConcerns.pdf, KF)

For psychologists, too, AIDS presents a unique and complex challenge- Although AIDS it a physical disease, in most instances its transmission and spread is dependent on the volitional behaviors of people (Ward, Hardy. & Dtotman, 1987). AIDS is not inadvertently "caught" by contact with airborne germ or contaminated food products. Instead, the majority of individuals who contract Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) infection do so through participating in behaviors that involve intimate contact with HIV-infected bodily fluids, such as Mood, semen, and possibly vaginal secretions (Friedland & Kkin, 1987). This infectious contact can be prevented. Even though biomedical science has made dramatic strides in our understanding of HIV and its endstage manifestation. AIDS, behavioral science contributions to prevention efforts have come more slowly (Clarke & Sen-cer, 1987; Des Jarlais, Trass, & Friedman, 1987). With scientists predicting an uncertain time\*pan before an effective AIDS vaccine is developed (National Academy of Sciences, 1988), the importance of prevention efforts through behavior change is dear (Osborn, 1986). Psy-chologists have a special role to play in developing these interventions.

AIDS bad, but not airborne

Deonandan 5 (Raywat, PhD, Epidemiologist, 5/1, http://podium.deonandan.com/avianflu.html, KF)

Without question, HIV/AIDS is the plague pandemic of our time. Not only did it newly infect almost 5 million people last year (13% children) and kill 3.1 million (16% children), but it hobbles national economies and decimates whole cultures, resulting in a lasting impact on countless more people than just those who are infected. It does so by being relatively easily transmitted and seriously lethal, and by affecting mostly people in the prime of life. For all its horror, though, HIV is thankfully not airborne like the flu virus; if an AIDS patient sneezes in your presence, you won't need to be quarantined.

AIDS can’t survive outside the body

Broadway House for Continuing Care 9 (6/4, http://www.broadwayhouse.org/about/faq.htm, KF)

Can you get AIDS from casual contact (shaking hands, hugging, etc)? No. HIV is not transmitted by day-to-day social contact; it is not transmitted by shaking hands, using public toilets, or being around AIDS patients who sneeze or cough. HIV is not airborne, water-borne nor food-borne. In fact, HIV can not survive long outside the body.

AIDS not airborne and preventable

Stiebert 3 (Johanna, dept of religious studies @ University of Tennessee, http://www.oikoumene.org/uploads/tx\_wecdiscussion/HIV-AIDS\_3\_-\_Does\_the\_Hebrew\_Bible\_Have\_Anything\_to\_Tell\_Us\_about\_HIV.pdf, KF)

According to the Torah, the ill and the vulnerable are to be treated with kindness and compassion (Lev. 19:14). Furthermore, the Hebrew Bible is clear about the fact that the spread of disease must be contained. Those afflicted with potentially contagious skin diseases must, therefore, be segregated from the remainder of the community and must warn everyone approaching of their status. HIV/AIDS is different to the condition referred to in the Hebrew Bible as “leprosy”26 in that it can be transmitted only through the exchange of bodily fluids: breast-milk, blood, semen and vaginal secretions. HIV/AIDS is not airborne and cannot be caught by simply being in the proximity of someone who is HIV-positive. This means that the isolation of persons who have HIV is not necessary. In the case of HIV/AIDS, prevention of transmission is ensured in a number of ways: by not sharing needles, avoiding contact with infected blood, by not breast-feeding, by abstaining from sexual intercourse, or consistently practising safe sex – depending on the particular circumstances. In accordance with the Levitical law (interpreted here analogously), it is the responsibility of all who know (or suspect)27 themselves to be HIV-positive to prevent spreading the virus. There is no shame in being HIV-positive; there is in deliberately exposing another person to contracting HIV.

AIDS – No Airborne

Not airborne – dies in 30 minutes without a host

Sharma 7 (Anuj, microbiologist, 3/12, http://doctor.ndtv.com/faq/ndtv/fid/10737/For\_how\_long\_does\_the\_HIV\_virus\_survive\_outside\_the\_body.html, KF)

HIV is a relatively fragile virus and is susceptible to drying, which means that it dies easily when exposed to environmental conditions outside the body. On the other hand, Hepatitis B virus is comparatively more hardy virus capable of tolerating more adverse conditions. Also, the blood required to transmit Hepatitis B is one thousandth that required for transmitting HIV. Though usually, the HIV virus dies off within 30 minutes outside the body, some experiments have shown that it can survive for 3 days outside the body, if the initial viral load was high, and not directly exposed to the environment. The risk of HIV infection from a needle suspected to be contaminated with HIV is between 0.2% and 0.5%, estimated on the basis of a number of studies of occupational exposure to HIV in the hospital setting. The risk is increased with higher viral load, which is related to the amount of blood introduced. There are many other variables (apart from volume of blood and viral load) that affect the transmission of HIV - the size of the needle, the depth of penetration and whether or not blood was injected are important considerations. It is difficult to answer the theoretical question without more concrete details.

AIDS – Focus Trade-Off

Saying AIDS affects everyone takes efforts away from groups hit hardest

Bennett & Sharp 96 (Amanda & Anita, Pulitzer Prize winning article, 5/1, http://www.pulitzer.org/archives/5997, KF)

But nine years after the America Responds to AIDS campaign first hit the airwaves, many scientists and doctors are raising new questions. Increasingly, they worry that the everyone-gets-AIDS message -- still trumpeted not only by government agencies but by celebrities and the media -- is more than just dishonest: It is also having a perverse, potentially deadly effect on funding for AIDS prevention. The emphasis on the broad reach of the disease has virtually ensured that precious funds won't go where they are most needed. For instance, though homosexuals and intravenous drug users now account for 83% of all AIDS cases reported in the U.S., the federal AIDS-prevention budget includes no specific allocation for programs for homosexual and bisexual men. And needle-exchange programs, widely seen as among the most effective methods available in fighting infection among drug users, are denied any federal funding.

Massive death preventable if global focus abandoned

Bennett & Sharp 96 (Amanda & Anita, Pulitzer Prize winning article, 5/1, http://www.pulitzer.org/archives/5997, KF)

Some scientists charge that tens of thousands of infections a year could be averted if only practical assistance were directed to the right people. Instead of aiming general warnings at non-drug-using heterosexuals, these critics say, the government should use the bulk of its anti-AIDS money to teach homosexual men to avoid unprotected anal sex and to dissuade addicts from sharing infected needles. "You can't stop this epidemic if you spend the money where the epidemic hasn't happened," says Ron Stall, associate professor of epidemiology at the University of California in San Francisco. Helene Gayle, who is in charge of AIDS prevention at the CDC, agrees that "increasingly, it is important to shift strategies to meet the epidemic." She says that the CDC, by giving communities more freedom to decide how to spend federal AIDS money, is now seeking to direct more help to those who need it most.

\*\*Anti-Biotic Resistance\*\*

ABR – Inevitable

Part of life

Rozeboom 8 (Dale Rozeboom et. al.Michigan State Swine Specialist and Prof. of Animal Science at Michigan State University, April, 2008 “Antibiotics in the Environment and Antibiotic Resistance,” Michigan State University http://www.thepigsite.com/articles/8/biosecurity-disinfection/2220/antibiotics-in-the-environment-and-antibiotic-resistance, KF)

Some soil bacteria naturally produce substances (antibiotics or antimicrobials) that inhibit the growth of other bacteria. Scientists cultivate these soil bacteria and collect the antibiotics produced. The antibiotic may be given to people to help fight infections or disease caused by other bacteria. Not all bacteria are affected the same way by the specific type of antibiotic. While the growth of non-resistant bacteria is suppressed, resistant bacteria can continue to live in the presence of antibiotics. Resistance is the inherent ability of some bacteria to resist being killed by an antibiotic. Resistance was present prior to the use of antibiotics and occurs as a result of genetic mutation or when extra chromosomal DNA (plasmid) is acquired from other bacteria. In theory, antibiotic use selects for resistant bacteria, allowing them to multiply without the competition of antibiotic-susceptible bacteria.

No jump from animals to humans

Rozeboom 8 (Dale Rozeboom et. al.Michigan State Swine Specialist and Prof. of Animal Science at Michigan State University, April, 2008 “Antibiotics in the Environment and Antibiotic Resistance,” Michigan State University http://www.thepigsite.com/articles/8/biosecurity-disinfection/2220/antibiotics-in-the-environment-and-antibiotic-resistance, KF)

Antibiotics have been used in animals over 60 years. However, antibiotic resistance only recently has become a major medical concern in hospitals. Whenever a population of bacteria, of importance to animals or humans, is exposed to an antibiotic it encourages the predominance of the most resistant strains of the bacteria. The most well-known example of this is how rapidly gonorrhea became resistant to penicillin. It is possible for resistant bacteria from animals to make their way into humans, but many barriers stand in their way. Most bacteria that cause animal diseases are specialized for that species (species-specific) and poorly invade humans. Zoonotic bacteria, such as certain species of Escherichia coli and Salmonella are of greater concern as they are transmissible from animals to humans. Usual precautions of washing hands and thoroughly cooking of foods eliminate the spread of these to humans, but these procedures do not help prevent environmental transmission (e.g., to drinking water). Antibiotic resistance can occur in bacteria even when the antibiotics have not been used. Researchers found tetracycline- and tylosinresistant bacteria in manure samples taken from storage facilities of swine farms where antimicrobials were not being used (Chander et al., 2006). Likewise, Smith and others (2007) reported that resistance of E. coli to tetracycline, sulfonamides and streptomycin was similarly prevalent in feces of broiler chickens both receiving and not receiving antibiotics. Chander and others (2006) also reported that tetracycline and tylosin resistant bacteria were isolated in soil of fields where manure was applied “regularly” and in the feces of dogs kept as pets on the farm. But, the prevalence of resistant bacteria did not differ among farms using or not using antimicrobials as a feed additive for growth promotion.

Not caused by antibiotics- industrial revolution

Davies 8 (Julian, Professor of Microbiology and Immunology @ University of British Columbia, “Resistance redux. Infectious diseases, antibiotic resistance and the future of mankind,” EMBO reports 9, S1, S18–S21, ProQuest, KF)

Given the ubiquity of the microbial world, it is not surprising that the main weapon in the treatment of infectious diseases came from the discovery that a range of microbial chemicals—antibiotics—can kill other microbes or inhibit their growth. The scientific basis for such apparent -cidal tendencies is still not understood; some of these naturally occurring small molecules might have evolved for protective purposes, but most are likely to have evolved for modulating inter-microbial communication. This chemical cross-talk depends on the concentrations of these small molecules; a given molecule acts as a messenger at low concentrations and exerts antibiotic activity at higher concentrations. Whatever their natural function, the discovery of microbial products with inhibitory or -cidal activity against laboratory strains of bacterial pathogens initiated the era of antibiotics approximately 60 years ago. It should be noted, however, that the incidence of infectious disease was already on the decline in much of the industrial world by the 1940s, owing to better sanitation, improved disinfection in hospitals, and overall improvements in personal hygiene and living standards. The groundbreaking work by Louis Pasteur (1822–1895), Robert Koch (1843–1910) and their disciples led to the isolation of the major pathogens and proved the role of ‘germs’ in disease. This increased understanding of microbiology translated into better health care, and successful publichealth efforts to reduce disease transmission and burden.

ABR – Inevitable

Already resistant strands before antibiotics

Davies 8 (Julian, Professor of Microbiology and Immunology @ University of British Columbia, “Resistance redux. Infectious diseases, antibiotic resistance and the future of mankind,” EMBO reports 9, S1, S18–S21, ProQuest, KF)

The problem of antibiotic resistance is not only man-made; resistance genes were already present in the bacterial population long before humans started to use antibiotics to fight bacterial infections (Abraham & Chain, 1940). The widespread resistance due to the cefotaxime (CTX-M) β-lactamases is a good example; the ancestral gene is thought to have been picked up from a strain of Kluyvera sp. and subsequently transmitted to other bacteria (Barlow et al, 2008). As a result of the extensive use of certain classes of antibiotics in the past 20 years, this gene has undergone many mutations and gene transfers, under increasing antibiotic selection, and has evolved into the family of extended spectrum β-lactamases (ESBLs). There is now a veritable pandemic with hundreds of different CTX-Ms being found in bacterial pathogens around the world. This is natural protein engineering on a grand scale, which David Livermore refers to as “the zeitgeist of resistance” (Livermore, 2007). Although these genes were first detected in bacterial strains in hospital settings, resistant bacteria with various CTX-M genes are being found increasingly in the community. Was this series of events inevitable? Could it have been stopped? After all, β‑lactamases had been recognized for many years. The costs in terms of mortality, morbidity and economic losses are significant, but hard to estimate. So, despite an armamentarium of antibacterial, antifungal and antiviral agents for the treatment of most infectious diseases, the biggest threats today are resistant pathogens, especially those in hospitals.

Some strains of bacteria will always be resistant

Soulsby 8 (Ernest, emeritus professor of animal pathology and member of the Specialist Advisory Committee on Antimicrobial Resistance, 4-29, http://www.bmj.com/cgi/content/full/331/7527/1219?maxtoshow=&HITS=10&hits=10&RESULTFORMAT=&andorexactfulltext=and&searchid=1&FIRSTINDEX=0&sortspec=relevance&volume=331&firstpage=1219&resourcetype=HWCIT, KF)

The idea that reducing antibiotic use would redress the problem formed part of a positive response on the part of the United Kingdom government to the House of Lords report,1 including a public information campaign, surveillance of resistance along the food chain, targets with respect to hospital acquired infections, and setting up of an overarching advisory body on all aspects of antibiotic use. However, the concept of overuse has proved too simplistic, for, although the evidence of overprescribing as the main driver of resistance is overwhelming,4 reductions in antibiotic use have not necessarily resulted in lowered levels of resistance: some pathogens' resistance has remained stable, and with others it may even have increased. For example, although penicillin resistance in Streptococcus pneumoniae has been declining,5 macrolide resistance in S pneumoniae has remained stable,6 and other species such as Haemophilus influenzae have shown no evidence of a fall in resistance.7 Resistance to fluoroquinolones in Escherichia coli has increased sharply despite a reduction in prescribing.8 Such resistant strains arethought to originate from patients' gut flora.4 The advent of extended spectrum β lactamases in E coli isolates resistant to cephalosporins through CTX-M enzymes now pose problems with urinary tract infections being resistant to the fluoroquinolones. The relation of E coli with extended spectrum β lactamases in animals to human infection is not yet clear. Such E coli can cause severediarrhoea and death in calves, but it also has the ability to confer resistance to a wide range of β lactam compounds such as penicillin and cephalosporins.

No proof of correlation

Ebner 8 (Paul, animal sci @ Purdue, http://www.ces.purdue.edu/extmedia/ID/cafo/ID-349.pdf, KF)

Although this issue has been debated for over four decades, there is still little agreement as to whether the use of antibiotics in food animal production poses a serious human health risk. There are several obstacles impeding any consensus. Foremost is the ecology of antibiotic resistance, or more precisely, the complexity of the ecology of antibiotic resistance. Determining whether someone is infected with an antibiotic-resistant organism is an easy task. Determining how that person became infected is also relatively easy. Determining how the antibiotic resistant organism acquired the genes responsible for antibiotic resistance is very difficult. There are too many culprits—most notable is the human use of antibiotics. Antibiotic therapy in humans directly amplifies the number of antibiotic resistant bacteria, both harmful and non-harmful. It creates an immediate and large reservoir of antibiotic resistance genes available to bacteria of all types. This is the trade-off in using the drugs.

ABR – Inevitable

No clear test to prove

Ebner 8 (Paul, animal sci @ Purdue, http://www.ces.purdue.edu/extmedia/ID/cafo/ID-349.pdf, KF)

Such clear cases are very rare. As such, several research groups in recent years have attempted to predict the impact of agricultural use of antibiotics on human health with models or risk assessments. Like more traditional studies, these models are also somewhat limited by the complexity of the ecology of antibiotic resistance. Seemingly, no two organisms, or two genes, or two environments behave alike. For instance, a model predicting the impact of ampicillin resistance may not be useful in predicting the impact of tetracycline resistance, or resistance to other antibiotics. Nevertheless, several such studies have been published in the past decade, but with varying predictions. Some models predict that the use of antibiotics in food animal production significantly contributes to the problem of antibiotic resistance in humans while others say that the contribution is minimal to non-existent2,3. However, as more data become available and more models are created and refined, a consensus should emerge as to which models are the most accurate in gauging the impact of the agricultural use of antibiotics on public health.

Drug resistant bacteria inevitable- current measures solve

Caron & Mousa 10 (Whitney P., Pharmaceutical Research Institute @ Albany college of pharmacy, Shaker A., King Saud University, 5/20, http://www.xyscrubs.com/blog/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/IDR-10018-prevention-strategies-for-antimicrobial-resistance-a-system\_052010-31.pdf, KF)

Abstract: Antibiotics offer great benefits by reducing the duration and severity of illnesses and aiding in infection transmission control. With this being said, the inexorable process of antimicrobial drug resistance is to some degree unavoidable. Although drug resistance will likely persist and is to be expected, the overall level can be dramatically decreased with increased attention to antibiotic overuse and the pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic properties of different drug formulations, and the use of proper hygiene and protective barriers. Implementation of such practices as microbial surveillance and prophylaxis has been shown to result in decreased hospital length of stay, health care costs and mortality due to drug-resistant infections. This review will summarize current progress in preventative techniques aimed at reducing the incidence of infection by antimicrobial-resistant bacteria and the emergence and spread of antimicrobial-resistant strains. By employing a variety of prevention strategies, including proper personal hygiene, prescreening for carrier status before hospital admission, disinfection of hospital rooms, and careful monitoring of antimicrobial prescribing, marked progress can be achieved in the control of drug-resistant pathogens, which can translate into more effective antimicrobial therapy.

Inevitably solved- current practices

Caron & Mousa 10 (Whitney P., Pharmaceutical Research Institute @ Albany college of pharmacy, Shaker A., King Saud University, 5/20, http://www.xyscrubs.com/blog/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/IDR-10018-prevention-strategies-for-antimicrobial-resistance-a-system\_052010-31.pdf, KF)

The emergence of drug-resistant bacteria is to some extent an inevitable consequence of the patterns of use of antibiotics in society today. Given the time and cost required to bring new, more effective antimicrobial therapeutics to market, drug discovery may not be the most effective approach to limiting antimicrobial resistance. Rather, there is substantial evidence to support that more appropriate and careful use of antibiotics, with particular attention to the variable PK and PD properties of different formulations, and even avoiding antibiotic treatment altogether in some cases, can significantly decrease or limit drug-resistant bacteria. In addition, relatively inexpensive and simple measures, such as microbial surveillance and prophylaxis, proper hygiene, the use of protective barriers, and environmental cleaning can translate into major savings in health care-related costs, and significant improvements in patient health and quality of care. While Stewart’s ‘war on pestilence’ certainly is not won, the task is not insurmountable, but will require a shift in behavior and attitudes among health care providers and patients.

Resistance as old as antibiotics

Fitzpatrick 10 (Michael, MD, 8/16, http://www.spiked-online.com/index.php/site/article/9424/, KF)

Or, more likely, it will not. The spectre of antibiotic-resistant microbes is as old as antibiotics. Over the past decade we have already survived Methicillin-Resistant Staphylococcus Aureus (MRSA), multi-drug resistant Tuberculosis, and highly resistant strains of HIV. The lesson of the swine flu scare is that the public should exercise a degree of scepticism over the doomsday warnings issued by leading figures in microbiology and public health.

ABR – No Magnitude

No evidence on concern level

PBS Frontline No Date Given (“Antibiotic Debate Overview” http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/meat/safe/overview.html, KF)

Although conclusive evidence directly linking the use of drugs in food animals to an increase in drug-resistant bacteria that make people sick has not been uncovered, a number of recent studies suggesting such a link concern many scientists. "There is no evidence that antibiotic resistance is not a problem, but there is insufficient evidence as to how big a problem it is," says Dr. Margaret Mellon, with the Union of Concerned Scientists.

ABR – Animal =/= Human

No way to tell if animals create antibiotic resistant strains

Ebner 8 (Paul, animal sci @ Purdue, http://www.ces.purdue.edu/extmedia/ID/cafo/ID-349.pdf, KF)

Because the ecology of antibiotic resistance is so complex, it is difficult to say definitively whether the use of antibiotics in food animal production negatively impacts human health. It is widely accepted that the use of the drugs, whether therapeutically or subtherapeutically, results in increases in the proportion of antibiotic-resistant bacteria. It is not clear, however, as to how much antibiotic resistance generated on the farm contributes to the problem of antibiotic resistance in human medicine. In recent years, many researchers have developed risk assessment models to address the problem but with contradictory results. As our knowledge of the ecology of antibiotic resistance grows, it will be easier to come to some consensus as to what measures, if any, should be taken to ensure that our meat, dairy, and poultry products continue to be produced in the safest manner possible.

ABR – Impact Calc

Preventative antibiotics good- outweigh ABR risk

Reuters 8 (12/31, http://www.reuters.com/article/2008/12/31/us-antibiotics-treatment-idUSTRE4BU4QU20081231?feedType=RSS&feedName=healthNews&sp=true, KF)

(Reuters) - Giving antibiotics to patients in intensive care units as a precaution saves lives, according to a major Dutch study published Wednesday. The findings in the New England Journal of Medicine suggest the benefits of administering antibiotics right away, even before an infection develops, outweigh the risks people will develop resistance to them, the researchers said. "We have seen that using antibiotics clearly results in a reduction in the number of deaths and intensive care units should make use of this knowledge," Anne Marie de Smet, a researcher at University Medical Center Utrecht, said in a statement.

Antibiotic resistant bacteria is stunted

Bohlin 2 (Ray, PhD in molecular biology, http://www.leaderu.com/science/pbs\_evolution.html, KF)

Another factor left out of the discussion is that antibiotic resistance always comes with a cost of its own. Antibiotic resistant bacteria are always inferior to the original wild-type bacteria. Their growth is stunted. Sometimes these costs can be compensated for but also at additional costs. Resistant bacteria are not better bacteria. Remove the antibiotic and they quickly lose out to the original wild-type bacteria. Therefore, to suggest that in the case of resistant tuberculosis that the bacteria evolved right inside the human host is highly misleading. The bacterial resistant forms were already present, the bacterium has not changed or evolved at all.

ABR – No Impact – SQ Solves

Nanotech solves

Popular Science 11 (Rebecca Boyle, contributor, 4/4, http://www.popsci.com/technology/article/2011-04/degradable-nanoparticles-search-intercept-and-destroy-antibiotic-resistant-bacteria, KF)

A new breed of biodegradable nanoparticles can glom on to drug-resistant bacteria, breaching their cell walls and leaking out their contents, selectively killing them. The polymer particles could someday be used in anything from injectable treatments for drug-resistant bacteria, to new antibacterial soaps and deodorants, according to inventors at IBM. After their work is done, the particles break apart, flushing away with the invaders they destroyed. The nanoparticles, which IBM says are relatively inexpensive, were effective against bugs that have been evolving to resist antibiotics, including methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA). Preliminary results suggest the particles could also be effective against yeast, fungus and small bacteria like E. coli, IBM says. Research on the new particles is reported in this week's issue of the journal Nature Chemistry.

Regulation solves

Lazarova 5 (Daniela, Reporter for Radio Prague, “Antibiotic resistance threatens public health,” March 16, 2005, http://www.radio.cz/en/article/64424/limit, KF)

The overuse of antibiotics in recent decades has resulted in a sharp rise in antimicrobial resistance, in other words -many antibiotics are no longer effective and illnesses which were considered easily curable may once again become life-threatening. There is now a network of antibiotics centres across the Czech Republic which cooperate closely with GPs and specialists, monitoring antibiotics prescriptions and giving doctors important feedback on the effects of overuse. However there is another important aspect to be considered - the amount of antibiotics that we get from the food chain. Dr. Jindrak again: "I think that about 50 percent of the total consumption of antibiotics - total exposure to antibiotics - is associated with their usage in animals. We have evidence that there is a transmission of resistance bacteria from animals to humans. That is really dangerous and it is necessary to intervene in both types of antibiotic usage."

\*\*Asia-Pacific\*\*

Asia – Stable

Asia will stay stable – states understand its in their best interests

Acharya 99 (Amitav, defense and strategic study, http://www.rsis.edu.sg/publications/WorkingPapers/WP03.pdf, dw: July 1999, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

 Fourth, the co-ordinated power balancing that takes place within a concert can only be sustained as long as it does not violate great power interest. Mearsheimer notes that “when those great powers have a dispute, self-interest determines each side’s policy and the concert may collapse as a result.”20 Today, the existence of serious territorial disputes among the major Asia Pacific powers reduces the likelihood of their engagement through a concert framework. Such disputes have prevented meaningful economic cooperation among the great powers, as between Japan and Russia over the Northern Territories. They provoke nationalist hysteria, as evident in the case of the Sino-Japanese dispute over the Senkaku/Daiyoutai islands. Apart from fuelling resentment and competition, these disputes can actually develop into military flashpoints. Despite their recent border treaty, a revival of Sino-Russian border disputes cannot be ruled out. Finally, in the Asia Pacific region, unlike 19th century Europe, the basic question of who qualifies for great power status and who can legitimately and meaningfully belong to a concert remain problematic. While Japan’s foreign ministry suggested four such power, the US, Japan, China and Russia, Singapore’s former Prime Minister, Lee Kuan Yew, has argued that the stability of the Asia Pacific region “still boils down to the relationship among the United States, Japan and China.”21 This is similar to the Chinese perspective, which does not see Russia as a major player in regional security as long as it remains inwardly focused and constrained by domestic political and economic crises. China’s leaders and strategic thinkers are known to envisage even a more select group, consisting solely of itself and the US, as the guardians of regional order. With its decision to go nuclear, India too is already staking its claim to be a party to any great power security regime, a claim which, if India survives the current sanctions imposed by the West and Japan, would be difficult for the others to resists. It seems clear that the notion of concert in the Asia Pacific cannot be meaningful except on the basis of a flexible and adjustable membership. Even as a concert system seems improbable in the current Asian political climate, the idea of great power leadership in managing security problems in the Asia Pacific region continues to have some resonance among the region’s policy-makers. Indeed, concert-based solutions to the region’s security problems predate the emergence of multilateral security institutions and dialogues. In 1987, then Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev had proposed the holding of talks between the US, the Soviet Union, Japan, China and India, on regional security issues.22 His proposal fell on deaf ears, however due to suspicions that marked relations among the major powers in the Cold War setting. Another example of great power primacy in regional security affairs was the role of the Permanent Five members of the UN Security Council to find a settlement to the Cambodia conflict during its final years. This effectively supplanted ASEAN’s stewardship of the Cambodia peace process, prompting resentment and anger from the architects of ASEAN’s Cambodia policy

Asia is generally stable and all other instability will be checked by defensive policing

Wong and Ansfield 11 (Edward and Jonathon, staff’s, http://www.nytimes.com/2011/04/01/world/asia/01china.html?\_r=2, dw: 3-31-2011, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

The Chinese military said Thursday that while the security situation in Asia and the Pacific was generally stable, it was becoming “more intricate and volatile,” with no clear solutions for tension points like the divided Korean Peninsula and with the United States increasing its involvement in regional issues. The military’s vision was laid out in a national defense white paper, a document published every two years since 1998. The paper tried to walk a line between trumpeting the modernization efforts of the Chinese military and assuaging the fears of foreign governments and analysts that the fast-growing People’s Liberation Army would be used for expansionist purposes or regional dominance. It stressed that China’s military buildup was purely defensive, a position Chinese leaders have long taken. The paper had more detail than previous editions on China’s efforts to establish confidence-building measures with foreign militaries. In the past year, perceptions by foreign countries of China’s military growth and of a more assertive foreign policy have resulted in diplomatic discord and discomfort, particularly between China and the United States.

Asia – No War

Asia will remain secure – ASEAN checks

Acharya 99 (Amitav, defense and strategic study, http://www.rsis.edu.sg/publications/WorkingPapers/WP03.pdf, dw: July 1999, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

In the early 1990s, “cooperative security” emerged as the main principle for organising multilateral security dialogues and cooperation among the Asia Pacific countries. This principle called for the avoidance of an explicit balance of power framework, including the rejection of “deterrence mind-sets” associated with great power geopolitics of the Cold War era. The notion of cooperative security emphasised “inclusiveness” and the equality of all the states. The institutional expression of cooperative security was the ASEAN Regional Forum. The ARF was to be based on the ASEAN model of consultations and consensus-building. The advent of the ARF meant that for the first time, a regional organization including all the major powers of the international system (the ARF’s members include the US, China, Russia, India and the EU, and Japan) would be “led” by a group of its weaker members.23 The ARF concept thus turned the idea of concert on its head. But the viability of this approach has been suspect from the start. To be sure, ASEAN’s leadership of the ARF offered important advantages. Without ASEAN sponsorship, Chinese participation in a regional multilateral security grouping would have been highly unlikely, ASEAN’s own norms and institutional style provided a ready-made foundation upon which the ARF could build itself. But keeping the ARF tied to the ASEAN framework also limits its relevance to security problems in Northeast Asia.

US intervention solves asian conflict

Prueher 98 (Joseph, Commander in chief of Pacific Command, interviewed, JFQ, dw: Autumn/Winter 98 da: 7-9-2011, lido)

The region is generally at peace but is not free from the possibility of major conflict. As Henry Kissinger recently noted, “Wars, while not likely, are not inconceivable. . . . Peace will require deliberate efforts.” There is no status quo to which every regional power adheres. There is no integrating organization such as the European Union or NATO to reconcile conflicting goals.While expanding commercial ties generally tend to promote peace, they can also produce new pressures. Continued growth will increase tension over access to scarce resources such as oil. Conversely, if economic growth rates continue to decline, dashed expectations among expanding populations could trigger instability. America is unusually well positioned among Asia-Pacific military powers. Our economic, diplomatic, and military capabilities can help maintain stability and prevent major conflict. Thus the United States is particularly suited to join with other nations as a partner to broker regional security, cushion tensions, and defuse crises.

Asia – Alt Causes

Alt cause – Iraq will kill all efforts to revive stability in region

Rolfe 7 (Jim, http://www.marshallfoundation.org/education/documents/APSS2007.pdf, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

Iraq. Participants generally view the war in Iraq as having a negative impact on regional security. A plurality believes that the war increases the likelihood of terrorist attacks in the region. A significant number also believe that the war has had a debilitating effect on the United States' ability to operate effectively in the Asia Pacific, although U.S. respondents generally do not share this view. Some respondents also argue that the war has reduced the United Stales' ability 10 soundly analyze the situation in the region. In response to an open-ended quest ion, a few of the analysts suggest other possible consequences of the Iraq war. These included the likelihood of intensified intra-lslam disputes and that China's regional position will be enhanced because of the war. Highlighting the uncertainties in the outlook, predictions were offered both that support for Muslim extremism in Southeast Asia will diminish and that it will increase.

Alt Cause – Terrorism, kills stability

Rolfe 7 (Jim, http://www.marshallfoundation.org/education/documents/APSS2007.pdf, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

Terrorism. The respondents as 3 group consider terrorism to be the most important short-term issue for the region as well as one of the important issues in the longer term. A clear majority believe that the United States' war on terrorism has increased the danger of terrorism in the region. Reflecting a similar reaction to the U.S. policy, an even larger majority believe that future military responses to terrorism should require authorization by the United Nations. A significant plurality of the analysts also sec terrorism as a significant threat to the internal security of their own country, but only a minority believe this threat has increased over the past year. They see the threat as coming from organized international networks (rather than home­grown groups) and they believe there has been increasing international cooperation to counter the threat. They slso judge, however, *that* the current level of cooperation is still not adequate.

Alt Causes – financial issues and other conflicts

Prueher 98 (Joseph, Commander in chief of Pacific Command, interviewed, JFQ, dw: Autumn/Winter 98 da: 7-9-2011, lido)

There are four. The most immediate threat is the situation on the Korean peninsula. Only a thin demilitarized zone separates North Korea’s million-man military from the combined forces of the United States and South Korea. At some point this standoff will end. Our readiness ensures peace until that occurs. Then there is potential instability resulting from the Asian financial crisis. We are working closely with our allies and friends in the region to alleviate the pressure. The size, shape, and timing of U.S. military contacts have been adjusted to maintain our engagement with them. Next is the China-Taiwan dispute. Although this is potentially the most contentious issue between the United States and China, we are building mutual understanding to resolve differences. The third challenge is the peaceful resolution of territorial disputes over small island groups in the South China Sea which sit astride shipping lanes linking the Persian Gulf and Southeast and East Asia. They contain exploitable deposits of both oil and natural gas. Eight nations—including China, the Philippines, Malaysia, and Vietnam—assert sovereignty over various island groups in the South China Sea. The United States takes no position on the legal merits of these competing claims but encourages the claimants to exercise restraint and avoid destabilizing actions.

**\*\*Bird Flu\*\***

Bird Flu – No Impact – TF

No timeframe

Chicago Tribune 5 (November 1, “Bird flu risk hinges on computation, mutation”, Mike Dorning, Washington Bureau, http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2005-11-01/news/0511010146\_1\_avian-flu-bird-flu-public-health/3, KF)

News reports on avian flu have taken on alarming tones as the virus has spread from chickens and ducks in Asia to swans in Croatia and, most recently, a parrot at an airport in England. But the risk that the disease poses to people remains frustratingly uncertain. Even now, no one is sure whether the virus will ever mutate into a disease that can spread easily from person to person and create the potential for a large-scale epidemic. Even if it does, it's not clear whether that would take months, years, a decade or longer.

Bird Flu – No Impact – No Spread

Inevitable survival- genetics

Xinhua 6 (November 2, “Genetic factors might influence human bird flu infection: WHO”, http://english.peopledaily.com.cn/200611/03/eng20061103\_317926.html, KF)

Genetic factors might influence human infection of bird flu, which may explain why some people get the disease and others don't, and why it remains rare, the World Health Organization (WHO) said on Thursday. Scientists suspect some people have "a genetic predisposition" for bird flu infection, and others don't, the UN agency said in a report, which generalized conclusions of a WHO expert meeting in September. The theory is based on data from rare instances of human-to- human transmission in genetically-related persons. "This possibility, if more fully explored, might help explain why human cases are relatively rare, and why the virus is not spreading easily from animals to humans or from human to human," the WHO said.

Too many factors have to add up for a pandemic

Huffman 6 (Mark, March 23, ConsumerAffairs.com, Bird Flue Pandemic Fears May Be Exagerrated,” http://www.consumeraffairs.com/news04/2006/03/bird\_flu\_fears.html, KF)

"Our findings provide a rational explanation for why H5N1 viruses rarely infect and spread from human to human although they can replicate efficiently in the lungs," University of Wisconsin-Madison researchers said in their study, reported in the journal Nature. "No one knows whether the virus will evolve into a pandemic strain, but flu viruses constantly change," Yoshihiro Kawaoka, the group's leader, said. "Certainly multiple mutations need to be accumulated for the H5N1 virus to become a pandemic strain."

No mutation- empirics

Lewis 6 (Truman, 5/22, http://www.consumeraffairs.com/news04/2006/05/bird\_flu\_indonesia.html, KF)

The WHO said it has sent a team to the area and says its scientists have found no evidence that the H5N1 bird flu virus has mutated. The scientists on the scene say the source of the cluster of infections is unknown but the most likely reason is exposure to infected birds or their feces. It's the largest bird flu cluster to date and could be the result of a large family gathering on April 29 where there was a shared environmental exposure. So far, investigators say no infections have been identified outside the family cluster. If the virus had mutated, there would probably have been more infections among other family members, close friends, neighbors, other villagers, or health care professionals who had been attending the infected patients.

 Mutations don’t matter

Medical News Today 6 (“Mutated Bird Flu Virus Might Not Spread Easily” 8-1, http://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/48478.php, KF)

Although many scientists have been concerned that the H5N1 bird flu virus may mutate one day and become easily human transmissible, a recent study seems to indicate that it might not spread easily among humans. Researchers from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), USA, tried to combine a common human flu virus with H5N1 and found it does not spread easily. This could mean that the mutated virus may not be such a giant threat to global human health. You can read about this study in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, August 2.

No transmission- too deep in lungs

Medical News Today 6 (“Mutated Bird Flu Virus Might Not Spread Easily” 8-1, http://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/48478.php, KF)

The current H5N1 virus can only infect a human deep down in the lungs, not the upper respiratory tract. This has advantages and disadvantages: Advantage: -- It is more difficult to make someone ill because the virus has to go a long way down. A human has to be exposed to a large cluster of the virus for longer to get ill. -- An infected human who coughs and sneezes will not emit many viruses, because they are deep down in the lungs - that is one of the reasons humans cannot infect other humans easily.

Bird Flu – No Impact – No Spread

No extinction- genetics

Nordqvist 6 (Christian, CEO Medical News Today, 11/3, http://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/55812.php, KF)

The reason some of us get bird flu infection and others don't may be down to our genetic make up, say experts from the World Health Organization (WHO), after analyzing information on the very rare cases of humans catching bird flu from other humans, where infection was only passed on to blood relatives. In May 2006, seven people died of bird flu in North Sumatra, Indonesia. Some of them were infected by blood relatives - all the victims belonged to one extended family. The scientists say this could eventually explain why humans do not catch it easily from birds/animals, and other humans.

Mutations aren’t a problem

Nordqvist 6 (Christian, CEO Medical News Today, 11/3, http://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/55812.php, KF)

Some scientists believe a mutated virus that could spread easily among humans would not be as deadly as the current H5N1 virus. This is because the current one has to get deep down into the human lung(s) to make a person ill - it does not infect the upper-respiratory tract, just the lower-respiratory tract. When an infected person coughs and/or sneezes, he/she does not emit many viruses (because they are so deep down). Hence, infecting another human is extremely difficult. In order to spread easily among humans it would need to infect the upper-respiratory tract. Upper-respiratory tract infections are easier to treat. Therefore, the theory goes, a mutated virus might infect many more people, but a lower percentage of cases would be fatal.

Mutated strands detected and cured

Nordqvist 6 (Christian, CEO Medical News Today, 6/23, http://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/45852.php, KF)

WHO added that viruses are always changing slightly. This current slight mutation is nothing to be alarmed about. The virus can mutate in many different ways, one of which could be in the direction that may become a threat to human public health - this has not happened in this case. The fact that H5N1 died within that cluster means the mutated virus probably died there as well. Detecting this mutation shows how advanced our surveillance system is becoming. The H5N1 bird flu virus strain has always had the potential of transmitting from human to human - albeit with great difficulty. For one human to infect another 'continuous close physical contact' is needed. The family cluster lived together in a very small room. If some of the members were infected and they slept together, the likelihood of human-to-human transmission would have been much greater.

Not spread by food

Beattie 6 (Tom, Iowa St-Dept of Food Sci,)

The entire poultry supply in the United States is safe regardless of the source. No birds in North America, either wild or domesticated, have been identified as carrying the virus. It is highly unlikely that people in the US will be made ill from the avian flu virus since we have little contact with live poultry. Since there is no evidence that suggests the virus is transmitted by consuming poultry products, consumers should feel safe in continued consumption of poultry and eggs. These products are safe as long as they are properly prepared to usual guidelines.

Bird Flu – No Impact – No Spread

No epidemic- no transmission

Siegel 5 (Medicine@New York University, Marc, “Don’t Worry Be Healthy: Fear is more likely to get you than the Avian Flu”, September 13th, http://www.slate.com/id/2126233/, KF)

Yet the science behind all the worry is questionable. It rests on the unproven claim that the avian flu will develop exactly like the strain that caused the flu pandemic of 1918. A March 2004 article in Science showed that the 1918 flu—which infected close to a billion people and killed 50 million or more—made the jump from birds to humans through a slight change in the structure of its hemagglutinins, the molecules by which the virus attaches itself to body cells. This mutation allowed the virus to kill more World War I soldiers than weapons did, effectively ending the war when forces on both sides became too sick to fight. The current bird flu, however, has a different molecular structure than the 1918 bug. And though it has infected millions of birds, there is no direct evidence that it is about to mutate into a form that would transmit from human to human. In isolated cases, food handlers in Asia have gotten sick, but that doesn't mean that a wildly lethal mutation is about to occur. As Wendy Orent points out in the New Republic, diseases that come from animals are often hard for humans to transmit. They lack the "essential characteristics" of virulent human infections—they're not durable, or waterborne, or carried by hospital workers, or transmitted sexually.

No way to transmit H5N1

Huffman 6 (Mark, March 23, ConsumerAffairs.com, Bird Flue Pandemic Fears May Be Exagerrated,” http://www.consumeraffairs.com/news04/2006/03/bird\_flu\_fears.html, KF)

The new studies may explain why the virus hasn't mutated so that it can be spread from one human to another. The disease appears to lodge in an unusual part of the human respiratory tract, far deeper in the lungs than most viruses settle. Using human tissue samples, the researchers have found that H5N1 in this part of the body can't be spread by sneezing and coughing, the way regular, seasonal cold and flu germs are.

Bird Flu – No Impact – Down

Bird flu dying

Nordqvist 6 (Christian, CEO Medical News Today, 5/15, http://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/43492.php, KF)

In South-East Asia, where the first human cases of bird flu surfaced in 2003, not one human or chicken has become infected in 2006 so far. Does this mean the H5N1 hits chickens hard, then a smattering of humans, and finally just evaporates? Or, as is the case with a tropical storm when the eye passes over you - is it a lull? The United Nations and the World Health Organisation are cautiously optimistic that the success stories of Thailand and Vietnam may be a sign of things to come in the rest of the world. Vietnam, which had the highest cases of human infection, like other areas of South East Asia, has had not animal or human cases so far this year. Thailand has also remained free this year so far. The much feared migration from Africa to Europe did not bring with it a wave of H5N1 infection. Much like the millennium bug fear, everyone waited apprehensively, and nothing happened. Not one migratory bird from Africa has been found to carry the H5N1 bird flu virus strain when arriving in Europe - so far.

Can stop bird flu- past knowledge

NYT 5 (11-2, lexis)

Avian flu viruses are not new. They are classified according to how likely they are to cause disease, based on the severity of the illness in poultry. Most avian flu viruses are classified as low There have been three outbreaks in the United States of the highly pathogenic form, in 1924, 1983 and 2004. "By 2004 we had learned a great deal about how to respond and confined it to one flock quite rapidly," said Ms. Teuber, of the Agriculture Department. Humans cannot be infected with the flu by eating a diseased bird if it is thoroughly cooked. The same cooking and handling procedures that provide protection against viruses and bacteria like salmonella and E. coli also provide protection against the virulent forms of avian flu, according to the Agriculture Department. The flu is usually spread through bird feces, saliva and nasal secretions or indirectly through contact with contaminated materials. So far, the flu does not seem to be easily transmitted from one person to another. For organic poultry producers, whose birds must have access to the outdoors, a temporary quarantine would not mean the end of organic poultry. Katherine DiMatteo, executive director of the Organic Trade Association, said that in a national emergency the organic producers would comply, though the birds would still have to be allowed to move around and peck.

No consensus among scientists

Chicago Tribune 5 (November 1, “Bird flu risk hinges on computation, mutation”, Mike Dorning, Washington Bureau, http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2005-11-01/news/0511010146\_1\_avian-flu-bird-flu-public-health/3, KF)

Asked whether the avian flu estimates provided solid cause for alarm, Arnold Monto, a professor of epidemiology at the University of Michigan School of Public Health and a consultant to the World Health Organization, said, "Basically, we really don't know. "The reason these numbers are being batted around is we need numbers for planning. Otherwise, I don't think anyone would go out on a limb with numbers," Monto said.

Bird Flu – No Impact – Meds

Survivors are immune

Medical News Today 7 (6/2, http://www.medicalnewstoday.com/releases/72413.php, KF)

Adults who have recovered from the potentially deadly H5N1 strain of avian influenza may hold the key to future treatments for the virus, according to an international team of researchers. In a study published in the open access journal PLoS Medicine, the researchers have shown how specific antibodies taken from avian flu survivors in Vietnam can be reproduced in the laboratory and prove effective at neutralising the virus in culture vitro and in mice.

Antivirals solve- T-705

Medical News Today 9 (12/25, http://www.medicalnewstoday.com/releases/174660.php, KF)

The Wisconsin research was conducted in mice and demonstrated that the compound was effective and safe against H5N1 virus, the highly pathogenic bird flu virus, which some scientists fear could spark a global epidemic of deadly influenza. The compound is also effective against seasonal flu and more worrisome varieties such as the H1N1 virus, and has already been tested against circulating seasonal influenza in humans in Japan where it is on the brink of Phase III clinical trials in people. The prospect of a new front-line drug for influenza, in particular highly pathogenic strains such as H5N1 virus, is important as there are few drugs capable of checking the shifty influenza virus. The new study showing the efficacy and safety of T-705 assumes more importance as instances of Tamiflu-resistant strains of H5N1 virus have recently been reported, raising concerns about the ability of current antiviral drugs to blunt a pandemic of deadly avian flu. Antiviral drugs are viewed as a readily available first line of defense against pandemic flu and are especially important for protecting health workers and others during an outbreak of disease. Vaccines, which utilize inactivated or weakened viruses to confer immunity, are the primary line of defense for influenza, but require months to formulate and mass-produce. Aside from its safety and basic efficacy, another key trait of the T-705 compound is the fact that it is effective even after an infection is acquired. Bird flu, notes Kawaoka, is almost always diagnosed in the hospital after symptoms of the disease manifest themselves: "This compound has a chance to save people who have gone into the disease course," he says.

 Gels solve

Nordqvist 6 (Christian, CEO Medical News Today, 9/11, http://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/51588.php, KF)

DermaSalve Sciences, a UK company that makes products for people with dry skin, has developed a gel that destroys the H5N1 bird flu virus strain in half-a-minute. The gel could be used by health and agricultural workers - it is applied on to the skin and remains effective for about 30 minutes.

Vaccines solve

Paddock 7 (Catharine, PhD business, 4/18, http://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/68109.php, KF)

The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) announced yesterday the first approval in the US of a vaccine against H5N1 avian influenza for use with humans. Commonly known as bird flu, the current deadly strain of the H5N1 avian virus is not spreading from human to human but only from birds to humans, as well as among birds themselves. But should H5N1 mutate into a human to human version, this vaccine may give limited early protection until a more effective version can be developed that is more tailored to a pandemic strain.

Tech solves

Siegel 5 (Medicine@New York University, Marc, “Don’t Worry Be Healthy: Fear is more likely to get you than the Avian Flu”, September 13th, http://www.slate.com/id/2126233/, KF)

Even if the worst-case scenario does occur and the virus mutates, there is no current indication that it will spread the way the Spanish flu did in 1918. That disease incubated in the World War I trenches before it spread across the world, infecting soldiers who were exhausted, packed together in trenches, and lacked access to hygiene. These conditions were an essential breeding ground for the virus. Today, there is no way a huge number of people would be packed together in WWI-like conditions. Also, technology allows doctors to diagnose and isolate flu patients far more effectively.

Bird Flu – Turn: Cynicism

Too much concern causes backlash, which leads to cynicism turning the case

Chicago Tribune 5 (November 1, “Bird flu risk hinges on computation, mutation”, Mike Dorning, Washington Bureau, http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2005-11-01/news/0511010146\_1\_avian-flu-bird-flu-public-health/3, KF)

Some medical researchers are concerned that the breathless tone that has colored the public discussion of avian flu could backfire, provoking cynicism and complacency if the virus does not emerge soon as a clear public health threat. That, in turn, could erode support for measures under way to strengthen the nation's ability to respond to new epidemics of flu and other diseases, they worry.

\*\*Central Asia\*\*

Central Asia – Alt Causes

Alt causes to stability – geopolitics and authoritarian priorities

Boyer 6 (Alan Lee, former commander and prof, College Review, vol 59, dw: Winter 2006, da: 7-7-2011, lido)

Regional Geopolitics. The Central Asian states and their neighbors are largely authoritarian. In such a neighborhood, democracy, human rights, and other Western concerns do not dominate the agenda. The regional powers (Russia, China, and Iran) are concerned about their influence over their weaker neighbors. They, especially Russia, desire regimes that are stable but follow their lead, politically and economically. No action the United States might take can be viewed in isolation; Washington must weigh the impact of any decision on the regional powers. Russia and China often see the United States as an outsider intruding on their spheres of influence. President Vladimir Putin and numerous Russian officials have expressed concern at U.S. presence in the region. In 2004, Putin suggested that Russia, China, and India should work together economically and politically to counterbalance U.S. hegemony.35 Essentially, he was advocating a new axis, or “strategic triangle,” to offset Russia’s own weaknesses. Greater American and other Western involvement in the region is likely to be resisted by the regional powers and to fuel competition, not inspire cooperation. A further geopolitical issue is the general failure of the regional cooperation needed to solve many of Central Asia’s most pressing issues, especially economic development and poverty, drug trafficking, transregional criminal activity, water and border disputes, and terrorism. Regional cooperation has improved somewhat over the last few years, but it still continues to be weak and ineffective. Most of the improvement has been in antiterrorism. Overall regional cooperation can be expected to remain weak as long as current regimes are in power.36 Unless Central Asian states can create a common security and economic identity, intraregional cooperation will likely suffer. Afghanistan is another geopolitical factor. As long as Afghanistan remains unstable and weak, its problems will continue to reduce Central Asian stability. Further, Afghanistan impacts American ability to influence Central Asia in two ways. First, it tends to dominate attention and allocation of resources in the region; time and money spent on Afghanistan means less of either for Central Asia.37 Secondly, Afghanistan serves as a haven for and source of radicalism and criminal activity. The drug trade undermines governance in poor states like Tajikistan, which worsens corruption—administrators are poorly paid, judges and border guards easily corrupted, etc. The institutions of Central Asia are not well equipped to deal with the forces emerging from Afghanistan.

Can’t solve for Central Asian stability – regional powers refuse to change from US work

Boyer 6 (Alan Lee, former commander and prof, College Review, vol 59, dw: Winter 2006, da: 7-7-2011, lido)

Regional Geopolitics. The Central Asian states and their neighbors are largely authoritarian. In such a neighborhood, democracy, human rights, and other Western concerns do not dominate the agenda. The regional powers (Russia, China, and Iran) are concerned about their influence over their weaker neighbors. They, especially Russia, desire regimes that are stable but follow their lead, politically and economically. No action the United States might take can be viewed in isolation; Washington must weigh the impact of any decision on the regional powers. Russia and China often see the United States as an outsider intruding on their spheres of influence. President Vladimir Putin and numerous Russian officials have expressed concern at U.S. presence in the region. In 2004, Putin suggested that Russia, China, and India should work together economically and politically to counterbalance U.S. hegemony.35 Essentially, he was advocating a new axis, or “strategic triangle,” to offset Russia’s own weaknesses. Greater American and other Western involvement in the region is likely to be resisted by the regional powers and to fuel competition, not inspire cooperation. A further geopolitical issue is the general failure of the regional cooperation needed to solve many of Central Asia’s most pressing issues, especially economic development and poverty, drug trafficking, transregional criminal activity, water and border disputes, and terrorism. Regional cooperation has improved somewhat over the last few years, but it still continues to be weak and ineffective. Most of the improvement has been in antiterrorism. Overall regional cooperation can be expected to remain weak as long as current regimes are in power.36 Unless Central Asian states can create a common security and economic identity, intraregional cooperation will likely suffer. Afghanistan is another geopolitical factor. As long as Afghanistan remains unstable and weak, its problems will continue to reduce Central Asian stability. Further, Afghanistan impacts American ability to influence Central Asia in two ways. First, it tends to dominate attention and allocation of resources in the region; time and money spent on Afghanistan means less of either for Central Asia.37 Secondly, Afghanistan serves as a haven for and source of radicalism and criminal activity. The drug trade undermines governance in poor states like Tajikistan, which worsens corruption—administrators are poorly paid, judges and border guards easily corrupted, etc. The institutions of Central Asia are not well equipped to deal with the forces emerging from Afghanistan.

Central Asia – Alt Causes

Can’t solve central Asian stability – no government will change themselves

Boyer 6 (Alan Lee, former commander and prof, College Review, vol 59, dw: Winter 2006, da: 7-7-2011, lido)

The Nature of the Regimes. As we have seen, the regimes that control Central Asian governments are not inclined to change or reform, and if they do not want to change, it is very difficult for the American government to make them. Even U.S. bases and seeming agreement on terrorism have not increased American influence. Central Asian regimes do not see terrorism as the United States does but as a factor through which they can use the United States against each other and to legitimize the suppression of domestic political opponents. This is especially true in Uzbekistan and, to a lesser degree, in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan. A good example occurred inUzbekistan on 13May 2005,when President Islam Karimov used deadly force to crack down on a protest by relatives of twentythree jailed businessmen. He justified his actions by calling the protestors Islamic extremists and terrorists.38 Uzbekistan and other Central Asian states have legitimate concerns about terrorism, especially the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan (IMU), but not to that extent—in any case, the United States destroyed the bulk of the IMU in Afghanistan in 2002. For the United States, this means that influence must be exercised in subtle and indirect ways. Washington has many such ways and does try to use them, but so far it has achieved only limited results. American “soft power” and support of international and nongovernmental organizations are two of its better tools.39 As countries become more integrated into globalization, international and nongovernmental organizations have greater opportunities to influence foreign audiences. Unfortunately, many of the positive aspects of globalization do not penetrate Central Asian society to any great extent.

Can’t solve stability – poverty and infrastructure

Boyer 6 (Alan Lee, former commander and prof, College Review, vol 59, dw: Winter 2006, da: 7-7-2011, lido)

The lack of Internet access or truly free media, low levels of development, and high poverty rates inhibit the effectiveness of American soft power. NGOs and IOs are very active in the region but have been unable to getmuch done.40 NGOs are largely foreign funded, have a limited base outside big cities, and are often suppressed by local governments.41 These factors severely hamper their ability to foster a vibrant civil society.

Can’t solve – pre-existing mentality against changing systems of governence

Boyer 6 (Alan Lee, former commander and prof, College Review, vol 59, dw: Winter 2006, da: 7-7-2011, lido)

Cultural Norms and Historical Legacies. Unlike the societies of Eastern Europe, those of Central Asia are not predisposed toward liberal modes of governance or life. The ruling elites have the same mentality they had prior to independence in 1991. Cultural norms like obedience to the clan and local leaders reinforce the authoritarian nature of their governments. Most people in the region do not have the cultural basis or experience needed to mature such liberal concepts as federalism, democracy (especially a genuine party system), free trade, or freedom of the press.42 This does not mean they cannot adopt liberal forms of governance, but it does mean that liberal institutions and ideas will require time and considerable effort to take hold. The conservative nature of the power structures in the region will continue to obstruct Western organizations, institutions, and ideas; therefore, the ability of Washington to use them as levers for reform will be limited.

Central Asia – Alt Causes

Can’t solve Central Asian stability – human rights

Boyer 6 (Alan Lee, former commander and prof, College Review, vol 59, dw: Winter 2006, da: 7-7-2011, lido)

Structural Issues. Geography, small and disconnected populations and economies, poor transportation networks, and weak institutions, combined with a generally hostile investment climate (pervasive corruption, weak rule of law, and ineffective economic structures), make it very hard for one of the West’s best tools, capitalism, to penetrate. Access to the world’s markets would likely lead to more and deeper interaction; given greater economic interaction, othe rWestern norms might penetrate that could improve governance and the overall quality of life. However, the region’s remoteness and the fragmentation of its markets tend to discourage investment, outside of the gas and oil sectors. These factors, combined with the influence of authoritarian neighbors like Russia and China, tend to impede the positive potentials of globalization and to restrict American influence. Closely related is Central Asia’s human rights record. The U.S. government and other Western entities have achieved modest success in this area, but human rights abuses seemto be standard operating procedure, especially in Uzbekistan. A case in point is that of Ruslan Sharipov, an Uzbek journalist and human rights activist convicted of what his supporters considered politically motivated and fabricated charges in August 2003. Torture, sexual assault, and other forms of abuse are common in the Uzbek penal system.43 The U.S. State Department, the Organization for Security Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), FreedomHouse, and numerous other organizations continue to document similar problems throughout Central Asia. External pressure and response to high-profile cases like Sharipov’s will help individuals, but wholesale change in the region’s poor human rights performance is unlikely any time soon. Until greater internal pressure for reform is forthcoming, the human rights outlook in Central Asia will be poor. The final implication for U.S. policy deals with the likelihood of conflict. It is unlikely that resource competition, drugs, poverty, radicalism, the criminalization of Central Asian society, the return of great-power rivalries, or other such trends will in themselves cause interstate conflict;44 however, one of them or a combination could catalyze fighting. The regimes themselves are the key factor—whether or not conflict occurs depends primarily on their ability to withstand the discontent and instability that are likely to arise in each state. Should one or more of these five states fail, conflict is likely to erupt, first within but then beyond the borders of individual countries.

Alt causes to solving stability – nearby wars cause instability

Nikolaev 9 (s., http://dlib.eastview.com/browse/doc/20578143, dw: 2009, da: 7-7-2011, lido)

Central Asia also stands out from a geostrategic perspective. It borders Russia and China, and lies in close proximity to a zone of high military-political turbulence, including Afghanistan, Iran, and Pakistan. India and the Persian Gulf are not too far away. After the September 11, 2001 events and the start of an anti-terror operation in Afghanistan, the role of the region in the international efforts to counter terrorism and extremism, and drag trafficking, which provides financial support to the first two, has grown significantly.

Central Asia – Stable Now

Central Asia is stable now – economics and trade

ETCN 9 (E-to-China, http://info.e-to-china.com/investment\_guide/71869.html, dw: 12-14-2009, da: 7-7-2011, lido)

The current situation in Central Asia is generally stable. Central Asian countries actively engaged in deepening the political and economic reforms, substantial improvements in people's livelihood and expanding contacts with foreign countries, nation-building cause has made considerable progress. As a friendly neighbor and partner, China, including Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan, Central Asian countries, including the remarkable achievements made since independence are sincerely pleased. Geographical closeness between China and Central Asian countries, cultural similarities, the traditional deep friendship and close personnel exchanges. To continuously consolidate and develop China's Central Asian countries with good-neighborly friendship and cooperative relations, the Chinese government's consistent policy, but also between China and Central Asian countries in line with the common interests of the people. China is willing to continue the spirit of mutual respect, equality and mutual benefit with the Central Asian countries to carry out pragmatic cooperation in various fields, to build peace, stability, development and harmony to make unremitting efforts to the region.

Central Asia is stable now – relations and trade agreements

ETCN 9 (E-to-China, http://info.e-to-china.com/investment\_guide/71869.html, dw: 12-14-2009, da: 7-7-2011, lido)

Wang Guangya, said that since 1992, Kazakhstan established diplomatic ties, with joint efforts, bilateral relations have maintained a good momentum of rapid and healthy development. In particular, in 2005 the Sino-Kazakh strategic partnership and long-term development of bilateral relations, pointing out the direction, planning a blueprint. In recent years, high-level exchanges between the two countries closer, deepening political mutual trust. The two sides will develop practical cooperation as an important material foundation of bilateral relations, play a geographical proximity, economic complementarity of advantages, and continuously strengthen cooperation in economy, trade, investment, energy, transportation, culture and other fields, the signing of the Sino-Kazakh cooperation in the field of non-resource planning and the implementation of action plan to jointly promote the large-scale cooperative projects have made positive progress in promoting bilateral social, economic and common development and prosperity. They also work together to jointly combat the 'three evil forces' and drug trafficking and other transnational criminal activities, the United Nations, Shanghai Cooperation Organization and other multilateral AsiaInfo maintain good cooperation within the framework of this region and world peace, stability and development make a positive contribution . During the visit to Kazakhstan, President Hu Jintao will meet with President Nursultan Nazarbayev held official talks on bilateral relations and of common concern in the international and regional issues of in-depth exchange of views. President Hu's visit will be the development of the Sino-Kazakh strategic partnership, to inject new impetus.

Central Asia is stable now - resources

Nikolaev 9 (s., http://dlib.eastview.com/browse/doc/20578143, dw: 2009, da: 7-7-2011, lido)

The geo-economic and geo-strategic value of Central Asia has been known for a long time now. With regard to the present situation it could be described as follows. The Central Asian region has huge reserves of hydrocarbons and a significant amount of other mineral resources, including deposits of non-ferrous, rare earth and precious metals (uranium, aluminum, nickel, tungsten, chromium, lead, copper, and silver). Its transit potential has an equal or perhaps even higher economic value: It could, therefore, become a key transport node for a transcontinental flow of goods between Europe and Asia. Even now major oil and gas route pass through the region. Central Asia also stands out from a geostrategic perspective. It borders Russia and China, and lies in close proximity to a zone of high military-political turbulence, including Afghanistan, Iran, and Pakistan. India and the Persian Gulf are not too far away.

\*\*China\*\*

China – No War

China forces are purely defensive – generals comments

Wong and Ansfield 11 (Edward and Jonathon, staff’s, http://www.nytimes.com/2011/04/01/world/asia/01china.html?\_r=2, dw: 3-31-2011, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

 It stressed that China’s military buildup was purely defensive, a position Chinese leaders have long taken. The paper had more detail than previous editions on China’s efforts to establish confidence-building measures with foreign militaries. In the past year, perceptions by foreign countries of China’s military growth and of a more assertive foreign policy have resulted in diplomatic discord and discomfort, particularly between China and the United States. “China attaches importance to its military relationship with the United States and has made ongoing efforts towards building a sound military relationship,” Senior Col. Geng Yansheng said at a news conference on Thursday. “The Chinese military is now taking steps to advance exchanges with the U.S. military this year.” But “there’s no denying that in developing military relations, we still face difficulties and challenges,” Colonel Geng added.

China doesn’t have the capibilities to have a war and relats check

Prueher 98 (Joseph, Commander in chief of Pacific Command, interviewed, JFQ, dw: Autumn/Winter 98 da: 7-9-2011, lido)

China is modernizing its military. As “paid pessimists,” the PACOM staff is watching carefully. But China will not possess a power projection capability that could threaten U.S. interests for at least a decade and a half. We are pursuing a long-haul, balanced national policy of constructive engagement with China to encourage its emergence as a secure, prosperous, and nonthreatening member of the international community. Increased Chinese transparency on security objectives and military modernization would help reassure the region. Contacts between the U.S. military and the People’s Liberation Army have expanded significantly in the last year. These exchanges are important. As President Jiang Zemin said to me during his recent visit to Hawaii, “Before we can build trust, we need to build understanding.” Expanding relations among officers who will lead the next generation is especially important. The trend of U.S.-Chinese relations is steadily upward, although perturbations can be expected. Common interests in regional peace and security outweigh our differences. Successful management of relations among the United States, Japan, and China is likely to be the principal determinant of regional peace and security in the decades ahead.

China won’t go to war – they have too much at risk, history

Hellyer 9 (Marcus, worked for DoD, http://www.defence.gov.au/jetwc/docs/publications%202010/Publctns\_050310\_IstheExpansionofChinese.pdf, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

China under the Communist Party has not been a pacifist power and has been willing to use force even beyond its borders.10 Nevertheless, there is little evidence to suggest that China is developing its military power in order to use it against its neighbours ‐ with the potential exception of Taiwan noted earlier. China has been very active in presenting a peaceful image of itself to the world. President Hu Jintao has used the term ‘harmonious world’ to describe China’s model of international relations and Zheng Bijian developed the term ‘peaceful rise’ to describe China’s development.11 The latest Chinese defence White Paper adopts this terminology stating that ‘China is unswervingly taking the road of peaceful development…endeavouring to build, together with other countries, a harmonious world of enduring peace and common prosperity.12 While Chinese statements should not be taken at face value, they should not be dismissed as mere rhetoric. There is considerable incentive for China to avoid conflict that would interfere with its continued economic growth. The need to maintain the international conditions necessary for economic growth has become a central goal of Chinese foreign policy.13 China has shown itself quite willing to peacefully resolve – or at least manage – disputes with its maritime neighbours. Indeed, its focus on avoiding conflict to permit development predates Hu Jintao and motivated its moderate behaviour over the South China Seas territorial disputes with ASEAN members in the 1990s. China acceded to the ASEAN code of conduct for the South China Sea and has embarked on joint resource development projects there with ASEAN members.14 Similarly, while China’s territorial disputes with Japan in the East China Sea have not been fully resolved, the two countries have declared East China Sea a sea of ‘peace, stability and cooperation’ and reached agreement on the joint development of gas fields.15

China – No War

China won’t go to war

Federation of American Scientists 6 (http://www.nukestrat.com/china/Book-15-34.pdf, dwL 11-30-2006, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

The tone of the reports, however, has changed considerably during the current Bush administration. The 1997 report during the Clinton era described significant developments in China’s modernization, but made a cautious overall projection: Evidence suggests … that China will develop her military strength at a measured pace. A more rapid or large-scale military build-up is seen by the Chinese leadership as unnecessary and detrimental to continued economic growth.... China’s nuclear strategy probably will continue to emphasize the development of a nuclear retaliatory capability as a deterrent against the potential use of nuclear weapons by existing nuclear weapons states. Ongoing ballistic missile modernization encompasses a shift from liquid to solid fuel missiles.43

China won’t go to war – no political will

Moore 6 (Scott, Research assistant, http://www.nti.org/e\_research/e3\_80.html, dw: 10-18-2006, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

The new generation of Chinese leaders, which has risen to power in the aftermath of the 1989 Tiananmen Square incident (liu si), has tended to consist of moderate technocrats,[10] who are unlikely to support radical policy reversals, such as the use of nuclear weapons. Chinese politics in general have also evolved into a "more pragmatic, risk-adverse" form.[11] This process was initiated by the rise of "interest group politics" during the tenure of President Jiang Zemin.[12] This new structure of decision-making involves the specialization of bureaucratic institutions, which have become more assertive, and occasionally resisted high-level decisions they believed to be ill conceived.[13] It is probable that certain institutions, such as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, would strongly resist the actual or threatened use of nuclear weapons against the United States in almost any situation. In a risk-adverse policy environment that seeks consensus, this kind of strong opposition may well prevail. It thus appears unlikely that any impetus for the use of nuclear weapons in a conflict with the United States would come from within the established Chinese policymaking apparatus. There are suggestions, however, that pressure for the actual or threatened use of nuclear weapons against the United States may come from outside China's policymaking elite, via a phenomenon that may be termed "hyper-nationalism."[14] The gradual expansion of freedom of speech in China has revealed some truly radical nationalistic perspectives, ranging from a kind of Chinese lebensraum (sheng cun kong jian)[15] to allegations of a kind of racist plot in Western policy towards China.[16] In a crisis situation, there are suggestions that such hyper-nationalism may exert significant pressure on policymakers to respond with an aggressive response, which could include nuclear weapons.

China – No Nukes

China can’t strike - NFU

Yunzhu 5 (Yao, phd, Strategic Insights, http://www.nps.edu/Academics/centers/ccc/publications/OnlineJournal/2005/Sep/yaoSep05.html, dw: Sep 2010, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

No first use (NFU) has been most frequently and consistently repeated in numerous Chinese government statements ever since China became a nuclear weapon state in 1964. By conceding the first use option, China has limited itself to retaliatory nuclear use only. China has also called all nuclear weapon states to commit themselves to a NFU policy at any time and in any circumstances.

China’s nuclear arsenal is mainly for deterrent effect, not for use in wars

Yunzhu 5 (Yao, phd, Strategic Insights, http://www.nps.edu/Academics/centers/ccc/publications/OnlineJournal/2005/Sep/yaoSep05.html, dw: Sep 2010, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

China has repeated its intention to maintain a very small nuclear arsenal on many occasions. In its 2003 Defense White Paper, China states that it “has always exercised utmost restraint on the development of nuclear weapons, and its nuclear arsenal is kept at the lowest level necessary for self-defense only.”[1] However, to make this small arsenal a credible deterrent, China has to make it survivable to a first nuclear strike, even that strike is overwhelming and devastating. In Chinese literature, “few but effective” (jinggan youxiao) are the words most frequently used to describe its necessary arsenal.

China won’t use nukes – too small of arsenal

Federation of American Scientists 6 (http://www.nukestrat.com/china/Book-15-34.pdf, dwL 11-30-2006, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

Some of the most important elements of the U.S. claims about Chinese nuclear weapons modernizations come from the CIA’s National Intelligence Estimates (NIEs), which occasionally are published in unclassified versions. The most important of these is the Foreign Missile Developments and the Ballistic Missile Threat Through 2015, published in December 2001, which contained what has since become the standard projection for the future size of Chinese nuclear forces: The Debate Over China’s Nuclear Modernization | 21 The intelligence community projects that Chinese ballistic missile forces will increase several-fold by 2015, but Beijing’s future ICBM force deployed primarily against the United States – which will number around 75 to 100 warheads – will remain considerably smaller and less capable than the strategic missile forces of Russia and the United States.47

China has taken a stance against using nuclear weapons

Yunzhu 5 (Yao, phd, Strategic Insights, http://www.nps.edu/Academics/centers/ccc/publications/OnlineJournal/2005/Sep/yaoSep05.html, dw: Sep 2010, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

China first called for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons in its proposal for a world summit in1963, before its first nuclear explosion. On the same day of China’s first nuclear explosion, it again stated that “the Chinese government hereby solemnly proposes to the governments of the world that a summit conference of all the countries of the world be convened to discuss the questions of the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons, and that as the first step, the summit conference conclude an agreement to the effect that the nuclear powers and those countries which may soon become nuclear powers undertake not to use nuclear weapons either against non-nuclear countries and nuclear-free zones or against each other."[2] This has evolved into China’s basic position on nuclear disarmament and it has never given up its efforts to promote an international convention to ban nuclear weapons.

China – No Nukes

China won’t use its nuclear weapons

Yunzhu 5 (Yao, phd, Strategic Insights, http://www.nps.edu/Academics/centers/ccc/publications/OnlineJournal/2005/Sep/yaoSep05.html, dw: Sep 2010, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

Mao Zedong, in elaborating China's reason to develop nuclear weapons, said “we will not only have possession of more aircraft and artillery pieces, but also atom bombs. In today’s world, we must have this thing if we don’t want to be bullied by others.”[3] The original purpose of nuclear development in China was to “break up the nuclear threat and smash the nuclear blackmail (dabuo he weixie, fensui he ezha).” As a political instrument, nuclear weapons are to be utilized mainly at the level of grand strategy, not as a winning tool in military operations. The military value of nuclear weapons lies only in its deterrent effect against nuclear attack. The officially declared missions of the Second Artillery Force are twofold: To deter the use of nuclear weapons against China, and To launch an effective nuclear counter-attack in the case of such an attack.[4] No distinction has been made in categorizing nuclear operations. A nuclear strike against China—whether conducted at strategic, operational or tactical level, with high or low yield warheads, or deadly or tolerable lethality—is perceived as the utmost form of warfare in Chinese war categorization, which must be responded strategically. In Chinese strategic literature, we only see the discussion on how to deter a nuclear war from happening, on how to prevent a conventional conflict from escalating into a nuclear war, and how to retaliate after suffering a nuclear attack—but never how to win a nuclear war. The primary Chinese perception is that nuclear wars are not to be won, but to be prevented. Retaliatory—Rather than Denial—Deterrence[5] Many Chinese cite Deng Xiaoping when explaining China's nuclear thinking. He explained, in a meeting with foreigners in 1983: "While you have some deterrence force, we also have some; but we don't want much. It will do just to possess it. Things like strategic weapons and deterrence forces are there to scare others. They must not be used first. But our possession will have some effect. The limited possession of nuclear weapons itself exert some pressure. It remains our position that we will develop a little (nuclear weapons). But the development will be limited. We have said repeatedly that our small amount (of nuclear weapons) is nothing. It is only to show that we also have what you have. If you want to destroy us, you yourself have to suffer some punishment at the same time."[6]

China won’t use nuke’s – the nuke’s are just for deterrence effects

National Intelligence Council 99 (http://www.fas.org/irp/nic/china\_wmd.html, dw: 11-5-1999, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

Third, we find that the evolution over time of China's doctrine and force structure is the story of trying to close the gap between real capability, on the one hand, and what one might call "aspirational doctrine" on the other. In the United States, the appropriate analog would be a comparison of current operational doctrine, as outlined in the Joint Doctrine publications series, with an aspirational doctrine, such as Joint Vision 2010. In the Chinese case, the discontinuity between reality and aspiration is of times referred to as the "capabilities-doctrine gap." At the present stage in the Second Artillery's modernization, China is nearing an historic convergence between doctrine and capability, allowing it to increasingly achieve a degree of credible minimal deterrence vis-à-vis the continental United States--a convergence of its doctrine and capability it has not confidently possessed since the weaponization of China's nuclear program in the mid-1960s.

China – No Nukes

Won’t go to war – China knows it’s outarmed

Moore 6 (Scott, Research assistant, http://www.nti.org/e\_research/e3\_80.html, dw: 10-18-2006, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

The last few years have witnessed growing concern over China's nuclear weapons posture. A succession of United States government reports[1] have expressed alarm over the evolving Chinese nuclear doctrine, as well as the modernization of nuclear forces. This interest has been paralleled by a vibrant discussion in the media, particularly within the United States. Prominent in this discussion have been concerns over the increasing capabilities of China's nuclear weapons, and possible revisions to China's long-standing pledge not conduct a first strike using nuclear weapons[2] (the so-called "No First Use" doctrine or bu shouxian shiyong). Despite the tumult, there is broad consensus among experts that the concerns generated in this discussion are exaggerated. The size of the Chinese nuclear arsenal is small, estimated at around 200 warheads;[3] Jeffrey Lewis, a prominent arms control expert, claims that 80 is a realistic number of deployed warheads.[4] In contrast, the United States has upwards of 10,000 warheads, some 5,700 of which are operationally deployed.[5] Even with projected improvements and the introduction of a new long-range Intercontinental Ballistic Missile, the DF-31A China's nuclear posture is likely to remain one of "minimum deterrence."[6] Similarly, despite concern to the contrary, there is every indication that China is extremely unlikely to abandon its No First Use (NFU) pledge.[7] The Chinese government has continued to deny any change to the NFU policy, a claim substantiated by many Chinese academic observers.[8] In sum, then, fears over China's current nuclear posture seem somewhat exaggerated. This document, therefore, does not attempt to discuss whether China's nuclear posture poses a probable, general threat to the United States; most signs indicate that even in the longer term, it does not. Rather, it seeks to analyze the most likely scenarios for nuclear conflict. Two such possible scenarios are identified in particular: a declaration of independence by Taiwan that is supported by the United States, and the acquisition by Japan of a nuclear weapons capability.

China – No Nukes

China won’t use nukes – history, deterrence

Tertrais 1 (Bruno, CSIS, research fellow, The Washington Quarterly, vol 24, da: 7-7-2011, lido)

What about China? Certainly, here lies one of the most pressing concerns of Western policymakers and observers: that the declared U.S. intention to deploy robust missile defenses may prompt China to increase the number of its strategic nuclear weapons dramatically. U.S. official estimates indicate that a tenfold expansion of the Chinese strategic nuclear arsenal is possible. 10 Given the importance of U.S. strategy in Beijing's strategic calculus, Beijing is likely ready to take the necessary measures to maintain its "don't mess with me" (i.e., minimum) deterrent capability vis-à-vis the United States. Given the uncertainties about the U.S. missile defense program, China probably has the means to ensure that the United States could never be confident that it is protected against any significant Chinese strike. Most analysts agree that, although U.S. missile defenses will affect the pace and scope of Chinese modernization that has been on track for a long time, it will not affect the existence of the modernization but may, at its worst, make it "more unpredictable." 11 Beijing has a long historical record of developing strategic programs very slowly; the Chinese leadership may be wary of entering into a competition that it may perceive--whatever the reality--as having been lethal to the Soviet Union. [End Page 128] Thus, for many reasons, China is likely to "jog" with rather than race with the United States. 12

\*\*Competitiveness\*\*

Competitiveness Down

Competitiveness low now- reduced spending on science research and innovation

Duncan 5 (Robert, Associate dean for research in the College of Arts and Sciences, University of New Mexico, 6/22, http://www.abqjournal.com/opinion/guest\_columns/363884opinion06-22-05.htm 7/8/11) HD

In the United States, our investments in basic research in the physical sciences are lagging, resulting in fewer and fewer of America's brightest getting doctorates in these fields. Industrial CEOs are beginning to discover what many science and engineering deans have known for the last few years, namely that foreign-trained scientists and engineers are generally every bit as capable on graduation as their counterparts educated within the United States. Craig Barrett, CEO of Intel, New Mexico's largest manufacturer with more than 5,000 employees, warns that high-tech companies will put new plants where the talent is. Since we can't compete on wages or population numbers, we must strengthen our stagnant federal investment in physical science research to make certain that we remain the world's leader in scientific discovery and innovation. Aside from the National Institutes of Health, the Bush administration's proposed budget for fiscal year 2006 would reduce spending on scientific research by 2 percent. Taking into account inflation, our level of scientific effort would decline by 5 percent. For the Department of Energy's Office of Science, the largest federal sponsor of research in the physical sciences, the proposed cut is even steeper: 4 percent in real dollars or 7 percent with inflation. Such a reduction would seriously undermine U.S. science leadership and concede even more canvas to our competitors in the global economic ring.

A2: Competitiveness

Competitiveness is a subtler problem than assumed by their authors

Krugman 91 (Paul, Prof of Econ @ MIT, Science New Series Vol. 254 No. 5033, 11/8/91, pp. 811-815, JSTOR) HD

There are valid reasons for concern over U.S. international competitiveness, but they are not what most people think. The common fear is that an economy that fails to keep up with its trading partners will suffer severe economic damage-incurable trade deficits, large-scale unemployment, perhaps economic collapse. This fear is unjustified. Both in theory and in practice, countries with lagging productivity are still able to balance their international trade, because what drives trade is comparative rather than absolute advantage. Maintaining productivity growth and technological progress is extremely important; but it is important for its own sake, not because it is necessary to keep up with international competition. The real competitive issue is subtler. There is no question that in many cases comparative advantage arises from self-reinforcing ex- ternal economies rather than as a result of underlying national resources. In such cases international competition may exclude a country from an industry in which it could have established a comparative advantage,or drive a country from an industry in which comparative advantage could have been maintained. In these cases, a intellectually respectable argument can be made for government policies to create or preserve advantage. The fact that an argument is intellectually respectable does not mean that it is right. Concerns over competitiveness that are valid in principle can be and have been misused or abused in practice. Competitiveness is both a subtler and a more problematic issue than is generally understood.

Competitiveness fails- differing definitions and rankings

Li 8 (Xin, ARC internal seminar, Sept 16, “An Analysis of National Competitiveness of China”) HD

First, despite many contributions, there are no widely-accepted definition (Boltho, 1996) and theory of competitiveness of nations (Aiginger, 2006). Second, the two high-profile world competitiveness reports by WEF and IMD gave very different rankings of China, 34th and 15th respectively, for the year of 2007. Third, given the reality, some economists even think the concept of national competitiveness meaningless (Krugman, 1994) because different people use it to mean different things. We argue, although there has been a lack of consensus on its meaning and measurement, national competitiveness is nevertheless an important issue and a useful way to integrate many different branches of thinking regarding economic development and competition. In Lall’s (2000) view, national competitiveness is a real issue that can be defined and measured.

Competitiveness is a vague, meaningless term that refers to industrial competition

Schnabel 97 (Morton, June, http://www.esa.doc.gov/sites/default/files/reports/documents/

internationalcompetitiveness\_0.pdf 7/7/11) HD

Some economists consider the idea of national competitiveness a vague, if not a meaningless concept. Ultimately, competitive advantage rests at the industry level. Rather than looking at aggregate measures of national competitiveness, many researchers examine firms and industries to determine what gives certain countries advantages in certain industries and what policies government can pursue or change to give their domestic industries a competitive edge.

A2: Competitiveness

Competitiveness isn’t effective- too many definitions

Lawrence 2 (Robert Z., Professor @ Harvard, http://www.econlib.org/library/Enc1/

Competitiveness.html 7/7/11) HD

Competitiveness," particularly with reference to an entire economy, is hard to define. Indeed, competitiveness, like love or democracy, actually has several meanings. And the question "Is America competitive?" has at least three interpretations: How well is the United States performing compared to other countries? How well has America performed in international trade? Are we doing the best we can?

Countries don’t compete- shared markets and transfer of goods

Krugman 94 (Paul, Prof of Econ @ MIT, Foreign Affairs Vol. 73, no. 2, March/April 1994, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/49684/paul-krugman/competitiveness-a-dangerous-obsession) HD

Moreover, countries do not compete with each other the way corporations do. Coke and Pepsi are almost purely rivals: only a negligible fraction of Coca-Cola's sales go to Pepsi workers, only a negligible fraction of the goods Coca-Cola workers buy are Pepsi products. So if Pepsi is successful, it tends to be at Coke's expense. But the major industrial countries, while they sell products that compete with each other, are also each other's main export markets and each other's main suppliers of useful imports. If the European economy does well, it need not be at U.S. expense; indeed, if anything a successful European economy is likely to help the U.S. economy by providing it with larger markets and selling it goods of superior quality at lower prices.

Countries don’t compete- one country’s economic growth doesn’t trigger another’s downturn

Krugman 94 (Paul, Prof of Econ @ MIT, Foreign Affairs Vol. 73, no. 2, March/April 1994, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/49684/paul-krugman/competitiveness-a-dangerous-obsession) HD

International trade, then, is not a zero-sum game. When productivity rises in Japan, the main result is a rise in Japanese real wages; American or European wages are in principle at least as likely to rise as to fall, and in practice seem to be virtually unaffected. It would be possible to belabor the point, but the moral is clear: while competitive problems could arise in principle, as a practical, empirical matter the major nations of the world are not to any significant degree in economic competition with each other. Of course, there is always a rivalry for status and power -- countries that grow faster will see their political rank rise. So it is always interesting to compare countries. But asserting that Japanese growth diminishes U.S. status is very different from saying that it reduces the U.S. standard of living -- and it is the latter that the rhetoric of competitiveness asserts.

A2: Competitiveness – No Solvency—Single-Issue

The plan alone can’t solve for the complexities of competitiveness

Li 8 (Xin, ARC internal seminar, Sept 16, “An Analysis of National Competitiveness of China”) HD

However, the ranking-by-a-single-index way of analyzing competitiveness of nations is inappropriate for three reasons: first, a single index can hardly capture the subtlety of such a complex phenomenon of national competitiveness (Buckley, Pass and Prescott, 1988; Yap, 2004); second, competitiveness is not a static concept therefore a single index alone cannot explain the dynamics of competitiveness (Buckley et al., 1988); third, the common methodological problems built in the designs of the Reports (Lall, 2001) can hardly be resolved.

The plan fails- not a broad-based overhaul of competitiveness

Porter 90 (Michael E., Institute for Strategy and Competitiveness, Harvard Business School, http://www.food-mac.com/Doc/200312/WorldEcoForum/Report03-04/BCI\_Chapter.pdf 7/7/11) HD

Successful economic development requires progress on multiple fronts simultaneously. Reform efforts need to be tightly connected to the country’s current stage of development.As an economy progresses, the constraints to its continued advancement shift.At strategic points in the development process, the whole basis of national competitiveness must be transformed. Many aspects of company strategy must be shifted and new requirements in the national business environment must be met. Our analysis provides the conceptual fram ework and comparative data to define such national agendas and to measure progress.

A single plan won’t solve- competitiveness is too far reaching

Porter 90 (Michael E., Institute for Strategy and Competitiveness, Harvard Business School, http://www.food-mac.com/Doc/200312/WorldEcoForum/Report03-04/BCI\_Chapter.pdf 7/7/11) HD

As the diamond framework reveals, almost everything matters for competitiveness.The schools matter, the roads matter, the financial markets matter, customer sophistication matters, among many other aspects of a nation’s circumstances, many of which are deeply rooted in a nation’s institutions, people, and culture.This makes improving competitiveness a special challenge, because there is no single policy or grand step that can create competitiveness, only many improvements in individual areas that inevitably take time to accomplish. Improving competitiveness is a marathon, not a sprint. How to sustain momentum in competitiveness improvements over time is among the greatest challenges facing countries.

No single policy solves competitiveness

Garelli 11 (Stéphane, President at IMD, Director of the World Competitiveness Center, http://www.imd.org/research/centers/wcc/upload/Fundamentals.pdf 7/7/11) HD

There is no single “recipe” for competitiveness. Various policies can be benchmarked and then each individual country needs to adapt them to their own environment. Competitiveness strategies succeed when they balance the economic imperatives imposed by world markets with the social requirements of a nation formed by history, value systems, and tradition.

A2: Competitiveness – No Solvency—Single-Issue

Institutional change is key to solving competitiveness

Porter 90 (Michael E., Institute for Strategy and Competitiveness, Harvard Business School, http://www.food-mac.com/Doc/200312/WorldEcoForum/Report03-04/BCI\_Chapter.pdf 7/7/11) HD

The disappointing results of past efforts suggest the need to rethink and restructure international development assistance.The aims, the institutional structure, and the process all must be redesigned. In the context of this Report, we focus on the aims of development aid.The goal of poverty reduction has taken prominence among development agencies in recent years, reflecting the view that aid must benefit the poor rather than enrich the elites in developing countries.The World Bank, for example, is requiring Poverty Reduction Strategies to qualify for the Bank’s concessional assistance. While this approach is laudable in many respects, it also carries a risk. Efforts to alleviate poverty that are unsustainable can gravitate to social spending and subsidies to disadvantaged groups. A better goal is to improve income, jobs, and wealth that is widely shared.This places the focus where it must be: on building a viable and competitive economy.Aid agencies must step up their attention to competitiveness relative to other agendas. Improvements in macroeconomic stability, political stability, and social conditions that are sustainable all depend, in the medium and long term, on having a competitive economy. Otherwise, any progress in these areas is temporary, as we have learned over and over again. New institutional structures will be necessary to advance competitiveness.These must include not only national governments but also need to incorporate the roles of business, educational organizations, regional governments, and other institutions. National competitiveness committees including these players should have formal responsibilities for planning and monitoring competitiveness programs.Aid must be based on objective national competitiveness assessments, not donor priorities.

A2: Competitiveness – Offense

Turn- focus on competitiveness causes ineffective spending

Krugman 94 (Paul, Prof of Econ @ MIT, Foreign Affairs Vol. 73, no. 2, March/April 1994, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/49684/paul-krugman/competitiveness-a-dangerous-obsession) HD

During the 1950s, fear of the Soviet Union induced the U.S. goverment to spend money on useful things like highways and science education. It also, however, led to considerable spending on more doubtful items like bomb shelters. The most obvious if least worrisome danger of the growing obsession with competitiveness is that it might lead to a similar misallocation of resources. To take an example, recent guidelines for government research funding have stressed the importance of supporting research that can improve U.S. international competitiveness. This exerts at least some bias toward inventions that can help manufacturing firms, which generally compete on international markets, rather than service producers, which generally do not. Yet most of our employment and value-added is now in services, and lagging productivity in services rather than manufactures has been the single most important factor in the stagnation of U.S. living standards.

Turn- focus on competitiveness causes trade conflict that goes nuclear

Krugman 94 (Paul, Prof of Econ @ MIT, Foreign Affairs Vol. 73, no. 2, March/April 1994, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/49684/paul-krugman/competitiveness-a-dangerous-obsession) HD

A much more serious risk is that the obsession with competitiveness will lead to trade conflict, perhaps even to a world trade war. Most of those who have preached the doctrine of competitiveness have not been old-fashioned protectionists. They want their countries to win the global trade game, not drop out. But what if, despite its best efforts, a country does not seem to be winning, or lacks confidence that it can? Then the competitive diagnosis inevitably suggests that to close the borders is better than to risk having foreigners take away high-wage jobs and high-value sectors. At the very least, the focus on the supposedly competitive nature of international economic relations greases the rails for those who want confrontational if not frankly protectionist policies. We can already see this process at work, in both the United States and Europe. In the United States, it was remarkable how quickly the sophisticated interventionist arguments advanced by Laura Tyson in her published work gave way to the simple-minded claim by U.S. Trade Representative Mickey Kantor that Japan's bilateral trade surplus was costing the United States millions of jobs. And the trade rhetoric of President Clinton, who stresses the supposed creation of high-wage jobs rather than the gains from specialization, left his administration in a weak position when it tried to argue with the claims of NAFTA foes that competition from cheap Mexican labor will destroy the U.S. manufacturing base.

Turn- focus on competitiveness destroys policymaking’s effectiveness

Krugman 94 (Paul, Prof of Econ @ MIT, Foreign Affairs Vol. 73, no. 2, March/April 1994, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/49684/paul-krugman/competitiveness-a-dangerous-obsession) HD

Perhaps the most serious risk from the obsession with competitiveness, however, is its subtle indirect effect on the quality of economic discussion and policymaking. If top government officials are strongly committed to a particular economic doctrine, their commitment inevitably sets the tone for policy-making on all issues, even those which may seem to have nothing to do with that doctrine. And if an economic doctrine is flatly, completely and demonstrably wrong, the insistence that discussion adhere to that doctrine inevitably blurs the focus and diminishes the quality of policy discussion across a broad range of issues, including some that are very far from trade policy per se.

A2: Competitiveness – No Impact – A2: Econ

Competitiveness not key to econ- exports are only 10% of the economy

Krugman 94 (Paul, Prof of Econ @ MIT, Foreign Affairs Vol. 73, no. 2, March/April 1994, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/49684/paul-krugman/competitiveness-a-dangerous-obsession) HD

How can this be in our interdependent world? Part of the answer is that the world is not as interdependent as you might think: countries are nothing at all like corporations. Even today, U.S. exports are only 10 percent of the value-added in the economy (which is equal to gnp). That is, the United States is still almost 90 percent an economy that produces goods and services for its own use. By contrast, even the largest corporation sells hardly any of its output to its own workers; the "exports" of General Motors -- its sales to people who do not work there -- are virtually all of its sales, which are more than 2.5 times the corporation's value-added.

A2: Competitiveness – No Impact – A2: Heg

Competitiveness is not key to hege- empirically denied- institutions and public interest key

Ferguson 3 (Niall, Herzog prof of financial history @ NYU, Foreign Affairs, Jan/Feb, JSTOR) HD

Not necessarily. It's tempting to assume that power is synonymous with a large economy- that big GDP equals big power. Hence many analysts point to China's huge economy and rapid growth as evidence that the country will soon gain superpower rank, if it hasn't already. Just project forward the average annual growth rates of the past 30 years, and Chinese GDP will equal that of the United States and exceed that of the EU within just two decades. But GDP doesn't stand for great diplomatic power. If institutions aren't in place to translate economic output into military hardware-and if the economy grows faster than public interest in foreign affairs-then product is nothing more than potential power. The United States overtook Great Britain in terms of GDP in the 1870s. But it was not until World War I that the United States finally overtook the British Empire as a global power.

\*\*Democracy

Democracy Up

Democracy high now- revolutions in the Arab world and North Africa

Friedman 11 (Dr. George, Chief Executive Officer and founder of STRATFOR, March 21, http://www.stratfor.com/weekly/20110321-libya-west-narrative-democracy 7/9/11) HD

To understand this logic, it is essential to begin by considering recent events in North Africa and the Arab world and the manner in which Western governments interpreted them. Beginning with Tunisia, spreading to Egypt and then to the Arabian Peninsula, the last two months have seen widespread unrest in the Arab world. Three assumptions have been made about this unrest. The first was that it represented broad-based popular opposition to existing governments, rather than representing the discontent of fragmented minorities — in other words, that they were popular revolutions. Second, it assumed that these revolutions had as a common goal the creation of a democratic society. Third, it assumed that the kind of democratic society they wanted was similar to European-American democracy, in other words, a constitutional system supporting Western democratic values.

Democracy’s on the rise with the Middle East catching up

Kimball 11 (Spencer, 6/14, http://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0,,15146939,00.html, 7/9/11) HD

For decades, the Arab world stagnated under authoritarianism despite a global expansion of democracy beyond its historic core in North America and Western Europe. According to the US think tank Freedom House, the number of democracies in the world more than doubled by the new millennium, as communism collapsed and strongmen from Latin America to Southeast Asia were forced from power. Although the Middle East appeared immune to this liberalizing trend, popular uprisings now referred to as the "Arab Spring" have successfully forced authoritarian regimes from power in Tunisia and Egypt, demonstrating that even political heavyweights like former Egyptian president Hosni Mubarak are ultimately accountable to the people. "We're seeing in a sense the global spread of the aspirations for democracy finally coming to the surface in the Arab world," Jack Goldstone, an expert on revolutions with George Mason University in Arlington, Virginia, told Deutsche Welle.

Democracy Down

Democracy low now- Obama’s unilateral action in Libya circumvented Congress and the democratic process

Kucinich 11 (Dennis, Democratic House Representative, July 6, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2011/jul/06/libya-nato1 7/9/11) HD

First, the war is illegal under the United States constitution and our War Powers Act, because only the US Congress has the authority to declare war and the president has been unable to show that the US faced an imminent threat from Libya. The president even ignored his top legal advisers at the Pentagon and the department of justice who insisted he needed congressional approval before bombing Libya.

Obama’s actions in Libya were undemocratic

Nichols 11 (John, Washington correspondent for the Nation, March 21, http://www.npr.org

/2011/03/21/134730963/the-nation-in-libya-us-forgot-about-congress, 7/9/11) HD

President Obama's approval of an intervention in Libya has also skipped the Congress. Was this necessary? Of course not. Obama could have consulted Congress; indeed, if the issue was pressing, he could have asked that the House and Senate be called into session over the weekend. Had the president gone to the Congress, it is doubtful that he would have met with opposition. As noted above, Gadhafi has few defenders. Consulting Congress does not mean that Congress will block a war. The constitutional system of checks and balances was not established merely to stop wars; it was established to allow members of Congress to add their insights, to propose timelines, to set limits and parameters for military initiatives. The debate, the discussion, the sifting and winnowing of information: This is the point. Unfortunately, it is a point that Obama has missed. The United States is now deep into what CNN calls the "Libya War," yet there has been no congressional debate, no advice or consent, no checks and balances. The Republic was well served by the drafters of a constitution, who gave the war-making power to Congress. They were wise, and right, to do so. And any president who fails to consult congress before engaging in warmaking ill serves the founding document and the republic.

Democracy – No Impact – Resilient

Impeachments prove the integrity and effectiveness of governments and the rule of law

Congressional Record 98 (Proceedings and Debates of the 105th Congress Second Session, October 19 to December 19, volume 144: part 19) HD

There is no doubt about it, Mr. Speaker, this is a difficult day. And yet it is really a day of affirmation, a day that says our system of government works. We are showing the world that our democracy is resilient. It deals fairly and it deals effectively with a leader who fails in his responsibilities. Mr. Speaker, today we are defending the rule of law and we are letting freedom work in the lives of Americans. This is tough for all of us. We are all saddened by it, but we will complete this work on this day and then we will go on. We will go on in a great Nation and we will go on in a government that once again strives to hold and preserve and assert its integrity along with its authority. For Mr. Speaker, this vote today is not about the character of a Nation. And, Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for the articles of impeachment and I intend to vote for the rule of law.

Democracy is resilient- empirically proven

Esler 98 (Gavin, award-winning broadcaster with the BBC, December 19, http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/cruise-missiles-wont-stop-the-dangers-facing-us-democracy-1192200.html 7/9/11) HD

America's democracy is resilient. The republic has survived the Civil War and civil rights, the surprise attack on Pearl Harbour and being torn apart by Vietnam. Americans endured the national tragedy of Watergate. They will surely endure the national farce of the Lewinsky scandal. For Nixon it was once a profoundly serious question of what did the President know and when did he know it. For many Americans that has been replaced by the Clinton question of what did the President touch and when did he touch it.

A2: Democ Solves War

Democracy doesn’t prevent wars- Israel and India prove

Shaw 0 (Martin, professor of international relations at University of Sussex, http://www.sussex.ac.uk/

Users/hafa3/democracy.htm 7/8/11) HD

In the global era, established liberal-democratic states do not fight each other. But once again, it obvious that this is not simply because they are democracies, but because they are embedded in the raft of common Western and global state institutions. Indeed it is not just liberal democracies which do not fight each other: the major non-Western states (Russia, China, India, Brazil, etc.), whether democratic or not, are not likely to fight with the dominant Western powers. Outside the Western core of global state power, however, national centres are more weakly integrated with its institutional structures, and regional institutions which might inhibit local conflicts are much weaker than they are in the core. In the Cold War era, interstate rivalries between major regional powers - such as between Russia and China, India and Pakistan and China, Indonesia and Malaysia, Iran and Iraq, Israel and the Arab states - led to wars and border incidents. While the integrative tendencies in the emerging global polity, including the democratisation trends, may increasingly inhibit wars, it clearly remains possible that such interstate rivalries will generate new wars. It is clear that democratisation in itself is not a guarantee of war-avoidance in such conficts. Israel, the only internally democratic state in the Middle East, has also been the most belligerent; Indian democracy has been quite compatible with bellicosity towards Pakistan. Democratic as well as military governments may see war, so long as it can be kept limited and relatively cost-free, as a means of boosting popularity. Thus Yeltsin’s Russia sought a military solution in the breakaway republic of Chechnya, despite the lessons of the late-Soviet failure in Afghanistan. Only in defeat did Russia’s weak democracy penalise the regime for the new disaster, and then not decisively.

Democracy doesn’t prevent violence- genocides occur within states

Ferguson 6 (Niall, Laurence A. Tisch Professor of History at Harvard, Senior Fellow of the Hoover Institution, “The War of the World”, p. xxxviii)

Did it matter how states were governed? It has become fashionable among political scientists to posit a correlation between democracy and peace, on the ground that democracies tend not to go to war with one another. On that basis, of course, the long-run rise of democracy during the twentieth century should have reduced the incidence of war. It may have reduced the incidence of war between states; there is, however, at least some evidence that waves of democratization in the 1920s, 1960s, and 1980s were followed by increases in the number of civil wars and wars of secession. This brings us to a central point. To consider twentieth-century conflict purely in terms of warfare between states is to overlook the importance of organized violence within states. The most notorious example is, of course, the war waged by the Nazis and their collaborators against the Jews, nearly six million of whom perished. The Nazis simultaneously sought to annihilate a variety of other social groups deemed to be ‘unworthy of life’, notably mentally ill and homosexual Germans, the social elite of occupied Poland and the Sinti and Roma peoples. In all, more than three million people from these other groups were murdered. Prior to these events, Stalin had perpetrated comparable acts of violence against national minorities within the Soviet Union as well as executing or incarcerating millions of Russians guilty or merely suspected of political dissidence. Of around four million non-Russians who were deported to Siberia and Central Asia, at least 1.6 million are estimated to have died as a result of the hardships inflicted on them. A minimum estimate for the total victims of all political violence in the Soviet Union between 1928 and 1953 is twenty-one million. Yet genocide predated totalitarianism. As we shall see, the policies of forced resettlement and deliberate murder directed against Christian minorities in the last years of the Ottoman Empire amounted to genocide according to the 1948 definition of the term.

Evidence for democracies preventing war is circumstantial at best

Walt 99 (Steven M., Professor of Political Science, January/February, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/54641/stephen-m-walt/never-say-never-wishful-thinking-on-democracy-and-war?page=3, 7/8/11) HD

Critics of the democratic-peace hypothesis make two main counterarguments. Their first line of attack holds that the apparent pacifism between democracies may be a statistical artifact: because democracies have been relatively rare throughout history, the absence of wars between them may be due largely to chance. Evidence for a democratic peace also depends on the time periods one examines and on how one interprets borderline cases like the War of 1812 or the American Civil War. Critics also note that strong statistical support for the proposition is limited to the period after World War II, when both the U.S.-led alliance system and the Soviet threat to Western Europe's democracies discouraged conflict between republics.

A2: Democ Solves War

Democracies avoid war for other reasons

Walt 99 (Steven M., Professor of Political Science, January/February, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/54641/stephen-m-walt/never-say-never-wishful-thinking-on-democracy-and-war?page=3, 7/8/11) HD

A second challenge focuses on the causal logic of the theory itself. Democratic-peace proponents often attribute the absence of war between republics to a sense of tolerance and shared values that makes using force against fellow republics illegitimate. (As noted above, Weart's version of this argument emphasizes the tendency for republics to see similar states as part of their own "in-group.") If this theory is true, however, there should be concrete historical evidence showing that democratic leaders eschewed violence against each other primarily for this reason. But critics like Christopher Layne have shown that when democratic states have come close to war, they have held back for reasons that had more to do with strategic interests than shared political culture. These cases suggest that even if democracies have tended not to fight each other in the past, it is not because they were democracies.

States justify violence and imperialism by excluding democracies from their inner circle

Walt 99 (Steven M., Professor of Political Science, January/February, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/54641/stephen-m-walt/never-say-never-wishful-thinking-on-democracy-and-war?page=3, 7/8/11) HD

Weart does recognize that shared political culture can be an unreliable barrier to war when serious conflicts of interest arise because states will simply use other criteria to exclude rivals from their "in-group." Thus, he acknowledges that religious differences drove the Swiss republics of Lucerne and Bern to war in the seventeenth century. He further admits that republics have had little difficulty justifying imperial expansion against less-developed but essentially democratic societies simply by declaring the victims "ignorant savages" and placing them outside the "civilized" in-group. Similarly, democracies like the United States overthrew freely elected governments in Guatemala and Chile because American suspicion that they might "go communist" was enough to exclude them from the circle of "acceptable" democracies. Weart, however, does not seem to realize how damning these admissions are to his argument and instead relies on ad hoc rationalizations to paper over the holes.

Turn- your authors promote a dangerous and false sense of security

The Economist 95 ("Democracies and war," p. 17-18, http://faculty.washington.edu/

caporaso/courses/203/readings/economist\_Democracies\_and\_war.pdf, 7/9/11) HD

The real danger, then, is that too great a confidence in a simple correlation between democracy and peace, based on outdated assumptions, may lull into a false sense of security those who proclaim it. This is not to devalue democracy, nor to advocate a tolerance of dictatorship. Democracy carries overwhelming advantages, including a close correlation with prosperity. The individual freedom it promotes is inherently good. The argument is rather that there is no easy route to perpetual peace, whether through democracy or anything else. Human nature tends to get in the way.

A2: Democ Solves War

No war because of lack of opportunity and geographic proximity, not because of democracy

Russett 93 (Bruce, Dean Acheson Professor of Political Science @ Yale, “The Fact of Democratic Peace,” *Grasping the Democratic Peace)* HD

Largely unnoticed, however, was the empirical fact that democracies had rarely if ever gone to war with each other during this period. Since there were few democracies, often at a distance from each other, it is hardly surprising that their failure to fight each other was little noticed. States need both an opportunity and a willingnessU to go to war with each other. Noncontiguous democracies, unless one or both were great powers, had little opportunity to fight each other. States cannot fight unless they can exert substantial military power against each others' vital territory. Most states, if not great powers with "global reach (large navies in this eraz3) could exert such power only against contiguous states or at least near neighbors. Furthermore, the willingness of states to fight depends in large part on issues over which they have conflicts of interest. Territorial disputes (over borders, or rights of ethnic groups whose presence is common to both) are rare in the absence of proximity.24 Since relatively few of the democracies bordered each other in the 1920s and 1930s, a LS not surprising that they generally avoided war with each other. Thus the empirical fact of little or no war between democracies up to this time could be obscured by the predominance of authoritarian states in the international system, and the frequent wars involving one or more such authoritarian states. One could still see the international system as not only anarchic, but in principle threatening the "war of all against all."

Democracies still vote for war

The Economist 95 ("Democracies and war," p. 17-18, http://faculty.washington.edu/

caporaso/courses/203/readings/economist\_Democracies\_and\_war.pdf, 7/9/11) HD

A second problem with Kant’s argument, at least when tested against modern societies with universal suffrage, is that it risks imputing too much gentleness of spirit to the average voter. True, people tend to recoil at the prospect of shedding their own blood, which is why the fiercest and earliest critics of wars tend to be people of an age to be conscripted, and sometimes serving soldiers—as happened when America fought in Vietnam, and Israel fought in Lebanon in 1982. But even otherwise kind-hearted citizens may not worry much when someone from another part of the country goes off to fight, especially if that other person has volunteered to do so.

No war now because democracies have a common enemy

Walt 99 (Steven M., Professor of Political Science, January/February, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/54641/stephen-m-walt/never-say-never-wishful-thinking-on-democracy-and-war?page=3, 7/8/11) HD

This brings us to a final gap in Weart's case. Even if its historical judgments are accurate, Never at War cannot tell us how republics would behave in a world in which they were the only type of government. Such a world has never existed, of course, and we simply do not know if the historical affinity among democracies would persist without authoritarian states. The struggle between authoritarian and democratic ideals has been a critical fault line for the past two millennia, and it is easy to understand why like-minded regimes have been inclined to cooperate when confronted by states whose ideals posed a direct threat to their own security. But were this basic distinction to evaporate, cleavages between democracies would probably become more salient. One can easily imagine republican states making invidious distinctions among themselves as conflicts of interest grew more acute, particularly if they no longer needed to join forces against monarchs and dictators. At the height of the Cold War, after all, Americans tended to see Japan as a liberal democracy molded largely in their own image. But as soon as Americans began to fear that Japan was overtaking them economically, they began to "discover" that Japanese politics were less liberal than they had previously thought. This episode suggests that if the United States were to face a democracy of roughly equal capabilities, both sides would find ways to place the other outside its own democratic "in-group." Republics may have tended to band together in the past, but a world composed solely of them might employ different criteria to identify friends and foes. Not only is Weart's interpretation of history problematic, its relevance for the future may be quite limited.

A2: Democ Solves War

Now that democracies no longer have common enemies, they will turn against each other

The Economist 95 ("Democracies and war," p. 17-18, http://faculty.washington.edu/

caporaso/courses/203/readings/economist\_Democracies\_and\_war.pdf, 7/9/11) HD

A deeper worry about the “democracies don’t fight one another” argument is that it may owe much of its force to the relative paucity of democracies in the past. Most simply, one would expect fewer democracies to be involved in fewer wars. To the extent that democracies were more thinly spread, they would have fewer shared borders over which to fight. And, since some of the biggest conflicts of the past century have been ideological as mush as territorial, liberal countries have almost by definition found themselves allies in the struggles against fascism and communism. Democracies have thus tended not to fight each other lately because they have been strategic allies in part—score one for the peace-through-democracy theorists—because they are democracies. Again, however, this does not mean democracies will always be allies. In the absence of a communist or fascist block of enemies, there will be less need for democracies to huddle together for survival.

A2: Democracy Solves Everything

Liberal democracies are key to solve for their impacts

Ayn R Key 8 (blog, August 29, http://aynrkey.blogspot.com/2008/08/democracy-is-not-panacea.html, 7/9/11) HD

People seem to think that "democracy" automatically means "liberal democracy". They forget that "democracy" is the form, and that "liberal" is the function. It is the "liberal" in "liberal democracy" that provides the restrained government instituted to protect the rights of the people. In terms of respecting the rights of the people, what is the effective difference between a liberal democracy and a liberal monarchy? One could argue that democracy gives people checks on the government should the government decide to move in an illiberal direction, whereas there are no checks if the king should decide so. The problem is what would be the check if the public decided to move the democratic government in an illiberal direction? Proponents of democracy do not have an answer for that.

Democracy isn’t an effective tool at the local or regional level

IDEA 6 (Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, 15 September, http://www.idea.int/conflict/upload/DCHS\_Launch\_Event\_Summary.pdf, 7/9/11) HD

SRSG Coomaarswamy opened the event with an engaging presentation on how democracy as a culture and value system is fundamental to handling tense social conflicts: it represents the nonviolent resolution of social difference through a set of principles that feature tolerance of dissent set against a foundational element of human rights. Democracy is not a panacea as a system of social conflict management, especially when it is challenged by problems such as deep socioeconomic inequalities or the mobilization of society along exclusive nationalist or religious lines. A serious challenge to democracy, she contended, arises from “ideologies of exclusion.” In reference to the challenges of democracy and conflict in Sri Lanka, she cited disappointment with the performance of democracy – especially at the local and regional level. Democracy has generated its own “anger movements” because the state has not been able to address problems of poverty; “it is the material and everyday [needs] that are more important to the people,” she said. There is an urgent need to adopt a needs-based approach to democracy building, especially with regard to peacebuilding; for democracy to flourish as an institution contributing to social peace, it must be realized more fully at the local level.

A2: Diamond

Diamond’s theories on democracy fail- lying leaders, economic downturns and no protection for human rights

Serunkuma 11 (Yusuf, student of interational politics and guest writer for the Observer, February 9, http://www.observer.ug/index.php?option=com\_content&task=view&id=12107&Itemid=66, 7/9/11) HD

What Larry Diamond fails to understand is that the world is searching for leaders that will not tell them lies; Islamist regimes often play their politics on this premise. It is indeed no wonder that the Islamist Party and the Muslim Brotherhood are smelling victory in Tunisia and Egypt, respectively. Surely then, there is no hope that democracy as we know it will ever address the conscience of the leaders of these movements. It will probably be something else, found in either religion or culture. In the US, Harvard, Stanford and Yale graduate politicians and lobbyists have plundered America for long, telling lies while accumulating wealth. The hardships that have fomented revolt in Egypt, Tunisia and Algeria are quite visible in many European countries and North America. So many Americans are out of work and there are many struggling economies in Europe. But all these are fully fledged democracies. It will be rather absurd to imagine that the Arabs will unquestioningly tread the same line — one that disconnects leaders from their consciences as we have seen, because, “the majority has decided.” As long as democracy does not translate into economic growth and human rights — there will be reason to doubt the outcomes of this wave of change.

Diamond’s categorization of democracies undermines his theories

Leicht & Jenkins 10 (Kevin T., The University of Iowa Department of Sociology, J. Craig, The Ohio State University Department of Sociology, http://wxy.seu.edu.cn/humanities/sociology/htmledit/

uploadfile/system/20100724/20100724163814618.pdf, 7/9/11) HD

Our point is that because Diamond adds qualifiers even to the baseline type of electoral democracy, his characterizations of “intermediate democracy” are then invariably just as vague as his subsequent characterizations of “democratic society.” In both cases, he lacks threshold standards or cut points which are proceduralist and bright line. In addition, as noted, “intermediacy” itself is a residual category, and all such categories are intrinsically vague. Yet, unlike his occasional references to the democratic society, this residual category is far more important for Diamond’s purposes at both a conceptual or theoretical level and in empirical application. After all, this category’s potential scope of application is extraordinarily expansive. It can potentially include nearly every established or consolidated democracy in the world as well as many new democracies.

\*\*Deontology\*\*

A2: Deontology

Deontology fails- no context for individual situations, disregard for others, and too general

Rainbow 2 (Catherine Rainbow is a teacher at Davidson College.“Descriptions of Ethical Theories and Principles” <http://www.bio.davidson.edu/people/kabernd/Indep/carainbow/Theories.htm> 7/6/11) HD

Although deontology contains many positive attributes, it also contains its fair number of flaws. One weakness of this theory is that there is no rationale or logical basis for deciding an individual's duties. For instance, businessman may decide that it is his duty to always be on time to meetings. Although this appears to be a noble duty we do not know why the person chose to make this his duty. Perhaps the reason that he has to be at the meeting on time is that he always has to sit in the same chair. A similar scenario unearths two other faults of deontology including the fact that sometimes a person's duties conflict, and that deontology is not concerned with the welfare of others. For instance, if the deontologist who must be on time to meetings is running late, how is he supposed to drive? Is the deontologist supposed to speed, breaking his duty to society to uphold the law, or is the deontologist supposed to arrive at his meeting late, breaking his duty to be on time? This scenario of conflicting obligations does not lead us to a clear ethically correct resolution nor does it protect the welfare of others. Since deontology is not based on the context of each situation, it does not provide any guidance when one enters a complex situation in which there are conflicting obligations (1,2).

Deontology fails- principles are too abstract, trigger negative reactions, or conflict when applied to specific cases

Treasury Board 6 (Canadian Treasury Board “Professional Ethics and Standards for the Evaluation Community in the Government of Canada” http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/cee/career-carriere/pesecgc-enpcegc/pesecgc-enpcegc-eng.asp#Sec2Deontology 7/6/11) HD

Among the criticisms of deontological theory is that it is difficult to get universal agreement on what principles should be considered fundamental. It is also difficult to prioritize and to apply such abstract principles as truth telling and the sanctity of life to specific cases that arise in one's day-to-day work. In addition, the application of certain principles, without reference to consequences, can have extremely negative results—for example, when telling the truth results in penalties for well-intentioned actions. Moreover, it is often the case that one principle will come into conflict with another. A celebrated example is truth telling versus the sanctity of life when one is considering whether to lie to a prospective murderer about the location of the intended victim. It is also argued that if exceptions are made in the application of a principle, it cannot be considered a fundamental one. Many deontologists, however, would approve of exceptions when a greater moral principle is at stake. At a less dramatic level than life and death, one can envisage an evaluator having to choose between the public's right to know and a client's right to privacy.

A2: Deontology

Deontology is corrupted- absolutism causes greater tragedies

Pritchett No Date (Adrian, University of Georgia graduate and attorney, paper written post 1998, “Kai Nielsen’s Support of Consequentialism and Rejection of Deontology” http://pritchea.myweb.uga.edu/phil3200paper1.htm 7/6/11) HD

Throughout the article, Nielsen concurrently argues that deontology should be rejected but that consequentialism is viable. We may reconstruct his argument as follows: Deontology, as a morally absolute theory, makes mistakes. Likewise, an absolutist form of consequentialism also makes mistakes. So absolutism is wrong. Unfortunately, deontology can only be formulated as some type of “moral absolutism,” while consequentialism can be flexible. Therefore, deontology should be rejected, and by rejecting deontology we are left with consequentialism as a viable theory. Nielsen relied heavily on examples to support his first premise that deontology makes mistakes. He discussed warfare to show how it is not the case that one is necessarily morally corrupt if he or she knowingly kills the innocent while making moves to kill combatants, but this point would not have been salient without having seen the movie he referred to, The Battle of Algiers. Nielsen did present an effective example, though, with the “case of the innocent fat man.” In this thought experiment, a fat man is leading a group of people out of a cave when he gets hopelessly stuck in the opening. There is a rising tide that will cause everyone inside the cave to drown unless they can get out. The only option for removing the fat man is to blast him out with dynamite that someone happens to have. Nielsen explains that the deontologist would hold that the fat man must not be blasted and killed because this would violate the prohibition against killing and it is only nature responsible for everyone else drowning. Nielsen challenges this principle by declaring that anyone in such a situation, including the fat man, should understand that the right thing to do is blast the fat man out in order to save the many lives in the cave. Furthermore, the deontologist exhibits “moral evasion” whenever he stands idly by and allows a greater tragedy than is necessary to occur. Nielsen explains that this is the kind of example that highlights the corrupt nature of deontology.

Deontology must be rejected because absolutism fails

Nielsen 9 (Kai, Philosophy Professor at University of Calgary, “Traditional Morality and Utilitarianism,” Ethics: The Big Questions, Ed. James P. Sterba, p.184) HD

My first exemplary tale was designed to show that our normal, immediate, rather, absolutistic, moral reactions need to be questioned along with such principles as “The direct intention of the death of an innocent person is never justifiable.” I have hinted (and later shall argue) that we should beware of our moral outrage here – our naturally conservative and unreflective moral reactions – for here the consequentialist has a strong case for what I should call “moral radicalism.” But, before turning to a defense of that, I want to tell another story taken from Philipa Foot but used for my own purposes.4 This tale, I shall argue, has a different imprt than our previous tale. Here our unrehearsed, commonsense moral reactions will stand up under moral scrutiny. But, I shall also argue when I consider them in Section III, that our commonsense moral reactions here, initial expectations to the contrary notwithstanding, can be shown to be justified on consequentialist grounds. The thrust of my argument for this case is that we are not justified in opting for a theistic and/or deontological absolutism or in rejecting consequentialism.

Deontology must be rejected- consequences outweigh

Nielsen 9 (Kai, Philosophy Professor at University of Calgary, “Traditional Morality and Utilitarianism,” Ethics: The Big Questions, Ed. James P. Sterba, p.184) HD

It is sometimes claimed that any consequentialist view of ethics has monstrous implications which make such a conception of morality untenable. What we must do – so the claim goes – is reject all forms of consequentialism and accept what has been labeled “conservatism” or “moral absolutism.” By “conservatism” is meant, here, a normative ethical theory which maintains that there is a privileged moral principle or cluster of moral principles, prescribing determinate actions, with which it would always be wrong no to act in accordance no matter what the consequences. A key example of such a principle is the claim that it is always wrong to kill an innocent human, whatever the consequences of not doing so. I will argue that such moral conservatism is itself unjustified and, indeed, has morally unacceptable consequences, while consequentialism does not have implications which are morally monstrous and does not contain evident moral mistakes.

A2: Deontology – Nuclear War O/W’s

Nuclear war outweighs deontology

Hardin and Mearsheimer 85 (Russell and John, Professors of Political Science at the University of Chicago, ol. 95, No. 3, Special Issue: Symposium on Ethics and Nuclear Deterrence, JSTOR) HD

Deontologists generally are far less ready than utilitarians are to concede that we may threaten evil (the evil of destroying innocent civilians in the Soviet Union) in order that good may come. However, very few deontologists, if any, would insist that the only considerations that determine the morality of an action are abstract characteristics of the action. In particular, the likely results of an action may also be taken into account, and when these are grievous, they may override the prima facie strictures against an action of a certain kind. Hence a deontologist might suppose that, in the case of nuclear deterrence, the good of the protection of Americans and others from various evil prospects finally outweighs deontological concern with the nature of the threat of killing millions of innocents, as Steven Lee concludes.

Deontologists choose conventional warfare over a nuclear war

Hardin and Mearsheimer 85 (Russell and John, Professors of Political Science at the University of Chicago, ol. 95, No. 3, Special Issue: Symposium on Ethics and Nuclear Deterrence, JSTOR) HD

Perhaps the starkest way to pose the issue of denuclearization is to suppose that nuclear weapons had never been invented and to ask what our world would be like without them. Many strategists are inclined to think that we would have had disastrous war with the Soviet Union. One suspects that most philosophers concerned with nuclear weapons and at least some strategists would prefer the counterfactual world in which there were no such weapons. If Robert Art and many of his fellow strategists are right, this preference wants examination. Consequentialists of either a limited or a broadly utilitarian persuasion might suppose that a hundred million dead in a conventional war with high probability would compare unfavorably to far more dead in a nuclear war with much lower probability. Deontologists have difficulty with moral conclusions drawn from such comparisons. But if the numbers are sufficiently stark, they must give even the staunchest deontologist pause.

\*\*Diseases, Generally\*\*

Diseases – No Extinction

The more virulent, the less likely extinction is

Adam 5 (Mike, Staff Writer for Newstarget.com, "Why the bird flu virus is less deadly but more dangerous," June 21, http://loveforlife.com.au/content/08/02/05/why-bird-flu-virus-less-deadly-more-dangerous-mike-adams-21st-june-2005, KF)

If you're a really deadly virus -- like Ebola, which kills 90 percent of the people infected -- then you're actually not very good at spreading from one person to the next. Why? You kill your host too quickly. You're so deadly that your host dies before you get a chance to be infectious. In order to be a pandemic, a virus must be highly infectious; it must be able to spread from one person to another in an undetectable way. When a virus becomes less-immediately lethal, it is able to survive in the host in an undetectable state, for a longer period of time. This is what makes viruses really, really dangerous: A dangerous virus is not lethal to one individual; rather, it can exist in a hidden state and be passed from one person to the next. It's the contagiousness of a virus that makes it dangerous. Let's say you're a virus and you consider "success" to be wiping people out. Obviously, viruses don't have that sort of thought process, this is just a way to explain their strategies. If you're a virus and you're trying to infect and kill people, you're going to be far more "successful" if you have a low kill rate but infect a billion people, rather than having a very high kill rate and only infecting 10 or 20 people. If you are a very deadly virus in the Congo, for example, and you manage to wipe out a small village, even though you were rather horrifying to the village and fatal to those people, you as a virus haven't been very successful. Why? You wiped out the village; there's nobody left to spread it. Now, again, of course viruses don't think this way: They don't have plans, they don't have strategies -- this is just evolutionary biology in play.

The more virulent a disease it is, the less of a concern it is

The Guardian 3 (“Second Sight”, September 25, http://technology.guardian.co.uk/online/story/0,3605,1048929,00.html, KF)

The parallel with the natural world is illustrative. Take the case of everyone's favourite evil virus, Ebola. This is so virulent that it kills up to 90% of infected hosts within one to two weeks. There is no known cure. So how come the entire population hasn't dropped dead from haemorrhaging, shock or renal failure? The "organism" is just too deadly: it kills too quickly and has too short an incubation period, so the pool of infected people doesn't grow.

No way of knowing how diseases begin

Lafee 9 (“Viruses versus hosts: a battle as old as time”, SCOTT MAY 3, http://www.signonsandiego.com/news/2009/may/03/1n3virus01745-viruses-versus-hosts-battle-old-time/?uniontrib, KF)

When and how a virus jumps species are difficult to determine. Usually the leap involves new and sustained exposure to a previously unknown virus. For example, HIV, the virus that causes AIDS, was originally a modest disease of chimpanzees. Researchers suspect simian HIV leapt to human hunters early in the past century. SARS, or severe acute respiratory syndrome, is believed to have originated in civet cats sold at Asian markets.

Mutations ensure extinction of the virus

Lafee 9 (“Viruses versus hosts: a battle as old as time”, SCOTT MAY 3, http://www.signonsandiego.com/news/2009/may/03/1n3virus01745-viruses-versus-hosts-battle-old-time/?uniontrib, KF)

But whatever type, viruses evolve in two fundamental ways. The first, called antigenic drift, is gradual but constant. A single virus can produce 1 billion offspring in a single day. This profligate rate is essential. Viruses need maximum numbers to boost their chances of finding hosts and ensuring survival. Such rapid replication guarantees that mistakes will be made, that tiny mutations in gene copying will result in new viral strains not recognized by immune systems. For small viruses such as influenza or hepatitis C, antigenic drift is critical to helping them evade detection during infection.

Diseases – No Extinction

Diseases become less virulent

Achenbach 3 (Joel, Washington Post Staff Writer, "Our Friend, the Plague," Nov, http://ngm.nationalgeographic.com/ngm/0311/resources\_who.html, KF)

Paul Ewald, a biologist at the University of Louisville, advocates a different approach to lethal microbes. Forget trying to obliterate them, he says, and focus instead on how they co-evolve with humans. Make them mutate in the right direction. Get the powers of evolution on our side. Disease organisms can, in fact, become less virulent over time. When it was first recognized in Europe around 1495, syphilis killed its human hosts within months. The quick progression of the disease—from infection to death—limited the ability of syphilis to spread. So a new form evolved, one that gave carriers years to infect others.

Always pockets of survival

Sowell 1 (Thomas, Fellow @ Hoover Institution, Jewish World Review, “The Dangers of “Equality””, 3-5, http://www.jewishworldreview.com/cols/sowell030501.asp, KF)

People have different vulnerabilities and resistances to a variety of diseases. That is why one disease is unlikely to wipe out the human species, even in one place. An epidemic that sweeps through an area may leave some people dying like flies while others remain as healthy as horses

Diseases – Cures Now

Essential oils solve

Science Daily 10 (4/4, http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2010/03/100330210942.htm?utm\_source=feedburner&utm\_medium=feed&utm\_campaign=Feed%3A+sciencedaily+%28ScienceDaily%3A+Latest+Science+News%29, KF)

ScienceDaily (Apr. 4, 2010) — Essential oils could be a cheap and effective alternative to antibiotics and potentially used to combat drug-resistant hospital superbugs, according to research presented at the Society for General Microbiology's spring meeting in Edinburgh. Professor Yiannis Samaras and Dr Effimia Eriotou, from the Technological Educational Institute of Ionian Islands, in Greece, who led the research, tested the antimicrobial activity of eight plant essential oils. They found that thyme essential oil was the most effective and was able to almost completely eliminate bacteria within 60 minutes. The essential oils of thyme and cinnamon were found to be particularly efficient antibacterial agents against a range of Staphylococcus species. Strains of these bacteria are common inhabitants of the skin and some may cause infection in immunocompromised individuals. Drug-resistant strains, such as meticillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) are extremely difficult to treat. "Not only are essential oils a cheap and effective treatment option for antibiotic-resistant strains, but decreased use of antibiotics will help minimise the risk of new strains of antibiotic resistant micro-organisms emerging," said Professor Samaras.

Medicine now

Fox 8 (Meghan, health and science editor @ Reuters, 10/26, http://www.reuters.com/article/2008/10/26/us-mrsa-antibiotics-idUSTRE49P2X920081026?feedType=RSS&feedName=healthNews&sp=true, KF)

(Reuters) - Two experimental antibiotics appear to work safely against an increasingly common and dangerous form of infection called methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus or MRSA, researchers said on Sunday. Doctors are clamoring for drugs that can fight the so-called superbug infection, which kills an estimated 19,000 people a year in the United States alone. The usual treatment, Pfizer Inc's Zyvox, has side effects and MRSA bacteria are already beginning to elude its effects by developing what is known as resistance. Privately owned Paratek Pharmaceuticals Inc. said its experimental antibiotic cleared MRSA infections in 98 percent of patients treated, compared to 93 percent of those treated with Zyvox, known generically as linezolid. "There were no drug-related serious adverse events," Dr. Michael Scheld of the University of Virginia and the Infectious Diseases Society of American told a news conference.

Free radicals solve

Popular Science 9 (Stuart Fox, staff, 12/17, http://www.popsci.com/science/article/2009-12/hydroxyurea-shows-promise-antibiotic, KF)

In fact, many antibiotics currently in use also kill bacteria by inducing hydroxyl free radical production, but hydroxyurea does so in a totally novel way. Thus, no bacteria on Earth has evolved any resistance to it. That lack of resistances means hydroxyurea can serve either as an antibiotic on its own, or as a helper to other, more widely resisted, antibiotics. And with multiple-drug-resistant bacteria becoming a bigger and bigger problem, any help is welcome.

Diseases – Cures Now

Health solves

Adam 5 (Mike, Staff Writer for Newstarget.com, "Why the bird flu virus is less deadly but more dangerous," June 21, http://loveforlife.com.au/content/08/02/05/why-bird-flu-virus-less-deadly-more-dangerous-mike-adams-21st-june-2005, KF)

Do you want to know the big strategy, the big picture? BE HEALTHY. If there were ever a reason to transform your health, letting go of those old, unhealthy habits and doing something positive for the future of your own health, this is as good a reason as you will find. This is a great reason! Give yourself a strong, healthy immune system, so you can survive the bird flu if it happens to come around. A strong, healthy, fully functioning immune system will absolutely give you a strong advantage over everyone else. If this thing ends up with a kill rate of 20 percent, meaning that four out of five people will survive this, you can easily be in the survival group if you take care of your health starting today. Who will be the one out of five who won't make it? Well, it will typically be a person with a suppressed immune system -- someone who is unable to fight off viral infections, unable to hydrate themselves well, or who doesn't have good communication between the cells and organs of their body. We see these kind of people all around us today -- everyday people, who are following the standard American diet, avoiding exercise, avoiding sunlight, not drinking enough water, eating a lot of processed foods and so on.

Quarantines solve

Camitz and Liljeros 5 (Martin, Swedish Institute for Infectious Disease Control, Fredrik, Medical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Karolinska Institute, "The effect of travel restrictions on the spread of a highly contagious disease in Sweden," Oct 5, http://arxiv.org/ftp/q-bio/papers/0505/0505044.pdf, KF)

Even though there is presently no treatment or vaccine for SARS, results show that limited quarantine as suggested here drastically decreases the risk of transmission and this may well turn out to be the most expedient form of intervention. In many countries, Sweden included, limiting freedom of travel is unconstitutional and must take the form of general recommendations. Additionally, certain professions of crucial importance to society during a crisis situation must be exempt from travel restrictions. The study shows that even if a substantial fraction of the population breaks the restrictions, this strategy is still viable. For other types of disease for which preventive treatment (pandemic flu) or vaccine (small-pox) are available, our results show that long-distance travelers are an important group for targeted control measures.

Disease – A2: New Diseases

No new diseases

Rothschild 89 (Peter R., MD and PhD, http://rothschildonprobiotics.com/Diseass-of-Fashion.html, KF)

On the other hand, it is equally true that every time a “new” disease is discovered the ailment turns inevitably into a thing of fashion. However, this prodigious multiplicity is not really surprising, because there are no new diseases. (Just like there are no new jokes, only people who haven’t heard them yet…) Thus, every time science becomes aware of a new disease, a statistically meaningful percentage of the population will identify with the description of which they were hitherto only symptomatically aware. That is, they were inflicted with an ailment whose true nature they ignored and came unhesitatingly forward when the condition was publicly exposed. Bingo! –the disease turned into a fashion. This is what happened also to cancer in the days when its nature was unknown; also to diabetes, nephritis and to a whole impressive catalog of syndromes. The latest of these happen to be AIDS and CFS.

Antimicrobiotics solve

ScienceDaily 11 (6/17, http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2011/06/110616193740.htm, KF)

ScienceDaily (June 17, 2011) — "Super bugs," which can cause wide-spread disease and may be resistant to most, if not all, conventional antibiotics, still have their weaknesses. A team of Canadian scientists discovered that specific mixtures of antimicrobial agents presented in lipid (fatty) mixtures can significantly boost the effectiveness of those agents to kill the resistant bacteria. This discovery was published online in The FASEB Journal. According to a researcher involved in the study, Richard Epand, Ph.D. from the Department of Biochemistry and Biomedical Science at McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, "This study may contribute to overcoming the lethal effects of drug resistant bacteria that is becoming an increasing clinical problem, particularly in hospitals."

Disease – Exaggerated

The media hypes up superbugs

Gullo 10 (Kellie, staff @ Cleveland Examiner, 9/20, http://www.examiner.com/diets-in-cleveland/antibiotic-resistant-super-bug-bacteria-what-you-can-do-finish-throw-away, KF)

Are these latest health reports reason to batten down the hatches and run for cover? Or, is this “super bug” an exaggerated, hyped-up piece of news (similar to the H1N1 virus) designed to propel the public into hysteria? This strain of bacteria has made its way to this country from India. It's been found in three patients treated in the U.S. so far. Some 37 cases have been detected in the U.K. Antibiotic resistant bacteria are certainly a challenge, and the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention even calls it "one of the world's most pressing public health problems." But don’t go into hiding just yet. The three identified in the U.S. did not die from their infections. One of the major problems in India, and other countries in South Asia, is that antibiotics can be obtained easily without prescription, increasing the risk that they may be misused by patients who don't need them. These organisms can also be spread in the environment if sanitary conditions are lacking. So ultimately, managing, changing and applying new guidelines to some of these conditions that are causing this powerful resistance should be the chief priority.

Genetic manipulation doesn’t create super diseases

GSA no date (Genetics Society of America, http://www.g3journal.org/site/misc/about.xhtml, KF)

But advances in genetics have generated concern among many people. Some fear that genetic engineering will lead to super-diseases and to supermen. Others are uncomfortable with the knowledge of their genetic heritage and the genetic determinism and discrimination it may bring. Many are wary of genetically modified plants, even as such organisms hold promise to improve nutrition throughout the world. While we are cognizant of the risks, these fears are greatly exaggerated in the public eye. Bringing more knowledge to the issues will allay concerns and steer thought and action in directions that strive to ameliorate real problems. The public needs to understand the potential accomplishments of genetic manipulation, and the facts about what remains impossible, unsafe, or unethical. We have the responsibility to foster a Genetic Enlightenment.

\*\*Endocrine Disruptors\*\*

Endocrine Disrupters – No Extinction

No extinction- lack of data

GreenFacts.org 5 (12/18, http://www.greenfacts.org/endocrine-disruptors/l-2/endocrine-disruptors-5.htm#1, KF)

Lack of scientifically sound data about the frequency, length and levels of exposure to endocrine disrupting chemicals (EDCs) is the weak link in the argument that they have harmful effects on human and animal health. Most of the information on EDC exposure has focused on the presence of persistent organic pollutants, such as PCBs, dioxins, DDT and other chlorine-containing pesticides, in Europe and North America. Exposures to other non-persistent EDCs have not been investigated in any depth.

No extinction- not related to humans

GreenFacts.org 5 (12/18, http://www.greenfacts.org/endocrine-disruptors/l-2/endocrine-disruptors-5.htm#1, KF)

Another shortcoming is the lack of information on exposure during critical periods of human or animal development. Moreover, the available information relates mostly to EDCs present in the environment – such as in the air, food and water – rather than to levels in blood and tissues in the body. Limited exceptions are human breast milk and fat tissue samples, which have been screened for potential EDCs, such as organochlorines.

No extinction- no brink

Milloy 1 (Steven, Fox News [http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,25065,00.html] Coming Soon: More

Chemical Scares Than Anyone Dreamed Possible/ May 20, 2001, KF)

A National Toxicology Program panel concluded that there is "credible evidence" that some chemicals can affect laboratory animals at very low levels � well below the "no effect" levels determined by traditional testing. This shocking, self-contradictory conclusion violates a fundamental principle of toxicology � namely that "the dose makes the poison." That is, all substances � including water, salt, and sugar � are poisons in sufficiently high amounts or doses. Below their "toxic" doses, substances aren't poisons. The chemicals most at risk are components of plastics used in food packaging, pesticides and other industrial compounds that have been under activist attack as so-called "environmental estrogens" or "endocrine disruptors" � hormone-like chemicals in the environment that are alleged to disrupt normal hormonal processes and cause everything from cancer to reproductive problems to attention-deficit disorder.

Endocrine Disruptors –- No Impact – Generally

No extinction- junk science

Gough 97 (Michael, Cato Institute [http://www.cato.org/speeches/sp-mg121597.html] Endocrine Disrupters,

Politics, Pesticides, the Cost of Food and Health/ December 1997)

Environmentalists and politicians and federal regulators have added environmental estrogens or endocrine disrupters to the "concerns" or scares that dictate "environmental health policy." That policy, from its beginning, has been based on ideology, not on science. To provide some veneer to the ideology, its proponents have spawned bad science and junk science that claims chemicals in the environment are a major cause of human illness. There is no substance to the claims, but the current policies threaten to cost billions of dollars in wasted estrogen testing programs and to drive some substantial proportion of pesticides from the market.

Endocrine disrupters fake- science preys on fear

Gough 97 (Michael, Cato Institute [http://www.cato.org/speeches/sp-mg121597.html] Endocrine Disrupters,

Politics, Pesticides, the Cost of Food and Health/ December 1997)

The chemicals that have those activities were called "environmental estrogens" or "endocrine disrupters." There was no more evidence to link them to every abnormality in wildlife than there had been in the 1960s to link every human cancer to chemicals. The absence of evidence wasn't much of a problem. Colborn and her colleagues believed that chemicals were the culprit, and the press and much of the public, nutured on the idea that chemicals were bad, didn't require evidence. Even so, Colborn had a problem that EPA faced in its early days. Soon after EPA was established, the agency leaders realized that protecting wildlife and the environment might be a good thing, but that Congress might not decide to lavish funds on such activities. They were sure, however, that Congress would throw money at programs that were going to protect human health from environmental risks.(3) Whether Colborn knew that history or not, she apparently realized that any real splash for endocrine disrupters depended on tying them to human health effects. Using the same techniques she'd used to catalogue the adverse effects of endocrine disrupters on wildlife, she reviewed the literature about human health effects that someway or another might be related to disruption of hormone activity. The list was long, including cancers, birth defects, and learning disabilities, but the big hitter on the list was decreased sperm counts. According to Colborn and other's analyses of sperm counts made in different parts of the world under different conditions of nutrition and stress and at different time periods, sperm counts had decreased by 50 percent in the post-World War II period.

Bad science drives their authors

Gough 97 (Michael, Cato Institute [http://www.cato.org/speeches/sp-mg121597.html] Endocrine Disrupters,

Politics, Pesticides, the Cost of Food and Health/ December 1997)

Whether the initial results were caused by a series of mistakes or a willful desire to show, once and for all, that environmental chemicals, especially pesticides are bad, bad, bad, we don't know. We do know that the results were wrong. No matter, EPA now assumes as a matter of policy that synergy occurs. Good science, repeatable science that showed the reported synergy didn't occur has been brushed aside. In its place, we have bad science or junk science. If the Tulane results were the products of honest mistakes, they're bad science; if they flowed from ideology, they're junk science. The effect is the same, but the reasons are different. The estrogenic disrupter testing under FQPA is going to cost a lot of money and cause a lot of mischief. But the effects of that testing are off somewhere in the future. More immediately, a combination of ideology-driven science and congressional misreading of that science threatens to drive between 50 and 80 percent of all pesticides from the market.

Endocrine Disruptors –- No Impact – Generally

EPA uses scare tactics

Gough 97 (Michael, Cato Institute [http://www.cato.org/speeches/sp-mg121597.html] Endocrine Disrupters,

Politics, Pesticides, the Cost of Food and Health/ December 1997)

The collapse of the cancer scare wasn't good news to everyone. Government bureaucrats and scientists in the anti-carcinogen offices and programs at EPA and elsewhere have secure jobs. Congress easily finds the will to write laws establishing environmental protection activities, but it lacks the will or patience to examine those activities to see if they've accomplished anything. And, let's face it, Congress doesn't eliminate established programs. But the growth of programs slows, and money can become scarce, and that can squeeze researchers who depend on EPA grants and contracts to fund their often senseless surveys and testing programs. Moreover, the fading of scares doesn't benefit environmental organizations that utter shrill cries about scares and coming calamities in their campaigns for contributions.

Empirically denied and scientifically disproven

Milloy 1 (Steven, Fox News [http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,25065,00.html] Coming Soon: More

Chemical Scares Than Anyone Dreamed Possible/ May 20, 2001, KF)

The endocrine-disruptor scare flared up about five years ago with the publication of the book Our Stolen Future, an alarmist compendium of anecdotal tales of chemicals allegedly wreaking havoc on the hormonal processes of humans and wildlife. The twist with the endocrine disruptor scare was the novel but unsubstantiated notion that even very low exposures to certain chemicals, below what were previously viewed as safe levels, could be harmful. After five years and $5 million of taxpayer-funded research, the case for the Our Stolen Future theory has only weakened.

Scientifically denied- no way to confirm

Milloy 1 (Steven, Fox News [http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,25065,00.html] Coming Soon: More

Chemical Scares Than Anyone Dreamed Possible/ May 20, 2001, KF)

Their claims are based in the work of Our Stolen Future cult leader and University of Missouri researcher Frederick vom Saal. His experiments on laboratory mice supposedly show that very low doses of some chemicals � thousands of times lower than current safe standards � increased prostate weight in male mice and advanced puberty in female mice. No other laboratory has been able to reproduce vom Saal's work. Traditionally, reproducibility of experiments is necessary before results may be considered "scientific." But vom Saal all but guaranteed that his work will never be reproduced. His experiments involved a unique strain of mice that he inbred in his laboratory for about 20 years. When the mice stopped producing the results he wanted, he killed them. Without the same strain of mouse, vom Saal's experiments can't be reproduced by others and his work can't be thoroughly evaluated.

No one chemical causes the impact

Milwaukee Journal Sentinel Online 7 (“Are Your Products Safe? You Can’t Tell”, JS Online, http://www.jsonline.com/watchdog/watchdogreports/29331224.html, KF)

 Because the effects of endocrine disruptors may take years to reveal themselves, it is almost impossible to say that a particular chemical caused a certain disease. There also is a lot of uncertainty about how these chemicals work inside your body. So, scientists extrapolate. They can't test their theories on humans. Instead, they have to rely on animal studies and try to figure out the implications for people.

Endocrine Disruptors –- No Impact – Generally

Experts wrong- influenced by bad science

Milloy 1 (Steven, Fox News [http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,25065,00.html] Coming Soon: More

Chemical Scares Than Anyone Dreamed Possible/ May 20, 2001, KF)

The panel met last October at the request of the Environmental Protection Agency. The EPA asked the panel to determine whether low doses of chemicals can interfere with hormonal processes. The EPA is required by a 1996 law to develop a screening program for chemicals suspected of having hormonal effects. The panel asked the public to nominate studies to be reviewed. Ground rules required that a study's raw data had to be submitted to the panel as a prerequisite for the study to be considered. The panel wanted to subject the data from these studies to "independent analysis." Vom Saal's studies were nominated, but he didn't submit his data. Inexplicably, the panel changed the ground rules to allow consideration of vom Saal's studies anyway. The reason it did that had more to do with intimidation of panel members than science, according to those involved in the process. The panel was stocked with powerful allies of vom Saal, including former EPA pesticide chief Lynn Goldman and NTP toxics chief George Lucier. Though there was plenty of reason to dismiss vom Saal's work and the low-dose theory, panel members not allied with vom Saal lacked the courage to do so. The implications of the panel's report are unsettling. The panel recommended that the EPA consider changing its guidelines for assessing risk of reproductive and developmental effects from chemicals. The recommendation is likely to spread to other national and international regulatory agencies. The low-dose theory coupled with vom Saal-style "science" puts virtually every industrial chemical and many consumer products at risk of being stringently regulated or banned without a scientific basis.

Can’t replicate endocrine disruptors studies- bad science

Safe 10 (Stephen, prof @ dept of veterinary physiology @ Texas A&M, 6/11, http://media.hoover.org/sites/default/files/documents/0817939326\_91.pdf, KF)

I drew attention to the extensive worldwide coverage in 1996– 97 of a report in Science indicating that combinations of weakly active estrogenic pesticides interacted synergisticallyand that this observation strongly supported the endocrine disruptor hypothesis. Scientists in my laboratory, among many others, had not observed these interactions, and about a year later, the authors of the Science paper withdrew it, stating that they had been unable to reproduce their own results. In contrast to zealously reporting the original finding, the media paid scant attention to scientific data showing “no synergism,” and I believed (and believe) that it was important to point this out.

No way to tell if a chemical is molecularly an endocrine disruptor

Exposure to Environmental Hazards 3 (Fall, University of Minnesota school of public health, http://enhs.umn.edu/current/5103/endocrine/character.html, KF)

Interestingly, the chemical structures of natural hormones and environmental hormones are most often very different. It is not possible to determine whether a chemical is an endocrine disruptor or not by merely looking at its chemical structure. Because the structures of endocrine disruptors are so variable and unpredictable, they are sometimes synthesized unintentionally. A couple examples include the pesticide DDT and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), both of which have estrogenic activity, but were originally synthesized for a completely unrelated purpose. The figure below demonstrates the structural diversity of chemicals in the environment reported to be estrogenic (1).

No way to research endocrine disruptors

Exposure to Environmental Hazards 3 (Fall, University of Minnesota school of public health, http://enhs.umn.edu/current/5103/endocrine/character.html, KF)

Because the endocrine system is vital to health, especially reproductive health and the maintenance of species, much effort is being placed into the research of chemicals that may disrupt this system. However, because there are so many unknowns about endocrine disruptors such as what chemicals are included, their persistence in the environment and their health effects, it is challenging to study them. John McLachlan, a researcher in this area writes, “As patterns begin to emerge in environmental endocrine science, recognition of similarities to those associated with evolution and development should provide insights to mechanisms and outcomes. Without pattern recognition, there is not the ability to predict, and without prediction there is not the possibility to prevent” (1).

Endocrine Disrupters – No Solvency – Inevitable

Endocrine disrupters impossible to avoid

Pollution Issues no date (http://www.pollutionissues.com/Ec-Fi/Endocrine-Disruption.html, KF)

Because chemicals that are known or suspected endocrine disruptors are used for a wide variety of purposes, it is difficult for people to know how to avoid exposure. Some endocrine disruptors are used as pesticides on food and others are used in certain types of plastics such as polyvinyl chloride (PVC or vinyl). These chemicals are not just found industrial and agricultural products, but also in the runoff of pesticides from treated fields and in the discharge of waste from industrial operations. Certain endocrine disruptors are not used anymore, but their residues linger in the food chain and are consumed by humans in the form of fatty foods. Because it is difficult for people to make decisions as to how to avoid exposure to endocrine disruptors, many environmental health advocates urge the government to regulate these chemicals more strictly.

Endocrine disrupters inevitable- environment, industry

Snyder et al 3 (Shane A., dept of R&D NV water authority, Paul Westerhoff, dept of civil engineering @ ASU, Yeomin Yoo, dept of civil engineering @ ASU, David L. Sedlak, dept of civil engineering @ UC-Berkeley, http://blog.thatsnatural.info/wp-content/uploads/2011/03/EES-review-2003.pdf, KF)

Endocrine disruption also can be caused by naturally occurring compounds. For example, estrogens from plant sources, known as phytoestrogens, have been linked to reproductive failures in animals since the 1930s (Walker and Janney, 1930; Levin et al., 1951; Brookbanks et al., 1969; Metzler and Pfeiffer, 1995; Safe and Gaido, 1998). This effect was evident in sheep grazing on certain strains of clover in New Zealand. These sheep exhibited severe reproductive impairment due to phytoestrogens (Millington et al., 1964; Adams, 1998). Likewise, the inability of captive cheetahs to reproduce at the Cincinnati Zoo was linked to a diet high in phytoestrogens (Setchell et al., 1987). In 1951, a vegetable oil was found to contain various phytoestrogens and phytoandrogens (Levin et al., 1951). Interestingly, various over-thecounter medicinal supplements, such as those recommended for estrogen replacement therapy in postmenopausal women, contain high levels of phytoestrogens. Research is necessary to assess the relative importance of phytoestrogens in human diet, both by direct ingestion of vegetables and vegetable products and possibly from bioaccumulation of phytoestrogens in meat products. Likewise, industrial activities that release large quantities of phytoestrogens may have adverse effects on aquatic ecosystems as evidenced by recent studies documenting masculinization of fish exposed to effluent from pulp and paper mills and the presence of androgenic compounds in these effluents (Munkittrick et al., 1997; Bortone and Cody, 1999; Larsson et al., 2000; Jenkins et al., 2001). Likewise, the degradation of vegetable matter and paper products in wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) may contribute to releases of phytoestrogens into the aquatic ecosystem.

Endocrine disrupters inevitable- diet

Safe 10 (Stephen, prof @ dept of veterinary physiology @ Texas A&M, 6/11, http://media.hoover.org/sites/default/files/documents/0817939326\_91.pdf, KF)

Although I am still concerned about environmental impacts of organochlorine pollutants and some endocrine disruptors, I have remained skeptical of the hypothesis that these chemicals are currently having global impact on human health. My skepticism is reinforced by the recently published scientific data that have been referenced in this chapter. My views are also due, in part, to the concepts put forward by Bruce Ames and Lois Gold, who pointed out that the human diet contains multiple toxins and carcinogens that occur naturally in food or are formed during cooking.46 Moreover, levels and often the potencies of “natural” carcinogens in the diet are far higher than those of carcinogenic industrial contaminants. A similar argument also holds true for endocrine disruptors where dietary intakes of phytoestrogens, and other endocrine-active substances including Ah receptor-active compounds, far outweigh the intakes of endocrine-active manmade environmental contaminants.

Inevitable consumption- daily life

Exposure to Environmental Hazards 3 (Fall, University of Minnesota school of public health, http://enhs.umn.edu/current/5103/endocrine/pathwayofexposure.html, KF)

Exposure to environmental estrogens and other endocrine disruptors can occur through a variety of different pathways. Because they are ubiquitous in the environment, they are found in our food, air, water, soil, pharmaceutical products, household products, and cosmetics to name a few. The three main pathways of exposure include ingestion, inhalation and dermal contact. To illustrate how human exposure to endocrine disruptors occurs, listed below are six representative endocrine disrupting chemicals and their exposure pathways.

Endocrine Disrupters – No Impact – Cancer

No consensus

WRI 99 (World Resources Institute, http://www.wri.org/publication/content/8345, KF)

The March 1996 publication of Our Stolen Future brought into full public view a debate that had been simmering in the scientific literature for several years. In this widely publicized book, zoologist Theo Colborn of the World Wildlife Fund and two coauthors hypothesize that some industrial chemicals commonly found in the environment could be wreaking havoc with human health by disrupting the body’s hormonal system. Specifically, the authors suggest that these substances dubbed “endocrine disruptors” because they interact with the endocrine, or hormone system may be playing a role in a range of problems, from reproductive and developmental abnormalities to neurological and immunological defects to cancer (1). Evidence suggests that, at high exposures, some of these substances, which include DDT and PCBs and some pesticides, can cause reproductive and developmental problems in wildlife. The question is whether these substances can exert similar effects on humans at the relatively low doses typically found in the environment. A lack of definitive evidence of adverse health effects in humans, yet abundant suggestive evidence associating these chemicals with problems in animals, has provided tinder for a volatile debate. Colborn and others believe that the weight of evidence in animals and people provides warning that these contaminants are threatening our fertility, intelligence, and basic survival (2). Others, such as Stephen Safe of Texas A&M University, believe these concerns are overstated, claiming they are based on findings that are contradictory at best or not relevant to the human situation.(3)(4) Although many of these chemicals have been banned by developed countries because of other documented adverse effects, their widespread dispersal and persistence in the environment makes them potential health menaces for a long time to come.

No proof – lack of research

WRI 99 (World Resources Institute, http://www.wri.org/publication/content/8345, KF)

The role of endocrine disruptors in causing these and other effects is now under active investigation worldwide. At this stage, the general consensus among most experts is that many more studies need to be done to assess whether the synthetic chemicals that have helped shape agriculture and industry are also shaping the health fates of individuals, or even the population at large. At the international level, the World Health Organization and the Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD) are undertaking an international inventory of research. National governments, other international organizations, and even private companies are funding and/or conducting research to fill in the current knowledge gaps (29)(30). In the interim, countries are struggling with whether and how to regulate these substances as scientific understanding evolves.

No cancer – no scientific proof

Breithaupt 4 (Holger, editor of Science & Society section of EMBO reports, life science society, http://www.nature.com/embor/journal/v5/n1/full/7400063.html#top, KF)

In fact, early observations on wild and laboratory animals showed that some compounds that are able to interact with receptor molecules, in particular with the oestrogen receptor, exert effects on the reproductive system of these animals. These observations were accompanied by reports on the increasing incidence of breast and prostate cancer and declining male fertility, and it was only a matter of time before the press took up the issue and parents became concerned about this slow poisoning of their children. However, as public fear mounted, the evidence for a creeping epidemic caused by endocrine disruptors in the environment remained elusive. Although most scientists now acknowledge that many substances can have an effect on the human endocrine system, more recent analysis has shown that many of the claims about health effects were either exaggerated or based on flawed analysis of observations. As Stephen H. Safe, Professor of Veterinary Physiology and Pharmacology and of Biochemistry and Biophysics at Texas A&M University (College Station, TX, USA) put it: “The hypothesis is okay, but we don't even have a problem.”

Endocrine Disrupters – No Impact – Cancer

Doesn’t cause cancer – no threshold

Breithaupt 4 (Holger, editor of Science & Society section of EMBO reports, life science society, http://www.nature.com/embor/journal/v5/n1/full/7400063.html#top, KF)

The only problem is that nobody actually knows whether the levels of endocrine disruptors in the environment are a threat to public health. “The so-called epidemic of endocrine diseases remains to be established,” said Raphael J. Witorsch, Professor of Physiology at Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond, VA, USA. A working group, convened by the Royal Society of London, UK, that investigated the health threat of endocrine- disrupting chemicals (EDCs) came to the same conclusion: “whilst high levels of exposure to some EDCs could theoretically increase the risk of such disorders, no direct evidence is available at present” (The Royal Society, 2000). Richard Sharpe, one of the original authors of the endocrine disruptor hypothesis, also acknowledged that “the threat [to human health] is minimal.” In fact, a series of studies that closely investigated the original publications claiming an increase in breast and prostate cancer and a decline in male fertility found that this is not so. “We now know that this is absolutely not true,” Safe said about health advocates who warn that endocrine disruptors could cause a worldwide epidemic of disorders and diseases. According to Witorsch, many of the original epidemiological analyses were flawed and lacked confounding factors.

No consensus of effect on health

Censky 8 (Annalyn, staff @ Arizona Republic, 1/21, http://www.azcentral.com/arizonarepublic/news/articles/0121endocrine0109.html, KF)

"Endocrine disruptors are everywhere," said David Walker, a University of Arizona researcher who studies the effect of the chemicals on native fish. "These are things that have made it easier for us to survive as a species, but at the same time, the long-term effect of being exposed to low doses of these compounds, nobody knows about." At present, very little is known about the threat to human health, but researchers at all three Arizona public universities hope to change that soon.

No connection – media hyperbole

Safe 95 (Stephen H., prof of physiology & pharmacology @ Texas A&M, http://www.d.umn.edu/~bmunson/Courses/Educ4234/Hormones4234.pdf, KF)

These results suggest that the increasing incidence of human breast cancer is not related to organochiorine environmental Contaminants and that decreases in sperm counts is highly debatable. Nevertheless, human populations are continually exposed to a wide variety of environmental and dietary estrogens, and these compounds clearly fit into the category of “endocrine disrupters.” The remainder of this article briefly describes the different structural classes of both environmental and dietary estrogens and quantitates human exposures to these compounds.

Endocrine Disrupters – No Impact – Cancer

No danger- media exaggeration

Safe 10 (Stephen, prof @ dept of veterinary physiology @ Texas A&M, 6/11, http://media.hoover.org/sites/default/files/documents/0817939326\_91.pdf, KF)

Not surprisingly, environmental and health research and regulatory agencies in most developed countries have issued lengthy reports on endocrine disruptors, and review articles on every aspect of this hypothesized problem have appeared in scientific journals. In addition, increased funding for researchon endocrine disruptors has resulted in new data as well as the generation of several controversies regarding interpretation of laboratory animalandcell culture data fromdifferent laboratories.Those results and controversies continue to attract media attention. In contrast, results from human studies have been less controversial and somewhat reassuring; however, reporting of these data has been minimal. Who cares if we are more than half the men our grandfathers were! Unfortunately,manyin the news media fail to report good news on environmental issues, which is a disservice to their readers/viewers.

No correlation between cancer and endocrine disruptors

Safe 10 (Stephen, prof @ dept of veterinary physiology @ Texas A&M, 6/11, http://media.hoover.org/sites/default/files/documents/0817939326\_91.pdf, KF)

The hypothesis that environmental endocrine disruptors may contribute to diseases of the male reproductive tract has spurred considerable research on this area, with a particular emphasis on changes that have occurred over time. There are no apparent global changes in sperm counts and fertility, rates of hypospadias and cryptorchidism, and birth sex ratios. Testicular cancer is increasing in most countries, but it is not correlated with other indicators of male reproductive capacity. Moreover, testicular cancer is increasing while DDE and other POPs are decreasing, suggesting that exposure to these compounds is not linked to testicular cancer.

\*\*Europe, General War\*\*

Europe – No Large-Scale war

**No large European war – wars are one stage**

Fritz 6 (Paul, phd student, http://psweb.sbs.ohio-state.edu/grads/fritz/chapter2.pdf, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

Though generally found only in passing remarks, the balance of power guides the realist claim that it is simply a matter of self-interests, not legitimacy nor necessarily magnanimity, which force victors to approach the defeated moderately or leniently. Without moderation or leniency in victory, a severely weakened great power would create a vacuum in the postwar world. Instability would follow, as other great powers would rush to fill the void. Gulick (1955, 75) captures this logic: “statesmen have often been moderate in their studied attempts to avoid humiliating a defeated power [because] an equilibrium cannot perpetuate itself unless the major components of that equilibrium are preserved. Destroy important makeweights and you destroy the balance.” An additional impetus to the call for moderation or leniency, a restored defeated state may be needed for balancing in postwar efforts to establish and then maintain international stability. Sheenan notes the wisdom of moderation or leniency: The victorious states after a balance of power war should seek neither to humiliate nor to destroy their recent enemy or enemies. The reason for such ‘restraint’ is that the recently vanquished will be important counterweights in the postwar balance of power system and their presence may be essential to restrain one or more of the recent victors who subsequently aspire to a dominant role themselves. (1996, 74) Jervis makes a similar observation: “because today’s adversary may be tomorrow’s ally, crippling [the defeated state] would be foolish … while the state would gain territory and wealth from dividing up the loser, others might gain even more, thus putting the state at a disadvantage in subsequent conflicts.” (1997, 131) Thus, the vanquished should be reintegrated or assimilated into the international system after a conflict, relatively unencumbered by desires of the victors to curtail its autonomy or power.

No European war – no superpowers in Europe due to lack of military capabilities

Wivel 4 (Andrew, prof @UCopenhagen, http://people.cas.sc.edu/coate/Readings/Wivel.pdf, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

Some realists stress the direct influence of balance considerations and argue that the security externalities of trade become irrelevant if an outside power takes care of security in the region, as in Europe after the Second World War (Waltz, 1979; Joffe, 1984; Mearsheimer, 1990; Heurlin, 1998; Wivel, 2000). According to Kenneth Waltz, it was the shift from multipolarity to bipolarity after the war that made European integration possible (Waltz, 1979: 70–1). For the first time in the history of the modern state system, no European powers were great powers in the international system and their preservation now depended ultimately on the great powers outside the region: the United States and the Soviet Union. Because they were all dependent on the United States for their security, the former West European great powers did not fear that the gains obtained through cooperation would be transformed into military strength and endanger their security and survival. They stopped balancing each other and benefited from the American presence aimed at balancing the Soviet Union. Other realists stress the indirect effects of balancing. They argue that alliances internalize the security externalities produced by trade, because the gains of free trade increasing the power of an alliance partner increase the relative power of the alliance (Gowa, 1994; Mansfield and Bronson, 1997). According to this explanation European integration became possible because of the shared alliance commitment of the major West European powers. Focusing on the importance of balancing, realists have interpreted the strengthening of the European integration project after the Cold War as a consequence of European balancing of the American superpower in the unipolar world order. Thus, initiatives such as the EMU and the ESDP are interpreted as evidence of an emerging policy of balancing leading to an action–reaction process between American and European policy-makers eventually resulting in sharpened United States policy positions and strengthened European Union institutions (cf.Wivel, 2000). Realists have argued that European integration — and regionalism in general — is at least partly dependent on hegemonic leadership.The hegemon provides the military and political resources needed to create and maintain order within its sphere of influence (Krasner, 1976), and the other powers may help finance the hegemon’s efforts in return (Gilpin, 1981). Some realists stress that United States hegemony in the transatlantic alliance was decisive for the formation and development of the European integration project. Changes over time and between different regions are explained in terms of the superpower’s changing or differentiated strategies (Grieco, 1999; Loriaux, 1999). In this interpretation we would explain the post-Cold War strengthening of the European integration project as a European response to a change in American strategy (Wivel, 2002b).

Europe – No war

No European war – Europe is weak

Moravcsik 10 (Andrew, http://www.princeton.edu/~amoravcs/library/current\_history.pdf, dw: March 2010, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

 It has become fashionable to view the global system as dominated by the United States, China, and India. How often do we hear from leading politicians that “The most important relationship in the twenty-first century is that between Washington and Beijing”? Or that the “rise of the rest” is the great phenomenon of our time? Missing from this equation is Europe. The “Old Continent’s” reputation for sluggish economic and demographic growth, political disunity, and weak militaries has convinced most foreign analysts that the future belongs to Asia and the United States. Indeed, among scholars, commentators, and politicians alike, the conventional view is that the contemporary world is “unipolar,” with the United States standing alone as a sole superpower. With the rise of China, India, and perhaps some other nations, the world may become—if it is not already—multipolar. But Europe’s role in the geopolitical balance, according to this view, remains insignificant. Such claims rest on economic, demographic, and military measures of power. European economic growth, it is said, is slow and getting slower. Meanwhile, a Brookings Institution study predicts that the median age in Europe will increase to 52.3 years in 2050 from 37.7 years in 2003 (whereas the median age for Americans will be only 35.4 years). This will have negative effects on Europe’s productivity, growth, and fiscal stability. And as long as the United States spends twice as much of its national income on defense as Europe collectively does, it is suggested, the Europeans are condemned to second-tier status. From Beijing to Washington—and even in Brussels—the Old Continent is widely viewed as a spent geopolitical force.

No European war – Europe specializes in hard power, not soft power

Moravcsik 10 (Andrew, http://www.princeton.edu/~amoravcs/library/current\_history.pdf, dw: March 2010, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

 Its considerable hard power notwithstanding, Europe is, in contrast to the United States, a “quiet” superpower. It specializes in the use of economic influence, international law, “soft power” (the capacity to attract others to your way of thinking), and “smart power” (matching military with civilian forms of influence). In fact, Europe today is more effective at projecting civilian power globally than any other state or non-state actor. And Europeans have demonstrated, contra realist claims, that such instruments of power can be extremely influential. Some of these tools are wielded by a unified Europe, some by European governments acting in loose coordination, and some by European governments acting unilaterally.

No European war – budget cuts and econ mean Europe will not have military dominance in the future

Moravcsik 10 (Andrew, http://www.princeton.edu/~amoravcs/library/current\_history.pdf, dw: March 2010, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

Of course Europe’s civilian as well as its military power derives ultimately from a highly productive economy. Policies like EU enlargement and association agreements with neighboring states are attractive to others because of the massive pull of the European economy. Aid, education, trade, the European social model, and other aspects of Europe’s foreign policy portfolio must be funded. Moreover, the informational, educational, and legal sophistication of European policies are byproducts of highly developed economies. This has led many to ask whether sluggish demographic and economic growth rates will undermine Europe’s role in the world. A 2008 assessment by the US National Intelligence Council (NIC) is typical. The NIC suggested: The drop-off in working-age population will prove a severe test for Europe’s social welfare model, a foundation stone of Western Europe’s political cohesion since World War II. Progress on economic liberalization is likely to continue only in gradual steps until aging populations or prolonged economic stagnation force more dramatic changes. There are no easy fixes for Europe’s demographic deficits except likely cutbacks in health and retirement benefits. Defense expenditures are likely to be cut further to stave off the need for serious restructuring of social benefits programs. The challenge of integrating immigrant, especially Muslim, communities will become acute if citizens faced with a sudden lowering of expectations resort to more narrow nationalism and concentrate on parochial interests, as happened in the past. Europe’s strategic perspective is likely to remain narrower than Washington’s. Divergent threat perceptions within Europe and the likelihood that defense spending will remain uncoordinated suggest the EU will not be a major military power by 2025.

\*\*Famine\*\*

Famine Up

Food shortages now- Africa

Flood 7/7 (Zoe, staff @ Vancouver Sun, 2011, http://www.vancouversun.com/news/African+food+shortage+becomes+major+crisis/5063400/story.html, KF)

Scores of Somali children are dying on the journey or within a day of arrival at refugee camps in Kenya and Ethiopia, as they flee the region's worst drought in decades, the UN refugee agency said on Wednesday. High levels of malnutrition, combined with violence in the war-torn Horn of Africa nation, are threatening "a human tragedy of unimaginable proportions," the UNHCR warned. After several seasons of failed rains and rising global food prices, drought has hit more than 12 million people across Somalia, Ethiopia, Kenya, Djibouti and Uganda Cattle and sheep are dying at higher rates than usual, reaching up to 60 per cent of mortality in some areas. "Over 10 million people are affected by the drought in one way or other," said Elisabeth Byrs, spokeswoman for the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. Food prices are soaring with grain prices in some parts of Kenya up to 80-per-cent higher than the five-year average, while in Ethiopia, the consumer price index jumped about 41 per cent. As a result, malnutrition rates are also rising, the UN agency said. Eleven districts in Kenya have also reported malnutrition rates above the emergency threshold. Hit hardest are parts of Somalia, affected not only by famine but the continuing civil war. Thousands of Somali refugees are making perilous journeys of hundreds of kilometres to seek assistance: 54,000 people crossed into Ethiopia and Kenya in June alone. Levels of serious malnutrition among newly-arrived Somali children in Ethiopia are exceeding 50 per cent, while in Kenya levels are reaching 30 to 40 per cent. Britain's leading 13 aid agencies have said that they face a shortfall of more than $100 million for their emergency response in the region. Many refugees arriving in Kenya are streaming into Dadaab, the world's largest refugee camp and already overflowing before the latest crisis. Reports suggest that young children are dying as families wait to be registered. "People are making incredibly gruelling journeys: some are walking for more than 20 days without food or water, facing attacks from armed groups or wild animals," Andrew Wander, the emergency media manager for Save the Children, said. "We don't have anything to eat," said Sainab Yusuf Mohamed, whose child died as they were trekking across the desert in search of help. "As we were burying his body, my second child died," she said by telephone from Bardhere District in southwest Somalia. UNHCR has described the needs for food, shelter, health services and other life-saving aid as "urgent and massive." Government representatives in the region warned that the situation could deteriorate further. "We haven't seen the worst of this drought yet," said Mohamed Elmi, the minister for development of northern Kenya. Underscoring the severity of the crisis, Islamist militants in Somalia have lifted a two-year-long ban on foreign aid agencies.

Lack of foresight guarantees a food crisis

Sachs 8 (Jeffrey D., staff @ Time, 4/24, http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1734834,00.html, KF)

The world economy has run into a brick wall. Despite countless warnings in recent years about the need to address a looming hunger crisis in poor countries and a looming energy crisis worldwide, world leaders failed to think ahead. The result is a global food crisis. Wheat, corn and rice prices have more than doubled in the past two years, and oil prices have more than tripled since the start of 2004. These food-price increases combined with soaring energy costs will slow if not stop economic growth in many parts of the world and will even undermine political stability, as evidenced by the protest riots that have erupted in places like Haiti, Bangladesh and Burkina Faso. Practical solutions to these growing woes do exist, but we'll have to start thinking ahead and acting globally.

Food shortage now- 4 warrants

Sachs 8 (Jeffrey D., staff @ Time, 4/24, http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1734834,00.html, KF)

The crisis has its roots in four interlinked trends. The first is the chronically low productivity of farmers in the poorest countries, caused by their inability to pay for seeds, fertilizers and irrigation. The second is the misguided policy in the U.S. and Europe of subsidizing the diversion of food crops to produce biofuels like corn-based ethanol. The third is climate change; take the recent droughts in Australia and Europe, which cut the global production of grain in 2005 and '06. The fourth is the growing global demand for food and feed grains brought on by swelling populations and incomes. In short, rising demand has hit a limited supply, with the poor taking the hardest blow.

Famine Up

Food shortages now- kills more than AIDS

Britt 11 (Robert Roy, Editor in Chief TechMediaNetwork, http://www.livescience.com/14447-global-food-shortage-urgent-climate-global-warming.html, KF)

A growing global food shortage has caused prices to double in recent years, and a growing consensus of scientists now blames climate change as one factor in an equation that includes a burgeoning population and increasingly scarce water supplies. More people around the planet are going hungry as a result. Even as prices have also risen in the United States, most residents may not grasp the scope and severity of the problem. Americans toss about 40 percent of their food in the garbage, according to a 2009 study. In this country, food waste per person has increased 50 percent since 1974. Yet one in seven people go to bed hungry every night, according to the United Nations World Food Program. Hunger kills more people than AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis combined. The problem is worst in developing countries. But the problem has implications beyond the borders of those poor countries.

Shortage now- warming

Britt 11 (Robert Roy, Editor in Chief TechMediaNetwork, http://www.livescience.com/14447-global-food-shortage-urgent-climate-global-warming.html, KF)

Scientists have been predicting for years that a warmer planet coupled with increasing water demands could cause food shortages. A study in 2007, building on and confirming previous research, warned that climate change could help cause food shortages leading to war. Other scientists have predicted that water shortages will fuel war. The situation became acute in 2008 when food shortages helped fuel uprisings in several poorer countries. High food prices played a role in the ouster of the Haitian government that year. Meanwhile, a consensus had emerged that food prices would likely double by the year 2080. That projection has been blown out of the water. Global food prices have spiked since the year 2000, mostly since 2006, with some key crops doubling.

Shortage now- population growth

Britt 11 (Robert Roy, Editor in Chief TechMediaNetwork, http://www.livescience.com/14447-global-food-shortage-urgent-climate-global-warming.html, KF)

Today (June 5), The New York Times provided an extensive look at a world struggling to feed itself. After interviews with dozens of scientists, farmers and food industry experts, the article confirmed what many experts have been saying: World population growth is outpacing food production, particularly with the four crops that provide the bulk of the world's nutrition: wheat, rice, corn and soybeans. As studies have shown previously, there's little land left to convert to farming, water supplies are drying up, and global warming is wreaking havoc on the growing seasons and contributing to weather extremes that destroy crops.

Shortage now- 6 examples

Britt 11 (Robert Roy, Editor in Chief TechMediaNetwork, http://www.livescience.com/14447-global-food-shortage-urgent-climate-global-warming.html, KF)

\* Thanks to significant research dollars spent on developing new strains of key crops and better growing techniques, global food production outpaced population growth for much of the 20th century, leading to a decline in the percentage of people going hungry. However, grain production per capita has fallen since the mid-1980s. \* Climate change is, as predicted, contributing to extremes — floods, droughts, heat waves — and altering growing seasons, all contributing to crop failures. [While no single event can be tied to climate change, climate experts have long said a warmer planet will cause more extremes in temperatures, precipitation and storminess.] \* Science had long expected that increases in carbon dioxide would actually help crops. But that logic has proven faulty in more recent studies. Though carbon dioxide is like fertilizer to plants, the well-documented CO2 increases since the Industrial Revolution — and higher levels predicted for the future — don't offset strains caused by heat, drought and flood. In short, scientists now say, heat kills. \* Increasing demand for drinking water is sucking acquirers dry faster than Nature can possibly replenish them, making water scarcer for farmers. \* The unrest sweeping the Arab world this year has also been linked, in part, to the rising cost of food.

Famine Up

Shortage now- unsustainable and overpopulated system

APCSS 98 (Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies, 9/11, http://www.apcss.org/Publications/Report\_Food\_Security\_98.html)

Nevertheless, as the world’s population grows by around 80 million per year, political and scientific leaders around the world are increasingly raising questions about the viability of the global food system in accommodating this unprecedented demographic change. Although population growth is not the only determinant of food security, it is an issue that focuses popular concern—and even alarm—about the sustainability of global food production. This is because intuitively it would seem that food shortages occur when "human populations outstrip the production capacity of the agricultural system on which they rely."3 But food shortages can also occur because of inequitable food distribution or a breakdown—perhaps resulting from war or civil strife—of the distribution systems that provide food. One study suggests that three major factors disrupt the ability of people to have access to food: inequitable food distribution, poverty, and political unrest.

Millions malnourished now- unstable food system

APCSS 98 (Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies, 9/11, http://www.apcss.org/Publications/Report\_Food\_Security\_98.html)

Today, more than 800 million people around the world are malnourished, despite the fact that food production has doubled during the past three decades. Some experts are warning that the number of malnourished could rise substantially as global demographic pressures clash with such limits as diminishing arable land and growing water scarcity. For this reason, so-called food security pessimists have become more vocal in recent years and have grabbed international headlines with their predictions of food shortages in the not-so-distant future. One pessimist who has gained considerable prominence in recent years is Lester Brown of the Washington D.C-based Worldwatch Institute. Brown argues that the food system is the "missing link" that connects global environmental degradation to loss of food security—and its economic consequences. Brown also asserts that as the pressures of diminishing arable land and decreasing water supplies become more acute, food prices will likely rise. For affluent nations, this will not influence food security much at all, since such a small proportion of disposable income goes to purchase food. But for the 1.3 billion people in the world who live on less than $1 per day, such price rises—even if they are very small—could have a devastating impact.5

Water shortage now

APCSS 98 (Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies, 9/11, http://www.apcss.org/Publications/Report\_Food\_Security\_98.html)

Water shortages were also identified as a potential food security challenge. Water is a key determinant of crop yields. In Asia, there are serious questions about the future availability of water. Many countries in the region are already facing significant water scarcity issues. One study that examined the availability of water from a global perspective concluded that "water availability will be a serious constraint to achieving the food requirements projected for 2025. The need for irrigation water is likely to be greater than currently anticipated, and the available supply of it less than anticipated."30 Other studies have suggested that a larger proportion of water supplies in the future will be devoted to domestic and industrial uses—at the expense of agriculture. Thus, "rapid growth in water demand, coupled with escalating costs of development of new water sources, could be a serious threat to future growth in food production, especially if it requires meeting household and industrial water demand through water savings from irrigated agriculture."31 In China, water constraints seriously threaten food security; more than 70 of China’s grain is produced on irrigated land. But the water intended for irrigation is increasingly being depleted by three major trends: the diversion of water from rivers and reservoirs to cities, the depletion of underground water supplies in aquifers, and the impact of growing pollution caused by industrialization.32

Famine Down

Enough food now- multiple warrants

APCSS 98 (Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies, 9/11, http://www.apcss.org/Publications/Report\_Food\_Security\_98.html)

At the other extreme, food security optimists tend to be more sanguine about the prospects for global food security in the future. Although they recognize that there are real challenges that must be overcome both now and in the future, they also believe that effective and enlightened policy responses can prevent any disasters. One clearly positive trend, they would argue, is the fact that global population growth is diminishing (in percentage terms), although absolute increases are expected to continue until the year 2050 primarily as a result of population momentum. Moreover, the challenges to food security (for instance land degradation) tend to be local, rather than global, suggesting that policy changes or improvements at the local level could dramatically increase agricultural yields. Food security optimists also believe that technology and research can create abundant food supplies in the future. Research in biotechnology, for instance, can lead to the creation of plant breeds that are resistant to pest species and other threats. Technology, moreover, is also key to the development of high-yield plant species.9 Food security optimists argue that there is much evidence that crop yields in many developing countries could be expanded significantly. China, for instance, has much room to increase its grain yields, despite the fact that such yields are high by developing-country standards. Chinese farmers could achieve higher yields by using high-yielding seed varieties, applying improved chemical fertilizers, and practicing greater efficiency in the use of pesticides and irrigation water.10 Norman Borlaug, father of the "Green Revolution", has recently argued that small farmers in many developing countries are capable of doubling or tripling their yields if they would integrate technology into their agricultural production.11 To bolster their case for the effects of technology and greater efficiency in food production, food security optimists point to the fact that food prices have fallen substantially in recent decades (real 1992 food prices are just 22% of food prices in 1950). Another indicator of greater food security is evidence that the per capita calorie supply of food has increased in every region of the world from the early 1960s until the late 1980s.

Food shortages – No Impact

Famine exaggerated- international humanitarian aid

The Times 3 (Michael Dynes, staff, 1/22, http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/article852501.ece, KF)

ENLES SINDOMBA, an impoverished mother of eight from Kabumbwe village in Zambia’s drought-stricken Southern Province, insists that her family has eaten nothing for four weeks. “It’s terrible,” she said. “There is no food in the village, and it hasn’t rained here for a month.” But none of her family shows any ill-effects from such deprivation. Mrs Sindomba is still able to breast-feed her child. She concedes that when she says she has not eaten for a month, she really means that she has not eaten any maize. The family still have chickens, goats and a few cattle. They are hungry, but a long way from starvation. It is almost a year since the United Nations’ World Food Programme (WFP) first alerted the international community to the threat of millions of people dying from a looming famine in southern Africa. But the most relevant question now is whether the international aid agencies have exaggerated the danger.

No food shortage- misinformed media

Ethiopian Review 11 (6/7, http://www.ethiopianreview.com/content/2704, KF)

ADDIS ABABA (Xinhua) — Ethiopia’s [Ministry of Misinformation] on Saturday refuted some foreign media and humanitarian organizations for their exaggerated reports on the current food shortage in pocket areas of the country. “It is ridiculous and unethical that some media outlets are reporting as if food grain price hike is typical of Ethiopia, though it is known that the existing global price hike is a result of soaring price of oil and ever-increasing demand of food grain among the developing countries,” the Ministry of Information said in a statement. Such fabricated reports can not undermine Ethiopia’s rapid economic growth registered during the last successive years, said the ministry. “The rapid national economic growth cannot be undermined by exaggerating minor problems,” it said. Recent reports from some foreign media said a severe drought in Ethiopia threatens up to 6 million children. “The reporting of some media is very much exaggerated and far from the truth,” it said.

No global shortage- diet improving

Dyson 2 (Tim, LSE, http://www.fathom.com/feature/122659/index.html, KF)

Dyson: There are a number of prominent people scattered around North America and, to some extent, Europe who suggest that the world faces major food problems because there has been very substantial population growth. They suggest that agriculture faces increasing environmental production constraints and that we are not going to be able to produce enough food for the people who are going to come along. Having looked at this situation in some depth over a period of years, I don't think that the situation is anywhere near as calamitous as is sometimes portrayed. I should immediately say that the world does face very significant food problems: there are several hundred million people in the world today who don't have enough food to eat. However, over recent decades things have been improving. Average levels of calorie and protein intake in most parts of the world have been increasing. Supplies of cereals and vegetables have been increasing. In most areas of the world, human diets have improved quite substantially. Diets have in general become more diverse. They have become richer in calories and richer in proteins. The one possible exception to this is sub-Saharan Africa.

No timeframe- have enough food for 9 billion people

Dyson 2 (Tim, LSE, http://www.fathom.com/feature/122659/index.html, KF)

If one looks into the future, the key issue is whether agricultural yields are going to continue to rise at reasonable rates. I see no reason to believe that they will not. I don't foresee any kind of major food crisis in the coming decades. There are major problems that we do need to address, but on balance things have been getting better. In terms of major world problems, I don't think food production should be at the top of the agenda--certainly not in comparison to the issue of climate change, which could be extremely serious. We should be able to produce enough food for the 9 billion people that there will be on the planet in a few decades time. Getting sufficient food to the poorest among the 9 billion is an issue. There will still be problems in that area in 20 or 30 years.

Food shortages – No Impact

No shortage- grains solve

Brunton 99 (Ron, anthropologist, http://www.pop.org/content/myth-of-world-food-shortages-1539, KF)

Although the rates of increase in the yields of some grains in certain countries show fluctuations and slowdowns in recent years, the overall prognosis for a continuation of the major gains of recent decades is very good. Despite indications that rice yields had begun to plateau in some East Asian countries during the 1980s, a 1993 study carried out by Donald Plucknett for the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research showed that with only few exceptions, yields of the three major grains, wheat, rice and corn, had continued to increase dramatically around the world over the previous decade. The study examined per hectare crop yields, which are the most appropriate measure for assessing progress in productivity, rather than total yields, which are affected by variations in the amount of cultivated land.19

No shortage- on the brink of GM revolution

Brunton 99 (Ron, anthropologist, http://www.pop.org/content/myth-of-world-food-shortages-1539, KF)

Indeed, rather than fearing that we are at the tail end of a period of rapidly increasing agricultural productivity, it is far more likely that we are in early phases of a major technological revolution based on the genetic manipulation of plants and animals.21 A single example of the way in which current developments could bring massive benefits can be seen in work designed to produce aluminium-tolerant grains. Aluminium is a problem on 30 to 40 percent of the world’s arable lands, particularly in the tropics where acidic soils make the aluminium soluble, allowing it to be taken up by plant roots. Varieties of corn which could produce 10 tons per hectare are only able to achieve around 2 tons in affected soils.22

No soil shortage- farmland plentiful

Brunton 99 (Ron, anthropologist, http://www.pop.org/content/myth-of-world-food-shortages-1539, KF)

But even ignoring the potential of biotechnology, some of the warnings about supposed constraints to increased agricultural yields are greatly exaggerated. In 1984 Lester Brown and Edward Wolf claimed that the global excess of soil erosion over soil formation was over 25 billion tons a year, and that if this continued it would be a major threat to the world’s agricultural productivity.23 In 1995, David Pimentel and his associates published a paper in Science which stated that the figure was three times higher.24 However, as an analysis by Pierre Crossen from Resources for the Future shows, “losses due to erosion and other forms of land degradation [such as salinization and soil compaction] do not pose a serious threat to the capacity of the global agricultural system to increase yields”.25 Crossen also notes that Pimentel and his associates, who are not experts on soil erosion and its effects on productivity, simply ignored more comprehensive research suggesting a far less alarming situation which had been carried out by scientists who were experts on the topic, even though they were aware of it. Analysing these other studies, Crossen calculates that from 1945 until 1990, ‘the cumulative average degradation-induced loss of global soil productivity was roughly 0.1 to 0.2 percent per year’, and that ‘there is reason to believe that in the future, losses are more likely to decrease than to increase’. This is because economic, technological and legal developments in many Third World countries are providing increasing incentives for farmers to take measures to protect their land from degradation.

Famine – No Solve: Politics

Famines are politically motivated

Encyclopedia of Public Health 5 (9/15, http://www.enotes.com/public-health-encyclopedia/famine, KF)

The immediate causes of famine are inadequate food production or market availability, price fluctuations, and limited household assets. Underlying causes, however, almost always involve misguided or deliberate public policy, repressive political systems, or natural or human-caused disaster. In countries with preexisting widespread poverty, unemployment, or debt, natural and human-caused disasters are the most common causes of food shortages and famine. Additionally, hunger has been often used as a deliberate weapon. Access to food is such a basic human need that control of the food supply translates into direct political and economic power. Over and over again in history, specific populations have been the victims of an interruption of their food supply with the intent to subdue them or drive them away.

Authoritarian government is the cause, not quantity of food

Gerhart 99 (Gail M., Human Rights Watch Africa Advisory Committee, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/54779/gail-m-gerhart/famine-crimes-politics-and-the-disaster-industry-in-africa, KF)

A powerful critique of the international humanitarian agencies dominating famine relief in Africa. Drawing on the work of economist Amartya Sen, the author argues that famine prevention requires a political contract that allows citizens to hold governments accountable for famine. Such a contract is rare in Africa, although most governments did recognize a political imperative to support their urban populations before the imposition of structural adjustment programs in the 1980s forced fiscal austerity. Today, international humanitarian agencies have unintentionally eliminated accountability by obliging Africans to cede responsebility for famine alleviation to foreign technical experts -- who often fail to address the fundamental political causes of famine. Driven by narrow definitions of social responsibility and their own institutional interests, relief organizations make compromises that often strengthen authoritarian regimes, disempower victims, and debase humanitarian ideals by using crude media hype to compete for funds. The phony famine alert in eastern Zaire in November 1996, vividly described in chapter ten, lends weight to de Waal's provocative conclusion that "most current humanitarian activity in Africa is useless or damaging and should be abandoned."

Access level determines famine- not amount

APCSS 98 (Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies, 9/11, http://www.apcss.org/Publications/Report\_Food\_Security\_98.html)

Food Security in terms of "Accessibility" vs. "Availability": Food security is almost always a matter of "access" instead of "availability" (in other words, food is often available--and the global agricultural system is capable of assuring this availability—but people cannot always get access for various reasons: economic, social or political). Overall, the seminar participants were very optimistic about "availability" of food (i.e. the actual growing of the food), but they were more pessimistic about "accessibility" to food, which is more dependent on political, economic and social factors. Food Security and Particular Political Systems: The cause of sudden famines is very complicated, but evidence suggests a correlation between famine and non-democratic political systems. In democratic societies, there is more accountability and powerful interest groups (which lessens the chance for famine). This explains why many democratic countries, even after experiencing successive periods of poor harvests, rarely have experienced famines.

Famines are politically caused

WomenAid 2k (2/20, http://www.womenaid.org/press/info/food/food4.html, KF)

Why does hunger exist? The causes of hunger are many and varied. Some are of natural origin, drought, crop pests, natural disasters; others are created by humans, for example by war or over exploitation of natural resources essential to food production. Yet the most important causes of hunger have their roots in economic, social and political factors, having to do with the ways in which the production and distribution of food are organised in the world. If you asked why a malnourished person is hungry, that person’s answer would probably be: "Because there is nothing to eat." During the course of the year, many farm communities only grow enough food to last for a six, eight, or ten month period, or must sell all they produce in order to meet urgent needs for cash. Another answer might be: "I have no money to buy food for my family". The man or woman supporting a family may be short of cash because of a poorly paid job, because of low prices received for agricultural products or other goods, or simply because he or she has been out of a job . Yet a third cause stems from problems facing the nation as a whole. Food may be available in a neighbouring country, but access to it may not be possible if there are no connecting roads or other means of transportation, if there is insufficient foreign exchange to buy it or if trade relationships between countries are poor. In general, hunger is concentrated where incomes are low, reinforcing the obvious connection between hunger and poverty.

Famine – No Solve: Politics

Distribution, not quantity, is key

Kruschandl 8 (Nelson, engineer, 11/26, http://www.solarnavigator.net/famine.htm, KF)

As observed by the economist Amartya Sen, famine is usually a problem of food distribution and poverty, rather than an absolute lack of food. In many cases such as the Great Leap Forward, North Korea in the mid-1990s, or Zimbabwe in the early 2000s, famine can be caused as an unintentional result of government policy. Famine is sometimes used as a tool of repressive governments as a means to eliminate opponents, as in the Ukrainian Famine of the 1930s. In other cases, such as Somalia, famine is a consequence of civil disorder as food distribution systems break down. There are a number of ongoing famines caused by war or deliberate political intervention. Today, nitrogen fertilizers, new natural pesticides, desert farming, and other new agricultural technologies are being used as weapons against famine. They increase crop yields by two, three, or more times. Developed nations share these technologies with developing nations with a famine problem. However, since modern famine is usually the result of war and distribution problems, it is questionable how much relevance or impact new agricultural technologies would have on this problem.

Politics takes-out famine solvency

Menon 8 (Roshni, UN Millienium Campaign, http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr2007-2008/papers/menon\_roshni\_2007a\_malawi.pdf, KF)

Vulnerabilities often arise as a result of political systems and unsustainable development policies that put people at risk. In the case of Malawi, poverty and vulnerability was already steadily inclining for several years as a consequence of an adverse combination of economic, climactic, demographic and political shocks and stresses. Indeed, the rapidly rising livelihood vulnerability of the predominantly rural population played a significant role in exacerbating the crisis. Contributing factors included: a) intensifying pressure on the land, compounded by a steady population growth; b) declining soil fertility associated with the lack of application of agricultural inputs; c) strictly limited off-farm and non-agricultural income generating opportunities; d) the continuing spread and impact of the HIV/AIDS pandemic, leading to a reduced labor force and increased household dependency ratios; e) government policies favoring urban populations and the business sector; and f) economic liberalization measures that have undermined farmers’ access to inputs and eliminated consumer subsidies and food price stabilization interventions. A combination of these factors placed the poorest and most vulnerable sections of the population at risk and in fact, it was this segment of the population that paid the highest price in terms of lives lost and destroyed livelihoods, leading to life-long destitution.

Corruption prevents distribution

Menon 8 (Roshni, UN Millienium Campaign, http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr2007-2008/papers/menon\_roshni\_2007a\_malawi.pdf, KF)

Donor-government relations were also terse at this time, as a result of donor claims of economic mismanagement and governance failures. It is further alleged that the donors delayed responding to the impending crisis, as relations with the Government of Malawi had soured during 2001 due to contention over a number of governance issues—one of which was how the SGR had been emptied. In fact, the IMF withheld balance of payment support, DFID, the EU and USAID suspended development assistance, and Denmark terminated its development projects and withdrew from Malawi entirely. Much of these suspensions were based on the belief that corruption and fraud were rampant in government,5 though these could not have occurred at a worse time for Malawi. In fact, it was only after reports of starvation-related deaths had been published by the media that the donors reversed their hard-line stance and offered food aid without condition.

\*\*Future Generations\*\*

No Future Gen. Rights

Our duties do not provide rights to future generation

Bandman 82 (Bertram, PhD, *Political Theory* 10, 1, February, p. 95-102, JSTOR, JM)

For an indefinite number of unborn beings to have rights implies an impossible burden of duties on current generations, a point aptly made by M. Cranston who says, "Rights bear a close relationship to duties.... If it is impossible for a thing to be done, it is absurd to claim it as a right."' For potential beings or those "not yet determinate" persons to have rights results in the thinning out of and evaporation of rights, ours as well as theirs. The point of the correlativity thesis, the "practicability" requirement, Cranston terms it, is that without corresponding duties against others, there can be no rights. To avoid the thinning out of rights requires eliminating (1). There is a further objection, however, to some who defend the rights of future generations. Some writers, like A. Baier, contend that the thoughts and cares of our past generation implied our rights or that our duties imply the rights of generations not yet born. Pletcher and Partridge likewise argue that our obligation to keep a clean campsite implies that "the next camper has a 'right' to a clear campsite." Pletcher and Partridge contend that we owe it to future campers to keep the site clean and Baier holds that we owe it to future students to order textbooks for them; these then become their rights. Baier, Pletcher, and Partridge use duties to imply rights. The correlativity between rights and duties is, however, a one-way implication relation. Although every right implies an obligation, it does not follow that every obligation implies a right. Joel Feinberg has shown that of various kinds of duties, some duties do not imply rights. Examples of some duties not correlated with corresponding rights are duties of self-sacrifice and duties of "love." These include duties to perform supererogatory or herioc acts without there being rights on the part of beneficiaries.12 Future generations do not necessarily have rights if they are derived from our duties, since duties do not generate rights. Neither Pletchers campsite obligations nor Baier's obligations to students imply rights for their beneficiaries.

Future generations have no concrete rights

Partridge 76 (Ernest, PhD, “Rawls and the Duty to Posterity,” http://www.oup.com/us/companion.websites/9780195332957/student/adtlchapter/pdf/Future\_Chapter.pdf, JM)

Perhaps the most common argument against the intelligibility of the "rights of future generations" asserts that since posterity does not exist now, it makes no sense to speak of posterity having rights now. (From this it is commonly, but not necessarily, inferred that it likewise makes no sense to speak of duties to posterity.) Thus, Macklin (1973) states: The ascription of rights is properly to be made to actual persons -- not possible persons. Since future generations can only be viewed as consisting of possible people, from any vantage point at which the description "future generations" is applicable, it would follow . . . that rights cannot properly be ascribed to future generations. (p. 1) Similarly, de George (1973) asserts that "the class specified by 'future generations' . . . has no presently existing members. Hence we can argue that this class has no presently existing rights, and that it has only possible future rights" (p. 3). Stearns (1972) agrees, although he suggests that "obligations" to the future might be defended on separate grounds. He writes: "Not-yet-existing persons do not have rights now, and therefore an obligation to produce goods for them and to prevent44 evils for them cannot correspond to rights claims" (p. 615). Finally, Rosenbaum (1973) has no doubts at all about the status of duties ("obligations") to posterity: "I take it as obvious that the general principle that obligations cannot be owed to merely potential individuals or groups of individuals needs no defense" (p. 2). Most of these flat assertions are supported by more basic objections to the notion of "rights to posterity." I shall present three of these objections and attempt to answer them.

Present Outweighs

Future generations inevitably will not have their rights recognized

Bandman 82 (Bertram, PhD, *Political Theory* 10, 1, February, p. 95-102, JSTOR, JM)

A further argument used is that if future generations cannot claim their own rights, others now living can represent, advocate, and protect their rights. Appealing as the argument on behalf of advocacy seems to be, to argue that representing an interest of some actual, future, or possible being confers a right commits the fallacy of affirming the consequent, for it is fallacious to argue that if X has rights, then X has interests. X has interests. Therefore X has rights. This fallacy is, for example, committed by Christopher Stone's defense of trees having rights.13 He argues that to have rights is to have interests that can be represented. Trees have such interests. Therefore trees have rights. There are other limits to the value of depending on representatives, advocates, or proxies admirably expressed by J. S. Mill who wrote: The rights and interests of every or any person are only secure from being disregarded when the person interested is himself able and habitually disposed to stand up for them.14 We are more likely to recognize the rights of those who are capable of making their own claims. The practical point is that representatives lose something if they represent too much. The practical difficulties of representing future generations again speaks to the thinning out of rights and provides a practical argument against expecting representatives now living to advocate the straightforward rights of future beings.

Present rights outweigh those of future generations

Bandman 82 (Bertram, PhD, *Political Theory* 10, 1, February, p. 95-102, JSTOR, JM)

I conclude that whereas future generations may have rights, they cannot now have in personam rights. They may have in rem rights that imply imperfect duties for us. Second, rights of future generations imply imperfect duties for present-day large groups, corporations, and states. Third, the rights of future generations to breathe clean air imply duties for their contemporaries, both individually and corporatively, that will also be imperfect. The rights of future generations are analogous to the current rights (which also imply imperfect duties) of all presently living persons to be fed. One can only formulate a defensible concept of rights of future generations by narrowly steering between two unacceptable alternatives, impracticability and greed, guided by a view of rights based on freedom, correlative duties, and justice. To parody Kant, the rights of Bandman / CLEAN AIR 101 future generations without the power to claim them freely and effectively is empty (contra 1). But rights without justice, by depriving faceless, voiceless, distant others, is blind (contra 3 and 4). And their having rights is a matter of justice - justice between generations. The minimal conditions of the rights of future generations (like the right to breathe clean air) then are that (1) future generations are put in a position to effectively claim their rights; (2) corresponding duties are imposed on other relevant persons; and (3) the freedoms and duties of present and future generations are oriented by rationally defensible principles of justice. To attribute conditional rights to future generations is to recognize that rights are not confined to those who are near and dear to us in space and time. But neither do such rights imply duties that impose too heavy a burden to act on.

Present Outweighs

Weighing future generations mutates justice

Leylim 10 (Cansin, MSc in Human Rights, August, http://lse.academia.edu/CansinLeylimIlgaz/Papers/424056/INTERGENERATIONAL\_JUSTICE\_Can\_Future\_People\_Have\_Rights\_Now, JM)

The main objection to the idea can clearly be seen in the title itself: future generations do not exist. Kantian normative theory is constructed on a base of respect for the individual, and is often the base for theories of normative ethics. If the person does not exist how can we talk about attributing rights to them and consequently, forming of an intergenerational theory? This implies that obligations can only make sense when they are owed to people who actually exist (Gosseries & Meyer, 2009, pp.3). Distinctly, here, the debate on whom to attribute rights surfaces. People who have existed in the past or who will exist in the future thus, does not qualify as right-holders. Joel Feinberg (2007) claims that the only beings that can have rights are the ones that have interests (pp.411). The question remains, if future people do not exist yet, they do not possess interests now, how can they have present rights? Moreover, "how can one have wronged another when there was no 'other' who stood to be wronged by one's conduct at the time of that conduct(...)?" (Kumar, 2003, pp.110). Ruth Macklin (1981) argues that "even if we believe that there will be such actual persons in the future, their rights cannot be said to exist until they (the persons) exist" (pp. 152). The crux of this argument is that attributing rights to future generations who do not yet exist, and holding ourselves morally responsible by necessitating obligations towards these non-existent people is not logically feasible. Beckerman and Pasek (2001) are among the most dedicated supporters of this idea. They present their argument in three points. The first one is that future generations cannot be said to have any rights. Secondly, any coherent theory of justice implies conferring rights on people. Lastly and consequently, the interests of future generations cannot be protected or promoted within the framework of any theory of justice (pp. 14). They reject the concept of intergenerational justice as a guide to our obligations to future generations by strictly claiming that such rhetoric is meaningless, "the general proposition that future generations cannot have anything, including rights, follows from the meaning of the present tense of the verb 'to have'" (pp. 16). "Unborn people cannot delegate anything, in the same way that they cannot do -in the present tense- anything (emphasis original)" (pp.22). To this end, the non-existence problem is linked with all the other arguments against attributing rights to posterity. If one does not exist, one does not have anything, and if one does not have anything then one certainly does not have rights. Consequently, how can we, as the present generation, harm the future people with our current conducts, when the future people do not yet exist?

Uncertainty mitigates our obligation to the future – the present outweighs

Leylim 10 (Cansin, MSc in Human Rights, August, http://lse.academia.edu/CansinLeylimIlgaz/Papers/424056/INTERGENERATIONAL\_JUSTICE\_Can\_Future\_People\_Have\_Rights\_Now, JM)

As previously mentioned, there is something to the idea of diminishing obligations. However, our having more limited obligations to future people results from the fact that we have less knowledge and control over the future, not, specifically, because future people are separated from us in time. The further we attempt to reach into the future, furthermore, the less knowledge and control we are likely to have. (The same principle operates with respect to our geographical separation from others—where greater spatial distances likewise tend to correlate with reduced knowledge and reduced control.) Quite generally, the less our knowledge or control over a situation, the more limited our obligations and responsibilities. Thus, although we have good reason to believe that our present consumption of fossil fuels will heat the globe, cause flooding, and promote disease in the next few centuries, we are much less certain about how our present fuel consumption will affect people living a millennium from now —or how those people might combat those effects. In addition, although our dumping of contaminants into the air and water will no doubt affect the Earth for a long time, we are best equipped to understand and predict only the most immediate effects of these actions. Our ability to influence and control future events likewise decreases the further we reach into the future. Since knowledge tends to be empowering, this is true partly because we cannot control as effectively what we do not know as well. However, it is also true that the more distant an effect is from its cause, the more opportunities there are for other factors to alter that effect— thus reducing our power to achieve the effect we intend. The moral implication of all this is that, as our knowledge and our power to influence the future diminish, so too does our obligation to take specific action for the sake of future people’s needs and interests. There is thus some justification for the notion of diminishing obligations, simply because we have more knowledge and control over what is nearest to us. Although this does not greatly reduce the weight of our most important obligations to future people (it certainly gives us no right to ignore our obligations to future people), it does seem to imply that ) An obligation to present people will normally take precedence over an obligation of the same sort (involving the same needs and interests) to future people.

Prediction Impossible

It is impossible to speak for the future – doing so is absurd

Hartwich 9 (Oliver Marc, Economist, “The Rights of the Future?” http://www.oliver-marc-hartwich.com/publications/the-rights-of-the-future, JM)

The first problem with future generations is so obvious that it sounds like a truism: They do not yet exist. While organisations like the WFC and its councillors claim to be ‘the voice of future generations,’ the truth is that these future generations do not and cannot have a voice. In fact, they do not have anything: no voices, no ambitions, no achievements, no preferences, no desires, no habits. Claiming that non-existing persons possess anything is so evidently absurd that it is hard to understand how the notion of future generations’ rights could ever be taken seriously. The ‘rights’ of future generations can only ever be a fiction that is administered by the present generation. Different legal systems around the world assume that the capability of holding rights and having duties begins at the moment of birth and ends with the death of a person. As a modification to this rule, the rights of the unborn child (the ‘nasciturus’) have been recognised since the time of Roman Law. Legal capacity is always bound to something that exists. One of the few exceptions to this almost universal rule seems to be Iceland where the well-being of elves enjoys some consideration in planning decisions.2 Mysticism aside, legal capacity is obviously linked to the present and the existing. It is not conceivable how either past or future generations can make their alleged rights heard today. The dead and the unborn hardly ever appear in election campaigns, courtrooms, or at political rallies. Decisions can only be made in the present, by the present.

No way to objectively determine future wants

Hartwich 9 (Oliver Marc, Economist, “The Rights of the Future?” http://www.oliver-marc-hartwich.com/publications/the-rights-of-the-future, JM)

Such an arrangement with a present-generation caretaker of future generations’ interests is problematic. The first question is who could claim to be this caretaker? The person of the caretaker matters because it determines the way in which future generations’ rights are interpreted. For example, if environmentalists like Shiva and Flannery were in charge of exercising the rights of future generations, they would necessarily do so in accordance with their own present-day ideological predispositions and their own current knowledge. This means that they would put less emphasis on economic growth or increasing private consumption and instead focus on other goals such as limiting energy use and preserving biodiversity. But what if we chose a different caretaker, say an economist whose goal was to increase wealth and productivity? Surely, this would have an effect on the way that the rights of future generations would be exercised. Again, it would be the economist’s own present-day predispositions that would determine the interpretation of the rights of future generations. It does not matter whose interpretation is correct, but there can be no doubt that the person in charge of exercising the rights of future generations matters greatly and influences the way in which these rights will be interpreted. It is a matter of preferences, priorities and predispositions. In a way, this is a problem for every relationship between a principal and his agent. The added difficulty here is, of course, that the principal has no way of choosing his agent, nor could he control his actions. The principal and his agent may in fact never meet. It is a strange kind of arrangement between the future and its self-appointed representatives. Those claiming to fight for future generations have no way of proving that they are actually working in any other person’s interests than their own. By claiming to speak for future generations, they are only trying to add additional legitimacy to the political agendas that they were pursuing anyway. The voice of the future turns out to come from a ventriloquist of the present.

Prediction Impossible

Speaking for the future impossible – empirically proven

Hartwich 9 (Oliver Marc, Economist, “The Rights of the Future?” http://www.oliver-marc-hartwich.com/publications/the-rights-of-the-future, JM)

The problems with future generations’ rights begin with determining who should be exercising them—but do not end there. Even if there were a due process for selecting people to legitimately speak for the future, it would still remain unclear what was required of ‘acting on behalf of the future.’ After all, the future is uncertain and to some degree unknowable. In the famous words of the Danish physicist and Nobel laureate Niels Bohr: ‘Prediction is very difficult, especially about the future.’ If the future were entirely predictable, then making provisions for it would be simple and straightforward. But life doesn’t work that way. Quite the reverse, life is full of surprises and even well-informed, knowledgeable people can and do err all the time. The president and founder of Digital Equipment Corp., Kenneth Olsen, said in 1977 that ‘There is no reason for any individual to have a computer in their home.’ The French military strategist Marshal Ferdinand Foch confidently predicted in 1911 that ‘Airplanes are interesting toys but of no military value.’ Even eminent economists are not immune from forecasting errors. On 17 October 1929, just a few days before the Great Crash, the famous American economist Irving Fisher wrote, ‘Stocks have reached what looks like a permanently high plateau.’ Going through human history, it is astonishing how many forecasts have turned out not just inaccurate but utterly wrong. Perhaps even more surprisingly, all these forecasting disasters haven’t cured us of the false belief in our ability to accurately predict the future. The basic problem of forecasting the future is our tendency to imagine the future as a linear continuation of the present. When looking at current trends, we often believe that they will go on indefinitely and that this will create problems. The classic example is that of a letter writer to the London Times in 1894 who was worried that with London’s ever-increasing traffic (most of it horse-drawn), the city’s streets would be covered by 10 feet of horse manure within decades. It did not occur to him that Londoners would find a way of solving this problem; nor did he foresee that the invention of the internal combustion engine would reduce the need for horse-drawn carriages. We should not feel smug at the naiveté of this worried Londoner of the 1890s. His way of thinking about the future is not too dissimilar to the pessimists of our time. For example, when environmentalists develop their apocalyptic visions of rising sea levels, they are making the same mistake. They believe that rising sea levels would inevitably lead to disaster—as if people would passively stand at a beach and watch the waters rise until they drown. In fact, sea levels have been rising for many centuries but nothing of the kind has happened. People have reacted intelligently to changes in sea levels. In the Netherlands, they built dykes to protect the country from rising tides.

No impact – targeting future generations prevents their existence

Leylim 10 (Cansin, MSc in Human Rights, August, http://lse.academia.edu/CansinLeylimIlgaz/Papers/424056/INTERGENERATIONAL\_JUSTICE\_Can\_Future\_People\_Have\_Rights\_Now, JM)

It's been argued by many (Schwartz (1978), Adams (1979), Parfit (1984)), that a change in our choices affects the identity of the future people. Derek Parfit (1984) has named this concept the Non-Identity Problem (pp.359). The essence of the problem is that "in different outcomes, different people would be born." (pp.359). The core of this concept is that if we choose to act by different policies than we do now in order to conserve for future people, future people who would be living in much worse conditions will not come into existence. Thus, a better future with different people will not benefit the initial people whose rights we would be trying to uphold. Robert Adams (1979) argues that every generation, like every individual, is the result of certain evils as well as goods. "We almost certainly would never have existed had there not been just about the same evils as actually occurred in a large part of human history" (pp.54). If we apply this logic to environmental ethics, it should not matter how detrimental our policies are, since essentially none of the initial people will exist under different circumstances. Therefore, it is not possible for our depletion of resources and degradation of the environment to hurt anyone. Thomas Schwartz (1978) argues against the claim that we owe our remote descendants certain things such as an adequate supply of natural resources or a clean environment. He asserts that "we've no obligation of extending indefinitely or even terribly far into the future to provide any widespread, continuing benefits to our descendants" (emphasis original) (pp.3). He gives the reason that "any effective attempts to "improve" the living conditions of the remote future will so alter "genetic shuffle" of future meetings, matings, and births, that such policies will, in fact. "repopulate" that future with different individuals (emphasis original)" (Partridge, 1990, pp.44). Since none of the individuals will exist in the future, who initially would be existing in the future which was not meddled with, that generation would not be made better off as a result of the meddling . Different people would be born because of our efforts to ameliorate their lives. After all, the attempts to improve the future would benefit no one, therefore there shall be no obligations to future generations (Schwartz, 1978, pp. 11). Thus, Schwartz advocates a laissez-faire policy rather than a restrictive one and claims that the beneficiaries of a restrictive policy would not be our descendants, but ourselves "-those of us, anyway, who get their kicks from the prospect of a flourishing future society" (pp.7).

Predictions Bad

Can’t predict problems – there’s a risk we harm future generations

Hartwich 9 (Oliver Marc, Economist, “The Rights of the Future?” http://www.oliver-marc-hartwich.com/publications/the-rights-of-the-future, JM)

Given this, how could we even try to exercise the rights of future generations when we know so little about the future? A thought experiment can show the problems with this. Suppose a World Future Council had existed in the year 1900, what would it have advocated? Fearing an end of coal, it is possible it would have tried to find alternative energies such as oil. Going back even further, a World Future Council in the year 1800 would have had different priorities. If Thomas Malthus had been a councillor, he would have pressed to stop population growth. After all, he had predicted a food crisis in his book The Principles of Population. In any case, the concerns of the past would have failed to adequately address the real problems of their respective futures. What are the chances of a council of wise men and women in the year 2009 finding answers to the supposed needs of the future? Surely, their methods of predicting the future would be more elaborate than the simple mathematics of Malthus or Jevons. But despite the fact that the models used today have become more complicated, there is no escaping the fact that they remain models. The scenarios used by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, for example, are based on extremely complex calculations. Yet this does not necessarily make them more accurate. None of the computer models used by climate scientists correctly predicted that temperatures over the past decade would actually fall despite rising carbon dioxide emissions. If they failed to predict the last 10 years, why should we believe that they can predict the next 100 years? With all these uncertainties about the future, the rights of future generations become a nebulous concept. Even if we all agreed on the best way to make the future a better place, there is still the danger that we would be focusing our efforts on the wrong issues. Many people believe that man-made climate change is the biggest threat for the future of the planet and the survival of humankind. Maybe they are right, in which case acting on behalf of the future would direct us to all sorts of climate-related policies. But given our human track record of predicting problems, we should not be too sure that these climate change activists are correct—in which case the efforts to stop climate change would be wasteful or even positively damaging. The real interest of future generations would have been to stop worrying about climate change and direct our efforts to other areas.

Future-focus obligates us to cyclic self-denial that threatens future generations

Hartwich 9 (Oliver Marc, Economist, “The Rights of the Future?” http://www.oliver-marc-hartwich.com/publications/the-rights-of-the-future, JM)

According to Antoine de Saint-Exupery, ‘We do not inherit the Earth from our parents, we borrow it from our children.’ It is a nice aphorism although aphorisms should not usually be taken literally. However, it is such thinking that is behind the idea of future generations’ rights. It is thought that we are not only caretakers exercising the future’s rights but that we are only handling possessions that do not actually belong to us. If this argument were true, we should not be allowed to use any resources—these resources are on ‘loan’ from future generations and thus have to be returned to them. A barrel of oil burnt today is a barrel of oil that future generations cannot burn any more. Consequently, any use of resources today would be no better than theft or embezzlement. Of course, not even most environmentalists would go so far as to call any use of resources criminal. Instead, they often argue that future generations should be put in a position in which they continue having access to non-renewable resources. The Earth Charter, for example, puts it like this: ‘Manage the extraction and use of nonrenewable resources such as minerals and fossil fuels in ways that minimise depletion and cause no serious environmental damage.’3 With all due respect, this is nonsense on stilts. In order to minimise depletion you have to stop extraction. Simply managing it would not be enough. It is a fact that non-renewable resources used today cannot be used again in the future. Coal, natural gas, uranium, oil: when they are gone, they are gone. Perhaps people like the drafters of the Earth Charter had something different in mind. Maybe they only wanted to ensure that all present and future generations could use the same amounts of these natural and non-renewable resources. Unfortunately, this would not solve the problem, either. If there were 999 generations after us, then we would have to divide the world’s nonrenewable resources by 1,000 and only consume our 0.1 percent share of the pie. But what if there were going to be 10,000 or 100,000 generations after us? Who knows? Given that planet Earth is thought to last for another 3 to 5 billion years, it is at least possible that there will be many, many more generations to follow our own. If we were to leave them their share of the non-renewable resources then, in effect, we would have to stop consuming them right now. The very idea that there are some resources that we have borrowed from the future leads us into a logical dead-end. We would have to stop using resources and drastically cut both our energy consumption and economic activity. Whether this ensures a world that future generations would like to inhabit is another matter.

Predictions Bad

Making choices for the future denies them humanity

Leylim 10 (Cansin, MSc in Human Rights, August, http://lse.academia.edu/CansinLeylimIlgaz/Papers/424056/INTERGENERATIONAL\_JUSTICE\_Can\_Future\_People\_Have\_Rights\_Now, JM)

The communitarian critique by many authors (Walzer (1983), Sandel (1998), Taylor (1999)), present the differences in the conceptions of good of different communities as a well-grounded argument against Rawls' justice theory. One might suggest that since contemporary societies cannot reach a consensus on the conception of the good life, it is rather difficult to try and preempt that of the future people. Often, the argument that what we conceive to be 'good' for us might not be perceived 'good' by future people, is raised. Brian Barry (1999) suggests that sustainability is maintaining some X, into the indefinite future. If X is defined by the conception of good, then another dilemma surfaces. He asserts that what should be maintained for future generations is presented as their chance to have a good life as we conceive it, however, this is quite questionable, "for one of the defining characteristics of human beings is their ability to form their own conceptions of the good life" (pp.104). Hence it would be presumptuous of the present generation to claim to know their choices.

\*\*Human Rights Cred\*\*

Human Rights Cred – Alt Causes

No solvency – Iraq, WoT

Weisbrot 9 (Mark, co-director of the Center for Economic and Policy Research, 3/12, http://www.cepr.net/index.php/op-eds-&-columns/op-eds-&-columns/washingtons-lost-credibility-on-human-rights, KF)

The U.S. State Department's annual human rights report got an unusual amount of criticism this year. This time the center-left coalition government of Chile was notable in joining other countries such as Bolivia, Venezuela, and China – who have had more rocky relations with Washington – in questioning the "moral authority" of the U.S. government's judging other countries' human rights practices. It's a reasonable question, and the fact that more democratic governments are asking it may signal a tipping point. Clearly a state that is responsible for such high-profile torture and abuses as took place at Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo, the regular killing of civilians in Afghanistan and Iraq, and has reserved for itself the right to kidnap people and send them to prisons in other countries to be tortured ("extraordinary rendition") has a credibility problem on human rights issues. Although President Obama has pledged to close down the prison at Guantanamo and outlaw torture by U.S. officials, he has so far decided not to abolish the practice of "extraordinary rendition," and is escalating the war in Afghanistan. But this tipping point may go beyond any differences – and they are quite significant – between the current administration and its predecessor. In the past, Washington was able to position itself as an important judge of human rights practices despite being complicit or directly participating in some of the worst, large-scale human rights atrocities of the post-World War II era – in Vietnam, Indonesia, Central America, and other places. This makes no sense from a strictly logical point of view, but it could persist primarily because the United States was judged not on how it treated persons outside its borders but within them. Internally, the United States has had a relatively well-developed system of the rule of law, trial by jury, an independent judiciary, and other constitutional guarantees (although these did not extend to African-Americans in most of the Southern United States prior to the 1960s civil rights reforms). Washington was able to contrast these conditions with those of its main adversary during the Cold War – the Soviet Union. The powerful influence of the United States over the international media helped ensure that this was the primary framework under which human rights were presented to most of the world. The Bush Administration's "shredding of the Constitution" at home and overt support for human rights abuses abroad has fostered not only a change in image but perhaps the standards by which "the judge" will henceforth be judged. One example may help illustrate the point: China has for several years responded to the State Department's human rights report by publishing its own report on the United States. It includes a catalogue of social ills in the United States, including crime, prison and police abuse, racial and gender discrimination, poverty and inequality. But the last section is entitled "On the violation of human rights in other nations." The argument is that the abuse of people in other countries – including the more than one million people who have been killed as a result of the United States' illegal invasion and occupation of Iraq – must now be taken into account when evaluating the human rights record of the United States.

Guantanamo destroyed all credibility

Hilde 9 (Thomas C., Prof @ School of Public Policy @ University of Maryland, 5/29, http://www.boell.de/publications/publications-6832.html, KF)

How to restore the credibility of a country whose foundations and self-understanding are based on the universality of freedom and human rights, but that has violated precisely those rights by practicing torture in Guantánamo and other prisons around the world? The image of the United States as a role model of liberal democracy has suffered tremendously over the last eight years. In the name of the global war on terror, former President Bush suspended the law for those detained as possible terrorists. Even though President Obama’s promise to close Guantánamo is recognized by the international community as a first step towards restoring U.S. credibility, several problems require comprehensive policy solutions: \* How to proceed with detainees that are considered to be dangerous? \* What to do with detainees who are cleared of suspicion, but might face torture in their country of origin? \* How to cope with evidence that is derived from torture?

Human Rights Cred – Alt Causes

No solvency – Gitmo

Krulak 10 (Charles C., retired Marine general, 6/13, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/06/12/AR2010061203603.html, KF)

The June 7 front-page story "Camp Costly" revealed how the United States has spent more than $500 million to upgrade the U.S. facility at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. But the greatest cost of Guantanamo has been to American global leadership and credibility as a nation that respects the rule of law. Gen. David H. Petraeus has made it clear that "the existence of Gitmo has indeed been used by the enemy against us" and that it serves as a lingering reminder of missteps in the war on terror such as the abuses at Iraq's Abu Ghraib prison.

No modeling – Treaty aversion

Moravcsik 4 (Andrew, prof of politics @ Princeton, http://www.princeton.edu/~amoravcs/library/unilateralism.pdf, KF)

THE STORY OF U.S. “EXCEF’TIONALISM” IN HUMAN RIGHTS POLICY-THE aversion of the United States to domestic application of international human rights treaties-has often been told. The apparent paradox is clear. The United States has a long tradition of unilateral action to promote domestic constitutional rights and international human rights.1 The United States has helped establish and enforce global human rights standards through rhetorical disapproval, foreign aid, sanctions, military intervention, and even multilateral negotiations. It does so even in some areas-most recently humanitarian intervention in Kosovo-where the costs are potentially high. At the same time, however, the United States remains extremely cautious about committing itself to the domestic application of binding international legal standards for human rights. In particular, it has been hesitant to ratify multilateral human rights treaties, despite their acceptance among nearly all advanced industrial democracies, many developing democracies, and, in many cases, nondemocratic governments. When the United States does ratify such treaties, it typically imposes so many reservations that ratification has no domestic effect.2

No modeling – too conservative

Moravcsik 4 (Andrew, prof of politics @ Princeton, http://www.princeton.edu/~amoravcs/library/unilateralism.pdf, KF)

For a half-century these two salient elements of conservatism in the United States, racial discrimination and economic libertarianism, placed the nation distinctly outside the mainstream of the global consensus on the definition of human rights. The result has been intense partisan conflict. The conservatism of the ideological spectrum in the United States means that firm adherence to international human rights norms does not command support from a broad centrist coalition, as is generally true in Europe, but instead creates a deep left-right split between liberals and conservatives. Competing views are represented, respectively, by the Democratic and Republican parties. Support for adherence to international human rights treaties comes disproportionately from Democratic presidents and members of Congress, while opposition comes disproportionately from Republican presidents and members of Congress. Although there are of course numerous individual exceptions to this rule, it holds up well as a generalization.34 During the 195Os, partisan opposition was led by Southern Democrats opposed to federal civil rights policy; today it is led by Republican senators due to their (globally idiosyncratic) stand on socioeconomic and racial rights, and also on religious, educational, and cultural issues.

Torture hurt credibility

The Guardian 9 (Even MacAskill & Stephen Bates, staff, 4/23, http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/apr/23/condoleezza-rice-cia-waterboarding, KF)

Carl Levin, the Democratic chairman of the committee, said: "The paper trail on abuse leads to top civilian leaders, and our report connects the dots." The report shows a paper trail going from Rumsfeld to Guantánamo to Afghanistan and to Iraq. The report says: "The abuse of detainees in US custody cannot simply be attributed to the actions of "a few bad apples" acting on their own. The fact is that senior officials in the United States government solicited information on how to use aggressive techniques, redefined the law to create the appearance of their legality, and authorised their use against detainees." The report, the result of an 18-month inquiry, revealed that the administration rejected advice from various branches of the armed services against using more aggressive techniques. The military questioned the morality and the reliability of information gained. The report condemned the techniques adopted, saying: "Those efforts damaged our ability to collect accurate intelligence that could save lives, strengthened the hand of our enemies, and compromised our moral authority."

Human Rights Cred – Alt Causes

No solvency – Gitmo

IHFHR 7 (International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights, June, http://www.icj.org/IMG/IHF.pdf, KF)

The only way for the United States to remedy the situation and to regain lost ground as a beacon of human rights and democracy is to change course and get back on a human rights track in the fight against terrorism. All abusive practices must end and the United States must ensure that its policies fully conform to international standards. Among the most important steps to this end would be an immediate closure of the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay and abolition of the military tribunal system for trying terrorist suspects, measures recently supported by former US Secretary of State Colin Powell. In the words of a Russian human rights defender, the United States will have to “clean its own house” before it can credibly act as a human rights proponent again and exercise influence when it raises human rights concerns with other governments. Current US policies send the signal that the US is not serious about human rights. The longer US practices encourage this message to persist, the more harm will be done, not only to US interests but also to those of people around the world who seek to have their rights honored and protected.

No solvency – domestic policies

Powell 8 (Catherine, Associate Professor of Law, Fordham Law School, http://www.iaohra.org/storage/pdf/human-rights-campaign/HRAHDomestic\_Policy\_Blueprint.pdf, KF)

Reaffirming and implementing the U.S. commitment to human rights at home is critical for two reasons. First, human rights principles are at the core of America’s founding values, and Americans (as well as others within our borders or in U.S. custody), no less than others around the world, are entitled to the full benefit of these basic guarantees. That can hardly be open to debate. The second reason is perhaps less obvious, but equally compelling. When the United States fails to practice at home what it preaches to others, it loses credibility and undermines its ability to play an effective leadership role in the world. Leading through the power of our example rather than through the example of our power3 is particularly critical now, at a juncture when the United States needs to cultivate international cooperation to address pressing issues – such as the current economic downturn – that have global dimensions. Perhaps not surprisingly, then, an overwhelming majority of Americans strongly embrace the notion of human rights: that is, the idea that every person has basic rights regardless of whether or not the government recognizes those rights.4

Domestic policies prevent hrts cred

Powell 8 (Catherine, Associate Professor of Law, Fordham Law School, http://www.iaohra.org/storage/pdf/human-rights-campaign/HRAHDomestic\_Policy\_Blueprint.pdf, KF)

Even so, there remains a gap between the human rights ideals that the United States professes and its actual domestic practice, resulting in both a gap in credibility and a weakening of U.S. moral authority to lead by example. Human rights include the right to be free from torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment, and yet the United States has committed such acts in the name of counterterrorism efforts. Human rights include the rights to emergency shelter, food, and water, as well as security of person, and yet the United States failed to adequately guarantee these rights in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. Human rights include the right to equality of opportunity, and yet inequalities persist in access to housing, education, jobs, and health care. Human rights include the right to equality in the application of law enforcement measures, and yet there are gross racial disparities in the application of the death penalty, and racial and ethnic profiling has been used unfairly to target African Americans, Latinos, and those who appear Arab, Muslim, South Asian, or immigrant (whether through traffic stops, airport screening, or immigration raids). Human rights include the right to equal pay and gender equality, and yet a pay gap persists between female and male workers. Certainly, the journey to fully realizing human rights is a work-in-progress, but to make progress, we must work – through smart, principled policies that advance the ability of the United States to live up to its own highest ideals.

Human Rights Cred – Not Real

International human rights aren’t recognized

Moravcsik 4 (Andrew, prof of politics @ Princeton, http://www.princeton.edu/~amoravcs/library/unilateralism.pdf, KF)

Should we care about the failure of the United States to ratify international human rights treaties? Does the ambivalent unilateralism of U.S. human rights policy make any real difference?55 Nearly all legal academics, NGOs, and politicians who comment on U.S. human rights policy assert that U.S. unilateralism has had a negative impact on the nation’s foreign and human rights policies, as well as on the international enforcement of human rights.56 Yet the available evidence from the sources most often cited-Senate hearings, legal articles, and the most important books on U.S. human rights policy-casts a skeptical light on such assertions. Activists, officials, scholars, and journalists have so far offered very little hard evidence to support the widespread claim that the failure of the United States to ratify human rights treaties has had a negative effect on U.S. international interests or ideals. If any such effects exist, they are certainly very subtle.57 Of course the lack of evidence cannot decisively disconfirm a claim, absent a structured and comprehensive inquiry. The most responsible conclusion is, therefore, simply that there is little evidence that U.S. ratification (or nonratification) of multilateral treaties has any effect on the realization of U.S. foreign policy goals or the promotion of global human rights. The argument that domestic rights would be enforced more thoroughly is more plausible. This is not to rule out the possibility that evidence for a stronger international impact of U.S. policy might exist, but until it is made available, any claims about the external implications of U.S. human rights policy must be viewed as at best speculative, if not misleading.

Individual policies don’t influence credibility

Fettweis 7 (Christopher J., assistant professor of national security affairs at the U.S. Naval War College, “Credibility and the War on Terror”, Political Science Quarterly, Winter 2007/2008. Vol. 122, Iss. 4;, p. Proquest)

A series of other studies have followed those of Hopf and Mercer, yielding similar results. The empirical record seems to suggest that there have been few instances of a setback in one arena influencing state behavior in a second arena.42 Daryl Press began his recent study expecting to find that perceptions of the opponent's credibility would be an important variable affecting state behavior.43 He chose three cases in which reputation would presumably have been vital to the outcome-the outbreak of the First World War, the Berlin Crisis of the late 1950s, and the Cuban Missile Crisis-and found, to his surprise, that in all three cases, leaders did not appear to be influenced at all by prior actions of their rivals, for better or for worse. Crisis behavior appeared to be entirely independent; credibility, therefore, was all but irrelevant. Mercer's conclusions about reputation seem to have amassed a good deal more supporting evidence in the time since he wrote.

Human Rights Cred – War

International human rights promotion leads to war

Baxi 98 (Upendra, Professor of Law, University of Warwick, accessed 8/1/05, Fall Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems, lexis)

The post-modernist critique of human rights further maintains that the telling of large global stories ("metanarratives") is less a function of emancipation as it as an aspect of the politics of intergovernmental desire that ingests the politics of resistance. Put another way, meta-narratives serve to co-opt into mechanisms and processes of governance the languages of human rights such that bills of rights may adorn many a military constitutionalism with impunity and that socalled human rights commissions may thrive upon state/regime sponsored violations. Not surprisingly, the more severe the human rights violation, the more the power elites declare their loyalty to the regime of human rights. The near-universality of ratification of the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), for example, betokens no human liberation of women. Rather, it endows the state with the power to tell more Nietschzean lies. n68 All too often, human rights languages become stratagems of imperialistic foreign policy through military invasions as well as through global economic diplomacy. n69 Superpower diplomacy at the United Nations is not averse to causing untold suffering through sanctions whose manifest aim is to serve the future of human rights. n70 The United States, the solitary superpower at the end of the millennium, has made sanctions for the promotion of human rights abroad a gourmet feast at the White House and on Capitol Hill.

Human rights divide societies and prevent cooperation

Gentry 4 (John A., retired Army officer, researcher and writer on defense and security issues, HUMAN RIGHTS: OPPOSING VIEWPOINTS, p. 52.)

The proliferation of human rights is a boon for rights-oriented bureaucracies and trial lawyers, but it damages the social fabric that turns groups of people into communities and communities into a nation. Because the only asset any government ultimately has is its legitimacy, the cost of a government’s inability to satisfy rights-based demands is overwhelming. That cost rises further when governments, and the political parties that seek to control them, favor some rights over competing claims to please political backers or to curry favor with voters.

Human rights detract from political dialogue and compromise

Gentry 4 (John A., retired Army officer, researcher and writer on defense and security issues, HUMAN RIGHTS: OPPOSING VIEWPOINTS, p. 52.)

Excessive human rights are anathema to nationhood because they denigrate the compromise, discipline, and sacrifice needed for collective work in pursuit of common goals in favor of the immediate gratification of individual desires. With personal desires enshrined as rights through justifications of ideology or theology, there is no need to share them or to compromise on their definition, cost, or speed of actualization. Rights are absolute by definition. With claims to rights clear, the shared community values and goals that helped bond society when rights were fewer and resource constraints more obvious are much less important. There is less need to work together and thus less of the glue of nationhood. Even when nationhood is diminished or destroyed, however, government structures remain to service the rights of individuals and small groups, including the employment rights of bureaucracies and unions built to provide services justified by rights.

\*\*Indo-Pak\*\*

Indo-Pak – No War

No Indo-Pak war - empirics

Moore 7 (Carl, blogger, http://www.carolmoore.net/nuclearwar/index.html#Threats, dw: May 2007, da: 7-4-2011, lido)

India and Pakistan have repeatedly threatened nuclear war against each other, most seriously in the last few years. In late December 2002 Pakistan's president, General Pervez Musharraf, addressing Air Force veterans in Karachi, said: he last year "personally" conveyed a clear "message" to Prime Minister Vajpayee, "through every international leader who came to Pakistan", namely, that Indian troops "should not expect a conventional war from Pakistan" if they "moved a single step across the international border or the Line of Control". In response Indian Defense Minister George Fernandez said: "We can take a bomb or two, or more. When we respond, there will be no Pakistan." About the same time former Army Chief of Staff Aslam Beg, then heading a right-wing Pakistani think tank said: "Our policy of deterrence is India-specific. No matter who comes for us, Israel, the United States or India we will take on India. If someone is thinking of taking on Pakistan they should know we will take on India." And despite subsequent detente between the two nations during the remainder of 2003, as late as fall, 2003 Ariel Sharon visited India, worrying Pakistan that he was once again proposing India do a surgical strike against Pakistani nuclear assets.

No Indo-Pak war – neither country can afford it, not enough weapons

Islamabad Sunday Times 11 (Why India is not America?, dw: 6-12-2011, dw: 7-6-2011, lexis, lido)

Such a sequence of action and inevitable reaction is the reason why a nuclear war between India and Pakistan is outside the realm of possibility, and why even a conventional war is almost impossible. Neither side would have much to gain from such a conflict, even should it finally prevail, and a lot to lose. Neither India nor Pakistan are front-rank military powers, except in terms of manpower, a factor that proved of little use to Saddan Hussein in Kuwait in 1991,when tens of thousands of his troops were cut to pieces by US aircraft and missile strikes. Both depend on outside sources for critical spare parts and fuel supplies, and while India has a much bigger economy than Pakistan, a conflict with its western neighbour would make vulnerable some of the country's most valuable assets. An example is the huge refinery at Jamnagar, which is less than five minutes flying time away from the Al Badr air base in southern Pakistan. As for a missile launched from within Pakistan,it would take only a few seconds to reach the facility. The truth is that neither country can afford a war, which is why it is all the more distressing that at least a "cold peace" is not allowed to descend on the subcontinent.

**Indo-Pak – No War**

India and Pakistan won’t go to war – Military checks

Karl 96 (David, phd, moodle.stoa.usp.br/mod/resource/view.php?id=28252, dw: Winter 1996, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

The restrained character of South Asia's nuclear rivalry undermines pessimistic concerns about the danger of preventive war. Singular among the countries that then possessed a nuclear capability, India did not follow up its 1974 test explosion with a full-fledged nuclear weapon program. There are a multitude of reasons for this, but one of them-military resistance to nuclear weapons does not easily tally with pessimists' concern for pernicious military biases. In the Indian case, while elements within the armed forces have long advocated the development of nuclear weapons, the desire for autonomy on the part of the military leadership has led it to reject the nuclear option, in part because this would create opportunities for civilian authorities to interject themselves more deeply into military decision-making and erode military prerogatives in the conduct of war operations.41 As one proliferation pessimist recently admitted, "in numerous private discussions, top Indian military officers in all three services say the handful of outspoken retired generals and admirals who urge India to become a nuclear-weapon state are at the outer fringe and do not represent mainstream thinking in the Indian officer corps."42 Contrary to some fears, India has accepted Pakistan as a de facto nuclear state, a development that in some measure eroded the regional dominance New Delhi gained through its decisive victory in the 1971 Indo-Pakistani War.43 Islamabad's nuclear capabilities have also not led to an unbridled arms com- petition between the two. In contrast to what on the surface appears to be a situation in which both sides "are careening along on a nuclear collision course," it is possible to identify a significant pattern of nuclear cooperation between New Delhi and Islamabad.44 Both sides have pledged not to attack each other's nuclear installations-an accord explicitly initiated by New Delhi to lay to rest preventive-strike rumors-and have exchanged lists of these facilities for this purpose. As an Indian proponent of nuclear weapons explains: Military countermeasures against proliferation in a neighboring country, espe- cially in the form of preemptive strikes on nuclear facilities, are a sure recipe for disaster in a densely populated region like southern Asia with numerous nuclear installations. A tit-for-tat retaliatory campaign between adversaries could wreak havoc, including radioactive fallout, in the region. It was this realization that prompted India to offer Pakistan a bilateral pact abjuring attacks on each other's declared nuclear facilities and storage sites.45

No war - communications

RIA Novosti 8 (http://en.rian.ru/analysis/20080125/97772224.html, dw: 1-25-2008, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

Pakistan is strictly observing the schedule of tests it has agreed with India. There are no deviations in the type or range of missiles. There is one important detail in this context. In 2007, Pakistan and India tested missiles, having notified each other in advance. They conducted some test launches almost simultaneously, as if emphasizing their commitment to the principle of parallel testing. This tradition goes back to 1998, when Pakistan tested nuclear weapons after India. But the principle of parallel testing is only limited to time. Comparison of missile systems' characteristics is obviously not in favor of Pakistan. Not without help from the great powers, India has gone so far ahead in the sphere of arms that it is pursuing its national interests from the Persian Gulf to the Malacca archipelago. Islamabad justifiably believes that the United States is ready to support India's claims to the status of a world power in exchange for its efforts to deter China and Iran.

Indo-Pak – No War

No war – deterrence, Musharaf

Sulekha news 8 (http://newshopper.sulekha.com/no-threat-of-india-pakistan-war-musharraf\_news\_1014578.htm, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

'Let me make clear to all that Pakistani forces are fully equipped and ready to face any aggression... but I would say that India should not dare to attack Pakistan,' Musharraf said when pressed by reporters as to what would happen if India attacks Pakistan. Musharraf, who had to resign in August under national and international pressure after ruling the country for almost nine years, said there were no chances of war between the two countries but was quick to add that Pakistan was capable of defending its borders if attacked.

No war - public

Sify news 9 (http://www.sify.com/news/no-threat-of-war-with-india-gilani-news-international-jegurOedfhc.html,, dw: 1-15-2009, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

 "Both countries are nuclear powers. I think there is no threat of war," Gilani told a brief news conference during a visit to the Information Ministry. He was responding to a question about army chief General Deepak Kapoor's comments on Wednesday that all options were open before New Delhi, including the "fighting option" as last resort, for dealing with Pakistan. Gilani indicated that the Indian government's stance is being influenced by public pressure. "There is tremendous pressure of the public on the government of India," he said. Pak doesn't want war, says Gilani Answering another question about Pakistan possibly abandoning the Iran-Pakistan-India gas pipeline project, Gilani said a special envoy of Iran who met him recently had given no indication that the venture will not be implemented.

Relations and governmental processes check war

Sify news 9 (http://www.sify.com/news/no-threat-of-war-with-india-gilani-news-international-jegurOedfhc.html,, dw: 1-15-2009, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

Answering another question about Pakistan possibly abandoning the Iran-Pakistan-India gas pipeline project, Gilani said a special envoy of Iran who met him recently had given no indication that the venture will not be implemented. On the investigation into the killing of Benazir Bhutto, Gilani said the UN probe into the former premier's assassination on December 27, 2007 is expected to start soon. Replying to a question on scrapping of the 17th amendment of the Constitution that gives the President sweeping powers to dismiss the Premier and dissolve Parliament, Gilani said the ruling PPP is committed to repeal the provisions. Mumbai terror attack special A two-thirds majority in both houses of Parliament is needed for scrapping the 17th amendment. The government is setting up a committee that will examine all suggestions in this regard and then forge consensus on the move, he added.

Indo-Pak – No War

No threat between India and Pakistan - intel

Inewsite 9 (http://www.inewsit.com/articles/entry/Is-there-no-threat-from-India-by-Afshain-Afzal¸dw: 6-8-2009, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

 US intelligence officials have confirmed that Washington is working to improve cooperation between Pakistan and India to share more information on counterterrorism matters. A Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) official added that the cooperation also included intelligence sharing on Taliban commanders who are carrying out insurgency against the Pakistani government. In the same regard, the Wall Street Journal also reported that CIA arranged for Pakistan and India to share information on the Pakistan-based Mujahideen organization Lashkar-e-Tayyiaba (LeT). The US also shares regular intelligence with India on Pakistan Army's operations against elements in Bajaur, the Swat Valley and Buner in Pakistan. In another development mediated by CIA, the Srinagar-Muzaffarabad bus service has been thrown open to everyone in India. Earlier, it was restricted only to people with relatives across the dividing Line of Control (LoC). Indian Government has eased the existing rules, as a result of which more people can now travel across the LoC. They don't need a valid passport but instead a permit issued by the Passport Officer in Indian Jammu and Kashmir would suffice. This permit would be valid for visit any where in Azad Jammu and Kashmir. In the same regard Indian Ministry of External Affair has issued clarifications that all Indian national can apply for across LoC travel in Pakistan. Indian Ministry of Foreign Affairs has given go ahead signal to a plan in which 'triple entry permit' would be granted to frequent travelers, which will put an end to going through various formalities. It appears that days are counted when the Indian nationals would also be allowed to visit Pakistan without necessary formalities.

No war – econ effects

Markey 10 (Daniel, Council on Foreign Relations, “Terrorism and Indo-Pakistani Esclation,” jstore, dw: January 2010, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

Aside from building diplomatic and coordination mechanisms, Washington could also prepare tools for coercing and inducing New Delhi and Islamabad away from military escalation. Granted, the recent U.S. track record on this score is mixed. In instances when either side felt its supreme national security to be at risk—such as during the 1998 nuclear tests—no combination of U.S. carrots or sticks could shake New Delhi or Islamabad from its path. On the other hand, Washington played an important role in walking back conflicts on several occasions, including in 1990, 1999, and 2001–2002, in each instance placing pressure on Islamabad and convincing New Delhi that many of its core demands were better achieved through diplomacy than through force. Yet Washington’s ability to induce restraint by making promises to New Delhi may be ending, as New Delhi believes that past guarantees have yielded too little. Washington would improve its negotiating position with India’s leadership if Islamabad convicts those responsible for prior attacks. Washington’s ability to threaten sanctions becomes more powerful the more Indian and Pakistani militaries and economies are tied to those of the United States. To the extent that India and Pakistan purchase or receive weapons systems and platforms manufactured in the United States, they become tied to U.S. suppliers for parts and technologies that could be withheld or slowed by Washington. Washington’s influence in multilateral settings also offers a potential means of coercive leverage. At present, for instance, Pakistan is especially beholden to the International Monetary Fund (IMF), in which the United States has a powerful voting stake.

Indo-Pak – No War

No war – political pressure

Markey 10 (Daniel, Council on Foreign Relations, “Terrorism and Indo-Pakistani Esclation,” jstore, dw: January 2010, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

 One lesson to be gleaned from the 2008 attack on Mumbai is that the Indian government felt tremendous domestic political pressure to take action, even if the prime minister believed that military retaliation would prove counterproductive. To help appease popular sentiment and respond to critics within and outside the governing coalition, the Congress Party leadership took several nonmilitary steps, including announcing a pause in its “composite dialogue” with Pakistan, approaching the UN Security Council to proscribe JuD as a terrorist organization, and canceling a 6 tour of Pakistan by India’s national cricket team. In the months after Mumbai, India used many similar diplomatic “safety valves” to the point that few remain today in the event of another crisis. Washington could encourage New Delhi to reinstitute similar mechanisms and identify new ones. Obvious points of departure include organizing an expanded range of people-to-people interactions, restarting working-level dialogues on technical issues such as trade and communication, and identifying multilateral settings—not limited to the United Nations—where India could take its case to the international community in the event of another attack. That said, the potential value of these safety valves must be balanced against the prospect that they could also inspire terrorists to launch a spoiler attack. More technical and procedural steps are less likely to provoke extremist groups than are symbolically charged actions, such as high-level summits and joint declarations.

No war – crisis communication checks

Markey 10 (Daniel, Council on Foreign Relations, “Terrorism and Indo-Pakistani Esclation,” jstore, dw: January 2010, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

 A second lesson from the Mumbai attack is that crisis communication between Indian and Pakistani governments is inadequate. Washington served as an essential, trusted interlocutor and intelligence transmission belt for both sides. Before the next crisis, Washington could work to improve communication, particularly between civilian officials. As another means to calm nerves or counsel restraint in the midst of a crisis, Washington could leverage the influence of—and coordinate its diplomacy with—other major regional and global players, including China, Great Britain, and Saudi Arabia. Building the technical means and political consensus to convene a small IndoPakistani crisis contact group on short notice would enhance U.S. capacity in this respect. Over the years, Washington has compiled a standard tool kit to improve crisis stability between India and Pakistan. U.S.-sponsored track-two dialogues between Indian and Pakistani political and military leaders have emphasized the danger of inadvertent or accidental escalation beyond the nuclear threshold and the urgent need for unified command, control, and communications systems. In spite of these and related efforts, communications between Pakistan’s chief policymakers appear to have suffered multiple breakdowns after Mumbai. One breakdown led to the sacking of the national security adviser by the prime minister; another created ill-timed confusion over whether the nation’s chief intelligence official would travel to New Delhi for consultations.

Trade opportunities check conflict

Markey 10 (Daniel, Council on Foreign Relations, “Terrorism and Indo-Pakistani Esclation,” jstore, dw: January 2010, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

 On the economic front, if Washington were to extend new preferential trade opportunities to Pakistan, particularly for textiles and garments, they would also offer coercive leverage in a time of crisis. Even the relatively mundane decision to revise official U.S. travel advisories can influence the behavior of U.S. investors and multinational corporations, imposing costs on Indian and Pakistani markets and mobilizing regional businessmen as advocates for stability and de-escalation. To take one step further, preparing plans for U.S. noncombatant evacuation operations in South Asia could also enhance Washington’s capacity to level credible economic threats on short notice. In general, coercive measures are more likely to succeed with Pakistan than with India, in part because the Pakistani state depends more on military and economic assistance from the United States and its allies. Poised on the edge of bankruptcy, Pakistan may be particularly susceptible to economic diplomacy unless it perceives an immediate, existential threat from India. That said, Washington must keep in mind that coercive threats can be costly to U.S. interests. If U.S. threats jeopardize other essential aspects of cooperation with Islamabad and New Delhi, or if they undermine the basic stability of the Pakistani state, they may do more harm than good, even if they avert some degree of military escalation in the near term.

Indo-Pak – No Escalation

No escalation – US will try not to get involved

Markey 10 (Daniel, Council on Foreign Relations staff, “Terrorism and Indo-Pakistani Esclation,” jstore, dw: January 2010, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

Aside from U.S. humanitarian concerns, the need to protect American citizens and business interests in South Asia, and the risk of nuclear escalation whenever tension rises between India and Pakistan, Washington’s immediate concern in the event of another terrorist attack in India lies in avoiding an Indo-Pakistani crisis that would undermine the U.S. war effort in Afghanistan or distract Pakistan from ongoing counterterror and counterinsurgency operations. The potential disruption of U.S. efforts in Afghanistan stems in part from the fact that Pakistan serves as a vital—in many ways irreplaceable—logistics hub and overland corridor for U.S. and NATO operations. An Indo-Pakistani military confrontation could close Pakistan’s ports or otherwise delay shipments for a significant time. Short of war, if Islamabad believes Washington is ignoring its concerns, it can manipulate these supply routes to demonstrate its strategic value to Washington. As the Obama administration ramps up its military commitment in Afghanistan, Washington’s logistical dependence upon Pakistan will only deepen. Previous Indo-Pakistani crises show that Pakistan’s military will give greater priority to the threat from India than to the threat from militants operating along the Afghan border. At the very least, a crisis with India would compel Pakistan’s general staff to redirect attention and time from ongoing operations in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) and could derail intelligence and law enforcement activities connected to a range of counterterror efforts. Even a relatively brief disruption of these activities could impose high costs on the United States, given the fact that al-Qaeda and other anti-Western terrorist groups operate from Pakistani territory. More broadly, the United States would also suffer if an Indo-Pakistani crisis weakens the stability and capacity of Pakistan’s government or creates new, long-lasting tensions between U.S. partners in New Delhi and Islamabad. The frailty of Pakistan’s governing institutions already offers a permissive environment to antistate militants and extremists. A failed military exchange with India could deliver a body blow to the legitimacy and authority of Pakistani state institutions, opening even more space for extreme alternatives. And although the United States has lived through periods of intense IndoPakistani hostility in the past, there has never been a time when bilateral relations with the two countries were simultaneously considered as strategically prized as they are today. Washington’s interest in Indo-Pakistani détente also grows the more the United States invests in Afghanistan’s stability; heightened violence between warring Afghan proxies supported by India and Pakistan would be an almost certain consequence of new hostilities between New Delhi and Islamabad.

Indo-Pak – Peace Talks Check

Both countries are entering peace talks – won’t go to war

Islamabad Sunday Times 11 (Why India is not America?, dw: 6-12-2011, dw: 7-6-2011, lexis, lido)

Interestingly, the US - which incessantly talks of peace between two countries whose bickering has given it great leverage over both - supports hardliners such as COAS P A Kayani, and connives at moves that weaken the few doves in the Pakistan establishment, such as President A A Zardari.For a brief while, President Zardari pointed out the very truth that Prime Minister Manmohan Singh never fails to mention, which is that both India and Pakistan need to enter into a period of stable and peaceable relations, with neither side seeking to destabilize the other. Analysts estimate that such tranquility between the two South Asian giants would add about 5% to Pakistan's rate of growth, and more than 1% to India's. This columnist believes that more and more people across both sides of the border appreciate the folly of seeking concessions from the other side that are politically impossible for them to accept. There is a need to formulate joint strategies against terrorism and economic and social backwardness, rather than keep away from genuine cooperation. Interestingly, these days the powerful Punjabi politcian, Mian Nawaz Sharif, seems to be articulating just such a viewpoint. Sharif has been realistic in his acceptance of the need for peace between India and Pakistan, and of the immense benefits that this would bring to both.Should there be greater cross-border trade, both sides of Punjab can develop at a much more rapid pace, as indeed can other parts of both India and Pakistan. Sadly, apparently because he is wary of being seen by the military as too soft on India, President Zardari has distanced himself from his earlier views, and is talking in harsher tones about India.

Indo-Pak – No Nukes

No nuclear war – mutually assured destruction assures neither state will go into war

Tepperman 9 (Jonathon, Newsweek, staff, Learning to Love The Bomb; Obama wants to rid the world of nuclear weapons. Why that might be a big mistake., dw: 9-14-2009, da: 7-6-2011, lexis, lido)

The record since then shows the same pattern repeating: nuclear-armed enemies slide toward war, then pull back, always for the same reasons. The best recent example is India and Pakistan, which fought three bloody wars after independence before acquiring their own nukes in 1998. Getting their hands on weapons of mass destruction didn't do anything to lessen their animosity. But it did dramatically mellow their behavior. Since acquiring atomic weapons, the two sides have never fought another war, despite severe provocations (like Pakistani-based terrorist attacks on India in 2001 and 2008). They have skirmished once. But during that flare-up, in Kashmir in 1999, both countries were careful to keep the fighting limited and to avoid threatening the other's vital interests. Sumit Ganguly, an Indiana University professor and co-author of the forthcoming India, Pakistan, and the Bomb, has found that on both sides, officials' thinking was strikingly similar to that of the Russians and Americans in 1962. The prospect of war brought Delhi and Islamabad face to face with a nuclear holocaust, and leaders on each side did what they had to do to avoid it.

Indo-Pak – No Nuke Steal

Terrorists won’t get hands on nuclear stock piles

Times of India 11 (http://articles.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/2011-06-22/india/29688979\_1\_ashfaq-pervez-kayani-pakistan-army-nuclear-arsenal, dw: 6-22-2011, da: 7-8-2011, lido)

His remark came against the backdrop of reports that the feeling of humiliation in Pakistani barracks over the Abbotabad raid combined with resentment over American operatives active on Pakistani soil has led to a groundswell of discontent against Kayani. However, Blake talked of a renewed effort on Kayani's part to engage with the US. He said the Pakistan army chief had helped Americans take out the wreckage of the helicopter which crashed inside the compound where Osama was holed up. The Americans were anxious not to let [China](http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/topic/China) lay its hands on the debris of the chopper whose design helped it dodge Pakistani radars. Blake also discounted the fear of terrorists laying their hands on Pakistan's nuclear weapons. The worry that terror groups may be able to secure the weapons spiked after jihadis successfully raided a naval base in [Karachi](http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/topic/Karachi). "Pakistan's nuclear assets remain under much tighter security than what was used at Mehran naval base," Blake said. When asked about the danger of radicals in the armed forces taking hold of weapons, the visiting US official said, "These are all issues that Pakistan needs to take seriously. But the nuclear arsenal is not at risk."

Indo-Pak – Deterrence checks

Deterrence checks indo-pak conflict – conflicts don’t escalate

Karl 96 (David, phd, moodle.stoa.usp.br/mod/resource/view.php?id=28252, dw: Winter 1996, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

One could argue that the presence of important constraining factors, such as Islamabad's military and economic dependency on the United States as well as India's dire financial condition, make the 1990 Kashmir crisis a less than definitive test for proliferation pessimism. But the impact of these factors should not be exaggerated. The Muslim insurgency in Kashmir, and alleged Pakistani support for it, was perceived in New Delhi as a manifest threat to India's territorial integrity and national identity; there was growing temptation in government circles, as well as important political groups, to use military force to resolve the crisis.53 U.S. security protection of Pakistan was bound to be seen as fickle by Islamabad, given the rocky history of U.S.-Pakistani rela- tions. Moreover, whatever restraint U.S. military and economic assistance engendered in Pakistan's nuclear activities, it came to an end in late 1990, when this assistance was terminated due to Washington's proliferation anxieties. On balance, South Asia's nuclear dynamics lend greater credence to proliferation optimism than to its critics. Steven Miller argues that the Indo-Pakistani nuclear relationship to date is so temporally limited, compared to the span of the Cold War, that it does not provide conclusive data about the security and stability effects of nuclear proliferation.54 But what this dyad lacks in a temporal dimension, it more than makes up for in terms of the overall intensity of the rivalry. South Asia's political-military circumstances give rise to a rather stark setting for deterrence encounters and epitomize the conditions many Western analysts fear will lead to catastrophe if proliferation increases in the world. Because of a surfeit of powerful and interlocking factors that are at work in pushing India and Pakistan toward military conflict, one would intuitively expect that the subcontinent is a "least likely" case for peaceful proliferation outcomes.

Deterrence checks conflict – proximity and prospect of bigger war

Waltz 2000 (Kenneth, prof, http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/gjia/gjia\_winspr00f.html, dw: Spring 2000, da: 7-8-2011, lido)

Journal Let’s turn our attention to the nuclear situation in South Asia. While nuclear weapons may have arguably helped stabilize the contentious relationship between India and Pakistan–no war has been fought since the introduction of nuclear weapons in the early 1970s–many observers worry that nuclear stability may not hold. What do you see as the prospects for stability? Waltz Stability in the subcontinent now exists; it had not existed since World War II and the partition of India and Pakistan. Now with nuclear weapons on both sides, India and Pakistan can no longer fight even a conventional war over Kashmir, as former General Beg and former General Sardarji both admitted. But we still fear instability such as the intractable dispute over the Kashmir. Yet the bitterness between the United States and the Soviet Union was deep enough during the Cold War, and deterrence worked. Why would India and Pakistan be different? Does India and Pakistan’s common border increase the risk? Probably not in a modern world where there are airplanes and missiles that can reach anywhere. What difference does it make that you’ve got a common border as long as it’s perfectly easy for the two countries in an adversarial relationship to reach each other? Geographic proximity may shrink warning time, but nuclear deterrence does not depend on being able to react with split–second timing. What’s the hurry? If you have received a damaging blow from another country and you’re going to retaliate, what difference does it make if you retaliate now, ten minutes from now, or tomorrow? A country still has that same fear of the retaliation, and it’s that fear of retaliation that deters. Proximity also does not mean vulnerability. Every country has enough space to move its weapons around; in order for me to believe that your force is vulnerable and consider a preemptive attack, I have to convince myself that I know exactly how many deliverable nuclear weapons you have. So if I think you have twelve weapons, I’ve got to know you don’t have a couple more. I’ve got to be sure that’s the number. And if I persuade myself that you have twelve and no more, I have to know where they are, and I have to be sure that you do not move them by the time I decide to attack. It’s estimated by Herbert York, former director of Lawrence Livermore National Laboratories, that a country making a relatively crude nuclear warhead would be able to make one weighing less than a ton–small enough to place in a van and move around.

**Indo-Pak – Deterrence checks**

Deterrence checks – gives countries risk of going to war

Waltz 2000 (Kenneth, prof, http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/gjia/gjia\_winspr00f.html, dw: Spring 2000, da: 7-8-2011, lido)

 You’ve got to be sure that in an attack, whether with nuclear weapons or conventional weapons, you’re attacking weapons. Now, it’s hard–nuclear weapons are small–to be sure that you’re going to destroy those weapons quickly and completely. With conventional weapons you at least have the illusion of control; that is, you can defend, you can delay, and you can exact a toll from the enemy. The ultimate question is whether you are going to win or lose. If you are fighting with nuclear weapons the issue is survival, not necessarily physically, but as a political entity. Military commanders are well aware of how many things can go wrong: failed intelligence, undetected warheads in an unexpected location. If Pakistan has two dozen nuclear weapons spread around and at least four or five India does not know about, is India going to attack and risk four or five warheads blowing up Indian cities? While the attack might not destroy India, what could be at stake that would be worth that price? It’s a risk to their regime, it’s a risk to rulers, and it’s a risk to the military. You don’t get much enthusiasm out of the military for fighting wars it’s going to lose.

Indo-Pak - Deterrence

Deterrence checks indo-pak conflict

Glover 10 (Stephen, columnist, http://www.dailymail.co.uk/debate/columnists/article-1267926/Kill-Trident-rate-nation-defend-itself.html, dw: 4-22-2010, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

The Cold War was won by the West as a result of nuclear deterrence. Without it, the much more powerful red Army would probably have invaded Western Europe decades ago and we might all be driving around in Ladas and getting drunk on cheap vodka. No properly functioning nuclear State has ever been invaded. India and Pakistan are now unlikely to go to war against each other for the simple reason that both possess nuclear weapons. Deterrence has worked between states, though all bets are off if a group of deranged terrorists should get hold of a 'dirty bomb'. The Soviet union may no longer pose much of a threat, but there may be other nuclear states that will threaten us in 30 years' time. China? Iran? North Korea? No one knows. We can only know that nuclear weapons provide the ultimate insurance. Since 1997, Britain has more than halved its number of nuclear warheads. We now have just 160. our ageing Trident submarines, which Labour and the Tories say they want to replace, are the only platform we have for the use of nuclear weapons. What does Mr Clegg propose? Land-based missiles are vulnerable to attack. Aeroplanes carrying bombs can obviously be shot down. But a submarine concealed underwater thousands of miles from a potential target is almost certainly beyond the reach of an adversary even with a first-class navy.

\*\*Intervening Actors/Gewirth\*\*

A2: Gewirth

Gewirth’s theories aren’t practical for application to real atrocities

Kohen 5 (Ari, Assistant Professor. Ph.D. Duke University Contemporary Political Science March 17,"The Possibility of Secular Human Rights: Alan Gewirth and the Principle of Generic Consistency") HD

We have no conception, of course, of what it would be like to die at the hands of a man wielding a machete or to wield that machete ourselves. By and large, we cannot even conceive of watching such a terrible spectacle. But we react to the idea of this crime in a far more immediate way than we do to the abstract physical assaults of Ames and Blake. The difference is two-fold for William F. Schulz, the executive director of Amnesty International USA. First, “I am stricken at heart because I have the imagination to know at least in proximate form what the experience, the pain, must have felt like. I am stricken at heart because on some level I identity with the victims; I know what it is to bleed.” 101 Second, “when I heard of cases of cruelty, I responded with revulsion. … It is a revulsion grounded in part in recognition. Recognition not that I am capable of inflicting exactly that kind of pain, I trust, but recognition that the capacity to inflict suffering, like the capacity to feel compassion, is a familiar one.” 102 Because we can imagine, at least in some small way, what it must have been like to be a victim in that situation, we recognize the importance of defending the idea of human rights around the world. And because we are all too familiar with the deepest and darkest part of ourselves, we can contribute to the conversation about how best to prevent violations of human rights. I have argued throughout this paper, for a variety of reasons, that men who butcher women and children like animals will not be dissuaded by Gewirth’s argument that they are acting inconsistently. The claim that we are all rational agents simply cannot bear the weight of the idea of human rights. If we want to argue, as Gewirth does, that there are certain features or qualities about human beings that preclude their wanton destruction, they must be far more persuasive than the generic features of action, and they must be grounded in the world as it is rather than the world of theory.

Gewirth’s theories are too abstract to function in reality

Kohen 5 (Ari, Assistant Professor. Ph.D. Duke University Contemporary Political Science March 17,"The Possibility of Secular Human Rights: Alan Gewirth and the Principle of Generic Consistency") HD

In abstracting away so many characteristics from human beings in order to create the prospective purposive agent, something has clearly been lost from Gewirth’s account of the justification for human inviolability. It might be philosophically interesting to consider whether the generic features of action can logically provide a secular grounding for the idea of human rights, but what is at stake for Gewirth seems overly academic. Human rights, however, are not simply academic and their justification is far more than a philosophical puzzle; they are deadly serious, often a matter of life and death. For this reason, human rights cannot be considered in a vacuum, and any attempt at their justification must be firmly entrenched in the real world. While I have quibbled with the PGC on its own terms and argued that (15) does not necessarily follow from (1), and while I have noted that a great many other theorists have done likewise, my deepest critique is that the PGC’s assumptions cause a great deal of trouble whether or not Gewirth’s theory ultimately makes logical sense. As Rorty argues, Gewirth’s theory removes the discussion of human rights from the realm of the actual and concentrates on the purely theoretical. In doing so, it calls to mind Arthur Koestler’s point that “Statistics don’t bleed; it is the detail which counts.” 98 Neither, it seems to me, do PPAs. And the terrible reality is that human beings do, often at the hands of others.

A2: Gewirth

Gewirth’s theories are divorced from reality- human beings are more complex than he assumes

Kohen 5 (Ari, Assistant Professor. Ph.D. Duke University Contemporary Political Science March 17,"The Possibility of Secular Human Rights: Alan Gewirth and the Principle of Generic Consistency") HD

In order to offer a truly compelling secular foundation for the idea of human rights, one must do more than Gewirth has done in demonstrating the logical necessity of accepting a principle that entails the universalization of the generic rights of freedom and well-being. As we have seen. Gewirth crafts an interesting argument for human rights in theory, but runs into considerable trouble when his theory is put into practice. As critics like Rorty and Sandel point out, there is something about the Principle of Generic Consistency that rings a bit hollow. For Rorty, the problem lies in Gewirth’s failure to appreciate the fierce partiality that often drives human rights violations; it is a confusion to point out contradictions to those who either refuse to recognize them or are not terribly troubled by them. For Sandel, the PGC must fail for the same reason that Rawls’ original position fails; there is simply no getting around the fact that human beings are more complex than abstract possessors of goods or prospective purposive agents. Any examination of human life that abstracts in these ways removes the discussion too far from the real world in which human rights are actually violated. These violations cannot be said to be the same thing as the simple removal of freedom and well-being from a PPA, for this sort of language is hopelessly sterile. Human rights violations happen, instead, to men like Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn and Primo Levi, who struggle desperately to survive and, if successful, carry the scars of their experiences with them for the rest of their lives. This is a mistake of the highest order, one that insults the victims and survivors of some of humanity’s most terrible tragedies. It is one that Gewirth and Beyleveld cannot possibly intend to make, but one that creeps up on them as the abstractions with which they deal multiply.

\*\*Iran\*\*

Iran – No Nukes

No nuclear war – Iran wouldn’t use its nuke’s

Pfaff 6 (William, staff, http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article11731.htm, dw: 1-31-2006, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

In theory, a threat of aggressive use of nuclear weapons exists, but in the Middle East it is accompanied by certainty of overwhelming Israeli (or even American) retaliation. Warning by American politicians that "rogue states" might attack Israel, the US, British bases on Cyprus, or Western Europe, are manipulation or propaganda. Individual Muslims may welcome martyrdom, but nations, even Muslim nations, do not. Israel, with its conventional arms and weapons of mass destruction, is amply capable of assuring its own military deterrence and defence, whatever Iran’s President, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, thinks or says. But Israel cannot expect long-term security without resolving its conflict with the Palestinians. As Israeli leaders know, solving the problem is chiefly up to Israel. Forty years of American involvement have mainly enabled the Israelis to avoid doing so. The danger of terrorists acquiring nuclear weapons exists, if barely. This would be possible only with a nuclear state’s complicity. The political plausibility of any government giving terrorists control of such weapons is next to nil, considering the risks involved for the benefactor state. The technical and logistical complexity of such an operation would also be great.

Iran – Deterrence

Deterrence and laws check war

Pfaff 6 (William, staff, http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article11731.htm, dw: 1-31-2006, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

The Washington official line seems meant to build pressure at the UN Security Council to impose sanctions on Iran, even while conceding that nothing practical is expected to result, and that nothing can be done about Iran’s resumption of nuclear processing. Iran at present is doing no more than it has a right to do in international law. The crossfire of public pronouncements draws attention to the inherent criticism of the Western position: the US and the other Security Council members can have nuclear weapons, and Israel, Pakistan and India (non-Security Council members), can have them too, but Iran shouldn’t proceed with its (currently) non-military programme. The US is even in discussion with India to supply nuclear materials (for strictly peaceful purposes, of course). All of this piles up in righteous Iranian eyes as evidence that Iran needs to go beyond its present programme and actually build nuclear weapons. National prestige and pride are involved, obviously — and nationalism is probably the most powerful of all political forces. Military strategy is also involved. So far as anyone in the non-Western world can see, Iraq’s mistake in 2003 was not to have a nuclear bomb or two in working order. That would have kept the US at bay, just as uncertainty about North Korea’s nuclear arms inhibits US policy in the Far East. Iran already possesses non-nuclear deterrents to American attack, which Iraq did not, and they are probably strong enough to keep both the US and Israel away from Iranian nuclear sites. Iran can close down a major part of Middle Eastern oil shipments by closing the Strait of Hormuz. It has combined Revolutionary Guard and ground forces three times the total of American forces now active in Iraq, where Tehran also has influence on the Shia clerical leadership, which holds the key to Iraq’s future. Nuclear weapons proliferation in the non-Western world is an old American preoccupation, but it is directly linked to Third World perceptions of the threat of American military intervention. The main, if not the only, advantage that nuclear weapons provide a country such as Iran is the deterrence of intervention by the US or Israel. The urge to possess these weapons is directly reciprocal to American non-proliferation pressures, and the threat of attack.

Deterrence checks – Iran is afraid of the US

Gardels 8 (Nathan, editor, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/nathan-gardels/abizaid-iraq-is-not-a-sui\_b\_114575.html, dw: 7-23-2008, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

General John Abizaid, the former commander of the US Central Command for Iraq and Afghanistan from 2003-2007, offered lots of wisdom and an impressive analysis of the Middle East. In this election season, every American, including Barack Obama and John McCain, should hear what he has to say. ON IRAN: Although he didn't say it outright, General Abizaid's implicit view seemed to be that the world would not be able to stop Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon and that we would have to learn to live with it. He questioned whether war with Iran to stop that eventuality would be a wise idea "at this particular time" not only because world oil flows would be shut down and turmoil would spread across the Middle East where Iran's Shia allies hold sway, but also because the US armed forces lacked strategic flexibility, bogged down as they are in Iraq and Afghanistan with "our ground forces tapped out." What, then, when they get the bomb? "I don't believe Iran is a suicide state," he said. "Deterrence will work with Iran. It is a country of many different power centers that are competing. Despite what their crazy president says, I doubt seriously whether the Iranians are interested in starting a nuclear war." As for the Israelis, Abizaid said "they can take care of themselves up to a point...." but "we and the Israelis are going to have to have a very clear conversation about what we will do if the Iranians develop and field a weapon. Over the next 20 years the relationship will have to go from a de-facto alliance to one of an unmistakable alliance." In other words, the US should extend its nuclear shield over Israel. We should be talking to Iran, according to Abizaid, just the way we talked to our other enemies in the past. "We need to make it very clear to the Iranians, the same way we made it clear to the Soviet Union and China, that their first use of nuclear weapons would result in the devastation of their nation."

Iran – Deterrence

Iran will not go to war – deterred

Sappenfield 6 (Mark, staff, http://www.csmonitor.com/2006/0718/p01s01-wome.html, dw: 7-18-2006, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

 Yet there are signs of increasing sophistication, perhaps due to help from Iran, experts say. On Friday, Hizbullah launched a more advanced missile, which struck an Israeli warship. Hizbullah rockets are also penetrating deeper into Israel than ever before, with several striking Haifa, Israel's third-largest city, on Sunday. Israel claims that four of the missiles were the Iranian-made Fajr-3, with a 28-mile range. For its part, Israel has so far relied mostly on air strikes as its military response. Monday, Israel acknowledged that its forces had invaded Lebanon, though they returned shortly after. Israel invaded southern Lebanon in 1982. Its army occupied the territory for three years, then withdrew because of the strain of the occupation and broad international condemnation. History also offers a note of caution to Israel's foes. In 1967, Israel responded to Egyptian aggression by taking the Sinai Peninsula and the Gaza Strip from Egypt, the West Bank from Jordan, and the Golan Heights from Syria. Years later, when Syria and Israel fought over control of Lebanon in 1982, Israeli jet fighters reportedly shot down 80 Syrian planes without losing any of its own. Israel's military superiority is built on American support and a skill honed by decades of fighting for the very existence of the nation. Israel receives the best equipment that the United States can offer its allies. "They have some of the most highly advanced weapons systems in the world," says Dr. Jones. Israel's air force, in particular, has no rival in the region, which makes air strikes the most effective – and most probable – means of Israeli retaliation and aggression. Yet Israel has so far focused most of its attacks on Lebanon, despite Hizbullah's links to Syria and Iran. Indeed, both sides have long used Lebanon as a way to harass the other, since Lebanon's military is almost irrelevant, analysts say. Even though Israel accuses Syria and Iran of backing Hizbullah's attacks, it hesitates to attack them directly. The reason is simple: Though Syria's aging military is no match for Israel's, it has missiles that could strike any part of Israel, as well as stocks of chemical weapons. Moreover, the 60 miles from the Israeli border to the Syrian capital of Damascus is one of the most heavily fortified zones in the world. "Syria doesn't have the capacity to win [a war against Israel], but it can cause lots of suffering," says Nadav Morag, former senior director for domestic policy in the Israel National Security Council. Iran more formidable than Syria By contrast, Iran presents a far more formidable challenge – but one that is so remote from Israel geographically as to make hostilities difficult. As with Syria, Iran's greatest threat lies in its missiles. Yet the prospect of firing missiles at America's greatest ally – at a time when it is surrounded by American forces in Iraq and Afghanistan – is decidedly risky. Likewise, the notion of an Israeli air strike against Iran presents enormous logistical hurdles. Although Iran does not possess a credible air force and has only mid-grade Russian air-defense systems to contend with Israeli jets, Israel would surely be denied overfly rights by the Arab countries that surround them, meaning it would have to take a circuitous and difficult oversea route to Iran. It would probably be a measure taken only as a last resort., Mr. Morag says.

Iran – No nukes in posession

All their evidence is spinning a report incorrectly – Iran has no nuke’s

Horton 10 (Scott, http://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/Opinion/2010/0917/Reality-check-Iran-is-not-a-nuclear-threat, dw: 9-17-2010, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

On September 6, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) released a new paper on the implementation of Iran’s Safeguards Agreement which reported that the agency has “continued to verify the non-diversion of declared nuclear material in Iran to any military or other special purpose.” Yet despite the IAEA report and clear assertions to the contrary, news articles that followed were dishonest to the extreme, interpreting this clean bill of health as just another wisp of smoke indicating nuclear fire in a horrifying near-future. A Washington Post article published the very same day led the way with the aggressive and misleading headline “UN Report: Iran stockpiling nuclear materials,” “shorthanding” the facts right out of the narrative. The facts are that Iran’s terrifying nuclear “stockpile” is a small amount of uranium enriched to industrial grade levels for use in its domestic energy and medical isotope programs, all of it “safeguarded” by the IAEA.

Iran doesn’t have the nuclear weapons for a war to happen

Horton 10 (Scott, http://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/Opinion/2010/0917/Reality-check-Iran-is-not-a-nuclear-threat, dw: 9-17-2010, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

If the smokescreen wasn’t thick enough, late last week a group of Marxist holy warrior exiles called the Mujahadeen-e-Khalq, working with the very same neoconservatives who sponsored Ahmad Chalabi’s Iraqi National Congress – which manufactured so much of the propaganda that convinced the American people to support the invasion of that country – accused the Iranian government of building a secret nuclear enrichment facility buried deep in tunnels near Qazvin. Headlines once again blared in total negligence and without verification that here indeed was, an official told Fox News, proof that Iran has a “hidden, secret nuclear weapons program.’” TV news anchors on every channel furiously mopped sweat from their brows, hearts-a-tremor. When will the forces of good rise to stop this evil?! Yet even US officials quickly admitted that they’ve known about these tunnels for years. “[T]here’s no reason at this point to think it’s nuclear,” one US official said – a quote that appeared in Fox’s article, but only after five paragraphs of breathless allegations. All day long, top-of-the-hour news updates on TV and radio let the false impression stand. IAEA inspectors have had open access to the gas conversion facility at Isfahan, the enrichment facility at Natanz, and the new lightwater reactor at Bushehr, as well as the secondary enrichment facility under construction at Qom.

Iran – No nukes in posession

Iranian bomb threat is incorrect and rooted in unfactual information

Luttwak 7 (Edward, staff, http://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/2007/05/themiddleofnowhere/, dw: 5-26-2007, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

 Then there is the new light cavalry of Iranian terrorism that is invoked to frighten us if all else fails. The usual middle east experts now explain that if we annoy the ayatollahs, they will unleash terrorists who will devastate our lives, even though 30 years of “death to America” invocations and vast sums spent on maintaining a special international terrorism department have produced only one major bombing in Saudi Arabia, in 1996, and two in the most permissive environment of Buenos Aires, in 1992 and 1994, along with some assassinations of exiles in Europe. It is true enough that if Iran’s nuclear installations are bombed in some overnight raid, there is likely to be some retaliation, but we live in fortunate times in which we have only the irritant of terrorism instead of world wars to worry about—and Iran’s added contribution is not likely to leave much of an impression. There may be good reasons for not attacking Iran’s nuclear sites—including the very slow and uncertain progress of its uranium enrichment effort—but its ability to strike back is not one of them. Even the seemingly fragile tanker traffic down the Gulf and through the straits of Hormuz is not as vulnerable as it seems—Iran and Iraq have both tried to attack it many times without much success, and this time the US navy stands ready to destroy any airstrip or jetty from which attacks are launched. As for the claim that the “Iranians” are united in patriotic support for the nuclear programme, no such nationality even exists. Out of Iran’s population of 70m or so, 51 per cent are ethnically Persian, 24 per cent are Turks (“Azeris” is the regime’s term), with other minorities comprising the remaining quarter. Many of Iran’s 16-17m Turks are in revolt against Persian cultural imperialism; its 5-6m Kurds have started a serious insurgency; the Arab minority detonates bombs in Ahvaz; and Baluch tribesmen attack gendarmes and revolutionary guards. If some 40 per cent of the British population were engaged in separatist struggles of varying intensity, nobody would claim that it was firmly united around the London government. On top of this, many of the Persian majority oppose the theocratic regime, either because they have become post-Islamic in reaction to its many prohibitions, or because they are Sufis, whom the regime now persecutes almost as much as the small Baha’i minority. So let us have no more reports from Tehran stressing the country’s national unity. Persian nationalism is a minority position in a country where half the population is not even Persian. In our times, multinational states either decentralise or break up more or less violently; Iran is not decentralising, so its future seems highly predictable, while in the present not much cohesion under attack is to be expected.

\*\*Middle East\*\*

Middle East – Deterrence checks

**Deterrence checks middle east conflict – emperics and fear**

Waltz 2000 (Kenneth, prof, http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/gjia/gjia\_winspr00f.html, dw: Spring 2000, da: 7-8-2011, lido)

We have this peculiar notion about the irrationality of rogue states. When he was Secretary of Defense, Les Aspin said these rogue leaders might be undeterrable. Others contend that some states may undertake courses of action even if they know that catastrophe may result. But who would do that? Not Saddam Hussein. Not Kim Il Sung when he was ruler of North Korea. What is a key characteristic of all those rulers? They are survivors, as they struggle to live in a harsh environment–both internally, with the constant danger of assassination, and externally, as they’re surrounded by enemies. And they survive for decades until they are carried out in a box. Are they irrational? Their behavior is ugly and nasty to be sure, but irrational? How could they survive? If they were not deterrable, how would they ever have survived? They don’t run the kind of risks that would put their regime into question. Kim Il Sung wanted to pass his reign onto his son, Kim Jong Il. They obviously love to rule, but they’ve got to have a country. They’re not going to risk the existence of their country. For example, Saddam Hussein was deterred during the Persian Gulf War. He did not arm the SCUD missiles with lethal warheads and shoot them at Israel. They were nuisance attacks. Why? Because he didn’t want us to pound him more heavily than he was being pounded. The allies, led by the United States, could have substantially destroyed that country without ever using nuclear weapons, and he knew it. Sure he was deterred. So how can we say irrational or undeterrable? But we do say it.

Middle East – No War

Middle East States don’t want war

Shaoxian 1 (Li, prof, http://www.china.org.cn/english/2001/Aug/17671.htm, dw: 8-17-2001, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

Second, war is not in line with the interests of several countries in the Middle East. None of the Israelis (including Sharon himself) wants war, because war would again put the very existence of the country in danger; Yasser Afrafat, as well, does not want war, because war would turn his 10 years peace efforts into nothing; Egypt and Syria, the other two big powers in Middle East, do not want war either. The president of Egypt Hosni Mubarak firmly rejected the possibility of war in an interview with Israeli TV. Bashar al-Assad, the new president of Syria, has put most his attention on domestic affairs.

**No Middle East War – empirics and deterrence prevent**

Sappenfield 6 (Mark, staff, http://www.csmonitor.com/2006/0718/p01s01-wome.html, dw: 7-18-2006, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

 Of the dangers presented by the conflict between Israel and Hizbullah in southern Lebanon, the possibility of a broader Middle East war is among the less likely. In the 1967 Arab-Israeli war – and repeatedly since – Israel has shown its clear military supremacy. So dominant has been Israel's advantage in both technology and tactics that former foes such as Jordan and Egypt sued for peace in those wars, while Tel Aviv's avowed enemies – Syria and Iran – have turned to backing terrorists. At this moment, the calculus doesn't appear to have changed. There is no coalition of Arab governments willing to unite militarily against Israel. Syria's military prowess has crumbled since the fall of the Soviet Union – its greatest benefactor – while Iran remains too geographically remote to strike effectively. The result is a new paroxysm of the proxy war that has existed in the region for a generation – ebbing and flowing as Hizbullah, armed and financed by Iran and Syria, harass Israel without provoking a major Middle East war, military analysts say. "No state is willing to deal with Israel conventionally," says Seth Jones, a terrorism expert at the RAND Corp. The shape of the conflict so far – sparked by Hizbullah's raid into northern Israel and capture of two Israeli soldiers – reveals both the capabilities and limitations of each side. Historically, Hizbullah has been able to do little more than nip at Israel's northern border with incursions and sporadic rocket attacks. By and large, its arsenal is primitive, comprising various short-range rockets that can destroy buildings only with a direct hit, yet are difficult to aim with any precision. It has continually fired rockets into northern Israel. Hizbullah's longer-range rockets Yet there are signs of increasing sophistication, perhaps due to help from Iran, experts say. On Friday, Hizbullah launched a more advanced missile, which struck an Israeli warship. Hizbullah rockets are also penetrating deeper into Israel than ever before, with several striking Haifa, Israel's third-largest city, on Sunday. Israel claims that four of the missiles were the Iranian-made Fajr-3, with a 28-mile range. For its part, Israel has so far relied mostly on air strikes as its military response. Monday, Israel acknowledged that its forces had invaded Lebanon, though they returned shortly after. Israel invaded southern Lebanon in 1982. Its army occupied the territory for three years, then withdrew because of the strain of the occupation and broad international condemnation. History also offers a note of caution to Israel's foes. In 1967, Israel responded to Egyptian aggression by taking the Sinai Peninsula and the Gaza Strip from Egypt, the West Bank from Jordan, and the Golan Heights from Syria. Years later, when Syria and Israel fought over control of Lebanon in 1982, Israeli jet fighters reportedly shot down 80 Syrian planes without losing any of its own. Israel's military superiority is built on American support and a skill honed by decades of fighting for the very existence of the nation. Israel receives the best equipment that the United States can offer its allies. "They have some of the most highly advanced weapons systems in the world," says Dr. Jones. Israel's air force, in particular, has no rival in the region, which makes air strikes the most effective – and most probable – means of Israeli retaliation and aggression. Yet Israel has so far focused most of its attacks on Lebanon, despite Hizbullah's links to Syria and Iran. Indeed, both sides have long used Lebanon as a way to harass the other, since Lebanon's military is almost irrelevant, analysts say. Even though Israel accuses Syria and Iran of backing Hizbullah's attacks, it hesitates to attack them directly. The reason is simple: Though Syria's aging military is no match for Israel's, it has missiles that could strike any part of Israel, as well as stocks of chemical weapons. Moreover, the 60 miles from the Israeli border to the Syrian capital of Damascus is one of the most heavily fortified zones in the world. "Syria doesn't have the capacity to win [a war against Israel], but it can cause lots of suffering," says Nadav Morag, former senior director for domestic policy in the Israel National Security Council. Iran more formidable than Syria By contrast, Iran presents a far more formidable challenge – but one that is so remote from Israel geographically as to make hostilities difficult. As with Syria, Iran's greatest threat lies in its missiles. Yet the prospect of firing missiles at America's greatest ally – at a time when it is surrounded by American forces in Iraq and Afghanistan – is decidedly risky. Likewise, the notion of an Israeli air strike against Iran presents enormous logistical hurdles. Although Iran does not possess a credible air force and has only mid-grade Russian air-defense systems to contend with Israeli jets, Israel would surely be denied overfly rights by the Arab countries that surround them, meaning it would have to take a circuitous and difficult oversea route to Iran.

Middle East – No War

No war in the middle east – all conflicts are settling over

Luttwak 7 (Edward, staff, http://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/2007/05/themiddleofnowhere/, dw: 5-26-2007, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

Strategically, the Arab-Israeli conflict has been almost irrelevant since the end of the cold war. And as for the impact of the conflict on oil prices, it was powerful in 1973 when the Saudis declared embargoes and cut production, but that was the first and last time that the “oil weapon” was wielded. For decades now, the largest Arab oil producers have publicly foresworn any linkage between politics and pricing, and an embargo would be a disaster for their oil-revenue dependent economies. In any case, the relationship between turmoil in the middle east and oil prices is far from straightforward. As Philip Auerswald recently noted in the American Interest, between 1981 and 1999—a period when a fundamentalist regime consolidated power in Iran, Iran and Iraq fought an eight-year war within view of oil and gas installations, the Gulf war came and went and the first Palestinian intifada raged—oil prices, adjusted for inflation, actually fell. And global dependence on middle eastern oil is declining: today the region produces under 30 per cent of the world’s crude oil, compared to almost 40 per cent in 1974-75. In 2005 17 per cent of American oil imports came from the Gulf, compared to 28 per cent in 1975, and President Bush used his 2006 state of the union address to announce his intention of cutting US oil imports from the middle east by three quarters by 2025. Yes, it would be nice if Israelis and Palestinians could settle their differences, but it would do little or nothing to calm the other conflicts in the middle east from Algeria to Iraq, or to stop Muslim-Hindu violence in Kashmir, Muslim-Christian violence in Indonesia and the Philippines, Muslim-Buddhist violence in Thailand, Muslim-animist violence in Sudan, Muslim-Igbo violence in Nigeria, Muslim-Muscovite violence in Chechnya, or the different varieties of inter-Muslim violence between traditionalists and Islamists, and between Sunnis and Shia, nor would it assuage the perfectly understandable hostility of convinced Islamists towards the transgressive west that relentlessly invades their minds, and sometimes their countries.

US and other western countries intervention in the middle east check conflict

Zein 9 (Mostafa, http://www.daralhayat.com/portalarticlendah/61348m dw: 9-30-2009, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

The Westerners, especially the United States, realize this very well. They also realize that their interests in the Middle East require from them to spread stability. Besides, large international institutions view the Iranian nuclear program as a primitive one that it is still very far from manufacturing a [nuclear] bomb or weapons. Their reaction was very violent for two additional reasons. First, to confirm, on the eve of the negotiations, that the West is united in confronting it [Iran], and that Russia which supports it, is willing to abandon it and adopt the comprehensive sanctions if Iran does not succumb to conditions. The second reason is an American one par excellence, and is aimed at covering the retreat of Obama in front of Benjamin Netanyahu who returned from Washington and New York with a resounding victory over the White House, when he insisted on rejecting the suspension of settlement activities, on the universal recognition of the Jewish aspect of Israel, and on normalizing the relations with the Arabs to start negotiations "without preconditions". In order to complete the picture and make everyone forget the pledges of Obama's administration regarding the Middle East, emphasis was made on demonizing Iran and its nuclear aspirations. The joint American-Israeli military maneuvers were depicted as a need to reaffirm their alliance in the face of the imminent Iranian threat. The Western-Iranian negotiations will last a long time. Israel will be the absent-present factor in all their details. Whenever the situation gets complicated, Israel will threaten to strike Iran. It will manipulate any Western concession to reinforce its arsenal and consolidate its occupation. We are afraid to believe the argument of the nuclear resurrection and to build our policies accordingly.

Middle East – Peace Talks check

Peace Talks check war

Shaoxian 1 (Li, prof, http://www.china.org.cn/english/2001/Aug/17671.htm, dw: 8-17-2001, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

Both sides should sit down and talk using as a basis the “confidence-building measures” cited in the Mitchell report as well as the ceasefire plan made in June. Shimon Peres, Israel foreign minister and the government’s leading dove, was fully aware that the only way to a ceasefire is for leaders to get together and talk. Israeli’s reprisals can only lead to more conflicts. It seems that Peres’s suggestion may give a gleam of hope for carrying out the ceasefire agreement of June. Of course, both sides want successful peace talks, the Israelis must be restrained and Palestinians must strive to exercise control and curb terrorism. Meantime, the US should intensify its efforts to help bring about successful peace talks.

\*\*Morality\*\*

A2: Morality

Morality is inconsistent and confusing in the face of specific situations

Hinman 98 (Lawrence, professor of Ethics, “Ethics: A Pluralistic
Approach to Moral Theory”)

Moral codes are seldom completely consistent. Our everyday life raises moral questions that we cannot answer immediately. Sometimes that is because there are contradictions among our different values, and we are uncertain about which value should be given priority. For example, in the aftermath of the September 11 attacks, many Americans felt a tension between their desire to thwart future terrorist attacks and their commitment to fundamental rights, including the right to privacy. At other times, our traditional values do not cover new situations, and we have to ﬁgure out how to extend them. The rise of vast databanks of information and increasingly sophisticated techniques of data mining have created an ethical vacuum, an area in which we need to develop new rules to govern new situations. We must step back and consciously reﬂect on our moral beliefs, thereby engaging in ethical reﬂection. Ethics, then, is the conscious reﬂection on our moral beliefs with the aim of improving, extending, or reﬁning those beliefs in some way. This book is an invitation for you to participate in the activity of ethical reﬂection.

Morality can’t be evaluated as a whole- the whole part is neither good nor bad

Fincke 10 (Daniel Adam, professor of philosophy, January 1, “On Deriving and Defending an Axiology of the Will to Power,” http://fordham.bepress.com/dissertations/AAI3431913, 7/6/11) HD

We are under no necessary obligation to endorse as desirable or normative every possible Disciplinary Morality we encounter or might devise. Later on, we will explore whether we can come up with normative bases for assessing particular proposed disciplinary moralities to which our souls or our cultures should submit. Both moralities that Nietzsche praises generally and those that he criticizes generally are functionally instances of Disciplinary Morality. It is the most general category of morality, with all specific moralities being built upon it or being "subspecies" of it, depending on how one wants to conceptualize the relationship. Of itself, Disciplinary Morality is neither good nor bad, desirable nor undesirable, it is just a naturally occurring dynamic present on every level of existence and culture. We can assess the worth of particular types of will to power exerting a Disciplinary Morality on others on a case-by-case basis or by comparing whole classes of cases, each for its respective worth.

There is a clearly defined opposition to morality

Fincke 10 (Daniel Adam, professor of philosophy, January 1, “On Deriving and Defending an Axiology of the Will to Power,” http://fordham.bepress.com/dissertations/AAI3431913, 7/6/11) HD

Nietzsche identifies himself throughout his career as an "immoralist". Later, in chapter 3, we will explore particular connotations Nietzsche gives to this descriptor, but it is important now to note that the very adoption of the name "immoralist" points implicitly to the possibility of distinguishing morality from other forms of ethical evaluation and of distinguishing moral value from other kinds of possible value. Unless Nietzsche is willing to quit assessing human conduct and character altogether—and he is not—"morality" is obviously not synonymous for him with his standards of advisable and unadvisable conduct, as it would be for most. Frequently Nietzsche evaluates—condemns, praises, prescribes, discourages—all sorts of human conduct and character. Therefore, to the extent that Nietzsche is placing himself in opposition to morality, he must be looking at morality either as a particular manner of determining best conduct, distinct from his own, or as a more specific subset of ethical rules and evaluative standards varying from his own.

A2: Morality

Morality fails- morals aren’t universal across cultures

Prinz 11 (Jesse, Professor of Philosophy, May/June, http://www.philosophynow.org/issue82/

Morality\_is\_a\_Culturally\_Conditioned\_Response 7/6/11) HD

Morals vary dramatically across time and place. One group’s good can be another group’s evil. Consider cannibalism, which has been practiced by groups in every part of the world. Anthropologist Peggy Reeves Sanday found evidence for cannibalism in 34% of cultures in one cross-historical sample. Or consider blood sports, such as those practiced in Roman amphitheaters, in which thousands of excited fans watched as human beings engaged in mortal combat. Killing for pleasure has also been documented among headhunting cultures, in which decapitation was sometimes pursued as a recreational activity. Many societies have also practiced extreme forms of public torture and execution, as was the case in Europe before the 18th century. And there are cultures that engage in painful forms of body modification, such as scarification, genital infibulation, or footbinding – a practice that lasted in China for 1,000 years and involved the deliberate and excruciating crippling of young girls. Variation in attitudes towards violence is paralleled by variation in attitudes towards sex and marriage. When studying culturally independent societies, anthropologists have found that over 80% permit polygamy. Arranged marriage is also common, and some cultures marry off girls while they are still pubescent or even younger. In parts of Ethiopia, half the girls are married before their 15th birthday.

Moral values can’t be shared because of critical differences

Prinz 11 (Jesse, Professor of Philosophy, May/June, http://www.philosophynow.org/issue82/

Morality\_is\_a\_Culturally\_Conditioned\_Response 7/6/11) HD

Deny variation. Some objectivists say moral variation is greatly exaggerated – people really agree about values but have different factual beliefs or life circumstances that lead them to behave differently. For example, slave owners may have believed that their slaves were intellectually inferior, and Inuits who practiced infanticide may have been forced to do so because of resource scarcity in the tundra. But it is spectacularly implausible that all moral differences can be explained this way. For one thing, the alleged differences in factual beliefs and life circumstances rarely justify the behaviors in question. Would the inferiority of one group really justify enslaving them? If so, why don’t we think it’s acceptable to enslave people with low IQs? Would life in the tundra justify infanticide? If so, why don’t we just kill off destitute children around the globe instead of giving donations to Oxfam? Differences in circumstances do not show that people share values; rather they help to explain why values end up being so different.

A2: Morality

Morality fails- not self-correcting like science

Prinz 11 (Jesse, Professor of Philosophy, May/June, http://www.philosophynow.org/issue82/

Morality\_is\_a\_Culturally\_Conditioned\_Response 7/6/11) HD

Deny that variation matters. Objectivists who concede that moral variation exists argue that variation does not entail relativism; after all, scientific theories differ too, and we don’t assume that every theory is true. This analogy fails. Scientific theory variation can be explained by inadequate observations or poor instruments; improvements in each lead towards convergence. When scientific errors are identified, corrections are made. By contrast, morals do not track differences in observation, and there also is no evidence for rational convergence as a result of moral conflicts. Western slavery didn’t end because of new scientific observations; rather it ended with the industrial revolution, which ushered in a wage-based economy. Indeed, slavery became more prevalent after the Enlightenment, when science improved. Even with our modern understanding of racial equality, Benjamin Skinner has shown that there are more people living in de facto slavery worldwide today than during the height of the trans-Atlantic slave trade. When societies converge morally, it’s usually because one has dominated the other (as with the missionary campaigns to end cannibalism). With morals, unlike science, there is no well-recognized standard that can be used to test, confirm, or correct when disagreements arise.

Innate judgments of good and bad fail in modern societies

Prinz 11 (Jesse, Professor of Philosophy, May/June, http://www.philosophynow.org/issue82/

Morality\_is\_a\_Culturally\_Conditioned\_Response 7/6/11) HD

The problem with human nature as a basis for universal morality is that it lacks normative import, that is, this doesn’t itself provide us with any definitive view of good and bad. Suppose we have some innate moral values. Why should we abide by them? Non-human primates often kill, steal, and rape without getting punished by members of their troops. Perhaps our innate values promote those kinds of behaviors as well. Does it follow that we shouldn’t punish them? Certainly not. If we have innate values – which is open to debate – they evolved to help us cope with life as hunter-gatherers in small competitive bands. To live in large stable societies, we are better off following the ‘civilized’ values we’ve invented.

Reason fails to judge morality- neutrality and inconsistency

Prinz 11 (Jesse, Professor of Philosophy, May/June, http://www.philosophynow.org/issue82/

Morality\_is\_a\_Culturally\_Conditioned\_Response 7/6/11) HD

Finally, the problem with reason, as we have seen, is that it never adds up to value. If I tell you that a wine has a balance between tannin and acid, it doesn’t follow that you will find it delicious. Likewise, reason cannot tell us which facts are morally good. Reason is evaluatively neutral. At best, reason can tell us which of our values are inconsistent, and which actions will lead to fulfillment of our goals. But, given an inconsistency, reason cannot tell us which of our conflicting values to drop, and reason cannot tell us which goals to follow. If my goals come into conflict with your goals, reason tells me that I must either thwart your goals, or give up caring about mine; but reason cannot tell me to favor one choice over the other.

A2: Morality—Absolutism

There is a middle ground in morality that your authors don’t assume

Zupancic 0 (Alenka, researcher at the Institute of Philosophy in the Slovene Academy
of Sciences, Ethics of the Real, p. 50) HD

We can see in these passages that Kant introduces a new element to his argument; the questions of the exception. Since all these passages contain response to Constant’s conception of the middle principle, let us once again recall Constant’s argument: It is a duty to tell the truth. The concept of duty is inseparable from the concept of right. A duty is what in one man corresponds to the right of another. When there are no rights, there are no duties. To tell the truth is thus a duty, but it is a duty only with regard to one who has a right to the truth. But no one has a right to a truth that harms others.

Exceptions exist to absolute claims of morality

Zupancic 0 (Alenka, researcher at the Institute of Philosophy in the Slovene Academy
of Sciences, Ethics of the Real, p. 52) HD

First of all, it should be stressed that Constant never uses the term ‘exception’, and never speaks of ‘exceptions to the rules’ or of the ‘right to lie’. He never says that in this particular case (that of the murderer pursuing our friend) we have the right to violate the general norm which requires that we tell the truth. On the contrary, what he says is that if we lie in such a situation, we do not in fact go against any (juridical) norm or duty. (‘Where there are no rights, there are no duties.’) In order to understand the point of Constant’s argument, we would do well briefly to consider the legal status of the so-called ‘case of necessity’. This is often described as a logical and juridical paradox, since it involves a kind of ‘legitimate’ violation of the law. Say I kill somebody in self-defense: if we describe this as a ‘violation permitted (or even prescribed) by the law’, we have a paradox. The paradox disappears, however, the moment that we realize that the case of necessity is not an ‘instance of the law’. In short, in such a case the judge would declare that no law has been violated, not that I was legally justified in violating the law. And this is what Constant is getting at. Constant is not (as Kant and many others maintain) saying that the murderer’s violation of the law legitimizes my own violation of the law (in the given case, my lying); he tries instead to show that in this case there is no violation of the law at all.

A2: Morality—Inevitable

Moralizing is inevitable- even immoralists are trapped in the cycle

Fincke 10 (Daniel Adam, professor of philosophy, January 1, “On Deriving and Defending an Axiology of the Will to Power,” http://fordham.bepress.com/dissertations/AAI3431913, 7/6/11) HD

Philosophers who reinterpret the worth of existing moral practices typically redefine moral terms or practices better to fit their ideals, rather than describe themselves as opponents of morality itself. The usual question is not whether morality itself should prevail, but rather what we should say morality's actual requirements and grounds are. To practice morality is most usually understood to be something along the lines of acting from well-intentioned character and choosing actions in accord with principles of right and wrong that are "correct" in some fundamental way, e.g. in some form of "objective grounding". While there can be wide 49 disagreements as to what constitutes good character or how to conceive or apply specific principles of right and wrong in complicated situations, it seems that one cannot consistently call these practices of making judgments themselves "wrong"—unless that is just an elliptical way of saying that those participating in the practices are employing incorrect, overextended, or corrupted standards. When an immoralist decries moralism she risks the charge that she is herself thereby moralizing—albeit in a self-loathing, self-effacing, self-contradictory way.

Morality Bad

Morality perpetuates the worst of society

Zupancic 0 (Alenka, researcher at the Institute of Philosophy in the Slovene Academy
of Sciences, Ethics of the Real, p. 1) HD

The ‘Freudian blow’ to philosophical ethics can be summarized as follows: what philosophy calls the moral law – and, more precisely, what Kant calls the categorical imperative – is in fact nothing other than the superego. This judgement provokes an ‘effect of disenchantment’ that call into question any attempt to base ethics on foundations other than the ‘pathological’. At the same time, it places ‘ethics’ at the core of what Freud called das Unbehagen in der Kultur: the discontent or malaise at the heart of civilization. 2 In so far as it has its origins in the constitution of the superego, ethics becomes nothing more than a convenient tool for any ideology which may try to pass off its own commandments as the truly authentic, spontaneous and ‘honourable’ inclinations of the subject. This thesis, according to which the moral law is nothing but the superego, calls, of course, for careful examination, which I shall undertake in Chapter 7 below.

Morality can’t be the basis for government action

Gewirth 81 (Alan, professor of philosophy, “Reason and Morality,” p.65) HD

In the agent’s statement, ‘I have rights to freedom and well-being,’ the subject of the rights is the agent himself, the same person for whom freedom and well-being are necessary goods. The object of the rights is these same necessary goods. Now in rights-judgments, the subject who is said to have rights is not always the same as the person who makes a claim or a rights-judgment attributing the rights to the subject. Moreover, a rights-judgment need not be set forth independently; it may, instead, figure as a subordinate clause wherein the attribution of rights to the subject is conditional. In all cases, however, there is assumed some reason or ground that is held, at least tentatively, to justify that attribution. This reason may, but need not, be some moral or legal code. In the present case, where what is at issue is the justification of a moral principle, such a principle cannot, of course, be adduced as constituting the justifying ground for the attribution of the generic rights to the agent. Rather, in his statement making this attribution, the justifying reason of the generic rights as viewed by the agent is the fact that freedom and well-being are the most general and proximate necessary conditions of all his purpose-fulfilling actions, so that without his having these conditions his engaging in purposive action would be futile or impossible. Because of this necessity, the agent who is the subject of the generic rights is assumed to set forth or uphold the rights-judgment himself, as knowing what conditions must be fulfilled if he is to be a purposive agent; and he upholds the judgment not merely conditionally or tentatively but in an unqualified way.

\*\*North Korea\*\*

NoKo – No SK Conventional War

**Geography prevents the north from conventionally attacking the south**

Myers 3 (Carlton, http://www.g2mil.com/korea.htm, staff, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

If North Korea insanely attacked, the South Koreans would fight on mountainous and urban terrain which heavily favors defense, and complete air superiority would shoot up anything the North Koreans put on the road. Assuming the North Koreans could start up a thousand of their old tanks and armored vehicles, they cannot advance through the mountainous DMZ. The South Koreans have fortified, mined, and physically blocked all avenues through these mountains, and it would take North Korean infantry and engineers weeks to clear road paths while under fire. The North Korean military could gain a few thousand meters with human wave assaults into minefields and concrete fortifications. However, these attacks would bog down from heavy casualties, and a lack of food and ammo resupply. Fighting would be bloody as thousands of South Korean and American troops and civilians suffer from North Korean artillery and commando attacks. Nevertheless, the North Korean army would be unable to breakthrough or move supplies forward. Even if North Korea magically broke through, all military analysts scoff at the idea that the North Koreans could bridge large rivers or move tons of supplies forward while under attack from American airpower.

NoKo – No War

No war – North Korea recognizes the uphill battle they would have

Myers 3 (Carlton, http://www.g2mil.com/korea.htm, staff, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

The chance of a Korean war is extremely unlikely. North Korean leaders realize they have no hope of success without major backing from China or Russia. The previous South Korean President, Kim Dae Jung, encouraged peace and visited North Korea. The two countries are reconnecting rail lines and sent a combined team to the Olympics. Even the United States is providing $500 million dollars a year in food to the starving North Koreans. The new South Korean President, Roh-Moo-hyun was elected on a peace platform and suggested US troops may be gone within ten years.

No war – times have changed, deterrence, relats

Kirk 10 (Donald, jnlst in Asia, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Korea/LF26Dg01.html, dw: 6-26-2010, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

The danger is both much worse and far less than it was then. It's worse in the sense that North Korea now has a number of nuclear devices, has conducted two underground nuclear tests and has exchanged nuclear know-how and components with clients in the Middle East, notably Iran and Syria. North Korea also has missiles, including a long-range model that's capable of carrying a warhead as far as Hawaii, Alaska or even the US west coast. And it has been exporting short- and mid-range missiles to clients in the Middle East and elsewhere. A nuclear war in Northeast Asia appears theoretical, so much so that most people in South Korea just shrug when asked about it. The prevailing sense is, It can't happen here. That's because, in the more immediate sense, a second Korean War on the ground, in the form of North Korean invasion, appears extremely remote. The holocaust that scorched the Korean Peninsula for more than three years remains truly the "forgotten war". It was a bloody interlude that caught the world by surprise when it broke out nearly five years after the end of World War II and then ended in 1953 in an uncertain armistice that endures, somehow, to this day. It's often said that the Korean War ended in a stalemate in which neither side won, that the shooting stopped where it had begun, on the line drawn by distant American and Soviet officials at the 38th parallel before the Japanese surrender in August 1945. That assessment, though, is not really true. Over the years since then South Korea has emerged as the winner by a wide margin. The South, after years of hardship, has exploded into one of the world's major economic powers with sophisticated skills and educational opportunities, markets overflowing and average incomes about 20 times higher than those of North Koreans. While South Korea has undergone political transition from dictatorship to democracy, North Korea's ruling elite remains firmly entrenched, at least to all outward appearances. Kim Jong-il, whose father Kim Il-sung initiated the war and remained in power until his death in 1994, may be ailing but remains strong enough to repress the power urges of his aging generals as well as any signs of dissent by his starving people. His dream is to prepare for take-over by his youngest son, Kim Jong-un, still in his late 20s. If North Korea is far too weak to stage an invasion, however, the North can still foment incidents that show how fragile is the peace. In the wake of the sinking of the Cheonan, the fear persists of more battles in disputed waters in the West or Yellow Sea, the scene of bloody shootouts between North and South Korean vessels in June 1999 and again in June 2002. For that matter, gunfire can always break out across the 155-mile-long demilitarized zone that has divided the peninsula since July 1953. Although we often hear that the war stopped where it began, North Korea retains the city of Kaesong, in South Korean hands before the war, while South Korea holds territory above the 38th parallel in the center and east. Kaesong is important since it's the site of an economic complex in which 120 small South Korean manufacturers operate factories staffed by 44,000 North Koreans. The North still earns money from Kaesong even though South Korea's President Lee Myung-bak cut off trade between South and North Korea, from which the North was netting about $200 million a year, in retaliation for the sinking of the Cheonan. Only 28,500 American troops remain in Korea, but US Navy vessels are joining South Korean vessels next month in drills that are a show of force in the Yellow Sea, and the US Seventh Air Force at Osan, south of Seoul, remains a powerful deterrent. China, whose "volunteers" saved the North from complete takeover by the Americans and South Koreans in 1950 and 1951, is now a huge trading partner with both the US and South Korea. The US-backed South prospers in a peculiar balance in which one fact is clear: nobody wants a second Korean War.

NoKo – No War

**No war – empirics prove north korea doesn’t want war**

Yokota 10 (Takashi, staff, Newsweek, lesix, dw: 6-7-2010, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

The two Koreas have seemed headed for a serious collision ever since international investigators confirmed that it was a North -Korean torpedo that sank the South's warship Cheonan on March 26. Last week Pyongyang's National Defense Commission threatened "all-out war" if Seoul is successful in its push for new international sanctions against the regime. And as South Korean President Lee Myung-bak cut off trade with the North and threatened to resume broadcasting propaganda across the demilitarized zone, four North Korean submarines abruptly left port, putting the South Korean Navy on high alert. Still, this fracas may not be all it seems. In fact, North Korean leader Kim Jong-Il seems to be seeking a face-saving way out. Even as the North's fire-breathing generals vowed to resume the fight that began in 1950, a statement from the regime's political leadership eschewed talk of war, merely freezing relations and scrapping a nonaggression agreement. Western intelligence reported no signs that Pyongyang was mobilizing for an actual armed showdown. And the North's Foreign Ministry issued its own statement, mostly denouncing the United States, but ending with a renewed pledge to denuclearize the Korean Peninsula. Translation: the regime's softer side wants out of this mess. Seoul, which wants to ease -tensions before hosting the G20 summit this fall, made sure to offer the North a way out: Lee demanded that Pyongyang "apologize and punish those responsible for the attack," laying down relatively easy terms for the North to resolve the conflict. Pyongyang may be preparing to comply. Even before the investigation concluded, the National Defense Commission dismissed Kim Il-Chol, its highest-ranking naval officer, citing his "old age." The naval chief is said to be in his late 70s, but so are many other commission members. Observers speculate that Pyongyang may use the dismissal to claim it has already punished the man responsible, perhaps setting the stage for an apology. Kenneth Quinones, a former State Department negotiator and Korea expert, says a "similar dynamic" guided North Korea's response when one of its submarines infiltrated South Korean territorial waters in 1996. Ultimately, moderate elements in Pyongyang persuaded the military hardliners to make an official apology. So far, history looks set to repeat itself.

North Korea would not strike the US - deterrence

Bandow 10 (Doug, fellow @ CATO, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=11965, dw: 7-14-2010, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

Even the North’s embryonic nuclear program does not directly threaten the United States. Nothing suggests that Kim is suicidal: he wants to live well in this life. It is unlikely he would strike at the United States, even if he had the means, because the U.S. arsenal virtually assures retaliatory annihilation. The prospect of proliferation is worrisome, but again, Kim likely understands, or could be made to understand, the enormous risks he would take selling materials to nonstate actors that might target the United States. 14 Washington still has an interest in denuclearizing the Korean peninsula, of course. But the presence of U.S. conventional forces only complicates an effort already facing extraordinary obstacles. The deployment provides Kim Jong-il with thousands of convenient American nuclear hostages. It is far better for Washington to promote nonproliferation in the region from a distance and with greater emphasis on the roles of South Korea, Japan, and especially China. 15 In short, any renewed Korean conflict would be an enormous human tragedy but would have only limited impact on fundamental American security interests. Washington nevertheless is stuck in the center of Korean affairs today because of the U.S.-ROK alliance, which provides a security guarantee to South Korea with no corresponding benefit to the United States. Absent this relationship, there would be no U.S. troops on the Korean peninsula within range of North Korean attack, and no American promise to intervene in any war that might result from a provocation by Pyongyang or retaliation by the South.

NoKo – No War

No war – North Korea will not strike

Joyner 9 (James, atlantic council, http://www.acus.org/new\_atlanticist/jones-north-korea-nukes-not-imminent-threat, dw: 5-28-2009, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

National Security Advisor Jim Jones declared in a speech to the Atlantic Council that the recent testing of a nuclear device and firing of Taepodong missiles by North Korea "are not an imminent threat" to the United States or the regions because "they have a long way to go" in perfecting the technology to weaponize their nukes. He added, however that "The imminent threat is the proliferation of that type of technology to other countries and potentially terrorist organizations and non-state actors." Naturally, this bold statement, especially coming after several days of hand-wringing in the media, was not going to go unchallenged. Blogger Rick Moran, writing at American Thinker, declares this "More Keystone Kops foreign policy from Obama." While noting that the administration has raised our military alert level, which "makes it clear that the North Korean threat is being taken very seriously by the White House," Moran wonders, "why go out of your way to downplay the threat by trotting out your national security advisor to state the obvious?" Similarly, Hot Air's Ed Morrissey wonders, "Has the Obama administration settled on a strategy of apathy? Does he think ignoring Kim will make him go away? I have to admit that no one has tried that strategy with North Korea, perhaps because no one has been crazy enough to think it will work." Interesting, Harvard IR scholar Stephen Walt suggests doing just that: North Korea's nuclear and missile tests are hardly good news, but they don’t justify going into full panic mode. We already knew that North Korea had a nuclear weapons capability, and though this latest test seems to have been slightly more powerful than the initial one, it doesn’t imply a qualitative shift in the strategic environment. North Korea's defiance is annoying, perhaps, but it’s not like the act of testing a nuclear weapon tells us something new about their regime. And let's not forget that the United States has tested a nuclear weapons 1030 times (plus another 24 joint tests with Great Britain), while Pyongyang has tested exactly twice. After noting that both Bill Clinton and George W. Bush failed to stop the DPRK's nuclear program because "our hands are largely tied," Walt concludes, So the best response is to remain calm, and stop talking as if this event is a test of Obama's resolve or a fundamental challenge to U.S. policy. In fact, the tests are just "business as usual" for North Korea, and it would better if the United States "under-reacts" rather than overreacts. Instead of giving Pyongyang the attention it wants, the United States should use this incident as an opportunity to build consensus among the main interested parties (China, Russia, South Korea, Japan) and let China take the lead in addressing it. Above all, the Obama administration should avoid making a lot of sweeping statements about how it will not "tolerate" a North Korean nuclear capability. The fact is that we've tolerated it for some time now, and since we don't have good options for dealing with it, that's precisely what we will continue to do.

NoKo – No War

No war – North Korea is militaristically inferior and thus will not attack

Morgan 6 (Patrick, http://cmp.sagepub.com/content/23/2/121.full.pdf+html, dw: April 2006, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

There are concerns that the North may attack because its leaders could be irrational, not taking deterrence seriously and miscalculating the consequences of an attack. Cited is the way the North often seems cavalier about a war, threatening one over all sorts of provocations, such as UN sanctions. Does this call U.S.–ROK deterrence into question? First, it is possible the regime could be irrational. It has a history of serious miscalculations and irrationality cannot be ruled out. However, contrary to the standard view, the target’s rationality is not a prerequisite for successful deterrence. Deterrence *theory* was initially constructed by assuming actor rationality, but deterrence *in practice* does not require rationality in either party. All that is required is sufficient fear of the consequences from the threatened retaliation to lead the target to forgo what the threat seeks to prevent. That fear can have rational or irrational roots; the perceptions and judgments behind it may be rational, irrational, or some combination of the two. The same is true for judgments that deterrence threats can be ignored. Elaborate cost-benefit calculations are not needed to be afraid of being hurt and to seek to avoid it. Officials can be irrationally (excessively or for the wrong reasons) frightened or nonrationally frightened (frozen by stress, uncertainty, surprise, anxiety, or premonitions of disaster). Against such decision makers deterrence and compellence threats may work well. Moreover, some variants of irrationality can make a leader or government easier, not harder, to deter. In fact, since it is usually impossible to determine how rational leaders and governments are, even in retrospect, there is no uncontested evidence that rationality is crucial in deterrence success. The most sophisticated explanation of how mutual nuclear deterrence works relies on the parties being aware that they may not be consistently rational, so threats it would be foolish to carry out nevertheless work because governments are not guaranteed to act rationally—deterrers can benefit from being irrational or the possibility they might be, or be crippled by this in trying to deliver highly credible threats. In short, there is no fixed relationship between rationality and deterrence success or failure (Morgan, 2003, pp. 42–79). The crucial variable in deterrence situations is the will of the target government to attack and of the deterrer to respond militarily. Deterrence is meant to shrink the target’s will to attack, and though deterrence threats can have some effect, that will is shaped by other factors as well. As a result, deterrence may succeed, or fail, when it “shouldn’t”; that is, the other elements, rational and irrational, shaping the challenger’s decision may be compatible with or reinforce deterrence threats, or may serve to override them (Morgan 2003, pp. 164–165). In a serious crisis, how strong will the North’s determination to attack be?9 In fact, it is unlikely to be high. If it has nuclear weapons this will be particularly true; they will lead it to be more cautious, less provocative. Its military inferiority would be an important factor, as would the weakness of its economy and its dependence on outsiders. So would its lack of true allies that share its worldview or have a huge stake in the regime’s survival after it started a war. Most importantly, an attack on the ROK, Japan, or U.S. forces would put the regime’s survival at risk, and this is a regime long dedicated, above all, to survival. Attacking with weapons of mass destruction (WMD)would replay Japan’s mistake of 1941: seeking to get the US to settle for peace by using means that make it implaccable.

\*\*Nuclear War\*\*

Nuclear War – Causes Extinction

Nuclear war causes extinction – darkness and subfreezing

Tangley 84 (Laura, prof, American Institute of Biological Sciences, vol 34, p 6-9, dw: Jan 1984, da: 7-4-2011, lido)

Far more significant than the consensus itself, however, was what the scientists agreed upon: they concluded that the long-term effects of a nuclear war, even a limited or "small" nuclear war, would be far worse than the horrible, yet already well-known, immediate effects and worse than any previous studies have indicated. In particular, they predicted that darkness and subfreezing temperatures would dominate the planet for weeks to months after a nuclear exchange and that radioactive fallout would be much higher than previous estimates. These and other physical changes, they said, could lead to a collapse of all biological systems in the Northern Hemisphere, and perhaps the Southern Hemisphere as well. If that happened, the biologists agreed—for the first time—that they could not rule out the possibility of human extinction. The scientists' somber conclusions were based primarily on a two-year study—conducted by Richard P. Turco. of R&D Associates. Marina del Rey, California; Owen B. Toon. Thomas P. Ackcrman, and James B. Pollack, of NASA's Ames Research Center. Moffett Field. California; and Carl Sagan. of Cornell University. Ithaca, New York— that used computer models to evaluate optical and climatic effects of the dust and smoke that would be generated in a nuclear war. Their paper. "Global Atmospheric Consequences of Nuclear War," also called the TTAPS paper after the last names of its authors, was published in a recent issue of Science. In order to account for the many uncertain-tics involved, the researchers ran computer simulations of dozens of different nuclear war scenarios, varying factors such as the size and kind of bombs, location and distribution of targets, timeof year, size of smoke and dust particles, and the speed at which those particles would fall through the atmosphere.

Nuclear War would cause extinction

Bostrom 2 (Nick, Prof, Journal of Evolution and Technology, http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html, da: 7-4-2011, lido)

The US and Russia still have huge stockpiles of nuclear weapons. But would an all-out nuclear war really exterminate humankind? Note that: (i) For there to be an existential risk it suffices that we can’t be sure that it wouldn’t. (ii) The climatic effects of a large nuclear war are not well known (there is the possibility of a nuclear winter). (iii) Future arms races between other nations cannot be ruled out and these could lead to even greater arsenals than those present at the height of the Cold War. The world’s supply of plutonium has been increasing steadily to about two thousand tons, some ten times as much as remains tied up in warheads ([9], p. 26). (iv) Even if some humans survive the short-term effects of a nuclear war, it could lead to the collapse of civilization. A human race living under stone-age conditions may or may not be more resilient to extinction than other animal species.

Nuclear War – Causes Extinction

Nuclear war causes extinction – temperatures, dust, deaths

Sagan 85 (Carl, former prof, http://www.cooperativeindividualism.org/sagan\_nuclear\_winter.html, da: 7-4-2011, lido)

We knew that nuclear explosions, particularly groundbursts, would lift an enormous quantity of fine soil particles into the atmosphere (more than 100,000 tons of fine dust for every megaton exploded in a surface burst). Our work was further spurred by Paul Crutzen of the Max Planck Institute for Chemistry in Mainz, West Germany, and by John Birks of the University of Colorado, who pointed out that huge quantities of smoke would be generated in the burning of cities and forests following a nuclear war. Croundburst -- at hardened missile silos, for example -- generate fine dust. Airbursts -- over cities and unhardened military installations -- make fires and therefore smoke. The amount of dust and soot generated depends on the conduct of the war, the yields of the weapons employed and the ratio of groundbursts to airbursts. So we ran computer models for several dozen different nuclear war scenarios. Our baseline case, as in many other studies, was a 5000-megaton war with only a modest fraction of the yield (20 percent) expended on urban or industrial targets. Our job, for each case, was to follow the dust and smoke generated, see how much sunlight was absorbed and by how much the temperatures changed, figure out how the particles spread in longitude and latitude, and calculate how long before it all fell out in the air back onto the surface. Since the radioactivity would be attached to these same fine particles, our calculations also revealed the extent and timing of the subsequent radioactive fallout. Some of what I am about to describe is horrifying. I know, because it horrifies me. There is a tendency -- psychiatrists call it "denial" -- to put it out of our minds, not to think about it. But if we are to deal intelligently, wisely, with the nuclear arms race, then we must steel ourselves to contemplate the horrors of nuclear war. The results of our calculations astonished us. In the baseline case, the amount of sunlight at the ground was reduced to a few percent of normal-much darker, in daylight, than in a heavy overcast and too dark for plants to make a living from photosynthesis. At least in the Northern Hemisphere, where the great preponderance of strategic targets lies, an unbroken and deadly gloom would persist for weeks. Even more unexpected were the temperatures calculated. In the baseline case, land temperatures, except for narrow strips of coastline, dropped to minus 25 Celsius (minus 13 degrees Fahrenheit) and stayed below freezing for months -- even for a summer war. (Because the atmospheric structure becomes much more stable as the upper atmosphere is heated and the low air is cooled, we may have severely underestimated how long the cold and the dark would last.) The oceans, a significant heat reservoir, would not freeze, however, and a major ice age would probably not be triggered. But because the temperatures would drop so catastrophically, virtually all crops and farm animals, at least in the Northern Hemisphere, would be destroyed, as would most varieties of uncultivated or domesticated food supplies. Most of the human survivors would starve. In addition, the amount of radioactive fallout is much more than expected. Many previous calculations simply ignored the intermediate time-scale fallout. That is, calculations were made for the prompt fallout -- the plumes of radioactive debris blown downwind from each target-and for the long-term fallout, the fine radioactive particles lofted into the stratosphere that would descend about a year later, after most of the radioactivity had decayed. However, the radioactivity carried into the upper atmosphere (but not as high as the stratosphere) seems to have been largely forgotten. We found for the baseline case that roughly 30 percent of the land at northern midlatitudes could receive a radioactive dose greater than 250 rads, and that about 50 percent of northern midlatitudes could receive a dose greater than 100 rads. A 100-rad dose is the equivalent of about 1000 medical X-rays. A 400-rad dose will, more likely than not, kill you. The cold, the dark and the intense radioactivity, together lasting for months, represent a severe assault on our civilization and our species. Civil and sanitary services would be wiped out. Medical facilities, drugs, the most rudimentary means for relieving the vast human suffering, would be unavailable. Any but the most elaborate shelters would be useless, quite apart from the question of what good it might be to emerge a few months later. Synthetics burned in the destruction of the cities would produce a wide variety of toxic gases, including carbon monoxide, cyanides, dioxins and furans. After the dust and soot settled out, the solar ultraviolet flux would be much larger than its present value. Immunity to disease would decline. Epidemics and pandemics would be rampant, especially after the billion or so unburied bodies began to thaw. Moreover, the combined influence of these severe and simultaneous stresses on life are likely to produce even more adverse consequences -- biologists call them synergisms -- that we are not yet wise enough to foresee. So far, we have talked only of the Northern Hemisphere. But it now seems - unlike the case of a single nuclear weapons test -- that in a real nuclear war, the heating of the vast quantities of atmospheric dust and soot in northern midlatitudes will transport these fine particles toward and across the Equator. We see just this happening in Martian dust storms. The Southern Hemisphere would experience effects that, while less severe than in the Northern Hemisphere, are nevertheless extremely ominous. The illusion with which some people in the Northern Hemisphere reassure themselves -- catching an Air New Zealand flight in a time of serious international crisis, or the like -- is now much less tenable, even on the narrow issue of personal survival for those with the price of a ticket. But what if nuclear wars can be contained, and much less than 5000 megatons is detonated?

Nuclear War – Causes Extinction

Small NW causes extinction

Sagan 85 (Carl, former prof, http://www.cooperativeindividualism.org/sagan\_nuclear\_winter.html, da: 7-4-2011, lido)

Perhaps the greatest surprise in our work was that even small nuclear wars can have devastating climatic effects. We considered a war in which a mere 100 megatons were exploded, less than one percent of the world arsenals, and only in low-yield airbursts over cities. This scenario, we found, would ignite thousands of fires, and the smoke from these fires alone would be enough to generate an epoch of cold and dark almost as severe as in the 5000 megaton case. The threshold for what Richard Turco has called The Nuclear Winter is very low. Could we have overlooked some important effect? The carrying of dust and soot from the Northern to the Southern Hemisphere (as well as more local atmospheric circulation) will certainly thin the clouds out over the Northern Hemisphere. But, in many cases, this thinning would be insufficient to render the climatic consequences tolerable -- and every time it got better in the Northern Hemisphere, it would get worse in the Southern. Our results have been carefully scrutinized by more than 100 scientists in the United States, Europe and the Soviet Union. There are still arguments on points of detail. But the overall conclusion seems to be agreed upon: There are severe and previously unanticipated global consequences of nuclear war-subfreezing temperatures in a twilit radioactive gloom lasting for months or longer. Scientists initially underestimated the effects of fallout, were amazed that nuclear explosions in space disabled distant satellites, had no idea that the fireballs from high-yield thermonuclear explosions could deplete the ozone layer and missed altogether the possible climatic effects of nuclear dust and smoke. What else have we overlooked? Nuclear war is a problem that can be treated only theoretically. It is not amenable to experimentation. Conceivably, we have left something important out of our analysis, and the effects are more modest than we calculate. On the other hand, it is also possible-and, from previous experience, even likely-that there are further adverse effects that no one has yet been wise enough to recognize. With billions of lives at stake, where does conservatism lie-in assuming that the results will be better than we calculate, or worse? Many biologists, considering the nuclear winter that these calculations describe, believe they carry somber implications for life on Earth. Many species of plants and animals would become extinct. Vast numbers of surviving humans would starve to death. The delicate ecological relations that bind together organisms on Earth in a fabric of mutual dependency would be torn, perhaps irreparably. There is little question that our global civilization would be destroyed. The human population would be reduced to prehistoric levels, or less. Life for any survivors would be extremely hard. And there seems to be a real possibility of the extinction of the human species.

Nuclear War – Causes Extinction

Nuclear War causes extinction – destroys ozone layer

Parkinson 3 (Stuart, staff, http://www.sgr.org.uk/resources/does-anybody-remember-nuclear-winter, dw: 7-28-2003, da: 7-4-2011, lido)

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. While the temperature at the surface would be low, the temperature of the upper part of the troposphere (5-11 km) would rise because of sunlight absorbed by the smoke, so there would be a huge temperature inversion. That would keep many other pollutants produced by widespread fires (e.g. dioxins, PCBs, sulphurous gases) down at the levels people breathe, making a very dense and highly toxic smog. One further environmental problem would be widespread destruction of the ozone layer caused by high levels of nitrogen oxides. The average loss of ozone could be as much as 70% - much higher than that currently cause by CFCs. So after several months when the smoke cleared and the sun began to shine again, there would be a large increase of UV radiation reaching the earth's surface. This would be bad for humans (e.g. eye and skin damage), but the major effect would be for other living things, notably sensitive plankton, which are at the bottom layer of the whole marine food chain. Animals would also suffer - blindness would be common - and blind animals would quickly starve. Altogether, nuclear winter would be an ecological disaster of a similar magnitude to the major extinctions of the past, such as that at the end of the Cretaceous period 65 million years ago when 75% of all species died out, including the dinosaurs. An added factor after a nuclear war would be radioactive contamination giving worldwide background radiation doses many times larger than has ever happened during the 3 billion years of evolution.

Nuclear War – Causes Extinction

Nuclear war causes extinction – ozone and temperatures

Starr 9 (Steven, Int’l Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation, da: 7-4-2011, http://inesap.org/node/11, lido)

U.S. researchers have confirmed the scientific validity of the concept of “nuclear winter” and have demonstrated that any conflict which targets even a tiny fraction of the global nuclear arsenal against large urban centers will cause catastrophic disruptions of the global climate. New studies show that a “regional” nuclear conflict, which targeted large population centers in the sub-tropics with 100 Hiroshima-size weapons – about 0.3% of the global nuclear arsenal –, could produce as many fatalities as World War II1 and would significantly disrupt the global climate for at least a decade.2 Following this “small” exchange, the world would rapidly experience cold conditions not felt since pre-industrial times. U.S.-Russian arms accords have reduced by two-thirds the total number of nuclear weapons in the world’s nuclear arsenals since nuclear winter was first described in the 1980s. The new research confirms that the smoke produced by a war fought with the current global nuclear arsenal would still produce a nuclear winter.3 Under such conditions, daily minimum temperatures in the world’s large agricultural areas would fall below freezing for more than a year and cause the collapse of modern agriculture and the starvation of billions of people. Nuclear Winter Nuclear detonations within urban and industrial areas would ignite immense mass fires which would burn everything imaginable and create millions of tons of thick, black smoke (soot). This soot would ultimately be lofted into the stratosphere. There it would absorb and block sunlight from reaching the lower atmosphere where greenhouse gases mainly reside, and thus act to reduce the natural greenhouse effect.4 The profound darkness and global cooling predicted to be result of this process (along with massive amounts of radioactive fallout and pyrotoxins,5 and ozone depletion) was first described in 1983 as nuclear winter.6 Joint research by Western and Soviet scientists led to the realization that the climatic and environmental consequences of nuclear war, in combination with the indirect effects of the collapse of society, could produce a nuclear winter which would cause famine for billions of people far from the war zones.7 These predictions led to extensive international research and peer review during the mid-1980s. A large body of work which essentially supported the initial findings of the 1983 studies was done by such groups as the Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment (SCOPE),8 the World Meteorological Organization,9 and the U.S. National Research Council of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences.10 The idea of nuclear winter, published and supported by prominent scientists, generated extensive public alarm and put political pressure on the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. to terminate a runaway nuclear arms race which, by 1986, had created a global nuclear arsenal of more than 65,000 nuclear weapons. Unfortunately, this was anathema to the nuclear weapons establishment and thus nuclear winter created a backlash among many powerful conservative groups, who undertook an extensive media campaign to brand it as “bad science” and the scientists who discovered it as “irresponsible.” Critics used various uncertainties in the studies and the first climate models (which are relatively primitive by current standards) as a basis to denigrate and reject the concept of nuclear winter. In 1986, the Council on Foreign Relations published an article by scientists from the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR), who predicted drops in global cooling about half as large as those first predicted by the 1983 studies and described this as a ‘nuclear autumn.’ Subsequent widespread criticism, in such publications as the Wall Street Journal and Time Magazine, often used the term “nuclear autumn” to imply that no important climatic change would result from nuclear war. In 1987, the National Review called nuclear winter a “fraud.” In 2000, Discover Magazine published an article which described nuclear winter as one of “The Twenty Greatest Scientific Blunders in History.”11 Sadly enough, for almost two decades this smear campaign limited serious discussion and prevented further studies of nuclear winter – and such criticism will continue.12 Yet the basic findings of the nuclear winter research, that extreme climatic changes would result from nuclear war, were never scientifically disproved and have been strengthened by the latest studies.

Nuclear War – Causes Extinction

Nuclear War causes extinction – global warming

Masters 9 (Jeff, blogger, da: 7-4-2011, dw: 4-10-2009, http://www.wunderground.com/blog/JeffMasters/comment.html?entrynum=1208, lido)

Well, it turns out that this portrayal of nuclear winter was overly optimistic, according to a series of papers published over the past few years by Brian Toon of the University of Colorado, Alan Robock of Rutgers University, and Rich Turco of UCLA. Their most recent paper, a December 2008 study titled, "Environmental Consequences of Nuclear War", concludes that "1980s predictions of nuclear winter effects were, if anything, underestimates". Furthermore, they assert that even a limited nuclear war poses a significant threat to Earth's climate. The scientists used a sophisticated atmospheric/oceanic climate model that had a good track record simulating the cooling effects of past major volcanic eruptions, such as the Philippines' Mt. Pinatubo in 1991. The scientists injected five terragrams (Tg) of soot particles into the model atmosphere over Pakistan in May of 2006. This amount of smoke, they argued, would be the likely result of the cities burned up by a limited nuclear war involving 100 Hiroshima-sized bombs in the region. India and Pakistan are thought to have 109 to 172 nuclear weapons of unknown yield. Figure 1. Global average temperature departure from normal since 1880 (top) and A.D. 1000 (bottom) in black, and those projected after a limited nuclear exchange between Pakistan and India of 100 Hiroshima-sized weapons in 2006 (in red). Temperatures are forecast to plunge 1.2°C (2.2°F) after such a war, reaching levels colder than anything seen in the past 1000 years. The 1815 eruption of Tambora in Indonesia produced a similar cooling, and led to the notorious "Year Without a Summer". Image credit: "Climatic consequences of a regional nuclear conflict" by Robock et al., Atmospheric chemistry and Physics, 7, 2003-2012, 2007. The intense heat generated by the burning cities in the models' simulations lofted black smoke high into the stratosphere, where there is no rain to rain out the particles. The black smoke absorbed far more solar radiation than the brighter sulfuric acid aerosol particles emitted by volcanic eruptions. This caused the smoke to heat the surrounding stratospheric air by 30°C, resulting in stronger upward motion of the smoke particles higher into the stratosphere. As a result, the smoke stayed at significant levels for over a decade (by contrast, highly reflective volcanic aerosol particles do not absorb solar radiation and create such circulations, and only stay in the stratosphere 1-2 years). The black soot blocked sunlight, resulting in global cooling of over 1.2°C (2.2°F) at the surface for two years, and 0.5°C (0.9°F) for more than a decade (Figures 1 and 2). Precipitation fell up to 9% globally, and was reduced by 40% in the Asian monsoon regions. This magnitude of this cooling would bring about the coldest temperatures observed on the globe in over 1000 years (Figure 1). The growing season would shorten by 10-30 days over much of the globe, resulting in widespread crop failures. The effects would be similar to what happened after the greatest volcanic eruption in historic times, the 1815 Tambora eruption in Indonesia. This cooling from this eruption triggered the infamous Year Without a Summer in 1816 in the Northern Hemisphere, when killing frosts disrupted agriculture every month of the summer in New England, creating terrible hardship. Exceptionally cold and wet weather in Europe triggered widespread harvest failures, resulting in famine and economic collapse. However, the cooling effect of this eruption only lasted about a year. Cooling from a limited nuclear exchange would create two to three consecutive "Years Without a Summer", and over a decade of significantly reduced crop yields. The authors found that the smoke in the stratosphere cause a 20% reduction in Earth's protective ozone layer, with losses of 25-45% over the mid-latitudes where the majority of Earth's population lives, and 50-70% ozone loss at northern high latitude regions such as Scandinavia, Alaska, and northern Canada. A massive increase in ultraviolet radiation at the surface would result, capable of causing widespread and severe damage to plants and animals. Thus, even a limited nuclear exchange could trigger severe global climate change capable of causing economic chaos and widespread starvation. Figure 2. Top: Time variation of global average surface air temperature and precipitation for a limited nuclear exchange between Pakistan and India of 100 Hiroshima-sized weapons, assuming they inject 5 Tg of Black Carbon (BC) into the stratosphere. The global average precipitation is 3 mm/yr, so the changes in years 2-4 represent a 9% global average reduction in precipitation. Bottom: Time variation of sunlight (shortwave radiation) at the surface, in watts per meter squared, due to the 1991 eruption of Mt. Pinatubo in the Philippines (blue line) and the limited nuclear war between India and Pakistan (black line). The effects of a limited nuclear war are far more severe and long lasting than the eruption of Pinatubo, the greatest eruption of the 20th century. Image credit: "Climatic consequences of a regional nuclear conflict" by Robock et al., Atmospheric chemistry and Physics, 7, 2003-2012, 2007. Climate change and the Doomsday Clock It is sobering to realize that the nuclear weapons used in the study represented only 0.3% of the world's total nuclear arsenal of 26,000 warheads. Fortunately, significant progress was made in the 1990s and 2000s to reduce the threat of nuclear war. If the 2002 Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty (SORT) is fully implemented by the U.S. and Russia as planned, by 2012 the world's stockpile of nuclear weapons will be just 6% of the 70,000 warheads that existed at the peak of the cold war in 1986. However, the threat of a more limited regional nuclear war has increased in recent decades, since more countries have been joining the nuclear club--an average of one country every five years. The 2007 move by the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists to move the hands of their Doomsday Clock two minutes closer to midnight--the figurative end of civilization--helped call attention to this increased threat. In addition, they also mentioned climate change for the first time as part of the rationale for moving the clock closer to midnight. I believe that climate change does not pose an immediate threat to civilization--at least for the next 20 years or so--and there is still time to significantly reduce the threat of "doomsday" levels of climate change to civilization if strong action is taken in the next 20 years to cut carbon emissions. Thus, setting the hands of the clock closer to midnight because of climate change is probably premature. However, climate change triggered by a limited nuclear war is a whole different situation. The twin disasters of a limited nuclear war, coupled with the devastating global climate change it could wreak, should remind us that there is no such thing as a small scale nuclear war. Even a limited nuclear war is a huge threat to Earth's climate. Thus, there is no cause more important to work for than peace, so, this Easter weekend, I plan on making myself--and thus the world--more peaceful.

Nuclear War – Causes Extinction

Nuclear war causes extinction – environmental destruction

Robuck 9 (Alan, prof, in an interview, http://www.time.com/time/health/article/0,8599,1873164,00.html, dw: 1-22-2009, da: 7-8-2011, lido)

Tensions between India and Pakistan have been high recently. If they escalated to all-out nuclear war, what would be the effect to the global climate? We looked at a scenario in which each country used 50 Hiroshima-sized weapons, which they are believed to have in their arsenals. That's enough firepower to kill around 20 million people on the ground. We were surprised that the amount of smoke produced by these explosions would block out sunlight, cool the planet, and produce climate change unprecedented in recorded human history. Your study predicts mass cooling. With all the heat and radioactivity of the explosions, why wouldn't nuclear war warm the planet? It has nothing to do with the radioactivity of the explosions — although that would be devastating to nearby populations. The explosions would set off massive fires, which would produce plumes of black smoke. The sun would heat the smoke and lift it into the stratosphere — that's the layer above the troposphere, where we live — where there is no rain to clear it out. It would be blown across the globe and block the sun. The effect would not be a nuclear winter, but it would be colder than the little ice age [in the 17th and 18th centuries] and the change would happen very rapidly — over the course of a few weeks. Would you be able to see the smoke? The sky would not be blue. It would be grey. And what would the results be for humanity? We calculated that there would be a shortening of the growing season in the mid-latitudes — that includes Europe and America in the Northern Hemisphere — by a couple of weeks. The growing season is defined as the period between the last frost in spring and first frost in the fall. Some crops that need the whole growing season would not reach fruition and there would be no yield. Others would grow more slowly and produce a small yield. In addition there would be less precipitation and it would be darker, also damaging yield. You compound that with [the shutdown of] the current global network of food trading — countries would likely stop shipping food and focus on feeding their own populations — and it's a big crisis. We don't have the resources to do detailed analyses on the impacts of crops in different farming regimes but this suggests it could be a very serious problem. How confident are you that your modeling is correct? We used ModelE, designed by NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies, and one of the models used to produce the results of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). The model does an excellent job of simulating climate change that resulted from volcanic eruptions in the past. That gave us confidence. What's more, a group repeated the calculations for the Pakistan-India scenario with a different model at the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Colo., and the results almost exactly agreed. Their research showed how the smoke from the fires would open up holes in the ozone, which would cause even more problems for humanity. We'd like other people to test the calculations with their models, but we're pretty confident that they'll get the same answer. So we get a clue of the climatic effects of nuclear war from volcanic eruptions? Yes. 1816 was known as the "year without summer." It followed the Tambora Volcano eruption in Indonesia in 1815. It was sudden climate change on a similar scale, and it resulted in a severe famine in Europe, food riots and mass emigrations. Volcanic aerosols have a lifetime of about a year in the stratosphere. The lifetime of soot from nuclear fires is about five years. It's obviously much harder for a society to recover from such an extended cooling.

Nuclear War causes extinction - climate

Mosher 11 (Dave, staff, http://novascience.wordpress.com/2011/02/25/how-one-nuclear-skirmish-could-wreck-the-planet/, dw: 2-25-2011, da: 7-8-2011, lido)

Even a small nuclear exchange could ignite mega-firestorms and wreck the planet’s atmosphere. New climatological simulations show 100 Hiroshima-sized nuclear bombs — relatively small warheads, compared to the arsenals military superpowers stow today — detonated by neighboring countries would destroy more than a quarter of the Earth’s ozone layer in about two years. Regions closer to the poles would see even more precipitous drops in the protective gas, which absorbs harmful ultraviolet radiation from the sun. New York and Sydney, for example, would see declines rivaling the perpetual hole in the ozone layer above Antarctica. And it may take more than six years for the ozone layer to reach half of its former levels. Researchers described the results during a panel Feb. 18 at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, calling it “a real bummer” that such a localized nuclear war could bring the modern world to its knees. “This is tremendously dangerous,” said environmental scientist Alan Robock of Rutgers University, one of the climate scientists presenting at the meeting. “The climate change would be unprecedented in human history, and you can imagine the world … would just shut down.” To defuse the complexity involved in a nuclear climate catastrophe, Wired.com sat down with Michael Mills, an atmospheric chemist at the National Center for Atmospheric Research, who led some of the latest simulation efforts.

Nuclear War – Turns Warming

Nuclear war will kill global temperatures

Ricciardi 11 (Michael, environmental author, http://planetsave.com/2011/03/02/limited-nuclear-war-could-halt-global-warming-nasa-predicts/, dw: 3-2-2011, da: 7-6-2011, lido)

Lead researchers Luke Oman at NASA’s Goddard Space Flight Center actually conceived of the idea five years ago at a meeting of the American Geophysical Union (AGU). He had been presenting his research on the impact of volcanoes (sulfur dioxide gas) on the climate, using a computer simulation. Several other colleagues approach him wanting to know the impact of black soot aerosols resulting from a nuclear conflict. The two “ingredients” or inputs (sulfur dioxide and soot) are different in their impacts. They differ principally in the amount of sunlight they absorb or reflect (or let pass through to reach the surface). Volcanic aerosols can warm the upper atmosphere somewhat, but generally produce a cooling effect on near-surface atmospheric temperatures. Initially, nuclear-borne fires would produce a dramatic heating effect, but the massive injection of black soot into the upper atmosphere that follows this would tend to counteract that by blocking incoming radiation. pinatubo eruption The initial input for the simulation was 5 teragrams (megatons) of black carbon particles injected into Earth’s upper troposphere. This is the estimated result of the surface detonation of 100 Hiroshima-size bombs (each equivalent to 15K tons of TNT). Although inferior to H-bombs and today’s nuclear arsenal (The US/Russia have primarily hydrogen bombs, designated by mega-tonnage), even this relatively modest exchange could have a dramatic climate impact that would last years. But it could also “revert” years of global warming impacts. The scientists used a general circulation model known as ModelE (developed at NASA’s Goddard Institute for Space Studies, New York). The model calculates ocean-atmosphere coupling effects in addition to allowing varying aerosol inputs. Running their simulation, the team found that global temperatures would fall by a little over 1 °C (1.8 °F) over the first three years (3 times more cooling, for 3 times longer, than from the Mt. Pinatubo explosion). Also, because black soot is smaller/lighter that the sulfur particles, they can be carried higher into the upper troposphere. Once in this atmospheric band, impacts can last up to a decade or more. A computer model shows that global temperature change in degrees Celsius (black) and precipitation changes in millimeters per day (red) would gradually recover in the 10-year period following a the injection of 5 teragrams of black carbon particles into Earth's atmosphere. Credit: Luke Oman and colleagues/Rutgers University Here is one typical scenario: In a theoretical regional war, as in one between India And Pakistan, widespread fires would result sending thick clouds of dust, ash and smoke into the troposphere. Acting as a gigantic black soot sun screen, the layer of black carbon aerosols would absorb a good deal of heat radiation (making it rise up higher like a hot-air balloon), warming the upper atmosphere, where it would continue to block some quantity of the in-coming solar radiation. On the surface, apart from suffering the effects of nuclear radiation, the short to medium-term impacts of this effect would be: 1] A decrease in global temperatures (up to 1.5° Celsius [2.7° F] drop in average global temperatures) over three years. This would be a slighter version of the “nuclear winter” that was so chillingly described by Carl Sagan in a televised panel discussion, following the broadcast of the film The Day After (early 198o’s). 2] A decrease in rainfall (up to 10%), two to four years after the event Since heat (input) is the driver of precipitation cycles, a decrease in heat input (insolation) would disrupt growing seasons and have a devastating effect on world agriculture. Fresh water will become scarce, millions will starve, mass migrations will lead to more suffering and conflict… Although the simulation shows a recovery after about ten years, the impact of such a “limited” nuclear scenario would be highly disruptive to life as we know it, and the impact on human civilization would be long-term (for example, through a protracted, global conflict, or series). According to colleagues at the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR), the nuclear scenario also results in loss of ozone in the stratosphere, which would then allow more solar input/radiation, countering any cooling impact (as the black carbon layer dissipates), and possibly reverting the Earth to its previous, warming state, or, sending it into a hothouse state. The simulated scenario was never conceived of as any sort of radical geo-engineering method, but to perhaps serve as a cautionary tale concerning impacts from a nuclear exchange. In an NASA website news article by Kathryn Hansen, the team was asked about the relevance of this simulation to policy makers: Source: Planetsave (http://s.tt/12tEN)

Nuclear War – O/W Warming

NW ow’s warming – Same magnitude, NW is faster – Models prove

Robuck 9 (Alan, prof, in an interview, http://www.time.com/time/health/article/0,8599,1873164,00.html, dw: 1-22-2009, da: 7-8-2011, lido)

Some scientists, most notably Freeman Dyson of The Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, have stirred controversy by arguing that nuclear weapons are a more urgent environmental threat than global warming. Do you agree? Yes. If India and Pakistan engaged in nuclear war, they would use about 0.3% of the global nuclear stockpile. And still the effects on the climate would be dramatic. Our calculations on nuclear winter from the early 1980s have been confirmed by modern climate models. And fundamentally the situation hasn't changed — even with reduced stockpiles there still exists enough weapons to cause nuclear winter. That's something that maybe people don't realize. I think we have to solve the problem of the existence of all these weapons before we have the luxury of worrying about global warming.

Nuclear War – No Extinction

Nuclear war has a low chance of causing extinction

Nissani 92 (M, prof, http://www.is.wayne.edu/mnissani/pagepub/CH2.html, da: 7-4-2011, lido)

VIII. Extinction? Extinction of humankind is often mentioned in this context. However, based on what we know now of the effects of nuclear war, extinction is highly improbable: under any likely set of assumptions, it seems that some of our kind will be able to pull through the hardships and survive.

A nuclear war wouldn’t kill a lot of people

Martin 2 (Brian, TFF associate, http://www.transnational.org/SAJT/forum/meet/2002/Martin\_ActivismNuclearWar.html, da: 7-4-2011, lido)

The confrontation between Indian and Pakistani governments earlier this year showed that military use of nuclear weapons is quite possible. There are other plausible scenarios. A US military attack against Iraq could lead Saddam Hussein to release chemical or biological weapons, providing a trigger for a US nuclear strike. Israeli nuclear weapons might also be unleashed. Another possibility is accidental nuclear war. Paul Rogers in his book Losing Control says that the risk of nuclear war has increased due to proliferation, increased emphasis on nuclear war-fighting, reduced commitment to arms control (especially by the US government) and Russian reliance on nuclear arms as its conventional forces disintegrate. A major nuclear war could kill hundreds of millions of people. But less catastrophic outcomes are possible. A limited exchange might kill "only" tens or hundreds of thousands of people. Use of nuclear "bunker-busters" might lead to an immediate death toll in the thousands or less.

Nuclear war is survivable

Nyquist 99 (JR, writer and expert, http://www.wnd.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE\_ID=19722, da: 7-4-2011, dw: 7-5-1999, lido)

As I write about Russia's nuclear war preparations, I get some interesting mail in response. Some correspondents imagine I am totally ignorant. They point out that nuclear war would cause "nuclear winter," and everyone would die. Since nobody wants to die, nobody would ever start a nuclear war (and nobody would ever seriously prepare for one). Other correspondents suggest I am ignorant of the world-destroying effects of nuclear radiation. I patiently reply to these correspondents that nuclear war would not be the end of the world. I then point to studies showing that "nuclear winter" has no scientific basis, that fallout from a nuclear war would not kill all life on earth. Surprisingly, few of my correspondents are convinced. They prefer apocalyptic myths created by pop scientists, movie producers and journalists. If Dr. Carl Sagan once said "nuclear winter" would follow a nuclear war, then it must be true. If radiation wipes out mankind in a movie, then that's what we can expect in real life. But Carl Sagan was wrong about nuclear winter. And the movie "On the Beach" misled American filmgoers about the effects of fallout. It is time, once and for all, to lay these myths to rest. Nuclear war would not bring about the end of the world, though it would be horribly destructive. The truth is, many prominent physicists have condemned the nuclear winter hypothesis. Nobel laureate Freeman Dyson once said of nuclear winter research, "It's an absolutely atrocious piece of science, but I quite despair of setting the public record straight." Professor Michael McElroy, a Harvard physics professor, also criticized the nuclear winter hypothesis. McElroy said that nuclear winter researchers "stacked the deck" in their study, which was titled "Nuclear Winter: Global Consequences of Multiple Nuclear Explosions" (Science, December 1983).

Nuclear War – No Extinction

No extinction – ways to survive it

Mydans 88 (Seth, staff, NYT, dw: 2-17-1988, da: 7-4-2011, http://www.nytimes.com/1988/02/17/world/new-zealand-ponders-a-nuclear-survival-kit.html?pagewanted=2&src=pm, lido)

''There have been other studies of the impacts of a nuclear winter, but I think we are the first to focus on what the societal responses might be and what steps might be taken for possible preparedness.'' New Zealand has long been seen as a potential refuge in the event of a nuclear war, and there has been a small but steady flow of immigrants from the Northern Hemisphere since the early 1960's. Some of these immigrants have joined mainstream society, but others have joined small survivalist communities scattered across this nation of three million people. Some of the survivalists say that in selecting New Zealand they have tried to take into account all the various catastrophes the future may hold, including earthquakes, tidal waves, ozone depletion and a global warming. Handbooks on the Market Handbooks are available in Wellington bookshops, like ''A Nuclear Survival Manual for New Zealanders'' by Brian Hildreth, whose tips range from finding drinking water to the digging of latrines to a discussion of whether to hide from or to fight fellow survivors. He prescribes a basic ''nuclear survival kit'' that includes a good raincoat, air rifle, vitamin C capsules, a ball of string, a cake of soap and maps. Cigarettes are included in the list, with the notation, ''If you are a smoker, sudden deprivation under stressful conditions may be difficult to cope with.''

Nuclear War doesn’t cause extinction - equip

Kearney 87 (Cresson H, Engineer, http://www.oism.org/nwss/s73p912.htm, lido)

An all-out nuclear war between Russia and the United States would be the worst catastrophe in history, a tragedy so huge it is difficult to comprehend. Even so, it would be far from the end of human life on earth. The dangers from nuclear weapons have been distorted and exaggerated, for varied reasons. These exaggerations have become demoralizing myths, believed by millions of Americans. While working with hundreds of Americans building expedient shelters and life-support equipment, I have found that many people at first see no sense in talking about details of survival skills. Those who hold exaggerated beliefs about the dangers from nuclear weapons must first be convinced that nuclear war would not inevitably be the end of them and everything worthwhile. Only after they have begun to question the truth of these myths do they become interested, under normal peacetime conditions, in acquiring nuclear war survival skills. Therefore, before giving detailed instructions for making and using survival equipment, we will examine the most harmful of the myths about nuclear war dangers, along with some of the grim facts.

Nuclear War – No Extinction

No Extinction – reproduction checks

Schilling 99 (Govert, astronomer, http://www.astro-tom.com/technical\_data/alien\_life.htm, dw: May 1999, da: 7-4-2011, lido)

The optimists claim that a stable, intelligent society could last for tens of millions of years, if not forever. This would certainly mitigate the effect of a bottleneck earlier in the Drake equation. In addition, a long-lived species might have time to spread to many stars, multiplying its presence. The pessimists point out that humans invented radio technology only decades ago, and that the human race has been on the verge of destroying itself (through technological warfare and pollution) for much of that time. The same technical power that enables interstellar communication also enables rapid self-destruction. But others have pointed out that the human animal (as opposed to human civilization) would be almost impossible to kill off completely at this point. People are too widespread and too capable; pockets of individuals would find ways to survive almost any conceivable nuclear war or ecological catastrophe. These survivors could repopulate the Earth in a few thousand years, and a second technical civilization would develop more easily than the first. Maybe this will happen many times. Perhaps the pessimists' most telling argument stems from an actual observation: Earth has not already been overrun with aliens (contrary to some popular opinion). This is a more profound observation than it might at first seem. A high civilization lasting for hundreds of millions of years would have plenty of time to spread to every planet in the galaxy, even at the slow speeds foreseeable with our own technology. The drive to fill up all available territory seems to be a universal trait of living things. And yet the Earth gives no sign of ever having been colonized by a high technology in its history, much less today. This is known as the Fermi paradox, after the nuclear physicist Enrico Fermi, who as early as 1950 asked, "Where is everybody?"

Nuclear war won’t cause deathly health risks

Kearney 87 (Cresson H, Engineer, http://www.oism.org/nwss/s73p912.htm, lido)

The smallest fallout particles those tiny enough to be inhaled into a person's lungs are invisible to the naked eye. These tiny particles would fall so slowly from the four-mile or greater heights to which they would be injected by currently deployed Soviet warheads that most would remain airborne for weeks to years before reaching the ground. By that time their extremely wide dispersal and radioactive decay would make them much less dangerous. Only where such tiny particles are promptly brought to earth by rain- outs or snow-outs in scattered "hot spots," and later dried and blown about by the winds, would these invisible particles constitute a long-term and relatively minor post-attack danger. Fortunately for all living things, the danger from fallout radiation lessens with time. The radioactive decay, as this lessening is called, is rapid at first, then gets slower and slower. The dose rate (the amount of radiation received per hour) decreases accordingly. Figure 1.2 illustrates the rapidity of the decay of radiation from fallout during the first two days after the nuclear explosion that produced it. R stands for roentgen, a measurement unit often used to measure exposure to gamma rays and X rays. Fallout meters called dosimeters measure the dose received by recording the number of R. Fallout meters called survey meters, or dose-rate meters, measure the dose rate by recording the number of R being received per hour at the time of measurement. Notice that it takes about seven times as long for the dose rate to decay from 1000 roentgens per hour (1000 R/hr) to 10 R/hr (48 hours) as to decay from 1000 R/hr to 100 R/hr (7 hours). (Only in high-fallout areas would the dose rate 1 hour after the explosion be as high as 1000 roentgens per hour.)

Nuclear War – No Extinction – AT: Dust/Temp

Dust and temps from nuclear war don’t cause extinction - empirics

Nyquist 99 (JR, writer and expert, http://www.wnd.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE\_ID=19722, da: 7-4-2011, dw: 7-5-1999, lido)

Nuclear winter is the theory that the mass use of nuclear weapons would create enough smoke and dust to blot out the sun, causing a catastrophic drop in global temperatures. According to Carl Sagan, in this situation the earth would freeze. No crops could be grown. Humanity would die of cold and starvation. In truth, natural disasters have frequently produced smoke and dust far greater than those expected from a nuclear war. In 1883 Krakatoa exploded with a blast equivalent to 10,000 one-megaton bombs, a detonation greater than the combined nuclear arsenals of planet earth. The Krakatoa explosion had negligible weather effects. Even more disastrous, going back many thousands of years, a meteor struck Quebec with the force of 17.5 million one-megaton bombs, creating a crater 63 kilometers in diameter. But the world did not freeze. Life on earth was not extinguished. Consider the views of Professor George Rathjens of MIT, a known antinuclear activist, who said, "Nuclear winter is the worst example of misrepresentation of science to the public in my memory." Also consider Professor Russell Seitz, at Harvard University's Center for International Affairs, who says that the nuclear winter hypothesis has been discredited. Two researchers, Starley Thompson and Stephen Schneider, debunked the nuclear winter hypothesis in the summer 1986 issue of Foreign Affairs. Thompson and Schneider stated: "the global apocalyptic conclusions of the initial nuclear winter hypothesis can now be relegated to a vanishingly low level of probability."

Nuclear War – Yes Escalation

**Multiple ways nuclear war could escalate to great power war**

Moore 7 (Carl, blogger, http://www.carolmoore.net/nuclearwar/alternatescenarios.html, dw: May 2007, da: 7-4-2011, lido)

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.

**Nuclear War – Yes Escalation**

**Nuclear War will escalate - accidents**

Moore 7 (Carl, blogger, http://www.carolmoore.net/nuclearwar/index.html#Accidental, dw: May 2007, da: 7-4-2011, lido)

The U.S. and Russia both have a nuclear policy of “launch on warning”--a "hair-trigger" alert system. This means that less than 15 minutes after detecting a missile attack -- real or false -- through radar and satellite early warning systems these nation's militaries must launch their 5,000 on-alert nuclear weapons or possibly loose them to a first strike by the other side. And of this 15 minutes, only two or three minutes are allowed for actual deliberation by the Presidents of the United States or Russia. Barely time to get a phone call through on their "red telephones." See a relevant video. Past Near-Accidental Nuclear War In the last 30 years there have been a number of incidents which would have led to nuclear war had not clear thinking human beings decided the warning systems were in error. (See Alan Phillips' 20 Mishaps that Might Have Started Accidental Nuclear War) In 1979 a nuclear war simulation tape in a NORAD computer was interpreted to be a real nuclear attack and for 6 minutes emergency preparations for nuclear retaliation were made until the error was discovered. In 1980 a flawed 64-cent chip in telephone switching hardware at NORAD started sending alarming messages to U.S. command centers that a nuclear attack was under way. In 1983, a Russian satellite interpreted sun glare off clouds as a U.S. nuclear attack by multiple missiles and only a lower officer’s decision the U.S. had no reason to attack prevented him from reporting the sighting as a nuclear attack. In the closest call with disaster, in January, 1995, Russian President Yeltsin was alerted after radar detected an unexpected scientific missile launch. His nuclear "football" was activated, and he was close to a decision to launch when the missile (which could have been carrying 10 nuclear weapons) went out to sea. It later was discovered military leaders had failed to pass on Norway’s alert that it would be launching a scientific satellite that day. Only the caution of a few rational-minded Russians saved most of you reading this from dying in a nuclear war in 1983 or 1995, i.e., the fact Russian nuclear commanders decided that false nuclear attack alerts were just that because the United States had no reason to launch a nuclear attack. However, had these accidents occurred when the U.S. was bombing Serbia in spring of 1999 or invading Iraq in 2003, who can say what the result might have been? Or what if a problem occurred soon after the U.S. made threats that Russia should quickly withdraw its troops from Georgia, an issue in early 2004?

Large scale nuk war could happen - deterrence

Mearshimer 99 (Michael, prof, http://www.ciaonet.org/conf/cfr10/, dw: 2-25-1999, da: 7-4-2011, lido)

The deterrence argument is that states still compete with themselves for security, and they oftentimes compete very intensely. But the fact of the matter is that sometimes deterrence is not very hard to achieve, and as a result, even though you have a lot of intense security competition, you don’t have war in the system, because deterrence works. I think a good example of this would be the Cold War. The fact of the matter is the two great powers never fought each other directly in the Cold War, and it wasn’t because war was obsolescent. There was nobody running around like Michael from 1945 to 1990 saying war was obsolescent. On the contrary, right? So what I’m saying here is you can have an absence of war, but it can be for two different sets of reasons; one the obsolescence rationale that Michael laid out, and two the deterrence rationale. Now I think the central claim that’s on the table is wrong-headed, and let me tell you why.

Large scale war is feasible - resources

Mearshimer 99 (Michael, prof, http://www.ciaonet.org/conf/cfr10/, dw: 2-25-1999, da: 7-4-2011, lido)

First of all, there are a number of good reasons why great powers in the system will think seriously about going to war in the future, and I’ll give you three of them and try and illustrate some cases. First, states oftentimes compete for economic resources. Is it hard to imagine a situation where a reconstituted Russia gets into a war with the United States and the Persian Gulf over Gulf oil? I don’t think that’s implausible. Is it hard to imagine Japan and China getting into a war in the South China Sea over economic resources? I don’t find that hard to imagine.

**Nuclear War – Yes Escalation**

Great Power War could happen – states try to enhance security

Mearshimer 99 (Michael, prof, http://www.ciaonet.org/conf/cfr10/, dw: 2-25-1999, da: 7-4-2011, lido)

A second reason that states go to war which, of course, is dear to the heart of realists like me, and that’s to enhance their security. Take the United States out of Europe, put the Germans on their own; you got the Germans on one side and the Russians on the other, and in between a huge buffer zone called eastern or central Europe. Call it what you want. Is it impossible to imagine the Russians and the Germans getting into a fight over control of that vacuum? Highly likely, no, but feasible, for sure. Is it hard to imagine Japan and China getting into a war over the South China Sea, not for resource reasons but because Japanese sea-lines of communication run through there and a huge Chinese navy may threaten it? I don’t think it’s impossible to imagine that.

Great Power war likely – nationalism triggers

Mearshimer 99 (Michael, prof, http://www.ciaonet.org/conf/cfr10/, dw: 2-25-1999, da: 7-4-2011, lido)

What about nationalism, a third reason? China, fighting in the United States over Taiwan? You think that’s impossible? I don’t think that’s impossible. That’s a scenario that makes me very nervous. I can figure out all sorts of ways, none of which are highly likely, that the Chinese and the Americans end up shooting at each other. It doesn’t necessarily have to be World War III, but it is great-power war. Chinese and Russians fighting each other over Siberia? As many of you know, there are huge numbers of Chinese going into Siberia. You start mixing ethnic populations in most areas of the world outside the United States and it’s usually a prescription for big trouble. Again, not highly likely, but possible. I could go on and on, positing a lot of scenarios where great powers have good reasons to go to war against other great powers.

Great Power war could happen - deterrence

Mearshimer 99 (Michael, prof, http://www.ciaonet.org/conf/cfr10/, dw: 2-25-1999, da: 7-4-2011, lido)

Second reason: There is no question that in the twentieth century, certainly with nuclear weapons but even before nuclear weapons, the costs of going to war are very high. But that doesn’t mean that war is ruled out. The presence of nuclear weapons alone does not make war obsolescent. I will remind you that from 1945 to 1990, we lived in a world where there were thousands of nuclear weapons on both sides, and there was nobody running around saying, “ War is obsolescent.” So you can’t make the argument that the mere presence of nuclear weapons creates peace. India and Pakistan are both going down the nuclear road. You don’t hear many people running around saying, “ That’s going to produce peace.” And, furthermore, if you believe nuclear weapons were a great cause of peace, you ought to be in favor of nuclear proliferation. What we need is everybody to have a nuclear weapon in their back pocket. You don’t hear many people saying that’s going to produce peace, do you?

Great Power war could happen – war not obsolete

Mearshimer 99 (Michael, prof, http://www.ciaonet.org/conf/cfr10/, dw: 2-25-1999, da: 7-4-2011, lido)

My third and final point here is, the fact of the matter is, that there’s hardly anybody in the national security establishment-and I bet this is true of Michael-who believes that war is obsolescent. I’m going to tell you why I think this is the case. Consider the fact that the United States stations roughly 100,000 troops in Europe and 100,000 troops in Asia. We spend an enormous amount of money on defense. We’re spending almost as much money as we were spending during the Cold War on defense. We spend more money than the next six countries in the world spend on defense. The questions is, why are we spending all this money? Why are we stationing troops in Europe? Why are we stationing troops in Asia? Why are we concentrating on keeping NATO intact and spreading it eastward? I’ll tell you why, because we believe that if we don’t stay there and we pull out, trouble is going to break out, and not trouble between minor powers, but trouble between major powers. That’s why we’re there. We know very well that if we leave Europe, the Germans are going to seriously countenance, if not automatically go, and get nuclear weapons. Certainly the case with the Japanese. Do you think the Germans and the Japanese are going to stand for long not to have nuclear weapons? I don’t think that’s the case. Again, that security zone between the Germans and the Russians-there’ll be a real competition to fill that. The reason we’re there in Europe, and the reason that we’re there in Asia is because we believe that great-power war is a potential possibility, which contradicts the argument on the table. So I would conclude by asking Michael if, number one, he believes we should pull out of Europe and pull out of Asia, and number two, if he does not, why not?

Nuclear War – No Escalation

No Great Power War - empirics

Moore 7 (Carl, blogger, http://www.carolmoore.net/nuclearwar/index.html#Threats, dw: May 2007, da: 7-4-2011, lido)

The 1945-1989 "Cold War" between the U.S.S.R. and the United States was one long nuclear standoff. These threats continued into even the late 1990s and could easily be prompted by some new regional crisis, especially as the United States continues to build military bases all around Russia's perimeter. David R. Morgan, National President, Veterans Against Nuclear Arms, describes in detail 16 threats to use nuclear weapons -- most of them from the United States, many of which continue as standing threats: 1946-Iran and Yugoslavia; 1948-Berlin; 1950-Korea; 1954-Vietnam and China; 1956-Suez; 1958-China; 1959 and 1961-Berlin; 1962 Cuba (the most famous and most dangerous situation); 1969-Vietnam; 1970-Jordan; 1973-Israel; 1980-Iran; 1983-Reagan's First Strike threats. And of course both the United States and Israel have repeatedly made it clear "no option" is off the table, first against Iraq and now against Iran. In my studies of the Middle East, I discovered the U.S. military presence has included other threats to use nuclear weapons to prevent any "Soviet aggression" in the area and especially to protect Israel. In 1956, President Eisenhower threatened to use nuclear weapons if the U.S.S.R. became involved in the Suez Crisis. In 1958, Eisenhower threatened Soviet-backed Egypt and Syria to keep them from interfering in Lebanon. In 1967, President Johnson considered using nuclear weapons during the Arab-Israeli war and the Washington-Moscow hot line was used for the first time. In 1973, during another Arab-Israeli war, President Nixon declared a nuclear alert that moved U.S. readiness to "DEFCON III". In 1979, after the invasion of Afghanistan, President Carter threatened to use "any means necessary", including nuclear weapons, in order to maintain U.S. supremacy in the Middle East. Israel's 1982 invasion of Lebanon, which included clashes with Syrian and Soviet troops, nearly triggered a nuclear alert. And U.S. ally Israel, in its efforts to hold on to and even expand what hundreds of hundreds of millions of Muslims consider to be "colonized" and "occupied" land in Israel and the occupied territories, has often used the nuclear threat. The Federation of American scientists site notes: : Strategically, Israel uses its long-range missiles and nuclear-capable aircraft (and, some say, submarines with nuclear-armed cruise missiles) to deter both conventional and unconventional attacks, or to launch "the Samson Option", an all-out attack against an adversary should defenses fail and population centers be threatened. In a lengthy article on Israel's nuclear capability, anti-nuclear activists John Steinbach writes: " Israel has made countless veiled nuclear threats against the Arab nations and against the Soviet Union (and by extension Russia since the end of the Cold War) One chilling example comes from Ariel Sharon, the current Israeli Prime Minister "Arabs may have the oil, but we have the matches." See more on Israeli nuclear weapons and its numerous "Samson Option" threats by Israeli leaders and their supporters. The Soviet Union and later Russia also have used the nuclear threat. Angered by the United States placing nuclear missiles in Turkey in the early sixties, Soviet leader Nikita Kruschev placed nuclear weapons in Cuba, leading to the Cuban missile crisis, the closest the world has come so far to nuclear war. (President Kennedy did not know there really were nuclear weapons when he threatened to invade and this information was released only after the fall of the Soviet Union.) Nevertheless, the nuclear standoff led to the Soviet Union withdrawing their nuclear missiles from Cuba and the U.S. withdrawing them from Turkey.

Nuclear War – No Escalation

Great Power War won’t happen – modern day costs and known consequences

Mandelbaum 99 (Michael, prof, http://www.ciaonet.org/conf/cfr10/, dw: 2-25-1999, da: 7-4-2011, lido)

So if I am right, then what has been the motor of political history for the last two centuries that has been turned off? This war, I argue, this kind of war, is obsolete; less than impossible, but more than unlikely. What do I mean by obsolete? If I may quote from the article on which this presentation is based, a copy of which you received when coming in, “ Major war is obsolete in a way that styles of dress are obsolete. It is something that is out of fashion and, while it could be revived, there is no present demand for it. Major war is obsolete in the way that slavery, dueling, or foot-binding are obsolete. It is a social practice that was once considered normal, useful, even desirable, but that now seems odious. It is obsolete in the way that the central planning of economic activity is obsolete. It is a practice once regarded as a plausible, indeed a superior, way of achieving a socially desirable goal, but that changing conditions have made ineffective at best, counterproductive at worst.” Why is this so? Most simply, the costs have risen and the benefits of major war have shriveled. The costs of fighting such a war are extremely high because of the advent in the middle of this century of nuclear weapons, but they would have been high even had mankind never split the atom. As for the benefits, these now seem, at least from the point of view of the major powers, modest to non-existent. The traditional motives for warfare are in retreat, if not extinct. War is no longer regarded by anyone, probably not even Saddam Hussein after his unhappy experience, as a paying proposition. And as for the ideas on behalf of which major wars have been waged in the past, these are in steep decline. Here the collapse of communism was an important milestone, for that ideology was inherently bellicose. This is not to say that the world has reached the end of ideology; quite the contrary. But the ideology that is now in the ascendant, our own, liberalism, tends to be pacific. Moreover, I would argue that three post-Cold War developments have made major war even less likely than it was after 1945. One of these is the rise of democracy, for democracies, I believe, tend to be peaceful. Now carried to its most extreme conclusion, this eventuates in an argument made by some prominent political scientists that democracies never go to war with one another. I wouldn’t go that far. I don’t believe that this is a law of history, like a law of nature, because I believe there are no such laws of history. But I do believe there is something in it. I believe there is a peaceful tendency inherent in democracy. Now it’s true that one important cause of war has not changed with the end of the Cold War. That is the structure of the international system, which is anarchic. And realists, to whom Fareed has referred and of whom John Mearsheimer and our guest Ken Waltz are perhaps the two most leading exponents in this country and the world at the moment, argue that that structure determines international activity, for it leads sovereign states to have to prepare to defend themselves, and those preparations sooner or later issue in war. I argue, however, that a post-Cold War innovation counteracts the effects of anarchy. This is what I have called in my 1996 book, The Dawn of Peace in Europe, common security. By common security I mean a regime of negotiated arms limits that reduce the insecurity that anarchy inevitably produces by transparency-every state can know what weapons every other state has and what it is doing with them-and through the principle of defense dominance, the reconfiguration through negotiations of military forces to make them more suitable for defense and less for attack. Some caveats are, indeed, in order where common security is concerned. It’s not universal. It exists only in Europe. And there it is certainly not irreversible. And I should add that what I have called common security is not a cause, but a consequence, of the major forces that have made war less likely. States enter into common security arrangements when they have already, for other reasons, decided that they do not wish to go to war. Well, the third feature of the post-Cold War international system that seems to me to lend itself to warlessness is the novel distinction between the periphery and the core, between the powerful states and the less powerful ones. This was previously a cause of conflict and now is far less important. To quote from the article again, “ While for much of recorded history local conflicts were absorbed into great-power conflicts, in the wake of the Cold War, with the industrial democracies debellicised and Russia and China preoccupied with internal affairs, there is no great-power conflict into which the many local conflicts that have erupted can be absorbed. The great chess game of international politics is finished, or at least suspended. A pawn is now just a pawn, not a sentry standing guard against an attack on a king.” Now having made the case for the obsolescence of modern war, I must note that there are two major question marks hanging over it: Russia and China. These are great powers capable of initiating and waging major wars, and in these two countries, the forces of warlessness that I have identified are far less powerful and pervasive than they are in the industrial West and in Japan. These are countries, in political terms, in transition, and the political forms and political culture they eventually will have is unclear. Moreover, each harbors within its politics a potential cause of war that goes with the grain of the post-Cold War period-with it, not against it-a cause of war that enjoys a certain legitimacy even now; namely, irredentism. War to reclaim lost or stolen territory has not been rendered obsolete in the way that the more traditional causes have. China believes that Taiwan properly belongs to it. Russia could come to believe this about Ukraine, which means that the Taiwan Strait and the Russian-Ukrainian border are the most dangerous spots on the planet, the places where World War III could begin.

Nuclear War – Yes Possible

Nuclear war could happen – new tech, new standards

Tannenwald 5 (Nina, prof, International Security, vol 29, p.5-49, muse, dw: 2005, da: 7-4-2011, lido)

What are the future prospects for the taboo? How might it unravel? It could unravel in several ways. It could weaken in the future if the NPT were to come under serious challenge by the proliferation of weapons to new states, if the nuclear doctrines of nuclear states continue to emphasize nuclear weapons as an important instrument of national security and even develop new roles for them, and if the nuclear states rely on nuclear threats and deployments as instruments of policy. Development of new generations of "mini-nukes" that blur the line between conventional and nuclear weapons, thus lowering the threshold for nuclear use, would be especially damaging. Even if the United States ultimately decided not to develop or to test new types of small nuclear weapons, loose talk about the potential utility of nuclear weapons could weaken the nuclear taboo. Finally, the taboo would certainly be severely damaged (even if not necessarily totally disrupted) by any use of nuclear weapons. Two factors could put pressure on the taboo in the coming decades: (1)changes in the nature of warfare and threats, and (2) U.S. hegemony. First, [End Page 43] the changing nature of warfare may create new pressures for consideration of nuclear options.

Nuclear War could happen - threats

Tannenwald 5 (Nina, prof, International Security, vol 29, p.5-49, muse, dw: 2005, da: 7-4-2011, lido)

The dominant threats to the security of states today are posed by nonstate actors, including terrorists, and so-called rogue states seeking access to weapons of mass destruction. Terrorists do not fight conventional wars and are difficult to deter. Such unconventional threats may place pressure on military and political leaders to consider new roles for nuclear weapons in preempting use of other weapons of mass destruction. If U.S. planners viewed nuclear weapons as the only effective means to preempt a threatened devastating rogue-actor attack with biological weapons, for example, political leaders might come under great pressure to consider use of nuclear weapons. The U.S.-led intervention in Afghanistan in 2001 reinforced interest among some U.S. military planners in the idea of "bunker buster" nuclear warheads that could penetrate deeply into the earth to destroy heavily reinforced underground facilities, such as those used in the production of chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons.145 Proponents also argue that smaller, more accurate, more "usable" nuclear weapons could reduce collateral damage and therefore would be more effective in the complex calculus of deterrence.146 Critics argue that the development of reduced-collateral-damage nuclear weapons is not technically feasible.147 Further, such weapons, by appearing more usable, would lower the threshold for using nuclear weapons and would accelerate the proliferation of nuclear weapons generally.148 Should production of these new warheads go forward, this would certainly represent a step backward in [End Page 44] terms of the taboo. Although in many respects this policy would be no different from past U.S. policies to build more usable warheads (e.g., in the 1970s), it would be worse for the taboo today because it would reverse expectations established by the U.S. decision in 1993 not to build new nuclear warheads.149

Nuclear War likely could happen – norms for using nuke’s are changing

Tannenwald 5 (Nina, prof, International Security, vol 29, p.5-49, muse, dw: 2005, da: 7-4-2011, lido)

A second factor putting pressure on the taboo would be a new interpretation of U.S. hegemony, in which the unrivaled power position of the United States after the end of the Cold War is coupled with a new Hobbesian ideology in which the most powerful state or Leviathan rightfully controls the world order. This new interpretation of hegemony could give rise to a discourse that seeks to legitimize use of nuclear weapons by the United States to enforce norms against so-called barbarians. In recent years, U.S. leaders have appeared to pursue new roles for nuclear weapons in counterproliferation strategies and the fight against terrorism, while expressing active disdain for the UN and international treaties and advocating a new doctrine of preemptive use of military force to prevent acquisition of weapons of mass destruction by other actors. In this view, norms that constrain others would not necessarily apply to the United States. The United States would reserve to itself alone the right to use force, including the use of nuclear weapons, to enforce nonproliferation, nonuse, and disarmament against other actors.150 The development of new mini-nukes would be consistent with this scenario.

Nuclear War – Yes Possible – AT: Deterrence Checks

Nuclear war won’t be checked by deterrence

Lieber and Press 6 (Keir and Daryl, Interntaional security, vol 30, p 7-44, da: 7-4-2011, lido)

This analysis challenges the prevailing optimism among scholars from all three major international relations traditions about the future of great power peace. For realists, optimism rests largely on the strategic stalemate induced by MAD.4 Liberal scholars, on the other hand, ªnd substantial reason for optimism in the pacifying effects of democracy, economic interdependence, and international institutions.5 But nuclear deterrence plays a supporting role for them as well. For example, several prominent liberals note that nuclear deterrence prevents states from seizing wealth and power by conquering their neighbors; trade and broader economic cooperation have become the only foreign policy strategies for amassing economic might.6 Similarly, some leading constructivists contend that nuclear weapons have rendered major power war so futile that the entire enterprise has been socialized out of the international system.7 One scholar argues that the nuclear stalemate dampens states’ security fears and allows them to pursue collective goals, develop shared identities, and create a culture of trust.8 Our analysis, however, pulls away one leg from these arguments.9 Nuclear weapons may no longer produce the peaceinducing stalemate that they did during the Cold War.10

**Nuclear War – Not Possible**

**Nuclear wars will never happen – all states understand that they would destroy themselves, empirics**

Tepperman 9 (Jonathon, Newsweek, staff, Learning to Love The Bomb; Obama wants to rid the world of nuclear weapons. Why that might be a big mistake., dw: 9-14-2009, da: 7-6-2011, lexis, lido)

The argument that nuclear weapons can be agents of peace as well as destruction rests on two deceptively simple observations. First, nuclear weapons have not been used since 1945. Second, there's never been a nuclear, or even a non-nuclear, war between two states that possess them. Just stop for a second and think about that: it's hard to overstate how remarkable it is, given the singular viciousness of the 20th century. As Kenneth Waltz, the leading "nuclear optimist" and a professor emeritus of political science at UC Berkeley puts it, "We now have 64 years of experience since Hiroshima. It's striking and against all historical precedent that for that substantial period, there has not been any war among nuclear states." To understand why--and why the next 64 years are likely to play out the same way--you need to start by recognizing that all states are rational on some basic level. Their leaders may be stupid, petty, venal, even evil, but they tend to do things only when they're pretty sure they can get away with them. Take war: a country will start a fight only when it's almost certain it can get what it wants at an acceptable price. Not even Hitler or Saddam waged wars they didn't think they could win. The problem historically has been that leaders often make the wrong gamble and underestimate the other side--and millions of innocents pay the price. Nuclear weapons change all that by making the costs of war obvious, inevitable, and unacceptable. Suddenly, when both sides have the ability to turn the other to ashes with the push of a -button--and everybody knows it--the basic math shifts. Even the craziest tin-pot dictator is forced to accept that war with a nuclear state is unwinnable and therefore not worth the effort. As Waltz puts it, "Why fight if you can't win and might lose everything?" Why indeed? The iron logic of deterrence and mutually assured destruction is so compelling it's led to what's known as the nuclear peace: the virtually unprecedented stretch since the end of World War II in which all the world's major powers have avoided coming to blows. They did fight proxy wars, ranging from Korea to Vietnam to Angola to Latin America. But these never matched the furious destruction of full-on great-power war (World War II alone was responsible for some 50 million to 70 million deaths). And since the end of the Cold War, such bloodshed has declined precipitously. Meanwhile, the nuclear powers have scrupulously avoided direct combat, and there's very good reason to think they always will. There have been some near misses, but a close look at these cases is fundamentally reassuring--because in each instance, very different leaders all came to the same safe conclusion. Take the mother of all nuclear standoffs: the Cuban missile crisis. For 13 days in October 1962, the United States and the Soviet Union each threatened the other with destruction. But both countries soon stepped back from the brink when they recognized that a war would have meant curtains for everyone. As important as the fact that they did is the reason why: Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev's aide Fyodor Burlatsky said later on, "It is impossible to win a nuclear war, and both sides realized that, maybe for the first time." The record since then shows the same pattern repeating: nuclear-armed enemies slide toward war, then pull back, always for the same reasons. The best recent example is India and Pakistan, which fought three bloody wars after independence before acquiring their own nukes in 1998. Getting their hands on weapons of mass destruction didn't do anything to lessen their animosity. But it did dramatically mellow their behavior. Since acquiring atomic weapons, the two sides have never fought another war, despite severe provocations (like Pakistani-based terrorist attacks on India in 2001 and 2008). They have skirmished once. But during that flare-up, in Kashmir in 1999, both countries were careful to keep the fighting limited and to avoid threatening the other's vital interests. Sumit Ganguly, an Indiana University professor and co-author of the forthcoming India, Pakistan, and the Bomb, has found that on both sides, officials' thinking was strikingly similar to that of the Russians and Americans in 1962. The prospect of war brought Delhi and Islamabad face to face with a nuclear holocaust, and leaders on each side did what they had to do to avoid it.

\*\*Prolif\*\*

Prolif – Slow TF

 Proliferation is slow

Gray 2000 (Colin, prof, http://fds.oup.com/www.oup.com/pdf/13/9780198296249.pdf, da:7-6-2011, lido)

 The numbers of nuclear-weapon, and nuclear-threshold, states, remain much lower than proliferation pessimists were predicting in the 1950s and 1960s. There is no question but that the pace of proliferation has been slow and at present shows no thoroughly convincing signs of a prospect for other than a distinctly steady acceleration. But, this trend, if that is what it is, of a deliberate pace in proliferation, is vulnerable to nuclear learning from any crisis, anywhere that seems to demonstrate a strategic necessity for nuclear arms. The trend that has produced only five NPT-’licensed’ nuclear-weapon states—which happen to be the Five Permanent Members of the UN Security Council—three unlicensed nuclear-weapon states (Israel, India, Pakistan), at least one near-nuclear-weapon threshold state (North Korea), and three would-be nuclear-weapon states (Iraq, Iran, Libya), is indeed impressive. Also it is impressive that, inter alia, Sweden, Switzerland, Japan, Argentina, Brazil, Egypt, and Taiwan, have stepped back from active pursuit of the military nuclear option. More noteworthy still was the renunciation in 1990 of actual, as opposed to virtual, nuclear weapons by a South Africa whose internal and external security condition has been transformed by and large for the better, and by the distinctly insecure extra-Russian legatees of part of the erstwhile Soviet nuclear arsenal.

Prolif is slow – states put prolif as side project priority

Waltz 2000(Kenneth, prof, http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/gjia/gjia\_winspr00f.html, dw: Spring 2000, da: 7-8-2011, lido)

It is now estimated that about twenty–five countries are in a position to make nuclear weapons rather quickly. Most countries that could have acquired nuclear military capability have refrained from doing so. Most countries do not need them. Consider Argentina, Brazil, and South Africa. Argentina and Brazil were in the process of moving toward nuclear military capability, and both decided against it–wisely I believe–because neither country needs nuclear weapons. South Africa had about half a dozen warheads and decided to destroy them. You have to have an adversary against whom you think you might have to threaten retaliation, but most countries are not in this position. Germany does not face any security threats–certainly not any in which a nuclear force would be relevant. I would expect the pattern of the past to be the same as the pattern in the future, in which one or two states per decade gradually develop nuclear weapons.

Prolif is slow - incentives

Yusuf 9 (Moeed, policy fellow, “Predicting Proliferation: The History of the Future of Nuclear Weapons,” Brookings institute policy paper, no 11, dw: Jan 2009, da: 7-8-2011, lido)

Third, the pace of proliferation has been consistently slower than has been anticipated by most experts due to a combination of overwhelming alarmism, the intent of threshold states, and many incentives to abstain from weapons development. In the post-Cold War period, the number of suspected threshold states has gradually decreased and the geographical focus has shifted solely to North-East Asia, South Asia, and the Middle East. There is also much greater concern that a nuclear chain reaction will break out than was the case during the Cold War.

Prolif – Slow TF

Prolif slow – no motive

Waltz 95 (Kenneth, prof, http://escholarship.org/uc/item/4cj4z5g2, da: 7-8-2011, dw: 1995, lido)

Nuclear weapons continue to spread ever so slowly, and the world seems to fare better as they do so. Yet the rapid spread—that is, the proliferation—of nuclear weapons remains a frightening prospect; the mind boggles at the thought of all or most countries having them. Whatever the policies of the United States and other countries may be, that prospect is hardly even a distant one. Many more countries can make nuclear weapons than do. One can believe that American opposition to nuclear arming stays the deluge only by overlooking the complications of international life. Any state has to examine many conditions before deciding whether or not to develop nuclear weapons. Our opposition is only one factor and is not likely to dissuade a determined state from seeking the weapons. Many states feel fairly secure living with their neighbors. Why should they want nuclear weapons? The answer usually given is “for prestige.” Yet it is hard to imagine a country entering the difficult and risky nuclear military business mainly for the sake of buoying its amour and gaining the attention that doing so may bring.

Prolif slow - expensive

Tepperman 9 (Jonathon, staff, dw: 8-29-2009, da: 7-8-2011, http://www.newsweek.com/2009/08/28/why-obama-should-learn-to-love-the-bomb.html, lido)

The risk of an arms race—with, say, other Persian Gulf states rushing to build a bomb after Iran got one—is a bit harder to dispel. Once again, however, history is instructive. "In 64 years, the most nuclear-weapons states we've ever had is 12," says Waltz. "Now with North Korea we're at nine. That's not proliferation; that's spread at glacial pace." Nuclear weapons are so controversial and expensive that only countries that deem them absolutely critical to their survival go through the extreme trouble of acquiring them. That's why South Africa, Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan voluntarily gave theirs up in the early '90s, and why other countries like Brazil and Argentina dropped nascent programs. This doesn't guarantee that one or more of Iran's neighbors—Egypt or Saudi Arabia, say—might not still go for the bomb if Iran manages to build one. But the risks of a rapid spread are low, especially given Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's recent suggestion that the United States would extend a nuclear umbrella over the region, as Washington has over South Korea and Japan, if Iran does complete a bomb. If one or two Gulf states nonetheless decided to pursue their own weapon, that still might not be so disastrous, given the way that bombs tend to mellow behavior.

Prolif slow – countries don’t commit

Gavin 9 (Francis, prof, http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/isec.2010.34.3.7, da: 7-8-2011, lido)

In his analysis of more than sixty years of failed efforts to accurately predict nuclear proliferation, analyst Moeed Yusuf concludes that “the pace of prolif-eration has been much slower than anticipated by most.” The majority of countries suspected of trying to obtain a nuclear weapons capability “never even came close to crossing the threshold. In fact, most did not even initiate a weapons program.” If all the countries that were considered prime suspects over the past sixty years had developed nuclear weapons, “the world would have at least 19 nuclear powers today.”44 As Potter and Mukhatzhanova argue, government and academic experts frequently “exaggerated the scope and pace of nuclear weapons proliferation.”45

Prolif – No mass prolif

No mass prolif – countries give up

Tepperman 9 (Jonathon, staff, dw: 8-29-2009, da: 7-8-2011, http://www.newsweek.com/2009/08/28/why-obama-should-learn-to-love-the-bomb.html, lido)

The risk of an arms race—with, say, other Persian Gulf states rushing to build a bomb after Iran got one—is a bit harder to dispel. Once again, however, history is instructive. "In 64 years, the most nuclear-weapons states we've ever had is 12," says Waltz. "Now with North Korea we're at nine. That's not proliferation; that's spread at glacial pace." Nuclear weapons are so controversial and expensive that only countries that deem them absolutely critical to their survival go through the extreme trouble of acquiring them. That's why South Africa, Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan voluntarily gave theirs up in the early '90s, and why other countries like Brazil and Argentina dropped nascent programs. This doesn't guarantee that one or more of Iran's neighbors—Egypt or Saudi Arabia, say—might not still go for the bomb if Iran manages to build one. But the risks of a rapid spread are low, especially given Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's recent suggestion that the United States would extend a nuclear umbrella over the region, as Washington has over South Korea and Japan, if Iran does complete a bomb. If one or two Gulf states nonetheless decided to pursue their own weapon, that still might not be so disastrous, given the way that bombs tend to mellow behavior.

No mass prolif – countries don’t develop very much

Gavin 9 (Francis, prof, http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/isec.2010.34.3.7, da: 7-8-2011, lido)

In his analysis of more than sixty years of failed efforts to accurately predict nuclear proliferation, analyst Moeed Yusuf concludes that “the pace of prolif-eration has been much slower than anticipated by most.” The majority of countries suspected of trying to obtain a nuclear weapons capability “never even came close to crossing the threshold. In fact, most did not even initiate a weapons program.” If all the countries that were considered prime suspects over the past sixty years had developed nuclear weapons, “the world would have at least 19 nuclear powers today.”44 As Potter and Mukhatzhanova argue, government and academic experts frequently “exaggerated the scope and pace of nuclear weapons proliferation.”45

No mass prolif – South Africa, Argentina, and Brazil prove

Waltz 0 (Kenneth, prof, http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/gjia/gjia\_winspr00f.html, dw: Spring 2000, da: 7-8-2011, lido)

It is now estimated that about twenty–five countries are in a position to make nuclear weapons rather quickly. Most countries that could have acquired nuclear military capability have refrained from doing so. Most countries do not need them. Consider Argentina, Brazil, and South Africa. Argentina and Brazil were in the process of moving toward nuclear military capability, and both decided against it–wisely I believe–because neither country needs nuclear weapons. South Africa had about half a dozen warheads and decided to destroy them. You have to have an adversary against whom you think you might have to threaten retaliation, but most countries are not in this position. Germany does not face any security threats–certainly not any in which a nuclear force would be relevant. I would expect the pattern of the past to be the same as the pattern in the future, in which one or two states per decade gradually develop nuclear weapons.

Prolif – Deterrence

Deterrence checks back nuclear exchange – Cuban missile crisis proves

Waltz 2000 (Kenneth, prof, http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/gjia/gjia\_winspr00f.html, dw: Spring 2000, da: 7-8-2011, lido)

Well, that is a different question. The United States and the Soviet Union developed peculiar ideas of nuclear deterrence: namely that thousands of warheads are required for deterrence. That notion was always crazy. At the time of the Cuban Missile Crisis our estimates were that the Soviet Union had only about seventy true strategic systems. We had thousands. Were we deterred? Yes we were. We did not strike at the nuclear warheads that the Soviet Union had in Cuba. The Air Force was asked if they could hit and destroy all the targets. And remember that they were close by, and there were not that many of them. The Air Force answered: “We promise we can get 90 percent.” Not enough. We were deterred. Now, nuclear weapons do not deter everybody from doing everything. They do not deter forays. They do not deter, for example, Arab countries from starting wars over the disputed terroritories. But they did dissuade the Egyptians and Syrians from trying to divide Israel during the 1973 Yom Kippur War. They pulled back for fear that the threat of the destruction of the Israeli State would prompt the use of nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons deter threats to the vital interests of the state, and they have done so in every case that comes to mind.

Deterrence works against rogue states

Waltz 2000 (Kenneth, prof, http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/gjia/gjia\_winspr00f.html, dw: Spring 2000, da: 7-8-2011, lido)

We have this peculiar notion about the irrationality of rogue states. When he was Secretary of Defense, Les Aspin said these rogue leaders might be undeterrable. Others contend that some states may undertake courses of action even if they know that catastrophe may result. But who would do that? Not Saddam Hussein. Not Kim Il Sung when he was ruler of North Korea. What is a key characteristic of all those rulers? They are survivors, as they struggle to live in a harsh environment–both internally, with the constant danger of assassination, and externally, as they’re surrounded by enemies. And they survive for decades until they are carried out in a box. Are they irrational? Their behavior is ugly and nasty to be sure, but irrational? How could they survive? If they were not deterrable, how would they ever have survived? They don’t run the kind of risks that would put their regime into question. Kim Il Sung wanted to pass his reign onto his son, Kim Jong Il. They obviously love to rule, but they’ve got to have a country. They’re not going to risk the existence of their country. For example, Saddam Hussein was deterred during the Persian Gulf War. He did not arm the SCUD missiles with lethal warheads and shoot them at Israel. They were nuisance attacks. Why? Because he didn’t want us to pound him more heavily than he was being pounded. The allies, led by the United States, could have substantially destroyed that country without ever using nuclear weapons, and he knew it. Sure he was deterred. So how can we say irrational or undeterrable? But we do say it.

Prolif – Deterrence

Deterrence prevents wars

Feith and Shulsky 9 (Douglas and Abram, for pol experts, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204313604574328430978849134.html#mod=rss\_opinion\_main, dw: 8-18-2009, da: 7-8-2011, lido)

 Mr. Obama here is mixing up pretext and policy. When criticized for pursuing nuclear weapons, proliferators like North Korea and Iran make diplomatic talking points out of the size of the great powers' arsenals. They try to shift the focus away from themselves by complaining that the Americans and Russians aren't working hard enough to reach disarmament goals envisioned in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. But depriving proliferators of such talking points won't affect their incentives to acquire nuclear weapons—or the world's incentives to counter the dangers that the North Korean and Iranian nuclear programs pose to international peace. Nor would cutting the U.S. and Russian arsenals by a few hundred weapons do anything significant to achieve Mr. Obama's goal of a world without nuclear weapons. The roadblock is the fact of U.S. dependence on nuclear deterrence. So long as the security of the U.S. and of our allies and friends requires such dependence, a non-nuclear world will remain out of reach. Inventing a way to dispense with nuclear deterrence will require a political or technological breakthrough of major magnitude. Retaining our dependence on nuclear weapons even at somewhat lower levels is an admission by the Obama administration that the proposed reductions don't actually bring us closer to a non-nuclear world. With Mr. Obama openly eager for a START follow-on treaty, Russian leaders have chosen to play coy and become demanding. So what might the U.S. have to pay for it? The price is likely to be high, as suggested by the "Joint Understanding" the U.S. and Russian presidents announced last month in Moscow. Point 5 of the Understanding specifies that the new treaty is to contain "a provision on the interrelationship of strategic offensive and strategic defensive arms." Russia will use this language (which Bush administration officials repeatedly rejected) to try to derail U.S. plans for a Europe-based missile system designed to counter Iranian missile threats. If Russia succeeds here, the new treaty would increase the value to Iran of acquiring nuclear weapons. By making it easier for a nuclear-armed Iran to threaten all of Europe and eventually the U.S., the new treaty would promote rather than discourage nuclear proliferation. Similarly, according to Point 6, the new treaty is to contain a provision on how non-nuclear, long-range strike weapons may affect strategic stability. Russia wants this to impede U.S. development of such weapons, probably by requiring that they be counted as if they had nuclear warheads. Hence the new treaty could shut down one of the more promising avenues for reducing U.S. dependence on nuclear arms for strategic strike. All in all, the Obama administration's nuclear weapons policies appear confused and self-defeating. Mr. Obama seems willing to pay for arms reductions that Russian officials have made clear will occur soon, due to aging or the planned modernization of systems, with or without a new treaty. Moreover, the Obama administration is opposing modernization measures designed to protect against the risk that the aging of U.S. weapons will compromise their safety or reliability.

Prolif – No accidents

Deterrence and security check accidents

Waltz 2000 (Kenneth, prof, http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/gjia/gjia\_winspr00f.html, dw: Spring 2000, da: 7-8-2011, lido)

 I think large numbers of weapons would raise that concern. But I think we can rely on their self–interest and their ingenuity to prevent accidents. Every country goes through a period where it has relatively crude weapons, although relatively crude weapons are not as crude as they used to be, and where they have small numbers and where there are some questions of vulnerability. But we have managed to get through those periods. The only strikes we’ve had have been at nuclear facilities before any warheads were produced, with no attacks where there were existing warheads and for good reason: Deterrence works.

No accidents will happen from prolif

Karl 96 (David, phd, moodle.stoa.usp.br/mod/resource/view.php?id=28252, dw: Winter 1996, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

Some proliferation optimists concede the crisis-stability dangers posed by emerging nuclear arsenals, but contend that such dangers are transitory as postures develop in size and sophistication, and can be alleviated even more quickly by the transfer of command and control technology from established nuclear powers to newer ones. While Brito and Intriligator see the progressive increase in the number of nuclear powers as a factor of stability, they also admit that proliferation increases the statistical probability of accidental war because newer nuclear powers will be less able to develop adequate technical safe- guards against accidental or unauthorized use. They, however, view this problem as "a relatively 'low'-probability event."74 But the resource limitations faced by Third World states make it questionable whether postures will evolve quickly or dramatically.75 They lack both the wherewithal to expand like the superpowers and the doctrinal impetus, which in the U.S. case came from extended-deterrence commitments to cover an extraordinary range of targets under a variety of circumstances and with a high degree of redundancy. The centrality of extended deterrence in U.S. strategic policy had two principal effects. First, by tying force requirements in an implicitly open-ended manner to the size of the Soviet military establishment, it sanctioned the deployment of an extensive number and variety of nuclear weapons. It also had the consequence of reinforcing and rationalizing the long-standing preemptive impulses and emphasis on counterforce targeting in U.S. nuclear planning. As one scholar notes, the risk of preemptive war in the Cold War was a function of the counterforce doctrines the superpowers followed, and not of any inherent logic of nuclear strategy. "In this respect, the superpower nuclear arms competition was sui generis: without exception, every sub-superpower proliferant has embraced countervalue, not counterforce, nuclear doctrines."76

Prolif – No Accidents

Accidents won’t happen – Russian security proves

Tepperman 9 (Jonathon, staff, dw: 8-29-2009, da: 7-8-2011, http://www.newsweek.com/2009/08/28/why-obama-should-learn-to-love-the-bomb.html, lido)

A much greater threat is that a nuclear North Korea or Pakistan could collapse and lose control of its weapons entirely. Yet here again history offers some comfort. China acquired its first nuke in 1964, just two years before it descended into the mad chaos of the Cultural Revolution, when virtually every Chinese institution was threatened—except for its nuclear infrastructure, which remained secure. "It was nearly a coup," says Desch, "yet with all the unrest, nobody ever thought that there might be an unauthorized nuclear use." The Soviets' weapons were also kept largely safe (with U.S. help) during the breakup of their union in the early '90s. And in recent years Moscow has greatly upped its defense spending (by 20 to 30 percent a year), using some of the cash to modernize and protect its arsenal.

No conflict – nuclearized rivals create fear within each other

Karl 96 (David, phd, moodle.stoa.usp.br/mod/resource/view.php?id=28252, dw: Winter 1996, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

Optimists have relaxed views of the preventive-war dangers entailed in situations in which a nuclear power confronts a nuclearizing rival. The practical difficulties of ensuring a disarming strike to preclude any possibility of nuclear retaliation make preventive actions a military gamble that states are very unlikely to take. As Waltz explains, "prevention and pre-emption are difficult games because the costs are so high if the games are not perfectly played.... Ultimately, the inhibitions [against such attacks] lie in the impossibility of knowing for sure that a disarming strike will totally destroy an opposing force and in the immense destruction even a few warheads can wreak."25 To optimists, states will have to learn to live with a rival's emerging nuclear armory Because strategic uncertainty is seen as having a powerful dissuasive effect, optimists usually view the very increase in the numbers of nuclear-armed states as an additional element of stability. Dagobert Brito and Michael Intriliator, for instance, argue that uncertainty over the reaction of other nuclear powers will make all hesitant to strike individually 26 As an example, they point to the restraint the superpowers exercised on each other in the 1960s, when first the United States and then the Soviet Union contemplated military action against China's nascent nuclear weapon sites. The net effect of the uncertain reaction of others is that "the probability of deliberate nuclear attack falls to near zero with three, four, or more nuclear nations."27 Similarly, Waltz reasons that even in cases of asymmetric proliferation within conflict dyads, nuclear weapons will prove "poor instruments for blackmail" because a "country that takes the nuclear offensive has to fear an appropriately punishing strike by someone. Far from lowering the expected cost of aggression, a nuclear offense even against a non-nuclear state raises the possible costs of aggression to incalculable heights because the aggressor cannot be sure of the reaction of other nuclear powers."28

\*\*Rights/Freedom\*\*

A2: Rights – General

Reasonable action is inherent in moral law- we can put other’s interests ahead of ours

Taylor 3 (Robert, professor of philosophy @ Princeton, “Rawl’s Defense of the Priority of Liberty: A Kantian Reconstruction.”  Princeton University Press.  Philosophy & PublicAffairs 31, No. 3, Pg 24.  Project MUSE) HD

Reasonableness, or the capacity for a sense of justice, is the ability to limit the pursuit of one's conception of the good out of a respect for the rights and interests of other people and out of a desire to cooperate with them on fair terms. A person who acts reasonably acts according to a principle of reciprocity: he seeks to give "justice to those who can give justice in return" (p. 447). The tight connection between reasonableness and autonomy is explained by Rawls in sec. 86 of Theory: "the sense of justice . . . reveals what the person is, and to compromise it is not to achieve for the self free reign but to give way to the contingencies and accidents of the world" (p. 503). When we act reasonably, says Rawls, we demonstrate an ability to subordinate the pursuit of our own good, which may be unduly influenced by the "contingencies and accidents of the world," to those principles we would choose as members of the intelligible realm—our reasonableness, in other words, is emblematic of our autonomy, our independence from natural and social contingencies. This explains our sense of shame when we fail to act reasonably: we behave then as if we were members of a "lower order" of animal, whose actions are determined by the laws of nature rather than the moral law (p. 225).

A2: Rights—Util

Utility outweighs liberty

Taylor 3 (Robert, professor of philosophy @ Princeton, “Rawl’s Defense of the Priority of Liberty: A Kantian Reconstruction.”  Princeton University Press.  Philosophy & PublicAffairs 31, No. 3, Pg 24.  Project MUSE) HD

Note that although the Priority of Liberty cannot be the focus of a realistic overlapping consensus, something analogous to it might be the focus of a constitutional consensus, that is, a "consensus on constitutional principles . . . rather than on a conception of justice." 27 Specifically, adherents of radically different reasonable comprehensive doctrines might be able to agree on a constitutional analogue of the Priority of Liberty (civil libertarianism) that effectively disallowed violations of the basic liberties under any circumstances; this approach might be institutionalized in part through a combination of written bills of rights and judicial review. Kantian liberals and others who endorse the Priority of Liberty [End Page 269] could be expected to support such a constitutional practice for obvious reasons. Liberal utilitarians (who support "special priority" for the basic liberties) might also support it: if they thought that basic liberties would otherwise be severely eroded through legislative encroachment, then they might endorse such civil libertarianism as a "second-best" corrective. Perhaps the other major comprehensive doctrines would sign on for similar reasons. This constitutional consensus would be unlikely to evolve into an overlapping consensus, however, for the reasons noted above: adherents of some reasonable comprehensive doctrines (e.g., liberal utilitarianism) are simply unable to endorse the Priority of Liberty, and neither their objections nor their doctrines are likely to disappear with the passage of time.

Satisfaction of desires outweighs- utility denies rationality

Taylor 3 (Robert, professor of philosophy @ Princeton, “Rawl’s Defense of the Priority of Liberty: A Kantian Reconstruction.”  Princeton University Press.  Philosophy & PublicAffairs 31, No. 3, Pg 24.  Project MUSE) HD

Is such acceptance likely? Consider the important example of the adherents of utilitarian reasonable comprehensive doctrines. Would a utilitarian be able to endorse a Kantian conception of free persons, with its elevation of rationality over the satisfaction of desire and its consequent implications for agent motivation in the Original Position? It seems unlikely that any utilitarian 8

 would countenance this variety of asceticism. 26 [End Page 268] Thus, utilitarians would be likely to focus on another interpretation of the idea of free persons or perhaps on an entirely different fundamental idea or set of ideas; doing so would lead them to structure the Original Position differently and would presumably produce a political conception of justice that did not include the Priority of Liberty. Rawls argues in Political Liberalism that classical utilitarians (such as Jeremy Bentham and Henry Sidgwick) would be likely to endorse a "political conception of justice liberal in content," but he never suggests that they would choose the Priority of Liberty, or Justice as Fairness more generally (PL, p. 170). We can conclude from this finding that the class of liberal political conceptions of justice constituting the focus of a realistic overlapping consensus would include conceptions that did not endorse the Priority of Liberty (although they would all give the basic liberties "special priority"). Moreover, Justice as Fairness might not be alone among the liberal conceptions in endorsing the Priority of Liberty: a reasonable comprehensive doctrine might, for example, support a Kantian conception of free persons but not Rawls's particular interpretation of society as a "fair system of cooperation," leading through the procedures of political constructivism to a liberal conception of justice that endorsed the Priority of Liberty but rejected, say, the Difference Principle. Thus, the Priority of Liberty would be one competitor idea among many in an overlapping consensus, endorsed by both adherents of Kantian comprehensive doctrines and their fellow travelers, but rejected by others.

A2: Rights—Util

Utilitarianism denies moral rights – rights not quantifiable

McCloskey 84 (HJ, professor of philosophy, “Utilitarianism and Natural Human Moral Rights.” R. G. Frey. Utility and Rights, p.121-122) HD

In spite of this, Bentham's clear apprehension of utilitarianism's commitment to rejecting the view that there are certain basic natural human moral rights that hold of human beings as human beings, very many utilitarians today seek to reconcile their utilitarianism with theories of human moral rights, with theories of natural moral rights of persons of the kinds set out in the UN Declarations, according to which we are claimed to possess various basic, fundamental moral rights simply by virtue of being human beings, or human persons, and not by virtue of the utility of a belief in and action on the basis of respect for such rights. Utilitarianism denies, and is committed to denying, that there are natural moral rights that hold of persons as persons, of human beings qua human beings. If its ethic is to be expressed in the language of moral rights, it might be said to hold that it is the greatest good or the greatest /pleasure that has a moral right to exist, that individual persons and animals have no moral right to a specific share in or of the greatest good, I their roles being those of being instruments for achieving or vehicles for bringing into being and sustaining the greatest good, they having a moral right to contribute to the common good as vehicles or instruments thereof. Of course, strictly speaking, an abstraction such as the greatest good cannot in any literal sense of 'moral right,' possess moral rights, whilst the rights individuals may possess as vehicles or instruments of the greatest good would be a mixed bunch, including such rights as the rights to live or to be killed, to be free or to be constrained, to be helped or to be harmed or used-the rights varying from person to person, situation to situation, from time to lime. Thus, if the greatest good could be realized by promoting the pleasure of only one or other of two distinct groups of one hundred persons, then, in terms of utilitarianism, it would morally be indifferent which group was chosen, and no member of either group would have a moral right to the pleasure. Similarly, if, in a war, the greatest good could be achieved only be sending a particular platoon on a suicide mission, the officer in charge would have the moral right to order the platoon to go on the mission, and the members of the platoon would have the moral right to be killed for the sake of the greatest good. This is a very different way of thinking about moral rights from that in terms of there being certain basic human moral rights.

A2: Human Rights

Human rights aren’t paramount

Gregg 10 (Benjamin, 8/1, http://www.utexas.edu/law/centers/humanrights/events/speaker-series-papers/Gregg.pdf 7/9/11) HD

For purposes of realizing human rights locally, through internal change not foreign imposition, human rights might be conceived as a kind of learning process, one embedded in the social system itself. This conception presupposes a non-essentialized understanding of culture, culture as socially constructed rather than as a priori categories of human understanding or as given in some superorganic sense. It presupposes culture as internally dynamic not static; as open to outside influences rather than hermetic; as marked by differences and tensions within rather than being homogenous and consensual; and as laced with power-relations rather than somehow power-free.

A2: Freedom

Curtailment of freedom is inevitable- we are constrained by our own humanity

Zupancic 0 (Alenka, researcher at the Institute of Philosophy in the Slovene Academy
of Sciences, Ethics of the Real, p. 22) HD

Kant holds that as human beings we are part of Nature, which means that we are entirely, internally and externally, subject to the laws of causality. Hence our freedom is limited not only from the ‘outside’ but also from the ‘inside’: we are no more free ‘in ourselves’ than we are ‘in the world’.

The plan can’t solve for freedom- it’s arbitrary

Zupancic 0 (Alenka, researcher at the Institute of Philosophy in the Slovene Academy
of Sciences, Ethics of the Real, p. 33) HD

In order to attain the freedom characteristic of the subject, one must not start with the arbitrary, the random as opposed to the lawlike. We cannot found the freedom of the subject on the fact that her actions may be unpredictable. This approach would only establish that we have not yet gone far enough in the direction required by the ‘postulate of de-psychologizing’. It may in fact be the case that the motives we initially attributed to the subject, which have fallen short of accounting for her actions, were not in fact the ones that led her to act, but this alone does not mean that there were not some other motives or ‘pathological interests’ which moved her. So this freedom cannot be founded upon the arbitrariness of our actions but, on the contrary, only upon law and necessity themselves: one has to discover the point where the subject itself plays an (active) part on lawful, casual necessity, the point where the subject itself is already inscribed in advance in what appear to be laws of causality independent of the subject.

A2: Ethics

Ethics promotes

Zupancic 0 (Alenka, researcher at the Institute of Philosophy in the Slovene Academy
of Sciences, Ethics of the Real, p. 3-4) HD

Kant is admired by Lacan above all for his break, at two crucial points, with 'traditional' ethics. The first is his break with the morality that spelled out obligations in terms of the possibility of fulfilling them. According to Lacan, the crucial point here is that morality as such, as Kant well knew, is a demand for the impossible: 'the impossibility in which we recognise the topology of our desire'. By insisting on the fact that the moral imperative is not concerned with what might or might be done. Kant discovered the essential dimension of ethics: the dimension of desire, which circles around the real qua impossible. This dimension was excluded from the purview of traditional ethics, and could therefore appear to it only as an excess, -So Kant's crucial first step involves taking the very thing excluded from the traditional field of ethics, and turning it into the only legitimate territory for ethics. If critics often criticize Kant for demanding the impossible. Lacan attributes an incontestable theoretical value to this Kantian demand. Kant's second break with the tradition, related to the first, was his rejection of the view that ethics is concerned with the 'distribution of the good' (the 'service of goods' in Lacan’s terms). Kant rejected an ethics based on 'my wanting what is good for others, provided of course that their good reflects my own'.

Ethics fails because good isn’t universal

Zupancic 0 (Alenka, researcher at the Institute of Philosophy in the Slovene Academy
of Sciences, Ethics of the Real, p. 56) HD

Indeed, it is in the choice between these alternatives that the crucial issue of Kantian ethics is formulated in the clearest possible way. If the moral law excludes any prior consideration of the good, then it is clear where this ethics stands in regard to these alternatives. Once the good comes on stage, the question necessarily arises: Whose good? This is what Lacan has in mind with ‘blow alternately hot and cold’: if I do not betray my brother or my neighbour, I may betray my other countrymen. Who is to decide whose good is more valuable? This is the fundamental deadlock of any ethics based on the good, be it ‘individualist’ or ‘communitarian’. The project of Kantian ethics is precisely to escape this deadlock, and this is why it is not just a version of ‘traditional ethics’, but an irreversible step towards something different. As we have seen, however, Lacan criticizes Kant for not making this point clearly enough: Kant seems to have trouble accepting some of the consequences of his own central theoretical stance. Therefore Lacan challenges him with this question: Must I follow my duty to tell the truth in so far as it preserves the authentic place of my jouissance, even if this is empty? Or must I resign myself to a lie which, by making me substitute forcefully the good for the principle of my jouissance, commands me to blow alternately hot and cold?

\*\*Russia\*\*

Russia – Deterrence Checks

Deterrence checks US-Russia war

McMahon 97 (Scott, Security analyst, http://www.fas.org/news/usa/1997/03/bmd970331d.htm, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

A cooperative U.S.-Russian approach to reducing strategic offensive arsenals and deploying BMD systems will reinforce peace and strategic stability. If a future confrontation nonetheless occurs, it would be unlikely to escalate as deterrence and crisis stability would prevail: Neither side could expect to launch a successful first strike using its limited BMD system for protection. In fact, even if the attacker found its victim's strategic forces at a peacetime level of preparedness (a heroically optimistic scenario) and destroyed a large portion of them, the attacker would still suffer a devastating retaliatory blow. This will be the case with the reduced force levels envisioned in the 1991 and 1993 START accords and at even lower strategic force levels.

Deterrence checks US-Russia conflict

Lantis et al 7 (Jeffrey Lantis, Tom Sauer, James Wirtz, Keir Lieber, International Security, vol 31, dw: Winter 2007, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

In 1974 Secretary of State Henry Kissinger questioned the principle of nuclear superiority: “What in the name of God is strategic superiority? What is the signiªcance of it, politically, militarily, operationally, at these levels of numbers? What do you do with it?”11 Even in the extremely unlikely event the United States uses nuclear weapons against Russia or China, whether either country can retaliate with one, five, ten, or a hundred nuclear weapons does not really matter for deterrence calculations. As advocates of minimum deterrence (like myself) argue, one accurate and invulnerable nuclear weapon is suffcient as a second-strike force. I can hardly imagine an attack against vital U.S. interests in the foreseeable future destructive enough to risk an assured nuclear response and the annihilation of one major U.S. city. Thus, the size of the nuclear arsenal does not matter, unless one believes that the United States can engage in a prolonged nuclear war and emerge victorious.12 Because a minimum deterrent is sufªcient, Russia and China need not worry greatly about the exact nature of the United States’ nuclear posture. In practice, China can apparently live with the tremendous nuclear imbalance that has existed since the mid1960s. It currently possesses 80–130 nuclear weapons, of which only 30 could be used on an intercontinental scale.13 Because of a lack of resources, Russia may have to pursue a similar course over time. In addition, some U.S. experts have argued that the security of the United States would be enhanced with a much smaller nuclear arsenal.14 A decision to shrink the U.S. arsenal would also strengthen the nuclear nonproliferation regime at a time when many observers believe that it is on the verge of collapse.15

Russia – Relats check

The US and Russia are greater allies – won’t go to war

Nichols 2 (Thomas, prof @ US Naval War College, http://www.allbusiness.com/legal/international-law-foreign-investment-finance/938980-1.html, dw: 1-1-2002, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

"We sail in the same boat," an aide to Russian president Vladimir Putin said in late 2002 of relations between NATO and Russia, adding the hope that greater cooperation and better relations between Moscow and the West will develop "dynamically." 1 But do we, in fact, "sail in the same boat?" Should we? Those who object to a closer partnership typically point out that Russia, while democratic in certain political processes, is not a democracy; that the war in Chechnya is indicative of the true nature of the Russian regime; and that in any case Russia is serving only its own blunted imperial ambitions rather than any sense of the greater good, in effect coaxing the West to put its stamp of approval on Moscow's efforts to recapture the former Soviet empire and to reemerge as a force to be reckoned with in Europe and beyond. The fundamental concern is that Russia cannot (or will not) change, and that Moscow's turn to the West is insincere, motivated by opportunism rather than conviction. Much of this concern is generated by the perception of President Putin himself, and understandably so. The idea that a former KGB agent, once sworn to the destruction of the Western system of government, has now seen the light and wishes to join the community of civilized nations is difficult for many to accept or comprehend. But this misses the continuity of Russian policy toward the West since 1991. While some of Putin's domestic policies have represented a shift away from those of his predecessor, his foreign policy is recognizable as a continuation and expansion of Boris Yeltsin's generally pro-Western line. Putin, even more than Yeltsin, has placed Russia squarely among the North Americans and Europeans as part of the "West." (Putin and Yeltsin have both shown a pro-Western orientation in their rhetoric, but because Putin almost certainly has more control over the decidedly anti-American Russian military and intelligence services than Yeltsin ever did, he has been more able to make it stick as a policy.) The source of this decade-long shift toward the West is rooted in a change in the way Russians--and perhaps more important, their leaders--see themselves. This is not to say that Russia has made a dramatic conversion to all of the democratic West's values and norms, but rather that Russia since 1991 (and, some would argue, since about the seventeenth century) has been slowly coming to the realization that its destiny is as a Western power, rather than as an outcast or perpetual challenger to the Western international system. Indeed, when asked in 2002 to name their nation's military and political allies, 27 percent of Russians named Western countries (including 14 percent who named the United States), and 15 percent cited the former Soviet republics of the Commonwealth of Independent States; only 10 percent named communist states such as China, Cuba, and North Korea. 2

Russia – No Nukes

Russia doesn’t have the weapons to go into a nuclear war

Lieber and Press 6 (Keir and Daryl, experts of nuc policy, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/61508/keir-a-lieber-and-daryl-g-press/the-rise-of-us-nuclear-primacy, dw: March/April 2006, lido)

Even as the United States' nuclear forces have grown stronger since the end of the Cold War, Russia's strategic nuclear arsenal has sharply deteriorated. Russia has 39 percent fewer long-range bombers, 58 percent fewer ICBMs, and 80 percent fewer SSBNs than the Soviet Union fielded during its last days. The true extent of the Russian arsenal's decay, however, is much greater than these cuts suggest. What nuclear forces Russia retains are hardly ready for use. Russia's strategic bombers, now located at only two bases and thus vulnerable to a surprise attack, rarely conduct training exercises, and their warheads are stored off-base. Over 80 percent of Russia's silo-based ICBMs have exceeded their original service lives, and plans to replace them with new missiles have been stymied by failed tests and low rates of production. Russia's mobile ICBMs rarely patrol, and although they could fire their missiles from inside their bases if given sufficient warning of an attack, it appears unlikely that they would have the time to do so.

No nukes – Moscow only has weapons for deterrence effect

BBC 9 (Russian commentator views reasons for changes to nuclear weapons policy, lexis, dw: 10-23-2009, da: 7-6-2011, lido)

No less curious is the intention to institutionalize and prescribe the conditions of the employment of nuclear weapons in regional and local wars. Until recently, Moscow had stated that these weapons are political. Moscow said that they exist only in order to deter the possessors of nuclear weapons from war with each other (it is no accident that war between the United States and the USSR also remained, thanks to you God, "cold"). For 30 years now, it has been considered to be impossible to win a nuclear war.

Russia – No War

US and Russia have good relations now – won’t go to war

Krickus 10 (Richard, prof, http://www.rferl.org/content/The\_Road\_To\_Resetting\_Moscow\_Ties\_Passes\_Through\_Berlin/1966883.html, dw: 2-24-2010, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

What is more, important developments are changing the dynamics of the German-Russian energy relationship. Many energy experts believe that Russia cannot provide the product to make the Nord Stream project an economic success, while new sources of natural gas are becoming available on the world market as a result of technological breakthroughs in extraction. These and other matters could be discussed at a summit with the purpose of maintaining good economic relations with Russia while making certain that they don’t cause serious friction among alliance members. Finally, U.S. foreign-policy makers have a stake in improving relations with Berlin that have been sullied over differences associated with Iraq and Afghanistan, the proper response to the global economic crisis, as well as conflicting views regarding relations with Moscow. To promote more harmonious relations with the largest and richest country in Europe, the United States could develop a special working group with Germany to resolve -- or at least mollify -- outstanding differences between both countries. Washington, in short, should acknowledge that it must reengage Berlin at the same time that it resumes relations with Moscow. A May summit in Berlin could advance that agenda.

Russia doesn’t have the incentive to go to war

Friedman and Logan 9 (Benjamin and Justin, phd and writer, expert, http://www.cato.org/pubs/articles/friedman\_logan\_hittingstopbuttononnatoexpansion.pdf, dw: 7-6-2010, da: 7-8-2011, lido)

No longer driven by a revolutionary ideology, Russia also lacks the Soviet Union’s ambitions. True, Russia does not like the democratic governments on its flanks in Ukraine and Georgia. But that is because these governments are pursuing policies that anger Russia, not because they are democratic per se. What Russia wants are pliant neighbors. That desire is typical of relatively powerful states: The long U.S. history of violent interventions in Latin America undermines whatever lectures we might direct at Moscow. Now compare today’s security situation to the one that caused nato’s formation in 1949. The Soviets had at least 700,000 troops deemed capable of overrunning a Western Europe left vulnerable by broken armies and empty treasuries. European poverty gave Moscow-backed Communist parties a realistic chance at taking power democratically. Fearing that the Soviet Union—by conquest or revolution—could seize enough of Europe’s industrial might to threaten the U.S., Americans sent aid via the Marshall Plan and troops via nato. U.S. intervention restored the balance of power, serving its own interests. No similar rationale justifies defending Georgia and Ukraine. In fact, allying with these countries simply creates defense liabilities for nato members. Alliances are not free. Credible defense commitments require spending and troops, particularly to defend long borders like Ukraine’s. With much of nato’s manpower tied down in Iraq and Afghanistan, new commitments may require new recruits, an expensive proposition in an era when the cost of military manpower is quickly appreciating. These are precisely the sorts of allies a prudent superpower would avoid. They offer few benefits, and come carrying pre-existing territorial conflicts with a stronger neighbor. Ukraine appears to be living up to its reputation for political instability, dangerously verging on the precipice of collapse in the wake of the global financial meltdown. Moreover, a recent poll indicated that 63 percent of Ukrainians do not even want nato membership. Georgia currently has Russian troops on its territory and is run by a leader with a demonstrated capacity for recklessness. nato backing will only encourage him.

Russia – No War

Russia won’t go to war – not enough military capabilities

Rivera 3 (David, prof, Political Science Quarterly, v 118, p 81-105, jstore, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

Other observers, however, painted a very different picture of post-Soviet Russia and defended the Kremlin against the imperialist charge. Explicitly taking Issue with many of the aforementioned authors, Stephen Sestanovich argued in 1991 that "the dominant interest now guiding Russian policy is [not intimidation or destabilization but] stability. For now, the picture of an expansionist juggernaut is—at the very least—far ahead of the facts.'"\* U.S. Ambassador to Moscow Thomas Pickering similarly maintained that "charges of resurgent Russian imperialism have been overstated. ... After the Soviet Union collapsed, Moscow pursued policies—such as drastically cutting military spending—that severely limited Its ability to rebuild the empire, even if it had wanted to."' In an overview of points of agreement and contention in U.S -Russian relations given Just prior (0 Bill Clinton's participation in the Moscow summit of May 1995, Pickering went even further by describing Russia's relations with Its CIS neighbors as containing "some positive trends which wc strongly support." In particular, the Ambassador praised Russia for its policies toward Ukraine, the Baltics, Moldova, and Nagorno-Karabakh.' Most dramatically. Leon Aron put the "Yeltsin revolution" in historical perspective by asserting that "not since the middle of the sixteenth century when the Russian expansion began, has there been a Russia leu aggressive, less belligerent, less threatening to neighbors and the world than the Russia wc sec today"\*

Russia – No War

Russia will not attack

Friedman and Logan 9 (Benjamin and Justin, phd and writer, expert, http://www.cato.org/pubs/articles/friedman\_logan\_hittingstopbuttononnatoexpansion.pdf, dw: 7-6-2010, da: 7-8-2011, lido)

This narrative is devoid of strategic logic. Leaving aside nuclear weapons, which deterrence renders unus­able, Russia is nor a great power, and is incapable of threatening Western Europe, let alone the United States. The World Bank predicts that Russia's economy will shrink by 4.5 percent this year, and its unem­ployment will hit 12 percent. Even close to the height of oil prices, Russia possessed a GDP only roughly equivalent co that of Italy and Portugal combined. Its stock market is down by mere than half since this time last year. Its defense spending totals about $70 billion annually less than what the U.S. spends on defense research and investment alonei, tor what remains a second-rate military. This is a country strong enough to pummel weak neighbors like Georgia, but one that shouldn't worry Europe, which spends roughly four times more. Balance of power theory tells us that if Russia grow more threatening, the members of the European Union—now collectively richer than the U.S.—will respond by investing more on defense than their current average of 2 percent of GDP, and by further integrating their military capacity. No longer driven by a revolutionary ideology, Russia also lacks the Soviet Union's ambitions. True, Rus­sia does not like the democratic governments on its flanks in Ukraine and Georgia. But that is because these governments are pursuing policies that anger Russia, not because they are democratic per se. What Russia wants are pliant neighbors. That desire is typical of relatively powerful states: The long U.S. his­tory of violent interventions in Latin America undermines whatever lectures we might direct at Moscow.

Russia – No War

No war – Russia understands potential economic harm

Bush 8 (Jason, staff, http://www.businessweek.com/globalbiz/blog/europeinsight/archives/2008/08/the\_new\_cold\_war.html, dw: 8-22-2008, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

The biggest loser from a prolonged cool-off will be Russia though. One interesting angle of the Georgian crisis is the negative impact on the Russian economy. In the days after the outbreak of war, the stock market and even the rouble plunged, and Russian banks found it harder to get credit lines abroad. This shows how far the new globalized Russia depends economically on the outside world. This economic dependence increases the West's options, but also means that the West doesn’t necessarily need to take strong-arm measures to restrain the Russians. The danger is that the West will now over-react, punishing Russia unnecessarily because of the overblown fears and simplistic analysis of the numerous Cold Warriors back home.

No war – Diplomacy checks

Bush 8 (Jason, staff, http://www.businessweek.com/globalbiz/blog/europeinsight/archives/2008/08/the\_new\_cold\_war.html, dw: 8-22-2008, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

Amid the jumpy hysteria of recent days, many people in the West have assumed that quiet diplomacy is powerless. This isn't true, however, as the French-brokered peace plan showed. For diplomacy to be effective, though, the West has to be seen as an honest broker. Instead of that, we have typically seen knee-jerk support for Georgia, and the usual anti-Russian stereotypes. Unfortunately, there appear to be plenty of people in the West who are now arguing for a new Cold War. They have fallen into the trap of believing that Putin is the new Hitler and Georgia the new Czechoslovakia, so “the West must make a stand”. In effect, these people are arguing for a cure that is actually a lot worse than the disease.

Russia – AT: Georgia Proves

**The Georgia conflict was inevitable given the circumstances – it doesn’t prove Russia is irrationally going to go to war**

Bush 8 (Jason, staff, http://www.businessweek.com/globalbiz/blog/europeinsight/archives/2008/08/the\_new\_cold\_war.html, dw: 8-22-2008, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

There is nothing at all mysterious about Russian policy. They have been in control of South Ossetia since the early 1990s and have had troops deployed there all that time. On 7 August, the Georgians launched a massive and well-prepared attack on the region, using multiple rocket launchers to attack residential areas of the South Ossetian capital Tskhinvali, and killing several of the Russian soldiers after targeting their barracks. You only have to imagine what the US reaction would be if Fidel Castro decided one day to launch an all-out attack on Guantanamo Bay, in the process killing hundreds of US citizens and US military personnel. The Russian military reaction was inevitable in the circumstances. The real mystery of the whole affair is what President Saakashvili was hoping to achieve with his extraordinary gamble, and why he chose to strike when he did. Tension has been rising in the region for some time, partly because of recent events in Kosovo, which declared independence in February, with western backing. That sets a precedent for the break-away states in Abkhazia and South Ossetia to do the same (as they have long wanted to do), which may have panicked the Georgians. The Russians have been warning for years that independence for Kosovo would start a chain-reaction in the Caucasus.

\*\*Science Diplomacy\*\*

A2: Sci Dip

Science diplomacy fails- science and government control are incompatible

COSEPUP and PGA 5 (Committee on Science, Engineering and Public Policy, and Policy and Global Affairs, http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record\_id=11289#orgs, 7/9/11) HD

An aspect of S&E strength deserving brief mention is the challenge in integrating scientific research and educational policies with foreign policy. A familiar, if only occasional, overlap between scientific and foreign policy has been seen in the realm of “big science” such as the multinational particle accelerators and detectors at CERN, large telescopes, and international ocean and geophysical projects. Negotiating big science is seldom easy, partly because of the obvious differences between the realms of science and large-scale political structures. Among the most obvious is that many intergovernment research activities are “top-down,” established and monitored by government officials, whereas most research collaborations are “bottom-up,” with scientists choosing partners and applying to government for research support. Traditional research linkages create what were long ago called “invisible colleges”97 of practitioners, below the radar of policymakers. As the globalization of S&E progresses, a better understanding of how to integrate top-down and bottom-up cooperation is needed if nations are to maximize the benefits of their investments in S&E.98 Scientists and engineers trained to work between cultures may be increasingly important as these negotiations proceed, and US students may benefit from overseas postgraduate training and research experience.

Resources aren’t being used for diplomacy

Lord et al 9 (Kristin, vice president at the Center for a New American Security and a nonresident fellow of the Brookings Institution, Vaughan Turekian, chief international officer and director of the Center for Science Diplomacy at the American Association for the Advancement of Science, “The Science of Diplomacy” http://www.cnas.org/node/918, 7/9/11) HD

Facing a complex set of foreign-policy challenges, the United States can no longer afford to overlook such a useful instrument of statecraft. Regrettably, the U.S. government is not well organized to take advantage of science diplomacy. The National Science Foundation and technical departments (Energy, Agriculture, Health and Human Services, and Defense) apply their resources to science -- but not to its diplomatic use. Thus, the Obama administration should appoint a senior-level ambassador for science and technology cooperation in the State Department. He or she could convene an interagency group coordinating the strategic use of science diplomacy.

Only a comprehensive policy solves

Zewail 10 (Ahmed, Obama’s science envoy to the Middle East and prof of physics @ Cal Institute of Technology, June 28, http://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/Global-Viewpoint/2010/0628/Science-not-Hollywood-or-Starbucks-is-America-s-best-soft-power, 7/9/11) HD

First, the US needs to define a coherent and comprehensive policy for pursuing science diplomacy with Muslim-majority countries. Despite many efforts by both public and private organizations, their initiatives remain fragmented. Second, the focus of a better-integrated effort should be on improving education and fostering the scientific and technological infrastructure that will bring about genuine economic gains and social and political progress. One way to build human capital in science, for example, would be for the US to encourage and support the creation of relatively simple earth science labs in elementary schools, along with the teacher training necessary to stimulate curiosity about workings of nature. For older students, I propose a new program, “Reformation of Education and Development,” whose acronym, READ, would have special significance for Muslims, as it is the first word of the Quran. Through the READ program, the US would support the establishment of centers of excellence in science and technology that can serve as educational hubs for talented high school and university students throughout the region. Third, these efforts must complement, not replace, US efforts to promote human rights and democratic governance in the Muslim world. The United States must also continue to pursue a just and secure two-state solution to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and work toward freeing the Middle East from nuclear proliferation.

A2: Sci Dip

Science diplomacy doesn’t solve their impacts

Dickson 10 (David, director of SciDev, June 28 http://scidevnet.wordpress.com/category/science-diplomacy-conference-2010/ 7/9/11) HD

There’s a general consensus in both the scientific and political worlds that the principle of science diplomacy, at least in the somewhat restricted sense of the need to get more and better science into international negotiations, is a desirable objective. There is less agreement, however, on how far the concept can – or indeed should – be extended to embrace broader goals and objectives, in particular attempts to use science to achieve political or diplomatic goals at the international level. Science, despite its international characteristics, is no substitute for effective diplomacy. Any more than diplomatic initiatives necessarily lead to good science. These seem to have been the broad conclusions to emerge from a three-day meeting at Wilton Park in Sussex, UK, organised by the British Foreign Office and the Royal Society, and attended by scientists, government officials and politicians from 17 countries around the world. The definition of science diplomacy varied widely among participants. Some saw it as a subcategory of “public diplomacy”, or what US diplomats have recently been promoting as “soft power” (“the carrot rather than the stick approach”, as a participant described it). Others preferred to see it as a core element of the broader concept of “innovation diplomacy”, covering the politics of engagement in the familiar fields of international scientific exchange and technology transfer, but raising these to a higher level as a diplomatic objective. Whatever definition is used, three particular aspects of the debate became the focus of attention during the Wilton Park meeting: how science can inform the diplomatic process; how diplomacy can assist science in achieving its objectives; and, finally, how science can provide a channel for quasi-diplomatic exchanges by forming an apparently neutral bridge between countries. There was little disagreement on the first of these. Indeed for many, given the increasing number of international issues with a scientific dimension that politicians have to deal with, this is essentially what the core of science diplomacy should be about. Chris Whitty, for example, chief scientist at the UK’s Department for International Development, described how knowledge about the threat raised by the spread of the highly damaging plant disease stem rust had been an important input by researchers into discussions by politicians and diplomats over strategies for persuading Afghan farmers to shift from the production of opium to wheat. Others pointed out that the scientific community had played a major role in drawing attention to issues such as the links between chlorofluorocarbons in the atmosphere and the growth of the ozone hole, or between carbon dioxide emissions and climate change. Each has made essential contributions to policy decisions. Acknowledging this role for science has some important implications. No-one dissented when Rohinton Medhora, from Canada’s International Development Research Centre, complained of the lack of adequate scientific expertise in the embassies of many countries of the developed and developing world alike. Nor – perhaps predictably – was there any major disagreement that diplomatic initiatives can both help and occasionally hinder the process of science. On the positive side, such diplomacy can play a significant role in facilitating science exchange and the launch of international science projects, both essential for the development of modern science. Europe’s framework programme of research programmes was quoted as a successful advantage of the first of these. Examples of the second range from the establishment of the European Organisation of Nuclear Research (usually known as CERN) in Switzerland after the Second World War, to current efforts to build a large new nuclear fusion facility (ITER). Less positively, increasing restrictions on entry to certain countries, and in particular the United States after the 9/11 attacks in New York and elsewhere, have significantly impeded scientific exchange programmes. Here the challenge for diplomats was seen as helping to find ways to ease the burdens of such restrictions. The broadest gaps in understanding the potential of scientific diplomacy lay in the third category, namely the use of science as a channel of international diplomacy, either as a way of helping to forge consensus on contentious issues, or as a catalyst for peace in situations of conflict. On the first of these, some pointed to recent climate change negotiations, and in particular the work of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, as a good example, of the way that the scientific community can provide a strong rationale for joint international action. But others referred to the failure of the Copenhagen climate summit last December to come up with a meaningful agreement on action as a demonstration of the limitations of this way of thinking. It was argued that this failure had been partly due to a misplaced belief that scientific consensus would be sufficient to generate a commitment to collective action, without taking into account the political impact that scientific ideas would have. Another example that received considerable attention was the current construction of a synchrotron facility SESAME in Jordan, a project that is already is bringing together researchers in a range of scientific disciplines from various countries in the Middle East (including Israel, Egypt and Palestine, as well as both Greece and Turkey). The promoters of SESAME hope that – as with the building of CERN 60 years ago, and its operation as a research centre involving, for example, physicists from both Russia and the United States – SESAME will become a symbol of what regional collaboration can achieve. In that sense, it would become what one participant described as a “beacon of hope” for the region. But others cautioned that, however successful SESAME may turn out to be in purely scientific terms, its potential impact on the Middle East peace process should not be exaggerated. Political conflicts have deep roots that cannot easily be papered over, however open-minded scientists may be to professional colleagues coming from other political contexts. Indeed, there was even a warning that in the developing world, high profile scientific projects, particular those with explicit political backing, could end up doing damage by inadvertently favouring one social group over another. Scientists should be wary of having their prestige used in this way; those who did so could come over as patronising, appearing unaware of political realities. Similarly, those who hold science in esteem as a practice committed to promoting the causes of peace and development were reminded of the need to take into account how advances in science – whether nuclear physics or genetic technology – have also led to new types of weaponry. Nor did science automatically lead to the reduction of global inequalities. “Science for diplomacy” therefore ended up with a highly mixed review. The consensus seemed to be that science can prepare the ground for diplomatic initiatives – and benefit from diplomatic agreements – but cannot provide the solutions to either.

\*\*Terrorism\*\*

Terrorism – No Nuclear Terrorism

Nuclear terrorist threats are exaggerated

Gertz and Lake 10 (Bill and Eli, Washington Times, http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/apr/14/obama-says-terrorist-nuclear-risk-is-growing/?page=1, dw:4-14-2010, da: 7-6-2011, lido)

But Henry Sokolski, a member of the congressional Commission on the Prevention of Weapons of Mass , Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism, said that there is no specific intelligence on ongoing terrorist procurement of nuclear material. “We were given briefings and when we tried to find specific intelligence on the threat of any known terrorist efforts to get a bomb, the answer was we did not have any.” Mr. Obama told reporters that there was a range of views on the danger but that all the conferees “agreed on the urgency and seriousness of the threat.” Mr. Sokolski said the idea that “we know that this is eminent has got to be somehow informed conjecture and apprehension, [but] it is not driven by any specific intelligence per se.” “We have reasons to believe this and to be worried, but we don’t have specific intelligence about terrorist efforts to get the bomb,” he said. “So we have to do general efforts to guard against his possibility, like securing the material everywhere.” A senior U.S. intelligence official also dismissed the administration’s assertion that the threat of nuclear terrorism is growing. “The threat has been there,” the official said. “But there is no new intelligence.” The official said the administration appears to be inflating the danger in ways similar to what critics of the Bush administration charged with regard to Iraq: hyping intelligence to support its policies. The official said one likely motivation for the administration’s new emphasis on preventing nuclear terrorism is to further the president’s goal of eliminating nuclear weapons. While the U.S. nuclear arsenal would be useful in retaliating against a sovereign state, it would be less so against a terrorist group. But if the latter is the world’s major nuclear threat, the official explained, then the U.S. giving up its weapons seems less risky.

Terrorists won’t get nukes

Gertz and Lake 10 (Bill and Eli, Washington Times, http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/apr/14/obama-says-terrorist-nuclear-risk-is-growing/?page=1, dw:4-14-2010, da: 7-6-2011, lido)

However, Brian Jenkins, author of the book “Will Terrorists Go Nuclear?” and a Rand Corp. adviser, said that al Qaeda in the past has been duped by supposed nuclear suppliers who initiated scams that suggest a “naivete and lack of technical capability on the part of the organization,” he said. “We have evidence of terrorist ambitions to obtain nuclear weapons or nuclear material but we have no evidence of terrorist capabilities to do either,” he said. In late 2001, after the U.S. invaded Afghanistan in the wake of the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks, some materials were discovered in al Qaeda bases such as crude diagrams of the basic components of a nuclear bomb. Mr. Jenkins, however, said that U.S. technical specialists concluded from the designs that al Qaeda did not have the ability to produce a nuclear weapon. In 2002, members of al Qaeda’s affiliate in Saudi Arabia attempted to purchase Russian nuclear devices through al Qaeda’s leadership in Iran, though the transactions did not move forward. In his 2007 memoir, “At the Center of the Storm,” Mr. Tenet wrote that “from the end of 2002 to the spring of 2003, we received a stream of reliable reporting that the senior al-Qaeda leadership in Saudi Arabia was negotiating for the purchase of three Russian nuclear devices.” Graham Allison, a Harvard professor and author of a book on nuclear terrorism, said he agrees with the president that the threat is growing, based on North Korea’s nuclear proliferation to Syria and instability in nuclear-armed Pakistan.

Terrorism – No Nuclear Terrorism

Nuclear Terrorist failure is very probable – technology and funding

Levi 7 (Michael, CFR Fellow for Science and Technology and , http://www.cfr.org/weapons-of-mass-destruction/likely-nuclear-terrorist-attack-united-states/p13097, dw: 4-17-2007, da: 7-6-2011, lido)

We should not, however, underestimate the odds of terrorist failure. There isn’t enough space here to make that point comprehensively, but I’ll try to convince you that simple arguments for why failure is highly unlikely may be weaker than they seem. The case for the ease of building a gun-type weapon provides a good example of how we often overestimate how easy a terrorist task may be. I certainly won’t debate the fact that Manhattan Project scientists “were so confident about this design that they persuaded military authorities to drop the bomb, untested, on Hiroshima.” But we should parse the word “untested” carefully. During the Manhattan Project, scientists and engineers spent years testing the gun itself; testing their casting and machining of the uranium metal to avoid fires and criticality accidents during production, and impurities in the product; testing the initiator that would trigger the chain reaction; and testing how different configurations of materials would behave, a project that led to the death of one physicist. No one conducted a full-scale test explosion, but that hardly means that building the weapon was trivial. A terrorist group would have to do many of the same things (though technological progress would make some steps easier) all while attempting to hide from law enforcement and intelligence. This doesn’t mean that terrorists couldn’t build a gun-type bomb, but it suggests that their chances of failure aren’t negligible. This takes on special importance in the context of a broader defense. Imagine a terrorist group faces only a twenty percent chance of failure while building a bomb. But imagine it also faces a similarly small chance of failure while attempting to purchase nuclear materials, while attempting to recruit scientists and engineers, while raising money for its plot, while smuggling materials into the United States, while purchasing non-nuclear components for its weapon, while assembling the bomb in a safehouse, and in other elements of its plot. If we combine, for example, ten such hurdles, we get a ninety percent chance of failure. We can debate the numbers, but this suggests that we shouldn’t be too quick to ignore small chances of terrorist failure.

No nuclear terrorism – requires too much equipment

Levi 7 (Michael, CFR Fellow for Science and Technology and , http://www.cfr.org/weapons-of-mass-destruction/likely-nuclear-terrorist-attack-united-states/p13097, dw: 4-17-2007, da: 7-6-2011, lido)

 A nuclear weapon requires highly enriched uranium (HEU) or plutonium, materials that don’t occur in nature and that terrorist groups cannot produce themselves. The ease of access to materials in state stockpiles is thus one of the main factors affecting the odds of a nuclear terrorist attack. The other big factor is motivation. Most terrorist groups have little incentive to pursue nuclear terrorism, since mass murder doesn’t serve their political ends—but for some groups, indiscriminate killing is precisely the goal. Most analysts agree that the availability of nuclear weapons and materials, and the utility to terrorist groups of successful nuclear attacks, are the two most important factors in determining the likelihood of nuclear terrorism, even if they disagree over how hard acquiring materials would be or over how many groups might expect to benefit from nuclear terrorism.

A ton of technological hurdles must be jumped through before getting a nuclear weapon – low probability of impact

Sterngold 4 (James, Staff, http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2004/04/18/MNGP9673BG1.DTL&ao=3, dw: 4-18-2004, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

 Michael May, a former director of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, where U.S. nuclear weapons are designed, and now a professor emeritus at the Center for International Security and Cooperation at Stanford, said the technological hurdles to a terrorist bomb remain, realistically, quite high. He discounted the possibility terrorists could make use of a stolen warhead because of all the sophisticated security devices built into them. He also said it would be all but impossible for a non-state terrorist group to develop the capability of making its own weapons-grade uranium, because of the industrial infrastructure required. The real fear, he said, is that terrorists could steal or buy from corrupt officials weapons-grade uranium, either from Russia or perhaps a country like Pakistan, where many government and military officials are sympathetic to radical Islamists. Getting that material is far more difficult than actually creating a workable weapon, he said. "Scientists have been pointing to this possibility for years," May said.

Terrorism – No Bomb

Terrorists couldn’t get a bomb - Too hard to get materials for bomb

Milhollin 2 (Gary, director of the Wisconsin Project on Nuclear Arms Control, commentary magazine, http://www.wisconsinproject.org/pubs/articles/2002/terror-bomb.htm, dw:Aug 2001, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

To make bomb-grade uranium, a terrorist group would need thousands of high-speed gas centrifuges, machined to exact dimensions, arranged in series, and capable of operating under the most demanding conditions. If they wanted to produce the uranium by a diffusion process, they would need an even greater number of other machines, equally difficult to manufacture and operate. If they followed Saddam Hussein's example, they could try building a series of giant electromagnets, capable of bending a stream of electrically charged particles-a no less daunting challenge. For any of these, they would also need a steady supply of natural uranium and a specialized plant to convert it to a gaseous form for processing.

**No terrorist would be able to get a bomb - Nobody would sell a bomb to a terrorist**

Milhollin 2 (Gary, director of the Wisconsin Project on Nuclear Arms Control, commentary magazine, http://www.wisconsinproject.org/pubs/articles/2002/terror-bomb.htm, dw:Aug 2001, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

Who would sell these things to would-be nuclear terrorists? The answer is: nobody. The world's nuclear-equipment makers are organized into a cooperative group that exists precisely to stop items like these from getting into unauthorized hands. Nor could a buyer disguise the destination and send materials through obliging places like Dubai (as Iran does with its hot cargoes) or Malta (favored by Libya's smugglers). The equipment is so specialized, and the suppliers so few, that a forest of red flags would go up. And even if the equipment could be bought, it would have to be operated in a place that the United States could not find.

Impossible to get a bomb - Materials would be easily sabotaged

Milhollin 2 (Gary, director of the Wisconsin Project on Nuclear Arms Control, commentary magazine, http://www.wisconsinproject.org/pubs/articles/2002/terror-bomb.htm, dw:Aug 2001, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

Even if terrorists somehow got hold of a reactor, they would need a special, shielded chemical plant to chop up its radioactive fuel, dissolve it in acid, and then extract the plutonium from the acid. No one would sell them a plutonium extraction plant, either. It is worth remembering that Saddam Hussein tried the reactor road in the 1970's. He bought one from France-Jacques Chirac, in his younger days, was a key facilitator of the deal-hoping it would propel Iraq into the nuclear club. But the reactor's fuel was sabotaged in a French warehouse, the person who was supposed to certify its quality was murdered in a Paris hotel, and when the reactor was finally ready to operate, a squadron of Israeli fighter-bombers blew it apart. A similar fate would undoubtedly await any group that tried to follow Saddam's method today.

Terrorists would not be able to steal a bomb – security, no place to buy

Milhollin 2 (Gary, director of the Wisconsin Project on Nuclear Arms Control, commentary magazine, http://www.wisconsinproject.org/pubs/articles/2002/terror-bomb.htm, dw:Aug 2001, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

If making nuclear-bomb fuel is a no-go, why not just steal it, or buy it on the black market? Consider plutonium. There are hundreds of reactors in the world, and they crank out tons of the stuff every year. Surely a dedicated band of terrorists could get their hands on some. This too is not so simple. Plutonium is only created inside reactor fuel rods, and the rods, after being irradiated, become so hot that they melt unless kept under water. They are also radioactive, which is why they have to travel submerged from the reactor to storage ponds, with the water acting as both coolant and radiation shield. And in most power reactors, the rods are welded together into long assemblies that can be lifted only by crane. True, after the rods cool down they can be stored dry, but their radioactivity is still lethal. To prevent spent fuel rods from killing the people who come near them, they are transported in giant radiation-shielding casks that are not supposed to break open even in head-on collisions. The casks are also guarded. If terrorists managed to hijack one from a country that had reactors they would still have to take it to a plant in another country that could extract the plutonium from the rods. They would be hunted at every step of the way.

**Terrorism – No Bomb**

Terrorists wouldn’t be able to steal from a government – Pakistan proves

Milhollin 2 (Gary, director of the Wisconsin Project on Nuclear Arms Control, commentary magazine, http://www.wisconsinproject.org/pubs/articles/2002/terror-bomb.htm, dw:Aug 2001, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

There is also the fact that Pakistan's nuclear program is controlled by the army, still headed by the country's president, Pervez Musharraf. In response to the September 11 terrorist attack on America, Musharraf created a new military command with direct control over the nuclear-weapons program. In the process, he sidelined officers sympathetic to the Taliban. After all these precautions, Musharraf is unlikely to let any bomb fuel slip through his fingers. The only possibility for terrorists to lay their hands on Pakistan's uranium would be if its government fell under the control of sympathizers; given that Pakistan's army is far and away the most effective and stable organization in the country, there is not much chance of that. If terrorists did procure some weapon-ready plutonium, would their problems be over? Far from it: plutonium works only in an "implosion"-type bomb, which is about ten times more difficult to build than the simple uranium bomb used at Hiroshima. In such a device, a spherical shock wave "implodes" inward and squeezes a ball of plutonium at the bomb's center so that it explodes in a chain reaction. To accomplish all this, one needs precision machine tools to build the parts, special furnaces to melt and cast the plutonium in a vacuum (liquid plutonium oxidizes rapidly in air), and high-precision switches and capacitors for the firing circuit. Also required are a qualified designer, a number of other specialists, and a testing program. Considering who the participating scientists are likely to be, the chances of getting an implosion bomb to work are rather small.

Terrorists wouldn’t be able to get the chemicles to build a bomb

Milhollin 2 (Gary, director of the Wisconsin Project on Nuclear Arms Control, commentary magazine, http://www.wisconsinproject.org/pubs/articles/2002/terror-bomb.htm, dw:Aug 2001, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

There are thus definite prospects in Russia. If terrorists could strike the mother lode, and get enough uranium for a gun-type bomb, they would be on their way. But the way would still be long. They would have to design the bomb, develop it, and build it, and that would be far from a trivial undertaking. They would have to have a competent bomb designer, who could be a physicist or engineer but would have to come with practical experience in making such things work. High-accuracy machine tools could be dispensed with-implosion not being required, much simpler technologies could be used for firing projectiles down artillery tubes-although someone would have to handle the uranium-235, refine it to metallic form, cast it, and then machine it. Still, with the help of a capable machinist and a chemical laboratory, none of these obstacles is insurmountable. The main risk would lie in getting caught. True, a uranium bomb would not produce many of the "signatures" that American intelligence agencies look for-the use of a lot of electricity (a sign of a uranium enrichment plant), the presence of contaminated air or water (a sign of a reactor or plutonium extraction plant), a noisy testing program-but a fair number of people would have to be recruited, and one of them could turn the others in. Purchase of equipment might arouse the suspicions of a seller. Above all, what would be needed is a sanctuary-a place in which to assemble the people and the equipment, and keep them together for a period of time. You cannot transport such an operation from cave to cave.

Impossible to buy a bomb

Milhollin 2 (Gary, director of the Wisconsin Project on Nuclear Arms Control, commentary magazine, http://www.wisconsinproject.org/pubs/articles/2002/terror-bomb.htm, dw:Aug 2001, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

Buying is not a great option, either. Since the 1970's, the Libyan dictator Muammar Qaddafi has tried to buy nuclear weapons from China, India, and Pakistan, reportedly offering billions of dollars. So far, there have been no takers. In 1996, General Alexander Lebed, then vying for the presidency of Russia, claimed that a number of "suitcase" bombs- meant to be carried by foot soldiers on demolition missions-had gone missing, but his claim was promptly denied by both the Russian and U.S. governments and has never gained much credibility. In November 2001, President Vladimir Putin said he could certify that no Russian warheads had fallen into terrorist hands.

Terrorism – No Bio/Chem

Too many barriers to biological or chemical terrorism

Parachini 1 (John, testimony, policy analyst, http://www.rand.org/pubs/testimonies/2005/CT183.pdf, dw: 10-12-2001, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

When it comes to the feasibility of using biological or chemical weapons, states are more likely to have the resources, technical capabilities, and organizational capacity to assemble the people, know-how, material, and equipment to produce such weapons and to be able to clandestinely deliver them to valued targets. Nonetheless, mustering the resources and capabilities to inflict a devastating blow with biological agents has proven to be a formidable task even for states. The United States and the former Soviet Union dedicated considerable national defense resources to their biological weapons programs, and both countries encountered significant difficulties along the way. Iraq also dedicated considerable resources to its biological weapons program; although Iraqs effort was more successful than most experts imagined possible, it still encountered a number of significant challenges. Some of these difficulties are unique and inevitable for state programs that aim to achieve a militarily significant capacity with military-grade agents. Lower standards of achievement are certainly possible. On balance, then, a state’s ability to command resources and organize them for certain priority scientific and industrial objectives presents the potential for the greatest threat of bioterrorism. When it comes to the feasibility of biological terrorism perpetrated by subnational groups and individuals, the range of capability (and level of consequence) depends on whether the groups or individuals are state-sponsored or not. Highconsequence biological attacks would require the assistance of a state sponsor or considerable resources. However, even these conditions do not ensure high-consequence attacks by sub-national groups or individuals. There are no widely agreed upon historical examples in the open source literature of states providing sub-national groups with biological weapons for overt or covert use. Money, arms, logistical support, training, and even training on how to operate in a chemically contaminated environment are all forms of assistance states have provided to terrorists. But historically they have not crossed the threshold and provided biological weapons materials to insurgency groups or terrorist organizations. Even if states sought to perpetrate biological attacks for their own purposes, they would probably not trust such an operation to groups or individuals that they do not completely control.

Terrorism – No Bio/Chem

Biological and Chemical terrorism is hard to have

Sievers 1 (Rod, staff, http://news.siuc.edu/news/October01/100901r1152.html, dw: 10-9-2001, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

"Certainly, bio and chemical terrorism is a credible threat," said Talley, the associate director of SIUC's Center for Environmental Health and Safety, "but it's not very practical for terrorists who want immediate results." Take crop dusters for instance. "Sure, someone could load up a crop duster with deadly chemicals or biologicals, but those agents would have to be spread over a very large, populated area to have any chance of causing a lot of harm," Talley said. "Getting a crop duster to fly over a large city at a low altitude just isn't very probable." Spraying deadly chemicals onto crops is a more likely scenario, but Talley believes the U.S. Department of Agriculture or the Food and Drug Administration, responsible for ensuring the safety of America's food supply, would be quick to quarantine contaminated food.

Biological and chemical terrorism have too many barriers

Sievers 1 (Rod, staff, http://news.siuc.edu/news/October01/100901r1152.html, dw: 10-9-2001, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

Talley admits that biohazards such as anthrax can do quite a bit of damage. But he notes that they are hard to produce in large quantities. "Other materials, such as Sarin gas, are more deadly, Talley said, "but again, it is very difficult to acquire these materials. And anyone handling this stuff would have to know what he's doing in order to minimize the risks to themselves. "There's something to be concerned about regarding all the different ways that a terrorist might use biohazards in an attack. But since each method and each type of chemical or biological involves so many factors, it would be pretty difficult to carry off a successful, large-scale attack."

\*\*Value to Life\*\*

A2: VTL

Value to life denies humanity’s resilience in the face of suffering or pain

Ozolins 3 (John, Australian Catholic U., Sophia, 42(2), Oct, http://www.springerlink.com/content/830525573hv68h88/fulltext.pdf 7/5/11) HD

Perhaps Schopenhauer comes close through his claim that the aim and purpose of life is death and once one stops ceaselessly striving to avoid death and to continue to live that we are finally able to come to terms with our existence. 6s In complete abandonment there can be no further depth to which we can sink and it is in the recognition of this that the possibility of salvation exists, that is, that our fate is in our hands. Because of this, it is also true that we can fail to grasp the opportunity. Shalamov, for example speaking of the Gulag, agrees that the possibility of a growth in profundity in prison exists, but that this is not what occurs. Solzhenitsyn accepts that many prisoners were corrupt, that they thieved from new arrivals, that they sought to gain an advantage over their fellows, noting in passing that the quantity of bread that was issued was such that one or two people had to die for each one that survived. Even so, not everyone succumbed to corruption, with many instances ofzeks rejecting corruption, but nevertheless flourishing. The possibility of a genuine nobility of soul was able to exist even in the most appalling conditions. Solzhenitsyn relates the story of Grigory Ivanovich Grigoryev, a soil scientist given a ten year sentence, a man who was never able to bow to the camp corruption of the soul, refusing to become a stoolie, refusing any position offered to him which might have improved his lot in camp. He was so monstrously honest, says Solzhenitsyn, that when he was sent to process potatoes with the vegetable storeroom brigade he did not steal any even though everyone else did. Even though Crrigoryev, not a young man and close to fifty when he entered the camp, always volunteered for the worst and hardest work, he grew strong in the camp, his rheumatism disappearing and his health becoming robust. In Solzhenitsyn's view, corruption set in only in those who were already corrupt to begin with. Consciousness of human dignity and steadfast faith in the human essence decided whether you became an animal or remained a human being. 69 These qualities are profoundly spiritual attitudes to life which are not dependent on a religious point of view. The concentration camps teach us that even in the midst of great deprivation and despite the efforts of evil individuals to degrade and to destroy in people their sense of being human that the human spirit can find ways of flourishing. The inmates of the camps had every reason to believe that they were unwanted, unloved and abandoned. But even so, in this utter affliction they were able to find the good. As Weil says, God appears even in the desolation in which he seems to be absent. The judgement that because some people are mentally or physically handicapped that they have no prospects of a happy life and only unrelieved suffering and misery and so should be aborted or humanely killed is too hasty. While it is true that many such people will face grave and serious problems, it is a harsh and incompassionate judgement to make that their lives are not worth living. Human beings are remarkably resilient in the face of serious deprivations and suffering and human solidarity demands that we seek to share the burdens of the suffering and alleviate it when we can. It does not demand that we do so by killing them, whether mercifully or not.

VTL creates an arbitrary hierarchy- value to life can apply to any creature

Harris 99 (John, Professor, center of Social Ethics and Policy, “The Concept of the Person and the Value of Life”, Project Muse) HD

Can one be more or less of a person? All of the elements in Locke's definition, intelligence, the ability to think and reason, the capacity for reflection, self consciousness, memory and foresight, are capacities that admit of degrees. Does this lead us into a hierarchy of persons and hence of moral importance or value? Let us try another thought experiment. Suppose you were asked to write down in rank order of importance, the 100 things that made life valuable, worth living, for you. Of course there would be no clear rank order in importance for many of the items, and many people would have died laughing long before the list had reached a hundred items. Some lists would tend toward the prurient, others toward the exalted. The philosophical interest in the exercise, contrasted with its human interest, lies not in the contents of the list, but rather in the fact that for anyone reading this essay, or indeed meeting Locke's criteria, there are things that make life valuable, worth living, or indeed valueless and hence not worth living. The importance of the exercise is not what is on the list, nor some moral or objective evaluation of what is or might be on the list. Rather the significance of the thought experiment is the fact that it identifies a particular sort of being, a being that can value existence. My suggestion then is that if we ask "which lives are valuable in the ultimate sense, which lives are the lives of persons?," the answer will be "the lives of any and every creature, whether organic or not, who is capable of valuing his/her or its own existence." The reasons why existence is valued, and the extent to which it is valued, are irrelevant to this question, although they may be relevant to other questions. Thus the question as to which individuals have lives that are valuable in this sense is a threshold one; anyone capable of valuing existence, whether they do or not, is a person in this sense. The possession of this capacity, to whatever degree it is possessed, meets Locke's criteria.

A2: VTL

Value to life can’t be reduced to a comparative number

Davis 1 (Dena, Professor of bioethics at Cleveland State University, “Is Life of Infinite Value?” Project Muse) HD

The more serious argument against valuing life is the "slippery slope," or what Radin calls the "domino effect." Returning to Hardwig's case, Hardwig argues that, because it is obvious to almost everybody that the daughter's burden is significantly greater, the mother has a "duty" to forgo the life-sustaining treatment. I would argue that the mother at least has the ethical option of refusing the treatment and, going further, of taking steps to end her life. After all, if Hardwig's argument is persuasive, there seems to be no reason why it should depend on the refusal of some life-saving treatment. But critics would argue that, if we allow for this case, then we will inevitably have to accept cases where people are pressured into refusing life-sustaining treatment because they have exhausted their health benefits, even though they might have many more enjoyable years of life ahead of them. Again, the notion of incomplete commodification suggests that the slippery slope is not inevitable. In Radin's terms (1996, p. 103), "a preordained victory of market understandings should not be presumed." Radin (1996, p. 95) argues that the "domino theory" of commodification, by which market regimes inevitably drive out nonmarket regimes, is false. She offers a number of important counterexamples. When society recognizes that things have nonmonetizable significance for their holders, it can regulate (curtail) the free market, without therefore declaring the item completely out of bounds in market terms. These curtailments recognize the important and intangible connection between the person and the "thing." Housing is a good example (although our society does a poor job of enacting these curtailments). A house or apartment, once a person has been living in it, is not simply a commodity, but also represents "continuity of residence that in our culture is supposed to provide for the stability of context essential to proper self-development" (Radin 1996, p. 112). Thus, housing is "appropriately incompletely commodified," by which I imagine that Radin is referring to such schemes as rent-controlled apartments, which can rise to their full market value only when occupied by new tenants.

Value to life creates a commodity that can be traded or taken away

Davis 1 (Dena, Ph. D., Professor of bioethics at Cleveland State University, “Is Life of Infinite Value?” Project Muse) HD

The main reason that some people so resist the idea that life cannot be valued in quantified ways is the fear of two consequences. First, there is a fear that talking about life as something that can be valued, balanced against other things, and so on, leads to "commodification." In other words, to place a value on life means bringing it into the marketplace as one more "thing," like a car or a house, that can be traded at will. This seems disrespectful and inimical to the ways in which we do value life in our culture, whether it is valued in religious terms (as a gift from God), or in secular (as the sine qua non for every other valuable thing we experience, from pleasure to courage to family). Even the least religious among us can stand in awe of this thing that we humans are powerless to create. In this thinking, all value is market value; the only way to resist commodification is to insist that something is of infinite value. Second, there is the fear that, once life becomes value-able, it can be traded off by others in ways that will lead inevitably to a slippery slope wherein we cut off resources for those who are no longer "productive."

Value to life becomes an arbitrary price tag

Davis 1 (Dena, Professor of bioethics at Cleveland State University, “Is Life of Infinite Value?” Project Muse) HD

Those who argue that "valuing" life equals "commodifying" life, and that the latter is obviously immoral, appear to hold the view that we valuers are exhibiting what Radin (1996, p. 8) calls a "a strong form of commensurability." Commensurability in this context means that all things that we value, from music to life to food to love to safety to intellectual stimulation and so on, can be reduced to some common denominator that allows us to see which item or combination of items has the larger unit of value. For adherents of this scheme, "there is no mystery about which of two items is more valuable; it is the one with the higher price tag" (Radin 1996, p. 9). But commensurability need not be complete, and it also need not reduce to dollar value (Radin 1996, p. 19). Returning to the couple who bought the engagement ring, the fact that the ring cost $10,000 on Monday, does not mean that the woman would then sell it for $11,000 on Tuesday; the fact that, sometime during that 24 hours, it was presented to her by her fiancé takes it out of the realm of the pure market (although she might later sell it to the highest bidder in order, for example, to raise a ransom to save her husband's life). We can "both know the price of something and know that it is priceless" (Radin 1996, p. 102).

VTL Bad—Impacts

Value to life judgments lead to isolation and discrimination

Harris 99 (John, Professor, center of Social Ethics and Policy, “The Concept of the Person and the Value of Life”, Project Muse) HD

The concept of the person has come to be intimately connected with questions about the value of life (see Warren 1997 for a detailed discussion of the links between personhood and moral status). It is invoked in circumstances in which we need a term of art, or as John Locke (1690), memorably put it "a forensic" term, for those sorts of beings who have some special value or moral importance and where we need to prioritize the needs or claims of different sorts of individuals. To identify individuals as persons is to bring them into the same moral category as ourselves and to judge someone to be a pre-person or a nonperson is to distance them in some sense from ourselves.

Value to life denies suffering- the impact is loss of humanity

Ozolins 3 (John, Australian Catholic U., Sophia, 42(2), Oct, http://www.springerlink.com/content/830525573hv68h88/fulltext.pdf 7/5/11) HD

Weil says that we should accept our suffering not because it is useful, but because it exists. 73 Thus, it is not because it is valuable in itself and so should be sought and endured, but because it exists as part of the human condition. Weil comments that the extreme greatness of Christianity lies not in that it provides a spiritual remedy for suffering, but that it finds a spiritual use for it. 74 St. Paul sees suffering as producing endurance, endurance as producing character and character as producing hope, and hope does not disappoint Christians because God's love has been poured into themY Even if we do not subscribe to a Christian view, or for that matter to a Hindu or Buddhist view, suffering provides a practical challenge to which we are obliged to respond, and although we do not actively seek to suffer, for this would be masochistic, we cannot avoid responding to it either if we want to flourish as human persons. Suffering provides the opportunity for relationships to be strengthened and renewed, for old hurts and misunderstandings to be forgiven and for peace and reconciliation to be achieved. For the terminally ill, it is the last such opportunity. To seek to insulate ourselves from suffering is to seek to avoid reality, for sickness and death are part of life. The utilitarian argument which tries to reduce suffering and human flourishing to a simple calculus weighing pleasures and pains cannot be sustained because neither suffering nor human flourishing consist in just pleasure or pain. Human beings are not merely sentient creatures moved to action by the promise of pleasure or the threat of pain. Sufferings of the human spirit are greater than any physical suffering and the loss of one's human dignity and capacity to love and be loved of far greater importance than death. Proponents of euthanasia and physician assisted suicide do not err because an easy death is not more inviting than a slow painful one, but because they not only deny any possibility of a resolution of the despair and hopelessness that someone requesting an end to his life is suffering but also, conflating pain and suffering, assert that pain and suffering is to be avoided at all costs. Pain can generally be controlled, but the suffering of the human spirit is often left untouched and the sufferer's real needs ignored. In the final analysis they deny that human beings can suffer in ways that other sentient creatures cannot and deny that human beings can flourish even in the face of unbearable suffering. The price, however, of avoiding pain and suffering at all costs - the loss of one's humanity - is too high. Suffering cannot be accorded either positive value or negative value and so cannot be weighed on the utilitarian's scale. If we fail to support the terminally ill by seeking to share their suffering, alleviating their sense of despair and hopelessness and being sensitive to the cries of the human heart then ending their lives through a lethal injection may not be the mercy that proponents of assisted suicide and euthanasia think it is - either for them or us.

Value to life justifies violence

Harris 99 (John, Professor, center of Social Ethics and Policy, “The Concept of the Person and the Value of Life”, Project Muse) HD

Defining "person" as a creature capable of valuing its own existence, makes plausible an explanation of the nature of the wrong done to such a being when it is deprived of existence. Persons who want to live are wronged by being killed because they are thereby deprived of something they value. Persons who do not want to live are not on this account harmed by having their wish to die granted, through voluntary euthanasia for example. Nonpersons or potential persons cannot be wronged in this way because death does not deprive them of anything they can value. If they cannot wish to live, they cannot have that wish frustrated by being killed. Creatures other than persons can, of course, be harmed in other ways, by being caused gratuitous suffering for example, but not by being painlessly killed.