
**Climate Resilience Negative**



[1NC – Warming Advantage 2](#_Toc394180596)

[1NC Frontline – Warming 3](#_Toc394180597)

[2NC – Warming Frontline Extensions 8](#_Toc394180598)

[2NC - Warming is Slow 9](#_Toc394180599)

[2NC – Not Anthropogenic 10](#_Toc394180600)

[2NC – No Impact on Biodiversity 14](#_Toc394180601)

[2NC – Not Catastrophic – No extinction 16](#_Toc394180602)

[2NC - No Weather Impacts 21](#_Toc394180603)

[2NC – Warming Answers – AT Blocks 23](#_Toc394180604)

[2NC- No Warming AT: Consensus – 24](#_Toc394180605)

[2NC - AT Tipping point 25](#_Toc394180606)

[2NC - AT Run-away warming 26](#_Toc394180607)

[2NC - AT Positive Feedbacks 27](#_Toc394180608)

[2NC -AT: Warming => War 28](#_Toc394180609)

[AT Warming Migrants 30](#_Toc394180610)

[AT: Coral Reefs 31](#_Toc394180611)

[AT: Hurricanes 33](#_Toc394180612)

[1NC Economy Advantage 34](#_Toc394180613)

[1NC Economy Frontline 35](#_Toc394180614)

[2NC AT: Warming Hurts Economy 37](#_Toc394180615)

[2NC - AT: Trade Leadership 38](#_Toc394180616)

[2NC - AT: Economic Decline Bad 39](#_Toc394180617)

[A2 Critical Advantage 41](#_Toc394180618)

[1NC – Critical Advantage 42](#_Toc394180619)

[1NC – Racism Answers 43](#_Toc394180620)

## 1NC – Warming Advantage

### 1NC Frontline – Warming

#### \_\_\_ They don’t solve warming –

*insert your own explanation*

#### \_\_\_ Warming is slow--even with feedbacks, temperature gains are low---prefer our evidence because it uses actual temperature models

**Taylor 2013** James M. Taylor, J.D., is managing editor of Environment & Climate News“Japanese Data Cast Doubt on Alarmist Temperature Claims” 2013 http://news.heartland.org/newspaper-article/2013/02/01/japanese-data-cast-doubt-alarmist-temperature-claims

Global temperatures are warming **much more slowly than claimed** by British and U.S. government agencies that produce temperature data reports, according to data compiled by the Japanese Meteorological Agency. According to meteorologist Anthony Watts, Japan is reporting that global temperatures during the past decade are approximately 0.25 degrees Celsius cooler than reported by the U.K. Met Office, the NASA Goddard Institute, and the NOAA National Climatic Data Center. The 0.25 degree difference is **staggering** considering the Earth **warmed merely 0.6 degrees** Celsius during the **entirety of the twentieth century**. Japanese scientists appear to be giving more weight to real-world temperature data than the U.K. and U.S. government agencies do, Watts reports. NASA, NOAA, and the Met Office make several adjustments to real-world temperature data that have the effect of **inflating recent temperature readings** and **reducing the temperatures** that were reported several decades ago. By contrast, the Japanese scientists give more weight to **real-world data** than to government agency adjustments that always seem to add more warming than appears in the raw temperature data. The Japanese data add weight to global temperature readings compiled by NASA satellite instruments. NASA satellite instruments show substantially less recent warming than is claimed by global warming alarmists and government agencies that adjust the real-world temperature readings. Because the NASA satellite instruments uniformly measure global temperatures, the **temperature readings do not require any adjustments to weed out asserted temperature anomalies.**

#### \_\_\_ Warming isn’t anthropogenic

Idso, Carter and Singer 2011 [Craig D. Ph.D Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Robert M. Ph.D Adjunct Research Fellow James Cook University, S. Fred Ph.D President of Science and Environmental Policy Project, Climate Change Reconsidered 2011 Interim Report” Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change http://nipccreport.org/reports/2011/pdf/2011NIPCCinterimreport.pdf

New evidence points to a larger role for solar forcing than the IPCC has acknowledged. Likely mechanisms include perturbation of ocean currents, tropospheric zonal mean-winds, and the intensity of cosmic rays reaching the Earth.  The IPCC underestimated the warming effect of chloroflourocarbons (CFCs) prior to their gradual removal from the atmosphere following the implementation of the Montreal Protocol in 2000. This could mean CO2 concentrations played a smaller role in the warming prior to that year, and could help explain the global cooling trend since 2000.  Other forcings and feedbacks about which little is known (or acknowledged by the IPCC) include stratospheric water vapor, volcanic and seismic activity, and enhanced carbon sequestration.

#### \_\_\_ No effect on biodiversity – and alternative causes outweigh

Ridley 14 (Matt, BA and DPhil degrees from Oxford University, he worked for the Economist for nine years as science editor, Washington correspondent and American editor fellow of the Royal Society of Literature and of the Academy of Medical Sciences, and a foreign honorary member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, “Climate Forecast: Muting the Alarm,” March 27, <http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303725404579460973643962840>)

**The** forthcoming report **apparently admits that climate change has extinguished no species so far and expresses "very little confidence" that it will do so. There is new emphasis that climate change is not the only environmental problem that matters and on adapting to it rather than preventing it**. **Yet the report still assumes 70% more warming by the last decades of this century than the best science now suggests. This is because of an overreliance on models rather than on data** in the first section of the IPCC report—on physical science—that was published in September 2013.

\*\*\*Report referenced = IPCC

#### \_\_\_ No catastrophic warming – Earth is cooling and any fluctuations are natural, not anthropogenic – prefer long-term predictions backed by empirics and real science – aff models are wrong

Ferrara 14 (Peter, \*\*Graduate of Harvard College and Harvard Law School, senior fellow for entitlement and budget policy @ Heartland, senior fellow at the Social Security Institute, White House Office of Policy Development under President Reagan, Associate Deputy Attorney General of the United States under the first President Bush\*\*, “The Period Of No Global Warming Will Soon Be Longer Than the Period of Actual Global Warming,” 2/24, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/peterferrara/2014/02/24/the-period-of-no-global-warming-will-soon-be-longer-than-the-period-of-actual-global-warming/>)

If you look at the record of global temperature data, you will find that the late 20th Century period of global warming actually lasted about 20 years, from the late 1970s to the late 1990s. Before that, the globe was dominated by about 30 years of global cooling, giving rise in the 1970s to media discussions of the return of the Little Ice Age (circa 1450 to 1850), or worse. But the record of satellite measurements of global atmospheric temperatures now shows no warming for at least 17 years and 5 months, from September, 1996 to January, 2014, as shown on the accompanying graphic. That is surely 17 years and 6 months now, accounting for February. When the period of no global warming began, the alarmist global warming establishment responded that even several years of temperature data does not establish a climate trend. That takes much longer. But **when the period of no global warming gets longer than the period of** actual global **warming,** what is the climate trend then? Even **worse for the theory of catastrophic, anthropogenic** (human caused), global **warming is that during this** now extended **period of no** global **warming** ~~man~~kind’s **emissions** of the carbon dioxide (CO2) that are supposed to be predominant in causing global warming **continued to explode,** with one third of all CO2 added to the atmosphere since the industrial revolution occurring during this period. The Economist magazine shocked the global warming establishment with an article in March, 2013 that began with this lede: “OVER the past 15 years air temperatures at the Earth’s surface have been flat while greenhouse-gas emissions have continued to soar. The world added roughly 100 billion tonnes of carbon to the atmosphere between 2000 and 2010. That is about a quarter of all the CO2 put there by humanity since 1750.” That one quarter is actually now one third since the industrial revolution, which is now increasingly at stake in this debate. We are not going to be able to power anything remotely like the modern industrial revolution, which is actually straining even now to burst out of the “Progressive” bonds holding it back (at least in America), using the wind sources that powered the Roman economy, plus dancing on sunbeams. Moreover, **the** now **extended trend of no** global **warming is** not turning around any time soon. **That increasingly established trend is being produced by** long term natural causes. **Even rank amateurs** among the general public **can see** that **the sun is the dominant influence on the Earth’s temperatures**. Even the most politicized **scientists** know that they **cannot deny** that solar activity such as sun spot cycles, and variations in solar magnetic fields or in the flux of cosmic rays, **have contributed to major climate changes** of the past, such as the Little Ice Age, particularly pronounced from roughly 1650 AD to 1850 AD, the Medieval Warm period from about 950 AD to 1250 AD, during which global temperatures were higher than today, and the early 20th century Warming Period from 1910 to 1940 AD. That solar activity, particularly sunspot cycles, is starting to mimic the same patterns that were seen during the Little Ice Age, as I discussed in a previous column. As a result, outside politically correct Western circles, where science today has been Lysenkoized on this issue, there is a burgeoning debate about how long of a cooling trend will result. **Britain’s Met Office**, an international cheerleading headquarters for global warming hysteria, **conceded** in December, 2012 that **there would be no further warming** at least through 2017, which would make 21 years with no global warming. The German Herald reported on March 31, 2013 regarding Russian scientist Dr Habibullo Abdussamatov from the St. Petersburg Pulkovo Astronomical Observatory, “Talking to German media the scientist who first made his prediction in 2005 said that after studying sunspots and their relationship with climate change on Earth, we are now on an ‘unavoidable advance towards a deep temperature drop.’” His colleague Yuri Nagovitsyn is quoted in The Voice of Russia saying, “**we could be in for a cooling period that lasts** 200-250 years.” Skepticism over the theory of catastrophic anthropogenic global warming is increasingly embraced in China and elsewhere in Asia as well. In addition, every 20 to 30 years, the much colder water near the bottom of the oceans cycles up to the top, where it has a slight cooling effect on global temperatures until the sun warms that water. That warmed water then contributes to slightly warmer global temperatures, until the next churning cycle. Known as the Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO) and the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation (AMO), **these natural causes are** also **contributing to the** stabilized **and** now even slightly declining natural **global temperature trends**. The foundation for the establishment argument for global warming are 73 climate models collected by the UN’s **IPCC** (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). But the problem is that the warming trends projected by these **models are all diverging** farther and farther **from the** real world trend **of actual temperature observations** discussed above, as I showed in a previous column, with another graphic. Because none of these models have been scientifically validated based on past temperature observations, they constitute a very weak scientific argument that does not remotely establish that the “science is settled,” and “global warming is a fact.” The current data discussed above establishes indisputably that global warming is not a fact today. The politicians seeking to browbeat down any continuing public debate are abusing their positions and authority with modern Lysenkoism, meaning “politically correct” science not established by the scientific method, but politically imposed. The science behind all of this is thoroughly explained in the 1200 pages of Climate Change Reconsidered II, authored by 50 top scientists organized into the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC), and published by the Heartland Institute in Chicago. You will want to own this volume if for no other reason than that it says here that future generations of scientists will look back and say this is the moment when we took the political out of the political science of “climate change,” and this is how we did it. Real scientists know that these 50 co-authors are real scientists. That is transparent from the tenor of the report itself. The publication is “double peer reviewed,” in that it discusses thousands of peer reviewed articles published in scientific journals, and is itself peer reviewed. That is in sharp contrast to President Obama’s own EPA, which issued its “endangerment finding” legally authorizing regulation of carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions, without submitting the finding to its own peer review board, as required by federal law. What were they so afraid of if 97% of scientists supposedly agree with them? **The conclusion** of the report **is** that **the U.N.’s IPCC has exaggerated the amount of** global **warming likely to occur due to ~~man~~kind’s** emissions of **CO2**, **and** the **warming** that human civilization will cause as a result “**is likely to be modest and cause no** net **harm to the** global **environment or** to **human well-being**.” **The primary, dominant cause of** global **climate change is natural causes**, not human effects, the report concludes. The fundamentals of the argument are that **carbon dioxide is** not some toxic industrial gas, but **a natural, trace gas** constituting just 0.038% of the atmosphere, or less than 4/100ths of one percent. The report states, “At the current level of 400 parts per million, we still live in a CO2-starved world. Atmospheric **levels** (**of CO2**) **15 times greater existed** during the pre-Cambrian period (about **550 million years ago**) **without** known adverse effects,” such as **catastrophic** global **warming**. Much was made of the total atmospheric concentration of CO2 growing past 400 parts per million. But one percent of the atmosphere would be 10,000 parts per million. Moreover, **human emissions of CO2 are only** 4% to 5% **of total global emissions**, counting natural causes.

#### \_\_\_\_ Won’t cause extreme weather events.

**Taylor 11** James M. Taylor, J.D., is managing editor of Environment & Climate News“The UN Pulls Back From Its Extreme Weather Claims” 11/30/11 http://www.forbes.com/sites/jamestaylor/2011/11/30/the-un-pulls-back-from-its-extreme-weather-claims/

Extreme weather events have recently assumed a central role in the global warming discussion. Al Gore spent the majority of his recent “24 Hours of Reality” internet program on extreme weather. Peter Gleick last week wrote a Forbes.com column in which he asserted a disbelief in “the increasing severity of extreme weather events influenced by climate change” is what distinguishes scientific skeptics from anti-science “deniers.” According to a recently published United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report, however, **there are many scientific gaps regarding asserted connections between global warming and extreme weather events**.  
The IPCC report, “Summary for Policymakers of the Special Report on Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation (SREX),” individually addresses several of the most frequently asserted extreme weather issues. SREX co-chair Qin Dahe discusses these in a press release accompanying the report.  
Dahe first addresses claims of more extreme temperature events due to global warming. According to Dahe, “There is high confidence that both maximum and minimum daily temperatures have increased on a global scale due to the increase in greenhouse gases.” In other words, there is an increase in extreme heat but a decrease in extreme cold. **Accordingly, there is little or no change in the frequency of extreme temperature events as a whole.**Turning next to droughts, Dahe reports only a “medium confidence” in assertions that global warming is causing more intense and lengthy droughts. According to Dahe, there is “a lack of direct observations and a lack of agreement in the available scientific studies” regarding global warming and drought. In common terms, a lack of direct observations and a lack of agreement in scientific studies means such assertions amount to **unproven speculation rather than fact.**Moving on to tropical cyclones, Dahe reports, “Confidence in any long-term trend in tropical cyclone intensity, frequency or duration is assessed to be low.”  
Perhaps the most compelling evidence for an increase in extreme weather events relates to heavy precipitation situations. The report finds, “It is likely that the frequency of heavy precipitation will increase in the 21st century over many regions.” Even here, however, there are important caveats. The increase in heavy precipitation is merely “likely” (**meaning at least a 66% probability**) rather than “very likely” (meaning at least a 90% probability). Moreover, the “likely” increase applies to “many” region” rather than “**most” regions** **or the planet as a whole.**Still more importantly, the report **does not find strong evidence** that the increase in heavy precipitation events will cause an **increase in flooding**. According to the report, “overall **there is low confidence** at the global scale regarding climate-driven changes in magnitude or frequency of river-related flooding, due to limited evidence and because the causes of regional changes are complex.”  
The most instructive findings of the report relate to economic damages from extreme weather events. Total economic losses from weather-related disasters are higher in developed countries with more property and wealth at risk. Economic losses in relation to Gross Domestic Product are higher in developing nations, however.

“Economic losses from weather- and climate-related disasters have been heavily influenced by increasing exposure of people and economic assets,” concludes the report. In other words, trends regarding total economic damages from extreme weather events largely reflect trends in property values and geographical patterns of development rather than trends regarding the frequency and severity of extreme weather events.  
Folks like Gore and Gleick may claim that anyone with doubts about an asserted connection between global warming and an increasing severity of extreme weather events is an anti-science “denier,” but the facts, and even the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, **tell a different story**.

## 2NC – Warming Frontline Extensions

### 2NC - Warming is Slow

#### Their study is wrong---err neg, their ev is media hype

**Taylor 2013** James M. Taylor, J.D., is managing editor of Environment & Climate News“Serious Flaws Uncovered in ‘4,000 Year’ Warming Paper” 3/15/13 http://news.heartland.org/newspaper-article/2013/03/15/serious-flaws-uncovered-4000-year-warming-paper

The mainstream media is reporting in breathless fashion about a new paper claiming current temperatures are their warmest in 4,000 years. Already, however, **scientists are reporting serious flaws** in the paper. The media may wish to paint a picture of **runaway global warming**, but the **science tells a completely different story**.

Recently graduated Ph.D. student Shaun Marcott has published a paper claiming he compiled a proxy temperature reconstruction indicating current temperatures are their warmest in at least 4,000 years. Proxy temperature reconstructions require careful scrutiny because the proxies are **not direct temperature measurements**, but represent other data and factors that may or **may not have a close correlation with past temperatures**. Some proxies are better than others. Also, an agenda-driven researcher can **easily cherry-pick certain anomalous proxies** that support a **predetermined conclusion** while **ignoring a much larger set of proxies that tell a different story**.

Although scientists have had little time so far to dig into the meat of Marcott’s data, methods, and conclusions, their initial observations are devastating. Don Easterbrook, geology professor emeritus at Western Washington University, has published two papers summarizing and documenting many of the already-discovered flaws in Marcott’s reconstruction. Easterbrook reports at least one more paper is on the way exposing flaws and areas of concern in Marcott’s reconstruction.

Easterbrook points out 80 percent of the data used by Marcott reflect oceanic data, not atmospheric temperatures. “Thus, they may reflect temperature changes from ocean upwelling, changes in ocean currents, or any one of a number of ocean variations not related to atmospheric climates,” Easterbrook writes. Marcott’s heavy dependence on oceanic rather than atmospheric proxies “in itself means that the Marcott et al. **temperatures are not a reliable measure of changing atmospheric climate**,” Easterbrook reports.

Easterbrook also notes Marcott recycled Michael Mann’s proxies to help compile the small portion of Marcott’s land-based proxies. **Discredited proxies by any other name are still discredited proxies.**

Perhaps most damaging, Easterbrook observes many other published studies and data, including analysis of extremely reliable Greenland ice core data, **contradict Marcott’s asserted proxy data.**

When many temperature studies, including studies presented by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, indicate current global temperatures are cooler than the vast majority of the past 4,000 years, and then an outlier study with quickly identified serious flaws claims the opposite, **one would think the media would make note of the discrepancies.** Unfortunately, the media has demonstrated little interest in doing so.

### 2NC – Not Anthropogenic

#### No anthropogenic warming

– cloud feedbacks AND PDO proves\*\*\*

Spencer ‘10 – climatologist and a Principal Research Scientist for U. of Alabama [Roy W, Ph.D. in meteorology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison in 1981, former Senior Scientist for Climate Studies at NASA’s Marshall Space Flight Center, where he and Dr. John Christy received NASA’s Exceptional Scientific Achievement Medal for their global temperature monitoring work with satellites, “The Great Global Warming Blunder: How Mother Nature Fooled the World's Top Climate Scientists”, pg # below, CMR]

IN SCIENCE it only takes **only one finding** to overturn decades of mainstream belief. Scientific knowledge is **not a matter of consensus**, as if scientific truth were something to be voted on. It is either true or not true. I have described new and important scientific evidence-some published, some unpublished at this writing—that supports two major conclusions that could end up dismantling the theory of anthropogenic global warming. The first conclusion is that recent satellite measurements of the Earth reveal the climate system to be relatively insensitive to warming influences, such as humanity's greenhouse gas emissions. This insensitivity is the result of more clouds forming in response to warming, thereby reflecting more sunlight back to outer space and reducing that warming. This process, known as negative feedback, is analogous to opening your car window or putting a sun shade over the windshield as the sun begins to heat the car's interior. An insensitive climate system does not particularly care how much we drive suvs or how much coal we burn for electricity. This evidence directly contradicts the net positive feedback exhibited in the computerized climate models tracked by the IPCC. It is well known that positive feedback in these models is what causes them to produce so much warming in response to humanity's greenhouse gas emissions. Without the high climate sensitivity of the models, anthropogenic global warming becomes **little more than** a minor **academic curiosity**. 153 The strong negative feedback in the real climate system has not been noticed by previous researchers examining satellite data because- they have not been careful about inferring causation. As is the case in all realms of scientific research, making the measurements is much easier than figuring out what those measurements mean in terms of cause and effect. Climate researchers have neglected to account for clouds causing temperature change (forcing) when they tried to determine how temperature caused clouds to change (feedback). They mixed up cause and effect when analyzing year-to-year variability in clouds and temperature. You might say they were fooled by Mother Nature. Clouds causing temperature to change created the illusion of a sensitive climate system. In order to help you understand this problem, I have used the example that I was given when I asked the experts how they knew that feedbacks in the climate system were positive. It was explained to me that when there is an unusually warm year, researchers have found that there is typically less cloud cover. The researchers assumed that the warming caused the decrease in cloud cover. This would be positive feedback because fewer clouds would let in more sunlight and thereby amplify the warming. But I always wondered: How did they know that it was the warming causing fewer clouds, rather than fewer clouds causing the warming? As we have seen, **they didn’t** know. And when the larger, contaminating effect of clouds causing temperature change is taken into account, the true signal of negative feedback emerges from the data. I have demonstrated this with a simple climate model by showing that the two directions of causation-forcing and feedback (or cause and effect) have distinctly different signatures both in the satellite data and in a simple model of the climate system. These distinct signatures even show up in the climate models tracked by the IPCC. Probably as a result of the contusion between cause and effect, climate models have been built to be too sensitive, with clouds erroneously amplifying rather than reducing warming in response to increasing atmospheric carbon dioxide concen 154 trations. The models then predict **far too much warming** when the small warming influence of more ~~man~~-made greenhouse gases is increased over lime in the models. This ultimately results in pre-dictions of serious lo catastrophic levels of warming for the future, which you then hear about through the news media. While different models predict various levels of warming, all of them exhibit positive feedbacks. The mix-up between cause and effect also explains why feedbacks previously diagnosed from satellite observations of the Earth by other researchers have been so variable. There have been differing levels of contamination of the feedback signal by forcing, depending on what year the satellites were observing the Earth The second major conclusion of this book is closely connected to the first. If the carbon dioxide we produce is not nearly enough to cause significant warming in a climate system dominated by negative feedback, then what caused the warming we have experienced over the last fifty years or more? New satellite measurements indicate that most of the global average temperature variability we have experienced in the last 100 years could have been caused by a natural fluctuation in cloud cover resulting from the Pacific: Decadal Oscillation (PDO). **Nine years of our best NASA satellite data,** combined with a simple climate model, reveal that the PDO causes cloud changes that might be sufficient to explain most of the major variations in global average temperature since 1900, including 75 percent of the warming trend. Those natural variations in clouds may be regarded as chaos in the climate system-direct evidence that the Earth is capable of causing its own climate change. Contrary to the claims of the IPCC, global warming or cooling does not require an external forcing mechanism such as more greenhouse gases, or a change in the sun, or a major volcanic eruption**. It is simply what the climate system does.** The climate system itself can cause its own climate change, supporting the widespread public opinion that global warming might simply be part of a **natural cycle**. I am not the first to suspect that the PDO might be causing climate change. I just look the issue beyond suspicion, with a quantitative 155 explanation based on both satellite observations and some analysis with a simple climate model. While some might claim that the timing of the PDO and associated changes in cloudiness in recent years is just a coincidence, I can make **the same claim for the** supposed **anthropogenic explanation** of global warming: Just because warming in the twentieth century happened during a period of increasing CO2 in the atmosphere **doesn't** necessarily **mean that the increasing CO2 caused the warming**. In fact, the PDO explanation for warming actually has a couple of advantages over the CO2 explanation. The first advantage is the fact that variations in cloud cover associated with the PDO actually "predict" the temperature changes that come later. It just so happens that the three PDO changes that occurred in the twentieth century were exactly what would be needed to explain most of the temperature changes that followed: warming until the 1940s, then slight cooling until the 1970s, and then resumed warming through the 1990s. This then answers a question I am sometimes asked: How do I know that the PDO-induced cloud changes caused the temperature changes, and not the other way around? It's because the temperature response comes after the forcing, not before. This PDO source of natural climate change can also explain 75 percent of the warming trend during the twentieth century. Addition of CO2 and other anthropogenic and natural forcings can explain the other 25 percent. This investigation took me only a few days with a desktop computer. In contrast, researchers have been tinkering for many years with various estimates of ~~manmade~~ aerosol (particulate) pollution in their attempts to explain why global warming stopped between 1940 and the late 1970s, even though this was a period of rapid increase in our greenhouse gas emissions. So, while the PDO explanation for temperature variations during the twentieth century fits like a hand in a glove, the IPPC’s explanation based on aerosol and greenhouse gas pollution had to be **wedged in with a crowbar.** Another advantage of the natural explanation for global 155 warming is that the mechanism-an energy imbalance of the Karth caused by natural cloud variations-was actually observed by satellite. In contrast, the cooling effects of aerosol pollution and the warming effects of greenhouse gas emissions have remained **too small to be measured**. They have to be calculated **theoretically** before being input into climate models. <153-156>

Reader note – PDO = Pacific Decadal Oscillation

#### Warming is natural – their argument is based off bad models and data

Ferrara ’12 – senior fellow @ Heartland, served in the White House Office of Policy Development under Reagan, Harvard graduate (Peter J, 'Fakegate' Follows 'Climategate', March 7, <http://townhall.com/columnists/peterferrara/2012/03/07/fakegate_follows_climategate/page/full/>, CMR)

The bottom line is that the temperature records are not consistent with the theory that human "greenhouse" gas emissions are the primary cause of global warming. Those records do not show temperatures rising in conjunction with such ever rising emissions as the globe increasingly industrializes. Instead, the temperature record shows an up and down pattern that follows the pattern of natural influences on global temperatures, such as cyclical sunspots and solar flares, and cycles of ocean churning from warmer to colder temperatures and back, such as the Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO).  
Moreover, the incorruptible and objective satellite temperature records show only modest warming starting in the late 1970s, which stopped roughly 10 years ago, with more recent declines. That is consistent with temperature proxy records found in nature, such as tree rings and ice cores. But that diverges significantly from the corruptible and subjectively compiled land based records, the repeated manipulation of which has prompted several prominent climate scientists to call for an investigation. Perhaps Gleick's skills in falsification can be found more broadly among his colleagues.  
In addition, the work of the UN's IPCC is based on numerous climate models that attempt to project temperatures decades into the future. Those models are all based on the circular assumption that the theory of [hu]man caused global warming is true. As 16 world leading climate scientists recently reported in a letter to the Wall Street Journal,  
 "[A]n important gauge of scientific expertise is the ability to make successful predictions. When predictions fail, we say that the theory is 'falsified' and we should look for the reasons for the failure. Shown in the nearby graph is the measured annual temperature of the earth since 1989, just before the first report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Also shown are the projections of the likely increase of temperature, as published in the Summaries of each of the four IPCC reports, the first in the year 1990 and the last in the year 2007.  
 "From the graph it appears that the projections [of the models] exaggerate, substantially, the response of the earth's temperature to CO2 which increased by about 11% from 1989 through 2011. Furthermore, when one examines the historical temperature record throughout the 20th century and into the 21st, the data strongly suggest a much lower CO2 effect than almost all models calculate."  
Seems like the models have been falsified**.**The likely reason for that failure is that while the models recognize that increased CO2 itself will not produce a big, catastrophic increase in global temperatures, the models assume that the very small amount of warming caused by increased CO2 will result in much larger temperature increases caused by positive feedbacks. The real, emerging science, as the Heartland publications indicate, is that the feedbacks are more likely to be offset by negative feedbacks, resulting in amuch smallernet temperature change. Scientists have pointed out that much higher CO2 concentrations deep in the earth's history, as shown by proxy records, did not result in catastrophic temperature increases, a very powerful rebuttal to the idea today's relatively low CO2 levels could trigger catastrophic global warming.  
The results of the latest, most advanced data collection also suggest that CO2 is not responsible for the modest global warming of the late 20th century. The UN models agree with established science that if human greenhouse gas emissions were causing global warming, there should be a hot spot of higher temperatures in the troposphere above the tropics, where collected concentrations would have the greatest effect, and the warming would show up first. This is known in the literature on climate science as "the fingerprint" for ~~man~~ caused global warming. But data from global weather satellites and more comprehensive weather balloons show no hotspot, and no fingerprint, which means no serious global warming due to human greenhouse gas emissions. QED.  
Moreover, satellites also have been measuring the energy entering the earth's atmosphere from the sun, and the energy escaping back out to space. If the theory of ~~man~~ caused global warming is correct, then the energy escaping back out should be less than the energy entering, as the greenhouse gases capture some of the energy in the atmosphere. But the satellite data show negligible difference.

#### It’c caused by cosmic rays and solar activity – best evidence proves

Solomon ’11 – executive director of Energy Probe (Lawrence, “Lawrence Solomon: Our cosmic climate”, Oct 4, <http://opinion.financialpost.com/2011/09/02/lawrence-solomon-our-cosmic-climate/>)

The 20-year-long global warming debate is in its final stages, the controversy having been settled over whether ~~manmade~~ causes such as carbon dioxide or natural causes such as the Sun dominate climate change on Earth. First, the global warming doomsayers lost the argument in the court of public opinion — barely one-third of the U.S. public, for example, now believes that human activity can lead to dangerous warming. Then, the doomsayers lost the economic argument when attempts to develop renewable energy proved utterly futile. The world is instead rapidly developing its fossil fuels, recently discovered to be so plentiful that they can meet ~~mankind’s~~ needs for centuries to come. And now, the global warming doomsayers have lost their pretended monopoly on the official science. Their long-standing claim that only a scientific fringe denies the dominant role of humans — a claim that was never true — has ended. One of the world’s largest and most prestigious scientific organizations — more on that later — now formally opposes the IPCC’s official position that the Sun and other natural phenomena are all-but irrelevant to climate change. To understand the nature of the IPCC’s just-ended scientific “monopoly,” place yourself in a meeting in Guangzhou, China in 1992, shortly after the IPCC was created, involving 130 delegates from 47 countries. In comes the Danish delegation with exciting findings from Danish scientists published just weeks earlier in the prestigious journal Science, showing a blockbuster correlation between solar activity and temperature on Earth. Not only did Science publish the findings, to make sure no one could miss their significance, Science trumpeted the findings in an accompanying article. “Take a good look at the graph on this page, reproduced from a report that appears on page 698. It’s giving climatologists goose bumps,” Science’s accompanying article began. This “is the most striking correlation ever found between climate and small variations in solar activity — and the strongest suggestion ever of a causal link.” The article, entitled Could the Sun Be Warming the Climate?, suggested that the tables had now turned in the global-warming debate by including this assertion from a prominent U.S. scientist: “The burden of proof that something’s wrong [with the Danish correlation] almost rests with the detractors.” What does the IPCC decide at that Guangzhou meeting when faced with this emphatic evidence that the Sun could be driving climate? The IPCC outright refuses to consider the Danish findings, saying it only has a mandate to investigate ~~manmade~~ causes of climate change. The IPCC and its followers then spent some $80-billion over the next two decades trying to establish that carbon dioxide and human activities explained climate change. They came up empty-handed — they found not a scintilla of compelling evidence, absolutely nothing, that could pin more than a dollop or two of warming on human activities. All that the IPCC scientists have to show for their efforts are endless computer models that don’t work — the models have not only failed to predict the climate over the last 20 years, they can’t model the past climate when they are run backwards. While this 20-year dead-end research was turning up failure after failure, the Danish science went from success to success. Geophysicist Eigil Friis-Christensen, a co-author of the startling Science study, continued his work with Henrik Svensmark and other Danish colleagues, making more and more progress and hypothesizing the mechanism through which the Sun heats and cools the planet. The answer could lie in the cosmic rays from beyond the solar system that continually bombard Earth, they surmised. Their theory was quite straightforward: The cosmic rays seed clouds. When the cloud cover is great, the Earth tends to cool; when the cloud cover dissipates, the Earth tends to warm. And why does the cloud cover vary? Here the role of the Sun comes to play. When the Sun is especially strong, its magnetic field tends to push the cosmic rays away from Earth, preventing clouds from forming and leading to a hotter planet. Likewise, when activity on the Sun weakens, so too does its magnetic field, allowing more clouds to form and leading to a cooler planet. “You’ll never prove cosmic rays can seed clouds,” the IPCC establishment retorted, and embarked on a smear campaign to discredit the Danes. The Danes were accused, falsely, of having made arithmetic errors, of having mishandling data, even of having fabricated data. But the Danes persevered. In 2006 they built a reaction chamber at the Danish National Space Centre, filled it with gases that approximated the composition of the lower atmosphere, added ultraviolet rays to mimic the rays of the Sun, and presto — the chamber soon filled with a vast number of floating microscopic droplets! These were ultra-small clusters of sulphuric acid and water molecules — the building blocks for cloud condensation nuclei — that had been catalyzed by the electrons released by the cosmic rays. “We were amazed by the speed and efficiency with which the electrons do their work,” Svensmark remarked of his breakthrough. The scientists inside the IPCC bubble again discredited and discounted the Danes’ findings, using the authority of the IPCC, a United Nations agency with representation from the nations of the world, to trump the findings from tiny Denmark. But to their dismay, the IPCC — less a scientific body than a lobbying organization — was itself soon trumped by the European Organization for Nuclear Research, or CERN, a true scientific agency involving 60 countries and 8,000 scientists at more than 600 universities and national laboratories. CERN, which is best known for having built the Large Hadron Collider — a multi-billion-dollar instrument that collides subatomic particles head-on at very high energy to recreate the conditions just after the Big Bang — decided to build a Cadillac version of the Danish chamber. It did, releasing the results last week and validating Danish findings that point to the role of cosmic rays in seeding clouds. In doing so, it also buried future talk of carbon dioxide as a significant driver of climate change. For good measure, CERN also notes that independent satellite evidence points to the effect of cosmic rays on clouds. Because of these and other discoveries, “climate models will need to be substantially revised,” CERN says, in its study and supplementary materials that mention various avenues worth exploring but carbon dioxide not once. Much more work will need to be done — CERN is now hot on the trail for what it believes is a missing ingredient in its recipe for the lower atmosphere, for example, and the Danes and others are also looking to the heavens, rather than to our coal plants and SUVs, in their quest to unlock the mysteries of climate change. As the lead author of the CERN study puts it, there is “strong evidence” that the Sun affects the climate through some mechanism, and “a cosmic ray influence on clouds is a leading candidate.” CO2 is not.

### 2NC – No Impact on Biodiversity

#### Your Biodiversity studies are flawed- difference between fine and coarse grid scales

Idso and Idso 2011 Craig D. (founder and chairman of the board of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change) Sherwood B. (president of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change) February “Carbon Dioxide and Earth’s Future Pursuing the Prudent Path” http://www.co2science.org/education/reports/prudentpath/prudentpath.pdf.

In discussing their findings, Randin et al. suggested that the vastly different results they obtained when using fine and coarse grid scales might help to explain what they call the Quaternary Conundrum, i.e. "why fewer species than expected went extinct during glacial periods when models predict so many extinctions with similar amplitude of climate change (Botkin et al., 2007)." In addition, they noted that "coarse-resolution predictions based on species distribution models are commonly used in the preparation of reports by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change," which are then used by "conservation planners, managers, and other decision makers to anticipate Biodiversity losses in alpine and other systems across local, regional, and larger scales," but which, unfortunately, give a highly-warped and erroneous view of the subject.

#### No direct correlation between warming and biodiversity loss – their models are wrong

**Stockwell 4/21**/12 – with the San Diego Computer Center at the University of California (David, “Errors of Global Warming Effects Modeling” http://landshape.org/enm/errors-of-global-warming-effects-modeling/, PZ)

Among those believing gross scientific inaccuracies are not justified, and such attitudes diminish the standing of scientists, I was invited to a meeting of a multidisciplinary group of 19 scientists, including Dan Bodkin from UC Santa Barbara, mathematician Matt Sobel, Craig Loehle and others at the Copenhagen base of BjÃ¸rn Lomborg, author of The Skeptical Environmentalist. This resulted in Forecasting the Effects of Global Warming on Biodiversity published in 2007 BioScience. We were particularly concerned by the cavalier attitude to model validations in the Thomas paper, and the field in general: Of the modeling papers we have reviewed, only a few were validated. Commonly, these papers simply correlate present distribution of species with climate variables, then replot the climate for the future from a climate model and, finally, use one-to-one mapping to replot the future distribution of the species,without any validation using independent data. Although some are clear about some of their assumptions (mainly equilibrium assumptions), readers who are not experts in modeling can easily misinterpret the results as valid and validated. For example, Hitz and Smith (2004) discuss many possible effects of global warming on the basis of a review of modeling papers, and in this kind of analysis the unvalidated assumptions of models would most likely be ignored. The paper observed that few mass extinctions have been seen over recent rapid climate changes, suggesting something must be wrong with the models to get such high rates of extinctions. They speculated that species may survive in refugia, suitable habitats below the spatial scale of the models. Another example of an unvalidated assumptions that could bias results in the direction of extinctions, was described in chapter 7 of my book Niche Modeling. Claims that 20th-century warming is ‘exceptional’ rely on selection of so-called temperature ‘proxies’ such as tree rings, and statistical tests of the significance of changes in growth. I modelled the proxy selection process here and showed you can get a hockey stick shape using random numbers (with serial correlation). When the numbers trend, and then are selected based on correlation with recent temperatures, the result is inevitably ‘hockey stick’ shaped: i.e. with a distinct uptick where the random series correlated with recent temperatures, and a long straight shaft as the series revert back to the mean. My reconstruction was similar to many other reconstructions with low variance medieval warm period (MWP).

#### Population growth makes bio-d loss inevitable

**Science Daily** 7/28/**11** (“Ongoing Global Biodiversity Loss Unstoppable With Protected Areas Alone” [http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2011/07/110728123059.htm](http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-15698183%20Accessed%206/18/12), PZ)

Continued reliance on a strategy of setting aside land and marine territories as "protected areas" is insufficient to stem global biodiversity loss, according to a comprehensive assessment published July 28 in the journal Marine Ecology Progress Series.

Despite impressively rapid growth of protected land and marine areas worldwide -- today totalling over 100,000 in number and covering 17 million square kilometers of land and 2 million square kilometers of oceans -- biodiversity is in steep decline. Expected scenarios of human population growth and consumption levels indicate that cumulative human demands will impose an unsustainable toll on Earth's ecological resources and services accelerating the rate at which biodiversity is being loss. Current and future human requirements will also exacerbate the challenge of effectively implementing protected areas while suggesting that effective biodiversity conservation requires new approaches that address underlying causes of biodiversity loss -- including the growth of both human population and resource consumption. Says lead author Camilo Mora of University of Hawaii at Manoa: "Biodiversity is humanity's life-support system, delivering everything from food, to clean water and air, to recreation and tourism, to novel chemicals that drive our advanced civilization. Yet there is an increasingly well-documented global trend in biodiversity loss, triggered by a host of human activities." "Ongoing biodiversity loss and its consequences for humanity's welfare are of great concern and have prompted strong calls for expanding the use of protected areas as a remedy," says fellow author Peter F. Sale, Assistant Director of the United Nations University's Canadian-based Institute for Water, Environment and Health. "While many protected areas have helped preserve some species at local scales, promotion of this strategy as a global solution to biodiversity loss, and the advocacy of protection for specific proportions of habitats, have occurred without adequate assessment of their potential effectiveness in achieving the goal." Drs. Mora and Sale warn that long-term failure of the protected areas strategy could erode public and political support for biodiversity conservation and that the disproportionate allocation of available resources and human capital into this strategy precludes the development of more effective approaches. The authors based their study on existing literature and global data on human threats and biodiversity loss. "The global network of protected areas is a major achievement, and the pace at which it has been achieved is impressive," says Dr. Sale. "Protected areas are very useful conservation tools, but unfortunately, the steep continuing rate of biodiversity loss signals the need to reassess our heavy reliance on this strategy." The study says continuing heavy reliance on the protected areas strategy has five key technical and practical limitations: Concludes Dr. Mora: "Given the considerable effort and widespread support for the creation of protected areas over the past 30 years, we were surprised to find so much evidence for their failure to effectively address the global problem of biodiversity loss. Clearly, the biodiversity loss problem has been underestimated and the ability of protected areas to solve this problem overestimated." The authors underline the correlations between growing world population, natural resources consumption and biodiversity loss to suggest that biodiversity loss is unlikely to be stemmed without directly addressing the ecological footprint of humanity. Based upon previous research, the study shows that under current conditions of human comsumption and conservative scenarios of human population growth, the cummulative use of natural resources of humanity will amount to the productivity of up to 27 Earths by 2050. "Protected areas are a valuable tool in the fight to preserve biodiversity. We need them to be well managed, and we need more of them, but they alone cannot solve our biodiversity problems," adds Dr. Mora. "We need to recognize this limitation promptly and to allocate more time and effort to the complicated issue of human overpopulation and consumption." "Our study shows that the international community is faced with a choice between two paths," Dr. Sale says. "One option is to continue a narrow focus on creating more protected areas with little evidence that they curtail biodiversity loss. That path will fail. The other path requires that we get serious about addressing the growth in size and consumption rate of our global population.”

### 2NC – Not Catastrophic – No extinction

#### No extinction – alarmist warming predictions not supported by science

Knappenberger 3-27-14 (Paul C. “Chip” Knappenberger is assistant director of the Center for the Study of Science at the Cato Institute, “Climate Alarm,” <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/climate-alarm>)

In its new report on the risks from human-caused climate change, the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) sets climate science back rather than “advancing” it. The report, counterfactually titled “What We Know,” is more an account of what the scientific community thought it knew about a decade ago than an up-to-date telling of current understanding. Not surprisingly, the group ignores the fact that climate science is moving in a direction that increasingly suggests that the risk of extreme climate change is lower than has been previously assessed. Instead, the AAAS continues to play up the chance of extreme outcomes with the intent of scaring us into taking action — action that would have little impact on either future climate change or the risks therefrom. The AAAS largely appeals to its own authority in trying to persuade us to believe its conclusions and yet informs its authority with old and obsolete science. Nowhere is this more true than in its justification for highlighting the risks of “abrupt climate change” and in its faith in the ability of climate models to provide reliable and informed guidance regarding the probability of extreme climate changes’ occurring in the future. The new report asserts: Below are some of the high-side projections and tail risks we incur by following the current path for CO2 and other greenhouse gas emissions. Most of these projections derive from computer simulations of Earth and its climate system. These models apply the best understanding science has to offer about how our climate works and how it will change in the future. There are many such models and all of them have been validated, to varying degrees, by their ability to replicate past climate changes. However, the best and most recent science shows the AAAS assessment to be outdated and badly misplaced. In fact, climate models have done remarkably poorly in replicating the evolution of global temperature during the past several decades, and high-end climate-change scenarios from the models are largely unsupported by observations. For example, in January, researchers John Fyfe and Nathan Gillett published an article in the prominent journal Nature Climate Change that found that “global warming over the past 20 years is significantly less than that calculated from 117 simulations of the climate by 37 models.” And last year, scientists Peter Stott and colleagues published a paper in the journal Environmental Research Letters that concluded that “the upper end of climate model temperature projections is inconsistent with past warming.” A host of other prominent papers that have examined the sensitivity of the climate to greenhouse-gas emissions collectively suggest that not only is future global warming likely to be less than previously expected, but, and perhaps more important, the outside chance that it will be extremely large has shrunk dramatically. This position is further supported by new research that downplays the threat of abrupt climate change from Arctic methane release, a shutdown of the Gulf Stream, and rapid sea-level rise. Instead of an informed report by the esteemed group focused on presenting what today’s best science tells us regarding the risks from extreme climate change and our ability to mitigate them, what we got from the AAAS was a textbook example of climate alarmism: link human-caused greenhouse-gas emissions to climate change, raise the possibility that climate change will be disastrous, and then tell us we have to act now to save ourselves. The first part of the AAAS guide to climate alarm is certainly true: Human-caused greenhouse-gas emissions do put pressure on the climate to warm. But the most important details — to what degree and of what character — are still uncertain and are being intensely studied and debated. The second part has been relegated to the realm of climate fantasy. Today’s leading science suggests that coming human-caused climate change is going to be less than expected, with a much-diminished associated risk of abrupt changes with catastrophic outcomes. Which means that the third part — that immediate action is required to reduce the risk of extreme change — is largely inapplicable (and such action is likely to be ineffective to boot). The new AAAS report runs up climate alarm but runs down climate science. The result is a misleading document that is aimed at influencing public policy. This is the situation that should be raising alarm.

Global focus shifting to adaptation – solves the impacts to warming best – plan is a mitigation strategy that tradesoff

Ridley 14 (Matt, BA and DPhil degrees from Oxford University, he worked for the Economist for nine years as science editor, Washington correspondent and American editor, fellow of the Royal Society of Literature and of the Academy of Medical Sciences, and a foreign honorary member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, “We have a new climate change consensus — and it's good news everyone,” <http://www.spectator.co.uk/features/9176121/armageddon-averted/>)

Nigel Lawson was right after all. Ever since the Centre for Policy Studies lecture in 2006 that launched the former chancellor on his late career as a critic of global warming policy, Lord Lawson has been stressing the need to adapt to climate change, rather than throw public money at futile attempts to prevent it. **Until now, the official line has been largely to ignore adaptation and focus instead on ‘mitigation’** — the misleading term for preventing carbon dioxide emissions. That has now changed. The received wisdom on global warming, published by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, was updated this week. The newspapers were, as always, full of stories about scientists being even more certain of environmental Armageddon. But the **document** itself revealed a far more striking story: it **emphasised, again and again, the need to adapt to climate change**. Even **in the main text of the press release** that accompanied the report, **the word ‘adaptation’ occurred ten times, the word ‘mitigation’ not at all**. The distinction is crucial. So far, the debate has followed a certain bovine logic: that global warming is happening, so we need to slow it down by hugely expensive decarbonisation strategies — green taxes, wind farms. And what good will this do? Is it possible to stop global warming in its tracks? Or would all these green policies be the equivalent of trying to blow away a hurricane? This question — **just how much can be achieved by mitigation** — **is** one not often addressed. **There is an alternative: accepting that the planet is warming, and seeing if we can adjust accordingly**. **Adaptation means** investing in **flood defences**, so that airports such as Schiphol can continue to operate below existing (and future) sea level, and **air conditioning**, so that cities such as Houston and Singapore can continue to grow despite existing (and future) high temperatures. It means **plant breeding,** so that maize can be grown in a greater range of existing (and future) climates, **better infrastructure**, so that Mexico or India can survive existing (and future) cyclones, **more world trade**, so that Ethiopia can get grain from Australia during existing (and future) droughts. Owen Paterson, the Secretary of State for the Environment, in repeatedly emphasising the need to adapt to climate change in this way, has been something of a lone voice in the government. But he can now count on the support of the mighty IPCC, a United Nations body that employs hundreds of scientists to put together the scientific equivalent of a bible on the topic every six years or so. Whereas the last report had two pages on adaptation, this one has four chapters. Professor Chris Field is the ~~chairman~~ of Working Group 2 of the IPCC, the part devoted to the effects of climate change rather than the cause. ‘The really big breakthrough in this report,’ he says, ‘is the new idea of thinking about managing climate change.’ His co-chair Vicente Barros adds: ‘Investments in better preparation can pay dividends both for the present and for the future … adaptation can play a key role in decreasing these risks’. After so many years, the penny is beginning to drop. In his book An Appeal to Reason, Lawson devoted a chapter to the importance of adaptation, in which he pointed out that the last **IPCC** report **in 2007** specifically **assumed** that **humans would not adapt. ‘Possible impacts,’** the report said, ‘**do not take into** account any changes or developments in **adaptive capacity.’** That is to say, if the world gets warmer, sea levels rise and rainfall patterns change, farmers, developers and consumers will do absolutely nothing to change their habits over the course of an entire century. It is a ludicrous assumption. But **this assumption was central**, Lawson pointed out, **to the** estimated future cost of climate change the **IPCC** reported. A notorious example was the report’s conclusion that, ‘assuming no adaptation’, crop yields might fall by 70 per cent by the end of the century — a conclusion based, a footnote revealed, on a single study of peanut farming in one part of India. Lawson pointed out that **adaptation had** six **obvious benefits** as a strategy, **which mitigation did not share. It required no international treaty**, but would work if adopted unilaterally; **it could be applied locally**; it **would produce results quickly**; it could **capture** any **benefits of warming while avoiding risks**; **it addressed existing problems** **that were merely exacerbated by warming; and it would bring benefits even if global warming proves** to have been **exaggerated**. Ask yourself, if you were a resident of the Somerset Levels, whether you would prefer a government policy of adapting to anything the weather might throw at you, whether it was exacerbated by climate change or not, or spending nearly £50 billion (by 2020) on low-carbon technologies that might in a few decades’ time, if adopted by the whole world, reduce the exacerbation of floods, but not the floods themselves. It is remarkable how far this latest report moves towards Lawson’s position. Professor Field, who seems to be an eminently sensible chap, clearly strove to emphasise adaptation, if only because the chance of an international agreement on emissions looks ever less likely. If you go through the report chapter by chapter (not that many people seem to have bothered), amid the usual warnings of potential danger, there are many sensible, if jargon-filled, discussions of exactly the points Lawson made. Chapter 17 concedes that ‘adaptation strategies … can yield welfare benefits even in the event of a constant climate, such as more efficient use of water and more robust crop varieties’. Chapter 20 even acknowledges that ‘**in some cases mitigation may** impede adaptation (e.g., reduced energy availability in countries with growing populations)’. A crucial point, this: that **preventing** the poor from getting access to **cheap electricity** from coal **might make them more vulnerable to climate change**. So green policies may compound the problem they seek to solve.

#### Warming won’t cause extinction

Mauldin 6/4/12 – B.S. and M.S. in electrical engineering from Cal-Berkeley, registered professional engineer (Paul, “Global Warming Alarmism: At the Tipping Point of Credibility?”, <http://smartenergyportal.net/article/global-warming-alarmism-tipping-point-credibility>, CMR)

If we believe all we're told then there is no hope. Why change anything? But, to the frustration and anger of the alarmists, we don't believe all we're told about a global warming doomsday. There's a growing belief both in the lay and scientific communities that there's another side to the story. There's mounting evidence that the presuppositions about human-caused climate change are wrong or at the best, distorted. The earth is warming, yes (although that's not all that clear to some), but our planet has gone through warming/cooling cycles in the past. Yes, there is a correlation with CO2 concentrations, but it's not clear which came first, the warming or the change in CO2. And the CO2/temperature-rise pairing cycles have also occurred throughout the past. But isn't the global warming skeptic community pretty much a bunch of ignorant, untrained, flat-earther types? Not at all, according to the study reported in Nature. (see The polarizing impact of science literacy and numeracy on perceived climate change risks). It turns out that the more scientifically literate you are, the less concerned you are about climate change. Scientific literacy and training leads one to follow their own rationale rather than to follow the herd. "Seeming public apathy over climate change is often attributed to a deficit in comprehension. The public knows too little science, it is claimed, to understand the evidence or avoid being misled. Widespread limits on technical reasoning aggravate the problem by forcing citizens to use unreliable cognitive heuristics to assess risk. We conducted a study to test this account and found no support for it. Members of the public with the highest degrees of science literacy and technical reasoning capacity were not the most concerned about climate change. Rather, they were the ones among whom cultural polarization was greatest. This result suggests that public divisions over climate change stem not from the public’s incomprehension of science but from a distinctive conflict of interest: between the personal interest individuals have in forming beliefs in line with those held by others with whom they share close ties and the collective one they all share in making use of the best available science to promote common welfare." If something just doesn't smell right about the smug but dire predictions frantically pumped out by the media and platoons of alarmist bloggers, you're going to question it. Particularly if you have a fundamental understanding of science and experience with the vagaries of the science/politics/media triumvirate. In the long run, continued climate-change fear mongering, hyperbole and name calling will destroy what little public interest is left. We might even see a 'brown' rebound, and that would be tragic.

#### No catastrophic warming – best science proves – dismiss claims of “consensus”

Bast & Spencer 14 (Joseph Bast is president of the Heartland Institute, and Roy Spencer is a principal research scientist for the University of Alabama in Huntsville and the U.S. Science Team Leader for the Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer on NASA's Aqua satellite, “The Myth of the Climate Change '97%',” 5/26, <http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303480304579578462813553136>)

Rigorous international surveys conducted by German scientists Dennis Bray and Hans von Storch —most recently published in Environmental Science & Policy in 2010—have found that most climate scientists disagree with the consensus on key issues such as the reliability of climate data and computer models. They do not believe that climate processes such as cloud formation and precipitation are sufficiently understood to predict future climate change. Surveys of meteorologists repeatedly find a majority oppose the alleged consensus. Only 39.5% of 1,854 American Meteorological Society members who responded to a survey in 2012 said ~~man~~-made global warming is dangerous. Finally, **the U.N.'s** Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change—which claims to speak for more than 2,500 scientists—**is** probably **the most frequently cited source for** the **consensus**. Its latest report claims that "human interference with the climate system is occurring, and climate change poses risks for human and natural systems." **Yet relatively few have** either **written on or reviewed research having to do with the key question: How much of the** temperature increase and other **climate changes observed in the 20th century was caused by ~~man~~-made greenhouse-gas emissions?** The IPCC lists only 41 authors and editors of the relevant chapter of the Fifth Assessment Report addressing "anthropogenic and natural radiative forcing." **Of the various petitions on global warming circulated for signatures by scientists, the one by the Petition Project,** a group of physicists and physical chemists based in La Jolla, Calif., **has by far the most signatures—more than 31,000 (more than 9,000 with a Ph.D.**). It was most recently published in 2009, and most signers were added or reaffirmed since 2007. **The petition states that "there is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of** . . . carbon dioxide, methane, or other **greenhouse gases is causing or will,** in the foreseeable future, **cause catastrophic heating** of the Earth's atmosphere and disruption of the Earth's climate." We could go on, but the larger point is plain. **There is** no basis **for the claim that 97% of scientists believe that ~~man~~-made climate change is a dangerous problem**.

#### No catastrophic warming – estimates exaggerated and earth is cooling

Ridley 14 (Matt, BA and DPhil degrees from Oxford University, he worked for the Economist for nine years as science editor, Washington correspondent and American editor, fellow of the Royal Society of Literature and of the Academy of Medical Sciences, and a foreign honorary member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, “Climate Forecast: Muting the Alarm,” March 27, <http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303725404579460973643962840>)

Messrs. Lewis and Crok argue that **the average of the best observationally based studies shows the amount of immediate warming to be expected if carbon dioxide levels double after 70 years is "likely" to be** between one and two degrees Centigrade, with a best estimate of **1.35C** (or 2.4F). That's **much lower than the IPCC assumes** in its forthcoming report. In short, the warming we experienced over the past 35 years—about 0.4C (or 0.7F) if you average the measurements made by satellites and those made by ground stations—is likely to continue at about the same rate: a little over a degree a century. Briefly during the 1990s there did seem to be warming that went as fast as the models wanted. But **for the past** 15-**17 years there has been** essentially **no net warming (a "hiatus"** now **conceded by the IPCC**), **a fact that** the **models did not predict and now struggle to explain**. The favorite post-hoc explanation is that because of natural variability in ocean currents more heat has been slipping into the ocean since 2000—although the evidence for this is far from conclusive. None of this contradicts basic physics. Doubling carbon dioxide cannot on its own generate more than about 1.1C (2F) of warming, however long it takes. All the putative warming above that level would come from amplifying factors, chiefly related to water vapor and clouds. The net effect of these factors is the subject of contentious debate. In climate science, the real debate has never been between "deniers" and the rest, but between "lukewarmers," who think ~~man-made~~ climate change is real but fairly harmless, and those who think the future is alarming. Scientists like Judith Curry of the Georgia Institute of Technology and Richard Lindzen of MIT MITD 0.00% have moved steadily toward lukewarm views in recent years. Even with its too-high, too-fast assumptions, the recently leaked draft of **the IPCC impacts report makes clear that when it comes to the effect on human welfare**, "for most economic sectors, **the impact of climate change will be** small relative to the impacts of other drivers," such as economic growth and technology, for the rest of this century. If temperatures change by about 1C degrees between now and 2090, as Mr. Lewis calculates, then the effects will be even smaller.

### 2NC - No Weather Impacts

#### Even if warming’s inevitable, it won’t cause increased storms or flooding—best and newest science proves no correlation

**NIPCC 13** Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change, 1/15 “Global Tropical Cyclone Activity of the Past Five Thousand Years” http://nipccreport.org/articles/2013/jan/15jan2013a1.html

\*\*Citing Nott and Forsyth, of the Centre for Tropical Environmental Sustainability Science, School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, James Cook University, Cairns, Queensland, Australia

In the words of Nott and Forsyth (2012), "understanding the long-term **natural variability** of tropical cyclones (TCs) is important for forecasting their future behavior and for the detection and attribution of changes in their activity as a consequence of anthropogenically induced climate change." And they state, in this regard, that "critical to these endeavors is determining whether, over the long-term, TCs occur randomly or display identifiable patterns influenced by one or several factors."

In an effort designed to shed some light on this important subject, Nott and Forsyth present what they describe as "new sedimentary data from the southwest (SW) Pacific and southeast (SE) Indian Ocean regions which allow us to make comparisons with existing sediment records from the Atlantic Ocean (Donnelly and Woodruff, 2007; Mann et al., 2009), northwest (NW) Pacific (Woodruff et al., 2009), Gulf of Mexico (Liu and Fearn, 1993, 2000; Lane et al., 2011) and the Gulf of Carpentaria, Australia (Rhodes et al., 1980)." And based upon such comparisons, the two Australian researchers report that "long-term global TC activity is not random." Rather, there is, as they demonstrate, "a **substantial degree of synchroneity** in global intense TC behavior over the past 3,000 to 5,000 years." Indeed, they say that "one of the most striking aspects of these records is they all display **extended alternating periods** (centuries to millennia) of relative quiescence and heightened intense TC activity irrespective of both the resolution and type of long-term TC record."

Based on such findings, **it is clear that something has orchestrated the ebbing and flowing of global TC activity over the last 5,000 years**, but that something has **most certainly not been changes in the atmosphere's CO2 concentration**, as it has remained quite stable over this entire period (with the exception of the past 100 years or so, when it has risen substantially, but without any demonstrable change in global TC activity). As a result, **there is no compelling reason to believe that any further increase in the air's CO2 content will have any significant impact on these destructive storms**.

#### Academic consensus—specifically regarding extremely weather events—doesn’t go aff

**Black 11** Richard Black, Environment Correspondent for BBC News, “Mixed messages on climate 'vulnerability'” http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-15698183

But when you get down to specifics, the **academic consensus is far less certain**.

There is "**low confidence**" that tropical cyclones have become more frequent, "limited-to-medium evidence available" to assess whether climatic factors have changed the frequency of floods, and "**low confidence**" on a global scale even on whether the frequency has risen or fallen.

In terms of attribution of trends to rising greenhouse gas concentrations, the uncertainties continue.

While it is "likely" that anthropogenic influences are behind the changes in cold days and warm days, there is only "medium confidence" that they are behind changes in extreme rainfall events, and "low confidence" in attributing any changes in tropical cyclone activity to greenhouse gas emissions or anything else humanity has done.

(These terms have specific meanings in IPCC-speak, with "very likely" meaning 90-100% and "likely" 66-100%, for example.)

And for the future, the draft gives even less succour to those seeking here a new mandate for urgent action on greenhouse gas emissions, declaring: "Uncertainty in the sign of projected changes in climate extremes over the coming two to three decades is relatively large because climate change signals are expected to be relatively small compared to natural climate variability".

It's also explicit in laying out that the rise in impacts we've seen from extreme weather events **cannot be laid at the door of greenhouse gas emissions**: "Increasing exposure of people and economic assets is the major cause of the long-term changes in economic disaster losses (high confidence).

"Long-term trends in normalized economic disaster losses **cannot be** reliably **attributed to** natural or **anthropogenic climate change."**

## 2NC – Warming Answers – AT Blocks

### 2NC- No Warming AT: Consensus –

#### Consensus is wrong

**Taylor 2/8** James M. Taylor, J.D., is managing editor of Environment & Climate News“Survey Shows Geoscientists and Engineers Are Skeptics” 2/8/13 http://news.heartland.org/newspaper-article/2013/02/08/survey-shows-geoscientists-and-engineers-are-skeptics

Only **36 percent of geoscientists and engineers** believe humans are creating a global warming crisis, according to a newly published survey reported in the **peer-reviewed** Organization Studies. The survey throws cold water on assertions by global warming alarmists that nearly all scientists agree humans are causing a global warming crisis.  
Nearly two-thirds of the 1,077 survey respondents said nature is the primary cause of recent global warming and/or that future global warming will **not be a very serious problem**.  
The survey is particularly compelling given **geoscientists’ focus on Earth science issues**.  
The survey results show geoscientists and engineers hold similar views as meteorologists. Two recent surveys of meteorologists (summarized here and here) **revealed similar skepticism regarding alarmist global warming claims**.

### 2NC - AT Tipping point

#### Warming tipping points inevitable – too late

**NPR 9** (1/26, Global Warming Is Irreversible, Study Says, All Things Considered, http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=99888903)

**Climate change is** essentially **irreversible**, according to a sobering new scientific study. As carbon dioxide emissions continue to rise, the world will experience more and more long-term environmental disruption. **The damage will persist even** when, and **if, emissions are brought under control, says** study author Susan **Solomon, who is among the world's top climate scientists**. "We're used to thinking about pollution problems as things that we can fix," Solomon says. "Smog, we just cut back and everything will be better later. Or haze, you know, it'll go away pretty quickly." That's the case for some of the gases that contribute to climate change, such as methane and nitrous oxide. But as Solomon and colleagues suggest in a new study published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, it is not true for the most abundant greenhouse gas: carbon dioxide. **Turning off the carbon dioxide emissions won't stop global warming**. "People have imagined that if we stopped emitting carbon dioxide that the climate would go back to normal in 100 years or 200 years. What we're showing here is that's not right. **It's** essentially **an irreversible change that will last for more than a thousand years,**" Solomon says. This is because **the oceans are** currently **soaking up** a lot of **the planet's excess heat — and** a lot of the **carbon dioxide put into the air. The carbon dioxide and heat will eventually start coming out of the ocean**. And that will take place for many hundreds of years. **Solomon is a scientist with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration**. Her new study looked at the consequences of this long-term effect in terms of sea level rise and drought.

### 2NC - AT Run-away warming

#### No Runaway Warming

**Taylor, 2k11** (James Taylor, senior fellow for environment policy at [The Heartland Institute](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/9338939/Global-warming-second-thoughts-of-an-environmentalist.html) and managing editor of Environment & Climate News, “Peer-Reviewed Study Finds Lower Probability of Extreme Climate Change” November 29th, 2011, Online @ <http://news.heartland.org/newspaper-article/2011/11/29/peer-reviewed-study-finds-lower-probability-extreme-climate-change> ht)

A newly published study in the peer-reviewed journal Science shows **climate has historically been less sensitive to changes in atmospheric carbon dioxide than United Nations computer models are programmed to assume.** According to the Science study, **a full doubling of atmospheric carbon dioxide will likely cause 2.3 degrees Celsius of warming rather than the UN-assumed 3.0 degrees of warming.** (For context, since the dawn of the Industrial Revolution, atmospheric carbon dioxide levels have risen only 40 percent.) “[T]hese **results imply lower probability of imminent extreme climatic change than previously thought,”** the Science study reports. While **the 2.3 degree prediction** is still likely too high, it **continues a consistent trend of newer global warming models predicting less future warming than had been previously predicted**. Reading statements from some of the most media-prominent alarmists, one would think they never predicted much warming in the first place. **“I was not terribly worried about runaway climate change before this. After all, we know that the Earth’s had much higher CO2 in the past** (and **the temperature were correspondingly much higher**), and **the Earth did not turn into Venus,”** prominent global warming alarmist Andy Dessler [told the](http://www.forbes.com/sites/larrybell/2012/05/29/global-warming-alarmism-when-science-is-fiction/) Houston Chronicle. It is certainly helpful to have reached agreement on such an important scientific point.

#### Warming feedbacks are negative – which means that warming won’t be fast.

David Bellamy PhD and Jack Barrett PhD 2007 OBE, founding president at the Conservation Foundation in London ; member of the advisory forum for the Scientific Alliance in Cambridge PROCEEDINGS OF THE INSTITUTION OF CIVIL ENGINEERS – CIVIL ENGINEERING, 2007, 160, No. CE2

Less than half of the CO2 produced by burning fossil fuels remains in the Earth’s atmosphere. The majority is either absorbed by the oceans or used in extra photosynthesis,17 both having benefits for the biomass in the two regions. The extra greening of the Earth affects the ‘albedo’— the fraction of the solar radiation reflected into space which therefore does not participate in the greenhouse effect—and is a negative feedback. Green matter reflects more energy than brown stuff. Other feedbacks include the positive feedback from extra water vapour associated with higher temperatures. Extra water vapour would increase the extent of absorption of terrestrial radiation and contribute to enhance global warming, but it would also compete with CO2 because there is spectral overlap. It would also contribute to more cloudiness and more rainfall, the extra cloudiness also affecting the albedo in such a way as to reduce the effectiveness of the solar radiation, a negative feedback. There must be a balancing of the positive and negative feedbacks over real time otherwise we would have a runaway situation, and that does not seem to be happening. Such runaway would only possibly occur if the infrared window was to be closed, as it is on Venus, and this is not possible on Earth.

### 2NC - AT Positive Feedbacks

#### **Positive feedbacks are impossible---C02 could double and we’d be fine**

Lindzen, MIT Meteorology professor, 2009 (Richard, Member of the National Academy of Sciences, PhD, Harvard, “The Climate Science Isn't Settled”, 11-30, [http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703939404574567423917025400.html](http://www.forbes.com/sites/warrenmeyer/2012/02/09/understanding-the-global-warming-debate/4/), DOA: 1-28-12)

Claims that climate change is accelerating are bizarre. There is general support for the assertion that GATA has increased about 1.5 degrees Fahrenheit since the middle of the 19th century. The quality of the data is poor, though, and because the changes are small, it is easy to nudge such data a few tenths of a degree in any direction. Several of the emails from the University of East Anglia's Climate Research Unit (CRU) that have caused such a public ruckus dealt with how to do this so as to maximize apparent changes. The general support for warming is based not so much on the quality of the data, but rather on the fact that there was a little ice age from about the 15th to the 19th century. Thus it is not surprising that temperatures should increase as we emerged from this episode. At the same time that we were emerging from the little ice age, the industrial era began, and this was accompanied by increasing emissions of greenhouse gases such as CO2, methane and nitrous oxide. CO2 is the most prominent of these, and it is again generally accepted that it has increased by about 30%. The defining characteristic of a greenhouse gas is that it is relatively transparent to visible light from the sun but can absorb portions of thermal radiation. In general, the earth balances the incoming solar radiation by emitting thermal radiation, and the presence of greenhouse substances inhibits cooling by thermal radiation and leads to some warming. That said, the main greenhouse substances in the earth's atmosphere are water vapor and high clouds. Let's refer to these as major greenhouse substances to distinguish them from the anthropogenic minor substances. Even a doubling of CO2 would only upset the original balance between incoming and outgoing radiation by about 2%. This is essentially what is called "climate forcing." There is general agreement on the above findings. At this point there is no basis for alarm regardless of whether any relation between the observed warming and the observed increase in minor greenhouse gases can be established. Nevertheless, the most publicized claims of the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) deal exactly with whether any relation can be discerned. The failure of the attempts to link the two over the past 20 years bespeaks the weakness of any case for concern. The IPCC's Scientific Assessments generally consist of about 1,000 pages of text. The Summary for Policymakers is 20 pages. It is, of course, impossible to accurately summarize the 1,000-page assessment in just 20 pages; at the very least, nuances and caveats have to be omitted. However, it has been my experience that even the summary is hardly ever looked at. Rather, the whole report tends to be characterized by a single iconic claim. The main statement publicized after the last IPCC Scientific Assessment two years ago was that it was likely that most of the warming since 1957 (a point of anomalous cold) was due to ~~man~~. This claim was based on the weak argument that the current models used by the IPCC couldn't reproduce the warming from about 1978 to 1998 without some forcing, and that the only forcing that they could think of was ~~man~~. Even this argument assumes that these models adequately deal with natural internal variability—that is, such naturally occurring cycles as El Nino, the Pacific Decadal Oscillation, the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation, etc. Yet articles from major modeling centers acknowledged that the failure of these models to anticipate the absence of warming for the past dozen years was due to the failure of these models to account for this natural internal variability. Thus even the basis for the weak IPCC argument for anthropogenic climate change was shown to be false. Of course, none of the articles stressed this. Rather they emphasized that according to models modified to account for the natural internal variability, warming would resume—in 2009, 2013 and 2030, respectively. But even if the IPCC's iconic statement were correct, it still would not be cause for alarm. After all we are still talking about tenths of a degree for over 75% of the climate forcing associated with a doubling of CO2. The potential (and only the potential) for alarm enters with the issue of climate sensitivity—which refers to the change that a doubling of CO2 will produce in GATA. It is generally accepted that a doubling of CO2 will only produce a change of about two degrees Fahrenheit if all else is held constant. This is unlikely to be much to worry about. Yet current climate models predict much higher sensitivities. They do so because in these models, the main greenhouse substances (water vapor and clouds) act to amplify anything that CO2 does. This is referred to as positive feedback. But as the IPCC notes, clouds continue to be a source of major uncertainty in current models. Since clouds and water vapor are intimately related, the IPCC claim that they are more confident about water vapor is quite implausible. There is some evidence of a positive feedback effect for water vapor in cloud-free regions, but a major part of any water-vapor feedback would have to acknowledge that cloud-free areas are always changing, and this remains an unknown. At this point, few scientists would argue that the science is settled. In particular, the question remains as to whether water vapor and clouds have positive or negative feedbacks. The notion that the earth's climate is dominated by positive feedbacks is intuitively implausible, and the history of the earth's climate offers some guidance on this matter. About 2.5 billion years ago, the sun was 20%-30% less bright than now (compare this with the 2% perturbation that a doubling of CO2 would produce), and yet the evidence is that the oceans were unfrozen at the time, and that temperatures might not have been very different from today's. Carl Sagan in the 1970s referred to this as the "Early Faint Sun Paradox." For more than 30 years there have been attempts to resolve the paradox with greenhouse gases. Some have suggested CO2—but the amount needed was thousands of times greater than present levels and incompatible with geological evidence. Methane also proved unlikely. It turns out that increased thin cirrus cloud coverage in the tropics readily resolves the paradox—but only if the clouds constitute a negative feedback. In present terms this means that they would diminish rather than enhance the impact of CO2. There are quite a few papers in the literature that also point to the absence of positive feedbacks. The implied low sensitivity is entirely compatible with the small warming that has been observed. So how do models with high sensitivity manage to simulate the currently small response to a forcing that is almost as large as a doubling of CO2? Jeff Kiehl notes in a 2007 article from the National Center for Atmospheric Research, the models use another quantity that the IPCC lists as poorly known (namely aerosols) to arbitrarily cancel as much greenhouse warming as needed to match the data, with each model choosing a different degree of cancellation according to the sensitivity of that model.

### 2NC -AT: Warming => War

#### No war impacts – the most recent and detailed compilation of studies proves

Sage ’12 (“CLIMATE CHANGE LINK TO WAR REMAINS TENUOUS”, Feb 1, <http://www.sagepub.com/press/2012/february/SAGE_CLIMATECHANGELINKWARREMAINSTENUOUS.sp>, CMR)

Los Angeles, CA (February 1, 2012) - Does climate change sow the seeds of war? Until recently, most answers to this political question have been based on speculation. **A landmark issue of the Journal of Peace Research** (JPR) **published by SAGE on behalf of the Peace Research Institute Oslo** (PRIO) **investigates** a host of potential **causes for conflict.** Many other factors **have a** far greater influence **than climate change on peace and stability**, most of the studies conclude.

On balance, the **authors** featured in JPR **only find limited support for an influence of climate change on armed conflict**. But this does not eliminate the possibility that when climate issues are framed as a security problem, this may influence actor perception and contribute to a self-fulfilling prophecy.

**In the** largest collection **of** peer-reviewed **writings on the topic** to date**, the authors employ systematic climate data and climate projections**. Most of the articles deal with civil war, a few with international war, and several studies go beyond state-based conflict to look at possible implications for communal conflict and other kinds of violence.

A number of studies focus on the role of rainfall. Cullen **Hendrix and** Idean **Salehyan (College of William and Mary and U**niversity of **N**orth **T**exas respectively) **use a new database of over 6000 conflicts over two decades in Africa. They find that** rainfall variability affects both large and small-scale political conflict but that **violent events are actually more likely in years of abundant rainfall. This** finding **casts doubt on the** common **assumption** **linking drought to violent conflict. Similar results are found in studies of Kenya (by** Ole Magnus **Theisen of the Norwegian University of Science and Technology**, NTNU) **and East Africa (by** Dominic **Kniveton of the University of Sussex and** Clionadh **Raleigh of Trinity College Dublin**). Studies of Kenya's drylands (by scholars in Germany and the Netherlands), Central Asia (by scholars at ETH Zürich), the Israel-Palestine conflict (by authors from both sides), and in two studies of international river basins (by authors from the Universities of Freiburg, Georgia, Oregon, and Colorado) suggest that institutional agreements are important to avoid an escalation of disputes about water allocations to armed clashes.

Another frequently posited link between climate change and conflict is the rate of natural disasters. Disasters are assumed to hurt growth and weaken the central government. However, **economists** Drago **Bergholt (Norwegian Business School) and** Päivi **Lujala (NTNU) find that** although more frequent **climate-related disasters** has a negative effect on economic growth, this **does not translate into more armed conflict**. More generally, Rune Slettebak (NTNU) finds that natural disasters actually tend to lower the risk of civil war. He finds more support for a perspective **from crisis sociology**, that people unite in adversity, There is a real risk that blaming the weather might be a distraction from more important causes of conflict, he warns.

An analysis of the 2005-09 World Values Survey (by scholars at NTNU) documents strong world-wide concern about global warming and suggests that this might eventually generate mass political participation and demand for political action. However, they find that variation across nations in wealth and CO2 emissions is not significantly related to the publics' assessments of the problem. Paradoxically, people from countries commonly believed to be more severely affected by climate change are less, not more concerned about global warming. Erik **Gartzke** (**University of California, San Diego) points out that** economic **development drives peace as well as climate change.** Thus, efforts to curb climate change in middle-income nations, if these limit income, may actually have a destabilising effect in security terms.

#### Zero Connection Between Climate Change and War

**Jeff Kueter, President, George C. Marshall Institute, May 2012** (http://www.marshall.org/pdf/materials/1089.pdf)

On May 3, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta told the Environmental Defense Fund that “the area of climate change has a dramatic impact on national security” because the various purported impacts of a warming climate “all raise demand for humanitarian assistance and disaster relief.” According to the Defense Department’s press account (“Panetta: Environment Emerges as National Security Concern,” American Forces Press Service, May 3, 2012), the Secretary then called for ratification of the Law of the Sea Treaty and discussed the military’s concerns about fuel costs. **The linkage between climate change and U.S. national security concerns is tenuous.** While the Defense Department has significant interests in examining its use of energy, those concerns are not related to the climate-conflict hypothesis. Energy is expensive, requires a complicated supply and logistics operation, and puts men and women in harm’s way as fuel convoys move through hostile environments. None of those concerns are related to climate change and any steps the military may take in this area will (or, at least, ought to be) judged on the merits of their contribution to military missions. No reasonable or unreasonable case can be made for DOD energy consumption being anything more than a trivial contributor to anthropogenic climate effects. But, the linkage between “rising sea levels, severe droughts, the melting of the polar caps, the more frequent and devastating natural disasters” and increasing demand for U.S. disaster and humanitarian operations cited by Secretary Panetta rests on little more than **conjecture and speculation**. Predicting the future in a way that is meaningful for preparing strategy, budgets, programs or the composition and character of the nation’s armed forces is challenging enough in those areas where defense planners have great experience and deep understanding. Projecting the assumed effects of human-induced climate change is imprecise. Climate forecasting rests on a mountain of assumptions about how the natural climate operates, how climatic variables interact with each other, how those interactions are best mathematically represented in a climate model, and whether there is adequate data to measure the variables. The climate models used to forecast the future fail to deliver (and may be incapable of producing) useful predictions at the regional level, which is the frame of analysis most pertinent to defense and security planning.

### AT Warming Migrants

#### No warming refugees – people will just move to cities AND this makes populations more stable

Vidal **2-4**-11 [John Vidal, environment editor at the Guardian, “Climate change not expected to lead to mass cross-border migration,” http://www.guardian.co.uk/global-development/poverty-matters/2011/feb/04/climate-climate-refugees]

Alarming predictions by the UN, charities and some environmentalists that between 200 million and 1 billion people could flood across international borders to escape the impacts of climate change in the next 40 years are unrealistic, distract from the real problems and could actually impoverish vulnerable people, new research suggests. Case studies from Bolivia, Senegal and Tanzania, three countries extremely prone to climate change, show that people affected by environmental degradation rarely move across borders. Instead, they adapt to new circumstances by moving short distances for short periods, often to cities. "The studies give no reason to think that environmental degradation linked to climate change will result in large flows of international migrants," says Cecilia Tacoli, a senior researcher with the International Insititute for Environment and Development (IIED) in London. "People affected by environmental degradation rarely moved across borders. Instead they moved to other rural areas or to local towns, often temporarily," she says. "This kind of migration," says Tacoli, "is a positive response by people being affected by desertification, soil degradation, disrupted rainfall patterns and the changes in temperature associated with climate change." Dire predictions of waves of forced climate change "refugees" have been made for more than 20 years. In 1990, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) said that its greatest single impact might be on human migration – with millions of people displaced by shoreline erosion, coastal flooding and agricultural disruption. Since then, Lord Stern, Christian Aid and environmentalists like Norman Myers predict that by 2050 between 200 million and 1 billion people could be displaced primarily because of environmental degradation linked to climate change. In fact, says Tacoli, non-environmental factors largely determine the duration, destination and composition of migrant flows. "Temporary migration is more likely to be directed towards urban centres, and increasingly towards smaller towns. Young people also move to towns, with boys as young as 14 going to work in construction and services such as watchmen," she says. Far from being a loss to local economies, Tacoli found that when people do move internationally they often invest back in their home regions, strengthening the economy and actually reducing people's vulnerability to climate change. "Both the relatively common internal migration and the relatively rare international migration can support poor people who are at risk from climate change," she says. "Migration is part of the solution, not part of the problem as many people think." "There is a danger," she says, "that alarmist predictions will backfire and result in policies that marginalise the poorest and most vulnerable groups. Governments often view migrants as a problem and either provide little support or actively discourage them from moving." Unfortunately, most governments and international agencies tend to see migration as a problem that needs to be controlled instead of a key part of the solution. "In doing so, they are missing opportunities to develop policies that can increase people's resilience to climate change. Policymakers need to redefine migration and see it as a valuable adaptive response to environmental risks and not as problem that needs to be tackled," says Tacoli. "We need rational, realistic responses to climate-change, not knee-jerk reactions that create new problems and increase vulnerability."

### AT: Coral Reefs

#### Most recent, peer reviewed study disproves warming harms coral reefs

C3 Headlines 5/23/12 (“Carbon Dioxide Emissions Facts: Ocean Acidification Impact On Marine Species Overestimated, Study Finds” http://www.c3headlines.com/are-coral-reefs-dying/, PZ)

Alarmists and anti-CO2 activists have loudly suggested that sea water that becomes more "acidified" will significantly harm marine species. Listening to the alarmists, one would surmise that mollusks such as clams and oysters would literally have their shells disappear from lower pH levels of oceans. A new peer reviewed study by Parker et al. punctures this hot air balloon of alarmism with empirical evidence from actual experiments. "The authors write that studies on the impact of ocean acidification on marine organisms that have been conducted to date "have only considered the impacts on 'adults' or 'larvae', ignoring the potential link between the two life-history stages and the possible carry-over effects that may be passed from adult to offspring,"...placed adults of wild-collected and selectively-bred populations of the Sydney rock oyster which they obtained at the beginning of reproductive conditioning - within seawater equilibrated with air of either 380 ppm CO2 (near-ambient) or 856 ppm CO2 (predicted for 2100 by the IPCC)...found that the larvae spawned from adults living in the "acidified" seawater were the same size as those spawned from adults living in near-ambient seawater; but they report that "larvae spawned form adults exposed to elevated CO2 were larger and developed faster."...concluding that the results of their work suggest that "marine organisms may have the capacity to acclimate or adapt to elevated CO2 over the next century."" [Laura M. Parker, Pauline M. Ross, Wayne A. O'Connor, Larissa Borysko, David A. Raftos, Hans-Otto Pörtner 2012: Global Change Biology] Conclusion: Climate alarmists claims of the ocean acidification impact on marine species has not been factual. As researchers continue their research, the carbon dioxide emissions facts are being firmly established with empirical evidence while exposing the frequent fearmongering and exaggerations to scientific sunlight.

#### No impact to warming - reefs are resilient and will adapt

P. Gosselin 6/28/11 - an Associate Degree in Civil Engineering at Vermont Technical College and a Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering at the University of Arizona in Tucson (“Threat to Coral Reefs Exaggerated, Says New Study” <http://notrickszone.com/2011/07/28/threat-to-coral-reefs-exaggerated-says-new-study/>, PZ)

Some scientists and media have gotten much attention claiming that the world’s coral reefs could disappear in as little as 20 to 30 years – all because of humans consuming fossil fuels and whatever. Now the Financial Times Germany reports on a study that claims this is all exaggerated. The world’s largest coral reef off the east coast of Australia is not going to disappear as fast as once previously thought, according to a new study. Warnings that the Great Barrier Reef could die off due to climate change over the next 20 to 30 years are exaggerated says Sean Connolly of the James Cook University.” This comes to no surprise for skeptics. How many millions of years and through what ranges of temperature swings have the coral reefs survived so far? Indeed a few tenths of a degree Celsius of change over decades will have no impact on the reefs. And I seriously doubt the reefs are going to do what the models tell them. The James Cook University Press release here says: …some current projections of global-scale collapse of reefs within the next few decades probably overestimate the rapidity and uniformity of the decline.” Again, if the relatively sudden transition from ice age to optimum did not kill them, why would a few tenths of a degree over decades or centuries do it? Wikipedia writes that coral reefs in the Persian Gulf have adapted to temperatures of 13 °C (55 °F) in winter and 38 °C (100 °F) in summer, i.e. 25°C change in 6 months. Like any species on the planet, reefs are always threatened by something. The press release writes: However reefs are naturally highly diverse and resilient, and are likely to respond to the changed conditions in different ways and at varying rates.” The James Cook press release, despite its obvious findings, still tries to convey an aura of alarm (for funding) yet admits that climate change is a natural process that has occurred time and again in the past. Past extinction crises in coral reef ecosystems appear to coincide with episodes of rapid global warming and ocean acidification, they say. This has led some to predict rapid, dramatic, global-scale losses of coral reefs.” The rapid changes they mention here were measured in degrees per decade and century, and not tenths of a degree as is the case with today’s relatively boring rate of change.

### AT: Hurricanes

#### Warming doesn’t increase hurricanes

**Idso and Idso 11** [Craig D., founder and chairman of the board of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, B.S. in Geography from Arizona State University, his M.S. in Agronomy from the University of Nebraska - Lincoln, and his Ph.D. in Geography from Arizona State University, former Director of Environmental Science at Peabody Energy, faculty researcher in the Office of Climatology at Arizona State University; and Sherwood, President of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, former Research Physicist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Research Service, Adjunct Professor in the Departments of Geology, Geography, and Botany and Microbiology at ASU, M.S from UMinnesota, receipt of the Arthur S. Flemming Award, "Carbon Dioxide and Earth’s Future," 1-31-11, http://www.co2science.org/education/reports/prudentpath/prudentpath.pdf]

Focusing on five ocean basins -- the Atlantic (1960-2007), the Western North Pacific (19602007), the Eastern North Pacific (1960-2007), the South Indian Ocean (1981-2007), and the South Pacific (1981-2007) -- Chan (2009) examined (1) the relationship between the seasonally averaged maximum potential intensity (MPI, an index of thermodynamic forcing) over each basin where TCs typically form and (2) the seasonal frequency of occurrence of intense TCs. In doing so, he determined that “only in the Atlantic does the MPI have a statistically significant relationship with the number of intense TCs, explaining about 40% of the variance,” while “in other ocean basins, there is either no correlation or the correlation is not significant.” The People’s Republic of China’s researcher thus states that “even in the Atlantic, where a significant correlation between the thermodynamic factors and the frequency of intense TCs exists, it is not clear whether global warming will produce a net increase in such a frequency, because model projections suggest an increase in vertical wind shear associated with an increase in sea surface temperature,” which phenomenon tends to work against intense TC development. As a result, Chan concludes that “it remains uncertain whether the frequency of occurrence of intense TCs will increase under a global warming scenario.” The results of this exercise led the two U.S. scientists to state that “TC activity in the NA varies out-of-phase with that in the ENP on both interannual and multidecadal timescales,” so that “when TC activity in the NA increases (decreases), TC activity in the ENP decreases (increases).” And they found that “the out-of-phase relationship seems to [have] become stronger in the recent decades,” as evidenced by the fact that the interannual and multidecadal correlations between the NA and ENP ACE indices were -0.70 and -0.43, respectively, for the period 19492007, but -0.79 and -0.59, respectively, for the period 1979-2007. In terms of the combined TC activity over the NA and ENP ocean basins as a whole, however, there was little variability on either interannual or multidecadal timescales; and real-world empirical data suggest that the variability that does exist over the conglomerate of the two basins has grown slightly weaker as the earth has warmed over the past six decades, which runs counter to climate-alarmist claims that earth’s hurricanes or tropical cyclones should become more numerous, stronger and longer-lasting as temperatures rise. Most recently, Wang et al. (2010) examined cross-basin spatial-temporal variations of TC storm days for the Western North Pacific (WNP), the Eastern North Pacific (ENP), the North Atlantic (NAT), the North Indian Ocean (NIO), and the Southern Hemisphere Ocean (SHO) over the period 1965-2008, for which time interval pertinent satellite data were obtained from the U.S. Navy’s Joint Typhoon Warning Center for the WNP, NIO and SHO, and from NASA’s (USA) National Hurricane Center for the NAT and ENP. And as a result of their efforts, they were able to report that “over the period of 1965-2008, the global TC activity, as measured by storm days, shows a large amplitude fluctuation regulated by the El Niño-Southern Oscillation and the Pacific Decadal Oscillation, but has no trend, suggesting that the rising temperature so far has not yet [had] an impact on the global total number of storm days.” So what does the future hold for us in terms of hurricanes? Based on the numerous empirical observations from the ocean basins described above, it is clear that there is no support for the climate-alarmist claim that global warming increases both the frequency and intensity of hurricanes. In fact, the data seem to suggest just the opposite. Thus, if the world warms any further in the future, for whatever reason (anthropogenic or natural), we would expect to see fewer and less intense hurricanes than have occurred recently.

## 1NC Economy Advantage

### 1NC Economy Frontline

#### \_\_\_ They don’t solve the Economy –

*insert your own explanation*

#### \_\_ No Internal Link – Warming has no effect on global growth

Ridley 14 (Matt, BA and DPhil degrees from Oxford University, he worked for the Economist for nine years as science editor, Washington correspondent and American editor, before becoming a self-employed writer and businessman, fellow of the Royal Society of Literature and of the Academy of Medical Sciences, and a foreign honorary member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, “We have a new climate change consensus — and it's good news everyone,” <http://www.spectator.co.uk/features/9176121/armageddon-averted/>)

**The report puts** the **global aggregate economic damage from climate change at less than 2.5 per cent of income** by the latter years of the century. This is a far lower number than Lord Stern arrived at in his notorious report of 2006, and this is taking the bleak view that there will be a further 2.5˚C rise from recent levels. This is the highest of nine loss estimates; the average is only 1.1 per cent. And the IPCC is projecting two thirds more warming per increment of carbon dioxide than the best observationally based studies now suggest, so the warming the IPCC outlines is not even likely with the highest emissions assumption. In other words, **even if you pile pessimism** upon pessimism, **assuming** relatively **little decarbonisation**, much global enrichment and **higher climate ‘sensitivity’** than now looks plausible — **leading to more rapid climate change — you still, on the worst estimate, hurt the world economy in a century by only about as much as it grows every year or two. Rather than inflict an awful economic toll, global warming would make our very rich descendants** — who are likely to be maybe eight or nine times as rich as we are today, on global average — **a bit less rich**.

#### \_\_\_ Trade is Non-Unique - US trade leadership is already down – lack of access markets and discriminatory rules.

Elliott 13 (Kimberly Ann Elliott, senior fellow at the Center for Global Development, “Restoring US Leadership on Trade and Development” 3/28/13 http://www.cgdev.org/publication/restoring-us-leadership-trade-and-development )

The stated priorities for US trade policy this year are completing the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) and launching the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership with the European Union. These regional trade deals will not necessarily be as problematic as their more outspoken critics contend, but they could make trade and growth even more difficult for excluded poor countries. US trade policy already discriminates against exports from poor Asian countries; the TPP could make things worse by, for example, giving preference to Vietnam’s exports over Cambodia’s. The proliferation of regional agreements also undermines the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the global rule-based trade system that particularly protects smaller, weaker developing countries. Taking the steps outlined in this brief would allow the United States to regain the leadership role it lost when other rich countries opened their markets to least developed countries (LDCs) as part of the global partnership under the Millennium Development Goals. Currently, the United States is behind even China and India in providing duty-free market access for poor countries.1 Taking these steps could also revitalize the WTO, which would benefit the US business community, as well as developing countries, and the gains would come at little or no cost to importcompeting sectors because LDCs account for less than 1 percent of total US imports.

**\_\_\_ No global economic collapse and it wouldn’t cause conflict**

**Drezner ’11** (Daniel Drezner, professor of international politics at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, 8-12-2011, “Please come down off the ledge, dear readers,” Foreign polivy, <http://drezner.foreignpolicy.com/>, CMR)

So, **when we last left off** this debate, **things were looking grim**. My concern in the last post was that the persistence of hard times would cause governments to take actions that would lead to a collapse of the open global economy, a spike in general riots and disturbances, and eerie echoes of the Great Depression. **Let's assume** that **the global economy persists in sputtering for a while**, because that's what happens after major financial shocks. **Why won't** these other **bad things happen? Why isn't it 1931?** Let's start with the obvious -- **it's not gonna be 1931 because there's some passing familiarity with how 1931 played out**. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve has devoted much of his academic career to studying the Great Depression. I'm gonna go out on a limb therefore and assert that if the world plunges into a another severe downturn, it's not gonna be because central bank heads replay the same set of mistakes. **The legacy of the Great Depression has also affected public attitudes and institutions that provide much stronger cement for the current system.** In terms of publuc attitudes, compare the results of this mid-2007 poll with this mid-2010 poll about which economic system is best. I'll just reproduce the key charts below: 2007 poll results 2010 poll results The headline of the 2010 results is that there's eroding U.S. support for the global economy, but a few other things stand out. U.S. support has declined, but it's declined from a very high level. In contrast, **support for free markets has increased in other major powers**, such as Germany and China. On the whole, **despite the worst global economic crisis** since the Great Depression, **public attitudes have not changed all that much**. **While there might be populist demands to "do something," that something is not a return to autarky** or anything so drastc. Another big difference is that **multilateral economic institutions are much more robust** now than they were in 1931. On trade matters, even if the Doha round is dead, the rest of **the W**orld **T**rade **O**rganization**'s** **corpus of trade-liberalizing measures are** still **working quite well.** Even beyond the WTO, the complaint about trade is not the deficit of free-trade agreements but the surfeit of them. **The IMF's resources have been strengthened as a result of the 2008 financial crisis**. The Basle Committee on Banking Supervision has already promulgated a plan to strengthen capital requirements for banks. True, it's a slow, weak-assed plan, but it would be an improvement over the status quo. As for the G-20, I've been pretty skeptical about that group's abilities to collectively address serious macroeconomic problems. That is setting the bar rather high, however. One could argue that **the G-20's most useful function is reassurance**. Even if there are disagreements, **communication can prevent them from growing into anything worse.** Finally, **a note about the possibility of riots and** other **general social unrest.** **The working paper** cited in my previous post **noted the links between austerity measures and increases in disturbances**. However, that paper contains the following important paragraph on page 19**: [I]n countries with better institutions, the responsiveness of unrest to budget cuts is generally lower**. **Where constraints on the executive are minimal, the coefficient on expenditure changes is strongly negative -- more spending buys a lot of social peace. In countries with Polity-2 scores above zero, the coefficient is about half in size, and less significant**. **As we limit the sample to ever more democratic countries, the size of the coefficient declines**. For full democracies with a complete range of civil rights, the coefficient is still negative, but no longer significant. This is good news!! **The world has a hell of a lot more democratic governments now than it did in 1931**. What happened in London, in other words, might prove to be the exception more than the rule. So yes, **the recent economic news might seem grim**. Unless political institutions and public attitudes buckle, **however, we're unlikely to repeat the mistakes of the** 19**30's**. And, based on the data we've got, that's not going to happen.

### 2NC AT: Warming Hurts Economy

#### No economy impact

Ridley 14 (Matt, BA and DPhil degrees from Oxford University, he worked for the Economist for nine years as science editor, Washington correspondent and American editor, before becoming a self-employed writer and businessman, fellow of the Royal Society of Literature and of the Academy of Medical Sciences, and a foreign honorary member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, “Climate Forecast: Muting the Alarm,” March 27, <http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303725404579460973643962840>)

Others, however, hit home. According to leaks, **this time the full report is much more cautious and vague about** worsening cyclones, changes in rainfall, climate-change refugees, and **the overall cost of global warming. It puts the overall cost at less than 2% of GDP for a 2.5 degrees Centigrade** (or 4.5 degrees Fahrenheit) **temperature increase during this century. This is vastly less than the much heralded prediction of** Lord **Stern**, who said climate change would cost 5%-20% of world GDP in his influential 2006 report for the British government.

### 2NC - AT: Trade Leadership

#### Not unique – overall flows in goods makes China the global trade leader already and they’re closing the gap in services

Romei 14 (Valentina Romei, “China and US battle for trade leadership” Financial Trimes Data, Jan 10 2014, <http://blogs.ft.com/ftdata/2014/01/10/china-and-us-battle-for-trade-leadership/>)

Countries around the world have become increasingly reliant on China as a trade partner, across a wide range of goods. On the import side, this is especially true of commodities: according to the international trade centre, China accounted for one-third to half of global imports of ores, oil seeds and grains, wood and copper in 2012. For exports, its strength is manufacturing: about half the global exports of silk, apparel, leather products and footwear originate in China. However, according to the international trade data, the US still dominates trade in services. The value of its total services trade is about double that of China. The US is particularly strong in exporting services (the US exports about three times the value of Chinese services exports). Adding commercial services to merchandise trade should actually put the US back the first place in global trade (services trade data is reported later than that for the trade in goods, so we still need to wait to confirm this). But there are reasons to think that the US will soon lose this leadership as well. Despite its strength, the US services trade dominance is fading quickly. In 2006, the US exported more than five-times the value of China’s service exports, but that fell to three-times last year. Similar reductions were seen in the imports of services.

### 2NC - AT: Economic Decline Bad

#### Recovery deep and resilient – no risk of relapse

Perry 13 (Mark J, full professor of economics at the Flint campus of The University of Michigan, where he has taught undergraduate and graduate courses in economics and finance since 1996. Starting in the fall of 2009, “A testament to economic resilience,” 12-24, <http://www.aei-ideas.org/2013/12/a-testament-to-economic-resilience-world-trade-and-output-both-reached-new-all-time-record-highs-in-october/>)

Bottom Line: **World industrial output and world merchandise trade both reached new record monthly highs** in October. The **volumes of world output and trade are now both** solidly **above** their previous **peaks during** the early months of **the global slowdown in** 2008 (by 10.1% and 7.2% respectively), suggesting that **the global economy has** now **made a** complete recovery from the 2008-2009 economic slowdown. At the forefront of the global economic expansion this year are the **emerging economies**, which **experienced especially strong growth** over the last year through October in both trade volumes (4.7% export growth and 5.4% import growth) and industrial output (4.1%). The complete recovery over the last several years in the global economy **to new record highs** for both **global trade and** global industrial **output demonstrates the** incredible resiliency **of economies around the world to recover and prosper, even following the worst financial crisis** and global economic slowdown **in generations**.

**Global economy resilient**

**Zakaria ‘9**—PhD Poli Sci @ Harvard [Fareed, Editor of Newsweek, “The Secrets of Stability,” 12/12, Newsweek, <http://www.newsweek.com/id/226425>, CMR]

A key measure of fear and fragility is the ability of poor and unstable countries to borrow money on the debt markets. So consider this: the sovereign bonds of tottering Pakistan have returned 168 percent so far this year. All this doesn't add up to a recovery yet, but it does reflect a return to some level of normalcy. And that rebound has been so rapid that even the shrewdest observers remain puzzled. "The question I have at the back of my head is 'Is that it?' " says Charles Kaye, the co-head of Warburg Pincus. "We had this huge crisis, and now we're back to business as usual?"  This revival did not happen because markets managed to stabilize themselves on their own. Rather, governments, having learned the lessons of the Great Depression, were determined not to repeat the same mistakes once this crisis hit. **By** massively **expanding state support for the economy**—through central banks and national treasuries—**they buffered the worst of the damage.**(Whether they made new mistakes in the process remains to be seen.) **The extensive social safety nets that have been established across the industrialized world also cushioned the pain**felt by many. Times are still tough, but **things are nowhere near as bad as in the** 19**30s**, when governments played a tiny role in national economies.  It's true that the massive state interventions of the past year may be fueling some new bubbles: the cheap cash and government guarantees provided to banks, companies, and consumers have fueled some irrational exuberance in stock and bond markets. Yet these **rallies** also **demonstrate the return of confidence, and confidence is a** very **powerful economic force.** When John Maynard Keynes described his own prescriptions for economic growth, he believed government action could provide only a temporary fix until the real motor of the economy started cranking again—the animal spirits of investors, consumers, and companies seeking risk and profit.  Beyond all this, though, I believe **there's a fundamental reason why we have not faced**global**collapse** in the last year. It is **the same reason**that**we weathered the** stock-market **crash of 1987, the recession of 1992, the Asian crisis of 1997, the Russian default of 1998, and the tech-bubble collapse** of **2000**.**The current global economic system is inherently more resilient than we think**. The world today is characterized by three major forces for stability, each reinforcing the other and each historical in nature.

**Economic decline doesn’t cause war – people tolerate bad econ, poor countries can’t organize wars, empirical studies prove**

**Miller 1**—Professor of Economics [Morris, Professor of Economics, Poverty: A Cause of War?, <http://archive.peacemagazine.org/v17n1p08.htm>, CMR]

**Library shelves are heavy with studies focused on the correlates and causes of war**. Some of the leading scholars in that field suggest that we drop the concept of causality, since it can rarely be demonstrated. Nevertheless, it may be helpful to look at the motives of war-prone political leaders and the ways they have gained and maintained power, even to the point of leading their nations to war. Poverty: The Prime Causal Factor? **Poverty is most often named as the prime causal factor.** Therefore we approach the question by asking whether poverty is characteristic of the nations or groups that have engaged in wars. As we shall see, **poverty has never been as significant a factor as one would imagine. Largely this is because of the traits of the poor as a group - particularly their tendency to tolerate their suffering in silence and/or be deterred by the force of repressive regimes. Their voicelessness and powerlessness translate into passivity.** Also, because of their illiteracy and ignorance of worldly affairs, the poor become susceptible to the messages of war-bent demagogues and often willing to become cannon fodder. The situations conductive to war involve political repression of dissidents, tight control over media that stir up chauvinism and ethnic prejudices, religious fervor, and sentiments of revenge. The poor succumb to leaders who have the power to create such conditions for their own self-serving purposes. Desperately poor people in **poor nations cannot organize wars,** which are exceptionally costly. **The statistics speak eloquently on this point. In the last 40 years the global arms trade has been about $1500 billion, of which two-thirds were the purchases of developing countries.** That is an amount roughly equal to the foreign capital they obtained through official development aid (ODA). Since ODA does not finance arms purchases (except insofar as money that is not spent by a government on aid-financed roads is available for other purposes such as military procurement) financing is also required to control the media and communicate with the populace to convince them to support the war. Large-scale armed conflict is so expensive that governments must resort to exceptional sources, such as drug dealing, diamond smuggling, brigandry, or deal-making with other countries. The reliance on illicit operations is well documented in a recent World Bank report that studied 47 civil wars that took place between 1960 and 1999, the main conclusion of which is that the key factor is the availability of commodities to plunder. **For greed to yield war, there must be financial opportunities. Only affluent political leaders and elites can amass such weaponry,** diverting funds to the military even when this runs contrary to the interests of the population. In most inter-state wars the antagonists were wealthy enough to build up their armaments and propagandize or repress to gain acceptance for their policies. Economic Crises? **Some scholars have argued** that it is not poverty, as such, that contributes to the support for armed conflict, but rather **some catalyst, such as** an **economic crisis. However, a study by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik shows that this hypothesis lacks merit. After studying 93 episodes of economic crisis** in 22 countries in Latin American and Asia since World War II, **they concluded that much of the conventional thinking about the political impact of economic crisis is wrong: "The severity of economic crisis** - as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - **bore no relationship** to the collapse of regimes ... or (in democratic states, rarely) **to an outbreak of violence**... In the cases of dictatorships and semi-democracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another)."

## A2 Critical Advantage

### 1NC – Critical Advantage

#### 1ST – ITS NOT REVERSE CAUSAL – THEIR HARMS DESCRIBE PAST EVENTS LIKE KATRINA AND SANDY, THEY AREN’T PREDICTIVE OF FUTURE CALAMATIES – VOTE NEGATIVE ON PRESUMPTION BECAUSE THEY CAN’T QUANTIFY FUTURE HARMS

#### 2ND – MOTIVE OVERWHELMS – IF THE STRUCTURE IS OVERWHELMINGLY RACIST, THEN WHY WOULD THE PLAN CHANGE THAT. THE RACIST BIAS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PREVENTS SOLVENCY

#### 3RD – SINGLE ISSUE FOCUS FAILS – CAN’T JUST FOCUS ON CLIMATE TO ADDRESS STRUCTURAL INEQUALITY

Giroux 12—1ac author (Henry, Hurricane Sandy in the Age of Disposability and Neoliberal Terror, truth-out.org/opinion/item/13025-hurricane-sandy-in-the-age-of-disposability#XXXVI)

The late Tony Judt argued that the American public needs to open a new conversation about politics, the language of justice, popular rights and the rhetoric of public action. Judt feared that the most dangerous threat America faced was the corrosive "loss of conviction, a loss of faith in the culture of open democracy, a sense of skepticism and withdrawal which is probably already quite far advanced."33 Judt argues that progressives need to move beyond single issue movements such as climate change in order to address and regroup such issues "into a conversation about society at large."34 He rightly argued that what has "been lacking for social movements [is the need] to find a common ground beyond the fragmentation of particularized politics, to address the totality of systems steeped in authoritarian practices."35 The politics of the wreckage produced by superstorm Sandy and disposability can only be understood within a broader view of society. Hurricane Sandy reminds Americans that they have to be vigilant about what populations are considered disposable, what lives are considered "unreal ... neither alive nor dead, but interminably spectral."36 Sandy prompts the American public to be more than moved in a moment of crisis in order to become more responsible to what is happening within a larger constellation of political, historical, economic and cultural forces. If we ignore these warnings, not only will an increasing number of individuals and groups become disposable, but the very promise of democracy will be rendered unintelligible, cast outside of the realm of reason, hope, and struggle.

#### 4TH INSERT OTHER SOLVENCY FRONT LINE FROM ABOVE

### 1NC – Racism Answers

#### \_\_\_ They don’t solve Racism–

*insert your own explanation*

#### SQ solves—racism disappearing and their claims are exaggeration

Social Issues Digest 7 [Wiseto Social Issues Digest is a magazine published by The Gale Group, “Racism in America is on the Wane” http://socialissues.wiseto.com/Articles/FO3020630253/]

The twentieth century saw remarkable changes in race relations. Jim Crow laws and fears of "miscegenation" were standard in 1900. By the late 1960s, the Supreme Court decisions in Brown v. Board of Education and Loving v. Virginia (1967) had abolished school segregation and laws banning interracial marriage, and the Civil Rights movement had gathered momentum. In the twenty-first century, racism continues to wane. Some claim systematic racism still exists, decrying such practices as "racial profiling" by law enforcement and alleging "environmental racism" by businesses and government. Upon examination, most of these claims are exaggerated. John Derbyshire argues that "overwrought sensitivities" are encouraged by "unscrupulous mountebanks" trying to use race for political gain. He negates theories of racial profiling as racist, illustrating it is a realistic reaction to data, such as Department of Justice statistics showing that, in 1997, 60 percent of robbery victims reported black assailants. Blacks were also eight times as likely to commit homicide as non-blacks (including Hispanics). He argues, "…equality before the law does not…guarantee equal outcomes for any law-enforcement process, only that a citizen who has come under reasonable suspicion will be treated fairly." The Supreme Court agreed that if "...race is only one factor in a generalized approach to the questioning of suspects, it may be considered." Jim F. Couch and others state careful study of accusations that minority residential areas are more likely to have hazardous-waste dumpsites and toxic pollution from industrial plants are fallacious, explaining that "…in the first comprehensive study of toxic-waste facilities to use census-tract data, D.L. Anderton and colleagues did not find any nationally consistent correlation between minorities and pollution." Another study found "…economic factors rather than race itself account for apparent environmental racism." Little data supports allegations of systemic racism, and much evidence shows the contrary.

Despite isolated incidents of true racism and bigotry, Murdock believes that America has made "tremendous progress…from churches to the ballot box to the bedroom" and that "Americans of various ethnicities are proving that---to paraphrase Rodney King---we all can just get along." He states racism has been "decreasing" for years and that America teaches tolerance. This view is supported by much empirical evidence. Murdock notes the achievements of black politicians elected by majorities of white voters, something he asserts would not happen in a land of "white bigots"; a steady decrease in anti-Semitism, illustrated by decreasing anti-Semitic crimes and acceptance of Jews in show business and intermarriages between Jews and gentiles; and growing rates of intermarriage in general. Orlando Patterson agrees with Murdock, stating that racism "will soon disappear in America," due to the ongoing hybridization of culture caused by immigration and migration patterns, sociological developments, intermarriage, and biotechnology. "By the middle of the twenty-first century," he states, "the social virus of race will have gone the way of smallpox."

Though racism has not been completely erased from American consciousness, the past 100 years prove how much society can progress. Within the next century, racism in America faces extinction.

#### Even if racism still exists it’s not sufficient to cause their impacts—attempting to solve it through the state turns it into a political pawn that renders movements irrelevant, turning case

Steele, LA Times, 6 [SHELBY STEELE, a research fellow at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, is the author of "White Guilt," published earlier this year. “Racism -- fact or faith?” http://www.latimes.com/news/printedition/asection/la-oe-steele23dec23,0,2076772.story]

Is racism now a powerful, subterranean force in our society? Is it so subtly infused into the white American subconscious as to be both involuntary and invisible to the racist himself? A recent CNN poll tells us that 84% of blacks and 66% of whites think racism is a "very serious" or "somewhat serious" problem in American life. Is this true?

In attempting to answer these questions, we must acknowledge one of the most profound achievements in recent human history: the death of white supremacy. Here was an event far more world-altering than the collapse of communism, and yet, out of a truly extraordinary historical blindness, it has gone utterly unnoticed. Possibly it was an event too conspicuous to see.

Many believe that it is racist for whites to say white supremacy is dead, and that it is Uncle Tomism for blacks to say it. But it is dead nevertheless. Once a legitimate authority with dominion over all the resources and peoples of the world, it is today universally seen as one of history's greatest evils. It is dead today because it has no authority anywhere in the world and no legitimacy out of which to impose itself. It was defeated by revolutions in the last half of the 20th century that spanned the globe from India to Algeria to the United States. It was defeated by the people who had suffered it. And even if it survives in some quarters as an idea, as a speculation, it now stigmatizes anyone associated with it to the point of ruin.

When Richards blasted forth with the "N-word" at a comedy club, his language met with universal condemnation. Today's acts of racism play out within an American society obsessed with purging itself of racism, a society that measures its very legitimacy by its intolerance for racism. When I was growing up in the last decade of segregation, even violent acts of racism were no threat to American legitimacy. When Richards said to his hecklers, "Fifty years ago we would have hung you up by your feet," he was longing for the days of my childhood, when blacks would fear to heckle a white comic — a time when violence enforced a much larger pattern of black subjugation. But Richards' hecklers only laughed at him. The difference between the two eras is the death of white supremacy.

This does not mean that racist behavior today is somehow benign. It means that today racism swims upstream in an atmosphere of ferocious intolerance. Moreover, today's racism is no longer in concert with an overt and systematic subjugation of blacks. While racism continues to exist, it no longer stunts the lives of blacks.

Yet a belief in the ongoing power of racism is, today, an article of faith for "good" whites and "truth-telling" blacks. It is heresy for any white or black to say openly that, today, underdevelopment and broken families are vastly greater problems for blacks than racism, even though this is obviously true. The problem is that this truth blames the victim. It suggests that black progress will come more from black effort than from white goodwill — even though white oppression caused the underdevelopment in the first place.

In other words, this truth is unfair. And when whites or blacks utter it, they are instantly identified with the unfairness rather than with the truth. So it propriety causes us to say that racism still explains black difficulty.

This explanation is also a source of power because it portrays blacks as victims. And wherever there are victims, there is justification for seeking power in their name. Thus the specter of black difficulty has been an enormous source of power for the left since the 1960s. To say racism is not the first cause of black problems is to put yourself at odds with the post-'60s left's most enduring fount of power.

This of course means that racism in the United States has parallel lives. In one life, it is the actual instances of racism on the ground. But, in its parallel life, it is a time-honored currency of power that still trades well in the United States. Here, racism lives as faith rather than fact. It is something you believe in out of unacknowledged self-interest.

So when race gets in the news, it is hard to know whether we are dealing with fact or faith. Was the political ad that some say defeated Harold Ford in Tennessee really racist, as the NAACP suspects, or was this old civil rights group ambulance-chasing for power? Did racism motivate the police shooting in Queens? Was the recent defeat of affirmative action at the polls in Michigan an example of racism or of an insistence on fairness? As we look at such events, are we judging facts or practicing a faith?

The great mistake Americans made after the civil rights victories of the '60s was to allow race to become a government-approved means to power. Here was the incentive to make racism into a faith. And its subsequent life as a faith has destroyed our ability to know the reality of racism in America. Today we live in a terrible ignorance that will no doubt last until we take race out of every aspect of public life — until we learn, as we did with religion, to separate it from the state.

#### SQ solves racism—if it doesn’t the aff won’t remedy the alt causes but psychology makes some racism inevitable

McWhorter 8 [John McWhorter is the author ofThe Power of Babel: A Natural History of Language, among other books, and has taught linguistics at Cornell and the University of California, Berkeley. He is a senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute. “The End Of Racism?,” Nov 5 http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/miarticle.htm?id=3374]

The question is whether the total eclipse of racism is either possible or necessary. It is neither, and Barack Obama's victory is a lesson in how the word racism has drifted beyond its core meaning into something more calisthenic than proactive.

It was one thing when legalized segregation and disenfranchisement were outlawed in the mid-60s. This was a massive undertaking, but people devoted their lives--sometimes literally--to making it happen.

It was something else when, in the wake of this, racism became socially taboo in most segments of American society. Sure, there are lapses. But anyone who thinks there has been anything short of a seismic shift in America's racial relations since the 60s should take a look at Mad Men. The very fact that it is news that there remain people who wouldn't vote for a black man shows that we live in a different world than 40 years ago.

The new frontier, however, is apparently people's individual psychologies: Not only must we not legislate racism or socially condone it, but no one is to even privately feel it. The problem is we can't entirely reach people's feelings. The social proscription has changed a lot of minds, especially of younger people who never knew the old days. But an America where nobody harbors racist sentiment? The very notion goes against everything we know about human hardwiring: Distrust of the other is inherent to our cognition.

Psychology has provided us with no method for rewiring brains to eliminate that. After describing one of countless studies revealing subliminal racial bias, Nicholas Kristof recently intoned "there's evidence that when people become aware of their unconscious biases, they can overcome them."

Oh, really? "Can," OK--but how often do they? How do we reach everybody? Do we mean overcoming bias so thoroughly that a test looking for what's "out there" would not still reveal it? It's a utopian pipe dream.

Now, if this racism of the scattered and subliminal varieties were the obstacle to achievement that Jim Crow and open bigotry were, then we would have a problem. But yesterday, we saw that this "out there" brand of racism cannot keep a black man out of the White House. Might it not be time to allow that our obsession with how unschooled and usually aging folk feel in their hearts about black people has become a fetish? Sure, there are racists. There are also rust and mosquitoes, and there always will be. Life goes on.

I know--what about "societal" racism? Well, if we can now relax about the backward folk "out there," then maybe Obama in the White House can help open up an honest discussion about the role racism does not play in black communities' problems.

Obama has come in for some criticism for not putting forth a "black" agenda--i.e., one designed to combat "racism" in various ways. It's because he knows that paradigm has no useful application to our times.

The harsher penalization of crack than powdered cocaine that has put so many black people in jail needs revision, but it was not created by racists: The Congressional Black Caucus helped pass it. Newark's schools are not failing because of racism, when New Jersey funds them as liberally as schools in the suburbs and most of the teachers and staff are black.

America has problems and our new president knows it. However, is America's main problem still "the color line" as W.E.B. DuBois put it 105 years ago? The very fact that the president is now black is a clear sign that it is no longer our main problem, and that we can, even as morally informed and socially concerned citizens, admit it.