### 1

#### Interpretation: All affirmative paradigm issues concerning theroy and arguments concerning fairness or education that the negative could violate must be read first in the affirmative speech. To clarify, theory arguments must be read at the top of the affirmative case before all substantive arguments.

#### Violation:

#### Vote neg:

#### [1] Strat – theory preempts drastically change neg strat since they’re the highest layer of the debate. If the aff reads all their substance, then covers theory, the neg is disadvantaged since any substantive case neg work could be drastically reduced by the norms they purport. The neg needs to know what conditions they need to meet prior to setting a strat, outweighs – reversibility – you’ve spent a long time prepping this aff so you should know how long it takes to get through it, but I don’t know the conditions of engagement which severely skews neg strat.

#### [2] Norm setting – Negs are more likely to conform to their interps if they’re at the top of the aff since they establish a context under which we construct our case neg. Any arg for why we should respond to the spikes are a net benefit to my interp.

#### [3] Substantive education – Spikes on top makes it easier for the neg to plan a strategy that meets your paradigm to ensure better engagement since the discussion is shifted away from theory spike extensions to the crux of the topic.

#### Also you can’t use your spikes to take out my shell:

#### [1] No abuse – my shell doesn’t indict your ability to read spikes or these specific ones, just their placement.

#### [2] Meta-theory outweighs – similar to how theory precludes substance by establishing norms around it, meta theory should preclude their args.

#### Vote on fairness – abuse skews your evaluation of substance – precedes education since if there’s abuse, you can’t expect me to clash. Drop the debater – I can’t respond to a new aff in the 2NR since I don’t have a 3NR to defend my offense – link turns 1AR theory – proves the aff forced me to be abusive.

#### No RVIs: (A) The 1AR would just sit on the shell so I’ll always lose to the unchecked 2AR collapse—also means evaluate theory after the 2NR. (B) Chills legit theory which leads to a race to the bottom—outweighs deterrence since you could just beat a bad theory shell. Use competing interps—either there’s a bright line which collapses, or there isn’t which causes intervention.

### 2

#### Nurse strikes devastates hospitals

Wright 10 Sarah H. Wright July 2010 "Evidence on the Effects of Nurses' Strikes" <https://www.nber.org/digest/jul10/evidence-effects-nurses-strikes> (Researcher at National Bureau of Economic Research)

U.S. hospitals were excluded from collective bargaining laws for three decades longer than other sectors because of fears **that strikes by nurses might imperil patients' health**. Today, while unionization has been declining in general, it is growing rapidly in hospitals, with the number of unionized workers rising from 679,000 in 1990 to nearly one million in 2008. In Do Strikes Kill? Evidence from New York State (NBER Working Paper No. 15855), co-authors Jonathan Gruber and Samuel Kleiner carefully examine the effects of nursing strikes on patient care and outcomes. The researchers match data on nurses' strikes in New York State from 1984 to 2004 to data on hospital discharges, including information on treatment intensity, patient mortality, and hospital readmission. They conclude that nurses' strikes were **costly to hospital patients**: in-hospital mortality **increased by 19.4 percent** and hospital readmissions **increased by 6.5 percen**t for patients admitted during a strike. Among their sample of 38,228 such patients, an estimated **138 more individuals died than would have without a stri**ke, and 344 more patients were readmitted to the hospital than if there had been no strike. "Hospitals functioning during nurses' strikes **do so at a lower quality of patient care,"** they write. Still, at hospitals experiencing strikes, the measures of treatment intensity -- that is, the length of hospital stay and the number of procedures performed during the patient's stay -- show no significant differences between striking and non-striking periods. Patients appear to receive the same intensity of care during union work stoppages as during normal hospital operations. Thus, the poor outcomes associated with strikes suggest that they might reduce hospital productivity. These poor health outcomes increased for both emergency and non-emergency hospital patients, even as admissions of both groups decreased by about 28 percent at hospitals with strikes. The poor health outcomes were not apparent either before or after the strike in the striking hospitals, suggesting that they are attributable to the strike itself. And, the poor health outcomes do not appear to do be due to different types of patients being admitted during strike periods, because patients admitted during a strike are very similar to those admitted during other periods. Hiring replacement workers apparently does not help: hospitals that hired replacement workers **performed no better** during strikes than those that did not hire substitute employees. In each case, patients with conditions that required intensive nursing were more likely to fare worse in the presence of nurses' strikes.

#### Hospitals are the critical internal link for pandemic preparedness.

Al Thobaity 20, Abdullelah, and Farhan Alshammari. "Nurses on the frontline against the COVID-19 pandemic: an Integrative review." Dubai Medical Journal 3.3 (2020): 87-92. (Associate Professor of Nursing at Taif University)

The majority of infected or symptomatic people seek medical treatment in medical facilities, particularly hospitals, as a high number of cases, especially those in critical condition, will have an impact on hospitals [4]. The concept of hospital resilience in disaster situations is defined as the ability to recover from the damage caused by huge disturbances quickly [2]. The resilience of hospitals to pandemic cases depends on the preparedness of the institutions, and not all hospitals have the same resilience. A lower resilience will affect the **sustainability of the health services**. This also affects healthcare providers such as doctors, nurses, and allied health professionals [5, 6]. Despite the impact on healthcare providers, excellent management of a pandemic depends on the level of **preparedness of healthcare providers, including nurses**. This means that if it was impossible to be ready before a crisis or disaster, responsible people will do all but the impossible to save lives.

#### New Pandemics are deadlier and faster are coming – COVID is just the beginning

Antonelli 20 Ashley Fuoco Antonelli 5-15-2020 <https://www.advisory.com/daily-briefing/2020/05/15/weekly-line> "Weekly line: Why deadly disease outbreaks could become more common—even after Covid-19" (Associate Editor — American Health Line)

While the new coronavirus pandemic suddenly took the world by storm, the truth is public health experts for years have warned that a virus similar to the new coronavirus would cause the next pandemic—and they say **deadly infectious disease outbreaks could become more common**. Infectious disease experts are always on the lookout for the next pandemic, and in a report published two years ago, researchers from the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health **predicted that the pathogen most likely to cause the next pandemic would be a virus similar to the common cold**. Specifically, the researchers predicted that the pathogen at fault for the next pandemic would be: A microbe for which people have not yet **developed immunities**, meaning that a large portion of the human population would be susceptible to infection; Contagious during the so-called "incubation period"—the time when people are infected with a pathogen but are not yet showing symptoms of the infection or are showing only mild symptoms; and Resistant to any known prevention or treatment methods. The researchers also concluded that such a pathogen would have a "low but significant" fatality rate, meaning the pathogen wouldn't kill human hosts fast enough to inhibit its spread. As **Amesh Adalja**—a senior scholar at the Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security, who led the report—told Live Science's Rachael Rettner at the time, "**It just has to make a lot of people sick" to disrupt society**. The researchers said RNA viruses—which include the common cold, influenza, and severe acute respiratory syndrome (or SARS, which is caused by a type of coronavirus)—fit that bill. And even though we had a good bit of experience dealing with common RNA viruses like the flu, Adalja at the time told Rettner that there were "a whole host of viral families that get very little attention when it comes to pandemic preparedness." Not even two years later, the new coronavirus, which causes Covid-19, emerged and quickly spread throughout the world, reaching pandemic status in just a few months. To date, officials have reported more than 4.4 million cases of Covid-19 and 302,160 deaths tied to the new coronavirus globally. In the United States, the number of reported Covid-19 cases has reached more than 1.4 million and the number of reported deaths tied to the new coronavirus has risen to nearly 86,000 in just over three months. Although public health experts had warned about the likelihood of a respiratory-borne RNA virus causing the next global pandemic, many say the world was largely unprepared to handle this type of infectious disease outbreak. And as concerning as that revelation may be on its own, **perhaps even more worrisome is that public health experts predict life-threatening infectious disease outbreaks are likely to become more common—meaning we could be susceptible to another pandemic in the future**. Why experts think deadly infectious disease outbreaks could become more common As the Los Angeles Times's Joshua Emerson Smith notes, infectious disease experts for more than ten years now have noted that "[o]utbreaks of dangerous new diseases with the potential to become pandemics have been on the rise—from HIV to swine flu to SARS to Ebola." For instance, a report published in Nature in 2008 found that **the number of emerging infectious disease events that occurred in the 1990s was more than three times higher than it was in the 1940s**. Many experts believe the recent increase in infectious disease outbreaks is tied to human behaviors that disrupt the environment, "such as **deforestation and poaching**," which have led "to increased contact between highly mobile, urbanized human populations and wild animals," Emerson Smith writes. In the 2008 report, for example, researchers noted that about 60% of 355 emerging infectious disease events that occurred over a 50-year period could be largely linked to wild animals, livestock, and, to a lesser extent, pets. Now, researchers believe the new coronavirus first jumped to humans from animals at a wildlife market in Wuhan, China. Along those same lines, some experts have argued that global climate change has driven an increase in infectious diseases—and could continue to do so. A federally mandated report released by the U.S. Global Change Research Program in 2018 warned that warmer temperatures could expand the geographic range covered by disease-carrying insects and pests, which could result in more Americans being exposed to ticks carrying Lyme disease and mosquitos carrying the dengue, West Nile, and Zika viruses. And experts now say continued warming in global temperatures, deforestation, and other environmentally disruptive behaviors have broadened that risk by bringing more people into contact with disease-carrying animals. Further, experts note that infectious diseases today are able to spread much faster and farther than they could decades ago because of increasing globalization and travel. While some have suggested the Covid-19 pandemic could stifle that trend, others argue globalization is likely to continue—meaning so could infectious diseases' far spread.

#### Future pandemics will cause extinction – it only takes one ‘super-spreader’ – US prevention is key

Bar-Yam 16 Yaneer Bar-Yam 7-3-2016 “Transition to extinction: Pandemics in a connected world” <http://necsi.edu/research/social/pandemics/transition> (Professor and President, New England Complex System Institute; PhD in Physics, MIT)

Watch as one of the more aggressive—brighter red — strains rapidly expands. After a time it goes extinct leaving a black region. Why does it go extinct? The answer is that it spreads so rapidly that it kills the hosts around it. Without new hosts to infect it then dies out itself. That the rapidly spreading pathogens die out has important implications for evolutionary research which we have talked about elsewhere [1–7]. In the research I want to discuss here, **what we were interested in is the effect of adding long range transportation** [8]. **This includes natural means of dispersal as well as unintentional dispersal by humans**, **like adding airplane routes**, which is being done by real world airlines (Figure 2). **When we introduce long range transportation into the model, the success of more aggressive strains changes. They can use the long range transportation to find new hosts and escape local extinction**. Figure 3 shows that **the more transportation routes introduced into the model, the more higher aggressive pathogens are able to survive and spread**. **As we add more long range transportation, there is a critical point at which pathogens become so aggressive that the entire host population dies**. **The pathogens die at the same time, but that is not exactly a consolation to the hosts. We call this** the phase **transition to extinction** (Figure 4). **With increasing levels of global transportation, human civilization may be approaching such a critical threshold.** In the paper we wrote in 2006 about the dangers of global transportation for pathogen evolution and pandemics [8], we mentioned the risk from Ebola. Ebola is a horrendous disease that was present only in isolated villages in Africa. It was far away from the rest of the world only because of that isolation. Since Africa was developing, it was only a matter of time before it reached population centers and airports. While the model is about evolution, it is really about which pathogens will be found in a system that is highly connected, and Ebola can spread in a highly connected world. The traditional approach to public health uses historical evidence analyzed statistically to assess the potential impacts of a disease. As a result, many were surprised by the spread of Ebola through West Africa in 2014. **As the connectivity of the world increases, past experience is not a good guide to future events. A key point about the phase transition to extinction is its suddenness**. **Even a system that seems stable, can be destabilized by a few more long-range connections, and connectivity is continuing to increase.** So how close are we to the tipping point? We don’t know but it would be good to find out before it happens. While Ebola ravaged three countries in West Africa, it only resulted in a handful of cases outside that region. One possible reason is that many of the airlines that fly to west Africa stopped or reduced flights during the epidemic [9]. In the absence of a clear connection, public health authorities who downplayed the dangers of the epidemic spreading to the West might seem to be vindicated. As with the choice of airlines to stop flying to west Africa, our analysis didn’t take into consideration how people respond to epidemics. It does tell us what the outcome will be unless we respond fast enough and well enough to stop the spread of future diseases, which may not be the same as the ones we saw in the past. **As the world becomes more connected, the dangers increase.** Are people in western countries safe because of higher quality health systems? **Countries like the U.S. have highly skewed networks of social interactions with some very highly connected individuals that can be “superspreaders.”** The chances of such an individual becoming infected may be low but **events like a mass outbreak pose a much greater risk** if they do happen. **If a sick food service worker in an airport infects 100 passengers, or a contagion event happens in mass transportation, an outbreak could very well prove unstoppable**.

### 3

#### CP Text: A just government should recognize the unconditional right of non-police workers to strike, abolishing police unions.

#### The aff makes police collective bargaining worse and gives more power to police unions and prevent gov action.

Andrew **Grim, 20** Ph.D. candidate in history at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, is at work on a dissertation on anti-police brutality activism in post-WWII Newark

- ("What is The Blue Flue and How Has It Increased Police Power," Washington Post, 7-1-2020, 11-2-2021https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2020/07/01/what-is-blue-flu-how-has-it-increased-police-power/)//AW

This weekend, officers from the New York City Police Department are rumored to be planning a walkout to protest calls to defund the police. This builds on a similar tactic used by police in Atlanta less than a month ago. On June 16, Fulton County District Attorney, Paul L. Howard Jr. announced that Garrett Rolfe, the Atlanta police officer who fatally shot Rayshard Brooks, would face charges of felony murder and aggravated assault. That night, scores of Atlanta Police Department officers caught the “blue flu,” calling out sick en masse to protest the charges against Rolfe. Such walkouts constitute, in effect, illegal strikes — laws in all 50 states prohibit police strikes. Yet, there is nothing new about the blue flu. It is a strategy long employed by police unions and rank-and-file officers during contract negotiations, disputes over reforms and, like in Atlanta, in response to disciplinary action against individual officers. The intent is to dramatize police disputes with municipal government and rally the citizenry to their side. But the result of such protests matter deeply as we consider police reform today. Historically, blue flu strikes have helped expand police power, ultimately limiting the ability of city governments to reform, constrain or conduct oversight over the police. They allow the police to leverage public fear of crime to extract concessions from municipalities.

#### Police unions use collective bargaining to reinforce systems of racism and violence. Clark ‘19

Paul F. Clark [School Director and Professor of Labor and Employment Relations, Penn State], 10-10-2019, "Why police unions are not part of the American labor movement," Conversation, [https://theconversation.com/why-police-unions-are-not-part-of-the-american-labor-movement-142538 //accessed 10/20/2021](https://theconversation.com/why-police-unions-are-not-part-of-the-american-labor-movement-142538%20//accessed%2010/20/2021) //marlborough jh

In the wake of George Floyd’s death at the hands of a Minneapolis police officer, news reports have suggested that [police unions bear some of the responsibility](https://www.salon.com/2020/06/27/police-unions-blamed-for-rise-in-fatal-shootings-even-as-crime-plummeted/) for the [violence perpetrated against African Americans](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/30/us/derek-chauvin-george-floyd.html). ¶Critics have assailed these unions for [protecting officers who have abused their authority](https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2020/06/09/limits-when-police-can-use-force-is-better-solution-than-banning-police-unions/). Derek Chauvin, the former police officer facing [second-degree murder charges for Floyd’s death](https://www.npr.org/2020/06/03/868910542/chauvin-and-3-former-officers-face-new-charges-over-george-floyds-death), had nearly [20 complaints filed against him during his career](https://www.mercurynews.com/2020/05/30/minneapolis-officers-work-personal-background-detailed-2/) but only received two letters of reprimand. ¶Many people who support labor unions in principle, who view them as a countervailing force against the power of employers, have only recently [come to view police unions as problematic](https://www.latimes.com/politics/story/2020-06-15/police-unions-george-floyd-reform) – as entities that [perpetuate a culture of racism and violence](https://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/how-police-union-power-helped-increase-abuses). But this sentiment reverberates through the history of the U.S. labor movement. As a [labor scholar](https://ler.la.psu.edu/people/pfc2) who has [written about unions](https://theconversation.com/essential-us-workers-often-lack-sick-leave-and-health-care-benefits-taken-for-granted-in-most-other-countries-136802) for [decades](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/bjir.12526), I think this viewpoint can be explained by the fact that police unions differ fundamentally from almost all trade unions in America. Foot soldiers for the status quo For many veterans of the labor movement, [police have been on the wrong side](https://plsonline.eku.edu/insidelook/history-policing-united-states-part-3) of the centuries-old struggle between workers and employers. [Rather than side with other members of the working class](https://www.businessinsider.com/mayhem-in-madison-police-remove-protesters-lockdown-capitol-2011-3), police have used their legal authority to protect businesses and private property, enforcing laws viewed by many as anti-union. The strain between law enforcement and labor goes back to the origins of [American unions in the mid 19th century](https://plsonline.eku.edu/insidelook/history-policing-united-states-part-3). Workers formed unions to fight for wage increases, reduced working hours and humane working conditions. For employers, this was an attack on the existing societal power structure. They enlisted the government as the defender of capital and property rights, and [police officers were the foot soldiers](http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2014/12/22/police-unions-havealwaysbeenalabormovementapart.html) who defended the status quo. ¶When workers managed to form unions, companies called on local police to disperse union gatherings, marches and picket lines, using [violence and mass arrests to break the will of strikers](https://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/how-1897-massacre-pennsylvania-coal-miners-morphed-galvanizing-crisis-forgotten-history-180971695/). A narrow focus Police work is a fundamentally conservative act. And police officers tend to be politically conservative and Republican. A poll of police [conducted in September 2016 by POLICE Magazine](https://www.policemag.com/342098/the-2016-police-presidential-poll) found that 84% of officers intended to vote for Donald Trump that November. And law enforcement unions like the Fraternal Order of Police, the International Union of Police Associations and the National Border Patrol Council [all endorsed Trump’s candidacy in 2016](https://theintercept.com/2016/10/09/police-unions-reject-charges-of-bias-find-a-hero-in-donald-trump/). This contrasts sharply with the 39% share of all [union voters who voted for Trump](https://www.wsj.com/articles/democrats-labor-to-stem-flow-of-union-voters-to-trump-11567422002) and the fact that every other union which made an [endorsement supported Hillary Clinton](https://justfacts.votesmart.org/candidate/evaluations/55463/hillary-clinton). Exclusively protecting the interests of their members, without consideration for other workers, also sets police unions apart from other labor groups. Yes, the first priority of any union is to fight for their members, but most other unions see that fight in the context of a [larger movement that fights for all workers](https://aflcio.org/what-unions-do/social-economic-justice). Police unions do not see themselves as [part of this movement](https://www.teenvogue.com/story/what-to-know-police-unions-labor-movement). With one exception – the [International Union of Police Associations](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2020/jun/11/police-unions-american-labor-movement-protest), which represents just [2.7% of American police](https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ftelea9716.pdf) – law enforcement unions are not affiliated with the AFL-CIO, the U.S. labor body that unites all unions. Alternative justice system A central concern with police unions is that they use collective bargaining to negotiate contracts that reduce police transparency and accountability. This allows officers who engage in excessive violence to [avoid the consequences of their actions](https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2020/06/10/police-unions-violence-research-george-floyd/) and remain on the job. In a way, some police unions have created an [alternative justice system](https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/06/restorative-justice-police-violence/489221/) that prevents police departments and municipalities from disciplining or discharging officers who have committed crimes against the people they are sworn to serve. In Minneapolis, residents filed more than [2,600 misconduct complaints](https://www.wsj.com/articles/the-problem-with-police-unions-11591830984) against police officers between 2012 and 2020. But only 12 of those grievances resulted in discipline. The most significant [punishment any officer received was a 40-hour suspension](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/30/us/derek-chauvin-george-floyd.html). Besides collective bargaining, police have used the political process – including [candidate endorsements and lobbying](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2020/jun/23/police-unions-spending-policy-reform-chicago-new-york-la) – to secure local and state legislation that protects their members and quells efforts to provide greater police accountability. Police officers are a formidable political force because they represent [the principle of law and order](https://www.thedailybeast.com/the-gop-and-police-unions-a-love-story). Candidates endorsed by the police unions can claim they are the law and order candidate. Once these candidates win office, police unions have [significant leverage to lobby for policies](https://nymag.com/intelligencer/2020/06/george-floyd-protests-police-abuse-reform-qualified-immunity-polls.html) they support or block those they oppose. Because of this power, critics claim that police unions don’t feel accountable to the citizens they serve. An attorney who sued the Minneapolis Police Department on behalf of a Black resident who was [severely beaten by police officers](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/30/us/derek-chauvin-george-floyd.html) said that he is convinced that Minneapolis “officers think they don’t have to abide by their own training and rules when dealing with the public.” George Floyd’s death has raised serious concerns about the current role of police and police unions in our society. Several unions have demanded that the International Union of Police Associations be expelled from the U.S. labor federation. Other [unions oppose expulsion](https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/politics-news/national-labor-groups-mostly-close-ranks-defend-police-unions-n1231573). They argue that the labor movement can have a greater impact on a police union that is inside the “House of Labor.” In any case, there is a growing recognition that police unions differ significantly from other unions. And there is a growing acceptance that they are not part of the larger American labor movement but rather a narrowly focused group pursuing their own self-interests, often to the detriment of the nation at large.

### Case

#### Reject 1AR theory —

#### 1 – It screws over the 2NR since I have to split my speech time to cover two different flows – outweighs any neg abuse since the 2AR collapse will always win if I can’t consolidate offense especially since the 2AR just needs to win one standard and weigh.

#### 2 – One speech isn’t enough to develop clear clash – outweighs since resolvability is a gateway issue to other impacts.

#### 3 – Guts education – affs will always ditch substance and go for theory because it’s so strategic.

#### And, they’ll say infinite abuse but (a) spikes solve and (b) this particular instance isn’t that abusive.

#### Also, if you think it’s too harsh, then default to drop the arg.

#### I meet –
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#### The Earth is cooling, and CO2 only controls two percent of global temperature – prefer NASA and professors over alarmists. Specifically true when their ev says nothing about CO2

Shedlock ‘19

(Michael, https://moneymaven.io/mishtalk/economics/amidst-global-warming-hysteria-nasa-expects-global-cooling-SJDpCv3V4EqKSOY11A378Q/, January 29) BW

\*\*GAT = global average temperature

Those promoting CO2 as the reason for global warming are hucksters and those taken in by hucksters. Please consider NASA Sees Climate Cooling Trend Thanks to Low Sun Activity. “We see a cooling trend,” said Martin Mlynczak of NASA’s Langley Research Center. “High above Earth’s surface, near the edge of space, our atmosphere is losing heat energy. If current trends continue, it could soon set a Space Age record for cold.” “The new data is coming from NASA’s Sounding of the Atmosphere using Broadband Emission Radiometry or SABER instrument, which is onboard the space agency’s Thermosphere Ionosphere Mesosphere Energetics and Dynamics (TIMED) satellite. SABER monitors infrared radiation from carbon dioxide (CO2) and nitric oxide (NO), two substances that play a vital role in the energy output of our thermosphere, the very top level of our atmosphere. “The thermosphere always cools off during Solar Minimum. It’s one of the most important ways the solar cycle affects our planet,” said Mlynczak, who is the associate principal investigator for SABER. The new NASA findings are in line with studies released by UC-San Diego and Northumbria University in Great Britain last year, both of which predict a Grand Solar Minimum in coming decades due to low sunspot activity. Both studies predicted sun activity similar to the Maunder Minimum of the mid-17th to early 18th centuries, which coincided to a time known as the Little Ice Age, during which temperatures were much lower than those of today. If all of this seems as if NASA is contradicting itself, you’re right — sort of. After all, NASA also reported last week that Arctic sea ice was at its sixth lowest level since measuring began. Isn’t that a sure sign of global warming? All any of this “proves” is that we have, at best, a cursory understanding of Earth’s incredibly complex climate system. So when mainstream media and carbon-credit salesman Al Gore breathlessly warn you that we must do something about climate change, it’s all right to step back, take a deep breath, and realize that we don’t have the knowledge, skill or resources to have much effect on the Earth’s climate.” Incredibly Complex Systems See the problem? Alarmists take one variable, CO2 that is only a tiny part of extremely long cycles and make projections far into to the future based off it. When I was in grade school, the alarmists were worried about global cooling. Amusingly, I recall discussing in science class the need to put soot on the arctic ice to melt it to stop the advance of glaciers. ​The latest Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Report said we have only 12 years left to save the planet. It triggered the usual frantic and ridiculous reactions. NBC News offered this gem: “A last-ditch global warming fix? A man-made ‘volcanic’ eruption” to cool the planet.” Its article proclaimed, “Scientists and some environmentalists believe nations might have to mimic volcanic gases as a last-ditch effort to protect Earth from extreme warming.” Geo-engineering: Ignoring the Consequences Watts Up With That discusses Geo-Engineering: Ignoring the Consequences. “From 1940 to almost 1980, the average global temperature went down. Political concerns and the alleged scientific consensus focused on global cooling. Alarmists said it could be the end of agriculture and civilization. Journalist Lowell Ponte wrote in his 1976 book, The Cooling. The problem then was – and still is now – that people are educated in the false philosophy of uniformitarianism: the misguided belief that conditions always were and always will be as they are now, and any natural changes will occur over long periods of time. Consequently, most people did not understand that the cooling was part of the natural cycle of climate variability, or that changes are often huge and sudden. Just 18,000 years ago we were at the peak of an Ice Age. Then, most of the ice melted and sea levels rose 150 meters (490 feet), because it was warmer for almost all of the last 10,000 years than it is today. During the cooling “danger,” geo-engineering proposals included: \* building a dam across the Bering Straits to block cold Arctic water, to warm the North Pacific and the middle latitudes of the Northern Hemisphere; \* dumping black soot on the Arctic ice cap to promote melting; \* adding carbon dioxide (CO2) to the atmosphere to raise global temperatures. “Taking carbon dioxide out of the atmosphere,” as advocated by the IPCC in its October 8 news conference, is also foolish. Historic records show that, at about 410 parts per million (ppm), the level of CO2 supposedly in the atmosphere now, we are near the lowest in the last 280 million years. As plants evolved over that time, the average level was 1200 ppm. That is why commercial greenhouses boost CO2 to that level to increase plant growth and yields by a factor of four.” The IPCC has been wrong in every prediction it’s made since 1990. It would be a grave error to use its latest forecasts as the excuse to engage in geo-engineering experiments with the only planet we have. ​Global Warming Errs Badly Next, please consider Extreme weather not proof of global warming, NASA on global cooling “To understand the great confusion about global warming or climate change, my most lucid guide has been Dr. Richard Lindzen — a former Alfred P. Sloan professor of meteorology at MIT and member of the US National Academy of Sciences — and his now famous lecture for the Global Warming Policy Foundation last October 8. In just a number of segments of his lecture, Dr. Lindzen crystallized for me why the church of global warming errs so badly in its dogma. Global warming promoters fostered the popular public perception of the science of climate change as quite simple. It is that here’s one phenomenon to be explained (“global average temperature,” or GAT, which, says Lindzen, is a thoroughly unscientific concept). And there’s one explanation for it: the amount of CO2 in the atmosphere. GAT is only one of many important phenomena to measure in the climate system, and CO2 is only one of many factors that influence both GAT and all the other phenomena. CO2’s role in controlling GAT is at most perhaps 2 percent, yet climate alarmists think of it as the “control knob.” Most people readily confuse weather (short-term, local-scale temperature, humidity, precipitation, wind, cloudiness, and more) with climate (long-term, large-scale of each) and think weather phenomena are driven by climate phenomena; they aren’t. Consequently, as Lindzen says, the currently popular narrative concerning this system is this: The climate, a complex multifactor system, can be summarized in just one variable, the globally averaged temperature change, and is primarily controlled by the 1 to 2 percent perturbation in the energy budget due to a single variable — carbon dioxide — among many variables of comparable importance.” Big Chill Did You Know the Greatest Two-Year Global Cooling Event Just Took Place? “Would it surprise you to learn the greatest global two-year cooling event of the last century just occurred? From February 2016 to February 2018 (the latest month available) global average temperatures dropped 0.56°C. You have to go back to 1982-84 for the next biggest two-year drop, 0.47°C—also during the global warming era. All the data in this essay come from GISTEMP Team, 2018: GISS Surface Temperature Analysis (GISTEMP). NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies (dataset accessed 2018-04-11 at ). This is the standard source used in most journalistic reporting of global average temperatures. The 2016-18 Big Chill was composed of two Little Chills, the biggest five month drop ever (February to June 2016) and the fourth biggest (February to June 2017). A similar event from February to June 2018 would bring global average temperatures below the 1980s average. February 2018 was colder than February 1998. If someone is tempted to argue that the reason for recent record cooling periods is that global temperatures are getting more volatile, it's not true. The volatility of monthly global average temperatures since 2000 is only two-thirds what it was from 1880 to 1999.

#### Ice age coming now which causes extinction – warming key to prevent.

Fleming, PhD, 19

(Rex, AtmosphericScience@Michigan, The Rise and Fall of the Carbon Dioxide Theory of Climate Change, 6-11, Springer, p.136-37)

A general picture of the causes of the famine problems in Europe is summarized by Plimer [5] in the following paragraph: “Land abatement, crop failure and soil losses were catastrophic because 90% of the population were subsistence farm families who needed enough grain to see them through the winter and enough spare grain to sow for the following year’s crop. Both the quantity and quality of harvests were vital for survival. Grain rotted in the fields and sometimes couldn’t be planted at all. Crop failure led to famine, famine led to disease and death. Famine led to a breakdown in society and even cannibalism. Gangs of desperately hungry peasants roamed the countryside searching for food.” The above details do not paint a pretty picture for the future if the next cool period is as bad as that of the Maunder Minimum. However, the Dalton Minimum (which followed) was not as bad, and lasted only 30 years (1795–1825) – details below are from Marusek [8] unless otherwise indicated. There was a famine in Europe in 1816. The eruption of Tambora in Indonesia on 10 April 1816 was another factor in diminishing the Sun’s intensity in a large part of the world. The winter of 1815–1816 was known as the year without a summer. Three long cold periods had extreme effects on Canada and the New England region of the USA. The first period in June killed most of the crops. The second period in July killed replanted crops. The third period in August killed corn, beans, potatoes and grape vines. The state of Connecticut had their coldest temperatures ever recorded and 1816 was the coldest year on record in the USA [5]. The cold years of 1816 and 1817 created a food crises and widespread unrest in Europe and especially in France. This accelerated immigration to the United States and many American farmers migrated south to warmer latitudes. In the UK the average temperature was 2 \_C colder and it rained or snowed almost every day. There were crop failures in Bengal in 1816 that triggered an outbreak of cholera – this spread from Bengal and was the world’s first cholera pandemic [2]. With a pending cold period and the many potential problems that could surface, one must look at the world population that exits today and see how it is increasing. There are population problems ahead, but fortunately the long term trend is finally changing. Throughout history there have been three trends in world population growth [10]. The first period of ‘pre-modernity’ was a very long term period of slow population growth. The second period beginning with ‘modernity’ in 1800 had an increasing growth rate that reached its highest value in 1962. This was attributed to rising standards of living and improving health standards. This current third period is underway. The population growth rate is falling and is expected to continue to fall (but the growth rate is still positive) – leading to an end of population growth by the end of this century. This is good news for future generations, but it is still bad news for the coming cool down where the world population is expected to be ~ 8 billion in 2024 – and it was only ~ 1 billion in 1800 when there was famine during the Dalton Minimum of the Little Ice Age. A cool down in time is certain and the solar dynamo activity appears to have already decreased. The Earth’s surface temperatures have remained relatively constant since 2000. Since the world’s oceans hold ~ 22 times the heat held by the atmosphere, the pause in the atmospheric warming may be due to the ocean’s delayed effect in warming the atmosphere. The degree of the upcoming cooling is clearly uncertain – it could be something far less than the Dalton Minimum, equal to that of the Dalton Minimum, or equivalent to the Maunder Minimum – clearly plans must be formulated for this range of contingencies. Governments need to begin making plans soon. If there were famines in the LIA with just 1 billion people on the planet, how will the world cope with famines with greater than 8 billion people expected on the planet in 2030? Just how the world’s governments will react to famines from crop failures around the planet is a question one doesn’t want to think about. Nevertheless, contingency plans must be prepared, and the content of this book would be in-complete without some discussion of potential required actions. The worst case scenario could lead to global misery and death on a large scale. On the positive side, humanity now has far greater knowledge and technology available compared to the capabilities of our ancestors of earlier times. Some of these assets are listed below.

#### No extinction – it takes 12 degrees without adaptation

Farquhar et al 17 [Sebastian Farquhar (PhD Candidate in Philosophy at Oxford and Project Manager at Future of Humanity Institute), John Halstead (climate activist and one of the co-founders of 350 Indiana-Calumet), Owen Cotton-Barratt (PhD in pure mathematics at Oxford. Previously worked as an academic mathematician and as Director of Research at the Centre for Effective Altruism), Stefan Schubert (Researcher at Department of Experimental Psychology at University of Oxford), Haydn Belfield (Associate Fellow at the Leverhulme Centre for the Future of Intelligence. He has a background in policy and politics, including as a Senior Parliamentary Researcher to a British Shadow Cabinet Minister, as a Policy Associate to the University of Oxford’s Global Priorities Project, and a degree in Philosophy, Politics and Economics from Oriel College, University of Oxford), Andrew Snyder-Beattie (Director of Research at the Future of Humanity Institute at Oxford, Holds degrees in biomathematics and economics and is currently pursuing a PhD in Zoology at Oxford), Existential Risk: Diplomacy and Governance, Global Priorities Project (Bostrom’s Institute), 2017-01-23, https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Existential-Risks-2017-01-23.pdf] TDI

The most likely levels of global warming are very unlikely to cause human extinction.15 The existential risks of climate change instead stem from tail risk climate change – the low probability of extreme levels of warming – and interaction with other sources of risk. It is impossible to say with confidence at what point global warming would become severe enough to pose an existential threat. Research has suggested that warming of 11-12°C would render most of the planet uninhabitable,16 and would completely devastate agriculture.17 This would pose an extreme threat to human civilisation as we know it.18 Warming of around 7°C or more could potentially produce conflict and instability on such a scale that the indirect effects could be an existential risk, although it is extremely uncertain how likely such scenarios are.19 Moreover, the timescales over which such changes might happen could mean that humanity is able to adapt enough to avoid extinction in even very extreme scenarios. The probability of these levels of warming depends on eventual greenhouse gas concentrations. According to some experts, unless strong action is taken soon by major emitters, it is likely that we will pursue a medium-high emissions pathway.20 If we do, the chance of extreme warming is highly uncertain but appears non-negligible. Current concentrations of greenhouse gases are higher than they have been for hundreds of thousands of years,21 which means that there are significant unknown unknowns about how the climate system will respond. Particularly concerning is the risk of positive feedback loops, such as the release of vast amounts of methane from melting of the arctic permafrost, which would cause rapid and disastrous warming.22 The economists Gernot Wagner and Martin Weitzman have used IPCC figures (which do not include modelling of feedback loops such as those from melting permafrost) to estimate that if we continue to pursue a medium-high emissions pathway, the probability of eventual warming of 6°C is around 10%,23 and of 10°C is around 3%.24 These estimates are of course highly uncertain. It is likely that the world will take action against climate change once it begins to impose large costs on human society, long before there is warming of 10°C. Unfortunately, there is significant inertia in the climate system: there is a 25 to 50 year lag between CO2 emissions and eventual warming,25 and it is expected that 40% of the peak concentration of CO2 will remain in the atmosphere 1,000 years after the peak is reached.26 Consequently, it is impossible to reduce temperatures quickly by reducing CO2 emissions. If the world does start to face costly warming, the international community will therefore face strong incentives to find other ways to reduce global temperatures.

#### No extinction- worst case we always have geoengineering to make earth more reflective, offsetting climate change

Nordhaus 19-- Nordhaus, William. "Climate change: The ultimate challenge for economics." *American Economic Review* 109.6 (2019): 1991-2014. William Nordhaus won the nobel prize in economic sciences in 2018 for his work on climate change.

I take this in reverse order. Plan C, geoengineering, makes the earth “whiter” or more reflective, so that less sunlight reaches the surface of the earth. This cooling effect can on average offset the warming that comes from the accumulation of CO2 in the atmosphere. Perhaps the easiest to visualize is putting millions of little mirror-like particles into the stratosphere. For example, we might artificially increase sulfate aerosols in the stratosphere above background levels. But geoengineering is dangerous. It is untested, will not offset climate change equally in all regions, will not deal with ocean carbonization, and will have major complications for international cooperation. To me, geoengineering resembles what doctors call “salvage therapy”—a potentially dangerous treatment to be used when all else fails. Doctors prescribe salvage therapy for people who are very ill and when less dangerous treatments are not available. No responsible doctor would prescribe salvage therapy for a patient who has just been diagnosed with the early stage of a treatable illness. Similarly, no responsible country should undertake geoengineering as the first line of defense against global warming.