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**Asteroid mining allows for extra-terrestrial contact**

**Forgan and Elvis 11**

Forgan and Elvis 3/29/11, Scottish Universities Physics Alliance (SUPA), Institute for Astronomy, University of Edinburgh, Harvard Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics , (“Extrasolar Asteroid Mining as Forensic Evidence for Extraterrestrial Intelligence, <http://arxiv.org/PS_cache/arxiv/pdf/1103/1103.5369v1.pdf>, 3/29/11)

While this argument is clearly Earth-oriented, much of it applies in general to intelligent species which consume planetary resources at sufficient rates. ETIs **[Extraterrestrial intelligences] which have similar economic concerns to ours will eventually find extraplanetary mining projects desirable as their own resources become depleted** (provided of course they are sufficiently technologically advanced). We suggest **the complexity of [targeted asteroid mining]** TAM **missions are such that most species capable of it have the potential to become truly space-faring. If technological civilisations more advanced than ours exist in the Galaxy, a distinct possibility given the estimated median age of terrestrial planets being around 1 Gyr older than Earth** (Lineweaver, 2001), and **asteroid mining is a common activity which underpins their existence, then searching for signatures of TAM is an appropriate activity for [the search for extraterrestrial intelligence] SETI to undertake.** However, we must balance this with the realization that systems 1 Gyr older than Earth will most likely no longer have debris discs. **Exactly why this is the case will be explained in more detail in the next section.**

**Competition over mineral harvesting makes aliens hostile**

**Mirsa and Baum 11**

Goldman Misra and Baum 11 [Shawn D. Domagal-Goldman, NASA Planetary Science Division, Jacob D. Haqq-Misra, Department of Meteorology, Pennsylvania State Seth D. Baum, Department of Geography, Pennsylvania State University, 22 April 2011 “Would Contact with Extraterrestrials Benefit or Harm Humanity? A Scenario Analysis”, Acta Astronautica, http://arxiv.org/pdf/1104.4462]

Another recommendation is that **humanity should avoid giving off the appearance of being a rapidly expansive civilization. If an ETI perceives humanity as such, then it may be inclined to attempt a preemptive strike against us so as to prevent us from growing into a threat to the ETI or others in the galaxy. Similarly, ecosystem-valuing universalist ETI may observe humanity’s ecological destructive tendencies and wipe humanity out in order to preserve the Earth system as a whole. These scenarios give us reason to limit our growth and reduce our impact on global ecosystems.** It would be particularly important for us to limit our emissions of greenhouse gases, since atmospheric composition can be observed from other planets. We acknowledge that the pursuit of emissions reductions and other ecological projects may have much stronger justifications than those that derive from ETI encounter, but that does not render ETI encounter scenarios insignificant or irrelevant.

**These hostile aliens would then steal the sun**

**Stephen Hawking 10 who…**

Stephen Hawking 10, Honorary Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts, a lifetime member of the Pontifical Academy of Sciences, and **in 2009 was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom,** the highest civilian award in the United States. Director of Research at the Centre for Theoretical Cosmology in the Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics at the University of Cambridge, Discovery Chanel Broadcast: Into the Universe with Stephen Hawking, April 25, 2010

**Such advanced aliens would perhaps become nomads, looking to conquer and colonize whatever planets they could reach. If so, it makes sense for them to exploit each new planet for material to build more spaceships so they could move on.** Who knows what the limits would be? **It might be possible to collect the energy from an entire star. To do that they could deploy millions of mirrors in space, encircling the whole sun and feeding the power to one single collection point.**

**The absence of sun causes extinction**

**Otterbein 08**

Otterbein 08, Holly, popular science reporter, Popular Science: “If the Sun went out, how long would life on earth survive”, 10/20/2008 http://www.popsci.com/node/24698

If you put a steamy cup of coffee in the refrigerator, it wouldn’t immediately turn cold. Likewise, if the sun simply “turned off” (which is actually physically impossible), the Earth would stay warm—at least compared with the space surrounding it—for a few million years. But we surface dwellers would feel the chill much sooner than that. **Within a week, the average global surface temperature would drop below 0°F. In a year, it would dip to –100°. The top layers of the oceans would freeze over**, but in an apocalyptic irony, that ice would insulate the deep water below and prevent the oceans from freezing solid for hundreds of thousands of years. Millions of years after that, our planet would reach a stable –400°, the temperature at which the heat radiating from the planet’s core would equal the heat that the Earth radiates into space, explains David Stevenson, a professor of planetary science at the California Institute of Technology. **Although some microorganisms living in the Earth’s crust would survive, the majority of life would enjoy only a brief post-sun existence. Photosynthesis would halt immediately, and most plants would die in a few weeks. Large trees, however, could survive for several decades, thanks to slow metabolism and substantial sugar stores. With the food chain’s bottom tier knocked out, most animals would die off quickly, but scavengers picking over the dead remains could last until the cold killed them.**

## 2

**Link: My opponent has cut their hair, cx checks**

**It is a sin to cut your hair.**

Moses, "**Leviticus 19:** 27 "'Various Laws” About 7 Century BCE https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Leviticus+19&version=NIV

When you enter the land and plant any kind of fruit tree, regard its fruit as forbidden.[[b](https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Leviticus+19&version=NIV#fen-NIV-3305b)] For three years you are to consider it forbidden[[c](https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Leviticus+19&version=NIV#fen-NIV-3305c)]; it must not be eaten. 24 In the fourth year all its fruit will be holy, an offering of praise to the Lord. 25 But in the fifth year you may eat its fruit. In this way your harvest will be increased. I am the Lord your God. 26 “‘Do not eat any meat with the blood still in it. “‘Do not practice divination or seek omens. 27 “‘**Do not cut the hair at the sides of your head** or clip off the edges of your beard. 28 “‘Do not cut your bodies for the dead or put tattoo marks on yourselves. I am the Lord.

**Thus my opp embraces Sin. Through embracing sin, my opponent opens up the road to chaos.**

Bishop **Keith**, 4-1-20**16**, "Sin Leads to Chaos," http://www.wordoffaith.cc/devotional/a-word-you-can-live-by/2016/sin-leads-to-chaos

The period from the Garden of Eden until the God gave the Law to His people through Moses is known as the "years of chaos." **The perfect creation of God** had **spiraled into complete disorder because of sin.** Genesis 6:5 tells us that "every imagination of the thoughts of [man's] heart was only evil continually." Notice that verse says that man's thoughts were nothing but evil! **That's the way sin works; unless it is stopped, it continues to spread. Sin is never satisfied with a little. It always wants more. The one transgression committed by Adam and Eve multiplied until every man was consumed with evil. There is no such thing as a "little sin." Some sins have more immediate negative consequences, but any sin that is ignored will lead to more sin. That's why the Apostle Paul said to give the devil no place.** Have you ever heard the saying, "Don't let the devil ride; if you let him ride, pretty soon, he'll want to drive?" You need to kick him out of your car, your home, your work, your church, and your community! Deal with sin in your life before it is allowed to create chaos. The Word says if we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. Do that today and keep moving forward in peace!

**The link’s clear: My opponent cut their hair and this is a sin.**

**The world of sin and chaos was a realm that invited the wrath of God, including major flooding.**

Russell M. **Grigg**, "Noah's Flood—why?, Creation Ministries International" https://creation.com/noahs-flood-why

In the last two issues of Creation magazine we have shown stamps with the biblical themes of 'The Creation of the World' and 'Jonah and the Great Fish', from Palau. In this issue, the 'Noah's Ark' stamps are from the island nation of St Vincent, in the West Indies.The 'Noah's Ark' stamps from the volcanic island of St. Vincent in the eastern Caribbean Sea.The artist has depicted the end of the Flood, with Noah's Ark resting on a mountain under a rainbow,1 and a selection of pairs of various animals, including koalas and kangaroos.Answers to various objections concerning the Flood—both scientific and practical—that skeptics have raised over the years have been published in many creationist books,2 films/videos,3 and magazines,4 so in this article we shall discuss the reasons why the Flood occurred.Genesis chapter 6 gives four reasons why **God sent the Flood [because] :'The wickedness of man was great in the earth'** (v. 5).'Every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually' (v. 5).'The earth was filled with violence' (v. 11).'The earth...was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth' (v. 12). (All the people on earth had corrupted their way.)The historical biblical record states, 'And **God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt**' (Genesis 6:12). This is in sharp contrast to God's declaration when he had finished creating the heaven and the earth, namely, 'And God saw everything that he had made, and behold, it was very good' (Genesis 1:31). It is astounding to consider that in the tenth generation from Adam the human race had become so wicked, evil, violent and corrupt that it was not fit to go on living. And of all mankind only four men and four women were spared, because they did not go with the great sin drift.Q: Are these reasons adequate to have warranted the wholesale destruction of the human race?A: The Bible tells us that mankind was created by God as a special being, made in God's image, to live according to the rules which God has laid down. When mankind breaks those rules judgment follows. Why? Because God, as a result of His holiness and justice, has decreed to punish the wicked and disobedient. Sometimes this punishment is evident to all in this life, but the ultimate punishment awaits the Day of Judgment. 'And it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment' (Hebrew 9:27). This judgment is described in Revelation 20:11-15. In the case of those living on earth in Noah's day, God adjudged that their deeds were such as to necessitate the penalty which He imposed.John Calvin commented, 'It [the whole earth] was not overwhelmed with a deluge of waters till it had first been immersed in the pollution of wickedness...that wickedness was too deeply seated in their hearts, to leave any hope of repentance.'5Q: Why were the earth and animals destroyed too? A : In so far as sin is a transgression of the law, it is guilt; in so far as it is a principle, it is pollution and defilement. Calvin said, 'The earth was like a wealthy house, well supplied with every kind of provision in abundance and variety. Now, since man has defiled the earth itself with his crimes, and has vilely corrupted all the riches with which it was replenished, the Lord also designed that the monument of his punishment should there be placed: just as if a judge, about to punish a most wicked and nefarious criminal, should, for the sake of greater infamy, command his house to be razed to the foundation. And this all tends to inspire us with a dread of sin; for we may easily infer how great is its atrocity, when the punishment of it is extended even to the brute creation.'6 God's mercy regarding the Flood is just as evident as His judgment, and is seen in the fact that God provided a way of escape for those who were prepared to believe what He had said, heed the warning He gave, and avail themselves of the means of salvation which He provided by instructing Noah to build the Ark (Genesis 6:14-16).Noah is described as 'a just man', 'perfect in his generations', who 'walked with God',7 and who 'found grace in the eyes of the Lord' (Genesis 6:8-9); he was also 'a preacher of righteousness' (2 Peter 2:5). From this it is very reasonable to conclude that his messages, perhaps preached from the platform of the partially completed Ark, included warnings of the coming judgment and invitations to his listeners to avail themselves of the one means of escape, which he was constructing. In the event, Noah and his family alone had regard to the wrath of God, and only eight people boarded the Ark in faith and were saved—Noah, his wife, his three sons, and their three wives.On one occasion Jesus said, 'As the days of Noah were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be' (Matthew 24:37). As we have seen, the days of Noah involved four types of iniquity: great wickedness, evil imaginations, violence and corruption, and these things have all become a way of life in the 1990s. When people are taught from kindergarten to adulthood through every branch of the media and the education system that the world made itself (and thus God is unnecessary or does not exist), and that they are nothing more than evolved animals, it is not surprising that they give themselves over to these sorts of behaviour. As a result, the Ten Commandments have become the 'ten suggestions', chastity is regarded as 'neurotic inhibition', immorality has become 'the new morality', perversion is 'an alternative life style', and the only absolute left in society is that there are no absolutes.8Violence and immorality, rather than being abhorrent in society, have become the subject of entertainment. Some films today portray more than 100 acts of violence per hour. And it seems that few films can be made these days without showing specific acts of adultery or fornication. It has become 'old-fashioned' to speak out against this, so it is little wonder that this celluloid action is emulated in real life, as happened when a film dealing with gang violence, called Boyz N the Hood opened in 800 cinemas across the USA in 1991. One man was killed and 20 other moviegoers were shot, stabbed or beaten up in a wave of copy-cat audience violence which erupted in cinemas, drive-ins, and car parks. The warnings given to Noah's generation are terrifyingly relevant today. **When God's mercy is rejected, then His judgment must and will fall.** But, as in the days of Noah, so now God has both given warning of the judgment to come and provided a way of salvation. The Ark was the only refuge from divine judgment then and it had to be entered by faith. As such it speaks to us of the Lord Jesus Christ, the only Saviour for sinful mankind today, whose death on the Cross must be appropriated by faith. 'For by grace are ye saved through faith' (Ephesians 2:8); 'Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved' (Acts 4:12). As the Apostle Paul declares, 'I declare unto you the Gospel...By which also ye are saved...how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; And that he was buried, and that He rose again the third day' (1 Corinthians 15: 1-4).

**Floods have severe economic disadvantages.**

Kimberly **Amadeo**, 9-9-20**17**, "Natural Disasters Are a Bigger Threat Than Terrorism," Balance, https://www.thebalance.com/cost-of-natural-disasters-3306214

Financial guru Warren Buffett said that **natural disasters have a greater economic impact than terrorism.** They include hurricanes, earthquakes, tornadoes, **floods**, droughts and tsunamis. They **cost the insurance industry billions.** If large enough, they can **slow economic growth for decades**.They can **[and]** **raise food and gas prices.** Global warming, according to a UN study, causes increased natural disasters. Perhaps the Sage of Omaha would agree that a war on global warming would be a better use of federal funds than the War on Terror. Listed below are the 13 most destructive natural disasters. Japan's economy was dealt a devastating blow by the 9-magnitude earthquake and tsunami that pummeled the country on March 11. An estimated 28,000 died, and 500,000 were displaced. It damaged the Fukushima nuclear power plant, which leaked radiation into the Pacific Ocean, raising levels to 4,000 times the legal limit. It could take months to stop the leak. Radiation has shown up in local milk and vegetables, and briefly appeared in Tokyo's drinking water. The World Bank estimated that Japan's disaster could cost $235 billion, and take five years to rebuild.The National Hurricane Center estimated Hurricane Katrina's damage at $108 billion, with $80 billion in insured losses. Half of these **losses were a result of flooding in New Orleans.** University of North Texas Profession Bernard Weinstein put **[with]** **the total economic impact at $250 billion.**Hurricane Irma is the most powerful Atlantic hurricane in recorded history. It was a Category 5 storm when it made landfall on Barbuda on September 6, 2017. Its winds were 185 miles per hour for 37 hours. That's longer than any storm ever recorded. It's expected to hit southern Florida on September 10. If so, it could inflict $200 billion in damage.Hurricane Harvey was a Category 4 storm that hit Texas on August 25, 2017. It caused $180 billion in damage. It affected 13 million people from Texas through Louisiana, Mississippi, Tennessee and Kentucky. As of September 9, 2017, 70 people have died.  Hurricane Sandy hit New Jersey on October 29, 2012. It had been downgraded to a tropical storm, but still did $50 billion in damage. That's because  of 12 1/2 foot storm surges.  It damaged or destroyed more than 650,000 homes and eight million customers lost power. It closed the NYSE for the first time in 27 years. The New Jersey electronic exchanges closed for two days. The storm killed 159 people either directly or indirectly. Hurricane Ike cost $29.5 billion. It damaged pipelines in the Gulf of Mexico and destroyed 10 Gulf offshore oil rigs. All 22 Texas land-based oil refineries were shut down. This part of Texas is home to a quarter of U.S. crude oil and refinery production. As a result, gas prices spiked to $5 a gallon, prompting the government to open the Strategic Petroleum Reserves.Hurricane Irene hit the Outer Banks of North Carolina on August 26, 2011. It was a Category 2 by the time it made landfall. Hurricanes lose power as they travel over land, so Irene became a Category 1 by the time it reached New York on August 27, and a tropical storm by the time it arrived in New England on Sunday. Irene was the first hurricane to hit the Boston area since 1991.Irene killed at least 20 people and left 4.5 million people without power. Property damage was $15.8 billion. University of Maryland economist Peter Morici estimated total economic impact at $45 billion.Between 200,000-250,000 people were killed by the 7.3 magnitude earthquake that ravaged Haiti in January 2010. That was 2 percent of the total Haitian population of 10 million. The Inter-American Development Bank estimated that it cost $8.5 billion in damage to Haiti's economy. The earthquake caused the country's GDP to contract 5.1 percent that year.The largest tornado outbreak in U.S. history occurred April 25-27, 2011. In that week, 305 twisters damaged the Southeast, breaking the 1974 record of 267 tornadoes. The outbreak caused $5 billion in damage.  One single tornado in 1999 cost $1 billion alone. Although experts disagree, there is reason to believe these expensive outbreaks will get worse.Volcanic clouds and ash from the May 21, 2011, eruption in Iceland threatened air traffic in Scotland, Ireland, France and other hubs in the northern European Union. Even though the Grimsvotn volcanic eruption was bigger than the previous year's, it wasn't as destructive economically. That's because the ash wasn't as dense, and dispersed more easily.Iceland's 2010 Eyjafjallajökull volcano eruption closed European airports for six days, costing airlines $200 million a day. They were not insured for this type of loss.Iceland's volcanic eruptions threatens the travel industry. It contributes $1 trillion to the European economy annually. The 2010 eruption cost the travel industry $5 billion to $10 billion a week. When air traffic in Europe slows, it threatens more than just passengers. Up to 40 percent of the world's goods by value moves by air. Drug companies, time-sensitive high-tech imports, and premium products such as fine Scotch whiskeys all sit on the tarmacs when airports are closed. **The 2011 Mississippi River flood was a 500-year event. Total economic damage could reach several billion.** Why? **The Mississippi River runs past farmlands and cities in six states. The flood's greatest damage could come when it empties in New Orleans, still recovering from Hurricane Katrina.**

**Environmental degradation increases war, instability, and hurts the economy**

**UN, 4** (United Nations News Center, “Environmental destruction during war exacerbates instability” November 5, 2004,<http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=12460&Cr=conflict&Cr1=environment>,

"These scars, **threatening water supplies, the fertility of the land and the cleanliness of the air are recipes for instability between communities and neighbouring countries**," he added. Citing a new UNEP report produced in collaboration with the UN Development Programme ([UNDP](http://www.undp.org/dpa/journalists/index.html)) and the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), Mr. Toepfer stressed that **environmental degradation could undermine local and international security by "reinforcing and increasing grievances within and between societies."** The study finds that **a decrepit and declining environment can depress economic activity and diminish the authority of the state in the eyes of its citizens.** It also points out that the addressing environmental problems can foster trust among communities and neighbouring countries. "Joint projects to clean up sites, agreements and treaties to better share resources such as rivers and forests, and strengthening cooperation between the different countries' ministries and institutions may hold the key to building trust, understanding and more stable relations," said the [**UNEP**](http://www.unep.org/) chief.

**The US is key to the global economy**

**Caploe 9**

David, CEO  
of the Singapore-incorporated American Centre for Applied Liberal Arts and  
Humanities in Asia., “Focus still on America to lead global recovery”, April 7,  
The Strait Times, lexis

IN THE  
aftermath of the G-20 summit, most observers seem to have missed perhaps the  
most crucial statement of the entire event, made by United States President  
Barack Obama at his pre-conference meeting with British Prime Minister Gordon  
Brown: 'The world has become accustomed to the US being a voracious consumer  
market, the engine that drives a lot of economic growth worldwide,' he said.  
'If there is going to be renewed growth, it just can't be the US as the  
engine.'  While superficially sensible, this view is deeply problematic. To begin with, it ignores the fact that **the global economy  
has** in fact **been  
'America-centred' for more than 60 years**. Countries - China, Japan, Canada, Brazil, Korea, Mexico and so on -  
either sell to the US or they sell to countries that sell to the US.  This system has generally been advantageous for all concerned.  
America gained certain historically unprecedented benefits, but the system also  
enabled participating countries - first in Western Europe and Japan, and later,  
many in the Third World - to achieve undreamt-of prosperity.  At the same  
time, this deep inter-connection between the US and the rest of the world also  
explains how the collapse of a relatively small sector of the US economy -  
'sub-prime' housing, logarithmically exponentialised by Wall Street's ingenious  
chicanery - has cascaded into the worst global economic crisis since the Great  
Depression.  To  
put it simply, Mr Obama doesn't seem to understand that **there is no other  
engine for the world economy** -  
and hasn't been for the last six decades. *If the US does not drive global economic growth, growth is not going  
to happen.* Thus, **US policies** to deal with the current crisis **are critical not just  
domestically, but also to the entire world**. Consequently,  
it is a matter of global concern that the Obama administration seems to be  
following Japan's 'model' from the 1990s: allowing major banks to avoid  
declaring massive losses openly and transparently, and so perpetuating 'zombie'  
banks - technically alive but in reality dead.  As analysts like Nobel  
laureates Joseph Stiglitz and Paul Krugman have pointed out, the  
administration's unwillingness to confront US banks is the main reason why they  
are continuing their increasingly inexplicable credit freeze, thus ravaging the  
American and global economies. Team Obama seems reluctant to acknowledge the  
extent to which its policies at home are failing not just there but around the  
world as well.  Which raises the question: If the US can't or won't or doesn't want to be the global economic engine, which country will?  The  
obvious answer is China. But that is unrealistic for three reasons.  First, **China's economic health is** more **tied to America's** than practically any other country in the world.  
Indeed, the reason China has so many dollars to invest everywhere - whether in  
US Treasury bonds or in Africa - is precisely that it has structured its own  
economy to complement America's. **The only way China can serve as the engine of the  
global economy is if the US starts pulling it first.**  Second, the US-centred system began at a time when its domestic  
demand far outstripped that of the rest of the world. The fundamental source of  
its economic power is its ability to act as the global consumer of last resort.  
 China, however, is a poor country, with low per capita income, even  
though it will soon pass Japan as the world's second largest economy. There are  
real possibilities for growth in China's domestic demand. But given its  
structure as an export-oriented economy, it is doubtful if even a successful  
Chinese stimulus plan can pull the rest of the world along unless and until  
China can start selling again to the US on a massive scale.  Finally, the  
key 'system' issue for China - or for the European Union - in thinking about  
becoming the engine of the world economy - is monetary: What are the  
implications of having your domestic currency become the global reserve  
currency?  This is an extremely complex issue that the US has struggled  
with, not always successfully, from 1959 to the present. Without going into  
detail, it can safely be said that though having the US dollar as the world's  
medium of exchange has given the US some tremendous advantages, it has also  
created huge problems, both for America and the global economic system.  
 The Chinese leadership is certainly familiar with this history. It will  
try to avoid the yuan becoming an international medium of exchange until it  
feels much more confident in its ability to handle the manifold currency  
problems that the US has grappled with for decades.  **Given all this, the US will remain the engine of  
global** economic **recovery for the  
foreseeable future**, even  
though other countries must certainly help. This crisis began in the US - and  
it is going to have to be solved there too.

**Global economic collapse causes North Korean aggression, Russian adventurism, and American isolationism. The impact is GLOBAL THERMONUCLEAR WAR.**

**Royal 10** — Jedidiah Royal, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense, M.Phil. Candidate at the University of New South Wales, 2010 (“Economic Integration, Economic Signalling and the Problem of Economic Crises,” Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, Edited by Ben Goldsmith and Jurgen Brauer, Published by Emerald Group Publishing, ISBN 0857240048, p. 213-215)

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may **increase the likelihood of external conflict**. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often **bloody transition** from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin. 1981) that leads to **uncertainty** about power balances, **increasing the risk of miscalculation** (Feaver, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner. 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland's (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that 'future expectation of trade' is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult [end page 213] to replace items such as energy resources, **the likelihood for conflict increases**, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4 Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write, The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are **strong** and **mutually reinforcing**. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn **returns the favour**. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to **amplify** the extent to which international and external conflicts **self-reinforce** each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002. p. 89) Economic decline has also been linked with an **increase in** the likelihood of **terrorism** (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to **spill across borders** and lead to **external tensions**. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. “Diversionary theory" suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have **increased incentives** to **fabricate external military conflicts** to create a 'rally around the flag' effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995). and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are **statistically linked** to an increase in the use of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at **systemic, dyadic and national levels**.5 This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention. This observation is **not contradictory** to other perspectives that link economic interdependence with a decrease in the likelihood of external conflict, such as those mentioned in the first paragraph of this chapter. [end page 214] Those studies tend to focus on dyadic interdependence instead of global interdependence and **do not specifically consider** the occurrence of and conditions created by economic crises. As such, the view presented here should be considered ancillary to those views.

**Nuclear War causes extinction- it’s the ultimate impact.**

**Starr 15**

(Steven Starr, 10-14-2015, accessed on 1-11-2021, Federation Of American Scientists, "Nuclear War, Nuclear Winter, and Human Extinction", <https://fas.org/pir-pubs/nuclear-war-nuclear-winter-and-human-extinction>/)/ZS

By Steven Starr • October 14, 2015 **While it is impossible to precisely predict all the human impacts that would result from a nuclear winter,** it is relatively simple to predict those which would be most profound. That is, **a nuclear winter would cause most humans and large animals to die from nuclear famine in a mass extinction event similar to the one that wiped out the dinosaurs.**

**The alt is to vote for the debater who leads to less sin, that being the affirmative debater as the aff debater is not openly admitting and normalizing sin.**

**Independent of considerations of future happiness or life, death is ontologically the worst possible evil since it destroys the subject itself**

**Paterson, 03** – Department of Philosophy, Providence College, Rhode Island (Craig, “A Life Not Worth Living?”, Studies in Christian Ethics.

Contrary to those accounts, I would argue that it is **death** per se that **is** really **the objective evil** for us, not because it deprives us of a prospective future of overall good judged better than the alter- native of non-being. It cannot be about harm to a former person who has ceased to exist, for no person actually suffers from the sub-sequent non-participation. Rather, **death in itself is an evil to us because it ontologically destroys the current existent subject — it is the ultimate in metaphysical lightening strikes.**80 The evil of death is truly an ontological evil borne by the person who already exists, independently of calculations about better or worse possible lives. Such an evil need not be consciously experienced in order to be an evil for the kind of being a human person is. **Death is an evil because of the change in kind it brings about, a change that is destructive of the type of entity that we essentially are. Anything, whether caused naturally or caused by human intervention (intentional or unintentional) that drastically interferes in the process of maintaining the person in existence is an objective evil for the person**. What is crucially at stake here, and is dialectically supportive of the self-evidency of the basic good of human life, is that death is a radical interference with the current life process of the kind of being that we are. In consequence, **death itself can be credibly thought of as a ‘primitive evil’ for all persons, regardless of the extent to which they are currently or prospectively capable of participating in a full array of the goods of life.81  In conclusion, concerning willed human actions, it is justifiable to state that any intentional rejection of human life itself cannot therefore be warranted since it is an expression of an ultimate disvalue for the subject, namely, the destruction of the present person; a radical ontological good that we cannot begin to weigh objectively against the travails of life in a rational manner.** To deal with the sources of disvalue (pain, suffering, etc.) we should not seek to irrationally destroy the person, the very source and condition of all human possibility.82

**Since preservation of life is intrinsically good we have an ethical obligation to meet that duty to the best of our ability – arguments like over-demandingness, act-omission distinction, and intent/foresight distinction are ultimately useless since they have no ethical grounding in an intrinsic good. It’s tautological to say that maximizing good will maximize the good, so any constraints on my framework are false. Thus, the role of the ballot is minimizing extinction in the debate space.**

## 3

# Method

**Joke cases are the superior method of debating in LD debate.**

1. **Serious arguments lead to an early grave**

**Walton**, Alice G. “Could Arguing With Family And Friends Lead To An Early Death?” Forbes, Forbes Magazine, 10 May 20**14,** [**www.forbes.com/sites/alicegwalton/2014/05/09/could-frequent-fights-with-friends-and-family-lead-to-an-early-grave/#56d2bd41785a**](http://www.forbes.com/sites/alicegwalton/2014/05/09/could-frequent-fights-with-friends-and-family-lead-to-an-early-grave/#56d2bd41785a)**.**

If you’re prone to bickering with those around you, a new study suggests that you may want to work on that. The research, published in the Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, reports **[there is] a strong link between the amount of arguing a person does and the risk of dying from any cause over the next 10 years.** Being a man and being out of work made the connection stronger. But across the board, there was **a significant association between mortality and the frequency of arguments with family, friends, and even neighbors.** The study, out of the University of Cogenhagen, followed almost 10,000 people, aged 36-52, for 11 years. The researchers asked them about their social relationships, paying special attention to which of the people in their lives tended to be linked with the most arguments. Over the course of the study, 196 women and 226 men died. About half of the deaths were due to cancer, and the other half from heart disease, accidents, and suicides.

**Mcdermott,** Nicholas. “Arguing Parents Can Give a Child Teenage Depression.” Daily Mail Online, Associated Newspapers, 29 Nov. 20**12,** [**www.dailymail.co.uk/health/article-2239897/Arguing-parents-child-teenage-depression.html**](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/health/article-2239897/Arguing-parents-child-teenage-depression.html)**.**

**Children who often see their parents having [arguments]** rows **are at risk of depression,** experts have warned. Teenagers who witnessed lots of arguments in early childhood **were more likely to suffer from the illness than others**, said a Cambridge University team. ‘Violent arguments in front of the children contribute to the likelihood of depression,’ said Professor Barbara Sahakian, of the university’s psychiatry department and co-author of the report. Research has found those who witnessed frequent arguments during childhood and possessed a gene making them more sensitive to emotions, were significantly likelier to become depressed. ‘If you are staying together for the sake of the family, then fighting and arguing in front of the kids is not good. **It would be better for them not to have that kind of environment.’** The team identified a gene that made some children more sensitive to emotions and also more likely to develop depression.

**Laughter is actually beneficial to health**

**Mayoclinic** April 21, 20**16**(<https://www.mayoclinic.org/healthy-lifestyle/stress-management/in-depth/stress-relief/art-20044456>)

Whether you're guffawing at a sitcom on TV or quietly giggling at a newspaper cartoon, laughing does you good. **Laughter is a great form of stress relief,** and that's no joke. Stress relief from laughter: A good sense of humor can't cure all ailments, but data is mounting about the positive things laughter can do. Short-term benefits: **A good laugh has great short-term effects**. When you start to laugh, **it** doesn't just lighten your load mentally, it actually induces physical changes in your body. Laughter **can**: **Stimulate many organs.** **Laughter enhances your intake of oxygen-rich air, stimulates your heart, lungs and muscles, and increases the endorphins that are released by your brain.**Activate and relieve your stress response. A rollicking laugh fires up and then cools down your stress response, and it can increase your heart rate and blood pressure. The result? A good, relaxed feeling.  
Soothe tension. Laughter can also stimulate circulation and aid muscle relaxation, both of which can help reduce some of the physical symptoms of stress.  
Long-term effects  
  
Laughter isn't just a quick pick-me-up, though. **It's also good for you over the long term**. Laughter may: **Improve your immune system. Negative thoughts manifest into chemical reactions that can affect your body by bringing more stress into your system and decreasing your immunity. In contrast, positive thoughts can actually release neuropeptides that help fight stress and potentially more-serious illnesses. Relieve pain.** Laughter may ease pain by causing the body to produce its own natural painkillers.  
Increase personal satisfaction. Laughter can also make it easier to cope with difficult situations. It also helps you connect with other people. Improve your mood. Many people experience depression, sometimes due to chronic illnesses. Laughter can help lessen your depression and anxiety and may make you feel happier. Improve your sense of humor Are you afraid you have an underdeveloped — or nonexistent — sense of humor? No problem. Humor can be learned. In fact, developing or refining your sense of humor may be easier than you think. Put humor on your horizon. Find a few simple items, such as photos, greeting cards or comic strips, that make you chuckle. Then hang them up at home or in your office. Keep funny movies, books or comedy albums on hand for when you need an added humor boost. Look online at joke websites. Go to a comedy club. Laugh and the world laughs with you. Find a way to laugh about your own situations and watch your stress begin to fade away. Even if it feels forced at first, practice laughing. It does your body good. Consider trying laughter yoga. In laughter yoga, people practice laughter as a group. Laughter is forced at first, but it can soon turn into spontaneous laughter. Share a laugh. Make it a habit to spend time with friends who make you laugh. And then return the favor by sharing funny stories or jokes with those around you.  
Knock, knock. Browse through your local bookstore or library's selection of joke books and get a few rib ticklers in your repertoire that you can share with friends. Know what isn't funny. Don't laugh at the expense of others. Some forms of humor aren't appropriate. Use your best judgment to discern a good joke from a bad, or hurtful, one.  
Laughter is the best medicine Go ahead and give it a try. Turn the corners of your mouth up into a smile and then give a laugh, even if it feels a little forced. Once you've had your chuckle, take stock of how you're feeling. Are your muscles a little less tense? Do you feel more relaxed or buoyant? **That's the natural wonder of laughing at work.**

**Joke cases are priori to Theory**

**Theory attacks an opponent for a violation of a debate rule/norm, on the premise, of education and fairness. Any joke case should be weighed over this, because of the health benefits. We can’t debate serious theory if we are dead. Education and fairness don’t matter if we are dead. Thus we must weigh joke cases above theory.**

**Joke cases are priori to Ks**

**A kritik is an argument that seeks to attack an underlying assumption in your case, or an action that is inherently bad. The debaters life, and safety should be prioritized over this. We can’t debate the serious K if we are dead. Thus weight joke cases above this.**

**Joke cases are priori to plans**

**These are serious arguments that cause death. No on topic serious discussion can be evaluated in this round.**