## 1

#### Interp – the aff must explicitly delineate a comprehensive role of the ballot and how the round plays out under it in the form of a text in the 1AC. To clarify, they must –

#### - Clarify how offense links to it, e.g. address the pre-fiat vs post-fiat distinction

#### - Clarify whether theory is relevant under it

#### - Clarify how to weigh between competing advocacies, e.g. if the ballot is determined by the flow

#### Violation – there’s no text in the 1AC

#### Standards –

#### 1] Engagement – if I don’t know how the role of the ballot functions, it’s impossible for me to engage the aff, since knowing what counts as offense for me is a prerequisite to being able to make meaningful arguments that clash with yours.

#### 2] Strategy Skew – you make formulating a strategy impossible since I don’t know what links to your evaluative mechanism. My interp means we know what a legitimate neg advocacy is, otherwise you can make up reasons mine doesn’t link to the role of the ballot in the next speech.

#### Fairness/Edu/DTD -

#### Competing Interpretations – a] Race to top – B] Reasonability bad –

#### ~ Reject Aff RVIs ~

#### A - Forcing the 1NC to go all in on the shell kills substance education and neg strat which outweighs on timeframe, B - discourages checking real abuse which outweighs on norm-setting and constituvisim C - Encourages baiting – outweighs because if the shell is frivolous, they can beat it quickly D – its illogical for you to win for proving you were fair – outweighs since logic is a litmus test for other arguments

#### 1NC theory first - 1] Abuse was self-inflicted- They started the chain of abuse and forced me down this strategy 2] Norming- We have more speeches to norm over whether it’s a good idea since the shell was read earlier.

#### Norming outweighs A] Constutivism- It’s the constitutive purpose of theory debating B] Sequencing- it’s a pre-requisite to actualizing any other voter like fairness or education  3] Longevity – voting for the shell solves this rounds abuse BUT also future round’s abuse

#### Neg abuse outweighs Aff abuse – 1] Infinite prep time before round to frontline 2] 2AR judge psychology and 1st and last speech 3] Infinite perms and uplayering in the 1AR.

#### Reasonability on 1AR shells – 1AR theory is very aff-biased because the 2AR gets to line-by-line every 2NR standard with new answers that never get responded to– reasonability checks 2AR sandbagging by preventing really abusive 1NCs while still giving the 2N a chance.

#### DTA on 1AR shells - They can blow up a blippy 20 second shell to 3 min of the 2AR while I have to split my time and can’t preempt 2AR spin which necessitates judge intervention and means 1AR theory is irresolvable so you shouldn’t stake the round on it.

#### RVIs on 1AR theory – 1AR being able to spend 20 seconds on a shell and still win forces the 2N to allocate at least 2:30 on the shell which means RVIs check back time skew – ows on quantifiability

#### [If applicable] No new 1ar theory paradigm issues- A] the 1NC has already occurred with current paradigm issues in mind so new 1ar paradigms moot any theoretical offense B] introducing them in the aff allows for them to be more rigorously tested which o/w’s on time frame since we can set higher quality norms.

## 2

#### Interp – if the aff defends anything other than the entire resolution then they must provide a linked article or a card by an author who explicitly advocates against the 1AC advocacy. Violation – Standards – 1] Limits – there are infinite things you could defend outside the exact text of the resolution which pushes you to the limits of contestable arguments, even if your interp of the topic is better, the only way to verify if it’s substantively fair is proof of counter-arguments.

#### 2] Shiftiness – having a counter-solvency advocate helps us conceptualize what their advocacy is and how it’s implemented. Intentionally ambiguous affirmatives we don’t know much about can’t spike out of DA’s and CP’s if they have an advocate that delineates these things.

#### 3] Research – forces the aff to go to the other side of the library and contest their own view points, as well as encouraging in depth-research about their own position.

## 3

#### Permissibility and presumption negate – a.  the resolution indicates the affirmative has to prove an obligation, and permissibility would deny the existence of an obligation which outweighs on textuality b. Statements are more often false than true because any part can be false. This means you negate if there is no offense because the resolution is probably false which outweighs on probability and if I’m textual I’m fair because the topic is the most predictable, so you could’ve engaged.

#### The neg burden is to prove that the aff won’t logically happen in the status quo, and the aff burden is to prove that it will.

**Prefer:**

**1] Text –**

**A] Ought is “used to express logical consequence” as defined by Merriam-Webster**

(<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought>) //Massa

**B] Oxford Dictionary defines ought as “used to indicate something that is probable.”**

<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/ought> //Massa

**2] Debatability – a) it focuses debates on empirics about squo trends rather than irresolvable abstract principles that’ve been argued for years b) moral oughts cannot guide action.**

**Grey 11,**Grey, JW. "The Is/Ought Gap: How Do We Get "Ought" from "Is?"" Ethical Realism. N.p., 19 July 2011. Web. 28 Oct. 2015. //Massa

**The is/ought gap is a problem in moral philosophy where what is the case and what ought to be the case seem quite different, and it presents itself as the following question** to David Hume: **How do we *know* what morally ought to be the case from what is the case?** Hume posed the question in A Treatise of Human Nature Book III Part I Section I: In **every system of morality**, which I have hitherto met with, I have always remark’d that the author proceeds for some time in the ordinary way of reasoning, and establishes the being of a God, or makes observations concerning human affairs, when of a sudden I am surpriz’d to find, that instead of the usual copulations of propositions, is and is not, I meet with no proposition that is not connected with an ought, or an ought not. This change **is imperceptible**; but is, however, of the last consequence. **For as this ought**, or ought not, **expresses some new relation** or affirmation, ‘tis necessary that it shou’d be observ’d and explain’d; and at the same time that a reason shou’d be given, **for what seems altogether inconceivable**, how this new relation can be a deduction from others, which are entirely different from it. It is here that Hume points out that **philosophers argue about** various **nonmoral facts, then somehow conclude what ought to be the case** (or what people ought to do) **based on** those facts (about **what is the case**). **For example, we might find out that arsenic is poisonous and conclude that we ought not consume it. But we need to know how nonmoral facts can lead to moral conclusions. These two things seem unrelated. The is/ought gap [isn’t]** doesn’t seem like **a problem for nonmoral oughts**—what we ought to do to accomplish our goals, fulfill our desires, or maintain our commitments. For example, we could say, “If you want to be healthy, you ought not consume arsenic.” However, it might be morally wrong to consume arsenic. If it is, we have some more explaining to do.

**Neg definition choice – the aff should have defined ought in the 1ac because it was in the rez so it’s predictable contestation, by not doing so they have forfeited their right to read a new definition – kills 1NC strategy since I premised my engagement on a lack of your definition – treat this as a shell if they engage in it.**

**Now negate:**

**1] Inherency – either a) the aff is non-inherent and you vote neg on presumption or b) it isn’t going to happen, because there is no way the congress is going to pass the plan during COVID, considering they have better things to do.**

**2] To go anywhere, you must go halfway first, and then you must go half of the remaining distance, and half of the remaining distance, and so forth to infinity – thus, motion is impossible because it necessitates traversing an infinite number of spaces in a finite amount of time. If movement is impossible, banning appropriation isn’t possible/a logical consequence of the resolution.**

**3**

## Case

#### Future generations extinction o/ws under util

GPP 17 (Global Priorities Project, Future of Humanity Institute at the University of Oxford, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, “Existential Risk: Diplomacy and Governance,” Global Priorities Project, 2017, <https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Existential-Risks-2017-01-23.pdf>/TK

1.2. THE ETHICS OF EXISTENTIAL RISK In his book Reasons and Persons, Oxford philosopher Derek Parfit advanced an influential argument about the importance of avoiding extinction: I believe that if we destroy mankind, as we now can, this outcome will be much worse than most people think. Compare three outcomes: (1) Peace. (2) A nuclear war that kills 99% of the world’s existing population. (3) A nuclear war that kills 100%. (2) would be worse than (1), and (3) would be worse than (2). Which is the greater of these two differences? Most people believe that the greater difference is between (1) and (2). I believe that the difference between (2) and (3) is very much greater. ... The Earth will remain habitable for at least another billion years. Civilization began only a few thousand years ago. If we do not destroy mankind, these few thousand years may be only a tiny fraction of the whole of civilized human history. The difference between (2) and (3) may thus be the difference between this tiny fraction and all of the rest of this history. If we compare this possible history to a day, what has occurred so far is only a fraction of a second.65 In this argument, it seems that Parfit is assuming that the survivors of a nuclear war that kills 99% of the population would eventually be able to recover civilisation without long-term effect. As we have seen, this may not be a safe assumption – but for the purposes of this thought experiment, the point stands. What makes existential catastrophes especially bad is that they would “destroy the future,” as another Oxford philosopher, Nick Bostrom, puts it.66 This future could potentially be extremely long and full of flourishing, and would therefore have extremely large value. In standard risk analysis, when working out how to respond to risk, we work out the expected value of risk reduction, by weighing the probability that an action will prevent an adverse event against the severity of the event. Because the value of preventing existential catastrophe is so vast, even a tiny probability of prevention has huge expected value.67 Of course, there is persisting reasonable disagreement about ethics and there are a number of ways one might resist this conclusion.68 Therefore, it would be unjustified to be overconfident in Parfit and Bostrom’s argument. In some areas, government policy does give significant weight to future generations. For example, in assessing the risks of nuclear waste storage, governments have considered timeframes of thousands, hundreds of thousands, and even a million years.69 Justifications for this policy usually appeal to principles of intergenerational equity according to which future generations ought to get as much protection as current generations.70 Similarly, widely accepted norms of sustainable development require development that meets the needs of the current generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.71 However, when it comes to existential risk, it would seem that we fail to live up to principles of intergenerational equity. Existential catastrophe would not only give future generations less than the current generations; it would give them nothing. Indeed, reducing existential risk plausibly has a quite low cost for us in comparison with the huge expected value it has for future generations. In spite of this, relatively little is done to reduce existential risk. Unless we give up on norms of intergenerational equity, they give us a strong case for significantly increasing our efforts to reduce existential risks. 1.3. WHY EXISTENTIAL RISKS MAY BE SYSTEMATICALLY UNDERINVESTED IN, AND THE ROLE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY In spite of the importance of existential risk reduction, it probably receives less attention than is warranted. As a result, concerted international cooperation is required if we are to receive adequate protection from existential risks. 1.3.1. Why existential risks are likely to be underinvested in There are several reasons why existential risk reduction is likely to be underinvested in. Firstly, it is a global public good. Economic theory predicts that such goods tend to be underprovided. The benefits of existential risk reduction are widely and indivisibly dispersed around the globe from the countries responsible for taking action. Consequently, a country which reduces existential risk gains only a small portion of the benefits but bears the full brunt of the costs. Countries thus have strong incentives to free ride, receiving the benefits of risk reduction without contributing. As a result, too few do what is in the common interest. Secondly, as already suggested above, existential risk reduction is an intergenerational public good: most of the benefits are enjoyed by future generations who have no say in the political process. For these goods, the problem is temporal free riding: the current generation enjoys the benefits of inaction while future generations bear the costs. Thirdly, many existential risks, such as machine superintelligence, engineered pandemics, and solar geoengineering, pose an unprecedented and uncertain future threat. Consequently, it is hard to develop a satisfactory governance regime for them: there are few existing governance instruments which can be applied to these risks, and it is unclear what shape new instruments should take. In this way, our position with regard to these emerging risks is comparable to the one we faced when nuclear weapons first became available. Cognitive biases also lead people to underestimate existential risks. Since there have not been any catastrophes of this magnitude, these risks are not salient to politicians and the public.72 This is an example of the misapplication of the availability heuristic, a mental shortcut which assumes that something is important only if it can be readily recalled. Another cognitive bias affecting perceptions of existential risk is scope neglect. In a seminal 1992 study, three groups were asked how much they would be willing to pay to save 2,000, 20,000 or 200,000 birds from drowning in uncovered oil ponds. The groups answered $80, $78, and $88, respectively.73 In this case, the size of the benefits had little effect on the scale of the preferred response. People become numbed to the effect of saving lives when the numbers get too large. 74 Scope neglect is a particularly acute problem for existential risk because the numbers at stake are so large. Due to scope neglect, decision-makers are prone to treat existential risks in a similar way to problems which are less severe by many orders of magnitude. A wide range of other cognitive biases are likely to affect the evaluation of existential risks.75

#### 1] Resiliency---most studies say famines would kill “billions” and some casually assert everyone would die---BUT, that’s an assumption not warranted by their studies

David S. **Stevenson 17**. Professor of planetary science at Caltech. 2017. “Agents of Mass Destruction.” The Nature of Life and Its Potential to Survive, Springer, Cham, pp. 273–340. link.springer.com, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-52911-0\_7./TK

When the dust settled, literally as well as figuratively, one would expect most human life to have been eliminated, along with most other large animal species. As a general rule those animals with a mass over 25 kg are most susceptible to extinction, because these have the largest appetites that are hardest to satiate. Although forests, not afflicted directly by the nuclear war, would shrivel, we would expect a reasonably fast recovery. This would be aided by elevated levels of carbon dioxide from all the incinerated cities and their residents. Thus, when the skies cleared plant life would recover strongly, aided in particular by a gross reduction in organisms that would otherwise eat them. Although the carbon dioxide-driven rebound might benefit plants, a spike in global temperatures could drive further species to extinction. It is, therefore, likely that Earth would suffer a global mass extinction event on a par with the demise of the dinosaurs at the end of the Cretaceous. What about humanity—would it survive? The direct death toll from the nuclear war would hover around 1.0–1.5 billion if we assume few survivors in the cities. Radioactive fallout might kill another few hundred million in areas downwind of the explosions. Remember that climate changes and nuclear winter-driven monsoon outflows would push radioactivity from Eurasia into China (assuming it was not directly involved) and southwards across India, southeast Asia and onto Australia and New Zealand. Likewise, much of South America and Africa would be grossly polluted by outflowing winds blowing from the devastated northern continents. These contaminated winds might kill another few hundred million. However, the real killer would be the prolonged cold. Aside from a meager band of bunkered humans with access to a long-lasting power supply that was sufficient to run underground greenhouses, almost all remaining humans in North America and Eurasia could expect to die from starvation over the ensuing few weeks to months if they could not move elsewhere. The death toll would then top two billion. Climatic effects in China, southern Asia and the southern hemisphere would lead to mass starvation, potentially killing a few billion more. If we begin our all-out war in the next 30 years, then of the ten billion likely to populate the planet, less than one billion would survive. Some calculations lower the surviving population to a few hundred thousand, with almost the entire human population starving to death. However, this may be a little overly pessimistic. Humans survived the ice ages where conditions were comparable to a nuclear winter. Certainly, the air wasn’t radioactive, and no, the skies weren’t darkened. However, the dregs of humanity are likely to cling on along the coastlines of southern South America, Southern Africa and the Antipodes. Living off the sea—the contaminated sea—humanity could cling on long enough for the biosphere to recover. Most of the planet would be uninhabitable for decades thanks to chemical and radioactive pollution from the war. However, there would be sufficient land to allow bands of survivors. At this point it is down to luck whether humanity survived overall. Humanity could become extinct if the remaining thousands of people are dispersed into isolated communities. Without a means to interbreed, small populations could become so inbred as to become unstable and go into catastrophic decline. Conversely, very isolated but manageable populations could diversify so that given sufficient time new species of humans might emerge in each community. Longer term, the planet would likely benefit from such a global conflict. Spurred on by an enhanced mutation rates and the loss of its top predator, most other surviving species would be presented with an evolutionary window where they could strongly diversify. Earth would experience its second Paleocene where surviving mammalian species could diversify to fill the niches we’d abandoned. Only the rapid re-expansion of remaining human species would prevent this—and this would likely depend on what technology remained and how quickly the population could re-grow.

#### 2] Radiation is wrong Incorrect---Japan and logic.

Arthur **Robinson &** Gary **North 86**. Robinson is the founder of the Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine, conducts laboratory research on the deamidation of peptides and proteins; North is an American economic historian. 06/01/1986. “Ch. 1: The Dangers from Nuclear Weapons: Myths and Facts.” in Fighting Chance: Ten Feet to Survival. Oregon Inst Science & Medicine./TK

° Myth: Fallout radiation penetrates everything; there is no escaping its deadly effects. ° Facts: Some gamma radiation from fallout will penetrate the shielding materials of even an excellent shelter and reach its occupants. However, the radiation dose that the occupants of an excellent shelter would receive while inside this shelter can be reduced to a dose smaller than the average American receives during his lifetime from X rays and other radiation exposures normal in America today. The design features of such a shelter include the use of a sufficient thickness of earth or other heavy shielding material. Gamma rays are like X rays, but more penetrating. Figure 1.3 shows how rapidly gamma rays are reduced in number (but not in their ability to penetrate) by layers of packed earth. Each of the layers shown is one halving-thickness of packed earth- about 3.6 inches (9 centimeters).3 A halving- thickness is the thickness of a material which reduces by half the dose of radiation that passes through it. The actual paths of gamma rays passing through shielding materials are much more complicated, due to scattering, etc., than are the straight-line paths shown in Fig. 1.3. But when averaged out, the effectiveness of a halving-thickness of any material is approximately as shown. The denser a substance, the better it serves for shielding material. Thus, a halving-thickness of concrete is only about 2.4 inches (6.1 cm). Book Page: 14 Fig. 1.3. Illustration of shielding against fallout radiation. Note the increasingly large improvements in the attenuation (reduction) factors that are attained as each additional halving-thickness of packed earth is added. ORNL-DWG 78-18834 If additional halving-thicknesses of packed earth shielding are successively added to the five thicknesses shown in Fig. 1.3, the protection factor (PF) is successively increased from 32 to 64, to 128, to 256, to 512, to 1024, and so on. ° Myth: A heavy nuclear attack would set practically everything on fire, causing "firestorms" in cities that would exhaust the oxygen in the air. All shelter occupants would be killed by the intense heat. ° Facts: On aclear day, thermal pulses (heat radiation that travels at the speed of light) from an air burst can set fire to easily ignitable materials (such as window curtains, upholstery, dry newspaper, and dry grass) over about as large an area as is damaged by the blast. It can cause second-degree skin burns to exposed people who are as far as ten miles from a one-megaton (1 MT) explosion. (See Fig. 1.4.) (A 1-MT nuclear explosion is one that produces the same amount of energy as does one million tons of TNT.) If the weather is very clear and dry, the area of fire danger could be considerably larger. On a cloudy or smoggy day, however, particles in the air would absorb and scatter much of the heat radiation, and the area endangered by heat radiation from the fireball would be less than the area of severe blast damage. Book Page: 15 Fig. 1.4. An air burst. Thefireball does not touch the ground. No crater. An air burst produces only extremely small radioactive particles-so small that they are airborne for days to years unless brought to earth by rain or snow. Wet deposition of fallout from both surface and air bursts can result in '"hot spots" at, close to, or far from ground zero. However, such '"hot spots" from air bursts are much less dangerous than the fallout produced by the surface or near-surface bursting of the same weapons. The main dangers from an air burst are the blast effects, the thermal pulses of intense light and heat radiation, and the very penetrating initial nuclear radiation from the fireball. ORNL.DWG 78.6267 "Firestorms" could occur only when the concentration of combustible structures is very high, as in the very dense centers of a few old American cities. At rural and suburban building densities, most people in earth- covered fallout shelters would not have their lives endangered by fires. ° Myth: In theworst-hit parts of Hiroshima and Nagasaki where all buildings were demolished, everyone was killed by blast, radiation, or fire. ° Facts: InNagasaki, some people survived uninjured who were far inside tunnel shelters built for conventional air raids and located as close as one-third mile from ground zero (the point directly below the explosion). This was true even though these long, large shelters lacked blast doors and were deep inside the zone within which all buildings were destroyed. (People far inside long, large, open shelters are better protected than are those inside small, open shelters.) Fig. 1.5. Undamaged earth-covered family shelter in Nagasaki. Many earth-covered family shelters were essentially undamaged in areas where blast and fire destroyed all buildings. Figure 1.5 shows a typical earth covered, backyard family shelter with a crude wooden frame. This shelter was essentially undamaged, although less than 100 yards from ground zero at Nagasaki.4 The calculated maximum overpressure (pressure above the normal air pressure) was about 65 pounds per square inch (65 psi). Persons inside so small a shelter without a blast doorwould have been killed by blast pressure at this distance from the explosion. However, in a recent blast test,5 an earth-covered, expedient Small-Pole Shelter equipped with blast doors was undamaged at 53 psi. The pressure rise inside was slight not even enough to have damaged occupants' eardrums. If poles are available, field tests have indicated that many families can build such shelters in a few days. The great life-saving potential of blast-protective shelters has been proven in war and confirmed by blast tests and calculations. For example, the area in which the air bursting of a 1-megaton weapon would wreck a 50-psi shelter with blast doors in about 2.7 square miles. Within this roughly circular area, practically all them occupants of wrecked shelters would be killed by blast, carbon monoxide from fires, or radiation. The same blast effects would kill most people who were using basements affording 5 psi protection, over an area of about 58 square miles.6 ° Myth: Because some modern H-bombs are over 1000 times as powerful as the A-bomb that destroyed most of Hiroshima, these H-bombs are 1000 times as deadly and destructive. ° Facts: A nuclear weapon 1000 times as powerful as the one that blasted Hiroshima, if exploded under comparable conditions, produces equally serious blast damage to wood-frame houses over an area up to about 130 times as large, not 1000 times as large. Book Page: 16 Top Previous Next For example, air bursting a 20-kiloton weapon at the optimum height to destroy most buildings will destroy or severely damage houses out to about 1.42 miles from ground zero.6 The circular area of at least severe blast damage will be about 6.33 square miles. (The explosion of a 20 kiloton weapon releases the same amount of energy as 20 thousand tons of TNT.) One thousand 20-kiloton weapons thus air burst, well separated to avoid overlap of their blast areas, would destroy or severely damage houses over areas totaling approximately 6,330 square miles. In contrast, similar air bursting of one 20- megaton weapon (equivalent in explosive power to 20 million tons of TNT) would destroy or severely damage the great majority of houses out to a distance of 16 miles from ground zero.6 The area of destruction would be about 800 square miles - not 6,330 square miles. Today few if any of Russia's huge intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) are armed with a 20-megaton warhead. Now a huge Russian ICBM, the SS-18, typically carries 10 warheads, each having a yield of 500 kilotons, each programmed to hit a separate target. See Jane's Weapon Systems, 1987-88. ° Myth: A Russian nuclear attack on the United States would completely destroy all American cities. ° Facts: As long as Soviet leaders are rational they will continue to give first priority to knocking out our weapons and other military assets that can damage Russia and kill Russians. To explode enough nuclear weapons of any size to completely destroy American cities would be an irrational waste of warheads. The Soviets can make much better use of most of the warheads that would be required to completely destroy American cities; the majority of those warheads probably already are targeted to knock out our retaliatory missiles by being surface burst or near-surface burst on their hardened silos, located far from most cities and densely populated areas. Unfortunately, many militarily significant targets - including naval vessels in port and port facilities, bombers and fighters on the ground, air base and airport facilities that can be used by bombers, Army installations, and key defense factories - are in or close to American cities. In the event of an all-out Soviet attack, most of these '"soft" targets would be destroyed by air bursts. Air bursting (see Fig. 1.4) a given weapon subjects about twice as large an area to blast effects severe enough to destroy "soft" targets as does surface bursting (see Fig. 1.1) the same weapon. Fortunately for Americans living outside blast and fire areas, air bursts produce only very tiny particles. Most of these extremely small radioactive particles remain airborne for so long that their radioactive decay and wide dispersal before reaching the ground make them much less life- endangering than the promptly deposited larger fallout particles from surface and near-surface bursts. However, if you are a survival minded American you should prepare to survive heavy fallout wherever you are. Unpredictable winds may bring fallout from unexpected directions. Or your area may be in a "hot spot" of life-endangering fallout caused by a rain-out or snow-out of both small and tiny particles from distant explosions. Or the enemy may use surface or near-surface bursts in your part of the country to crater long runways or otherwise disrupt U.S. retaliatory actions by producing heavy local fallout. Today few if any of Russia's largest intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) are armed with a 20-megaton warhead. A huge Russian ICBM, the SS-18, typically carries 10 warheads each having a yield of 500 kilotons, each programmed to hit a separate target. See "Jane's Weapon Systems. 1987-1988." However, in March 1990 CIA Director William Webster told the U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee that ".... The USSR's strategic modernization program continues unabated," and that the SS-18 Mod 5 can carry 14 to 20 nuclear warheads. The warheads are generally assumed to be smaller than those of the older SS-18s. ° Myth: So much food and water will be poisoned by fallout that people will starve and die even in fallout areas where there is enough food and water. ° Facts: If the falloutparticles do not become mixed with the parts of food that are eaten, no harm is done. Food and water in dust-tight containers are not contaminated by fallout radiation. Peeling fruits and vegetables removes essentially all fallout, as does removing the uppermost several inches of stored grain onto which fallout particles have fallen. Water from many sources -- such as deep wells and covered reservoirs, tanks, and containers -- would not be contaminated. Even water containing dissolved radioactive elements and compounds can be made safe for drinking by simply filtering it through earth, as described later in this book. ° Myth: Most of the unborn children and grandchildren of people who have been exposed to radiation from nuclear explosions will be genetically damaged will be malformed, delayed victims of nuclear war. ° Facts: The authoritative study by the National Academy of Sciences, A Thirty Year Study of the Survivors qf Hiroshima and Nagasaki, was published in 1977. It concludes that the incidence of abnormalities is no higher among children later conceived by parents who were exposed to radiation during the attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki than is the incidence of abnormalities among Japanese children born to un-exposed parents. This is not to say that there would be no genetic damage, nor that some fetuses subjected to large radiation doses would not be damaged. But the overwhelming evidence does show that the exaggerated fears of radiation damage to future generations are not supported by scientific findings

**3] Nuclear Winter doesn’t cause Extinction**

Fred **Singer** 6-27-20**18** “Remember Nuclear Winter?" <https://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2018/06/remember_nuclear_winter.html> (Professor emeritus at the University of Virginia and a founding director and now chairman emeritus of the Science & Environmental Policy Project)/Elmer + TK

**Nuclear Winter** burst on the academic scene in December 1983 with the publication of the hypothesis in the prestigious journal Science. It was accompanied by a study by Paul Ehrlich, et al. that hinted that it might cause the **extinction of human life** on the planet. MCANW stands for Medical Campaign Against Nuclear Weapons. Photo via Wellcome Images. The five authors of the Nuclear Winter hypothesis were labeled **TTAPS**, using the initials of their family names (T stands for Owen Toon and P stands for Jim Pollak, both Ph.D. students of Carl Sagan at Cornell University.) Carl Sagan himself was the main author and driving force. Actually, Sagan had scooped the Science paper by publishing the gist of the hypothesis in Parade magazine, which claimed a readership of 50 million! Previously, Sagan had briefed people in public office and elsewhere, so they were all primed for the popular reaction, which was tremendous. Many of today's readers may not remember Carl Sagan. He was a brilliant astrophysicist but also highly political. Imagine Al Gore, but with an excellent science background. Sagan had developed and narrated a television series called Cosmos that popularized astrophysics and much else, including cosmology, the history of the universe. He even suggested the possible existence of extraterrestrial intelligence and started a listening project called SETI (Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence). SETI is still searching today and has not found any evidence so far. Sagan became a sort of icon; many people in the U.S. and abroad knew his name and face. Carl Sagan also had another passion: saving humanity from a general nuclear war, a laudable aim. He had been arguing vigorously and publicly for a "freeze" on the production of more nuclear weapons. President Ronald Reagan outdid him and negotiated a nuclear weapons reduction with the USSR. In the meantime, much excitement was stirred up by Nuclear Winter. **Study after study tried to confirm and expand the hypothesis**, led by the Defense Department (**DOD**), which took the hypothesis seriously and spent **millions of dollars** on various reports that **accepted** Nuclear Winter rather **uncritically**. The National Research Council (**NRC**) of the National Academy of Sciences published a report that put in **more quantitative detail**. It enabled critics of the hypothesis to **find flaws – and many did**. The names Russell **Seitz**, Dick **Wilson** (both of Cambridge, Mass.), Steve **Schneider** (Palo Alto, Calif.), and Bob **Ehrlich** (Fairfax, Va.) (no relation to Paul Ehrlich) come to mind. The hypothesis was **really "politics disguised as science**." The whole TTAPS scheme was **contrived to deliver the desired consequence**. It required the smoke layer to be of **just the right thickness, covering the whole Earth, and lasting for many months.**The Kuwait oil fires in 1991 produced a lot of smoke, but it **rained out** after a few days. I had a mini-debate with Sagan on the TV program Nightline and published a more critical analysis of the whole hypothesis in the journal Meteorology & Atmospheric Physics. I don't know if Carl ever saw my paper. But I learned a lot from doing this analysis that was useful in later global warming research. For example, the initial nuclear bursts **inject water vapor** into the stratosphere, which **turns into contrail-like cirrus clouds**. That actually leads to a strong initial **warming** and a "**nuclear summer**."

#### 3] No extinction from Ozone – bounces back, in the meantime wear glasses and sunscreen!

Brian **Martin 82** [Brian Martin (Professor of Social Sciences @ the University of Wollongong) December 1982 “The global health effects of nuclear war” Current Affairs Bulletin, Vol. 59, No. 7, pp. 14-26, online @ http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/pubs/82cab/index.html, loghry]/recut TK

Another major threat to ozone comes from nuclear explosions. Nitric oxide is produced essentially by the 'burning' of nitrogen in the atmosphere, and this occurs whenever air temperatures are sufficiently hot: in automobile engines, in aircraft engines and in nuclear explosions. Studies of the creation of oxides of nitrogen by nuclear explosions were first undertaken as part of the SST debate, to determine whether the nuclear weapons tests in the 1950s and 1960s had reduced observed ozone levels.[28] It was only in 1974 that John Hampson made a point which had been overlooked, namely that large-scale nuclear war could cause a major and disastrous reduction in ozone levels.[29] Calculations made in the mid-1970s assuming large nuclear arsenals with many high-yield explosions concluded that reductions of ozone could reach 50 per cent or more in the northern hemisphere, with smaller reductions in the southern hemisphere.[30] But since the number of high-yield weapons in present nuclear arsenals is now smaller, much less oxides of nitrogen would be deposited in the stratosphere by nuclear war than assumed in earlier calculations, and so significant ozone reductions are unlikely.[31] This conclusion remains tentative. The actual behaviour of stratospheric ozone is quite complicated, involving many chemical compounds and numerous chemical reactions, the changing effects of temperature, the angle and intensity of sunlight, and the effect of air motions. Computer models of the effects of nuclear war on ozone are able to take into account only a part of this complexity, and new information about chemical reaction rates in particular have led in the past to periodic revisions in the calculated effects of added oxides of nitrogen. If significant ozone reduction did occur, the most important direct effect on humans would be an increase in skin cancer. However, this is seldom lethal, and could be avoided by reducing exposure to sunlight. Potentially more serious would be effects on crops.[32] Some of the important grains, for example, are sensitive to uv. Whether the net effects on crop yields would be significant is hard to estimate. But whatever the reduction in ozone, ozone levels would return pretty much to normal after a few years.[9] It seems unlikely that in the context of a major nuclear war the changes in uv alone would be of serious concern. In particular, the threat of human extinction raised by Jonathan Schell in The Fate of the Earth,[33] based mostly on effects of increased uv from ozone reduction, seems very small indeed. It is sometimes claimed that nuclear war could destroy ozone to such an extent that humans and animals would be blinded by excess uv. Even if large numbers of high-yield weapons were exploded, this possibility seems very unlikely except for a contribution to snow blindness in the far north. Stratospheric ozone can never be completely removed, but at most reduced greatly. Even if a 50 per cent or more reduction in ozone occurred - and as noted this seems improbable with present nuclear arsenals - protection from uv for humans could be obtained from sunglasses or just ordinary glasses, which absorb uv. For animals, the following considerations are relevant. Ozone levels vary considerably from place to place and from time to time, both seasonally and daily (sometimes by up to 50 per cent). Sunlight at the equator typically passes through only half as much ozone as at the mid-latitudes, yet animals at the equator are not known to go blind more often than elsewhere. Furthermore, most ozone reductions from a nuclear war would be in the mid and high latitudes, where ozone levels are higher to start with and where the 'path length' of sunlight through ozone is increased due to its oblique angle of incidence. But this does not mean complacency is warranted, as the concerns of John Hampson illustrate.

### Spark

#### 1]Extinction is inevitable from future technology — nanotech, our simulation gets shut down, AI, biotech, particle accelerators, and black swans

Bruce **Sterling**, 6-1-20**18**, "When Nick Bostrom says “Bang”," WIRED, https://www.wired.com/beyond-the-beyond/2018/06/nick-bostrom-says-bang/TK

4.1 Deliberate misuse of nanotechnology In a mature form, molecular nanotechnology will enable the construction of bacterium-scale self-replicating mechanical robots that can feed on dirt or other organic matter [22-25]. Such replicators could eat up the biosphere or destroy it by other means such as by poisoning it, burning it, or blocking out sunlight. A person of malicious intent in possession of this technology might cause the extinction of intelligent life on Earth by releasing such nanobots into the environment.[9] The technology to produce a destructive nanobot seems considerably easier to develop than the technology to create an effective defense against such an attack (a global nanotech immune system, an “active shield” [23]). It is therefore likely that there will be a period of vulnerability during which this technology must be prevented from coming into the wrong hands. Yet the technology could prove hard to regulate, since it doesn’t require rare radioactive isotopes or large, easily identifiable manufacturing plants, as does production of nuclear weapons [23]. Even if effective defenses against a limited nanotech attack are developed before dangerous replicators are designed and acquired by suicidal regimes or terrorists, there will still be the danger of an arms race between states possessing nanotechnology. It has been argued [26] that molecular manufacturing would lead to both arms race instability and crisis instability, to a higher degree than was the case with nuclear weapons. Arms race instability means that there would be dominant incentives for each competitor to escalate its armaments, leading to a runaway arms race. Crisis instability means that there would be dominant incentives for striking first. Two roughly balanced rivals acquiring nanotechnology would, on this view, begin a massive buildup of armaments and weapons development programs that would continue until a crisis occurs and war breaks out, potentially causing global terminal destruction. That the arms race could have been predicted is no guarantee that an international security system will be created ahead of time to prevent this disaster from happening. The nuclear arms race between the US and the USSR was predicted but occurred nevertheless. 4.2 Nuclear holocaust[winter] The US and Russia still have huge stockpiles of nuclear weapons. But would an all-out nuclear war really exterminate humankind? Note that: (i) For there to be an existential risk it suffices that we can’t be sure that it wouldn’t. (ii) The climatic effects of a large nuclear war are not well known (there is the possibility of a nuclear winter). (iii) Future arms races between other nations cannot be ruled out and these could lead to even greater arsenals than those present at the height of the Cold War. The world’s supply of plutonium has been increasing steadily to about two thousand tons, some ten times as much as remains tied up in warheads ([9], p. 26). (iv) Even if some humans survive the short-term effects of a nuclear war, it could lead to the collapse of civilization. A human race living under stone-age conditions may or may not be more resilient to extinction than other animal species. 4.3 We’re living in a simulation and it gets shut down A case can be made that the hypothesis that we are living in a computer simulation should be given a significant probability [27]. The basic idea behind this so-called “Simulation argument” is that vast amounts of computing power may become available in the future (see e.g. [28,29]), and that it could be used, among other things, to run large numbers of fine-grained simulations of past human civilizations. Under some not-too-implausible assumptions, the result can be that almost all minds like ours are simulated minds, and that we should therefore assign a significant probability to being such computer-emulated minds rather than the (subjectively indistinguishable) minds of originally evolved creatures. And if we are, we suffer the risk that the simulation may be shut down at any time. A decision to terminate our simulation may be prompted by our actions or by exogenous factors. While to some it may seem frivolous to list such a radical or “philosophical” hypothesis next the concrete threat of nuclear holocaust, we must seek to base these evaluations on reasons rather than untutored intuition. Until a refutation appears of the argument presented in [27], it would intellectually dishonest to neglect to mention simulation-shutdown as a potential extinction mode. 4.4 Badly programmed superintelligence When we create the first superintelligent entity [28-34], we might make a mistake and give it goals that lead it to annihilate humankind, assuming its enormous intellectual advantage gives it the power to do so. For example, we could mistakenly elevate a subgoal to the status of a supergoal. We tell it to solve a mathematical problem, and it complies by turning all the matter in the solar system into a giant calculating device, in the process killing the person who asked the question. (For further analysis of this, see [35].) 4.5 Genetically engineered biological agent With the fabulous advances in genetic technology currently taking place, it may become possible for a tyrant, terrorist, or ~~lunatic~~ to create a doomsday virus, an organism that combines long latency with high virulence and mortality [36]. Dangerous viruses can even be spawned unintentionally, as Australian researchers recently demonstrated when they created a modified mousepox virus with 100% mortality while trying to design a contraceptive virus for mice for use in pest control [37]. While this particular virus doesn’t affect humans, it is suspected that an analogous alteration would increase the mortality of the human smallpox virus. What underscores the future hazard here is that the research was quickly published in the open scientific literature [38]. It is hard to see how information generated in open biotech research programs could be contained no matter how grave the potential danger that it poses; and the same holds for research in nanotechnology. Genetic medicine will also lead to better cures and vaccines, but there is no guarantee that defense will always keep pace with offense. (Even the accidentally created mousepox virus had a 50% mortality rate on vaccinated mice.) Eventually, worry about biological weapons may be put to rest through the development of nanomedicine, but while nanotechnology has enormous long-term potential for medicine [39] it carries its own hazards. 4.6 Accidental misuse of nanotechnology (“gray goo”) The possibility of accidents can never be completely ruled out. However, there are many ways of making sure, through responsible engineering practices, that species-destroying accidents do not occur. One could avoid using self-replication; one could make nanobots dependent on some rare feedstock chemical that doesn’t exist in the wild; one could confine them to sealed environments; one could design them in such a way that any mutation was overwhelmingly likely to cause a nanobot to completely cease to function [40]. Accidental misuse is therefore a smaller concern than malicious misuse [23,25,41]. However, the distinction between the accidental and the deliberate can become blurred. While “in principle” it seems possible to make terminal nanotechnological accidents extremely improbable, the actual circumstances may not permit this ideal level of security to be realized. Compare nanotechnology with nuclear technology. From an engineering perspective, it is of course perfectly possible to use nuclear technology only for peaceful purposes such as nuclear reactors, which have a zero chance of destroying the whole planet. Yet in practice it may be very hard to avoid nuclear technology also being used to build nuclear weapons, leading to an arms race. With large nuclear arsenals on hair-trigger alert, there is inevitably a significant risk of accidental war. The same can happen with nanotechnology: it may be pressed into serving military objectives in a way that carries unavoidable risks of serious accidents. In some situations it can even be strategically advantageous to deliberately make one’s technology or control systems risky, for example in order to make a “threat that leaves something to chance” [42]. 4.7 Something unforeseen We need a catch-all category. It would be foolish to be confident that we have already imagined and anticipated all significant risks. Future technological or scientific developments may very well reveal novel ways of destroying the world. Some foreseen hazards (hence not members of the current category) which have been excluded from the list of bangs on grounds that they seem too unlikely to cause a global terminal disaster are: solar flares, supernovae, black hole explosions or mergers, gamma-ray bursts, galactic center outbursts, supervolcanos, loss of biodiversity, buildup of air pollution, gradual loss of human fertility, and various religious doomsday scenarios. The hypothesis that we will one day become “illuminated” and commit collective suicide or stop reproducing, as supporters of VHEMT (The Voluntary Human Extinction Movement) hope [43], appears unlikely. If it really were better not to exist (as Silenus told king Midas in the Greek myth, and as Arthur Schopenhauer argued [44] although for reasons specific to his philosophical system he didn’t advocate suicide), then we should not count this scenario as an existential disaster. The assumption that it is not worse to be alive should be regarded as an implicit assumption in the definition of Bangs. Erroneous collective suicide is an existential risk albeit one whose probability seems extremely slight. (For more on the ethics of human extinction, see chapter 4 of [9].) 4.8 Physics disasters The Manhattan Project bomb-builders’ concern about an A-bomb-derived atmospheric conflagration has contemporary analogues. There have been speculations that future high-energy particle accelerator experiments may cause a breakdown of a metastable vacuum state that our part of the cosmos might be in, converting it into a “true” vacuum of lower energy density [45]. This would result in an expanding bubble of total destruction that would sweep through the galaxy and beyond at the speed of light, tearing all matter apart as it proceeds. Another conceivability is that accelerator experiments might produce negatively charged stable “strangelets” (a hypothetical form of nuclear matter) or create a mini black hole that would sink to the center of the Earth and start accreting the rest of the planet [46]. These outcomes seem to be impossible given our best current physical theories. But the reason we do the experiments is precisely that we don’t really know what will happen. A more reassuring argument is that the energy densities attained in present day accelerators are far lower than those that occur naturally in collisions between cosmic rays [46,47]. It’s possible, however, that factors other than energy density are relevant for these hypothetical processes, and that those factors will be brought together in novel ways in future experiments. The main reason for concern in the “physics disasters” category is the meta-level observation that discoveries of all sorts of weird physical phenomena are made all the time, so even if right now all the particular physics disasters we have conceived of were absurdly improbable or impossible, there could be other more realistic failure-modes waiting to be uncovered. The ones listed here are merely illustrations of the general case.

#### 2] Growth causes a global toxification crisis - risks extinction

Ehrlichand Ehrlich 13 Paul R. Ehrlich, Professor of Biology and President of the Center for Conservation Biology at Stanford University, and Adjunct Professor at the University of Technology, Sydney, Anne H. Ehrlich, Senior Research Scientist in Biology at Stanford and focuses her research on policy issues related to the environment, “Can a collapse of global civilization be avoided?”, Proc Biol Sci. Mar 7, 2013; 280(1754)/TK

Another possible threat to the continuation of civilization is global toxification. Adverse symptoms of exposure to synthetic chemicals are making some scientists increasingly nervous about effects on the human population [77–79]. Should a global threat materialize, however, no planned mitigating responses (analogous to the ecologically and politically risky ‘geoengineering’ projects often proposed to ameliorate climate disruption [80]) are waiting in the wings ready for deployment. Much the same can be said about aspects of the epidemiological environment and the prospect of epidemics being enhanced by rapid population growth in immune-weakened societies, increased contact with animal reservoirs, high-speed transport and the misuse of antibiotics [81]. Nobel laureate Joshua Lederberg had great concern for the epidemic problem, famously stating, ‘The survival of the human species is not a preordained evolutionary program’ [82, p. 40]. Some precautionary steps that should be considered include forbidding the use of antibiotics as growth stimulators for livestock, building emergency stocks of key vaccines and drugs (such as Tamiflu), improving disease surveillance, expanding mothballed emergency medical facilities, preparing institutions for imposing quarantines and, of course, moving as rapidly as possible to humanely reduce the human population size. It has become increasingly clear that security has many dimensions beyond military security [83,84] and that breaches of environmental security could risk the end of global civilization.

#### 3] War is inevitable---BUT, the longer we wait, the worse it gets.

Seth **Baum &** Anthony **Barrett 18**. Global Catastrophic Risk Institute. 2018. “A Model for the Impacts of Nuclear War.” SSRN Electronic Journal. Crossref, doi:10.2139/ssrn.3155983./TK

On the other end of the spectrum, the norm could be weaker. The Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombings provided a vivid and enduring image of the horrors of nuclear war—hence the norm can reasonably be described as a legacy of the bombings. Without this image, there would be less to motivate the norm. A weaker norm could in turn have led to a nuclear war occurring later, especially during a near-miss event like the Cuban missile crisis. A later nuclear war would likely be much more severe, assuming some significant buildup of nuclear arsenals and especially if “overkill” targeting was used. A new nuclear war could bring a similarly wide range of shifts in nuclear weapons norms. It could strengthen the norm, hastening nuclear disarmament. Already, there is a political initiative drawing attention to the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons use in order to promote a new treaty to ban nuclear weapons as a step towards complete nuclear disarmament (Borrie 2014). It is easy to imagine this initiative using any new nuclear attacks to advance their goals. Alternatively, it could weaken the norm, potentially leading to more and/or larger nuclear wars. This is a common concern, as seen for example in debates over low-yield bunker buster nuclear weapons (Nelson 2003). Given that the impacts of a large nuclear war could be extremely severe, a shift in nuclear weapons norms could easily be the single most consequential effect of a smaller nuclear war.

#### Industrial civilization wouldn’t recover.

Lewis **Dartnell 15**. UK Space Agency research fellow at the University of Leicester, working in astrobiology and the search for microbial life on Mars. His latest book is The Knowledge: How to Rebuild Our World from Scratch. 04-13-15. "Could we reboot a modern civilisation without fossil fuels? – Lewis Dartnell." Aeon. https://aeon.co/essays/could-we-reboot-a-modern-civilisation-without-fossil-fuels/TK

Imagine that the world as we know it ends tomorrow. There’s a global catastrophe: a pandemic virus, an asteroid strike, or perhaps a nuclear holocaust. The vast majority of the human race perishes. Our civilisation collapses. The post-apocalyptic survivors find themselves in a devastated world of decaying, deserted cities and roving gangs of bandits looting and taking by force. Bad as things sound, that’s not the end for humanity. We bounce back. Sooner or later, peace and order emerge again, just as they have time and again through history. Stable communities take shape. They begin the agonising process of rebuilding their technological base from scratch. But here’s the question: how far could such a society rebuild? Is there any chance, for instance, that a post-apocalyptic society could reboot a technological civilisation? Let’s make the basis of this thought experiment a little more specific. Today, we have already consumed the most easily drainable crude oil and, particularly in Britain, much of the shallowest, most readily mined deposits of coal. Fossil fuels are central to the organisation of modern industrial society, just as they were central to its development. Those, by the way, are distinct roles: even if we could somehow do without fossil fuels now (which we can’t, quite), it’s a different question whether we could have got to where we are without ever having had them. So, would a society starting over on a planet stripped of its fossil fuel deposits have the chance to progress through its own Industrial Revolution? Or to phrase it another way, what might have happened if, for whatever reason, the Earth had never acquired its extensive underground deposits of coal and oil in the first place? Would our progress necessarily have halted in the 18th century, in a pre-industrial state? It’s easy to underestimate our current dependence on fossil fuels. In everyday life, their most visible use is the petrol or diesel pumped into the vehicles that fill our roads, and the coal and natural gas which fire the power stations that electrify our modern lives. But we also rely on a range of different industrial materials, and in most cases, high temperatures are required to transform the stuff we dig out of the ground or harvest from the landscape into something useful. You can’t smelt metal, make glass, roast the ingredients of concrete, or synthesise artificial fertiliser without a lot of heat. It is fossil fuels – coal, gas and oil – that provide most of this thermal energy. In fact, the problem is even worse than that. Many of the chemicals required in bulk to run the modern world, from pesticides to plastics, derive from the diverse organic compounds in crude oil. Given the dwindling reserves of crude oil left in the world, it could be argued that the most wasteful use for this limited resource is to simply burn it. We should be carefully preserving what’s left for the vital repertoire of valuable organic compounds it offers. But my topic here is not what we should do now. Presumably everybody knows that we must transition to a low-carbon economy one way or another. No, I want to answer a question whose interest is (let’s hope) more theoretical. Is the emergence of a technologically advanced civilisation necessarily contingent on the easy availability of ancient energy? Is it possible to build an industrialised civilisation without fossil fuels? And the answer to that question is: maybe – but it would be extremely difficult. Let’s see how. We’ll start with a natural thought. Many of our alternative energy technologies are already highly developed. Solar panels, for example, represent a good option today, and are appearing more and more on the roofs of houses and businesses. It’s tempting to think that a rebooted society could simply pick up where we leave off. Why couldn’t our civilisation 2.0 just start with renewables? Well, it could, in a very limited way. If you find yourself among the survivors in a post-apocalyptic world, you could scavenge enough working solar panels to keep your lifestyle electrified for a good long while. Without moving parts, photovoltaic cells require little maintenance and are remarkably resilient. They do deteriorate over time, though, from moisture penetrating the casing and from sunlight itself degrading the high-purity silicon layers. The electricity generated by a solar panel declines by about 1 per cent every year so, after a few generations, all our hand-me-down solar panels will have degraded to the point of uselessness. Then what? New ones would be fiendishly difficult to create from scratch. Solar panels are made from thin slices of extremely pure silicon, and although the raw material is common sand, it must be processed and refined using complex and precise techniques – the same technological capabilities, more or less, that we need for modern semiconductor electronics components. These techniques took a long time to develop, and would presumably take a long time to recover. So photovoltaic solar power would not be within the capability of a society early in the industrialisation process. Perhaps, though, we were on the right track by starting with electrical power. Most of our renewable-energy technologies produce electricity. In our own historical development, it so happens that the core phenomena of electricity were discovered in the first half of the 1800s, well after the early development of steam engines. Heavy industry was already committed to combustion-based machinery, and electricity has largely assumed a subsidiary role in the organisation of our economies ever since. But could that sequence have run the other way? Is there some developmental requirement that thermal energy must come first? On the face of it, it’s not beyond the bounds of possibility that a progressing society could construct electrical generators and couple them to simple windmills and waterwheels, later progressing to wind turbines and hydroelectric dams. In a world without fossil fuels, one might envisage an electrified civilisation that largely bypasses combustion engines, building its transport infrastructure around electric trains and trams for long-distance and urban transport. I say ‘largely’. We couldn’t get round it all together. When it comes to generating the white heat demanded by modern industry, there are few good options but to burn stuff While the electric motor could perhaps replace the coal-burning steam engine for mechanical applications, society, as we’ve already seen, also relies upon thermal energy to drive the essential chemical and physical transformations it needs. How could an industrialising society produce crucial building materials such as iron and steel, brick, mortar, cement and glass without resorting to deposits of coal? You can of course create heat from electricity. We already use electric ovens and kilns. Modern arc furnaces are used for producing cast iron or recycling steel. The problem isn’t so much that electricity can’t be used to heat things, but that for meaningful industrial activity you’ve got to generate prodigious amounts of it, which is challenging using only renewable energy sources such as wind and water. An alternative is to generate high temperatures using solar power directly. Rather than relying on photovoltaic panels, concentrated solar thermal farms use giant mirrors to focus the sun’s rays onto a small spot. The heat concentrated in this way can be exploited to drive certain chemical or industrial processes, or else to raise steam and drive a generator. Even so, it is difficult (for example) to produce the very high temperatures inside an iron-smelting blast furnace using such a system. What’s more, it goes without saying that the effectiveness of concentrated solar power depends strongly on the local climate. No, when it comes to generating the white heat demanded by modern industry, there are few good options but to burn stuff. But that doesn’t mean the stuff we burn necessarily has to be fossil fuels. Let’s take a quick detour into the pre-history of modern industry. Long before the adoption of coal, charcoal was widely used for smelting metals. In many respects it is superior: charcoal burns hotter than coal and contains far fewer impurities. In fact, coal’s impurities were a major delaying factor on the Industrial Revolution. Released during combustion, they can taint the product being heated. During smelting, sulphur contaminants can soak into the molten iron, making the metal brittle and unsafe to use. It took a long time to work out how to treat coal to make it useful for many industrial applications. And, in the meantime, charcoal worked perfectly well. And then, well, we stopped using it. In retrospect, that’s a pity. When it comes from a sustainable source, charcoal burning is essentially carbon-neutral, because it doesn’t release any new carbon into the atmosphere – not that this would have been a consideration for the early industrialists. But charcoal-based industry didn’t die out altogether. In fact, it survived to flourish in Brazil. Because it has substantial iron deposits but few coalmines, Brazil is the largest charcoal producer in the world and the ninth biggest steel producer. We aren’t talking about a cottage industry here, and this makes Brazil a very encouraging example for our thought experiment. The trees used in Brazil’s charcoal industry are mainly fast-growing eucalyptus, cultivated specifically for the purpose. The traditional method for creating charcoal is to pile chopped staves of air-dried timber into a great dome-shaped mound and then cover it with turf or soil to restrict airflow as the wood smoulders. The Brazilian enterprise has scaled up this traditional craft to an industrial operation. Dried timber is stacked into squat, cylindrical kilns, built of brick or masonry and arranged in long lines so that they can be easily filled and unloaded in sequence. The largest sites can sport hundreds of such kilns. Once filled, their entrances are sealed and a fire is lit from the top. The skill in charcoal production is to allow just enough air into the interior of the kiln. There must be enough combustion heat to drive out moisture and volatiles and to pyrolyse the wood, but not so much that you are left with nothing but a pile of ashes. The kiln attendant monitors the state of the burn by carefully watching the smoke seeping out of the top, opening air holes or sealing with clay as necessary to regulate the process. Brazil shows how the raw materials of modern civilisation can be supplied without reliance on fossil fuels Good things come to those who wait, and this wood pyrolysis process can take up to a week of carefully controlled smouldering. The same basic method has been used for millennia. However, the ends to which the fuel is put are distinctly modern. Brazilian charcoal is trucked out of the forests to the country’s blast furnaces where it is used to transform ore into pig iron. This pig iron is the basic ingredient of modern mass-produced steel. The Brazilian product is exported to countries such as China and the US where it becomes cars and trucks, sinks, bathtubs, and kitchen appliances. Around two-thirds of Brazilian charcoal comes from sustainable plantations, and so this modern-day practice has been dubbed ‘green steel’. Sadly, the final third is supplied by the non-sustainable felling of primary forest. Even so, the Brazilian case does provide an example of how the raw materials of modern civilisation can be supplied without reliance on fossil fuels. Another, related option might be wood gasification. The use of wood to provide heat is as old as mankind, and yet simply burning timber only uses about a third of its energy. The rest is lost when gases and vapours released by the burning process blow away in the wind. Under the right conditions, even smoke is combustible. We don’t want to waste it. Better than simple burning, then, is to drive the thermal breakdown of the wood and collect the gases. You can see the basic principle at work for yourself just by lighting a match. The luminous flame isn’t actually touching the matchwood: it dances above, with a clear gap in between. The flame actually feeds on the hot gases given off as the wood breaks down in the heat, and the gases combust only once they mix with oxygen from the air. Matches are fascinating when you look at them closely. Wartime gasifier cars could achieve about 1.5 miles per kilogram. Today’s designs improve upon this To release these gases in a controlled way, bake some timber in a closed container. Oxygen is restricted so that the wood doesn’t simply catch fire. Its complex molecules decompose through a process known as pyrolysis, and then the hot carbonised lumps of charcoal at the bottom of the container react with the breakdown products to produce flammable gases such as hydrogen and carbon monoxide. The resultant ‘producer gas’ is a versatile fuel: it can be stored or piped for use in heating or street lights, and is also suitable for use in complex machinery such as the internal combustion engine. More than a million gasifier-powered cars across the world kept civilian transport running during the oil shortages of the Second World War. In occupied Denmark, 95 per cent of all tractors, trucks and fishing boats were powered by wood-gas generators. The energy content of about 3 kg of wood (depending on its dryness and density) is equivalent to a litre of petrol, and the fuel consumption of a gasifier-powered car is given in miles per kilogram of wood rather than miles per gallon. Wartime gasifier cars could achieve about 1.5 miles per kilogram. Today’s designs improve upon this. But you can do a lot more with wood gases than just keep your vehicle on the road. It turns out to be suitable for any of the manufacturing processes needing heat that we looked at before, such as kilns for lime, cement or bricks. Wood gas generator units could easily power agricultural or industrial equipment, or pumps. Sweden and Denmark are world leaders in their use of sustainable forests and agricultural waste for turning the steam turbines in power stations. And once the steam has been used in their ‘Combined Heat and Power’ (CHP) electricity plants, it is piped to the surrounding towns and industries to heat them, allowing such CHP stations to approach 90 per cent energy efficiency. Such plants suggest a marvellous vision of industry wholly weaned from its dependency on fossil fuel. Is that our solution, then? Could our rebooting society run on wood, supplemented with electricity from renewable sources? Maybe so, if the population was fairly small. But here’s the catch. These options all presuppose that our survivors are able to construct efficient steam turbines, CHP stations and internal combustion engines. We know how to do all that, of course – but in the event of a civilisational collapse, who is to say that the knowledge won’t be lost? And if it is, what are the chances that our descendants could reconstruct it? In our own history, the first successful application of steam engines was in pumping out coal mines. This was a setting in which fuel was already abundant, so it didn’t matter that the first, primitive designs were terribly inefficient. The increased output of coal from the mines was used to first smelt and then forge more iron. Iron components were used to construct further steam engines, which were in turn used to pump mines or drive the blast furnaces at iron foundries. And of course, steam engines were themselves employed at machine shops to construct yet more steam engines. It was only once steam engines were being built and operated that subsequent engineers were able to devise ways to increase their efficiency and shrink fuel demands. They found ways to reduce their size and weight, adapting them for applications in transport or factory machinery. In other words, there was a positive feedback loop at the very core of the industrial revolution: the production of coal, iron and steam engines were all mutually supportive. In a world without readily mined coal, would there ever be the opportunity to test profligate prototypes of steam engines, even if they could mature and become more efficient over time? How feasible is it that a society could attain a sufficient understanding of thermodynamics, metallurgy and mechanics to make the precisely interacting components of an internal combustion engine, without first cutting its teeth on much simpler external combustion engines – the separate boiler and cylinder-piston of steam engines? It took a lot of energy to develop our technologies to their present heights, and presumably it would take a lot of energy to do it again. Fossil fuels are out. That means our future society will need an awful lot of timber. An industrial revolution without coal would be, at a minimum, very difficult In a temperate climate such as the UK’s, an acre of broadleaf trees produces about four to five tonnes of biomass fuel every year. If you cultivated fast-growing kinds such as willow or miscanthus grass, you could quadruple that. The trick to maximising timber production is to employ coppicing – cultivating trees such as ash or willow that resprout from their own stump, becoming ready for harvest again in five to 15 years. This way you can ensure a sustained supply of timber and not face an energy crisis once you’ve deforested your surroundings. But here’s the thing: coppicing was already a well-developed technique in pre-industrial Britain. It couldn’t meet all of the energy requirements of the burgeoning society. The central problem is that woodland, even when it is well-managed, competes with other land uses, principally agriculture. The double-whammy of development is that, as a society’s population grows, it requires more farmland to provide enough food and also greater timber production for energy. The two needs compete for largely the same land areas. We know how this played out in our own past. From the mid-16th century, Britain responded to these factors by increasing the exploitation of its coal fields – essentially harvesting the energy of ancient forests beneath the ground without compromising its agricultural output. The same energy provided by one hectare of coppice for a year is provided by about five to 10 tonnes of coal, and it can be dug out of the ground an awful lot quicker than waiting for the woodland to regrow. It is this limitation in the supply of thermal energy that would pose the biggest problem to a society trying to industrialise without easy access to fossil fuels. This is true in our post-apocalyptic scenario, and it would be equally true in any counterfactual world that never developed fossil fuels for whatever reason. For a society to stand any chance of industrialising under such conditions, it would have to focus its efforts in certain, very favourable natural environments: not the coal-island of 18th-century Britain, but perhaps areas of Scandinavia or Canada that combine fast-flowing streams for hydroelectric power and large areas of forest that can be harvested sustainably for thermal energy. Even so, an industrial revolution without coal would be, at a minimum, very difficult. Today, use of fossil fuels is actually growing, which is worrying for a number of reasons too familiar to rehearse here. Steps towards a low-carbon economy are vital. But we should also recognise how pivotal those accumulated reservoirs of thermal energy were in getting us to where we are. Maybe we could have made it the hard way. A slow-burn progression through the stages of mechanisation, supported by a combination of renewable electricity and sustainably grown biomass, might be possible after all. Then again, it might not. We’d better hope we can secure the future of our own civilisation, because we might have scuppered the chances of any society to follow in our wake.

#### -- Nuke war solves, it’ll spur political will for meaningful disarmament.

Daniel **Deudney 18**. Associate Professor of Political Science at Johns Hopkins University. 03/15/2018. “The Great Debate.” The Oxford Handbook of International Security. www.oxfordhandbooks.com, doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198777854.013.22./TK

Although nuclear war is the oldest of these technogenic threats to civilization and human survival, and although important steps to restraint, particularly at the end of the Cold War, have been achieved, the nuclear world is increasingly changing in major ways, and in almost entirely dangerous directions. The third “bombs away” phase of the great debate on the nuclear-political question is more consequentially divided than in the first two phases. Even more ominously, most of the momentum lies with the forces that are pulling states toward nuclear-use, and with the radical actors bent on inflicting catastrophic damage on the leading states in the international system, particularly the United States. In contrast, the arms control project, although intellectually vibrant, is largely in retreat on the world political stage. The arms control settlement of the Cold War is unraveling, and the world public is more divided and distracted than ever. With the recent election of President Donald Trump, the United States, which has played such a dominant role in nuclear politics since its scientists invented these fiendish engines, now has an impulsive and uninformed leader, boding ill for nuclear restraint and effective crisis management. Given current trends, it is prudent to assume that sooner or later, and probably sooner, nuclear weapons will again be the used in war. But this bad news may contain a “silver lining” of good news. Unlike a general nuclear war that might have occurred during the Cold War, such a nuclear event now would probably not mark the end of civilization (or of humanity), due to the great reductions in nuclear forces achieved at the end of the Cold War. Furthermore, politics on “the day after” could have immense potential for positive change. The survivors would not be likely to envy the dead, but would surely have a greatly renewed resolution for “never again.” Such an event, completely unpredictable in its particulars, would unambiguously put the nuclear-political question back at the top of the world political agenda. It would unmistakeably remind leading states of their vulnerability It might also trigger more robust efforts to achieve the global regulation of nuclear capability. Like the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki that did so much to catalyze the elevated concern for nuclear security in the early Cold War, and like the experience “at the brink” in the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962, the now bubbling nuclear caldron holds the possibility of inaugurating a major period of institutional innovation and adjustment toward a fully “bombs away” future.

#### High food prices reduce opium production in Afghanistan – key to defeating the Taliban

Huschke, Mayme and Herb Frank Fund Research Fellow @ the Streit Council, 11

(Griffin, ISAF Loves High Grocery Bills: The Silver Lining in the Upcoming Food Riots, <http://blog.streitcouncil.org/2011/01/10/isaf-loves-high-grocery-bills-the-silver-lining-in-the-upcoming-food-riots/>)

Trying to put a positive spin on higher food prices takes us to the southern poppy fields of Afghanistan. As mentioned below, the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan cultivates more poppy than all other countries combined (they’re pretty good at growing pot, too), and has the highest relative rates of opium addiction in the world. Poppy cultivation, production, refinement, and trafficking all provide a major sources of funding for the Taliban and Afghan warlords, and the UN Office of Drugs and Crime has linked high areas of insecurity with the densest areas of opium cultivation. In some of the poorest places in the south, poppy has become a kind of currency of its own. The thing is, a lot of poppy farmers don’t actually want to grow poppy. Most devout farmers follow an interpretation of the Koran that prohibits opiates, and have seen the lives of their friends and family devastated by addiction. They also understand its illegal, and don’t want to run afoul of ISAF and Afghan forces. But for some, it’s the only living they can make–much like Wallace from The Wire . Others are simply terrorized into growing drugs for the Taliban. In other places, the soil is too poor and barren to support any other crop but the sand-loving poppy or that bushels of poppy are used for interest payments on loans. NATO officials have long been frustrated by a number of obstacles to successfully combating poppy growth. Poppy cultivation was initially dismissed by Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld in the aftermath of the ISAF invasion (which kept the Secretary’s record of pithily dismissing really important things intact). When poppy cultivation and heroin production became too large to ignore, ISAF officials tried a number of tactics to halt the massive increase in growth, including alternative livelihoods, interdiction, eradication, increased law enforcement, and better education. It didn’t really work. In fact, the major determent to poppy cultivation rates since the U.S.-led invasion in 2001, was the spike in food prices in 2007-2008. For the first time in a long time, desperately poor Afghan farmers could get more at market for growing grains than poppy, and planted their crops accordingly. Where the ISAF program failed, the invisible hand succeeded. The ghost of Adam Smith was also present in supply factors contributing to poppy reduction. The Taliban had grown so much poppy in the previous years that they had exceeded world demand for heroin. Yes, that’s right, the Taliban had made more heroin, the most addictive drug on the planet, than world demand. And while the Taliban doesn’t really get women’s rights or the innate human desire for music, they sure understand basic economics. The oversupply of heroin caused prices to fall, and it was cutting into the insurgents’ bottom line. So in 2007, instead of intimidating, terrorizing, and forcing farmers to grow poppy, which would drive prices even lower, the Taliban let people grow grains and pay off debts in other ways. Since then, opium production has declined, and several of the ISAF’s tactics, especially peer-pressure from local shuras (local governing religious councils), has played a role in keeping opium production down. There’s also simply more areas under government control, which makes it easier to enforce the domestic poppy ban. In the end though, the UN concludes that market factors play the largest part in discouraging farmers from poppy cultivation. And for hundreds of service men and women working to fight opium production in Afghanistan right now, higher food prices probably sound pretty good.

**Failure in Afghanistan sparks multiple nuclear wars**

**Carafano ’10** (Con: Obama must win fast in Afghanistan or risk new wars across the globe By JAMES JAY CARAFANO   Saturday, Jan. 2, 2010 James Jay Carafano is a senior research fellow for national security at The Heritage Foundation and directs its Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies.

There’s little chance Kabul will become Saigon 1968. If the war in Afghanistan starts going south for allied forces, President Obama will probably quit rather than risk getting bogged down. President Lyndon B. Johnson considered Vietnam more a distraction than a national mission, yet he ramped up the troop commitment all the same. In 1968, the North Vietnamese launched a major offensive during the Tet holiday. They lost that battle. Badly! But the fact that they were able to mount such a large-scale offensive gave many Americans—including Walter Cronkite—the impression that the war wasn’t winnable. As “the U.S. is bogged down” became the common view, Johnson’s presidency fell to ashes.  Not much chance Obama will go that route. If the violence **skyrockets next year** and it looks as though the president’s ambitious objectives **can’t be met**, Afghanistan could look a lot more like Vietnam in 1973. U.S. forces withdrew. Our abandoned ally was soon overrun. South Vietnam became a gulag; Cambodia sprouted the killing fields; life in Laos was just plain lousy. By 1979, the Sino-Vietnamese war erupted.  We can expect similar results if Obama’s Afghan strategy fails and he opts to cut and run. Most forget that throwing South Vietnam to the wolves made the world a far more dangerous place.  The Soviets saw it as an unmistakable sign that America was in decline. They abetted military incursions in Africa, the Middle East, southern Asia and Latin America. They went on a conventional- and nuclear-arms spending spree. They stockpiled enough smallpox and anthrax to kill the world several times over. State-sponsorship of terrorism came into fashion. Osama bin Laden called America a “paper tiger.” If we live down to that moniker in Afghanistan, odds are the world will **get a lot less safe.**Al-Qaida would be back in the game. Regional terrorists would go after both Pakistan and India—potentially triggering a nuclear war between the two countries.  Sensing a **Washington in retreat**, Iran and North Korea could shift their **nuclear programs into overdrive**, hoping to save their failing economies by selling their nuclear weapons and technologies to all comers. Their nervous neighbors would want nuclear arms of their own.  The resulting nuclear arms race could be far more dangerous than the Cold War’s two-bloc standoff. With multiple, independent, nuclear powers cautiously eyeing one another, the world would look a lot more like Europe in 1914, when precarious shifting alliances snowballed into a very big, tragic war.  The list goes on. There is no question that countries such as Russia, China and Venezuela would rethink their strategic calculus as well. That could produce all kinds of serious regional challenges for the United States. Our allies might rethink things as well. Australia has already hiked its defense spending because it can’t be sure the United States will remain a responsible security partner. NATO might well fall apart. Europe could be left with only a puny EU military force incapable of defending the interests of its nations.  None of this is to suggest that staying in Afghanistan is an easy option. Wars never are.

### Bunkers

#### Isolated island populations repopulate Earth after radiation and nuclear winter – bunkers and submarines expand the likelihood of survival

Turchin and Green 18 (Alexey Turchin – Scientist for the Foundation Science for Life Extension in Moscow, Russia, Founder of Digital Immortality Now, author of several books and articles on the topics of existential risks and life extension. Brian Patrick Green – Director of technology ethics at the Markkula Center for Applied Ethics, teaches AI ethics in the Graduate School of Engineering at Santa Clara University. <MKIM> “Islands as refuges for surviving global catastrophes”. September 2018. DOA: 7/20/19. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/FS-04-2018-0031/full/html?fullSc=1&mbSc=1&fullSc=1)/Recut> TK

Different types of possible catastrophes suggest different scenarios for how survival could happen on an island. What is important is that the island should have properties which protect against the specific dangers of particular global catastrophic risks. Specifically, different islands will provide protection against different risks, and their natural diversity will contribute to a higher total level of protection: **Quarantined island survives pandemic** . An island could impose effective quarantine if it is sufficiently remote and simultaneously able to protect itself, possibly using military ships and air defense. **Far northern aboriginal people survive an ice age**. Many far northern people have adapted to survive in extremely cold and dangerous environments, and under the right circumstances could potentially survive the return of an ice age. However, their cultures are endangered by globalization. If these people become dependent on the products of modern civilization, such as rifles and motor boats, and lose their native survival skills, then their likelihood of surviving the collapse of the outside world would decrease. Therefore, preservation of their survival skills may be important as a defense against the risks connected with **extreme cooling**. Remote polar island with high mountains survives brief global warming of median surface temperatures, up to 50˚C. There is a theory that the climates of planets similar to the Earth could have several semi-stable temperature levels (Popp et al., 2016). If so, because of climate change, the Earth could transition to a second semi-stable state with a median global temperature of around 330 K, about 60˚C, or about 45˚C above current global mean temperatures. But even in this climate, **some regions of Earth could still be survivable for humans**, such as the Himalayan plateau at elevations above 4,000 m, but below 6,000 (where oxygen deficiency becomes a problem), or on polar islands with mountains (however, global warming affects polar regions more than equatorial regions, and northern island will experience more effects of climate change, including thawing permafrost and possible landslides because of wetter weather). In the tropics, the combination of increased humidity and temperature may increase the wet bulb temperature above 36˚C, especially on islands, where sea moisture is readily available. In such conditions, proper human perspiration becomes impossible (Sherwood and Huber, 2010), and there will likely be increased mortality and morbidity because of tropical diseases. If temperatures later returned to normal – either naturally or through climate engineering – **the rest of the Earth could be repopulated**. ‘‘Swiss Family Robinsons’’ survive on a tropical island, unnoticed by a military robot ‘‘mutiny’’. Most AI researchers ignore medium-term AI risks, which are neither near-term risks, like unemployment, nor remote risks, like AI superintelligence. But a large drone army – if one were produced – could receive a wrong command or be infected by a computer virus, leading it to attack people indiscriminately. Remote islands without robots could provide protection in this case, allowing survival until such a drone army ran out of batteries, fuel, ammunition or other supplies: Primitive tribe survives civilizational collapse. The inhabitants of **North Sentinel Island**, near the Andaman Islands in the Indian Ocean, are hostile and uncontacted. **The Sentinelese survived the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami apparently unaffected** (Voanews, 2009), and if the rest of humanity disappear, **they might well continue their existence without change.** Tropical Island survives extreme global nuclear winter and glaciation event. Were a **nuclear**, bolide impactor or volcanic “**winter**” scenario to unfold, these islands would remain surrounded by Warm Ocean, and local volcanism or other energy sources might provide heat, energy and food. Such island refuges may have helped life on Earth survive during the **“Snowball Earth”** event in Earth’s distant past (Hoffman et al., 1998). Remote island base for project “Yellow submarine”. Some catastrophic risks such as a gamma ray burst, a global nuclear war with high radiological contamination or multiple pandemics might be best survived **underwater in nuclear submarines** (Turchin and Green, 2017). However, after a catastrophe, the submarine with survivors would eventually need a place to dock, and an island with some prepared amenities would be a reasonable starting point for rebuilding civilization. Bunker on remote island. For risks which include multiple or complex catastrophes, such as a bolide impact, extreme volcanism, tsunamis, multiple pandemics and nuclear war with radiological contamination, **island refuges could be strengthened with bunkers**. Richard Branson survived hurricane Irma on his own island in 2017 by seeking refuge in his concrete wine cellar (Clifford, 2017). Bunkers on islands would have higher survivability compared to those close to population centers, as they will be neither a military target nor as accessible to looters or unintentionally dangerous (e.g. infected) refugees. These bunkers could potentially be connected to water sources by underwater pipes, and passages could provide cooling, access and even oxygen and food sources.

#### 15 islands are capable of facilitating post-apocalyptic human repopulation – We’ll insert this chart

Turchin and Green 18 (Alexey Turchin – Scientist for the Foundation Science for Life Extension in Moscow, Russia, Founder of Digital Immortality Now, author of several books and articles on the topics of existential risks and life extension. Brian Patrick Green – Director of technology ethics at the Markkula Center for Applied Ethics, teaches AI ethics in the Graduate School of Engineering at Santa Clara University. <MKIM> “Islands as refuges for surviving global catastrophes”. September 2018. DOA: 7/20/19. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/FS-04-2018-0031/full/html?fullSc=1&mbSc=1&fullSc=1)/recut> TK
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#### Bunkers solve

Karim Jebari 15. Royal Institute of Technology, KTH, Teknikringen. 06/2015. “Existential Risks: Exploring a Robust Risk Reduction Strategy.” Science and Engineering Ethics, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 541–554./TK

Costs While this measure would be quite expensive, it would probably be much cheaper than even the most optimistic assessments of colonizing the moon. There are already shelters that could be refitted for this purpose. A nuclear reactor with highly enriched uranium, similar to that which powers large submarines, would probably be the most costly item. Thus, a comparison with an Ohio-class submarine, with a crew of 155, seems reasonable. This submarine costs 2 billion USD. Even if this shelter would be an order of magnitude more expensive, it would still cost only a fraction of what a Moon colony would cost on the most optimistic cost assessment. Furthermore, this facility would reduce the risk of black swan extinction events with existing and proven technology. It could also be implemented at a very short notice, compared with even the most optimistic plans to colonize the Moon. Conclusion The notion of black swan extinction events present us with a daunting task. How to even start thinking about risks that are unknown? The stakes are further raised when considering that, on a large number of normative theories, an existential catastrophe implies a staggering loss of value. Thus, it is unwise to ignore the risk such an event represents. In engineering safety, a number of heuristics and strategies are device to prevent a catastrophic failure in a large number of possible scenarios. These strategies could be employed in thinking about how to reduce the risk of a black swan extinction event. Safety barriers are an instance of such a strategy. These could be actual physical barriers in some systems, or subsystems that prevent catastrophic failure by compartmentalization and physical separation. This article has discussed an example implementation of this strategy: isolated, continuously manned and self-sufficient underground refuges that could protect a large enough number of people to ensure the continued existence of mankind. While building such a ‘‘doomsday shelter’’ is less glamorous than colonizing the Moon, it may give us much more risk reduction for the money invested. The conceptual sketch of the project in this paper should be further developed in an interdisciplinary research project, which could benefit from the extensive literature on isolated, self-containing habitats. Architecture, engineering, social psychology and decision theory would probably be needed to fully assess the costs, and social and technological challenges.

#### Only needs 100 – enough to repopulate and gain hunter gatherers

Corey S. Powell 18, 8-13-2018, "How many humans would it take to keep our species alive? One scientist's surprising answer," NBC News, https://www.nbcnews.com/mach/science/how-many-humans-would-it-take-keep-our-species-alive-ncna900151/TK

In recent years, astronomers have found thousands of planets orbiting nearby stars, making the old science-fiction trope of off-world colonies seem a bit less absurd. But it was the 2016 discovery of a potentially habitable Earth-size planet around Proxima Centauri, the nearest star after the sun, that really got people thinking: Are we too vulnerable to asteroid strikes and other cataclysms to stick with our single planet? Could we safeguard our species by sending a space ark to a new home, a la "Battlestar Galactica" or the movie "Passengers?" Frédéric Marin is among those who are doing the hard thinking. The University of Strasbourg astrophysicist has been focusing not on the engineering issues of interstellar travel (which lie beyond current technology) but on the biology side of the question: How many crew members would be needed for an interstellar voyage that might last dozens of generations? In other words, what is the minimum number of people required to deliver and successfully plant a self-sustaining population of Homo sapiens on another Earth? “I was reading a lot on the human psychological aspect of spaceflight, and I realized that all books I’ve read and all the movies I’ve seen that were dealing with multiple-generation ships were very naïve,” Marin says. “Since I have access to huge computing power and state-of-the-art simulation tools, I decided to solve this on my spare time.” So when he wasn’t busy simulating galaxies and black holes, Marin created a computer program that mimics the progress of a breeding population. Then he used the program, dubbed Heritage, to simulate the risks a spacefaring population would face, including the effects of inbreeding as well as of catastrophic events like a deadly pandemic or being hit by some celestial object. A paper about his research was published in February in the Journal of the British Interplanetary Society. The magic number The number Marin came up with is 98. Just 98 healthy people would be needed to operate the ship over many generations and to set up a healthy (non-inbred) population on another world, he estimates. That number holds even for his test case of a space ark mission lasting more than 6,000 years, although he allows for the population aboard the ark to grow over time — up to about 500, perhaps. The implications of this finding go far beyond the sorts of spaceships we might be able to build in another century or two. “Our results apply to any enclosed environment where emigration and immigration are not possible,” Marin says. “The same elements are essential for any self-sustaining colony, so our code can easily compute the survival rate of a group of humans after a local or global catastrophe as well.” So even if billions of humans were wiped out by some catastrophe, as long as a suitable group of 98 survived and were able to mate, Marin says, they could carry enough genetic diversity to propagate the species and rebuild the population. Rival calculation Marin acknowledges that 98 sounds like an awfully small number. But he insists it makes sense, even knowing that Cameron Smith, an anthropologist at Portland State University in Oregon, looked at the same basic problem in 2014 and came up with a minimum crew size of 14,000. “Genetic minimum viable population doesn’t deal with real-world concerns,” Smith says, adding that he based his calculation on the demographics of actual populations on Earth. Many hunter-gatherer societies survive in groups of about 100, but even isolated tribes always interact with and have offspring with neighboring groups. Even a population of 14,000 strikes Smith as a modest number if you’re counting on it to sustain our species. “Suppose a catastrophe comes along and it knocks out 70 percent of the population,” he says. “Now the demographic structure of the population has been so disrupted that you can no longer find appropriate mating partners. One little catastrophe and the whole thing could fall apart.” The settling of the South Pacific is an interesting case study, according to Smith. That’s because Polynesians populated the islands one by one, much as we might eventually populate other planets. Of course, the Polynesians had abundant open land for population growth and were followed by a stream of other migrants who could keep things going if they got wiped out.