# A2 – Westwood – Egypt

## 1

#### Interpretation: the aff must not defend an unjust government

#### A just government protects minorities rights.

W. West Allen 21, 6-2-2021, (West Allen is an intellectual property litigator and counselor who represents a wide variety of international clients in U.S. Federal Courts.) "President’s Message: The Constitution Guarantees Us," Federal Bar Association, <https://www.fedbar.org/blog/presidents-message-the-constitution-guarantees-us/> CHO

The U.S. Constitution is built upon the chief foundational cornerstone of popular sovereignty—the fundamental principle that the source of all government power is the people. Sovereign power does not arise from the divine right of kings, political parties of a state, or might of the military. The authority of any commonwealth, rather, is originally vested in and derived from its citizens. This verity exists among every nation of the world—precisely as America’s Founders declared it from the Pennsylvania State House in 1776—because all human beings are by nature equal, free, and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, including life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. A just government exists only as charted by the people in order to protect the fundamental rights of the people. These rights can never be surrendered to government under any circumstances. To ensure a correct understanding of this proper relationship between people and their charted government, America fixed within its U.S. Constitution, as ordained and established by the people, an unambiguous enumeration of certain inherent rights that are to be held inviolate by government. These rights are guaranteed and rendered sacrosanct by their explicit incorporation directly into America’s written governmental charter. The people’s first 10 amendments to their Constitution comprise the fourth fundamental principle of the U.S. Constitution—the Bill of Rights. 1 The ideas of liberty and equality expressed by Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence and thereafter by James Madison and others in the U.S. Constitution were not new. The American colonies had been granted charters that included represented assemblies and even basic rights recognized since the Magna Carta that no “freeman could be imprisoned or destroyed except by lawful judgment of his peers or by the law of the land.”2 George Mason’s Virginia Declaration of Rights of 1776 had declared that all are by nature equally free and independent and have certain inherent rights. The bill or declaration of rights of Pennsylvania, from the committee led by Benjamin Franklin, did likewise. But never before had such a promissory note of freedom been written so expressly and directly into a nation’s founding documents, and never had the natural rights of individual citizens been enumerated and guaranteed so unequivocally in a written constitution. The American experiment of government was unique: a free people chartered a government and conditioned their government’s power on its ability to guarantee and safeguard the natural rights of every citizen. Government would no longer dictate the rights of the people. The people, rather, would dictate to their chartered government its limited authority and declare certain inherent, or natural, rights inviolate. This was the new American standard. And to improve and repair it, the wise would include a statement of particular individual liberties and limits on government—a bill of rights. Madison, the principal author of the U.S. Constitution and its Bill of Rights, originally opposed making inclusion of a bill of rights a precondition for ratification of the Constitution. He, along with Alexander Hamilton and others, did not think a separate bill of rights was necessary. They believed that since the Constitution “is itself, in every rational sense, and to every useful purpose, A BILL OF RIGHTS,” no further amendments were required.3 “For why declare that things shall not be done which there is no power to do?”4 In other words, since the Constitution expressly separated the powers of government and only gave government express limited powers, what need was there to restrict what was never given? Some believed, further, that attempting to enumerate certain rights was not just unnecessary, but dangerous. If the Constitution contained various exceptions to powers not granted by the people, such language could afford a colorable pretext to the unscrupulous, who might seek more power than the people granted in the first place. Following four months of debate in the summer of 1787, the Philadelphia delegates produced a constitution that did not contain an explicit bill of rights.5 It may have been Jefferson, far from the cacophony of heated constitutional debates in Philadelphia in 1787, who ultimately helped his brethren hear reason and see the light. While serving as U.S. minister to France at the time, Jefferson received a copy of the proposed U.S. Constitution. He approved, generally, but wrote to Madison voicing concern that the Constitution did not contain an express bill of rights. Jefferson understood the principle of a bill of rights and why an unequivocal guarantee of unalienable individual liberties and limits on government was imperative to the success of the new nation. Without such a guarantee, a new government, and certainly those eager to wield its national power, could readily abuse that power, usurp the people’s authority and, in time, destroy individual liberties. Jefferson admonished Madison of this critical omission when he famously wrote his friend in December 1787: “A bill of rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on earth … and what no just government should refuse, or rest on inference.”6 Thanks to Jefferson and a popular groundswell of the people in many state ratifying conventions who understood the significance of a bill of rights, Madison and his congressional colleagues listened. Madison eventually proposed a series of 19 constitutional amendments to the First Congress on June 8, 1789, just over one month after George Washington was inaugurated as the first president of the United States. Madison’s proposals, many incorporated directly from proposals by state ratifying conventions and state constitutions, were duly considered and debated by the new legislature. In the end, 12 of Madison’s amendments survived the congressional approval process and went to the states for ratification on Sept. 25, 1789.7 Of those congressionally approved 12 amendments, just 10 were ratified and incorporated into the Constitution, when, more than two years later, on Dec. 15, 1791, Jefferson’s home state of Virginia ratified 10 of the proposed 12 amendments.8 In time, these original amendments to the U.S. Constitution became known as the Bill of Rights. According to its preamble, the Bill of Rights is the result of the “Conventions of a number of the States, having at the time of their adopting the Constitution, expressed a desire, in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added … [to extend] the ground of public confidence in the Government[.]”9 The original Bill of Rights was mostly forged from ideas already expressed within revolutionary-era state constitutions, which included vital guarantees of individual rights and specific limits on government authority. These principles were understood as maxims by which “every wise and enlightened people will regulate their conduct,” and as Patrick Henry explained, “which no free people ought ever to abandon … [and] of which the observance is essential to the security of happiness.”10 Sadly, the protections of these first 10 amendments were largely ignored by the courts and the states for the first 100 years after the Bill of Rights was ratified in 1791, just as Madison had predicted. But in time, the wise and honest within America began to repair the standard raised by our founding generation. By the 20th century, with the leadership of citizens like Abraham Lincoln, Frederick Douglass, and Martin Luther King Jr., our nation began to vigorously enforce the Bill of Rights against the states. Americans began to understand and see what our Founders had hoped they would—that these vital guarantees of individual rights and limits on government could be more than bulwarks of mere parchment, but “a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir” and see fulfilled.11 The Bill of Rights, as declared by the American people in the U.S. Constitution, has providential and inspired purpose. It constitutes the preeminent declaration of freedoms of human dignity based on principles of moral agency and liberty. It transcends politics, party, and government. As with all truth, it prevails. Consequently, as nations and citizens honor the constitutional principles of the Bill of Rights, they prosper; as nations and citizens ignore them, they falter. What are the unalienable rights that are recognized and guaranteed by the world’s most successful nations? They bear repeating and demand careful individual study: the freedom of religion, the freedom to exercise one’s faith and conscience,12 the freedom of speech, the freedom of the press,13 the right to peaceably assemble, and the right to petition government for a redress of grievances. They include the people’s inherent civil liberties that prohibit the housing of soldiers in residential homes, unreasonable government searches and seizures, self-incrimination, and double jeopardy. They encompass and protect the right to due process of law, the right to a fair and speedy jury trial, the right to bear arms to maintain the people’s defense of their liberties, and the right to be free from excessive bails, fines, and unusual punishments. To further protect against the concern that a new federal government might claim rights not listed in the Bill of Rights, Madison drafted what became the Ninth Amendment, which says that that “the enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.” To ensure that Congress would be viewed as a government of limited rather than unlimited powers, Madison included the Tenth Amendment, which says the “powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.” We would do well to understand these amendments with the earnestness that Madison and his generation intended. Together, the Constitution’s first 10 amendments defend not only majorities of the people against an overreaching federal government but also minorities against overreaching state government. The Bill of Rights proscribes as law the proper limits of government and prohibits the state from abridging the fundamental freedoms and civil liberties that all individuals possess on the basis of their humanity. It is unique among the political writings of the world in that it unambiguously sets forth the most critical and vital civil liberties that simultaneously engender strong and successful nations. Honoring the Bill of Rights ennobles and advances governments that justly derive their power from the consent of the governed. It increases civil accord, security, and happiness among a nation’s citizens. No action by any government or person acting under color of law should therefore ever subvert these unalienable rights.14 And never are these rights more important, subject to greater danger, and in more need of defense than in times of national crisis. It is now the work of this generation to uphold and repair this standard that was wrought and raised by the architects of the American Republic. The Bill of Rights, along with the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, remains a promissory note of liberty to its heirs. The enduring principles of these documents should be studied and advocated by all. It is the responsibility of every citizen of our nation—but especially its judges and lawyers as guardians of the Constitution—to honor, uphold, and defend the liberties guaranteed in the Bill of Rights. We are they who will honor and fulfill the promises of liberty made over two centuries ago.

#### Violation – Egypt discriminate consistently.

**MinorityRights 19** [“Egpytian Government Fails to Uphold Its Constitution, Discrimination Persists for Religious and Ethnic minorities – new report” <https://minorityrights.org/2019/01/24/egyptian-government-fails-to-uphold-its-constitution-discrimination-persists-for-religious-and-ethnic-minorities-new-report/> Samrawit Gougsa, Communications Officer (London, UK)]

With little improvement to the situation of Egypt’s religious and ethnic minorities since the drafting of the 2014 Constitution, hopes that the country would see a more inclusive and secure future for all its citizens – regardless of faith or ethnicity – remain unfulfilled, says Minority Rights Group International (MRG) in a new report. “Egypt’s 2014 Constitution speaks very clearly about issues such as freedom of belief, equality among citizens and the right of Nubians to return to their lands,” says Silvia Quattrini, Middle East and North Africa Programmes Coordinator at MRG. “However, none of this has been respected or implemented in reality so far.” According to [*Justice Denied, Promises Broken: The Situation of Egypt’s Minorities Since 2014*](https://minorityrights.org/publications/justice-denied-promises-broken-the-situation-of-egypts-minorities-since-2014/)*,* Egypt’s government has demonstrated patterns of discrimination and exclusion towards religious and ethnic minorities. The report describes how Christians still struggle for permission to build churches, face communal violence and unfair informal dispute resolution mechanisms that often result in the displacement of community members from their homes. Meanwhile, other minorities such as Bahá’i and non-Sunni Muslim groups including Shi’a, Ahmadis and Quranists continue to be unrecognised, making it difficult for them to practice their religion freely. The report also highlights how progress on Nubian rights has been reversed, with the government halting the development of legislation that would facilitate the resettlement of the community in their ancestral territory and instead opening their land to external development. Meanwhile, Bedouin communities in North Sinai face mass displacement, widespread violence and a growing humanitarian crisis, with little in the way of government protection, compensation or emergency support. “Activists for Nubian rights have also faced several restrictions on their freedom to express concern over these issues, such as the 24 individuals who were arrested and detained while peacefully protesting in Aswan in 2017,” says Silvia Quattrini. “As for Bedouins in North Sinai, the fight against terrorism has often been used as a justification to expel entire communities from their lands. This trend is part of an increasing general crackdown on civil society organisations which has particularly affected the country’s minorities over the past four years.”

#### Standards:

#### 1 - Precision — anything else justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### 2 - Limits – there are 200 governments in the world – letting them pick an unjust ones explodes limits via infinite permutations of governments.

#### Paradigm:

#### Fairness – Debate is a competitive activity governed by rules. You can’t evaluate who did better debating if the round is structurally skewed, so fairness is a gateway to substantive debate.

#### DTD – Time spent on theory cant be compensated for, the 1nc was already skewed, and its key to deterring abuse.

#### Prefer Competing interps -

#### 1. reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention.

#### 2. it Causes a race to the bottom where debaters push the limit as to how reasonably abusive, they can be.

#### No RVI’s -

#### 1. Chills some debaters from reading theory against abusive postions.

#### 2. incentivizes theory baiting where you can just bait theory to win.

## 2

#### Interpretation: The affirmative may not specify a just government.

#### “A” is an indefinite article that modifies “just government” in the res – means that you have to prove the resolution true in a vacuum, not a particular instance

CCC (“Articles, Determiners, and Quantifiers”, http://grammar.ccc.commnet.edu/grammar/determiners/determiners.htm#articles, Capital Community College Foundation, a nonprofit 501 c-3 organization that supports scholarships, faculty development, and curriculum innovation) LHSLA JC/SJ

The three articles — a, an, the — are a kind of adjective. The is called the definite article because it usually precedes a specific or previously mentioned noun; a and an are called indefinite articles because they are used to refer to something in a less specific manner (an unspecified count noun). These words are also listed among the noun markers or determiners because they are almost invariably followed by a noun (or something else acting as a noun). caution CAUTION! Even after you learn all the principles behind the use of these articles, you will find an abundance of situations where choosing the correct article or choosing whether to use one or not will prove chancy. Icy highways are dangerous. The icy highways are dangerous. And both are correct. The is used with specific nouns. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something that is one of a kind: The moon circles the earth. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something in the abstract: The United States has encouraged the use of the private automobile as opposed to the use of public transit. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something named earlier in the text. (See below..) If you would like help with the distinction between count and non-count nouns, please refer to Count and Non-Count Nouns. We use a before singular count-nouns that begin with consonants (a cow, a barn, a sheep); we use an before singular count-nouns that begin with vowels or vowel-like sounds (an apple, an urban blight, an open door). Words that begin with an h sound often require an a (as in a horse, a history book, a hotel), but if an h-word begins with an actual vowel sound, use an an (as in an hour, an honor). We would say a useful device and a union matter because the u of those words actually sounds like yoo (as opposed, say, to the u of an ugly incident). The same is true of a European and a Euro (because of that consonantal "Yoo" sound). We would say a once-in-a-lifetime experience or a one-time hero because the words once and one begin with a w sound (as if they were spelled wuntz and won). Merriam-Webster's Dictionary says that we can use an before an h- word that begins with an unstressed syllable. Thus, we might say an hisTORical moment, but we would say a HIStory book. Many writers would call that an affectation and prefer that we say a historical, but apparently, this choice is a matter of personal taste. For help on using articles with abbreviations and acronyms (a or an FBI agent?), see the section on Abbreviations. First and subsequent reference: When we first refer to something in written text, we often use an indefinite article to modify it. A newspaper has an obligation to seek out and tell the truth. In a subsequent reference to this newspaper, however, we will use the definite article: There are situations, however, when the newspaper must determine whether the public's safety is jeopardized by knowing the truth. Another example: "I'd like a glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put the glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. Exception: When a modifier appears between the article and the noun, the subsequent article will continue to be indefinite: "I'd like a big glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put a big glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. Generic reference: We can refer to something in a generic way by using any of the three articles. We can do the same thing by omitting the article altogether. A beagle makes a great hunting dog and family companion. An airedale is sometimes a rather skittish animal. The golden retriever is a marvelous pet for children. Irish setters are not the highly intelligent animals they used to be. The difference between the generic indefinite pronoun and the normal indefinite pronoun is that the latter refers to any of that class ("I want to buy a beagle, and any old beagle will do.") whereas the former (see beagle sentence) refers to all members of that class

#### The article “a” implies a nonspecific or generic reading of the word “just government”.

Walden 20 Walden University [The Writing Center provides a broad range of writing instruction and editing services for students at Walden University, including writing assistance for undergraduates, graduate students, and doctoral capstone writers], “"A" or "An"” last modified July 14 2020, <https://academicguides.waldenu.edu/writingcenter/grammar/articles> SM

When to Use "A" or "An" "A" and "an" are used with singular countable nouns when the noun is nonspecific or generic. I do not own a car. In this sentence, "car" is a singular countable noun that is not specific. It could be any car. She would like to go to a university that specializes in teaching. "University" is a singular countable noun. Although it begins with a vowel, the first sound of the word is /j/ or “y.” Thus, "a" instead of "an" is used. In this sentence, it is also generic (it could be any university with this specialization, not a specific one). I would like to eat an apple. In this sentence, "apple" is a singular countable noun that is not specific. It could be any apple.

#### “just government” is a generic indefinite singular.

Leslie 12 Leslie, Sarah-Jane. “Generics.” In Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Language, edited by Gillian Russell and Delia Fara, 355–366. Routledge, 2012. <https://www.princeton.edu/~sjleslie/RoutledgeHandbookEntryGenerics.pdf> SM

GENERICS VS. EXISTENTIALS The interpretation of sentences containing bare plurals, indefinite singulars, or definite singulars can be either generic as in (1) respectively or existential/specific as in (2): (1) Tigers are striped A tiger is striped The tiger is striped. (2) Tigers are on the front lawn A tiger is on the front lawn The tiger is on the front lawn. The subjects in (1) are prima facie the same as in (2), yet their interpretations in (1) are intuitively quite different from those in (2). In (2) we are talking about some particular tigers, while in (1) we are saying something about tigers in general. There are some tests that are helpful in distinguishing these two readings. For example, the existential interpretation is upward entailing, meaning that the statement will always remain true if we replace the subject term with a more inclusive term. For example, if it is true that tigers are on the lawn, then it will also be true that animals are on the lawn. This is not so if the sentence is interpreted generically. For example, it is true that tigers are striped, but it does not follow that animals are striped (Lawler 1973 Laca 1990; Krifka et al 1995). Another test concerns whether we can insert an adverb of quantification (in the sense of Lewis 1975) with minimal change of meaning (Krifka et al 1995). For example, inserting “usually” in the sentences in (1) (e.g. “tigers are usually striped”) produces only a small change in meaning, while inserting “usually” in (2) dramatically alters the meaning of the sentence (e.g. “tigers are usually on the front lawn). (For generics such as “mosquitoes carry malaria”, the adverb “sometimes” is perhaps better used than “usually”.)

#### This applies to the res –

#### 1 - Upward entailment test – “\_\_\_\_ ought to recognize the right to strike” doesn’t entail “just governments ought to recognize the right to strike” because there are just governments other than india

#### 2 - Adverb test – adverb test – adding “always” doesn’t change its meaning because recognition is unconditional.

#### Violation:

#### Standards:

#### 1 - Precision – the counter-interp justifies them arbitrarily doing away with random words in the resolution which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution. Independent voter for jurisdiction – the judge doesn’t have the jurisdiction to vote aff if there wasn’t a legitimate aff.

#### 2 - Limits – there are infinite governments that could be just – explodes limits since there are tons of independent affs plus functionally infinite combinations, all with different advantages in different political situations. Kills neg prep and debatability since there are no DAs that apply to every aff – i.e. laws about the right to strike in the US are different than in New Zealand – means the aff is always more prepared and wins just for speccing.

#### 3 - TVA – just read your aff as an advantage under a whole adv, solves your offense

## 3

#### Interpretation: The affirmative debater must articulate a distinct ROB in the form of a delineated text in the 1AC speech.

#### Violation:

#### Standards:

#### 1 - Strat Skew – Absent a text in the 1AC, they can read multiple pieces of offense under different ROBs and then read a new one in the 1AR so they never substantively lose debates under the ROB. They can warrant things like condo logic, consequentialist policy-making offense for their aff, or kritikal impacts that deviate from their plan and then read an incredibly nuanced ROB in the 1ar that makes it so only the conceded or under-covered offense matters. Stable advocacies are key to fairness since otherwise you aren’t bound by anything you say. Infinite abuse – Reading a new ROB in the 1AR makes it so all you have to do is dump on the 1N ROB and marginally extend your warrants in the 2ar and the neg can’t do anything about it since there is no 3NR to answer the 2ar weighing or extrapolations, you already have conceded offense, all you need is the ROB.

#### 2 - Reciprocity –

#### A - restarting the ROB debate in the 1ar puts you at a 7-6 advantage on the framing debate since I have to propose one in the 1N since 2N arguments are new – putting it in the aff makes it 13-13

#### B - you have one more speech to contest my ROB and weigh, I can only possibly answer your ROB in the 2n but you can do comparative weighing in the 2ar

#### C - I can only read a ROB in the 1N so you should read it in your first speech as well – that’s definitionally an equal burden.

## 4

#### Interpretation: The affirmative must have a carded solvency advocate in the 1AC.

#### Violation -

#### Standards:

#### 1. predictability - no way for the neg to predict the advocacy because it’s not in the lit – this decks DA and CP ground - outweighs because ground is the key determinant of engagement.

#### 2. limits – no solvency advocate allows infinite possible affs – also justifies breaking affs that are at the edges of the topic with no advocate.

#### 3. shiftiness - no way to guarantee the DAs and CPs we read link or solve because they can re-interpret the plan in the 1ar – creates a 7-6 skew that prevents new 2nr ev to prove normal means from checking.

## 5

#### The ROB is to vote for the debater who bests proves the truth or falsity of the resolution.

#### Prefer:

#### 1. Ground - truth testing allows for the more ground than any other ROB since it allows for an infinite amount of arguments on a range of argumentation style giving the most breadth and depth of topic and phil ed.

#### 2. Textuality – Five Dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to affirm as to prove true[[2]](#footnote-2) and negate as to deny the truth of which means the sole judge jurisdiction is to vote on the resolution’s truth or falsity. This outweighs on common usage – it is abundantly clear that our roles are verified.

#### Negate -

#### 1 - just[[3]](#footnote-3) means “very recently; in the immediate past” so the rez has already passed.

#### 2 - of[[4]](#footnote-4) is to “expressing an age” but the rez doesn’t delineate a length of time.

#### 3 - recognize[[5]](#footnote-5) is to “Officially regard (a qualification) as valid or proper” but a right isn’t a qualification.

#### 4 - to[[6]](#footnote-6) is to “expressing motion in the direction of (a particular location)” but the rez doesn’t have a location.

#### 5 - right[[7]](#footnote-7) is to “conforming to facts or truth” rez doesn’t specify what workers are right about.

**6 - Strike[[8]](#footnote-8) is defined as** to delete something rez doesn’t spec what to delete.

## Case

#### 1 – No Famine

#### A - No food scarcity.

**Jalsevac 04** (Paul, Life site news a division of Interim Publishing, “The Inherent Racism of Population Control”, http://www.lifesite.net/waronfamily/Population\_Control/Inherentracism.pdf)

The pattern continues today. Economist Dennis Avery explained in 1995 that, food production was more than keeping pace with population growth since the world had, “more than doubled world food output in the past 30 years. We have raised food supplies per person by 25 percent in the populous Third World.”4 The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (UNFAO) also dispelled fears of shortages in the food supply when, in preparation for the World Food Summit in Rome in November of 1995 it reported that, “Globally food supplies have more than doubled in the last 40 years…at a global level, there is probably no obstacle to food production rising to meet demand.”5 The UNFAO also later estimated that, simply with the present available technologies fully employed, the world could feed 30 to 35 billion people, i.e. roughly six times the present world population.6 It also reported that the number of people considered malnourished has declined from 36 percent in 1961-1970 to 20 percent in 1988-90 and later proclaimed that “earlier fears of chronic food shortages over much of the world proved unfounded.”7 The World Bank joined in to predict in 1993 that the improvement in the world food supply would continue, while pointing out that in developing countries grain production has grown at a faster rate than population since 1985. Grain production has slowed in the United States, but that is because stocks have grown so large that additional production could not be stored.8 A further wealth of evidence is available to remove any concerns about resource shortage in the modern world.

#### B - Zero risk of starvation.

**Reichman 95** - Former senior editor at the Cato Institute (Sheldon “The International Population Stabilization and Reproductive Health Act (S. 1029)” <http://www.cato.org/testimony/ct-ps720.html>)

Food is abundant. Since 1948, according to the UN Food and Agriculture Organization and the U.S. Department of Agriculture, annual world food production has outpaced the increase in population. Today, per capita production and per-acre yields are at all-time highs. Prices of agricultural products have been falling for over 100 years. The average inflation-adjusted price of those products, indexed to wages, fell by more than 74 percent between 1950 and 1990. While Lester Brown of the Worldwatch Institute and the noted butterfly expert Paul Ehrlich predict higher food prices and increasing scarcity, food is becoming cheaper and more plentiful. That good news is due largely to technological advances (the "green revolution") that have provided better seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, and methods of farming.

#### 2 – No Nuclear Winter

#### A - Rigorous climate simulations prove that hydrophilic black carbon would cause to atmospheric precipitation – results in a rainout effect that quickly reverses nuclear cooling.

Reisner et al. 18 (Jon Reisner – Climate and atmospheric scientist at the Los Alamos National Laboratory. Gennaro D’Angelo – Climate scientist at the Los Alamos National Laboratory, Research scientist at the SETI institute, Associate specialist at the University of California, Santa Cruz, NASA Postdoctoral Fellow at the NASA Ames Research Center, UKAFF Fellow at the University of Exeter. Eunmo Koo - Scientist at Applied Terrestrial, Energy, and Atmospheric Modeling (ATEAM) Team, in Computational Earth Science Group (EES-16) in Earth and Environmental Sciences Division and Co-Lead of Parallel Computing Summer Research Internship (PCSRI) program at the Los Alamos National Laboratory, former Staff research associate at UC Berkeley. Wesley Even - Computational scientist in the Computational Physics and Methods Group at Los Alamos National Laboratory. Matthew Hecht – Atmospheric scientist at the Los Alamos National Laboratory. Elizabeth Hunke - Lead developer for the Los Alamos Sea Ice Model (CICE) at the Los Alamos National Laboratory responsible for development and incorporation of new parameterizations, model testing and validation, computational performance, documentation, and consultation with external model users on all aspects of sea ice modeling, including interfacing with global climate and earth system models. Darin Comeau – Climate scientist at the Los Alamos National Laboratory. Randy Bos - Project leader at the Los Alamos National Laboratory, former Weapons Effects program manager at Tech-Source. James Cooley – Computational scientist at the Los Alamos National Laboratory specializing in weapons physics, emergency response, and computational physics. <MKIM> “Climate impact of a regional nuclear weapons exchange:An improved assessment based on detailed source calculations”. 3/16/18. DOA: 7/13/19. <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/2017JD027331>)

\*BC = Black Carbon

The no-rubble simulation produces a significantly more intense fire, with more fire spread, and consequently a significantly stronger plume with larger amounts of BC reaching into the upper atmosphere than the simulation with rubble, illustrated in Figure 5. While the no-rubble simulation **represents the worst-case scenario** involving vigorous fire activity, **only a relatively small amount of carbon makes its way into the stratosphere** during the course of the simulation. But while small compared to the surface BC mass, stratospheric BC amounts from the current simulations are significantly higher than what would be expected from burning vegetation such as trees (Heilman et al., 2014), e.g., the higher energy density of the building fuels and the initial fluence from the weapon produce an intense response within HIGRAD with initial updrafts of order 100 m/s in the lower troposphere. Or, in comparison to a mass fire, wildfires will burn only a small amount of fuel in the corresponding time period (roughly 10 minutes) that a nuclear weapon fluence can effectively ignite a large area of fuel producing an impressive atmospheric response. Figure 6 shows vertical profiles of BC multiplied by 100 (number of cities involved in the exchange) from the two simulations. The total amount of BC produced is in line with previous estimates (about 3.69 Tg from no-rubble simulation); however, the majority of BC resides **below the stratosphere** (3.46 Tg below 12 km) and can be **readily impacted by scavenging from precipitation** either via pyro-cumulonimbus produced by the fire itself (not modeled) or other synoptic weather systems. While the impact on climate of these more realistic profiles will be explored in the next section, it should be mentioned that **these estimates are** still **at the high end**, considering the inherent simplifications in the combustion model that lead to **overestimating BC production**. 3.3 Climate Results Long-term climatic effects critically depend on the initial injection height of the soot, with larger quantities reaching the upper troposphere/lower stratosphere inducing a greater cooling impact because of longer residence times (Robock et al., 2007a). Absorption of solar radiation by the BC aerosol and its subsequent radiative cooling tends to heat the surrounding air, driving an initial upward diffusion of the soot plumes, an effect that depends on the initial aerosol concentrations. **Mixing and sedimentation** tend to **reduce this process**, and low altitude emissions are also significantly impacted by precipitation if aging of the BC aerosol occurs on sufficiently rapid timescales. But once at stratospheric altitudes, aerosol dilution via coagulation is hindered by low particulate concentrations (e.g., Robock et al., 2007a) and lofting to much higher altitudes is inhibited by gravitational settling in the low-density air (Stenke et al., 2013), resulting in more stable BC concentrations over long times. Of the initial BC mass released in the atmosphere, most of which is emitted below 9 km, **70% rains out within the first month** and 78%, or about 2.9 Tg, is removed within the first two months (Figure 7, solid line), with the remainder (about 0.8 Tg, dashed line) being transported above about 12 km (200 hPa) within the first week. This outcome differs from the findings of, e.g., Stenke et al. (2013, their high BC-load cases) and Mills et al. (2014), who found that most of the BC mass (between 60 and 70%) is lifted in the stratosphere within the first couple of weeks. This can also be seen in Figure 8 (red lines) and in Figure 9, which include results from our calculation with the initial BC distribution from Mills et al. (2014). In that case, only 30% of the initial BC mass rains out in the troposphere during the first two weeks after the exchange, with the remainder rising to the stratosphere. In the study of Mills et al. (2008) this percentage is somewhat smaller, about 20%, and smaller still in the experiments of Robock et al. (2007a) in which the soot is initially emitted in the upper troposphere or higher. In Figure 7, the e-folding timescale for the removal of tropospheric soot, here interpreted as the time required for an initial drop of a factor e, is about one week. This result compares favorably with the “LT” experiment of Robock et al. (2007a), considering 5 Tg of BC released in the lower troposphere, in which 50% of the aerosols are removed within two weeks. By contrast, the initial e-folding timescale for the removal of stratospheric soot in Figure 8 is about 4.2 years (blue solid line), compared to about 8.4 years for the calculation using Mills et al. (2014) initial BC emission (red solid line). The removal timescale from our forced ensemble simulations is close to those obtained by Mills et al. (2008) in their 1 Tg experiment, by Robock et al. (2007a) in their experiment “UT 1 Tg”, and © 2018 American Geophysical Union. All rights reserved. by Stenke et al. (2013) in their experiment “Exp1”, in all of which 1 Tg of soot was emitted in the atmosphere in the aftermath of the exchange. Notably, the e-folding timescale for the decline of the BC mass in Figure 8 (blue solid line) is also close to the value of about 4 years quoted by Pausata et al. (2016) for their long-term “intermediate” scenario. In that scenario, which is also based on 5 Tg of soot initially distributed as in Mills et al. (2014), the factor-of2 shorter residence time of the aerosols is caused by particle growth via coagulation of BC with organic carbon. Figure 9 shows the BC mass-mixing ratio, horizontally averaged over the globe, as a function of atmospheric pressure (height) and time. The BC distributions used in our simulations imply that the upward transport of particles is substantially less efficient compared to the case in which 5 Tg of BC is directly injected into the upper troposphere. The semiannual cycle of lofting and sinking of the aerosols is associated with atmospheric heating and cooling during the solstice in each hemisphere (Robock et al., 2007a). During the first year, the oscillation amplitude in our forced ensemble simulations is particularly large during the summer solstice, compared to that during the winter solstice (see bottom panel of Figure 9), because of the higher soot concentrations in the Northern Hemisphere, as can be seen in Figure 11 (see also left panel of Figure 12). Comparing the top and bottom panels of Figure 9, the BC reaches the highest altitudes during the first year in both cases, but the concentrations at 0.1 hPa in the top panel can be 200 times as large. Qualitatively, the difference can be understood in terms of the air temperature increase caused by BC radiation emission, which is several tens of kelvin degrees in the simulations of Robock et al. (2007a, see their Figure 4), Mills et al. (2008, see their Figure 5), Stenke et al. (2013, see high-load cases in their Figure 4), Mills et al. (2014, see their Figure 7), and Pausata et al. (2016, see one-day emission cases in their Figure 1), due to high BC concentrations, but it amounts to only about 10 K in our forced ensemble simulations, as illustrated in Figure 10. Results similar to those presented in Figure 10 were obtained from the experiment “Exp1” performed by Stenke et al. (2013, see their Figure 4). **In that scenario as well, somewhat less that 1 Tg of BC remained in the atmosphere after the initial rainout**. As mentioned before, the BC aerosol that remains in the atmosphere, lifted to stratospheric heights by the rising soot plumes, undergoes sedimentation over a timescale of several years (Figures 8 and 9). This mass represents the effective amount of BC that can force climatic changes over multi-year timescales. In the forced ensemble simulations, it is about 0.8 Tg after the initial rainout, whereas it is about 3.4 Tg in the simulation with an initial soot distribution as in Mills et al. (2014). Our more realistic source simulation involves the worstcase assumption of no-rubble (along with other assumptions) and hence serves as an upper bound for the impact on climate. As mentioned above and further discussed below, our scenario induces perturbations on the climate system similar to those found in previous studies in which the climatic response was driven by roughly 1 Tg of soot rising to stratospheric heights following the exchange. Figure 11 illustrates the vertically integrated mass-mixing ratio of BC over the globe, at various times after the exchange for the simulation using the initial BC distribution of Mills et al. (2014, upper panels) and as an average from the forced ensemble members (lower panels). All simulations predict enhanced concentrations at high latitudes during the first year after the exchange. In the cases shown in the top panels, however, these high concentrations persist for several years (see also Figure 1 of Mills et al., 2014), whereas the forced ensemble simulations indicate that the BC concentration starts to decline after the first year. In fact, in the simulation represented in the top panels, mass-mixing ratios larger than about 1 kg of BC © 2018 American Geophysical Union. All rights reserved. per Tg of air persist for well over 10 years after the exchange, whereas they only last for 3 years in our forced simulations (compare top and middle panels of Figure 9). After the first year, values drop below 3 kg BC/Tg air, whereas it takes about 8 years to reach these values in the simulation in the top panels (see also Robock et al., 2007a). Over crop-producing, midlatitude regions in the Northern Hemisphere, the BC loading is reduced from more than 0.8 kg BC/Tg air in the simulation in the top panels to 0.2-0.4 kg BC/Tg air in our forced simulations (see middle and right panels). The more rapid clearing of the atmosphere in the forced ensemble is also signaled by the soot optical depth in the visible radiation spectrum, which drops below values of 0.03 toward the second half of the first year at mid latitudes in the Northern Hemisphere, and everywhere on the globe after about 2.5 years (without never attaining this value in the Southern Hemisphere). In contrast, the soot optical depth in the calculation shown in the top panels of Figure 11 becomes smaller than 0.03 everywhere only after about 10 years. The two cases show a similar tendency, in that the BC optical depth is typically lower between latitudes 30º S-30º N than it is at other latitudes. This behavior is associated to the persistence of stratospheric soot toward high-latitudes and the Arctic/Antarctic regions, as illustrated by the zonally-averaged, column-integrated mass-mixing ratio of the BC in Figure 12 for both the forced ensemble simulations (left panel) and the simulation with an initial 5 Tg BC emission in the upper troposphere (right panel). The spread in the globally averaged (near) surface temperature of the atmosphere, from the control (left panel) and forced (right panel) ensembles, is displayed in Figure 13. For each month, the plots show the largest variations (i.e., maximum and minimum values), within each ensemble of values obtained for that month, relative to the mean value of that month. The plot also shows yearly-averaged data (thinner lines). The spread is comparable in the control and forced ensembles, with average values calculated over the 33-years run length of 0.4-0.5 K. This spread is also similar to the internal variability of the globally averaged surface temperature quoted for the NCAR Large Ensemble Community Project (Kay et al., 2015). These results imply that surface air temperature differences, between forced and control simulations, which lie within the spread may not be distinguished from effects due to internal variability of the two simulation ensembles. Figure 14 shows the difference in the globally averaged surface temperature of the atmosphere (top panel), net solar radiation flux at surface (middle panel), and precipitation rate (bottom panel), computed as the (forced minus control) difference in ensemble mean values. The sum of standard deviations from each ensemble is shaded. Differences are qualitatively significant over the first few years, when the anomalies lie near or outside the total standard deviation. Inside the shaded region, differences may not be distinguished from those arising from the internal variability of one or both ensembles. The surface solar flux (middle panel) is the quantity that appears most affected by the BC emission, with qualitatively significant differences persisting for about 5 years. The precipitation rate (bottom panel) is instead affected only at the very beginning of the simulations. The red lines in all panels show the results from the simulation applying the initial BC distribution of Mills et al. (2014), where the period of significant impact is much longer owing to the higher altitude of the initial soot distribution that results in longer residence times of the BC aerosol in the atmosphere. When yearly averages of the same quantities are performed over the IndiaPakistan region, the differences in ensemble mean values lie within the total standard deviations of the two ensembles. The results in Figure 14 can also be compared to the outcomes of other previous studies. In their experiment “UT 1 Tg”, Robock et al. (2007a) found that, when only 1 Tg of soot © 2018 American Geophysical Union. All rights reserved. remains in the atmosphere after the initial rainout, temperature and precipitation anomalies are about 20% of those obtained from their standard 5 Tg BC emission case. Therefore, the largest differences they observed, during the first few years after the exchange, were about - 0.3 K and -0.06 mm/day, respectively, comparable to the anomalies in the top and bottom panels of Figure 14. Their standard 5 Tg emission case resulted in a solar radiation flux anomaly at surface of -12 W/m2 after the second year (see their Figure 3), between 5 and 6 time as large as the corresponding anomalies from our ensembles shown in the middle panel. In their experiment “Exp1”, Stenke et al. (2013) reported global mean surface temperature anomalies not exceeding about 0.3 K in magnitude and precipitation anomalies hovering around -0.07 mm/day during the first few years, again consistent with the results of Figure 14. In a recent study, Pausata et al. (2016) considered the effects of an admixture of BC and organic carbon aerosols, both of which would be emitted in the atmosphere in the aftermath of a nuclear exchange. In particular, they concentrated on the effects of coagulation of these aerosol species and examined their climatic impacts. The initial BC distribution was as in Mills et al. (2014), although the soot burden was released in the atmosphere over time periods of various lengths. Most relevant to our and other previous work are their one-day emission scenarios. They found that, during the first year, the largest values of the atmospheric surface temperature anomalies ranged between about -0.5 and -1.3 K, those of the sea surface temperature anomalies ranged between -0.2 and -0.55 K, and those of the precipitation anomalies varied between -0.15 and -0.2 mm/day. All these ranges are compatible with our results shown in Figure 14 as red lines and with those of Mills et al. (2014, see their Figures 3 and 6). As already mentioned in Section 2.3, the net solar flux anomalies at surface are also consistent. This overall agreement suggests that the **inclusion of organic carbon aerosols, and** ensuing **coagulation** with BC, **should not dramatically alter the climatic effects** resulting from our forced ensemble simulations. Moreover, aerosol growth would likely **shorten the residence time of the BC particulate in the atmosphere** (Pausata et al., 2016), possibly **reducing the duration of these effects.**

#### **B - No credible scenario for extinction—outdated fringe science and well-meaning threat inflation.**

Scouras 19 (James Scouras, Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory, formerly served on the congressionally established Comission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP) Attack, “Nuclear War as a Global Catastrophic Risk”, Cambridge Core, 9-2-2019, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-benefit-cost-analysis/article/nuclear-war-as-a-global-catastrophic-risk/EC726528F3A71ED5ED26307677960962, accessed 12-1-2019, HKR-cjh)

It might be thought that we know enough about the risk of nuclear war to appropriately manage that risk. The consequences of unconstrained nuclear attacks, and the counterattacks that would occur until the major nuclear powers exhaust their arsenals, would far exceed any cataclysm humanity has suffered in all of recorded history. The likelihood of such a war must, therefore, be reduced as much as possible. But this rather simplistic logic raises many questions and does not withstand close scrutiny. Regarding consequences, does unconstrained nuclear war pose an existential risk to humanity? The consequences of existential risks are truly incalculable, including the lives not only of all human beings currently living but also of all those yet to come; involving not only Homo sapiens but all species that may descend from it. At the opposite end of the spectrum of consequences lies the domain of “limited” nuclear wars. Are these also properly considered global catastrophes? After all, while the only nuclear war that has ever occurred devastated Hiroshima and Nagasaki, it was also instrumental in bringing about the end of the Pacific War, thereby saving lives that would have been lost in the planned invasion of Japan. Indeed, some scholars similarly argue that many lives have been saved over the nearly threefourths of a century since the advent of nuclear weapons because those weapons have prevented the large conventional wars that otherwise would likely have occurred between the major powers. This is perhaps the most significant consequence of the attacks that devastated the two Japanese cities. Regarding likelihood, how do we know what the likelihood of nuclear war is and the degree to which our national policies affect that likelihood, for better or worse? How much confidence should we place in any assessment of likelihood? What levels of likelihood for the broad spectrum of possible consequences pose unacceptable levels of risk? Even a very low (nondecreasing) annual likelihood of the risk of nuclear war would result in near certainty of catastrophe over the course of enough years. Most fundamentally and counterintuitively, are we really sure we want to reduce the risk of nuclear war? The successful operation of deterrence, which has been credited – perhaps too generously – with preventing nuclear war during the Cold War and its aftermath, depends on the risk that any nuclear use might escalate to a nuclear holocaust. Many proposals for reducing risk focus on reducing nuclear weapon arsenals and, therefore, the possible consequences of the most extreme nuclear war. Yet, if we reduce the consequences of nuclear war, might we also inadvertently increase its likelihood? It’s not at all clear that would be a desirable trade-off. This is all to argue that the simplistic logic described above is inadequate, even dangerous. A more nuanced understanding of the risk of nuclear war is imperative. This paper thus attempts to establish a basis for more rigorously addressing the risk of nuclear war. Rather than trying to assess the risk, a daunting objective, its more modest goals include increasing the awareness of the complexities involved in addressing this topic and evaluating alternative measures proposed for managing nuclear risk. I begin with a clarification of why nuclear war is a global catastrophic risk but not an existential risk. Turning to the issue of risk assessment, I then present a variety of assessments by academics and statesmen of the likelihood component of the risk of nuclear war, followed by an overview of what we do and do not know about the consequences of nuclear war, emphasizing uncertainty in both factors. Then, I discuss the difficulties in determining the effects of risk mitigation policies, focusing on nuclear arms reduction. Finally, I address the question of whether nuclear weapons have indeed saved lives. I conclude with recommendations for national security policy and multidisciplinary research. 2 Why is nuclear war a global catastrophic risk? One needs to only view the pictures of Hiroshima and Nagasaki shown in figure 1 and imagine such devastation visited on thousands of cities across warring nations in both hemispheres to recognize that nuclear war is truly a global catastrophic risk. Moreover, many of today’s nuclear weapons are an order of magnitude more destructive than Little Boy and Fat Man, and there are many other significant consequences – prompt radiation, fallout, etc. – not visible in such photographs. Yet, it is also true that not all nuclear wars would be so catastrophic; some, perhaps involving electromagnetic pulse (EMP) attacks 2 Many mistakenly believe that the congressionally established Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP) Attack concluded that an EMP attack would, indeed, be catastrophic to electronic systems and consequently to people and societies that vitally depend on those systems. However, the conclusion of the commission, on whose staff I served, was only that such a catastrophe could, not would, result from an EMP attack. Its executive report states, for example, that “the damage level could be sufficient to be catastrophic to the Nation.” See www.empcommision.org for publicly available reports from the EMP Commission. See also Frankel et al., (2015).2 using only a few high-altitude detonations or demonstration strikes of various kinds, could result in few casualties. Others, such as a war between Israel and one of its potential future nuclear neighbors, might be regionally devastating but have limited global impact, at least if we limit our consideration to direct and immediate physical consequences. Nevertheless, smaller nuclear wars need to be included in any analysis of nuclear war as a global catastrophic risk because they increase the likelihood of larger nuclear wars. This is precisely why the nuclear taboo is so precious and crossing the nuclear threshold into uncharted territory is so dangerous (Schelling, 2005; see also Tannenwald, 2007). While it is clear that nuclear war is a global catastrophic risk, it is also clear that it is not an existential risk. Yet over the course of the nuclear age, a series of mechanisms have been proposed that, it has been erroneously argued, could lead to human extinction. The first concern3 arose among physicists on the Manhattan Project during a 1942 seminar at Berkeley some three years before the first test of an atomic weapon. Chaired by Robert Oppenheimer, it was attended by Edward Teller, Hans Bethe, Emil Konopinski, and other theoretical physicists (Rhodes, 1995). They considered the possibility that detonation of an atomic bomb could ignite a self-sustaining nitrogen fusion reaction that might propagate through earth’s atmosphere, thereby extinguishing all air-breathing life on earth. Konopinski, Cloyd Margin, and Teller eventually published the calculations that led to the conclusion that the nitrogen-nitrogen reaction was virtually impossible from atomic bomb explosions – calculations that had previously been used to justify going forward with Trinity, the first atomic bomb test (Konopinski et al., 1946). Of course, the Trinity test was conducted, as well as over 1000 subsequent atomic and thermonuclear tests, and we are fortunately still here. After the bomb was used, extinction fear focused on invisible and deadly fallout, unanticipated as a significant consequence of the bombings of Japan that would spread by global air currents to poison the entire planet. Public dread was reinforced by the depressing, but influential, 1957 novel On the Beach by Nevil Shute (1957) and the subsequent 1959 movie version (Kramer, 1959). The story describes survivors in Melbourne, Australia, one of a few remaining human outposts in the Southern Hemisphere, as fallout clouds approached to bring the final blow to humanity. In the 1970s, after fallout was better understood to be limited in space, time, and magnitude, depletion of the ozone layer, which would cause increased ultraviolet radiation to fry all humans who dared to venture outside, became the extinction mechanism of concern. Again, one popular book, The Fate of the Earth by Jonathan Schell (1982), which described the nuclear destruction of the ozone layer leaving the earth “a republic of insects and grass,” promoted this fear. Schell did at times try to cover all bases, however: “To say that human extinction is a certainty would, of course, be a misrepresentation – just as it would be a misrepresentation to say that extinction can be ruled out” (Schell, 1982). Finally, the current mechanism of concern for extinction is nuclear winter, the phenomenon by which dust and soot created primarily by the burning of cities would rise to the stratosphere and attenuate sunlight such that surface temperatures would decline dramatically, agriculture would fail, and humans and other animals would perish from famine. The public first learned of the possibility of nuclear winter in a Parade article by Sagan (1983), published a month or so before its scientific counterpart by Turco et al. (1983). While some nuclear disarmament advocates promote the idea that nuclear winter is an extinction threat, and the general public is probably confused to the extent it is not disinterested, few scientists seem to consider it an extinction threat. It is understandable that some of these extinction fears were created by ignorance or uncertainty and treated seriously by worst-case thinking, as seems appropriate for threats of extinction. But nuclear doom mongering also seems to be at play for some of these episodes. For some reason, portions of the public active in nuclear issues, as well as some scientists, appear to think that arguments for nuclear arms reductions or elimination will be more persuasive if nuclear war is believed to threaten extinction, rather than merely the horrific cataclysm that it would be in reality (Martin, 1982). 4 As summarized by Martin, “The idea that global nuclear war could kill most or all of the world’s population is critically examined and found to have little or no scientific basis.” Martin also critiques possible reasons for beliefs or professed beliefs about nuclear extinction, including exaggeration to stimulate action.4 To summarize, nuclear war is a global catastrophic risk. Such wars may cause billions of deaths and unfathomable suffering, as well set civilization back centuries. Smaller nuclear wars pose regional catastrophic risks and also national risks in that the continued functioning of, for example, the United States as a constitutional republic is highly dubious after even a relatively limited nuclear attack. But what nuclear war is not is an existential risk to the human race. There is simply no credible scenario in which humans do not survive to repopulate the earth.

#### Isolated island populations repopulate Earth after radiation and nuclear winter – bunkers 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)

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.

#### No ozone impact.

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]

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.

#### Current arsenal sizes ensure no extinction – BUT – 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. //reem

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.

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

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

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.

#### The military is developing isomer bombs - even just testing will destroy the universe.

Bekkum 04 – Gary S. Bekkum, Founder of Spacetime Threat Assessment Report Research, Founder of STARstream Research, Futurist, “American Military is Pursuing New Types of Exotic Weapons”, Pravda, 8-30, http://www.starstreamresearch.com/dark\_matters.htm

Recently the British science news journal "New Scientist" revealed that the American military is pursuing new types of exotic bombs - including a new class of isomeric gamma ray weapons. Unlike conventional atomic and hydrogen bombs, the new weapons would trigger the release of energy by absorbing radiation, and respond by re-emitting a far more powerful radiation. In this new category of gamma-ray weapons, a nuclear isomer absorbs x-rays and re-emits higher frequency gamma rays. The emitted gamma radiation has been reported to release 60 times the energy of the x-rays that trigger the effect. The discovery of this isomer triggering is fairly recent, and was first reported in a 1999 paper by an international group of scientists. Although this controversial development has remained fairly obscure, it has not been hidden from the public. Beyond the visible part of defense research is an immense underground of secret projects considered so sensitive that their very existence is denied. These so-called "black budget programs" are deliberately kept from the public eye and from most political leaders. CNN recently reported that in the United States the black budget projects for 2004 are being funded at a level of more than 20 billion dollars per year. In the summer of 2000 I contacted Nick Cook, the former aviation editor and aerospace consultant to Jane's Defence Weekly, the international military affairs journal. Cook had been investigating black budget super-secret research into exotic physics for advanced propulsion technologies. I had been monitoring electronic discussions between various American and Russian scientists theorizing about rectifying the quantum vacuum for advanced space drive. Several groups of scientists, partitioned into various research organizations, were exploring what NASA calls "Breakthrough Propulsion Physics" - exotic technologies for advanced space travel to traverse the vast distances between stars. Partly inspired by the pulp science fiction stories of their youth, and partly by recent reports of multiple radar tracking tapes of unidentified objects performing impossible maneuvers in the sky, these scientists were on a quest to uncover the most likely new physics for star travel. The NASA program was run by Marc Millis, financed under the Advanced Space Transportation Program Office (ASTP). Joe Firmage, then the 28-year-old Silicon Valley CEO of the three billion dollar Internet firm US Web, began to fund research in parallel with NASA. Firmage hired a NASA Ames nano-technology scientist, Creon Levit, to run the "International Space Sciences Organization", a move which apparently alarmed the management at NASA. The San Francisco based Hearst Examiner reported that NASA's Office of Inspector General assigned Special Agent Keith Tate to investigate whether any proprietary NASA technology might have been leaking into the private sector. Cook was intrigued when I pointed out the apparent connections between various private investors, defense contractors, NASA, INSCOM (American military intelligence), and the CIA. While researching exotic propulsion technologies Cook had heard rumors of a new kind of weapon, a "sub-quantum atomic bomb", being whispered about in what he called the "dark halls" of defense research. Sub-quantum physics is a controversial re-interpretation of quantum theory, based on so-called pilot wave theories, where an information field controls quantum particles. The late Professor David Bohm showed that the predictions of ordinary quantum mechanics could be recast into a pilot wave information theory. Recently Anthony Valentini of the Perimeter Institute has suggested that ordinary quantum theory may be a special case of pilot wave theories, leaving open the possibility of new and exotic non-quantum technologies. Some French, Serbian and Ukrainian physicists have been working on new theories of extended electrons and solitons, so perhaps a sub-quantum bomb is not entirely out of the question. Even if the rumors of a sub-quantum bomb are pure fantasy, there is no question that mainstream physicists seriously contemplate a phase transition in the quantum vacuum as a real possibility. The quantum vacuum defies common sense, because empty space in quantum field theory is actually filled with virtual particles. These virtual particles appear and disappear far too quickly to be detected directly, but their existence has been confirmed by experiments that demonstrate their influence on ordinary matter. "Such research should be forbidden!" In the early 1970's Soviet physicists were concerned that the vacuum of our universe was only one possible state of empty space. The fundamental state of empty space is called the "true vacuum". Our universe was thought to reside in a "false vacuum", protected from the true vacuum by "the wall of our world". A change from one vacuum state to another is known as a phase transition. This is analogous to the transition between frozen and liquid water. Lev Okun, a Russian physicist and historian recalls Andrei Sakharov, the father of the Soviet hydrogen bomb, expressing his concern about research into the phase transitions of the vacuum. If the wall between vacuum states was to be breached, calculations showed that an unstoppable expanding bubble would continue to grow until it destroyed our entire universe! Sakharov declared that "Such research should be forbidden!" According to Okun, Sakharov feared that an experiment might accidentally trigger a vacuum phase transition.

#### Space col causes inter-colony wars and war with ETs---extinction.

Marko **Kovic 18**. Social scientist (PhD in political communication, University of Zurich), co-founder and CEO of the consulting firm ars cognitionis, co-founder and president of the thinktank ZIPAR, the Zurich Institute of Public Affairs Research. 06-12-18. “Political, moral, and security challenges of space colonization.” ZIPAR. https://zipar.org/discussion-paper/political-moral-security-challenges-space-colonization/

3.3 Extraterrestrial life The scientific understanding of the origins of humankind and of life on Earth thus far paints a clear picture: We are the “products” of biological evolution, just as all other life forms on Earth. Furthermore, we know that life can come into existence where there was no life before, through so-called abiogenetic mechanisms. These basic facts lead to a clear conclusion: It is very improbable that life on Earth is a once-in-a-universe event; it is highly probable that life has come into existence elsewhere in the universe as well. We do not know whether extraterrestrial life currently exists, and whether there is any extraterrestrial life in our vicinity (as far as we know, there is none in our Solar System). In theory, our galaxy might be full of life and even highly intelligent and technologically advanced life, but, as the famous Fermi paradox posits32, there is no trace of any extraterrestrial intelligence. Be that as it may, it is possible that there is extraterrestrial life beyond Earth, and it is possible that we will come into contact with extraterrestrial life due to colonization activity. What should our moral attitude towards extraterrestrial life look like? The moral issue of our attitudes towards extraterrestrial life can be divided into three classes of problems, according to the type of life we are dealing with: Primitive non-sentient life. Primitive sentient life. Non-primitive sentient life. Primitive non-sentient life are life forms that resemble microbial life forms on Earth, such as bacteria. Extraterrestrial microbial life can be of great instrumental value, specifically to humans, but also in a more general sense. That is a strong argument in favor of studying and preserving extraterrestrial microbial life33; we should not go out of our way to destroy microbial life, because that life might be very useful. The main moral issue about primitive non-sentient life, however, is not the question of instrumental value, but rather the question of intrinsic value: Is there a moral obligation for humans not to manipulate or even end extraterrestrial microbial life forms? This problem is, in all likelihood, the most pressing moral issue about extraterrestrial life and space colonization and one that deserves greater practical attention34. A common argument in favor of the intrinsic value position is that of conation or goal-orientedness35 36: Because even microbial life forms act vaguely rational (they have goals and behave so as to achieve their goals), their existence has some intrinsic value. The problem with this moral argument is that it can easily lead to the conclusion of strong conservationism, whereby any habitable planet or moon should remain uncolonized, lest we interfere with microbes that we might have failed to detect37. In addition, if we accept a strong version of the intrinsic value argument, we already have immense moral problems: On Earth, we do not particularly care for any microbial life form on intrinsic grounds, and we even actively fight some of them. Primitive sentient life are life forms that are not as intelligent as humans, but that are sentient, in the sense of being able to experience positive or negative affective states. Even though sentience is not a perfectly precise concept38, and even though we lack the means for truly assessing qualia (subjective experiences) of life forms other than humans39, it is almost certain that we humans are not the only life form capable of experiencing pain and pain-related suffering and that many animals on our planet are sentient as well40. Sentient extraterrestrial life forms require a different moral stance than non-sentient life forms. Imagine, for example, that two human space ship are about to land on an exoplanet. As the space ships are landing, the exhaust from their engines heats up the ground. Space ship A is landing on a nest of insect-like non-sentient life forms, frying them alive in the process. Space ship B is landing on a herd of bunny-like sentient creatures, frying them alive in the process. Both outcomes are unfortunate, but undoubtedly, killing the sentient bunny-like creatures must be morally worse than killing the non-sentient insect-like creatures, because the bunnies experienced enormous pain while they were being killed. Our moral stance towards sentient primitive extraterrestrial life will have to take sentience into account. Avoiding suffering in sentient extraterrestrial life should be a universal rule of space colonization. Somewhat obviously, such a rule would also prohibit treating sentient extraterrestrial life forms as food (But it is highly improbable that humans would have to routinely rely on extraterrestrial sentient life forms as sources of nutrition, even though we would be technologically advanced enough to engage in intersolar space colonization. We are in the process of overcoming traditional agriculture today41; reverting to traditional agriculture on future extrasolar colonies would amount to an extraordinarily improbable and inefficient anachronism.). Non-primitive sentient life are life forms that are sentient and possess a general intelligence at least as great as our own (It is possible that highly intelligent life forms might be non-sentient, but at least on Earth, sentience seems to correlate with intelligence.). The moral challenge of this type of extraterrestrial life is the same as with primitive sentient life, and there are additional moral problems to consider. If there are intelligent life forms beyond Earth, their levels of technological development will have great variance; some life forms will be intelligent, but not yet developed, whereas others will be intelligent and much more technologically advanced than we are. Intelligent life forms that are less technologically developed than we are present us with a moral problem: Should we interact with such civilizations and try to help them develop faster and overcome problems? This moral problem has perhaps most famously been explored in the television show Star Trek with its “Prime Directive”: The fictional United Federation of Planets is never to interfere with a technologically undeveloped civilization in order to avoid doing damage (Alas, the protagonists of Star Trek end up violating the Prime Directive time and again; doing so makes for a good story.). More generally, the problem of non-interference can be described as a reversed Zoo hypothesis42, whereby it is not extraterrestrial civilizations treating Earth like a conservation project, but us humans pondering whether we should treat extraterrestrial civilizations as conservation projects. A strong argument in favor of non-interference is the risk of both causing bad outcomes, both in the short- as well as in the long-term. Interacting with less developed civilizations might inadvertently do more harm than good, and it might steer the affected civilizations away from a path to development that might be beneficial to humankind in the long run. On the other hand, however, not investing a small amount of resources to greatly improve lives and reduce suffering seems morally dubious. If an extraterrestrial civilization that is going through a historical era similar to our Middle Ages is confronted with some catastrophic disease like our Black Death pandemic, not helping that civilization fight that pandemic seems cruel; not least because the cost for helping that civilization would almost certainly be trivially low. 3.4 Cosmic suffering Imagine that humankind has successfully mastered phase II colonization (colonization beyond our Solar System). All the problems described in the previous sections and subsections have long been successfully solved, and humankind is progressing steadily and peacefully. Then, something happens. At some point and for some reason, future humans decide that they do not want to merely engage in space colonization, but to do more: Actively seed the universe with (non-human) life43. Given the technological development of future humankind, it is relatively easy to send out non-sentient primitive life forms across the galaxy. Unfortunately, something horrible happens: The primitive microbial life-forms sent out into the cosmos mutate into aggressive bacteria that attack any life form they encounter, including sentient life – and in doing so, they cause tremendous pain and agony in the organisms they attack. The benevolent idea of spreading life has quickly turned into unimaginable suffering of trillions of sentient beings across the galaxy. Colonizing humans have thus created suffering on a cosmic, or astronomical, scale44. Cosmic suffering is the risk of creating suffering on a scale that is either not possible or not as probable without space colonization. There are many potential scenarios in which successful space colonization results in cosmic suffering. For example, the general problem of the repugnant conclusion discussed further above can also be regarded as an example of this class of risks. Cosmic suffering is a severe problem because it is contingent on, or at least made more likely by, successful space colonization. The conceptually challenging aspect of cosmic suffering is the correlation of cosmic suffering with the degree of space colonization: The greater the level of space colonization, the greater the risks of cosmic suffering become. This is the opposite of the relationship between space colonization and existential risks: The greater the level of space colonization, the lower existential risks become – this is one of the main motivations for space colonization, after all. In other words, successful space colonization decreases the probability that something goes wrong for humankind in terms of existential risks, but it increases the probability that something goes wrong in terms of suffering for the whole universe. 4. Security challenges In the above discussions of political and moral challenges, it is presumed that the problems and challenges that arise do so in a generally peaceful system of colonization. However, peace in the sense of a lack of armed conflict is not guaranteed with space colonization. On the contrary: Space colonization might produce new kinds of security challenges. 4.1 Inter-colonial war Violence and war have been decreasing over the course of our civilization’s history45 46 47. The decrease in violent armed conflict has coincided with an increase in cultural, political, and economic interconnectedness. Even though major armed conflicts are not yet a thing of the past48, humankind will probably continue on its current trajectory of peace. With space colonization, however, the trend of growing closer together might reverse because of increasing fragmentation, and with that reversal, peaceful cooperation might again give way to armed conflict. Some amount of human fragmentation due to space colonization is almost inevitable. One of the strongest biases we humans have is the intergroup bias49: We tend to separate people into ingroups and outgroups, and we generally favor our own ingroup over any outgroup. Our ingroup favoritism is often the source of collective identity: We identify with our home city and think it is better than other cities; we identify with our favorite football team and think it is better than other teams; we identify with our country of origin and think it is better than other countries. In a future in which humans have successfully mastered type I colonization (colonization within our Solar System) and perhaps even type II colonization (intersolar colonization), belonging to one habitat rather than another will almost certainly also be a source of collective identity. Humans born and raised on Venus would probably have more positive general attitudes towards Venus than towards Earth. That is not a problem in and of itself, but it can become a problem: If humankind is very successful at space colonization and manages to establish colonies across the galaxy, the ingroup dynamics within colonies and regions of colonies might grow so much that the perceived benefits of armed conflict increase, and the perceived costs decrease. In part, this might be due to the infrahumanization (or dehumanization) bias50: Our intergroup bias can have the effect of perceiving members of the outgroup as less human than members of our own ingroup. The problem of intergroup bias and armed conflict could be compounded by real biological differences in the long-term future. In the long term, different colonies of humans might adopt different stances on human enhancement technology and embrace different kinds of enhancement technologies. These differential paths of human enhancement might result in technology-induced quasi-speciation, whereby different strands of humans have increasingly distinct biological traits. The ultimate result of such a development might be a strong fragmentation of humankind and an increasing arms race in order to defend against the outgroup of all the (former) humans that are different from the ingroup (former) humans51. 4.2 Extraterrestrial (existential) risks Space colonization will increase the probability of discovering and coming into contact with extraterrestrial intelligence, either biological or artificial (in the sense of hypothetical advanced artificial general intelligence52). That prospect poses some moral challenges, as argued in subsection 3.3. However, it might also pose a security challenge if an extraterrestrial intelligence more technologically advanced than humankind has goals and preferences that go against the goals and preferences of humankind. In general, there are three categories of attitudes an extraterrestrial intelligence can have towards humankind53. First, an extraterrestrial intelligence can be benevolent. A benevolent extraterrestrial intelligence is one that would change its goals and preferences upon learning of humankind. Humankind is a benevolent intelligence: If we, for example, came into contact with an extraterrestrial civilization, we would obviously take the goals and preferences of that civilization into account and update our own goals and preferences, since we are morally advanced enough to do so. Second, an extraterrestrial intelligence can be apathetic. An apathetic extraterrestrial intelligence is one that does not at all change its goals and preferences upon learning of humankind. An apathetic intelligence would neither try to accommodate humankind, nor would it react in some non-friendly way. It would not care at all. The attitude of an apathetic intelligence is similar to the attitude we humans have when it comes to some random microbial life form on Earth: We might understand that that life form exists, but we do not care either way. Third, an extraterrestrial intelligence can be hostile. Hostility in a general sense means that an intelligence reacts to learning of humankind by regarding its own goals and preferences as categorically more important than humankind’s. A hostile extraterrestrial intelligence is not necessarily a security threat to humankind; hostility in this context does not mean hostility in the Hollywood kind but hostility in the sense of active disregard of humankind’s goals and preferences. That, however, might still represent a tremendous security risk. For example, a hostile intelligence might prefer humankind not to exist because our mere existence is perceived as a slight discomfort to the extraterrestrial intelligence. Hostile extraterrestrial intelligence thus represents a form of existential risk.
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