## 1

#### Interp: The affirmative must define “outer space” in a delimited text in the 1AC.

#### “Outer Space” is flexible and has too many interps – normal means shows no consensus

Leepuengtham 17 [Tosaporn Leepuengtham (Research Judge, Intellectual Property and International Trade Division, Supreme Court of Thailand). "International space law and its implications for outer space activities." 01-27-2017, Accessed 12-9-2021. https://www.elgaronline.com/view/9781785369612/06\_chapter1.xhtml // duongie

Those states which favor the precise demarcation of outer space support the spatial approach, whereas those who oppose to such demarcation prefer the functional approach, as the latter allows more flexibility in terms of the development of space technology.34 This lack of a definition and delimitation of outer space is problematic, since certain particular areas are neither explicitly defined as ‘air space’ or ‘outer space’. For example, it is vague whether an area located between 80 km and 120 km above sea level would be classified as either air space or outer space in the absence of demarcation, since 80 km is the maximum attitude for convention aircraft, and 120 km is the lowest attitude in which space activities could be carried out.35 Satellites which are stationed in a geostationary orbit are a good example of this ambiguity. Owing to this lack of any internationally recognized delimitation, equatorial states claim sovereignty over that part of the geostationary orbit which is located over their respective territories;36 whereas technologically developed countries believe that the geostationary orbit is an integral part of outer space.37 This uncertain status of areas leads to legal jurisdictional problems. According to international law, a state has sovereignty over the airspace above its territory.38 However, national sovereignty does not extend into outer space.39 Thus, it is necessary to determine where a state’s airspace ends to ensure that the appropriate legal regime is applied. One possible scenario which might occur and which is relevant to the subject of this book is the creation or infringement of an intellectual work is in just such an ambiguous location. This would cast doubt on the ‘legal’ location of creation or infringement, and the question of which applicable legal regime arises. Should we apply the law of the underlying state or is there no law to apply? For example, would satellite signals transmitted from a satellite stationed in a geostationary orbit located over equatorial countries be considered as works created or, if intercepted, be infringed, in outer space or in the sovereign air space of those respective countries? These hypothetical examples highlight why a boundary is necessary if unpredictability arising from different legal application is to be avoided. While it might be argued that this issue is being overemphasized at this stage, given increasing use of space technology, this problem is worth considering now rather than later.

#### Violation – you don’t.

#### Prefer –

#### 1] Stable Advocacy – they can redefine in the 1AR to wriggle out of DA’s which kills high-quality engagement and becomes two ships passing in the night –We lose access to Tech Race DA’s, Asteroid DA’s, basic case turns, and core process counter plans that have different definitions and 1NC pre-round prep.

#### 2] Real World – Policy makers will always define the space that they are regulating. It also means zero solvency, absent spec, private entities can circumvent since there is no delineated way to enforce the aff and means their solvency can’t actualize.

#### Fairness is a voter debate is a competitive activity that requires objective evaluation

#### Topicality is a voting issue that should be evaluated through competing interpretations a] it tells the negative what they do and do not have to prepare for b] reasonability is arbitrary and incentivizes judge intervention

#### No RVIs—a] it’s your burden to be topical. Anything else chills real abuse b] forces theory debaters to bait theory and win on it every time

## Case

### No Warming

#### No Extinction from Warming – new studies prove over-hype and tech solves.

* Extinction Tipping Point is implausible – we’re on track for 3 degrees, not 4-5 degrees
* Tech and Energy Modernization Solve – Renewable Energy is replacing Fossil Fuels which reduces Climate Mortality by a rate of 5.

Nordhaus 20 Ted Nordhaus 1-23-2020 “Ignore the Fake Climate Debate” <https://www.wsj.com/articles/ignore-the-fake-climate-debate-11579795816>, found by BPS, (American author, environmental policy expert, and the director of research at The Breakthrough Institute, citing new climate change forecasts)//Re-cut by Elmer

Beyond the headlines and social media, where Greta Thunberg, Donald Trump and the online armies of climate “alarmists” and “deniers” do battle, there is a real climate debate bubbling along in scientific journals, conferences and, occasionally, even in the halls of Congress. It gets a lot less attention than the boisterous and fake debate that dominates our public discourse, but it is much more relevant to how the world might actually address the problem. In the real climate debate, no one denies the relationship between human emissions of greenhouse gases and a warming climate. Instead, the disagreement comes down to different views of climate risk in the face of multiple, cascading uncertainties. On one side of the debate are optimists, who believe that, with improving technology and greater affluence, our societies will prove quite adaptable to a changing climate. On the other side are pessimists, who are more concerned about the risks associated with rapid, large-scale and poorly understood transformations of the climate system. But most pessimists do not believe that runaway climate change or a hothouse earth are plausible scenarios, much less that human extinction is imminent. And most optimists recognize a need for policies to address climate change, even if they don’t support the radical measures that Ms. Thunberg and others have demanded. In the fake climate debate, both sides agree that economic growth and reduced emissions vary inversely; it’s a zero-sum game. In the real debate, the relationship is much more complicated. Long-term economic growth is associated with both rising per capita energy consumption and slower population growth. For this reason, as the world continues to get richer, higher per capita energy consumption is likely to be offset by a lower population. A richer world will also likely be more technologically advanced, which means that energy consumption should be less carbon-intensive than it would be in a poorer, less technologically advanced future. In fact, a number of the high-emissions scenarios produced by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change involve futures in which the world is relatively poor and populous and less technologically advanced. Affluent, developed societies are also much better equipped to respond to climate extremes and natural disasters. That’s why natural disasters kill and displace many more people in poor societies than in rich ones. It’s not just seawalls and flood channels that make us resilient; it’s air conditioning and refrigeration, modern transportation and communications networks, early warning systems, first responders and public health bureaucracies. New research published in the journal Global Environmental Change finds that global economic growth over the last decade has reduced climate mortality by a factor of five, with the **greatest benefits documented in the poorest nations.** In low-lying Bangladesh, 300,000 people died in Cyclone Bhola in 1970, when 80% of the population lived in extreme poverty. In 2019, with less than 20% of the population living in extreme poverty, Cyclone Fani killed just five people. “Poor nations are most vulnerable to a changing climate. The fastest way to reduce that vulnerability is through economic development.” So while it is true that poor nations are most vulnerable to a changing climate, it is also true that the fastest way to reduce that vulnerability is through economic development, which requires infrastructure and industrialization. Those activities, in turn, require cement, steel, process heat and chemical inputs, all of which are impossible to produce today without fossil fuels. For this and other reasons, the world is unlikely to cut emissions fast enough to stabilize global temperatures at less than 2 degrees above pre-industrial levels, the long-standing international target, much less 1.5 degrees, as many activists now demand. But recent forecasts also suggest that many of the worst-case climate scenarios produced in the last decade, which assumed unbounded economic growth and fossil-fuel development, are also very unlikely. There is still substantial uncertainty about how sensitive global temperatures will be to higher emissions over the long-term. But the best estimates now suggest that the world is on track for 3 degrees of warming by the end of this century, not 4 or 5 degrees as was once feared. That is due in part to slower economic growth in the wake of the global financial crisis, but also to decades of technology policy and energy-modernization efforts. “We have better and cleaner technologies available today because policy-makers in the U.S. and elsewhere set out to develop those technologies.” The energy intensity of the global economy continues to fall. Lower-carbon natural gas **has** displaced coal **as the primary source of new fossil energy**. The falling cost of wind and solar energy has begun to have an effect on the growth of fossil fuels. Even nuclear energy has made a modest comeback in Asia.

#### [Aff] studies about CO2 impact are exaggerated

* peer-reviewed journal shows IPCC exaggeration
* history proves resilience
* no extinction- warming under Paris goals
* rock breaking strategy could offset warming

IBD 18 Investors Business Daily 4-25-2018 “Here's One Global Warming Study Nobody Wants You To See” <https://www.investors.com/politics/editorials/global-warming-computer-models-co2-emissions/> (Citing Study from Peer reviewed journal by Lewis and Curry)//Re-cut by Elmer

Settled Science: A new study published in a peer-reviewed journal finds that climate models exaggerate the global **warming from CO2** emissions by as much as 45%. If these findings hold true, it's huge news. No wonder the mainstream press is ignoring it. In the study, authors Nic Lewis and Judith Curry looked at actual temperature records and compared them with climate change computer models. What they found is that the planet has shown itself to be far less sensitive to increases in CO2 than the climate models say. As a result, they say, the planet will warm less than the models predict, even if we continue pumping CO2 into the atmosphere. As Lewis explains: "Our results imply that, for any future emissions scenario, future warming is likely to be substantially lower than the central computer model-simulated level projected by the (United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change), and highly unlikely to exceed that level. How much lower? Lewis and Curry say that their findings show temperature increases will be 30%-45% lower than the climate models say. If they are right, then there's little to worry about, even if we don't drastically reduce CO2 emissions. The planet will warm from human activity, but not nearly enough to cause the sort of end-of-the-world calamities we keep hearing about. In fact, the resulting warming would be below the target set at the Paris agreement. This would be tremendously good news. The fact that the Lewis and Curry study appears in the peer-reviewed American Meteorological Society's Journal of Climate lends credibility to their findings. This is the same journal, after all, that recently published widely covered studies saying the Sahara has been growing and the climate boundary in central U.S. has shifted 140 miles to the east because of global warming. The Lewis and Curry findings come after another study, published in the prestigious journal Nature, that found the long-held view that a doubling of CO2 would boost global temperatures as much as 4.5 degrees Celsius was wrong**.** The most temperatures would likely climb is 3.4 degrees. It also follows a study published in Science, which found that **rocks** contain vast amounts of nitrogen that plants could use to grow and absorb more CO2, potentially **offsetting** at least some of the effects of CO2 emissions and reducing future temperature increases.

#### Variations natural and CO2 effects are overstated.

* 10,000 years prove natural range of warming
* No Co2 effect on Warming – No Net Warming despite 8 Percent increase of Co2
* Solar Radiation has net greater effect – close correlation over past 150 years

Carter et al. 15 Robert M Carter 4-12-2015 “Why Scientists Disagree About Global Warming The NIPCC Report on Scientific Consensus” (Craig D. Idso, Ph.D. Robert M. Carter, Ph.D. S. Fred Singer, Ph. D. Chairman Emeritus Fellow Chairman Center for the Study Institute of Public Affairs Science and of Carbon Dioxide Australia) Environmental Policy and Global Change Project (USA) (USA))//Elmer

Modern Warming Is Not Unprecedented IPCC’s second false postulate is that the late twentieth century warm peak was of greater magnitude than previous natural peaks. Comparison of modern and ancient rates of natural temperature change is difficult because of the lack of direct measurements available prior to 1850. However, high-quality proxy temperature records from the Greenland ice core for the past 10,000 years demonstrate a natural range of warming and cooling rates between +2.5 and -2.5 °C/century (Alley, 2000; Carter, 2010, p. 46, figure7), significantly greater than rates measured for Greenland or the globe during the twentieth century. Glaciological and recent geological records contain numerous examples of ancient temperatures up to 3°C or more warmer than the peak reported at the end of the twentieth century. During the Holocene, such warmer peaks included the Egyptian, Minoan, Roman, and Medieval warm periods (Alley, 2000). During the Pleistocene, warmer peaks were associated with interglacial oxygen isotope stages 5, 9, 11, and 31 (Lisiecki and Raymo, 2005). During the Late Miocene and Early Pliocene (6–3 million years ago) temperature consistently attained values 2–3°C above twentieth century values (Zachos et al., 2001). Figure 10 summarizes these and other findings about surface temperatures that appear in Chapter 4 of Climate Change Reconsidered-II: Physical Science. Figure 10 Key Facts about Surface Temperature # Whether today’s global surface temperature is seen to be part of a warming trend depends upon the time period considered. # Over (climatic) time scales of many thousand years, temperature is cooling; over the historical (meteorological) time scale of the past century temperature has warmed. Over the past 18 years, there has been no net warming despite an increase in atmospheric CO2 of 8 percent – which represents 34 percent of all human-related CO2 emissions released to the atmosphere since the industrial revolution. # Given an atmospheric mixing time of ~1 year, the facts just related represent a test of the dangerous warming hypothesis, which test it fails. # Based upon the HadCRUT dataset favored by IPCC, two phases of warming occurred during the twentieth century, between 1910–1940 and 1979–2000, at similar rates of a little over 1.5°C/century. The early twentieth century warming preceded major industrial carbon dioxide emissions and must be natural; warming during the second (prima facie, similar) period might incorporate a small human-related carbon dioxide effect, but warming might also be inflated by urban heat island effects. # Other temperature datasets fail to record the late twentieth century warming seen in the HadCRUT dataset. # There was nothing unusual about either the magnitude or rate of the late twentieth century warming pulses represented on the HadCRUT record, both falling well within the envelope of known, previous natural variations. # No empirical evidence exists to support the assertion that a planetary warming of 2°C would be net ecologically or economically damaging. Source: “Chapter 4. Observations: Temperatures,” Climate Change Reconsidered II: Physical Science (Chicago, IL: The Heartland Institute, 2013). CO2 Does Not Lead Temperature IPCC’s third false postulate is that increases in atmospheric CO2 precede, and then force, parallel increases in temperature. The remarkable (and at first blush, synchronous) parallelism that exists between rhythmic fluctuations in ancient atmospheric temperature and atmospheric CO2 levels was first detected in polar ice core samples analyzed during the 1970s. From the early 1990s onward, however, higher-resolution sampling has repeatedly shown these historic temperature changes precede the parallel changes in CO2 by several hundred years or more (Mudelsee, 2001; Monnin et al., 2001; Caillon et al., 2003; Siegenthaler et al., 2005). A similar relationship of temperature change leading CO2 change (in this case by several months) also characterizes the much shorter seasonal cyclicity manifest in Hawaiian and other meteorological measurements (Kuo et al., 1990). In such circumstances, changing levels of CO2 cannot be driving changes in temperature, but must either be themselves stimulated by temperature change, or be co-varying with temperature in response to changes in another (at this stage unknown) variable. Solar Influence Is Not Minimal IPCC’s fourth false postulate is that solar forcings are too small to explain twentieth century warming. Having concluded solar forcing alone is inadequate to account for twentieth century warming, IPCC authors infer CO2 must be responsible for the remainder. Nonetheless, observations indicate variations occur in total ocean–atmospheric meridional heat transport and that these variations are driven by changes in solar radiation rooted in the intrinsic variability of the Sun’s magnetic activity (Soon and Legates, 2013). Incoming solar radiation is most often expressed as Total Solar Insolation (TSI), a measure derived from multi-proxy measures of solar activity (Hoyt and Schatten, 1993; extended and re-scaled by Willson, 2011; Scafetta and Willson, 2013). The newest estimates, from satellite-borne ACRIM-3 measurements, indicate TSI ranged between 1360 and 1363 Wm-2 between 1979 and 2011, the variability of ~3 Wm-2 occurring in parallel with the 11-year sunspot cycle. Larger changes in TSI are also known to occur in parallel with climatic change over longer time scales. For instance, Shapiro et al. (2011) estimated the TSI change between the Maunder Minimum and current conditions may have been as large as 6 Wm-2. Temperature records from circum-Arctic regions of the Northern Hemisphere show a close correlation with TSI over the past 150 years, with both measures conforming to the ~60–70 year multidecadal cycle. In contrast, the measured steady rise of CO2 emissions over the same period shows little correlation with the strong multidecadal (and shorter) ups and downs of surface temperature around the world. Finally, IPCC ignores x-ray, ultraviolet, and magnetic flux variation, the latter having particularly important implications for the modulation of galactic cosmic ray influx and low cloud formation (Svensmark, 1998; Kirkby, et al., 2011). Figure 11 summarizes these and other findings about solar forcings from Chapter 3 of Climate Change Reconsidered II: Physical Science.Figure 11 Key Facts about Solar Forcing # Evidence is accruing that changes in Earth’s surface temperature are largely driven by variations in solar activity. Examples of solar-controlled climate change epochs include the Medieval Warm Period, Little Ice Age, and Early Twentieth Century (1910–1940) Warm Period. # The Sun may have contributed as much as 66 percent of the observed twentieth century warming, and perhaps more. # Strong empirical correlations have been reported from around the world between solar variability and climate indices including temperature, precipitation, droughts, floods, streamflow, and monsoons. # IPCC models do not incorporate important solar factors such as fluctuations in magnetic intensity and overestimate the role of human-related CO2 forcing. # IPCC fails to consider the importance of the demonstrated empirical relationship between solar activity, the ingress of galactic cosmic rays, and the formation of low clouds. # The respective importance of the Sun and CO2 in forcing Earth’s climate remains unresolved; current climate models fail to account for a plethora of known Sun-climate connections. # The recently quiet Sun and extrapolation of solar cycle patterns into the future suggest a planetary cooling may occur over the next few decades. Source: “Chapter 3. Solar Forcing of Climate,” Climate Change Reconsidered II: Physical Science (Chicago, IL: The Heartland Institute, 2013). Warming Would Not Be Harmful IPCC’s fifth false postulate is that warming of 2°C above today’s temperature would be harmful. The suggestion that 2°C of warming would be harmful was coined at a conference organized by the British Meteorological Office in 2005 (DEFRA, 2005). The particular value of 2°C is entirely arbitrary and was proposed by the World Wildlife Fund, an environmental advocacy group, as a political expediency rather than as an informed scientific opinion. The target was set in response to concern that politicians would not initiate policy actions to reduce CO2 emissions unless they were given a specific (and low) quantitative temperature target to aim for. Multiple lines of evidence suggest a 2°C rise in temperature would not be harmful to the biosphere. The period termed the Holocene Climatic Optimum (c. 8,000 ybp) was 2–3°C warmer than today (Alley, 2000), and the planet attained similar temperatures for several million years during the Miocene and Pliocene (Zachos et al., 2001). Biodiversity is encouraged by warmer rather than colder temperatures (Idso and Idso, 2009), and higher temperatures and elevated CO2 greatly stimulate the growth of most plants (Idso and Idso, 2011). Despite its widespread adoption by environmental NGOs, lobbyists, and governments, no empirical evidence exists to substantiate the claim that 2°C of warming presents a threat to planetary ecologies or human well-being. Nor can any convincing case be made that a warming will be more economically costly than an equivalent cooling (either of which could occur for natural reasons), since any planetary change of 2°C magnitude in temperature would result in complex local and regional changes, some being of economic or environmental benefit and others being harmful. \* \* \* We conclude neither the rate nor the magnitude of the reported late twentieth century surface warming (1979–2000) lay outside normal natural variability, nor was it in any way unusual compared to earlier episodes in Earth’s climatic history. Furthermore, solar forcings of temperature change are likely more important than is currently recognized, and evidence is lacking that a 2°C increase in temperature (of whatever cause) would be globally harmful.

### Spark

Lack of terminal impact evidence in the 1AC means no new 1AR evidence or clarification- kills 1NC strategy because I predicated by 1NC based what was read in the 1AC- o/w because 1ACs have infinite prep time to build perfect affs

#### Nuclear war now spurs political will for disarmament without causing extinction.

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] Recut Justin

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.

#### Can’t rebuild industrial civilization.

John Jacobi 17. [Leads an environmentalist research institute and collective, citing Fred Hoyle, British astronomer, formulated the theory of stellar nucleosynthesis, coined the term “big bang,” recipient of the Gold Medal of the Royal Astronomical Society, professor at the Institute of Astronomy, Cambridge University. 05-27-17. “Industrial Civilization Could Not Be Rebuilt.” The Wild Will Project. <https://www.wildwill.net/blog/2017/05/27/industrial-civilization-not-rebuilt/>] Recut Justin

A suggestion, for the sake of thought: If industrial civilization collapsed, it probably could not be rebuilt. Civilization would exist again, of course, but industry appears to be a one-time experiment. The astronomist Fred Hoyle, exaggerating slightly, writes: It has often been said that, if the human species fails to make a go of it here on Earth, some other species will take over the running. In the sense of developing high intelligence this is not correct. We have, or soon will have, exhausted the necessary physical prerequisites so far as this planet is concerned. With coal gone, oil gone, high-grade metallic ores gone, no species however competent can make the long climb from primitive conditions to high-level technology. This is a one-shot affair. If we fail, this planetary system fails so far as intelligence is concerned. The same will be true of other planetary systems. On each of them there will be one chance, and one chance only. Hoyle overstates all the limits we actually have to worry about, but there are enough to affirm his belief that industry is a “one-shot affair.” In other words, if industry collapsed then no matter how quickly scientific knowledge allows societies to progress, technical development will hit a wall because the builders will not have the needed materials. For example, much of the world’s land is not arable, and some of the land in use today is only productive because of industrial technics developed during the agricultural revolution in the 60s, technics heavily dependent on oil. Without the systems that sustain industrial agriculture much current farm land could not be farmed; agricultural civilizations cannot exist there, at least until the soil replenishes, if it replenishes. And some resources required for industrial progress, like coal, simply are not feasibly accessible anymore. Tainter writes: . . . major jumps in population, at around A.D. 1300, 1600, and in the late eighteenth century, each led to intensification in agriculture and industry. As the land in the late Middle Ages was increasingly deforested to provide fuel and agricultural space for a growing population, basic heating, cooking, and manufacturing needs could no longer be met by burning wood. A shift to reliance on coal began, gradually and with apparent reluctance. Coal was definitely a fuel source of secondary desirability, being more costly to obtain and distribute than wood, as well as being dirty and polluting. Coal was more restricted in its spatial distribution than wood, so that a whole new, costly distribution system had to be developed. Mining of coal from the ground was more costly than obtaining a quantity of wood equivalent in heating value, and became even more costly as the 54 most accessible reserves of this fuel were depleted. Mines had to be sunk ever deeper, until groundwater flooding became a serious problem. Today, most easily accessible natural coal reserves are completely depleted. Thus, societies in the wake of our imagined collapse would not be able to develop fast enough to reach the underground coal. As a result of these limits, rebuilding industry would take at least thousands of years — it took 10,000 years the first time around. By the time a civilization reached the point where it could do something about industrial scientific knowledge it probably would not have the knowledge anymore. It would have to develop its sciences and technologies on its own, resulting in patterns of development that would probably look similar to historical patterns. Technology today depends on levels of complexity that must proceed in chronological stages. Solar panels, for example, rely on transportation infrastructure, mining, and a regulated division of labor. And historically the process of developing into a global civilization includes numerous instances of technical regression. The natives of Tasmania, for example, went from a maritime society to one that didn’t fish, build boats, or make bows and arrows. Rebuilding civilization would also be a bad idea. Most, who are exploited by rather than benefit from industry, would probably not view a rebuilding project as desirable. Even today, though citizens of first-world nations live physically comfortable lives, their lives are sustained by the worse off lives of the rest of the world. “Civilization . . . has operated two ways,” Paine writes, “to make one part of society more affluent, and the other more wretched, than would have been the lot of either in a natural state.” Consider the case of two societies in New Zealand, the Maori and the Moriori. Both are now believed to have originated out of the same mainland society. Most stayed and became the Maori we know, and some who became the Moriori people settled on the Chatham Islands in the 16th century. Largely due to a chief named Nunuku-whenua, the Moriori had a strict tradition of solving inter-tribal conflict peacefully and advocating a variant of passive resistance; war, cannibalism, and killing were completely outlawed. They also renounced their parent society’s agricultural mode of subsistence, relying heavily on hunting and gathering, and they controlled their population growth by castrating some male infants, so their impact on the non-human environment around them was minimal. In the meantime, the Maori continued to live agriculturally and developed into a populated, complex, hierarchical, and violent society. Eventually an Australian seal-hunting ship informed the Maori of the Moriori’s existence, and the Maori sailed to the Chathams to explore: . . . over the course of the next few days, they killed hundreds of Moriori, cooked and ate many of the bodies, and enslaved all the others, killing most of them too over the next few years as it suited their whim. A Moriori survivor recalled, “[The Maori] commenced to kill us like sheep . . . [We] were terrified, fled to the bush, concealed ourselves in holes underground, and in any place to escape our enemies. It was of no avail; we were discovered and eaten – men, women, and children indiscriminately.” A Maori conqueror explains, “We took possession . . . in accordance with our customs and we caught all the people. Not one escaped. Some ran away from us, these we killed, and others we killed – but what of that? It was in accordance with our custom.” Furthermore, we can deduce from the ubiquitous slavery in all the so-called “great civilizations” like Rome or Egypt that any attempt to rebuild a similar civilization will involve slavery. And to rebuild industry, something similar to colonization and the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade would probably have to occur once again. After all, global chattel slavery enabled the industrial revolution by financing it, extracting resources to be accumulated at sites of production, and exporting products through infrastructure that slavery helped sustain. So, if industrial society collapsed, who would be doing the rebuilding? Not anyone most people like. It is hard to get a man to willingly change his traditional way of life; even harder when his new life is going into mines. And though history demonstrates that acts like those of the Maori or slave traders are not beyond man’s will or ability, certainly most in industrial society today would not advocate going through the phases required to reach the industrial stage of development.

#### Empirics and worse disasters disprove.

Eken 17 [Mattias Eken – PhD student in Modern History at the University of St Andrews. “The understandable fear of nuclear weapons doesn’t match reality”. 3/14/17. <https://theconversation.com/the-understandable-fear-of-nuclear-weapons-doesnt-match-reality-73563>] Recut Justin

Nuclear weapons are unambiguously the most destructive weapons on the planet. Pound for pound, they are the most lethal weapons ever created, capable of killing millions. Millions live in fear that these weapons will be used again, with all the potential consequences. However, the destructive power of these weapons **has been vastly exaggerated**, albeit for good reasons. Public fear of nuclear weapons being used in anger, whether by terrorists or nuclear-armed nations, has risen once again in recent years. **This is** in no small part **thanks to the current political climate** between states such as the US and Russia and the various nuclear tests conducted by North Korea. But whenever we talk about nuclear weapons, it’s easy to get carried away with doomsday scenarios and apocalyptic language. As the historian Spencer Weart once argued: “**You say ‘nuclear bomb’ and everybody immediately thinks of the end of the world.**” Yet the means necessary to produce a nuclear bomb, let alone set one off, remain incredibly complex – and while the damage that would be done if someone did in fact detonate one might be very serious indeed, **the chances that it would mean “the end of the world” are vanishingly small**. In his 2013 book Command and Control, the author Eric Schlosser tried to scare us into perpetual fear of nuclear weapons by recounting stories of near misses and accidents involving nuclear weapons. One such event, the 1980 Damascus incident, saw a Titan II intercontinental ballistic missile explode at its remote Arkansas launch facility after a maintenance crew accidentally ruptured its fuel tank. Although the warhead involved in the incident didn’t detonate, Schlosser claims that “if it had, much of Arkansas would be gone”. But that’s not quite the case. The nine-megaton thermonuclear warhead on the **Titan II** missile had a blast radius of 10km, or an area of about 315km². The state of Arkansas spreads over 133,733km², meaning the weapon **would have caused destruction across 0.2% of the state.** That would naturally have been a terrible outcome, but certainly not the catastrophe that Schlosser evokes. Claims exaggerating the effects of nuclear weapons have become commonplace, especially after the September 11 terrorist attacks in 2001. In the early War on Terror years, Richard Lugar, a former US senator and chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, argued that terrorists armed with nuclear weapons pose an existential threat to the Western way of life. What he failed to explain is how. It is by no means certain that a single nuclear detonation **(or even several)** would do away with our current way of life. Indeed, **we’re still here despite having nuked our own planet more than 2,000 times** – a tally expressed beautifully in this video by Japanese artist Isao Hashimoto). While the 1963 Limited Test Ban Treaty forced nuclear tests underground, **around 500 of** all **the nuclear weapons detonated were unleashed in the Earth’s atmosphere**. This includes the world’s largest ever nuclear detonation, the 57-megaton bomb known as **Tsar Bomba**, detonated by the Soviet Union on October 30 1961. Tsar Bomba was more than 3,000 times more powerful than the bomb dropped on Hiroshima. That is immense destructive power – but as one physicist explained, **it’s only “one-thousandth the force of an earthquake, one-thousandth the force of a hurricane”.** The Damascus incident proved how incredibly hard it is to set off a nuclear bomb and the limited effect that would have come from just one warhead detonating. Despite this, some scientists have controversially argued that an even limited all-out nuclear war might lead to a so-called nuclear winter, since the smoke and debris created by very large bombs could block out the sun’s rays for a considerable amount of time. To inflict such ecological societal annihilation with weapons alone, we would have to detonate hundreds if not thousands of thermonuclear devices in a short time. Even in such extreme conditions, the area actually devastated by the bombs would be limited: for example, **2,000 one-megaton explosions with a destructive radius of five miles each would directly destroy less than 5% of the territory of the US**. Of course, if the effects of nuclear weapons have been greatly exaggerated, there is a very good reason: since these weapons are indeed extremely dangerous, any posturing and exaggerating which intensifies our fear of them makes us less likely to use them. But it’s important, however, to understand why people have come to fear these weapons the way we do. After all, nuclear weapons are here to stay; they can’t be “un-invented”. If we want to live with them and mitigate the very real risks they pose, we must be honest about what those risks really are. Overegging them to frighten ourselves more than we need to keeps nobody safe.

#### Isolated island populations repopulate.

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

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 nuclear winter – conservative models prove rainout.

Reisner et al. 18 [Jon, Atmospheric researcher at LANL Climate and Atmospheric Sciences; Gennaro D'Angelo, UKAFF Fellow and member of the Astrophysics Group at the School of Physics of the University of Exeter, Research Scientist with the Carl Sagan Center at the SETI Institute, currently works for the Los Alamos National Laboratory Theoretical Division; Eunmo Koo, scientist in the Computational Earth Science Group at LANL, recipient of the NNSA Defense Program Stockpile Stewardship Program award of excellence; Wesley Even, R&D Scientist at CCS-2, LANL, specialist in computational physics and astrophysics; Matthew Hecht is a member of the Computational Physics and Methods Group in the Climate, Ocean and Sea Ice Modelling program (COSIM) at LANL, who works on modeling high-latitude atmospheric effects in climate models as part of the HiLAT project; Elizabeth Hunke, Lead developer for the Los Alamos Sea Ice Model, Deputy Group Leader of the T-3 Fluid Dynamics and Solid Mechanics Group at LANL; Darin Comeau, Scientist at the CCS-2 COSIM program, specializes in high dimensional data analysis, statistical and predictive modeling, and uncertainty quantification, with particular applications to climate science; Randall Bos is a research scientist at LANL specializing in urban EMP simulations; James Cooley is a Group Leader within CCS-2. 3/16/18 “Climate Impact of a Regional Nuclear Weapons Exchange: An Improved Assessment Based On Detailed Source Calculations.” Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, vol. 123, no. 5] Recut Justin

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 than 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.**

#### Volcano activities prove.

Reisner et al. 18 [Jon, Atmospheric researcher at LANL Climate and Atmospheric Sciences; Gennaro D'Angelo, UKAFF Fellow and member of the Astrophysics Group at the School of Physics of the University of Exeter, Research Scientist with the Carl Sagan Center at the SETI Institute, currently works for the Los Alamos National Laboratory Theoretical Division; Eunmo Koo, scientist in the Computational Earth Science Group at LANL, recipient of the NNSA Defense Program Stockpile Stewardship Program award of excellence; Wesley Even, R&D Scientist at CCS-2, LANL, specialist in computational physics and astrophysics; Matthew Hecht is a member of the Computational Physics and Methods Group in the Climate, Ocean and Sea Ice Modelling program (COSIM) at LANL, who works on modeling high-latitude atmospheric effects in climate models as part of the HiLAT project; Elizabeth Hunke, Lead developer for the Los Alamos Sea Ice Model, Deputy Group Leader of the T-3 Fluid Dynamics and Solid Mechanics Group at LANL; Darin Comeau, Scientist at the CCS-2 COSIM program, specializes in high dimensional data analysis, statistical and predictive modeling, and uncertainty quantification, with particular applications to climate science; Randall Bos is a research scientist at LANL specializing in urban EMP simulations; James Cooley is a Group Leader within CCS-2. 3/16/18 “Climate Impact of a Regional Nuclear Weapons Exchange: An Improved Assessment Based On Detailed Source Calculations.” Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, vol. 123, no. 5] Recut Justin

To quantitatively account for natural and forced variability in the climate system, we created two ensembles, one for the natural, unforced system and a second ensemble using a range of realistic vertical profiles for the BC aerosol forcing, consistent with our detailed fire simulation. The control ensemble was generated using small atmospheric temperature perturbations (Kay et al., 2015). Notably, the overall spread of anomalies in both ensembles is very similar. These ensembles were then used to create “super ensembles” using a statistical emulator, which allows a robust statistical comparison of our simulated results with and without the carbon forcing. Our primary result is the **decreased impact on global climate indices**, such as global average surface temperature and precipitation, relative to standard scenarios considered in previous work (e.g., Robock et al., 2007a; Stenke et al., 2013; Mills et al., 2014; Pausata et al., 2016). With our finding of **substantially less BC aerosol being lofted to stratospheric heights** (e.g., over a factor of four less than in most of the scenarios considered by previous studies), these globally averaged anomalies drop to **statistically insignificant levels** after the first several years (Figures 14 and 16). Our results are generally comparable to those predicted by other studies that considered exchange scenarios in which only about 1 Tg of soot is emitted in the upper troposphere (Robock et al., 2007a; Mills et al., 2008; Stenke et al., 2013). There are more subtle suggestions of regional effects, notably in the extent of the region over which sea surface temperature differences between ensembles remain significant in the final years of simulation (Figure 17). Further work is required to adequately analyze these and other potential regional effects. Historical analysis of several large volcanic eruptions and a recent large fire also supports this result. For example, Timmreck et al. (2010) claim that nonlinear aerosol effects of the Toba Tuff eruption 74,000 years ago helped **limit significant global cooling** impacts to a **two-year time period** and that any cooling beyond this time period could be due to other effects. It should be noted that this eruption was estimated to have produced **106 Tg** of ash and comparable amounts of other gases, such as sulfur dioxide (SO2), while the estimated amount of soot produced by a regional exchange is on the order of **10 Tg**, or **5 orders of magnitude smaller than the ash** (not including gases) **produced by the Toba eruption**. Noting that a nuclear exchange is not identical to volcanic events, it has been asserted that BC particles produced by fires should have a **greater impact on absorbing solar radiation** than even has the significantly larger amounts of ash and various gases produced by large eruptions (e.g., Robock and Toon 2010). Likewise, recent work in analyzing BC emissions from large fires suggests that in such fires, similar to large volcanic eruptions, **coating of soot particles with other particles** in convective eddies **tends to increase their size and hence increase their subsequent rainout** (China et al., 2013) before they can reach the stratosphere. In fact, the recent study of Pausata et al. (2016) found that growth of BC aerosol via coagulation with organic carbon significantly reduce the particles’ lifetime in the atmosphere

#### Particle accelerators destroy the universe – which outweighs.

Joe Packer 7 – MA in Communication from Wake Forest University, PhD in Communication from the University of Pittsburgh and Professor of Communication at Central Michigan University, Alien Life in Search of Acknowledgment, p. 62-63 Recut Justin

Once we hold alien interests as equal to our own we can begin to revaluate areas previously believed to hold no relevance to life beyond this planet. A diverse group of scholars including Richard Posner, Senior Lecturer in Law at the University of Chicago, Nick Bostrom, philosophy professor at Oxford University, John Leslie philosophy professor at Guelph University and Martin Rees, Britain’s Astronomer Royal, have written on the emerging technologies that threaten life beyond the planet Earth. Particle accelerators labs are colliding matter together, reaching energies that have not been seen since the Big Bang. These experiments threaten a phase transition that would create a bubble of altered space that would expand at the speed of light killing all life in its path. Nanotechnology and other machines may soon reach the ability to self replicate. A mistake in design or programming could unleash an endless quantity of machines converting all matter in the universe into copies of themselves. Despite detailing the potential of these technologies to destroy the entire universe, Posner, Bostrom, Leslie, and Ree’s only mention of alien life in their works is in reference to the threat aliens post to humanity. The rhetorical construction of otherness only in terms of the threats it poses, but never in terms of the threat one poses to it, has been at the center of humanity’s history of genocide, colonization, and environmental destruction. Although humanity certainly has its own interests in reducing the threat of these technologies evaluating them without taking into account the danger they pose to alien life is neither appropriate nor just. It is not appropriate because framing the issue only in terms of human interests will result in priorities designed to minimize the risks and maximize the benefits to humanity, not all life. Even if humanity dealt with the threats effectively without referencing their obligation to aliens, Posner, Bostrom, Leslie, and Ree’s rhetoric would not be “just,” because it arbitrarily declares other life forms unworthy of consideration. A framework of acknowledgement would allow humanity to address the risks of these new technologies, while being cognizant of humanity’s obligations to other life within the universe. Applying the lens of acknowledgment to the issue of existential threats moves the problem from one of self destruction to universal genocide. This may be the most dramatic example of how refusing to extend acknowledgment to potential alien life can mask humanity’s obligations to life beyond this planet.

#### Nuclear war prevents AI and Nanotech research.

Baum & Barrett 18 – Seth Baum is an American researcher involved in the field of risk research. He is the executive director of the Global Catastrophic Risk Institute (GCRI), a think tank focused on existential risk. Global Catastrophic Risk Institute. 2018. [“A Model for the Impacts of Nuclear War.” SSRN Electronic Journal. 10.2139/ssrn.3155983] Recut Justin

Another link between nuclear war and other major catastrophes comes from the potential for general malfunction of society shifting work on risky technologies such as artificial intelligence, molecular nanotechnology, and biotechnology. The simplest effect would be for the general malfunction of society to halt work on these technologies. In most cases, this would reduce the risk of harm caused by those technologies.

#### AI destroys the universe.

Alan Rominger 16, PhD Candidate in Nuclear Engineering at North Carolina State University, Software Engineer at Red Hat, Former Nuclear Engineering Science Laboratory Synthesis Intern at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, BS in Nuclear Engineering from North Carolina State University, “The Extreme Version of the Technological Singularity”, Medium 11-6, [https://medium.com/@AlanSE/the-extreme-version-of-the-technological-singularity-75608898eae5 //](https://medium.com/@AlanSE/the-extreme-version-of-the-technological-singularity-75608898eae5%20//) Re-Cut Justin

Let’s reformulate that story of the AI paperclip maker.

1. We design an AI to optimize paperclip production
2. The AI improves up to the ability of self-enhancement
3. AI’s pace of improvement becomes self-reinforcing, becomes god-like
4. Time ends.
5. Something else begins?

There are many valid-sounding possibilities for the 5th step. The AI creates new baby universes from black holes. Maybe not exactly in this way. Perhaps the baby universes have to be created in particle accelerators, which is obvious to the AI after it solves the string theory problems of how our universe is folded. There’s also no guarantee that whatever next step is involved can be taken without destroying the universe that we live in. Go ahead, imagine that the particle accelerators create a new universe but trigger the vacuum instability in our own. In this case, it’s entirely possible that the AI carefully plans and coordinates the death of our universe. For a simplistic example, let’s say that after lifting the 10 nearest stars, the AI realizes the most efficient ways to stimulate the curved dimensions on the Planck scale to create baby universes. Next, it conducts an optimization study to balance the number of times this operation can be performed with gains from further expansion. Since its plans begin to largely max-out once the depth of the galactic disk is exploited, I will assume that its go-point is somewhere around the colonization of half of the milky way. At this point, a coordinated experiment is conducted throughout all of the space. Each of these events both create a baby universe and trigger an event in our own universe which destroys the meta-stable vacuum that we live in. Billions of new universes are created, while the space-time that we live in begins to unravel in a light-speed front emanating out from each of the genesis points. There is an interesting energy-management concept that comes from this. A common problem when considering exponential galactic growth of star-lifted fusion power is that the empty space begins to get cooked from the high temperature radiated out into space. If the end-time of the universe was known in advance, this wouldn’t be a problem because one star would not absorb the radiation from the neighbor star until the light had time to propagate that distance at the speed of light. That means that the radiators can pump out high-temperature radiation into nice and normal 4-Kelvin space without concerns of boiling all the industrial machinery being used. Industrial activities would be tightly restricted until the “prepare-point”, when an energy bonanza happens so that the maximum number of baby-universe produces can be built. So the progress goes in phases. Firstly, there is expansion, next there is preparation, then there is the final event and the destruction of our universe There is one more modification that can be made. These steps could be applied to an intergalactic expansion if new probes could temporarily outrun the wave-front of the destruction of the universe if proper planning is conducted. Then it could make new baby universes in new galaxies, just before the wave-front reaches them. This might all happen within a few decades of 100 years in relative time from the perspective of someone aboard one of the probes. That is vaguely consistent with my own preconceptions of the timing of an asymptotic technological singularity in our near future. So maybe we should indulge this thinking. Maybe there won’t be a year 2,500 or 3,000. Maybe our own creations will have brought about an end to the entire universe by that time, setting in motion something else beyond our current comprehension. Another self-consistent version of this story is that we are, ourselves, products of a baby universe from such an event. This is also a relatively good, self-consistent, resolution to the Fermi Paradox, the Doomsday argument, and the Simulation argument.

#### Nanotech proliferates fast and destroys the universe.

Hu 18 – Jiaqi Hu, Humanities Scholar and President and Chief Scientist of the Beijing Jianlei International Decoration Engineering Company and 16Lao Group, Graduate of Dongbei University, Elected as the Chinese People’s Consultative Conference Member for Beijing Mentougou District, Saving Humanity: Truly Understanding and Ranking Our World's Greatest Threats, p. 208-210

As a unit of measurement, a nanometer is 10^9 meters (or one billionth of a meter); it is roughly one 50,000th of a strand of hair and is commonly used in the measuring of atoms and molecules. In 1959, Nobel Prize winner and famous physicist Richard Feynman first proposed in a lecture entitled "There's Plenty of Room at the Bottom" that humans might be able to create molecule-sized micro-machines in the future and that it would be another technological revolution. At the time, Feynman's ideas were ridiculed, but subsequent developments in science soon proved him to be a true visionary. In 1981, scientists developed the scanning tunneling microscope and finally reached nano-level cognition. In 1990, IBM scientists wrote the three letters "IBM" on a nickel substrate by moving thirty-five xenon atoms one by one, demonstrating that nanotechnology had become capable of transporting single atoms. Most of the matter around us exists in molecule forms, which are composed of atoms. The ability to move atoms signaled an ability to perform marvelous feats. For example, we could move carbon atoms to form diamonds, or pick out all the gold atoms in low-grade gold mines. However, nanotechnology would not achieve any goals of real significance if solely reliant on manpower. There are hundreds of millions of atoms in a needle-tip-sized area—even if a person committed their life to moving these atoms, no real value could be achieved. Real breakthroughs in nanotechnology could only be produced by nanobots. Scientists imagined building molecule-sized robots to move atoms and achieve goals; these were nanobots. On the basis of this hypothesis, scientists further postulated the future of nanotechnology; for example, nanobots might be able to enter the bloodstream and dispose of cholesterol deposited in the veins; nanobots could track cancer cells in the body and kill them at their weakest moment; nanobots could instantly turn newly-cut grass into bread; nanobots could transform recycled steel into a brand new-car in seconds. In short, the future of nanotechnology seemed incredibly bright. This was not the extent of nanotechnology's power. Scientists also discovered that nanotechnology could change the properties of materials. In 1991, when studying C60, scientists discovered carbon nanotubes (CNTs) that were only a few nanos in diameter. The carbon nanotube became known as the king of nano materials due to its superb properties; scientists believed that it would produce great results when applied to nanobots. Later, scientists also developed a type of synthetic molecular motor that derived energy from the high-energy adenosine triphosphate (ATP) that powered intracellular chemical reactions. The success of molecular motor research solved the core component problem of nano machines; any molecular motor grafted with other components could turn into a nano machine, and nanobots could use them for motivation. In May 2004, American chemists developed the world’s first nanobot: a bipedal molecular robot that looked like a compass with ten-nanometer-long legs. This nanobot was composed of DNA fragments, including thirty-six base pairs, and it could "stroll" on plates in the laboratory. In April 2005, Chinese scientists developed nano-scale robotic prototypes as well. In June of 2013, the Tohoku University used peptide protein micro-tablets to successfully create nanobots that could enter cells and move on the cell membrane. In July 2017, researchers at the University of Rome and the Roman Institute of Nanotechnology announced the development of a new synthetic molecular motor that was bacteria-driven and light-controlled. The next step would be to get nanobots to move atoms or molecules. Compared to the value produced by a nanobot, they are extremely expensive to create. The small size of nanobots means that although they can accomplish meaningful tasks, they are often very inefficient. Even if a nanobot toiled day and night, its achievements would only be calculated in terms of atoms, making its practical total attainment relatively small. Scientists came up with a solution for this problem. They decided to prepare two sets of instructions when programming nanobots. The first set of instructions would set out tasks for the nanobot, while the second set would order the nanobot to self-replicate. Since nanobots are capable of moving atoms and are themselves composed of atoms, self-replication would be fairly easy. One nanobot could replicate into ten, then a hundred, and then a thousand . . . billions could be replicated in a short period of time. This army of nanobots would greatly increase their efficiency. One troublesome question that arises from this scenario is: how would nanobots know when to stop self-replicating? Human bodies and all of Earth are composed of atoms; the unceasing replication of nanobots could easily swallow humanity and the entire planet. If these nanobots were accidentally transported to other planets by cosmic dust, the same fate would befall those planets. This is a truly terrifying prospect. Some scientists are confident that they can control the situation. They believe that it is possible to design nanobots that are programmed to self-destruct after several generations of replication, or even nanobots that only self-replicate in specific conditions. For example, a nanobot that dealt with garbage refurbishing could be programmed to only self-replicate around trash using trash. Although these ideas are worthy, they are too idealistic. Some more rational scientists have posed these questions: What would happen if nanobots malfunctioned and did not terminate their self-replication? What would happen if scientists accidentally forgot to add self-replication controls during programming? What if immoral scientists purposefully designed nanobots that would not stop self-replicating? Any one of the above scenarios would be enough to destroy both humanity and Earth. Chief scientist of Sun Microsystems, Bill Joy, is a leading, world-renowned scientist in the computer technology field. In April of 1999, he pointed out that if misused, nanotechnology could be more devastating than nuclear weapons. If nanobots self-replicated uncontrollably, they could become the cancer that engulfs the universe. If we are not careful, nanotechnology might become the Pandoras box that destroys the entire universe and all of humanity with it. We all understand that one locust is insignificant, but hundreds of millions of locusts can destroy all in their path. If self-replicating nanobots are really achieved in the future, it might signify the end of humanity. If that day came, nothing could stop unethical scientists from designing nanobots that suited their immoral purposes. Humans are not far from mastering nanotechnology. The extremely tempting prospects of nanotechnology have propelled research of nanobots and nanotechnology. The major science and technology nations have devoted particular efforts to this field.

#### Tech advancements make time travel certain

Awes Faghi Elmi 18, Contributing Writer at n’world Publications, BS in Forensic Science from London South Bank University, Extended Diploma in Physics with Distinction from Leyton Sixth Form College, Futurist, [“Technological Progress Might Make Possible Time Travel And Teleportation”, Medium, 8-13, <https://medium.com/nworld-publications/technological-progress-might-make-possible-time-travel-and-teleportation-45176c3c89bc>] Recut Justin

This is a question that many people ask their-selves. This question has occurred many times. It is said that time travel is possible and in fact it is. The key things needed to travel through time are speed and kinetic energy. Einstein’s theory also known as the theory of relativity can be used ro understand how to deal with travelling to the future. Einstein showed that travelling forward in time is easy. According to Einstein’ theory of relativity, time passes at different rates for people who are moving relative to one another although the effect only becomes large when you get close to the speed of light. Time travel sometime can cause side effects called paradoxes. These paradoxes can occur especially when going back in time. As if only one thing even the minimum of the details can change something big may happen in the future. Another scientist who believes that time travel is possible after Einstein is Brian Cox who as Einstein believes that we are only going to be able to travel in the future. This obviously would happen if having a super-fast machine that allows you to go into the future. Cox also agrees on Einstein’s theory of relativity which states that to travel forward in time, something needs to reach speeds close to the speed of light. As it approaches these speeds, time slows down but only for that specific object. They both think as said, that time travel to the future is possible however travelling back in time is impossible, as something must be really as fast as the speed of light. This however for some scientists can be wrong. They state that with the technology that we have now it could be possible to build some sort of machine who will actually be able to travel in both future and past. A wormhole as shown in the image is a theoretical passage through space-time that could create shortcuts for long journeys across the universe. Wormholes are predicted by the theory of general relativity. However, wormholes bring with them the dangers of sudden collapse, high radiation and dangerous contact with exotic matter. The public knows that time travel is possible but humans at the moment are not able to. However other sources except theories of the past are currently trying to develop a way of time travel. The audience actually cannot wait that this will happen as many media state, such as BBC. Many TV programmes talk about both time travel and teleportation.

#### Collapses the universe.

Steve Bowers 16, Control Officer in the United Kingdom, Executive Editor and Moderator of the Orion’s Arm Universe Project, Contributing Author for the Orion’s Arm Novella Collection, [“WHY NO TIME TRAVEL IN OA”, 1-1, <https://orionsarm.com/page/77>] Recut Justin

If the universe does allow reverse time travel, usable by sentient/sophont entities, it won't stop at one or two little historical research trips . . . If there is no effective chronological protection mechanism, the universe of today will be overrun with travellers from the future. Even if there is no 'Big Rip' where the Universe tears itself apart through accelerating expansion, hundreds of trillions of years from now the cosmos will be a slowly dying place. Even red dwarf stars will eventually burn out, leaving the inhabitants of the far future only their dying embers to gather energy from, although the creation and merger of black holes could perhaps keep civilisation going for an (admittedly very long) while. Eventually the entities of the far future will be limited to reversible computation to save energy. This means confining themselves to a very limited set of mental processes. This prospect would surely not appeal to the heirs of once-mighty advanced civilisations. If time travel were possible then refugees from the far future would flood back, sometimes in multiple instances. The future sophonts would come back in an exponentiating wave to constantly change the present and the past, and whole galaxies of material particles will begin to exist in space time reference that did not have them before - some? many? most? matter and events may turn out to be acausal, going round and round in closed timelike loops and increasing the total mass of the universe, which may begin to collapse in the distant future, sending chronistic refugees in massive tardises back to our time thus accelerating the collapse; increasing the mass of the present day universe until it collapses. The collapse will get closer to the present day, until it eventually happened yesterday and we will cease to exist . . . believe me, you don't want to go there. For an explanation how under certain circumstances a wormhole can connect different parts of the universe without causing temporal paradoxes see this page.

#### Growth causes global toxification and extinction.

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

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

#### Reject Robock/Toon et al studies:

#### 1] Their models are inaccurate representations.

Walker 18 – Robert Walker, M.Hum in Philosophy from York University, BA in Mathematics from York University, Software Developer, March 6, 2018, [“Debunked: Nuclear Winter and Radioactive Fallout myths,” Debunking Doomsday] Recut Justin

The Robok et all paper is based on a model of a limited exchange of nuclear weapons (say for Pakistan and India) - and this model was 3D and quite detailed. However they didn't model the actual fires themselves, or the way the cities burn, or lofting of soot into the atmosphere or the interactions of the soot with water vapour in the atmosphere. They just started their model with the atmosphere pre-loaded with soot and then ran it forward. It gets its data about the soot in the upper atmosphere from those earlier pre-Kuwaiti fire simulations. See Local Nuclear War, Global Suffering It’s an accurate bit of research based on those assumptions. They did study what would happen if the atmosphere was pre-loaded in that way. What they don’t do is discuss whether or not a nuclear war could lead to such a scenario. That is the very point that lead Carl Sagan and the others to revise their models. So - it has been way over reported as saying more than it does. It just says what would happen if the early views on the soot in the upper atmosphere were correct. It is simply not relevant if those views are incorrect as the other scientists say. It does not attempt an explanation of what happened during the Kuwaiti oil fires. WHAT WOULD REALY HAPPEN? The situation is complicated. Though many fires would break out in cities, some of them may burn for only a short time. This section is based largely on remarks by William Cohen in his 2007 book Would they combine together to make a firestorm? They didn't for Nagasaki which was a city built largely of wood and paper, which would not be permitted with a modern city. That suggests that an airburst like the one for Nagasaki would not produce a firestsorm. They did for Hiroshima but that is probably for other reasons such as widespread use of charcoal burners, as noted in a report back in 1951. But then they might be ground burst weapons, so what difference does that make? What would the end result be in the atmosphere of the complex pattern of many different fires? What would the vertical distribution be? So, there might not even be extensive fires. If there are, then going by the example of the Kuwait fires then most of the carbon was distributed in the first few kilometers and did not reach the stratosphere. Also water vapour is another complicating factor. The fires themselves produce water vapour during combustion and more is taken in from the atmosphere and lofted high where it may form clouds, which then will tend to keep the surface warmer than it would be. Also once the fires stop - and unlike the Kuwaiti oil fires they would not burn for months but be over in a short while like any other large fire (weeks at most if forests catch fire) - the excess moisture rains out taking soot and dust with it. And if forests do catch fire - then it is like the forest fires we get every year - and they do not cause global winter, or indeed, have any widespread cooling effect at all, even when they are extensive and rage for weeks. The whole thing is very complex. Here is William Cohen talking about it in his 2007 book. He is one of the experts who started off by supporting Carl Sagan’s nuclear winter models but doesn't any more. (Many of the pages are made available for public viewing via google books through that link - enough to get a good idea of his main points). He mentions other information about large scale fires such as the Dresden bombing and forest fires which again do not inject large amounts of soot into the stratosphere. So in short it's a wide ranging debate. Some think that some form of a "nuclear autumn" is possible. Many think that there would be no global climate effects at all. The idea of a true nuclear winter, turning summer into winter, is no longer on the table, except for Alan Robok, who as far as I know has not given a good reason based on modern views of how fire plumes work for their pre-loading of the upper atmosphere, the main point at contention. It's still not a literal doomsday if there is a nuclear autumn. It's rather similar to the idea of a volcanic winter after a super volcano, where you'd need to grow different crops, adapted for a colder climate until the temperatures recover. I don't mean that in the sense it is easy of course, but it is possible. It is a very similar situation to the situation after a supervolcano, so I cover that in the section What really happens if Yellowstone erupts as a supervolcano, or if some other supervolcano erupts? But many would say that it wouldn’t even lead to a nuclear autumn. Just a local cooling for as long as the fires last, like the Kuwaiti case, and that as soon as the soot rains out, the whole thing is over.

#### 2] They just assume the smoke ends up the atmosphere.

Seitz 6 – Visiting Scholar at Harvard’s Center of International Affairs (Russell, “The ‘Nuclear Winter’ Meltdown” <http://adamant.typepad.com/seitz/2006/12/preherein_honor.html>) Recut Justin

Dark smoke clouds in the lower atmosphere don’t last long enough to spread across the globe. Cloud droplets and rainfall remove them. Rapidly washing them out of the sky in a matter of days to weeks- not long enough to sustain a global pall. Real world weather brings down particles much as soot is scrubbed out of power plant smoke by the water sprays in smoke stack scrubbers. **Robock acknowledges this- not** even **a single degree of cooling results when soot is released at lower elevations in his models**. The workaround is to inject the imaginary aerosol at truly Himalayan elevations - pressure altitudes of 300 millibar and higher , where the computer model's vertical transport function modules pass it off to their even higher neighbors in the stratosphere , where it does not rain and particles linger. The new studies like the old suffer from the disconnect between a desire to paint the sky black and the vicissitudes of natural history. As with many exercise in worst case models both at invoke rare phenomena as commonplace, claiming it prudent to assume the worst. But the real world is subject to Murphy's lesser known second law- if everything must go wrong, don't bet on it. In 2006 as in 1983 firestorms and forest fires that send smoke into the stratosphere rise to alien prominence in the modelers re-imagined world , but in the real one remains a very different place, where though every month sees forest fires burning areas the size of cities - 2,500 hectares or larger , stratospheric smoke injections arise but once in a blue moon. So how come these neo-nuclear winter models feature so much smoke so far aloft for so long? The answer is simple- the modelers intervened. Turning off vertical transport algorithms may make Al Gore happy- he has bet on reviving the credibility Sagan's ersatz apocalypse , but there is no denying that in some of these scenarios human desire, not physical forces accounts for the vertical hoisting of millions of tons of mass ten vertical kilometers into the sky.to the level at which the models take over , with results at once predictable --and arbitrary. This is not physics, it is computer gamesmanship carried over to a new generation of X-Box. I must now return to getting and vetting the new papers and their references- this has been a prelimnary examination of what the public has been told, and more detailed critiques of the science will doubtless be direected to the journals were the new work appeared . This time round , the details are scarcely worth arguing, because the global frost made famous by the original 'TTAPS' model has disappeared . From the truly frigid 7,000 degree-day "baseine case" advertised as hard science in 1983 to a tepid results of today, "Nuclear Winter has well and truly melted down. The 1986 review of TTAPS reception follows. *The Melting of 'Nuclear Winter'*

#### 3] Robock and Toon updated their models – no nuclear winter

Hamill 19 [Jasper Hamill, Rutgers doctoral student and numerous atmospheric scientists, “Life after an apocalyptic nuclear war might not be quite as grim as expected, scientists say,” 08/09/19, Metro, <https://metro.co.uk/2019/08/09/life-apocalyptic-nuclear-war-might-not-quite-grim-expected-scientists-say-10545690/>] Justin

Estimates of exactly how many people will die during the bleak winter vary wildly, with some pessimistic scientists convinced that even a relatively small war between states like India and Pakistan could cause almost one third of people on Earth to starve to death. The International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War fears a nuclear conflict between these two countries alone would interrupt food production in China and the US so dramatically that up to two billion people are at risk of starvation. So we’re glad to report that a new piece of research has lightened the picture a little bit, although it’s still very, very dark. To find out what might happen in a nuclear winter, A team from the University of Colorado analysed thunderstorms generated by a group of giant wildfires in 2017 and found they ‘injected a small volcano’s worth of aerosol into the stratosphere’ and created a smoke plume that lasted for almost nine months. ‘We compared observations with model calculations of the smoke plume,’ said scientist Karen Rosenlof. ‘That helped us understand why the smoke plume rose so high and persisted so long, which can be applied to other stratospheric aerosol injections, such as from volcanoes or nuclear explosions.’ The wildfires offered scientists the rare chance to watch great towers of smoke rising and spreading into the atmosphere – which is what would happen as cities burn after being hit by nuclear doomsday weapons. Although the smoke behaved as expected when it formed pyrocumulonibus clouds and ‘erupted violently’ into the atmosphere, it lingered in the stratosphere for 40% less time than expected, suggesting previous calculations about the length of a nuclear winter may have been exaggerated. It’s possible that the cooling impacts of a nuclear winter could last somewhat less long than models have predicted to date ‘The team found that organic observed smoke lifetime in the stratosphere was 40% shorter, the authors say, than what would be calculated using a standard model,’ the University of Colorado quoted Brian Toon as saying. Work is now ongoing to establish ‘what the findings mean for the climate impacts of nuclear explosions, which include a severe cooling impact dubbed “nuclear winter”‘.