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### No Solvency—Other Countries 1NC

#### No global action – too many conflicts – empirics prove

Daily Mirror 6 – 18 – 14 (“Global warming continues to be a serious global issue,” 6-18-14, http://www.dailymirror.lk/business/features/48574-global-warming-continues-to-be-a-serious-global-issue.html)

But **the decline of emissions in** the **developed countries is more than matched by continued growth in developing countries like China and India**, the new figures show. Coal, the dirtiest and most carbon-intensive fossil fuel, is growing fastest, with coal-related emissions leaping more than 5 percent in 2011, compared with the previous year. Emissions continue to grow so rapidly that **an international goal of limiting** the ultimate **warming** of the planet to 3.6 degrees, established three years ago, **is** on the verge of becomingunattainable, said researchers affiliated with the Global Carbon Project, a network of scientists that tracks emissions. Yet, **nations around the world**, **despite** a formal treaty pledging to limit warming — and 20 years **of negotiations** aimed at putting it into effect — **have shown little appetite for** the kinds of **controls** required **to accomplish that goal**. **The conflicts and controversies** discussed **are** monotonously familiar: the **differing obligations of industrialized and developing nations**, the question of **who will pay to** help poor nations **adapt**, the urgency of protecting **tropical forests and the need to rapidly develop and deploy clean energy** technology.

### No Solvency—Other Countries 2NC

#### Even a binding agreement fails

Kilisek 6 – 18 – 14 (Roman Kilisek is a Global Energy & Natural Resources Analyst and a contributor at Breaking Energy, “Opinion: Why Obama's 'Clean Power' Plan May Prove Counterproductive for 2015 Global Climate Agreement,” 6-18-14, http://theenergycollective.com/jared-anderson/401811/opinion-why-obama-s-clean-power-plan-may-prove-counterproductive-2015-global-c)

It is important to remember that **without China, India and other emerging economies, no real progress on the climate front can be achieved**. These countries have been served a perfect argument, which improves their bargaining position significantly; namely, if the US is not willing and/or able to pass federally binding carbon emission standards in a top-down approach but, instead, actually acknowledges that giving significant flexibility to states in meeting carbon emission reduction targets is the better approach, this flexibility on a country-by-country basis is even more called for on the international level. This, however, **would not help the global climate agreement cause**. A good indication is that many environmental organizations are not too happy with the currently proposed ‘Clean Power Plan’. Consequently, **a global climate agreement in 2015 is illusive and will at best consist of a plethora of** watered down**,** voluntary**, and**, above all, flexible **carbon emission reduction targets and strategies**. **Emerging market countries will strive to** adopt strategies to avoid public international shaming while making sure **not** to **hurt** **their** own **growing** **economies** and their international competitiveness. In contrast, the current US administration seems to go down the road of regulating the coal industry into an uncompetitive situation with collateral damage to be determined later. Maybe, it would be a good idea to show some flexibility in regard to the coal industry too. To be clear, it is this administration’s prerogative to outline its vision for a sound domestic energy policy. However, the administration should not be allowed by Congress to not only reduce the use of coal in US power generation but turning US coal reserves and infrastructure into effectively ‘stranded assets’ by indirectly preventing the further expansion of US coal export facilities. The US coal industry is still the workhorse of US power generation and will be for the foreseeable future. Without the fossil-fuel sector the US would probably still be emerging…

#### No modeling - economic concerns

Kilisek 6 – 18 – 14 (Roman Kilisek is a Global Energy & Natural Resources Analyst and a contributor at Breaking Energy, “Opinion: Why Obama's 'Clean Power' Plan May Prove Counterproductive for 2015 Global Climate Agreement,” 6-18-14, http://theenergycollective.com/jared-anderson/401811/opinion-why-obama-s-clean-power-plan-may-prove-counterproductive-2015-global-c)

What do the proposed rules suggest to **China, India and other emerging economic powerhouses** around the world? At this stage, most of those countries **can ill afford nor are willing to unnecessarily constrain their growth trajectories. Sure, they are willing to talk the ‘environmental talk’ and incorporate more renewables into their respective energy mix** understanding the costs of pollution (e.g. China) **but are unlikely to turn the switch completely from fossil-fuel** fired **power generation** **to** European-style **renewable power** generation **or** US-style **natural gas**-fired power generation. This may change once those countries catch up economically – i.e. on a GDP per capita basis. On this road, however, higher electricity prices are detrimental. **Also note, natural gas**-fired power generation **is** ‘cleaner’ than other options but **not entirely “clean” from a** greenhouse gas **emissions perspective**. **The issue** here **is methane emissions**. Methane is explicitly mentioned only seven times on 645 pages. It would be hard to argue against the appearance that the ‘methane issue’ was de-emphasized.

#### Can’t solve warming

Mufson 6 – 4 – 14 (“Will the new EPA rules for coal plants inspire other countries?,” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2014/06/04/will-the-new-epa-rules-for-coal-plants-inspire-other-countries/?tid=hpModule_a2e19bf4-86a3-11e2-9d71-f0feafdd1394>)

Many U.S. executives doubt, however, that either China or India, where a new government is just settling in, will follow the U.S. lead, or that Japan, which has closed its nuclear power plants and revved up consumption of coal and natural gas, can stick to its earlier commitments. Such business executives, the Chamber of Commerce, and an association of steel companies argue that the United States is simply sacrificing its competitive advantage by adding to its electricity costs. Jay Timmons, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, said in a conference call Monday that "the administration's unilateral action could shift jobs to China and India." EPA says, however, that its regulations would not add much or anything to electricity rates and that the regulations would boost the U.S. economy. Jeffrey Holmstead, a lobbyist at Bracewell & Giuliani and the former top EPA official for clean air in the Bush administration, said, "I think the question is, now that the administration has said, 'Here’s what we've done on cars, what we're willing to do on power plants,' China, India, what are you willing to do? The assertion by the administration is that by showing leadership, we will persuade other countries to come to the table and do aggressive things of their own. I think that remains to be seen."

### No Solvency—Other Countries 2NC—AT: U.S. Key

#### U.S. emissions and declining and insignificant – other countries outweigh

Knappenberger 6 – 17 – 14 (Paul C. “Chip” Knappenberger is the assistant director of the Center for the Study of Science at the Cato Institute, “The EPA’s New Emissions Regulations Will Not Cool the Planet,” <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/epas-new-emissions-regulations-will-not-cool-planet>)

The EPA has announced a set of ambitious and potentially onerous new regulations aimed at reducing the carbon dioxide emissions from existing power plants in the U.S. by 30 percent by the year 2030. The regulations are part of President Obama’s plan to “lead by example” when it comes to tackling climate change. But **there is an underlying scientific truth** that the EPA and President **Obama do not want to reveal**. **The effort, no matter how large, to restrict carbon dioxide emissions from the U.S. will have** no scientifically detectable impact of the future course of the weather and climate at any scale, global, regional or local. So **it doesn’t matter whether the EPA** proposes regulations to **reduce** power plant **emissions by 30** percent by 2030, or by 50 percent, **or even 100 percent** by **tomorrow**. Aside from the varying degrees of economic and social chaos that will arise, the impact on the climate will be the same. None. The same is true for the impact on the weather. The future will still hold all manner of extreme events like tornadoes, hurricanes, droughts, floods, heat waves and blizzards. And **nobody will be able to detect any change** in their characteristics resulting **from** the EPA **actions to restrict carbon dioxide emissions**. This is not because carbon dioxide emissions from human activities don’t add a pressure for the earth’s temperature to rise; they do. But it is because **the level of natural noise in the climate system is high**, **and** because **the relative U.S. contribution to** the **global** carbon dioxide **emissions** total **is** meager **and in** rapid decline. **The days of carbon dioxide emissions from the U.S.** and other developed countries **dominating the world’s total are behind us**. Going forward, **it is the developing nations like China and India** and their efforts to bring improved energy access to their large populations **that have the greatest impact on future climate change**. For example, **mainstream projections of climate change** between now and the end of the century **are** for the earth’s average surface temperature to increase by about **2.5° C**. Of that rise, about 2.2° C is expected to come from carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions from the developing world. Of the remaining 0.3° C of projected temperature rise, **the U.S. portion is** expected to be about half of that, or about **0.15° C**.That’s it. That’s all the warming that the President and the EPA are able to thwart. But they are not keen on telling you that.

### No Solvency—Too Late/Past Tipping Pt

**Warming tipping points inevitable – too late**

**NPR 9** (1/26, Global Warming Is Irreversible, Study Says, All Things Considered, http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=99888903)

**Climate change is** essentially **irreversible**, according to a sobering new scientific study. As carbon dioxide emissions continue to rise, the world will experience more and more long-term environmental disruption. **The damage will persist even** when, and **if, emissions are brought under control, says** study author Susan **Solomon, who is among the world's top climate scientists**. "We're used to thinking about pollution problems as things that we can fix," Solomon says. "Smog, we just cut back and everything will be better later. Or haze, you know, it'll go away pretty quickly." That's the case for some of the gases that contribute to climate change, such as methane and nitrous oxide. But as Solomon and colleagues suggest in a new study published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, it is not true for the most abundant greenhouse gas: carbon dioxide. **Turning off the carbon dioxide emissions won't stop global warming**. "People have imagined that if we stopped emitting carbon dioxide that the climate would go back to normal in 100 years or 200 years. What we're showing here is that's not right. **It's** essentially **an irreversible change that will last for more than a thousand years,**" Solomon says. This is because **the oceans are** currently **soaking up** a lot of **the planet's excess heat — and** a lot of the **carbon dioxide put into the air. The carbon dioxide and heat will eventually start coming out of the ocean**. And that will take place for many hundreds of years. **Solomon is a scientist with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration**. Her new study looked at the consequences of this long-term effect in terms of sea level rise and drought.

**Even with co2 cuts, can’t prevent warming**

**Times Online 8**

5/23, Copenhagen Consensus: global warming, http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article3992368.ece DA 7-11-2010

There is unequivocal evidence that humans are changing the planet’s climate. **We are already committed to average temperature increases of about 0.6°C**, even without further rises in atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration. **The world has focused on** mitigation — **reducing carbon emissions — a close look at the costs and benefits suggests that relying on this alone is a poor approach**. Option One: Continuing focus on mitigation **Even if mitigation** — economic measures like taxes or trading systems — **succeeded in capping emissions at 2010 levels, then the world would pump out 55 billion tonnes of carbon emissions in 2100, instead of 67 billion tonnes**. **It is a difference of 18 per cent: the benefits would remain smaller than 0.5 per cent of the world’s GDP for more than 200 years. These benefits simply are not large enough to make the investment worthwhile**.

**Too much co2 has already been released – can’t prevent warming**

**Longley 8**

Robert, Global Warming Inevitable This Century, NSF Study Finds, http://usgovinfo.about.com/od/technologyandresearch/a/climatetochange.htm DA 7-11-2010

**Despite efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, global warming and a greater increase in sea level are inevitable during this century, according to a new study** performed by a team of climate modelers at the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) in Boulder, Colo. **Indeed, say the researchers, whose work was funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF), globally averaged surface air temperatures would still rise one degree Fahrenheit** (about a half degree Celsius) by the year 2100, **even if no more greenhouse gases were added to the atmosphere. And the resulting transfer of heat into the oceans would cause global sea levels to rise another 4 inches** (11 centimeters) from thermal expansion alone. The team's findings are published in this week's issue of the journal "Science." “**This study is another in a series that employs increasingly sophisticated simulation techniques to understand the complex interactions of the Earth,**” says Cliff Jacobs of NSF’s atmospheric sciences division.

### No Warming !—Cooling + Not Anthro 1NC

#### No catastrophic warming – Earth is cooling and any fluctuations are natural, not anthropogenic – prefer long-term predictions backed by empirics and real science – aff models are wrong

Ferrara 14 (Peter, \*\*Graduate of Harvard College and Harvard Law School, senior fellow for entitlement and budget policy @ Heartland, senior fellow at the Social Security Institute, White House Office of Policy Development under President Reagan, Associate Deputy Attorney General of the United States under the first President Bush\*\*, “The Period Of No Global Warming Will Soon Be Longer Than the Period of Actual Global Warming,” 2/24, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/peterferrara/2014/02/24/the-period-of-no-global-warming-will-soon-be-longer-than-the-period-of-actual-global-warming/>, CMR)

If you look at the record of global temperature data, you will find that the late 20th Century period of global warming actually lasted about 20 years, from the late 1970s to the late 1990s. Before that, the globe was dominated by about 30 years of global cooling, giving rise in the 1970s to media discussions of the return of the Little Ice Age (circa 1450 to 1850), or worse. But the record of satellite measurements of global atmospheric temperatures now shows no warming for at least 17 years and 5 months, from September, 1996 to January, 2014, as shown on the accompanying graphic. That is surely 17 years and 6 months now, accounting for February. When the period of no global warming began, the alarmist global warming establishment responded that even several years of temperature data does not establish a climate trend. That takes much longer. But **when the period of no global warming gets longer than the period of** actual global **warming,** what is the climate trend then? Even **worse for the theory of catastrophic, anthropogenic** (human caused), global **warming is that during this** now extended **period of no** global **warming** mankind’s **emissions** of the carbon dioxide (CO2) that are supposed to be predominant in causing global warming **continued to explode,** with one third of all CO2 added to the atmosphere since the industrial revolution occurring during this period. The Economist magazine shocked the global warming establishment with an article in March, 2013 that began with this lede: “OVER the past 15 years air temperatures at the Earth’s surface have been flat while greenhouse-gas emissions have continued to soar. The world added roughly 100 billion tonnes of carbon to the atmosphere between 2000 and 2010. That is about a quarter of all the CO2 put there by humanity since 1750.” That one quarter is actually now one third since the industrial revolution, which is now increasingly at stake in this debate. We are not going to be able to power anything remotely like the modern industrial revolution, which is actually straining even now to burst out of the “Progressive” bonds holding it back (at least in America), using the wind sources that powered the Roman economy, plus dancing on sunbeams. Moreover, **the** now **extended trend of no** global **warming is** not turning around any time soon. **That increasingly established trend is being produced by** long term natural causes. **Even rank amateurs** among the general public **can see** that **the sun is the dominant influence on the Earth’s temperatures**. Even the most politicized **scientists** know that they **cannot deny** that solar activity such as sun spot cycles, and variations in solar magnetic fields or in the flux of cosmic rays, **have contributed to major climate changes** of the past, such as the Little Ice Age, particularly pronounced from roughly 1650 AD to 1850 AD, the Medieval Warm period from about 950 AD to 1250 AD, during which global temperatures were higher than today, and the early 20th century Warming Period from 1910 to 1940 AD. That solar activity, particularly sunspot cycles, is starting to mimic the same patterns that were seen during the Little Ice Age, as I discussed in a previous column. As a result, outside politically correct Western circles, where science today has been Lysenkoized on this issue, there is a burgeoning debate about how long of a cooling trend will result. **Britain’s Met Office**, an international cheerleading headquarters for global warming hysteria, **conceded** in December, 2012 that **there would be no further warming** at least through 2017, which would make 21 years with no global warming. The German Herald reported on March 31, 2013 regarding Russian scientist Dr Habibullo Abdussamatov from the St. Petersburg Pulkovo Astronomical Observatory, “Talking to German media the scientist who first made his prediction in 2005 said that after studying sunspots and their relationship with climate change on Earth, we are now on an ‘unavoidable advance towards a deep temperature drop.’” His colleague Yuri Nagovitsyn is quoted in The Voice of Russia saying, “**we could be in for a cooling period that lasts** 200-250 years.” Skepticism over the theory of catastrophic anthropogenic global warming is increasingly embraced in China and elsewhere in Asia as well. In addition, every 20 to 30 years, the much colder water near the bottom of the oceans cycles up to the top, where it has a slight cooling effect on global temperatures until the sun warms that water. That warmed water then contributes to slightly warmer global temperatures, until the next churning cycle. Known as the Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO) and the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation (AMO), **these natural causes are** also **contributing to the** stabilized **and** now even slightly declining natural **global temperature trends**. The foundation for the establishment argument for global warming are 73 climate models collected by the UN’s **IPCC** (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). But the problem is that the warming trends projected by these **models are all diverging** farther and farther **from the** real world trend **of actual temperature observations** discussed above, as I showed in a previous column, with another graphic. Because none of these models have been scientifically validated based on past temperature observations, they constitute a very weak scientific argument that does not remotely establish that the “science is settled,” and “global warming is a fact.” The current data discussed above establishes indisputably that global warming is not a fact today. The politicians seeking to browbeat down any continuing public debate are abusing their positions and authority with modern Lysenkoism, meaning “politically correct” science not established by the scientific method, but politically imposed. The science behind all of this is thoroughly explained in the 1200 pages of Climate Change Reconsidered II, authored by 50 top scientists organized into the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC), and published by the Heartland Institute in Chicago. You will want to own this volume if for no other reason than that it says here that future generations of scientists will look back and say this is the moment when we took the political out of the political science of “climate change,” and this is how we did it. Real scientists know that these 50 co-authors are real scientists. That is transparent from the tenor of the report itself. The publication is “double peer reviewed,” in that it discusses thousands of peer reviewed articles published in scientific journals, and is itself peer reviewed. That is in sharp contrast to President Obama’s own EPA, which issued its “endangerment finding” legally authorizing regulation of carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions, without submitting the finding to its own peer review board, as required by federal law. What were they so afraid of if 97% of scientists supposedly agree with them? **The conclusion** of the report **is** that **the U.N.’s IPCC has exaggerated the amount of** global **warming likely to occur due to mankind’s** emissions of **CO2**, **and** the **warming** that human civilization will cause as a result “**is likely to be modest and cause no** net **harm to the** global **environment or** to **human well-being**.” **The primary, dominant cause of** global **climate change is natural causes**, not human effects, the report concludes. The fundamentals of the argument are that **carbon dioxide is** not some toxic industrial gas, but **a natural, trace gas** constituting just 0.038% of the atmosphere, or less than 4/100ths of one percent. The report states, “At the current level of 400 parts per million, we still live in a CO2-starved world. Atmospheric **levels** (**of CO2**) **15 times greater existed** during the pre-Cambrian period (about **550 million years ago**) **without** known adverse effects,” such as **catastrophic** global **warming**. Much was made of the total atmospheric concentration of CO2 growing past 400 parts per million. But one percent of the atmosphere would be 10,000 parts per million. Moreover, **human emissions of CO2 are only** 4% to 5% **of total global emissions**, counting natural causes.

### No Warming !—Cooling + Not Anthro 1NC

#### No catastrophic warming – best science proves – dismiss claims of “consensus”

Bast & Spencer 14 (Joseph Bast is president of the Heartland Institute, and Roy Spencer is a principal research scientist for the University of Alabama in Huntsville and the U.S. Science Team Leader for the Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer on NASA's Aqua satellite, “The Myth of the Climate Change '97%',” 5/26, <http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303480304579578462813553136>)

Rigorous international surveys conducted by German scientists Dennis Bray and Hans von Storch —most recently published in Environmental Science & Policy in 2010—have found that most climate scientists disagree with the consensus on key issues such as the reliability of climate data and computer models. They do not believe that climate processes such as cloud formation and precipitation are sufficiently understood to predict future climate change. Surveys of meteorologists repeatedly find a majority oppose the alleged consensus. Only 39.5% of 1,854 American Meteorological Society members who responded to a survey in 2012 said man-made global warming is dangerous. Finally, **the U.N.'s** Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change—which claims to speak for more than 2,500 scientists—**is** probably **the most frequently cited source for** the **consensus**. Its latest report claims that "human interference with the climate system is occurring, and climate change poses risks for human and natural systems." **Yet relatively few have** either **written on or reviewed research having to do with the key question: How much of the** temperature increase and other **climate changes observed in the 20th century was caused by man-made greenhouse-gas emissions?** The IPCC lists only 41 authors and editors of the relevant chapter of the Fifth Assessment Report addressing "anthropogenic and natural radiative forcing." **Of the various petitions on global warming circulated for signatures by scientists, the one by the Petition Project,** a group of physicists and physical chemists based in La Jolla, Calif., **has by far the most signatures—more than 31,000 (more than 9,000 with a Ph.D.**). It was most recently published in 2009, and most signers were added or reaffirmed since 2007. **The petition states that "there is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of** . . . carbon dioxide, methane, or other **greenhouse gases is causing or will,** in the foreseeable future, **cause catastrophic heating** of the Earth's atmosphere and disruption of the Earth's climate." We could go on, but the larger point is plain. **There is** no basis **for the claim that 97% of scientists believe that man-made climate change is a dangerous problem**.

#### No catastrophic warming – estimates exaggerated and earth is cooling

Ridley 14 (Matt, BA and DPhil degrees from Oxford University, he worked for the Economist for nine years as science editor, Washington correspondent and American editor, before becoming a self-employed writer and businessman, fellow of the Royal Society of Literature and of the Academy of Medical Sciences, and a foreign honorary member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, “Climate Forecast: Muting the Alarm,” March 27, <http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303725404579460973643962840>)

Messrs. Lewis and Crok argue that **the average of the best observationally based studies shows the amount of immediate warming to be expected if carbon dioxide levels double after 70 years is "likely" to be** between one and two degrees Centigrade, with a best estimate of **1.35C** (or 2.4F). That's **much lower than the IPCC assumes** in its forthcoming report. In short, the warming we experienced over the past 35 years—about 0.4C (or 0.7F) if you average the measurements made by satellites and those made by ground stations—is likely to continue at about the same rate: a little over a degree a century. Briefly during the 1990s there did seem to be warming that went as fast as the models wanted. But **for the past** 15-**17 years there has been** essentially **no net warming (a "hiatus"** now **conceded by the IPCC**), **a fact that** the **models did not predict and now struggle to explain**. The favorite post-hoc explanation is that because of natural variability in ocean currents more heat has been slipping into the ocean since 2000—although the evidence for this is far from conclusive. None of this contradicts basic physics. Doubling carbon dioxide cannot on its own generate more than about 1.1C (2F) of warming, however long it takes. All the putative warming above that level would come from amplifying factors, chiefly related to water vapor and clouds. The net effect of these factors is the subject of contentious debate. In climate science, the real debate has never been between "deniers" and the rest, but between "lukewarmers," who think man-made climate change is real but fairly harmless, and those who think the future is alarming. Scientists like Judith Curry of the Georgia Institute of Technology and Richard Lindzen of MIT MITD 0.00% have moved steadily toward lukewarm views in recent years. Even with its too-high, too-fast assumptions, the recently leaked draft of **the IPCC impacts report makes clear that when it comes to the effect on human welfare**, "for most economic sectors, **the impact of climate change will be** small relative to the impacts of other drivers," such as economic growth and technology, for the rest of this century. If temperatures change by about 1C degrees between now and 2090, as Mr. Lewis calculates, then the effects will be even smaller.

#### Earth cooling – long-term trend

Taylor 4/30/14 (James, Senior Fellow, The Heartland Institute; Managing Editor, Environment and Climate News, “20 Years of Winter Cooling Defy Global Warming Claims,” <http://www.forbes.com/sites/jamestaylor/2014/04/30/twenty-years-of-winter-cooling-defy-global-warming-claims/>)

Winter temperatures throughout the United States are in a 20-year cooling trend, defying alarmist global warming predictions and debunking claims that warmer winters are causing environmental catastrophe. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) data, presented by the International Climate and Environmental Change Assessment Project, reveal this winter’s exceptionally cold winter was merely the continuation of a long-term cooling trend. The trend line for the past 20 years shows more than two degrees Fahrenheit of cooling in U.S. winter temperatures since 1995. The two decades of cooling temperatures defy alarmist assertions that global warming is causing warmer winters. The Weather Channel presented a typical example of such bogus winter warming claims in a December 13, 2013 article, titled “Winters Getting Warmer In U.S., But Precipitation Trends Are a Mixed Bag.” At the very top of the article, The Weather Channel posted a map of U.S. winter temperature trends from 1970-2012, produced by the alarmist website Climate Central. Virtually the entire map is colored various shades of red, reflecting an asserted winter warming trend during the period. The map is accompanied by an insert claiming U.S. winter temperatures rose 0.61 degrees Celsius between 1970 and 2012. U.S. winter temperatures. Credit: International Climate and Environmental Change Assessment Project. U.S. winter temperatures. Credit: International Climate and Environmental Change Assessment Project. As U.S. Historical Climatology Network (USHCN) data show, The Weather Channel and Climate Central engaged in deceptive and unscrupulous cherry-picking to mislead readers into thinking a long-term cooling trend was actually a long-term warming trend. The NOAA data referenced and linked above show winter temperatures have been cooling for the past 20 years. U.S. Historical Climatology Network data show the cooling trend extends back even further, all the way to 1930. Nevertheless, The Weather Channel and Climate Central deliberately chose an outlier year, 40-plus years ago (1970), with a winter much cooler than other years immediately before and after, and compared it to a recent outlier year (2012) with a winter that was much warmer than other years immediately before and after. As the NOAA and USHCN data show, almost any way you slice and dice the data, the United States is in a long-term winter cooling trend. The period 1930-2014 shows cooling. The period 1995-2014 shows cooling. The long-term trend line from just about any other year to the present shows cooling. Nevertheless, a very few data points can be cherry-picked to give the illusion of winter warming, so that’s just what The Weather Channel and Climate Central did. The winter cooling trend is important for other reasons, as well. Global warming activists frequently assert that warmer winters are causing all sorts of environmental harms. The poster child for these alarmist claims is assertions that pine beetle infestations in the western United States are caused by warmer winters failing to keep pine beetle populations in check. Clearly, this and other assertions of warmer winters causing environmental havoc are pure garbage, given than winters have been cooling for the past 20 years, and indeed the past 80 years. Global warming cannot be causing pine beetle epidemics if the claim depends on assertions that winters are getting warmer. Winters are not getting warmer; they are getting cooler. Therefore, global warming cannot be causing recent pine beetle epidemics. Objective scientists point out, instead, that pine beetle epidemics have occurred for millennia, including in extremely cold places like Alaska. Government forestry practices that have unnaturally suppressed wildfires, leaving in place an unnatural density of old and weakened trees, are much more likely to fuel pine beetle epidemics. Score this one Objective Science 1: Global Warming Alarmists 0.

### No Warming !—Not Anthro 2NC

#### No anthropogenic warming

– cloud feedbacks AND PDO proves\*\*\*

Spencer ‘10 – climatologist and a Principal Research Scientist for U. of Alabama [Roy W, Ph.D. in meteorology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison in 1981, former Senior Scientist for Climate Studies at NASA’s Marshall Space Flight Center, where he and Dr. John Christy received NASA’s Exceptional Scientific Achievement Medal for their global temperature monitoring work with satellites, “The Great Global Warming Blunder: How Mother Nature Fooled the World's Top Climate Scientists”, pg # below, CMR]

IN SCIENCE it only takes **only one finding** to overturn decades of mainstream belief. Scientific knowledge is **not a matter of consensus**, as if scientific truth were something to be voted on. It is either true or not true. I have described new and important scientific evidence-some published, some unpublished at this writing—that supports two major conclusions that could end up dismantling the theory of anthropogenic global warming. The first conclusion is that recent satellite measurements of the Earth reveal the climate system to be relatively insensitive to warming influences, such as humanity's greenhouse gas emissions. This insensitivity is the result of more clouds forming in response to warming, thereby reflecting more sunlight back to outer space and reducing that warming. This process, known as negative feedback, is analogous to opening your car window or putting a sun shade over the windshield as the sun begins to heat the car's interior. An insensitive climate system does not particularly care how much we drive suvs or how much coal we burn for electricity. This evidence directly contradicts the net positive feedback exhibited in the computerized climate models tracked by the IPCC. It is well known that positive feedback in these models is what causes them to produce so much warming in response to humanity's greenhouse gas emissions. Without the high climate sensitivity of the models, anthropogenic global warming becomes **little more than** a minor **academic curiosity**. 153 The strong negative feedback in the real climate system has not been noticed by previous researchers examining satellite data because- they have not been careful about inferring causation. As is the case in all realms of scientific research, making the measurements is much easier than figuring out what those measurements mean in terms of cause and effect. Climate researchers have neglected to account for clouds causing temperature change (forcing) when they tried to determine how temperature caused clouds to change (feedback). They mixed up cause and effect when analyzing year-to-year variability in clouds and temperature. You might say they were fooled by Mother Nature. Clouds causing temperature to change created the illusion of a sensitive climate system. In order to help you understand this problem, I have used the example that I was given when I asked the experts how they knew that feedbacks in the climate system were positive. It was explained to me that when there is an unusually warm year, researchers have found that there is typically less cloud cover. The researchers assumed that the warming caused the decrease in cloud cover. This would be positive feedback because fewer clouds would let in more sunlight and thereby amplify the warming. But I always wondered: How did they know that it was the warming causing fewer clouds, rather than fewer clouds causing the warming? As we have seen, **they didn’t** know. And when the larger, contaminating effect of clouds causing temperature change is taken into account, the true signal of negative feedback emerges from the data. I have demonstrated this with a simple climate model by showing that the two directions of causation-forcing and feedback (or cause and effect) have distinctly different signatures both in the satellite data and in a simple model of the climate system. These distinct signatures even show up in the climate models tracked by the IPCC. Probably as a result of the contusion between cause and effect, climate models have been built to be too sensitive, with clouds erroneously amplifying rather than reducing warming in response to increasing atmospheric carbon dioxide concen 154 trations. The models then predict **far too much warming** when the small warming influence of more man-made greenhouse gases is increased over lime in the models. This ultimately results in pre-dictions of serious lo catastrophic levels of warming for the future, which you then hear about through the news media. While different models predict various levels of warming, all of them exhibit positive feedbacks. The mix-up between cause and effect also explains why feedbacks previously diagnosed from satellite observations of the Earth by other researchers have been so variable. There have been differing levels of contamination of the feedback signal by forcing, depending on what year the satellites were observing the Earth The second major conclusion of this book is closely connected to the first. If the carbon dioxide we produce is not nearly enough to cause significant warming in a climate system dominated by negative feedback, then what caused the warming we have experienced over the last fifty years or more? New satellite measurements indicate that most of the global average temperature variability we have experienced in the last 100 years could have been caused by a natural fluctuation in cloud cover resulting from the Pacific: Decadal Oscillation (PDO). **Nine years of our best NASA satellite data,** combined with a simple climate model, reveal that the PDO causes cloud changes that might be sufficient to explain most of the major variations in global average temperature since 1900, including 75 percent of the warming trend. Those natural variations in clouds may be regarded as chaos in the climate system-direct evidence that the Earth is capable of causing its own climate change. Contrary to the claims of the IPCC, global warming or cooling does not require an external forcing mechanism such as more greenhouse gases, or a change in the sun, or a major volcanic eruption**. It is simply what the climate system does.** The climate system itself can cause its own climate change, supporting the widespread public opinion that global warming might simply be part of a **natural cycle**. I am not the first to suspect that the PDO might be causing climate change. I just look the issue beyond suspicion, with a quantitative 155 explanation based on both satellite observations and some analysis with a simple climate model. While some might claim that the timing of the PDO and associated changes in cloudiness in recent years is just a coincidence, I can make **the same claim for the** supposed **anthropogenic explanation** of global warming: Just because warming in the twentieth century happened during a period of increasing CO2 in the atmosphere **doesn't** necessarily **mean that the increasing CO2 caused the warming**. In fact, the PDO explanation for warming actually has a couple of advantages over the CO2 explanation. The first advantage is the fact that variations in cloud cover associated with the PDO actually "predict" the temperature changes that come later. It just so happens that the three PDO changes that occurred in the twentieth century were exactly what would be needed to explain most of the temperature changes that followed: warming until the 1940s, then slight cooling until the 1970s, and then resumed warming through the 1990s. This then answers a question I am sometimes asked: How do I know that the PDO-induced cloud changes caused the temperature changes, and not the other way around? It's because the temperature response comes after the forcing, not before. This PDO source of natural climate change can also explain 75 percent of the warming trend during the twentieth century. Addition of CO2 and other anthropogenic and natural forcings can explain the other 25 percent. This investigation took me only a few days with a desktop computer. In contrast, researchers have been tinkering for many years with various estimates of manmade aerosol (particulate) pollution in their attempts to explain why global warming stopped between 1940 and the late 1970s, even though this was a period of rapid increase in our greenhouse gas emissions. So, while the PDO explanation for temperature variations during the twentieth century fits like a hand in a glove, the IPPC’s explanation based on aerosol and greenhouse gas pollution had to be **wedged in with a crowbar.** Another advantage of the natural explanation for global 155 warming is that the mechanism-an energy imbalance of the Karth caused by natural cloud variations-was actually observed by satellite. In contrast, the cooling effects of aerosol pollution and the warming effects of greenhouse gas emissions have remained **too small to be measured**. They have to be calculated **theoretically** before being input into climate models. <153-156>

Reader note – PDO = Pacific Decadal Oscillation

**Warming is natural – their argument is based off bad models and data**

- warming correlated with natural influences – sunspots, solar flares, ocean churning

- Earth stopped warming over 10 years ago

- IPCC models are based off flawed long-term models that exaggerate C02

- negative feedback checks catastrophic warming

- lack of tropospheric warming proves

- equal energy transfer proves

**Ferrara ’12** – senior fellow @ Heartland, served in the White House Office of Policy Development under Reagan, Harvard graduate (Peter J, 'Fakegate' Follows 'Climategate', March 7, <http://townhall.com/columnists/peterferrara/2012/03/07/fakegate_follows_climategate/page/full/>, CMR)

The bottom line is that the temperature records are not consistent with the theory that human "greenhouse" gas emissions are the primary cause of global warming. Those records do not show temperatures rising in conjunction with such ever rising emissions as the globe increasingly industrializes. Instead, the temperature record shows an up and down pattern that follows the pattern of natural influences on global temperatures, such as cyclical sunspots and solar flares, and cycles of ocean churning from warmer to colder temperatures and back, such as the Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO).

Moreover, the incorruptible and objective satellite temperature records show only modest warming starting in the late 1970s, which stopped roughly 10 years ago, with more recent declines. That is consistent with temperature proxy records found in nature, such as tree rings and ice cores. But that diverges significantly from the corruptible and subjectively compiled land based records, the repeated manipulation of which has prompted several prominent climate scientists to call for an investigation. Perhaps Gleick's skills in falsification can be found more broadly among his colleagues.

In addition, the work of the UN's IPCC is based on numerous climate models that attempt to project temperatures decades into the future. Those models are all based on the circular assumption that the theory of man caused global warming is true. As 16 world leading climate scientists recently reported in a letter to the Wall Street Journal,

"[A]n important gauge of scientific expertise is the ability to make successful predictions. When predictions fail, we say that the theory is 'falsified' and we should look for the reasons for the failure. Shown in the nearby graph is the measured annual temperature of the earth since 1989, just before the first report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Also shown are the projections of the likely increase of temperature, as published in the Summaries of each of the four IPCC reports, the first in the year 1990 and the last in the year 2007.

"From the graph it appears that the projections [of the models] exaggerate, substantially, the response of the earth's temperature to CO2 which increased by about 11% from 1989 through 2011. Furthermore, when one examines the historical temperature record throughout the 20th century and into the 21st, the data strongly suggest a much lower CO2 effect than almost all models calculate."

Seems like the models have been falsified**.**

The likely reason for that failure is that while the models recognize that increased CO2 itself will not produce a big, catastrophic increase in global temperatures, the models assume that the very small amount of warming caused by increased CO2 will result in much larger temperature increases caused by positive feedbacks. The real, emerging science, as the Heartland publications indicate, is that the feedbacks are more likely to be offset by negative feedbacks, resulting in amuch smallernet temperature change. Scientists have pointed out that much higher CO2 concentrations deep in the earth's history, as shown by proxy records, did not result in catastrophic temperature increases, a very powerful rebuttal to the idea today's relatively low CO2 levels could trigger catastrophic global warming.

The results of the latest, most advanced data collection also suggest that CO2 is not responsible for the modest global warming of the late 20th century. The UN models agree with established science that if human greenhouse gas emissions were causing global warming, there should be a hot spot of higher temperatures in the troposphere above the tropics, where collected concentrations would have the greatest effect, and the warming would show up first. This is known in the literature on climate science as "the fingerprint" for man caused global warming. But data from global weather satellites and more comprehensive weather balloons show no hotspot, and no fingerprint, which means no serious global warming due to human greenhouse gas emissions. QED.

Moreover, satellites also have been measuring the energy entering the earth's atmosphere from the sun, and the energy escaping back out to space. If the theory of man caused global warming is correct, then the energy escaping back out should be less than the energy entering, as the greenhouse gases capture some of the energy in the atmosphere. But the satellite data show negligible difference.

#### It’c caused by cosmic rays and solar activity – best evidence proves

Solomon ’11 – executive director of Energy Probe (Lawrence, “Lawrence Solomon: Our cosmic climate”, Oct 4, <http://opinion.financialpost.com/2011/09/02/lawrence-solomon-our-cosmic-climate/>, CMR)

The 20-year-long global warming debate is in its final stages, the controversy having been settled over whether manmade causes such as carbon dioxide or natural causes such as the Sun dominate climate change on Earth. First, the global warming doomsayers lost the argument in the court of public opinion — barely one-third of the U.S. public, for example, now believes that human activity can lead to dangerous warming. Then, the doomsayers lost the economic argument when attempts to develop renewable energy proved utterly futile. The world is instead rapidly developing its fossil fuels, recently discovered to be so plentiful that they can meet mankind’s needs for centuries to come. And now, the global warming doomsayers have lost their pretended monopoly on the official science. Their long-standing claim that only a scientific fringe denies the dominant role of humans — a claim that was never true — has ended. One of the world’s largest and most prestigious scientific organizations — more on that later — now formally opposes the IPCC’s official position that the Sun and other natural phenomena are all-but irrelevant to climate change. To understand the nature of the IPCC’s just-ended scientific “monopoly,” place yourself in a meeting in Guangzhou, China in 1992, shortly after the IPCC was created, involving 130 delegates from 47 countries. In comes the Danish delegation with exciting findings from Danish scientists published just weeks earlier in the prestigious journal Science, showing a blockbuster correlation between solar activity and temperature on Earth. Not only did Science publish the findings, to make sure no one could miss their significance, Science trumpeted the findings in an accompanying article. “Take a good look at the graph on this page, reproduced from a report that appears on page 698. It’s giving climatologists goose bumps,” Science’s accompanying article began. This “is the most striking correlation ever found between climate and small variations in solar activity — and the strongest suggestion ever of a causal link.” The article, entitled Could the Sun Be Warming the Climate?, suggested that the tables had now turned in the global-warming debate by including this assertion from a prominent U.S. scientist: “The burden of proof that something’s wrong [with the Danish correlation] almost rests with the detractors.” What does the IPCC decide at that Guangzhou meeting when faced with this emphatic evidence that the Sun could be driving climate? The IPCC outright refuses to consider the Danish findings, saying it only has a mandate to investigate manmade causes of climate change. The IPCC and its followers then spent some $80-billion over the next two decades trying to establish that carbon dioxide and human activities explained climate change. They came up empty-handed — they found not a scintilla of compelling evidence, absolutely nothing, that could pin more than a dollop or two of warming on human activities. All that the IPCC scientists have to show for their efforts are endless computer models that don’t work — the models have not only failed to predict the climate over the last 20 years, they can’t model the past climate when they are run backwards. While this 20-year dead-end research was turning up failure after failure, the Danish science went from success to success. Geophysicist Eigil Friis-Christensen, a co-author of the startling Science study, continued his work with Henrik Svensmark and other Danish colleagues, making more and more progress and hypothesizing the mechanism through which the Sun heats and cools the planet. The answer could lie in the cosmic rays from beyond the solar system that continually bombard Earth, they surmised. Their theory was quite straightforward: The cosmic rays seed clouds. When the cloud cover is great, the Earth tends to cool; when the cloud cover dissipates, the Earth tends to warm. And why does the cloud cover vary? Here the role of the Sun comes to play. When the Sun is especially strong, its magnetic field tends to push the cosmic rays away from Earth, preventing clouds from forming and leading to a hotter planet. Likewise, when activity on the Sun weakens, so too does its magnetic field, allowing more clouds to form and leading to a cooler planet. “You’ll never prove cosmic rays can seed clouds,” the IPCC establishment retorted, and embarked on a smear campaign to discredit the Danes. The Danes were accused, falsely, of having made arithmetic errors, of having mishandling data, even of having fabricated data. But the Danes persevered. In 2006 they built a reaction chamber at the Danish National Space Centre, filled it with gases that approximated the composition of the lower atmosphere, added ultraviolet rays to mimic the rays of the Sun, and presto — the chamber soon filled with a vast number of floating microscopic droplets! These were ultra-small clusters of sulphuric acid and water molecules — the building blocks for cloud condensation nuclei — that had been catalyzed by the electrons released by the cosmic rays. “We were amazed by the speed and efficiency with which the electrons do their work,” Svensmark remarked of his breakthrough. The scientists inside the IPCC bubble again discredited and discounted the Danes’ findings, using the authority of the IPCC, a United Nations agency with representation from the nations of the world, to trump the findings from tiny Denmark. But to their dismay, the IPCC — less a scientific body than a lobbying organization — was itself soon trumped by the European Organization for Nuclear Research, or CERN, a true scientific agency involving 60 countries and 8,000 scientists at more than 600 universities and national laboratories. CERN, which is best known for having built the Large Hadron Collider — a multi-billion-dollar instrument that collides subatomic particles head-on at very high energy to recreate the conditions just after the Big Bang — decided to build a Cadillac version of the Danish chamber. It did, releasing the results last week and validating Danish findings that point to the role of cosmic rays in seeding clouds. In doing so, it also buried future talk of carbon dioxide as a significant driver of climate change. For good measure, CERN also notes that independent satellite evidence points to the effect of cosmic rays on clouds. Because of these and other discoveries, “climate models will need to be substantially revised,” CERN says, in its study and supplementary materials that mention various avenues worth exploring but carbon dioxide not once. Much more work will need to be done — CERN is now hot on the trail for what it believes is a missing ingredient in its recipe for the lower atmosphere, for example, and the Danes and others are also looking to the heavens, rather than to our coal plants and SUVs, in their quest to unlock the mysteries of climate change. As the lead author of the CERN study puts it, there is “strong evidence” that the Sun affects the climate through some mechanism, and “a cosmic ray influence on clouds is a leading candidate.” CO2 is not.

### No Warming !—No Extinction

#### No extinction – their evidence is alarmist groupthink, not science – insiders agree

Torres 4/3/2014 (Richard, William F. Buckley Fellow at the National Review Institute, “IPCC Insider Rejects Global-Warming Report,” <http://www.nationalreview.com/node/374986/print>)

Richard **Tol, a professor of economics at** the University of **Sussex** in the United Kingdom **and an expert on climate change, removed his name from the** **latest** Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (**IPCC) report**. While he considers much of the science sound and supports the underlying purpose of the IPCC, Tol says the United Nations agency’s inflammatory and alarmist claims delegitimize the IPCC as a credible and neutral institution. “**In the** SPM [**Summary** for Policymakers], **and much more largely in the media, we see** all these **scare stories**,” Tol tells National Review Online. “**We’re all going to die, the four horsemen of the apocalypse** . . . I felt uncomfortable with the direction [the IPCC report] was going.” **Tol**, who **has been working with the IPCC since 1994**, was the lead author of Chapter 10 of the report, on key economic sectors and services. He was also a contributor to Chapters 17 and 19, on the economics of adaptation to climate change and emergent risks, respectively. He took his name off of the final summary because he felt **the IPCC did not properly account for human technological ingenuity** and downplayed the potential benefits of global warming. “In the current SPM **there are a number of statements in there that are widely cited that are just not correct**,” Tol says. **One prediction** has it **that crop yields will begin to fall** dramatically, a statement “that is particularly not supported by the chapter itself,” Tol says. “What it **completely forgets** is **technological progress and that** crop **yields have been going up for as long as we’ve looked at crop yields**.”Beyond misleading statements on agriculture, Tol says the IPCC report cites only the maximum estimate for how much it will cost to protect against **sea-level rise** associated with current climate-change predictions. “Why do we show the maximum but not the average?” he says. Estimates say that “for a tenth of a percent of [worldwide] GDP we **can protect** all **vulnerable populations along all coasts**.” The report also stresses that global warming will cause more deaths due to heat stress, but ignores that global warming would reduce cold stress, which actually kills more people than heat stress each year. **Tol is far from a conspiracy theorist**, **but** he nonetheless **thinks the IPCC has built-in biases that keep it from adequately checking alarmism**. First, **there is a self-selection bias: People who are most concerned about the impact of climate change are most likely to be represented on the panel**. Next, **most of the panelists are professors involved in similar academic departments, surrounded by like-minded people who reinforce each other’s views**. **Those views are welcomed by the civil servants who review the report, because their “departments, jobs, and careers depend on climate being a problem**,” Tol says. “**There are natural forces pushing these people in the same direction**. I think **the IPCC should have safeguards against this tendency, but it does not**.”

#### No extinction – alarmist warming predictions not supported by science

Knappenberger 3-27-14 (Paul C. “Chip” Knappenberger is assistant director of the Center for the Study of Science at the Cato Institute, “Climate Alarm,” <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/climate-alarm>)

In its new report on the risks from human-caused climate change, the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) sets climate science back rather than “advancing” it. The report, counterfactually titled “What We Know,” is more an account of what the scientific community thought it knew about a decade ago than an up-to-date telling of current understanding. Not surprisingly, the group ignores the fact that climate science is moving in a direction that increasingly suggests that the risk of extreme climate change is lower than has been previously assessed. Instead, the AAAS continues to play up the chance of extreme outcomes with the intent of scaring us into taking action — action that would have little impact on either future climate change or the risks therefrom. The AAAS largely appeals to its own authority in trying to persuade us to believe its conclusions and yet informs its authority with old and obsolete science. Nowhere is this more true than in its justification for highlighting the risks of “abrupt climate change” and in its faith in the ability of climate models to provide reliable and informed guidance regarding the probability of extreme climate changes’ occurring in the future. The new report asserts: Below are some of the high-side projections and tail risks we incur by following the current path for CO2 and other greenhouse gas emissions. Most of these projections derive from computer simulations of Earth and its climate system. These models apply the best understanding science has to offer about how our climate works and how it will change in the future. There are many such models and all of them have been validated, to varying degrees, by their ability to replicate past climate changes. However, the best and most recent science shows the AAAS assessment to be outdated and badly misplaced. In fact, climate models have done remarkably poorly in replicating the evolution of global temperature during the past several decades, and high-end climate-change scenarios from the models are largely unsupported by observations. For example, in January, researchers John Fyfe and Nathan Gillett published an article in the prominent journal Nature Climate Change that found that “global warming over the past 20 years is significantly less than that calculated from 117 simulations of the climate by 37 models.” And last year, scientists Peter Stott and colleagues published a paper in the journal Environmental Research Letters that concluded that “the upper end of climate model temperature projections is inconsistent with past warming.” A host of other prominent papers that have examined the sensitivity of the climate to greenhouse-gas emissions collectively suggest that not only is future global warming likely to be less than previously expected, but, and perhaps more important, the outside chance that it will be extremely large has shrunk dramatically. This position is further supported by new research that downplays the threat of abrupt climate change from Arctic methane release, a shutdown of the Gulf Stream, and rapid sea-level rise. Instead of an informed report by the esteemed group focused on presenting what today’s best science tells us regarding the risks from extreme climate change and our ability to mitigate them, what we got from the AAAS was a textbook example of climate alarmism: link human-caused greenhouse-gas emissions to climate change, raise the possibility that climate change will be disastrous, and then tell us we have to act now to save ourselves. The first part of the AAAS guide to climate alarm is certainly true: Human-caused greenhouse-gas emissions do put pressure on the climate to warm. But the most important details — to what degree and of what character — are still uncertain and are being intensely studied and debated. The second part has been relegated to the realm of climate fantasy. Today’s leading science suggests that coming human-caused climate change is going to be less than expected, with a much-diminished associated risk of abrupt changes with catastrophic outcomes. Which means that the third part — that immediate action is required to reduce the risk of extreme change — is largely inapplicable (and such action is likely to be ineffective to boot). The new AAAS report runs up climate alarm but runs down climate science. The result is a misleading document that is aimed at influencing public policy. This is the situation that should be raising alarm.

#### Warming won’t cause extinction

– their impacts are alarmism, not supported by experts

Mauldin 6/4/12 – B.S. and M.S. in electrical engineering from Cal-Berkeley, registered professional engineer (Paul, “Global Warming Alarmism: At the Tipping Point of Credibility?”, <http://smartenergyportal.net/article/global-warming-alarmism-tipping-point-credibility>, CMR)

If we believe all we're told then there is no hope. Why change anything? But, to the frustration and anger of the alarmists, we don't believe all we're told about a global warming doomsday. There's a growing belief both in the lay and scientific communities that there's another side to the story. There's mounting evidence that the presuppositions about human-caused climate change are wrong or at the best, distorted. The earth is warming, yes (although that's not all that clear to some), but our planet has gone through warming/cooling cycles in the past. Yes, there is a correlation with CO2 concentrations, but it's not clear which came first, the warming or the change in CO2. And the CO2/temperature-rise pairing cycles have also occurred throughout the past. But isn't the global warming skeptic community pretty much a bunch of ignorant, untrained, flat-earther types? Not at all, according to the study reported in Nature. (see The polarizing impact of science literacy and numeracy on perceived climate change risks). It turns out that the more scientifically literate you are, the less concerned you are about climate change. Scientific literacy and training leads one to follow their own rationale rather than to follow the herd. "Seeming public apathy over climate change is often attributed to a deficit in comprehension. The public knows too little science, it is claimed, to understand the evidence or avoid being misled. Widespread limits on technical reasoning aggravate the problem by forcing citizens to use unreliable cognitive heuristics to assess risk. We conducted a study to test this account and found no support for it. Members of the public with the highest degrees of science literacy and technical reasoning capacity were not the most concerned about climate change. Rather, they were the ones among whom cultural polarization was greatest. This result suggests that public divisions over climate change stem not from the public’s incomprehension of science but from a distinctive conflict of interest: between the personal interest individuals have in forming beliefs in line with those held by others with whom they share close ties and the collective one they all share in making use of the best available science to promote common welfare." If something just doesn't smell right about the smug but dire predictions frantically pumped out by the media and platoons of alarmist bloggers, you're going to question it. Particularly if you have a fundamental understanding of science and experience with the vagaries of the science/politics/media triumvirate. In the long run, continued climate-change fear mongering, hyperbole and name calling will destroy what little public interest is left. We might even see a 'brown' rebound, and that would be tragic.

### No Warming !—Adaptation 1NC

Global focus shifting to adaptation – solves the impacts to warming best – plan is a mitigation strategy that tradesoff

Ridley 14 (Matt, BA and DPhil degrees from Oxford University, he worked for the Economist for nine years as science editor, Washington correspondent and American editor, before becoming a self-employed writer and businessman, fellow of the Royal Society of Literature and of the Academy of Medical Sciences, and a foreign honorary member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, “We have a new climate change consensus — and it's good news everyone,” <http://www.spectator.co.uk/features/9176121/armageddon-averted/>)

Nigel Lawson was right after all. Ever since the Centre for Policy Studies lecture in 2006 that launched the former chancellor on his late career as a critic of global warming policy, Lord Lawson has been stressing the need to adapt to climate change, rather than throw public money at futile attempts to prevent it. **Until now, the official line has been largely to ignore adaptation and focus instead on ‘mitigation’** — the misleading term for preventing carbon dioxide emissions. That has now changed. The received wisdom on global warming, published by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, was updated this week. The newspapers were, as always, full of stories about scientists being even more certain of environmental Armageddon. But the **document** itself revealed a far more striking story: it **emphasised, again and again, the need to adapt to climate change**. Even **in the main text of the press release** that accompanied the report, **the word ‘adaptation’ occurred ten times, the word ‘mitigation’ not at all**. The distinction is crucial. So far, the debate has followed a certain bovine logic: that global warming is happening, so we need to slow it down by hugely expensive decarbonisation strategies — green taxes, wind farms. And what good will this do? Is it possible to stop global warming in its tracks? Or would all these green policies be the equivalent of trying to blow away a hurricane? This question — **just how much can be achieved by mitigation** — **is** one not often addressed. **There is an alternative: accepting that the planet is warming, and seeing if we can adjust accordingly**. **Adaptation means** investing in **flood defences**, so that airports such as Schiphol can continue to operate below existing (and future) sea level, and **air conditioning**, so that cities such as Houston and Singapore can continue to grow despite existing (and future) high temperatures. It means **plant breeding,** so that maize can be grown in a greater range of existing (and future) climates, **better infrastructure**, so that Mexico or India can survive existing (and future) cyclones, **more world trade**, so that Ethiopia can get grain from Australia during existing (and future) droughts. Owen Paterson, the Secretary of State for the Environment, in repeatedly emphasising the need to adapt to climate change in this way, has been something of a lone voice in the government. But he can now count on the support of the mighty IPCC, a United Nations body that employs hundreds of scientists to put together the scientific equivalent of a bible on the topic every six years or so. Whereas the last report had two pages on adaptation, this one has four chapters. Professor Chris Field is the chairman of Working Group 2 of the IPCC, the part devoted to the effects of climate change rather than the cause. ‘The really big breakthrough in this report,’ he says, ‘is the new idea of thinking about managing climate change.’ His co-chair Vicente Barros adds: ‘Investments in better preparation can pay dividends both for the present and for the future … adaptation can play a key role in decreasing these risks’. After so many years, the penny is beginning to drop. In his book An Appeal to Reason, Lawson devoted a chapter to the importance of adaptation, in which he pointed out that the last **IPCC** report **in 2007** specifically **assumed** that **humans would not adapt. ‘Possible impacts,’** the report said, ‘**do not take into** account any changes or developments in **adaptive capacity.’** That is to say, if the world gets warmer, sea levels rise and rainfall patterns change, farmers, developers and consumers will do absolutely nothing to change their habits over the course of an entire century. It is a ludicrous assumption. But **this assumption was central**, Lawson pointed out, **to the** estimated future cost of climate change the **IPCC** reported. A notorious example was the report’s conclusion that, ‘assuming no adaptation’, crop yields might fall by 70 per cent by the end of the century — a conclusion based, a footnote revealed, on a single study of peanut farming in one part of India. Lawson pointed out that **adaptation had** six **obvious benefits** as a strategy, **which mitigation did not share. It required no international treaty**, but would work if adopted unilaterally; **it could be applied locally**; it **would produce results quickly**; it could **capture** any **benefits of warming while avoiding risks**; **it addressed existing problems** **that were merely exacerbated by warming; and it would bring benefits even if global warming proves** to have been **exaggerated**. Ask yourself, if you were a resident of the Somerset Levels, whether you would prefer a government policy of adapting to anything the weather might throw at you, whether it was exacerbated by climate change or not, or spending nearly £50 billion (by 2020) on low-carbon technologies that might in a few decades’ time, if adopted by the whole world, reduce the exacerbation of floods, but not the floods themselves. It is remarkable how far this latest report moves towards Lawson’s position. Professor Field, who seems to be an eminently sensible chap, clearly strove to emphasise adaptation, if only because the chance of an international agreement on emissions looks ever less likely. If you go through the report chapter by chapter (not that many people seem to have bothered), amid the usual warnings of potential danger, there are many sensible, if jargon-filled, discussions of exactly the points Lawson made. Chapter 17 concedes that ‘adaptation strategies … can yield welfare benefits even in the event of a constant climate, such as more efficient use of water and more robust crop varieties’. Chapter 20 even acknowledges that ‘**in some cases mitigation may** impede adaptation (e.g., reduced energy availability in countries with growing populations)’. A crucial point, this: that **preventing** the poor from getting access to **cheap electricity** from coal **might make them more vulnerable to climate change**. So green policies may compound the problem they seek to solve.

### No Warming !—Adaptation 2NC

#### Only adaptation solves – mitigation fails and tradesoff

Ridley 14 (Matt, BA and DPhil degrees from Oxford University, he worked for the Economist for nine years as science editor, Washington correspondent and American editor, before becoming a self-employed writer and businessman, fellow of the Royal Society of Literature and of the Academy of Medical Sciences, and a foreign honorary member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, “We have a new climate change consensus — and it's good news everyone,” <http://www.spectator.co.uk/features/9176121/armageddon-averted/>)

**To avoid** this little **harm, we could go for adaptation** — let poor people get as rich as possible and use their income to protect themselves and their natural surroundings against floods, storms, potential food shortages and loss of habitat. **Or we could go for mitigation, getting the entire world to agree to give up the fossil fuels that provide us with 85 per cent of our energy**. Or **we could try both**, which is what the IPCC now recommends. But **the** one **truly bonkers thing to do would be to go unilaterally into a policy of subsidising** the rich to install **tech**nologies **that drive up the cost of energy**, desecrate the countryside, kill golden eagles, clear-cut swamp forests in North Carolina, turn grain into motor fuel, so driving up the price of food and killing people, **and prevent poor people** in Africa **getting** loans to build coal-fired, **cheap power** stations instead of inhaling smoke from wood fires cut from virgin forests. **All this we are doing** in this country, **with** almost no prospect **of cutting carbon emissions enough to affect the climate**. **That’s** the very opposite of adaptation — **preventing** the economic **growth that would enable us to adapt while failing to prevent any climate change**.

#### Adaptation solves all impacts – empirics prove

Ridley 14 (Matt, BA and DPhil degrees from Oxford University, he worked for the Economist for nine years as science editor, Washington correspondent and American editor, before becoming a self-employed writer and businessman, fellow of the Royal Society of Literature and of the Academy of Medical Sciences, and a foreign honorary member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, “Climate Forecast: Muting the Alarm,” March 27, <http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303725404579460973643962840>)

Indeed, **a small amount of warming spread over a long period will,** most experts think, **bring net improvements to human welfare**. Studies such as by the IPCC author and economist **Professor** Richard **Tol of Sussex** University in Britain **show that** global warming has probably done so already. **People can** adapt **to such change**—which essentially means capture the benefits but minimize the harm. Satellites have recorded a roughly 14% increase in greenery on the planet over the past 30 years, in all types of ecosystems, partly as a result of man-made CO2 emissions, which enable plants to grow faster and use less water. There remains a risk that the latest science is wrong and rapid warming will occur with disastrous consequences. And if renewable energy had proved by now to be cheap, clean and thrifty in its use of land, then we would be right to address that small risk of a large catastrophe by rushing to replace fossil fuels with first-generation wind, solar and bioenergy. But since these forms of energy have proved expensive, environmentally damaging and land-hungry, it appears that in our efforts to combat warming we may have been taking the economic equivalent of chemotherapy for a cold. Almost **every global environmental scare of the past half century proved** exaggerated **including the population "bomb," pesticides, acid rain, the ozone hole**, falling sperm counts, **g**enetically **e**ngineered **crops and killer bees**. **In** every case**, institutional scientists gained a lot of funding from the scare and then quietly converged on the view that the problem was much more moderate than the extreme voices had argued. Global warming is no different**.

### No Warming !—Logarithmic

#### Warming is logarithmic – ensures any impact is self-correcting

Ferrara 14 (Peter, \*\*Graduate of Harvard College and Harvard Law School, senior fellow for entitlement and budget policy @ Heartland, senior fellow at the Social Security Institute, White House Office of Policy Development under President Reagan, Associate Deputy Attorney General of the United States under the first President Bush\*\*, “The Period Of No Global Warming Will Soon Be Longer Than the Period of Actual Global Warming,” 2/24, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/peterferrara/2014/02/24/the-period-of-no-global-warming-will-soon-be-longer-than-the-period-of-actual-global-warming/>, CMR)

Furthermore, **the temperature impact of increased concentrations of CO2 declines logarithmically**. Or as the report says, “**Atmospheric** carbon dioxide (**CO2**)…**exerts a diminishing warming effect as its concentration increases**.” **That means there is a** natural limit **to how much increased CO2 can effectively warm the planet, as the effect of more and more CO2 ultimately becomes** negligible **as CO2 concentration grows**. Maybe **that is why even with many times more CO2 in the atmosphere** in the deep past, **there was** no catastrophic global warming.

### AT: BioD

#### No effect on biodiversity – but alt causes outweigh

Ridley 14 (Matt, BA and DPhil degrees from Oxford University, he worked for the Economist for nine years as science editor, Washington correspondent and American editor, before becoming a self-employed writer and businessman, fellow of the Royal Society of Literature and of the Academy of Medical Sciences, and a foreign honorary member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, “Climate Forecast: Muting the Alarm,” March 27, <http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303725404579460973643962840>)

\*\*\*Report referenced = IPCC

**The** forthcoming report **apparently admits that climate change has extinguished no species so far and expresses "very little confidence" that it will do so. There is new emphasis that climate change is not the only environmental problem that matters and on adapting to it rather than preventing it**. **Yet the report still assumes 70% more warming by the last decades of this century than the best science now suggests. This is because of an overreliance on models rather than on data** in the first section of the IPCC report—on physical science—that was published in September 2013.

### AT: Ocean Acidification

#### Ocean acidification thesis wrong – won’t cause extinction, C02 actually helps, and alt causes outweigh

Ridley ’12 – BA and PhD from Oxford (worked for the Economist for nine years as science editor, Washington correspondent and American editor, before becoming a self-employed writer and businessman, “Taking Fears of Acid Oceans With a Grain of Salt”, Jan 7, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203550304577138561444464028.html>, CMR)

Coral reefs around the world are suffering badly from overfishing and various forms of pollution. Yet many experts argue that the greatest threat to them is the acidification of the oceans from the dissolving of man-made carbon dioxide emissions. The effect of acidification, according to J.E.N. Veron, an Australian coral scientist, will be "nothing less than catastrophic.... What were once thriving coral gardens that supported the greatest biodiversity of the marine realm will become red-black bacterial slime, and they will stay that way." This is a common view. The Natural Resources Defense Council has called ocean acidification "the scariest environmental problem you've never heard of." Sigourney Weaver, who narrated a film about the issue, said that "the scientists are freaked out." The head of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration calls it global warming's "equally evil twin." But do the scientific data support such alarm? Last month scientists at San Diego's Scripps Institution of Oceanography and other authors published a study showing how much the pH level (measuring alkalinity versus acidity) varies naturally between parts of the ocean and at different times of the day, month and year. "On both a monthly and annual scale, even the most stable open ocean sites see pH changes many times larger than the annual rate of acidification," say the authors of the study, adding that because good instruments to measure ocean pH have only recently been deployed, "this variation has been under-appreciated." Over coral reefs, the pH decline between dusk and dawn is almost half as much as the decrease in average pH expected over the next 100 years. The noise is greater than the signal. Another recent study, by scientists from the U.K., Hawaii and Massachusetts, concluded that "marine and freshwater assemblages have always experienced variable pH conditions," and that "in many freshwater lakes, pH changes that are orders of magnitude greater than those projected for the 22nd-century oceans can occur over periods of hours." This adds to other hints that the ocean-acidification problem may have been exaggerated. For a start, the ocean is alkaline and in no danger of becoming acid (despite headlines like that from Reuters in 2009: "Climate Change Turning Seas Acid"). If the average pH of the ocean drops to 7.8 from 8.1 by 2100 as predicted, it will still be well above seven, the neutral point where alkalinity becomes acidity. The central concern is that lower pH will make it harder for corals, clams and other "calcifier" creatures to make calcium carbonate skeletons and shells. Yet this concern also may be overstated. Off Papua New Guinea and the Italian island of Ischia, where natural carbon-dioxide bubbles from volcanic vents make the sea less alkaline, and off the Yucatan, where underwater springs make seawater actually acidic, studies have shown that at least some kinds of calcifiers still thrive—at least as far down as pH 7.8. In a recent experiment in the Mediterranean, reported in Nature Climate Change, corals and mollusks were transplanted to lower pH sites, where they proved "able to calcify and grow at even faster than normal rates when exposed to the high [carbon-dioxide] levels projected for the next 300 years." In any case, freshwater mussels thrive in Scottish rivers, where the pH is as low as five. Laboratory experiments find that more marine creatures thrive than suffer when carbon dioxide lowers the pH level to 7.8. This is because the carbon dioxide dissolves mainly as bicarbonate, which many calcifiers use as raw material for carbonate. Human beings have indeed placed marine ecosystems under terrible pressure, but the chief culprits are overfishing and pollution. By comparison, a very slow reduction in the alkalinity of the oceans, well within the range of natural variation, is a modest threat, and it certainly does not merit apocalyptic headlines.

### AT: Economy

#### No effect on global growth

Ridley 14 (Matt, BA and DPhil degrees from Oxford University, he worked for the Economist for nine years as science editor, Washington correspondent and American editor, before becoming a self-employed writer and businessman, fellow of the Royal Society of Literature and of the Academy of Medical Sciences, and a foreign honorary member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, “We have a new climate change consensus — and it's good news everyone,” <http://www.spectator.co.uk/features/9176121/armageddon-averted/>)

**The report puts** the **global aggregate economic damage from climate change at less than 2.5 per cent of income** by the latter years of the century. This is a far lower number than Lord Stern arrived at in his notorious report of 2006, and this is taking the bleak view that there will be a further 2.5˚C rise from recent levels. This is the highest of nine loss estimates; the average is only 1.1 per cent. And the IPCC is projecting two thirds more warming per increment of carbon dioxide than the best observationally based studies now suggest, so the warming the IPCC outlines is not even likely with the highest emissions assumption. In other words, **even if you pile pessimism** upon pessimism, **assuming** relatively **little decarbonisation**, much global enrichment and **higher climate ‘sensitivity’** than now looks plausible — **leading to more rapid climate change — you still, on the worst estimate, hurt the world economy in a century by only about as much as it grows every year or two. Rather than inflict an awful economic toll, global warming would make our very rich descendants** — who are likely to be maybe eight or nine times as rich as we are today, on global average — **a bit less rich**.

#### No economy impact

Ridley 14 (Matt, BA and DPhil degrees from Oxford University, he worked for the Economist for nine years as science editor, Washington correspondent and American editor, before becoming a self-employed writer and businessman, fellow of the Royal Society of Literature and of the Academy of Medical Sciences, and a foreign honorary member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, “Climate Forecast: Muting the Alarm,” March 27, <http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303725404579460973643962840>)

Others, however, hit home. According to leaks, **this time the full report is much more cautious and vague about** worsening cyclones, changes in rainfall, climate-change refugees, and **the overall cost of global warming. It puts the overall cost at less than 2% of GDP for a 2.5 degrees Centigrade** (or 4.5 degrees Fahrenheit) **temperature increase during this century. This is vastly less than the much heralded prediction of** Lord **Stern**, who said climate change would cost 5%-20% of world GDP in his influential 2006 report for the British government.

### AT: Sea Level Rise

#### Adaptation solves – alarmism is just political hype

Rahn 14 (Richard W. Rahn is a senior fellow at the Cato Institute and chairman of the Institute for Global Economic Growth, “RAHN: The global-warming apocalypses that didn’t happen,” April 21, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2014/apr/21/rahn-the-world-did-not-end/>)

For instance, **sea levels have been slowly rising since** the end of the Little Ice Age around **1850**. **Coastal cities have not disappeared**, though, **because in the normal course of constantly rebuilding structures and infrastructures, we have been elevating them**. For the most part, **this is** not a piece of some grand master plan (other than building codes for new structures), but **the basic fact is that “new” cities are constantly being built on top of “old cities,” a practice that has gone on for** at least **a few thousand years**. The good news is that **mankind will** probably **adapt to climate change just fine, as we have been adapting since the end of the Ice Age**. New studies show that to date, the benefits of global warming have been greater than the costs, and are likely to remain so for many more decades. More carbon dioxide, warmer temperatures and more rainfall benefit farming. Shipping costs are reduced as ports, roads and rails have more ice- and snow-free days. Cold weather kills more people than warm weather, and most people enjoy longer warm seasons for sports and other recreation. **The reason we have a global-warming crisis is because crisis sells**. **It allows politicians to tax, spend and assert more control**. Undoubtedly, more people would have read this column, if the headline had been, “World to end.” So ignore the “experts” and enjoy the summer, which most of us will find is too short.

### AT: Warming => War

#### No war impacts – the most recent and detailed compilation of studies proves

Sage ’12 (“CLIMATE CHANGE LINK TO WAR REMAINS TENUOUS”, Feb 1, <http://www.sagepub.com/press/2012/february/SAGE_CLIMATECHANGELINKWARREMAINSTENUOUS.sp>, CMR)

Los Angeles, CA (February 1, 2012) - Does climate change sow the seeds of war? Until recently, most answers to this political question have been based on speculation. **A landmark issue of the Journal of Peace Research** (JPR) **published by SAGE on behalf of the Peace Research Institute Oslo** (PRIO) **investigates** a host of potential **causes for conflict.** Many other factors **have a** far greater influence **than climate change on peace and stability**, most of the studies conclude.

On balance, the **authors** featured in JPR **only find limited support for an influence of climate change on armed conflict**. But this does not eliminate the possibility that when climate issues are framed as a security problem, this may influence actor perception and contribute to a self-fulfilling prophecy.

**In the** largest collection **of** peer-reviewed **writings on the topic** to date**, the authors employ systematic climate data and climate projections**. Most of the articles deal with civil war, a few with international war, and several studies go beyond state-based conflict to look at possible implications for communal conflict and other kinds of violence.

A number of studies focus on the role of rainfall. Cullen **Hendrix and** Idean **Salehyan (College of William and Mary and U**niversity of **N**orth **T**exas respectively) **use a new database of over 6000 conflicts over two decades in Africa. They find that** rainfall variability affects both large and small-scale political conflict but that **violent events are actually more likely in years of abundant rainfall. This** finding **casts doubt on the** common **assumption** **linking drought to violent conflict. Similar results are found in studies of Kenya (by** Ole Magnus **Theisen of the Norwegian University of Science and Technology**, NTNU) **and East Africa (by** Dominic **Kniveton of the University of Sussex and** Clionadh **Raleigh of Trinity College Dublin**). Studies of Kenya's drylands (by scholars in Germany and the Netherlands), Central Asia (by scholars at ETH Zürich), the Israel-Palestine conflict (by authors from both sides), and in two studies of international river basins (by authors from the Universities of Freiburg, Georgia, Oregon, and Colorado) suggest that institutional agreements are important to avoid an escalation of disputes about water allocations to armed clashes.

Another frequently posited link between climate change and conflict is the rate of natural disasters. Disasters are assumed to hurt growth and weaken the central government. However, **economists** Drago **Bergholt (Norwegian Business School) and** Päivi **Lujala (NTNU) find that** although more frequent **climate-related disasters** has a negative effect on economic growth, this **does not translate into more armed conflict**. More generally, Rune Slettebak (NTNU) finds that natural disasters actually tend to lower the risk of civil war. He finds more support for a perspective **from crisis sociology**, that people unite in adversity, There is a real risk that blaming the weather might be a distraction from more important causes of conflict, he warns.

An analysis of the 2005-09 World Values Survey (by scholars at NTNU) documents strong world-wide concern about global warming and suggests that this might eventually generate mass political participation and demand for political action. However, they find that variation across nations in wealth and CO2 emissions is not significantly related to the publics' assessments of the problem. Paradoxically, people from countries commonly believed to be more severely affected by climate change are less, not more concerned about global warming. Erik **Gartzke** (**University of California, San Diego) points out that** economic **development drives peace as well as climate change.** Thus, efforts to curb climate change in middle-income nations, if these limit income, may actually have a destabilising effect in security terms.

### C02 Impact Turn—1NC

#### Sustained C02 emissions key to avert extinction

Ferrara 14 (Peter, \*\*Graduate of Harvard College and Harvard Law School, senior fellow for entitlement and budget policy @ Heartland, senior fellow at the Social Security Institute, White House Office of Policy Development under President Reagan, Associate Deputy Attorney General of the United States under the first President Bush\*\*, “The Period Of No Global Warming Will Soon Be Longer Than the Period of Actual Global Warming,” 2/24, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/peterferrara/2014/02/24/the-period-of-no-global-warming-will-soon-be-longer-than-the-period-of-actual-global-warming/>, CMR)

In addition, CO2 is actually essential to all life on the planet. **Plants need CO2 to grow and conduct photosynthesis,** which is **the natural process that creates food** for animals and fish at the bottom of the food chain. The **increase of CO2** in the atmosphere that has occurred due to human emissions **has** actually **increased ag**ricultural **growth and output** as a result, **causing** actually an **increased greening of the planet**. **So has** any **warming caused by** **such** human **emissions**, as minor **warming increases ag**ricultural **growth**. The report states, “**CO2 is a vital nutrient** used by plants **in photosynthesis**. **Increasing** **CO2** in the atmosphere ‘**greens’** **the planet and helps feed the growing human population**.”

### C02 Impact Turn—2NC

#### No warming, no impact – but C02 sustains the biosphere – best evidence proves

Idso 14 (Craig D, Ph.D., lead editor and chief scientist for the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change, “Efforts to cap CO2 emissions are adverse to human health and welfare,” <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/energy-environment/197001-efforts-to-cap-co2-emissions-are-adverse-to-human>)

In his State of the Union address, President Obama advocated an energy policy aimed at reducing emissions of carbon dioxide (CO2), which he claims are causing catastrophic changes to the earth’s **climate** and “harming western communities.” In his policy prescription, the president advocates a combination of increased regulation of the energy and transportation industries and more government spending on research designed to bring low-carbon-emitting sources of energy, i.e., so-called renewables, to market. He considers those actions to be the only viable options “leading to a cleaner, safer planet.” But the president’s **concerns** for the planet **are based upon flawed** and **speculative science**; and his policy prescription is a recipe for failure. With respect to the science, Obama conveniently fails to disclose the fact that literally **thousands of scientific studies have produced findings** that run **counter** to his view of future climate. As just one example, and a damning one at that, all of the computer models upon which his vision is based failed to predict **the current plateau in global temperature** that **has continued for the past 16 years**. **That** **the earth has not warmed significantly during this period, despite an 8 percent increase in** atmospheric **CO2**, **is a major indictment of the models’ credibility** in predicting future climate, **as well as the** president’s **assertion that debate on this topic is “settled.”** Numerous other problems with Obama’s model-based view of future climate have been filling up the pages of peer-reviewed science journals for many years now, as evidenced by the recent work of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change, which published a 1,000-page report in September highlighting a large and well-substantiated alternative viewpoint that contends that **rising atmospheric CO2 emissions will have a** much smaller, if not **negligible, impact on future climate, while generating** several biospheric **benefits**. Concerning these benefits, **atmospheric CO2 is the building block of plant life**. **It is used** by earth’s plants **in** the process of **photosynthesis** to construct their tissues and grow. And **as has been conclusively demonstrated in** numerous scientific studies, **the more CO2 we put into the air, the better plants grow**. Among other findings, **they produce greater amounts of biomass, become more efficient at using water, and are better able to cope with environmental stresses** such as pollution and high temperatures. The implications of these benefits are enormous. One recent study calculated that over the 50-year period ending in 2001, the direct monetary benefits conferred by the atmospheric CO2 enrichment of the Industrial Revolution on global crop production amounted to a staggering $3.2 trillion. And projecting this positive externality forward in time reveals it will likely bestow an additional $9.8 trillion in crop production benefits between now and 2050. By ignoring these realities, Obama’s policy prescription is found to be erroneous. The taxation or regulation of CO2 emissions is an unnecessary and detrimental policy option that should be shunned. Why would any government advocate to increase regulations and raise energy prices based on flawed computer model projections of climate change that will never come to pass? Why would any government advance policy that seeks to destroy jobs, rather than to promote them? Why, in fact, would they actually “bite the hand that feeds them?” We live in a time when half the global population experiences some sort of limitation in their access to energy, energy that is needed for the most basic of human needs, including the production of clean water, warmth, and light. One-third of those thus impacted are children. An even greater portion finds its ranks among the poor. As a society, it is time to recognize and embrace the truth. **Carbon dioxide** is not a pollutant. Its increasing concentration only minimally affects earth’s climate, while it **offers** tremendous benefits to the biosphere. Efforts to regulate and reduce CO2 emissions will hurt far more than they will help.

**Rising CO2 spurs plant growth ---- prevents famine ensuring global peace**

**Idso ‘99** (Dr. Sherwood, President, former Research Physicist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Research Service at the U.S. Water Conservation Laboratory in Phoenix, Arizona and Dr. Keith, Ph.D. in Botany at Arizona State University, President and Vice President of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, CO2 Science, “Give Peace a Chance by Giving Plants a Chance”, Vol. 2, No. 19, 10-1, <http://www.co2science.org/scripts/CO2ScienceB2C/articles/V2/N19/EDIT.jsp>, CMR)

President Carter begins by stating that "when the Cold War ended 10 years ago, we expected an era of peace" but got instead "a decade of war." He then asks why peace has been so elusive, answering that most of today's wars are fueled by poverty, poverty in developing countries "whose economies depend on agriculture but which lack the means to make their farmland productive." This fact, he says, suggests an obvious, but often overlooked, path to peace: "raise the standard of living of the millions of rural people who live in poverty by increasing agricultural productivity," his argument being that thriving agriculture, in his words, "is the engine that fuels broader economic growth and development, thus paving the way for prosperity and peace." Can the case for atmospheric CO2 enrichment be made any clearer? Automatically, and without the investment of a single hard-earned dollar, ruble, or what have you, people everywhere promote the cause of peace by fertilizing the atmosphere with carbon dioxide; for CO2 - one of the major end-products of the combustion process that fuels the engines of industry and transportation - is the very elixir of life, being the primary building block of all plant tissues via the essential role it plays in the photosynthetic process that sustains nearly all of earth's vegetation, which in turn sustains nearly all of the planet's animal life. As with any production process, the insertion of more raw materials (in this case CO2) into the production line results in more manufactured goods coming out the other end, which, in the case of the production line of plant growth and development, is biosphere-sustaining food. And as President Carter rightly states, "leaders of developing nations must make food security a priority." Indeed, he ominously proclaims in his concluding paragraph that "there can be no peace until people have enough to eat." Within this context, we recently completed a project commissioned by the Greening Earth Society entitled "Forecasting World Food Supplies: The Impact of the Rising Atmospheric CO2 Concentration," which we presented at the Second Annual Dixy Lee Ray Memorial Symposium held in Washington, DC on 31 August - 2 September 1999. We found that continued increases in agricultural knowledge and expertise would likely boost world food production by 37% between now and the middle of the next century, but that world food needs, which we equated with world population, would likely rise by 51% over this period. Fortunately, we also calculated that the shortfall in production could be overcome - but just barely - by the additional benefits anticipated to accrue from the many productivity-enhancing effects of the expected rise in the air's CO2 content over the same time period. Our findings suggest that the world food security envisioned by President Carter is precariously dependent upon the continued rising of the atmosphere's CO2 concentration. As Sylvan Wittwer, Director Emeritus of Michigan State University's Agricultural Experiment Station, stated in his 1995 book, Food, Climate, and Carbon Dioxide: The Global Environment and World Food Production, "The rising level of atmospheric CO2 could be the one global natural resource that is progressively increasing food production and total biological output, in a world of otherwise diminishing natural resources of land, water, energy, minerals, and fertilizer. It is a means of inadvertently increasing the productivity of farming systems and other photosynthetically active ecosystems. The effects know no boundaries and both developing and developed countries are, and will be, sharing equally." So, let's give peace a chance. Let's give plants a chance. And, while we're at it, let's give all of the world's national economies a chance as well. Let's let the air's CO2 content rise unimpeded, and let's let the peoples of the world reap the multitudinous benefits that come from the God-given - and scientifically proven - aerial fertilization effect of atmospheric CO2 enrichment. Let's live and let live. And let's let CO2 do its wonderful work of promoting world peace via the planet-wide prosperity that comes from enhanced agricultural productivity.

### AT—Warming Hurts Ag

**Warming doesn’t hurt crop yields and CO2 offsets any effect it might have**

**Carter et al. 11**—lead authors are Robert Carter, Ph.D., Adjunct Research Fellow at James Cook University – AND – Craig Idso, Ph.D., Chairman at the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change – AND – Fred Singer, Ph.D., President of the Science and Environmental Policy Project; contributing authors are Susan Crockford, Joseph D’Aleo, Indur Goklany, Sherwood Idso, Madhav Khandekar, Anthony Lupo, Willie Soon, and Mitch Taylor (© 2011, Climate Change Reconsidered: 2011 Interim Report, The Heartland Institute, <http://www.nipccreport.org/reports/2011/pdf/2011NIPCCinterimreport.pdf>)

A final flaw in the analysis of Schlenker and Roberts (2009) is their acknowledged ―inability to account for CO2 concentrations,‖ the increasing levels of which, in their own words, ―might spur plant growth and yields,‖ **such that ―yield declines stemming from warmer temperatures therefore may be offset by CO2 fertilization**.‖ This has been found to be the case by many different studies, as we recount in Section 5.5 of this report.

**The negative impact of warming on agriculture is highly exaggerated – warm-weather crops are silver-linings in climate change.**

**Mendelsohn ’94** [Robert, PhD Medicine from University of Chicago, “The Impact of Global Warming on Agriculture: A Ricardian Analysis,” The American Economic Review, JSTOR]

The striking difference between the crop-revenue and cropland approaches is a useful reminder of how we can be misled by our mental images. The specter of global warming calls up the vista of corn blistering on the stalk or desiccated wheat fields. Yet the major grains so vulnerable to drought—wheat and corn—represented only $22.5 billion of the $143 billion of farm marketings in 1982. Our results suggest that **the vulnerability of American agriculture to climate change may be exaggerated** if the analysis is limited to the major grains. A broader vision should also include the warm-weather crops such as cotton, fruits, vegetables, rice, hay, and grapes in addition to other sectors such as livestock and poultry. Whereas past production-function studies focus ominously on the vulnerable cool-weather grains, the comprehensive crop-revenue Ricardian model reminds us that **the irrigated warm-weather crops be a silver lining behind the climate-change cloud**.