

Be careful if you run these cards with the hunger disadvantage. That position assumes increases in warming and would contradict some of these cards!

*** Research faulty .....	2
Their sources exaggerate to secure funding .....	2
Consensus over warming is a myth .....	3
*** No catastrophic warming .....	4
Satellite data is best and proves no catastrophic warming .....	4
History proves increased CO2 is not correlated with temperature rise .....	4
The best available evidence concludes any warming will be slow and not dangerous .....	5
*** A2: Sea Level Rise .....	6
Sea level rise is not anthropogenic .....	6
Warming is actually decreasing sea levels.....	6
Too much damage already done and sea levels will continue to rise even after stabilization .....	7
*** A2: Water Wars .....	8
Water wars are inevitable with or without more climate change.....	8
Warming solves water shortages .....	8
Deterrence Blocks Water Wars.....	9
Water Can't Cause War: Two Reasons: History Proves It and Most Water Resources Are Shared .....	9
Conflict Over Water Never Causes War.....	9
No Escalation Will Occur Over Water: Conflicts Empirically De-escalate .....	10
Water conflict doesn't escalate—too many limiting factors.....	11

\*\*\* Research faulty

## **Their sources exaggerate to secure funding**

Dr **Roche**, whose PhD in agricultural science is from University College, Dublin, The Daily News (New Plymouth, New Zealand), September 25, **2003**

"The point is further highlighted when you look at the concern of people for the global environment. All countries considered the global environment to be in a significantly worse state than either their national or local environment. He identified three sources of our negative perception -- researchers, environmental organisations and the media." Dr Roche said researchers were arguably the most important communicators of environmental pessimism because they were generally people with academic credentials and therefore seen as credible. "We are always researching negative aspects of the environment. After all, there is no point in researching something we know is OK. Therefore, we only hear bad stories about the environment, never good. "However, research also contributes to our fear of global demise in a much more sinister way. The constant need to attract scarce funding often forces researchers to release preliminary data before it is full analysed, thereby giving a false impression of the size of the problem and it also encourages scientists to release more scary scenarios than actually exist." Dr Roche said the environmental movements themselves were also an outlet for the pessimistic environmental story. "Environmental organisations are well funded and therefore have a vested interest in research results and resultant political decisions. In other words, if research was to show there was no environmental problem, people funding the environmental organisations would find some other way to spend their money. It is in their interest to 'offer up scary scenarios'." On the media's role in negative perceptions, Dr Roche said everyone had heard the pessimistic stories -- the loss of rainforests and other wildlife habitats, the rapid extinction of species, the depletion of natural resources, the benefits of organic food, the increased incidence of cancer (often blamed on modern ways of producing food), global warming, famine, floods and other major weather events on the increase.

## **Consensus over warming is a myth**

**DAILY MAIL** (London), January 12, 2004

The claim that there's a scientific consensus behind global warming is also bogus. In 1992, more than 40 atmospheric scientists said the theory was highly uncertain and warned against using theoretical climate models which they said were not supported by existing records. In 1997, dozens of meteorologists, geologists, atmospheric scientists and other experts said global warming was based solely on unproven scientific theories and imperfect computer models. In 1998, 18,000 scientists signed the Oregon Petition which again criticised this 'flawed' research, said historic evidence showed that increased atmospheric carbon dioxide was environmentally helpful and predicted that the 1997 Kyoto agreement to reduce industrial emissions would trap the developing world in poverty. One of the world's most eminent meteorologists, Professor Richard Lindzen, has also protested that while the science behind the Kyoto protocol was suitably equivocal about global warming, the document's highly politicised summary - the part actually being used to force reduced industrial activity on to the Western world - was written instead by government representatives, who had conjured up 'scary scenarios for which there is no evidence'.

\*\*\* No catastrophic warming

Satellite data is best and proves no catastrophic warming

Thomas **Pearson**, research analyst at CEI, **2002**, in *Global Warming and Other Eco-myths* edited by Ronald Bailey, pg. 322

Highly accurate temperature measurements, however, have been taken from space using microwave sounding units (MSUs) aboard satellites since 1979. The data series graphed on the opposite page shows the difference between recorded temperature and the 1979 mean values. In October 2001, the average global temperature departure was 0.1450C, with a Northern Hemisphere temperature departure of 0.1460C and a Southern Hemisphere departure of 0.1430C, yielding an average increase of only 0.060C per decade.. The satellite data are highly correlated with balloon temperature data taken from radiosonde instruments, strengthening the confidence in the accuracy of the satellite data. MSUs measure the temperature of the lower troposphere, the atmospheric layer from the surface to 20,000 feet. This layer of the atmosphere is important for climatic research because, according to global circulation models, global warming would be much more pronounced in the lower troposphere than on the surface. The failure of the satellite data to verify rapid global warming predictions provides a strong argument against fears that man-made global warming will result in a climate catastrophe.

History proves increased CO2 is not correlated with temperature rise

**DAILY MAIL** (London), January 12, **2004**

Then there's the claim that the climate is the hottest on record. But this statistical record goes back only a few centuries, if that. Yet there's plenty of other evidence that the climate in Europe was warmer than now by at least two degrees in 1100, when vines grew in Northumberland and farmers settled in Greenland. Since this was followed by the Little Ice Age, which lasted until 1880, it's hardly surprising - and surely a cause for rejoicing - that since then the climate has warmed up by about 0.6 degrees, well within normal patterns. As for the presumed villain of the piece, carbon dioxide, this makes up such a tiny fraction of the atmosphere that even if it doubled it would make little difference to the climate. And, like sea levels, it doesn't correlate with climate change. Historically, it has increased hundreds of years after the climate has warmed up. Between 1940 and 1975, when industrial activity - which produces carbon dioxide - rose rapidly, the climate actually cooled.

The best available evidence concludes any warming will be slow and not dangerous

Robert **Balling**, director of the office of climatology at ASU, “The Threat of Global Warming Has Been Exaggerated,” *Conserving the Environment*, 1999, p. 46

I believe that the best available evidence argues strongly against any rapid and substantial changes to the planetary temperature. Since 1989, a fascinating spectrum of opinions has emerged in the global warming debate. On one end of this spectrum are scientists and some policymakers suggesting that an increase in greenhouse gases will not create any catastrophic climate changes in the decades to come. Their assessment leads to the conclusion that the most probable climatic changes (for example, increasing nighttime temperatures, lowering afternoon temperatures, increasing precipitation) may not be disastrous and could even be beneficial to life on the planet.

### \*\*\* A2: Sea Level Rise

## Sea level rise is not anthropogenic

John **Christy**, professor of Atmospheric Science at the University of Alabama in Huntsville, **2002**, in *Global Warming and Other Eco-myths* edited by Ronald Bailey, pg. 21-22

SEA LEVEL RISE is a serious concern because many human settlements live at the margin of low coastal plains and islands so that small changes could have significant consequences. Sea level, however, should not be thought of as being constant. Science is clear that, just as with climate, there is no law that states sea level should remain stationary. During the last major ice age, 25,000 years ago, the sea level was more than 300 feet lower than today, so a considerable amount of rise has already occurred naturally. In the past 6,000 years, the sea rose about 2 inches per century, but the rate increased about 1,850 to 6 inches per century, a rate change occurring before humans could have had any influence. Sea level changes naturally. Over the time period shown in Figure 1.1, the total rise in average sea level has been about 9 inches. Individual coastlines have wide variations in the rise (or fall) because local changes in sea level depend on many factors, including rising or subsiding coastal land. This 6—inch— per—century rate has remained steady since 1850 and has not accelerated.

## Warming is actually decreasing sea levels

Fred **Singer**, President of the Science and Environmental Policy Project, Wall Street Journal, April 30, **1997**

But even if there were to be a warming, the consequences would most likely be benign. The much-feared threat of a future sea-level rise is diminishing, according to published science estimates, and there is a good chance that a warming may cause sea level to drop—as increased evaporation from the ocean puts more ice on the polar caps. Agriculturists agree that the expected warmer nights and winters would be beneficial for crops. Many economists—including some of the organizers of the big sign-in—concur that warming is good for mankind.

## Too much damage already done and sea levels will continue to rise even after stabilization

Denis **Culley**, University of Maine School of law, Marine Law Institute, University of Maine School of Law Ocean and Coastal Law Journal, **2002**

Geological and marine fossil evidence shows that in the past 35,000 years there have been significant fluctuations in the sea levels on earth.<sup>n58</sup> These changes are "primarily caused by a melting of land-based glacier ice and the thermal expansion of ocean water."<sup>n59</sup> In their year 2001 Report on Climate Change, the IPCC explained the role that thermal expansion plays in sea level rise: As the ocean warms, the density decreases and thus even at constant mass the volume of the ocean increases. This thermal expansion (or steric sea level rise) occurs at all ocean temperatures and is one of the major contributors to sea level changes during the 20[su'th'] and 21[su'st'] centuries. Water at higher temperature or under greater pressure (ie. greater depth) expands more for a given heat input, so the global average expansion is affected by the distribution of heat within the ocean.<sup>n60</sup> This rise in sea level, which until fairly recently has been measured by a sparse network of coastal and mid-ocean tidal gauges is now being monitored via satellite using radar altimetry.<sup>n61</sup> The global sea level averages ascertained from these measurements show an annual rise of approximately 2.6 mm per year. <sup>n62</sup> Notable, and indeed alarming, though this current trend is, the IPCC notes: The large heat capacity of the ocean means that there will be considerable delay before the full effects of surface warming are felt throughout the depth of the ocean. As a result, the ocean will not be in equilibrium and global average sea level will continue to rise for centuries after atmospheric greenhouse gas concentrations have stabilized.

### \*\*\* A2: Water Wars

Water wars are inevitable with or without more climate change

Paul **Brown**, Environment Correspondent for The Guardian, Global Warming: Can Civilization Survive?, 1996, p. 107-108

THE WORLD FACES A CRISIS over lack of freshwater even without climate change. Already 40 per cent of the world's population have water shortages, and with rapidly rising populations demand increases all the time. In a statement to the press, Ismail Seageldin, vice-president of the World Bank, said in August 1995: 'Many of the wars of this century were about oil, but wars of the next century will be over water.' The Bank were reporting that 80 countries around the world were experiencing water shortages which threatened their agricultural industry and health. That took no account of shortages yet to come as a result of climate change, so graft on to that already grim picture the prospect of lower rainfall, high temperatures, more evaporation and more extended droughts in most of the countries already suffering water shortages, and a crisis can rapidly turn into a series of disasters.

Warming solves water shortages

David **Ridenour**, Vice President of The National Center for Public Policy Research, Cure to Global Warming Could Be Worse Than the Disease, July, 1997, <http://www.nationalcenter.org/NPA165.html>, accessed 12/23/02

According to the World Bank, one-third of the world's population already suffers from chronic water shortages. The Worldwatch Institute predicts that this situation will be exacerbated further by the addition of an estimated 2.6 billion people to the world's population over the next 30 years. By 2025, the group claims, some three billion people -- or 40% of the world's population -- could be living in countries without sufficient water supplies, leading to crop failures, diminished economic development and even to regional conflicts as nations find it necessary to fight for control over scarce water resources. While the scientific community is divided over many aspects of the global warming theory, the effect of global warming on precipitation levels is not one of them: Global warming would mean more condensation and more evaporation, producing more and/or heavier rains. Global warming, therefore, could offer the answer to the water scarcity problem that the Worldwatch Institute has been seeking. If history is any indication, greater precipitation may be only one of many benefits of global warming. For example, between the 10th and 12th Centuries, when the temperature of the planet was roughly 0.5 degrees Celsius warmer than it is today, agriculture in North America and Europe flourished and the southern regions of Greenland were free of ice, allowing cultivation by Norse settlers.

## Deterrence Blocks Water Wars

Kim **Ghattas** Inter Press Service, 8/5, 1999

Economic and military might play a role too. Poor and arid countries such as Jordan or the Palestinian territories, no matter how desperate, cannot afford to launch a war against powerful neighbors, who, in turn, use their control of water sources into bargaining weapons. Around 90 percent of the water from the West Bank is consumed by Israel, yet the Israeli government demands Palestinians to cut back on their consumption and cuts agreed supplies to Jordan.

## Water Can't Cause War: Two Reasons: History Proves It and Most Water Resources Are Shared

Lester **Brown**, President Of Worldwatch, FDCH Political Transcripts, January 9, 1998

When you get down to it, it's hard to fight over water sometimes. I mean it sounds good when you don't go beyond the one sentence sort of level. But I remember in September of 1965 being in India at the time of the Indian-Pakistan war, and the Indian army had advanced half way to Lahore. The war lasted for some months, but at no point was the exchange water, in the Indus River system that Indian and Pakistan have because they share that system, it works only if they cooperate; at no point was the flow of water disrupted and at no point was there even a threat that it would be disrupted because they both would lose. And most water resources are shared either underground aquifer or surface water resources, and it's not always easy to win a water war. I think that's the point I want to make.

## Conflict Over Water Never Causes War

UNESCO **Courier** February 1, 1999

It must be noted at the outset that countries have recognized that water is too vital a resource for nations to go to war. Throughout the many wars fought in the twentieth century, water facilities have by and large escaped unscathed. In the three major wars between Pakistan and India, for example, water could have been used as a formidable weapon by both sides. Not only did they both refuse this deadly option, they implemented water sharing agreements even as bullets were flying. Low-level violence punctuated by full-fledged war has been simmering in the Jordan Valley since the 1920s between Israel and the neighbouring Arab nations. Yet you can count on one hand the number of times water supplies have been specifically targeted.

## History Proves there Won't Be War Over Water

Kim **Ghattas** Inter Press Service, 8/5, 1999

Although worried about dwindling water resources, Omar Touqan, a water resource expert with the United Nations in Beirut, does not believe in the possibility of armed conflicts to resolve disputes for access the vital liquid. "Even in the Jahiliyya (the Arab dark ages) we didn't fight for water (and) there's no reason to do so now. Unless a country actually has another political aim, water will not be the sole reason for a war," said Touqan.

## No Escalation Will Occur Over Water: Conflicts Empirically De-escalate

Kim **Ghattas** Inter Press Service, 8/5, 1999

Analysts say that, although no major war should be expected, there will be the occasional rising tension, such as the flare up in Turkish-Syrian relations last September, which almost led to open conflict. Since 1989, Turkey has been working on a \$ 32 billion project known as Southeastern Anatolian Project (GAP) consisting of 22 dams and 19 power plants, which worries Syria and Iraq, where water flows from the Tigris and Euphrates will decrease substantially. Since 1989, Turkey has been working on a \$ 32 billion project known as Southeastern Anatolian Project (GAP) consisting of 22 dams and 19 power plants, which worries Syria and Iraq, where water flows from the Tigris and Euphrates will decrease substantially.

## Water conflict doesn't escalate—too many limiting factors

Jacques **Leslie**, Harper's Magazine, July 1, 2000

Yet such wars haven't quite happened. Aaron Wolf, an Oregon State University specialist in water conflicts, maintains that the last war over water was fought between the Mesopotamian city states of Lagash and Umma 4,500 years ago. Wolf has found that during the twentieth century only 7 minor skirmishes were fought over water while 145 water-related treaties were signed. He argues that one reason is strategic: in a conflict involving river water, the aggressor would have to be both downstream (since the upstream nation enjoys unhampered access to the river) and militarily superior. As Wolf puts it, "An upstream riparian would have no cause to launch an attack, and a weaker state would be foolhardy to do so." And if a powerful downstream nation retaliates against a water diversion by, say, destroying its weak upstream neighbor's dam, it still risks the consequences, in the form of flood or pollution or poison from upstream. So, until now, water conflicts have simmered but rarely boiled, perhaps because of the universality of the need for water. Almost two fifths of the world's people live in the 214 river basins shared by two or more countries; the Nile links ten countries, whose leaders are profoundly aware of one another's hydrologic behavior. Countries usually manage to cooperate about Water, even in unlikely circumstances. In 1957, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and South Vietnam formed the Mekong Committee, which exchanged information throughout the Vietnam War. Through the 1980s and into the 1990s, Israeli and Jordanian officials secretly met once or twice a year at a picnic table on the banks of the Yarmuk River to allocate the river's water supply; these so-called picnic-table summits occurred while the two nations disavowed formal diplomatic contact. Jerome Delli Priscoli, editor of a thoughtful trade journal called Water Policy and a social scientist at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, believes the whole notion of water conflict is overemphasized: "Water irrigation helped build early communities and bring those communities together in larger functional arrangements. Such community networking was a primary impetus to the growth of civilization. Indeed, water may actually be one of humanity's great learning grounds for building community.... The thirst for water may be more persuasive than the impulse toward conflict."