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## 1NC DA

#### Status quo excise taxes on guns are key to funding for wildlife restoration.

Corn and Gravelle 13 [M.Lynne and Jane G. Specialists in Natural Resources/Economic Policy. “Guns, Excise Taxes, and Wildlife Restoration” Congressional Research Service. <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R42992.pdf>. March 12, 2013. 1/12/16] KK

As a result of the recent debate over guns, gun rights, and gun-related violence, there has been a marked increase in sales of many weapons as well as ammunition. Through an excise tax on firearms and ammunition, such sales have a marked beneficial effect on funding for state wildlife programs through the Wildlife Restoration Program (also known as Pittman-Robertson or P-R). This report examines these taxes, their allocation, and their use. It also examines the effects of sequestration of this account, pursuant to the Budget Control Act of 2011 (BCA, P.L. 112-25). The Excise Taxes The Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act of 1937 (16 U.S.C. 669-669k; P-R) uses the proceeds from a federal excise tax to fund grants to states and territories for projects to benefit wildlife resources and to conduct programs for hunter education. The excise tax predates the act, having begun in 1919. The excise tax is set at 10% of the wholesale price for pistols and revolvers, and 11% for other firearms as well as shells or cartridges,1 and is collected by the wholesaler. An 11% tax on archery equipment is also deposited into the fund. The tax is applied whether the equipment is likely to be used for hunting or not. Total collections from these taxes were $388.2 million in FY2011 and $555.3 million in FY2012. Most of the tax is collected from firearms and ammunition. Of the tax on firearms and ammunition, approximately one-third is due to each source: 31% for pistols and revolvers, 37% for other firearms, and 31% for ammunition.2 These amounts become available for expenditure in the year following their collection.3 (See Figure 1.)

#### The Pittman-Robertson act is specifically key to restoring populations

Frantz 16 [Tyler. Reporter for The Daily News. ”Sportsmen sustain wildlife” <http://www.ldnews.com/story/sports/outdoors/2016/01/01/tyler-frantz-sportsmen-sustain-wilflife/78175952/>. Lebanon Daily News- Part of USA Today. January 1, 2016. 1/12/16] KK

Hunters, anglers and trappers aren’t afraid to “put their money where their mouth is.“ In fact, if it weren’t for sportsmen stepping up and fitting the bill for wildlife conservation, our nation’s white-tailed deer, wild turkey, pronghorn antelope, rocky mountain elk and assorted waterfowl populations could potentially be non-existent today. In the early 1900’s, unregulated and commercial over-harvest of game species, coupled with severe drought, timbering and habitat loss across the country, put an extreme stress on the nation’s wildlife species. It was at this time when those who care most about these species - the sportsmen who so passionately pursue them - approached congress with a proposal to help protect our country’s wild places and the wildlife inhabiting them. In 1937, the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (also known as the Pittman-Robertson Act) became a law, through which an excise tax on the sale of firearms and ammunition products would be used to help fund wildlife conservation in the United States. According to the National Shooting Sports Foundation, revenue generated from the PR excise tax is apportioned to state wildlife agencies for conservation efforts, hunter’s education, shooting range projects and program grants. More specifically, the firearms and ammunition industry supports an 11 percent excise tax on all rifle, shotgun and ammunition sales, plus a 10 percent excise tax on handgun sales. Together, the PR Act has garnered more than $8 billion for conservation and public land access since its inception. Similar excise taxes also exist on archery equipment, such as bows, quivers, broad heads and arrow shafts, as well as fishing gear and other outdoors-related items. However, few consumers actually notice the tax, since industry manufacturers typically build them into the overall sales price of the products. According to the Fish & Wildlife Funding Survey, conducted by the Wildlife Conservation Fund of America, the agency’s annual contribution is comprised of $749 million through excise taxes paid solely by sportsmen (25.7 percent), more than $1.42 billion through state hunting and fishing license sales (48.7 percent) and $608 million in other revenues, including Federal Duck Stamp sales and sportsmen-led conservation organization contributions (20.8 percent). The remaining approximately five percent comes from state funds and interest income.

#### PR also is key to national park management.

NSSF 13 [National Shooting Sports Foundation. Trade association for America’s firearms industry. “Pittman-Robertson Excise Tax” <http://www.nssf.org/factsheets/PDF/PittmanRobertsonFacts.pdf>. Published by the NSSF. 2o13. 1/12/16] KK

What types of projects are funding by Pittman-Robertson? States use the apportioned funds to restore and manage wildlife habitat, for both game and nongame species alike, and to open and maintain access for hunting, shooting and other outdoor recreation. White-tailed deer, elk, turkey and antelope are some of the many species that have seen their populations grow as a result of Pittman-Robertson funding. Additionally, the funds deliver hunter education programs and research projects focused on critical habitat management practices. Why is Pittman-Robertson so effective? Pittman-Robertson creates a direct link between those that hunt and participate in the shooting sports and the resources needed to expand and enhance opportunities to hunt and shoot. Known as the North American model of wildlife conservation, this user pays public benefit model is extremely successful because sportsmen and women and the industries that serve them have always been willing to pay extra to enhance, expand and protect America’s hunting, shooting and conservation heritage

#### Parks are biodiversity hotspots.

Joe Roman, Paul R. Ehrlich, Robert M. Pringle, and John C. Avise, February 2009, Joe Roman is a conservation biologist, author, and fellow at the Gund Institute for Ecological Economics and a McCurdy Visiting Scholar at the Duke University Marine Lab, Paul R. Ehrlich is the President of the Center for Conservation Biology, Stanford; Co-founder of the field of coevolution, Robert M. Pringle is a Graduate Student in Conservation Biology, Stanford University, and John C. Avise is Distinguished Professor, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology, “Facing Extinction: Nine Steps to Save Biodiversity,” http://www.thesolutionsjournal.com/feature\_article/2009-02-24-facing-extinction-nine-steps-save-biodiversity

Many countries have national parks that feature special landscapes and geological formations: the volcanic caldera of Yellowstone, the Grand Canyon, Mount Kilimanjaro. In addition to these traditional and essential parks, there is a need to protect a carefully designed network of reserves on each continent and in every ocean. This global series, or archipelago, of biological refuges—biodiversity parks—will preserve key features of the Earth’s biological legacy inherited from the evolutionary past into the future. Such parks, in effect, would celebrate and honor the evolutionary heritage reflected in biological diversity, just as traditional national parks and monuments preserve special geological features or honor important historical events in human affairs. Rather than merely constructing museums that memorialize biocide, biodiversity parks would offer explicit protection for endangered species and evolutionarily distinctive ecosystems. The task is not as insurmountable as it might appear. By preserving and endowing just 25 biodiversity hotspots (less than two percent of the earth’s land area) we could help protect 44% of vascular plant species and 35% of all species of mammals, birds, reptiles and amphibians for $500 million a year7—less than 0.1% of the funds allocated to the United States’ Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP) to bail out incompetent financial institutions. One difficulty with many current park systems is that reserves often tend to be on residual lands that are not very valuable for resource extraction or human subsistence. A study of new reserves in Australia showed that they were typically gazetted on steep and infertile public lands, areas least in need of protection.8 Without proper planning, ad hoc reserves can be ineffective, often occupying less productive land, making the goal of protecting biodiversity more expensive and less likely to succeed. Well-placed networks of sanctuaries, designed with an awareness of ongoing climate disruption and the unique biotic facets of the sites, can help shepherd many species through the extinction crisis. In discussing parks, we often think of landscapes, but the biodiversity crisis affects aquatic systems as well. Protection of the oceans requires safeguards against overfishing and networks of marine reserves that include rich nearshore habitats (such as coral reefs and upwellings) as well as deep-sea vents and abyssal plains. As on land, these protected areas should range from strict nature reserves where fishing and extraction are forbidden to seascapes that are managed for their cultural and ecological value. Areas that are open to exploitation should be managed sustainably to meet the long-term resource needs of local communities, while providing natural services such as recreational opportunities and water purification.9

#### Biodiversity decline is the biggest impact

Chen 2k Professor of Law and Vance K. Opperman Research Scholar, University of Minnesota Law School (Jim, Globalization and Its Losers, Winter 2000, 9 Minn. J. Global Trade 157, Lexis)

Conscious decisions to allow the extinction of a species or the destruction of an entire ecosystem epitomize the "irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources" that NEPA is designed to retard. 312 The original Endangered Species Act gave such decisions no quarter whatsoever; 313 since 1979, such decisions have rested in the hands of a solemnly convened "God Squad." 314 In its permanence and gravity, natural extinction provides the baseline by which all other types of extinction should be judged. The Endangered Species Act explicitly acknowledges the "esthetic, ecological, educational, historical, recreational, and scientific value" of endangered species and the biodiversity they represent. 315 Allied bodies of international law confirm this view: 316 global biological diversity is part of the commonly owned heritage of all humanity and deserves full legal protection. 317 Rather remarkably, these broad assertions understate the value of biodiversity and the urgency of its protection. A Sand County Almanac, the eloquent bible of the modern environmental movement, contains only two demonstrable biological errors. It opens with one and closes with another. We can forgive Aldo Leopold's decision to close with that elegant but erroneous epigram, "ontogeny repeats phylogeny." 318 What concerns [\*208] us is his opening gambit: "There are some who can live without wild things, and some who cannot." 319 Not quite. None of us can live without wild things. Insects are so essential to life as we know it that if they "and other land-dwelling anthropods ... were to disappear, humanity probably could not last more than a few months." 320 "Most of the amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals," along with "the bulk of the flowering plants and ... the physical structure of most forests and other terrestrial habitats" would disappear in turn. 321 "The land would return to" something resembling its Cambrian condition, "covered by mats of recumbent wind-pollinated vegetation, sprinkled with clumps of small trees and bushes here and there, largely devoid of animal life." 322 From this perspective, the mere thought of valuing biodiversity is absurd, much as any attempt to quantify all of earth's planetary amenities as some trillions of dollars per year is absurd. But the frustration inherent in enforcing the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) has shown that conservation cannot work without appeasing Homo economicus, the profit-seeking ape. Efforts to ban the international ivory trade through CITES have failed to stem the slaughter of African elephants. 323 The preservation of biodiversity must therefore begin with a cold, calculating inventory of its benefits. Fortunately, defending biodiversity preservation in humanity's self-interest is an easy task. As yet unexploited species might give a hungry world a larger larder than the storehouse of twenty plant species that provide nine-tenths of humanity's current food supply. 324 "Waiting in the wings are tens of thousands of unused plant species, many demonstrably superior to those in favor." 325 As genetic warehouses, many plants enhance the productivity of crops already in use. In the United States alone, the [\*209] genes of wild plants have accounted for much of "the explosive growth in farm production since the 1930s." 326 The contribution is worth $ 1 billion each year. 327 Nature's pharmacy demonstrates even more dramatic gains than nature's farm. 328 Aspirin and penicillin, our star analgesic and antibiotic, had humble origins in the meadowsweet plant and in cheese mold. 329 Leeches, vampire bats, and pit vipers all contribute anticoagulant drugs that reduce blood pressure, prevent heart attacks, and facilitate skin transplants. 330 Merck & Co., the multinational pharmaceutical company, is helping Costa Rica assay its rich biota. 331 A single commercially viable product derived "from, say, any one species among ... 12,000 plants and 300,000 insects ... could handsomely repay Merck's entire investment" of $ 1 million in 1991 dollars. 332 Wild animals, plants, and microorganisms also provide ecological services. 333 The Supreme Court has lauded the pesticidal talents of migratory birds. 334 Numerous organisms process the air we breathe, the water we drink, the ground we stroll. 335 Other species serve as sentries. Just as canaries warned coal miners of lethal gases, the decline or disappearance of indicator species provides advance warning against deeper [\*210] environmental threats. 336 Species conservation yields the greatest environmental amenity of all: ecosystem protection. Saving discrete species indirectly protects the ecosystems in which they live. 337 Some larger animals may not carry great utilitarian value in themselves, but the human urge to protect these charismatic "flagship species" helps protect their ecosystems. 338 Indeed, to save any species, we must protect their ecosystems. 339 Defenders of biodiversity can measure the "tangible economic value" of the pleasure derived from "visiting, photographing, painting, and just looking at wildlife." 340 In the United States alone, wildlife observation and feeding in 1991 generated $ 18.1 billion in consumer spending, $ 3 billion in tax revenues, and 766,000 jobs. 341 Ecotourism gives tropical countries, home to most of the world's species, a valuable alternative to subsistence agriculture. Costa Rican rainforests preserved for ecotourism "have become many times more profitable per hectare than land cleared for pastures and fields," while the endangered gorilla has turned ecotourism into "the third most important source of income in Rwanda." 342 In a globalized economy where commodities can be cultivate2d almost anywhere, environmentally [\*211] sensitive locales can maximize their wealth by exploiting the "boutique" uses of their natural bounty. The value of endangered species and the biodiversity they embody is "literally ... incalculable." 343 What, if anything, should the law do to preserve it? There are those that invoke the story of Noah's Ark as a moral basis for biodiversity preservation. 344 Others regard the entire Judeo-Christian tradition, especially the biblical stories of Creation and the Flood, as the root of the West's deplorable environmental record. 345 To avoid getting bogged down in an environmental exegesis of Judeo-Christian "myth and legend," we should let Charles Darwin and evolutionary biology determine the imperatives of our moment in natural "history." 346 The loss of biological diversity is quite arguably the gravest problem facing humanity. If we cast the question as the contemporary phenomenon that "our descendants most regret," the "loss of genetic and species diversity by the destruction of natural habitats" is worse than even "energy depletion, economic collapse, limited nuclear war, or conquest by a totalitarian government." 347 Natural evolution may in due course renew the earth with a diversity of species approximating that of a world unspoiled by Homo sapiens -- in ten million years, perhaps a hundred million. 348

## 2NC

### Turns Econ

#### BioD key to the economy

PLTA 14 [(Pennsylvania Land Trust Association) “Economic Benefits of Biodiversity” Conservationtools.org Feb 24] AT

Economic impact studies identify a variety of economic benefits generated by biodiversity. The studies described in this guide each analyzed one or more of these benefits, including the following: Enabling the agricultural and forest industry through processes such as pollination, pest control, nutrient provision, genetic diversity, and disease prevention and control Provision of wild harvested food products such as fish, large and small animals, and maple syrup Provision of medicinal plants and raw materials for pharmaceuticals Enabling nature-based tourism and the hunting and fishing industry Natural degradation of chemicals released into the environment, a significant cost savings over physical, chemical and thermal bioremediation. Reduced healthcare costs through the prevention of the spread of disease. Reduction of worldwide poverty. Sustaining the natural ecosystems on which humans, and therefore human economic systems, depend.

### Econ Turns Soft Power

#### **Economic decline turns soft power---crushes relations with all countries**

Sanders, ’90 [Jerry W. Sanders 90, Prof. Peace and Conflict Studies, UC, Berkeley [“Global Ecology and World Economy: Collision Course or Sustainable Future”, Bulletin of Peace Proposals Vol. 21 (4) p. 395-401]

Circumstances of looming catastrophe like these call for a maximum of world order and international cooperation. Historically, however, it is in just such times that the political will for global governance is in shortest supply. In a period of economic stagnation and trade competition, a declining hegemonic power will think less about maintaining world order than about shoring up its position relative to new challengers and upstarts. Multilateral cooperation will run up against similar constraints, due to suspicions that others may gain at one’s own expense by ‘free riding’ on the ‘public goods’ provided by environmental protection, trade regulation, or collective security regimes. The tendency will be for states to withhold the resources and the legitimacy required for supranational structures to work. And left to fend for themselves in a climate of economic stagnation, individual nations will be little able and even less inclined to end their destabilizing environ mental practices. Thus the groundwork will be laid for a chain reaction of conflicts across a spectrum of relations, with one nation after another forced into escalating confrontation along several fronts.

#### **Especially because economic power is sticky power**

Nye 6, Gov Professor at Harvard, ‘6 (Joseph, “Think again: soft power” Yale Global)

No. In a recent article on options for dealing with Iran, Peter Brookes of the Heritage Foundation refers to “soft power options such as economic sanctions.” But there is nothing soft about sanctions if you are on the receiving end. They are clearly intended to coerce and are thus a form of hard power. Economic strength can be converted into hard or soft power: You can coerce countries with sanctions or woo them with wealth. As Walter Russell Mead has argued, “economic power is sticky power; it seduces as much as it compels.” There’s no doubt that a successful economy is an important source of attraction. Sometimes in real-world situations, it is difficult to distinguish what part of an economic relationship is comprised of hard and soft power. European leaders describe other countries’ desire to accede to the European Union (EU) as a sign of Europe’s soft power. Turkey today is making changes in its human rights policies and domestic law to adjust to EU standards. How much of this change is driven by the economic inducement of market access, and how much by the attractiveness of Europe’s successful economic and political system? It’s clear that some Turks are replying more to the hard power of inducement, whereas others are attracted to the European model of human rights and economic freedom.

### Turns Systemic Impact

#### Biodiversity key to quality of life improvements

Mittermeier ‘11

(et al, Dr. Russell Alan Mittermeier is a primatologist, herpetologist and biological anthropologist. He holds Ph.D. from Harvard in Biological Anthropology and serves as an Adjunct Professor at the State University of New York at Stony Brook. He has conducted fieldwork for over 30 years on three continents and in more than 20 countries in mainly tropical locations. He is the President of Conservation International and he is considered an expert on biological diversity. Mittermeier has formally discovered several monkey species. From Chapter One of the book Biodiversity Hotspots – F.E. Zachos and J.C. Habel (eds.), DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-20992-5\_1, # Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2011. This evidence also internally references Norman Myers, a very famous British environmentalist specialising in biodiversity. available at: http://www.academia.edu/1536096/Global\_biodiversity\_conservation\_the\_critical\_role\_of\_hotspots)

Extinction is the gravest consequence of the biodiversity crisis, since it is¶ irreversible. Human activities have elevated the rate of species extinctions to a¶ thousand or more times the natural background rate (Pimm et al. 1995). What are the¶ consequences of this loss? Most obvious among them may be the lost opportunity¶ for future resource use. Scientists have discovered a mere fraction of Earth’s species¶ (perhaps fewer than 10%, or even 1%) and understood the biology of even fewer¶ (Novotny et al. 2002). As species vanish, so too does the health security of every human. Earth’s species are a vast genetic storehouse that may harbor a cure for¶ cancer, malaria, or the next new pathogen – cures waiting to be discovered.¶ Compounds initially derived from wild species account for more than half of all¶ commercial medicines – even more in developing nations (Chivian and Bernstein¶ 2008). Natural forms, processes, and ecosystems provide blueprints and inspiration¶ for a growing array of new materials, energy sources, hi-tech devices, and¶ other innovations (Benyus 2009). The current loss of species has been compared¶ to burning down the world’s libraries without knowing the content of 90% or¶ more of the books. With loss of species, we lose the ultimate source of our crops¶ and the genes we use to improve agricultural resilience, the inspiration for¶ manufactured products, and the basis of the structure and function of the ecosystems that support humans and all life on Earth (McNeely et al. 2009). Above and beyond¶ material welfare and livelihoods, biodiversity contributes to security, resiliency,¶ and freedom of choices and actions (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment 2005).¶ Less tangible, but no less important, are the cultural, spiritual, and moral costs¶ inflicted by species extinctions. All societies value species for their own sake,¶ and wild plants and animals are integral to the fabric of all the world’s cultures¶ (Wilson 1984). The road to extinction is made even more perilous to people by the loss of the broader ecosystems that underpin our livelihoods, communities, and economies(McNeely et al.2009). The loss of coastal wetlands and mangrove forests, for example, greatly exacerbates both human mortality and economic damage from tropical cyclones (Costanza et al.2008; Das and Vincent2009), while disease outbreaks such as the 2003 emergence of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome in East Asia have been directly connected to trade in wildlife for human consumption(Guan et al.2003). Other consequences of biodiversity loss, more subtle but equally damaging, include the deterioration of Earth’s natural capital. Loss of biodiversity on land in the past decade alone is estimated to be costing the global economy $500 billion annually (TEEB2009). Reduced diversity may also reduce resilience of ecosystems and the human communities that depend on them. For example, more diverse coral reef communities have been found to suffer less from the diseases that plague degraded reefs elsewhere (Raymundo et al.2009). As Earth’s climate changes, the roles of species and ecosystems will only increase in their importance to humanity (Turner et al.2009).¶ In many respects, conservation is local. People generally care more about the biodiversity in the place in which they live. They also depend upon these ecosystems the most – and, broadly speaking, it is these areas over which they have the most control. Furthermore, we believe that all biodiversity is important and that every nation, every region, and every community should do everything possible to conserve their living resources. So, what is the importance of setting global priorities? Extinction is a global phenomenon, with impacts far beyond nearby administrative borders. More practically, biodiversity, the threats to it, and the ability of countries to pay for its conservation vary around the world. The vast majority of the global conservation budget – perhaps 90% – originates in and is spent in economically wealthy countries (James et al.1999). It is thus critical that those globally ﬂexible funds available – in the hundreds of millions annually – be guided by systematic priorities if we are to move deliberately toward a global goal of reducing biodiversity loss.¶ The establishment of priorities for biodiversity conservation is complex, but can be framed as a single question. Given the choice, where should action toward reducing the loss of biodiversity be implemented ﬁrst? The ﬁeld of conservation planning addresses this question and revolves around a framework of vulnerability and irreplaceability (Margules and Pressey2000). Vulnerability measures the risk to the species present in a region – if the species and ecosystems that are highly threatened are not protected now, we will not get another chance in the future. Irreplaceability measures the extent to which spatial substitutes exist for securing biodiversity. The number of species alone is an inadequate indication of conserva-tion priority because several areas can share the same species. In contrast, areas with high levels of endemism are irreplaceable. We must conserve these places because the unique species they contain cannot be saved elsewhere. Put another way, biodiversity is not evenly distributed on our planet. It is heavily concentrated in certain areas, these areas have exceptionally high concentrations of endemic species found nowhere else, and many (but not all) of these areas are the areas at greatest risk of disappearing because of heavy human impact.¶ Myers’ seminal paper (Myers1988) was the ﬁrst application of the principles of irreplaceability and vulnerability to guide conservation planning on a global scale. Myers described ten tropical forest “hotspots” on the basis of extraordinary plant endemism and high levels of habitat loss, albeit without quantitative criteria for the designation of “hotspot” status. A subsequent analysis added eight additional hotspots, including four from Mediterranean-type ecosystems (Myers 1990).After adopting hotspots as an institutional blueprint in 1989, Conservation Interna-tional worked with Myers in a ﬁrst systematic update of the hotspots. It introduced two strict quantitative criteria: to qualify as a hotspot, a region had to contain at least 1,500 vascular plants as endemics (¶ >¶ 0.5% of the world’s total), and it had to have 30% or less of its original vegetation (extent of historical habitat cover)remaining. These efforts culminated in an extensive global review (Mittermeier et al.1999) and scientiﬁc publication (Myers et al.2000) that introduced seven new hotspots on the basis of both the better-deﬁned criteria and new data. A second systematic update (Mittermeier et al.2004) did not change the criteria, but revisited the set of hotspots based on new data on the distribution of species and threats, as well as genuine changes in the threat status of these regions. That update redeﬁned several hotspots, such as the Eastern Afromontane region, and added several others that were suspected hotspots but for which sufﬁcient data either did not exist or were not accessible to conservation scientists outside of those regions. Sadly, it uncovered another region – the East Melanesian Islands – which rapid habitat destruction had in a short period of time transformed from a biodiverse region that failed to meet the “less than 30% of original vegetation remaining”

### O/W Nuke War

#### We also control the only existential risk – nuclear war is contained to a single location, but global ecological collapse spares nobody

Hunter 3 Founder of Greenpeace and epic activist [Robert, *Thermageddon*, pp. 58-59]

Even though, from the beginning, Rachel Carson had warned of worldwide chemical fallout patterns, the individuals who were most sensitive to her message believed (some still do) it must be possible to find a haven or refuge outside The System, somewhere beyond the reach of the thrashing tails of the dying urban dinosaurs. The back-to-the-land movement, with its flurry of communes being set up as close to the end of the road as possible, in remote valleys or on the shores of isolated bays, was a reenactment of the North American pioneer stage, embodying the same spirit of independence and naive faith in Utopia. A fantasy existed that even a nuclear war was survivable if you lived far enough away from any big cities and you had a supply of seeds, some solar panels, iodine pills, a gun, and a copy of The Whole Earth Catalogue. And it was true, should the nuclear exchange be limited, that it was just possible there would be survivors out in the bush and the countryside, somewhat unscathed. In the face of a truly drastic climateflip of the ecosystem, unfortunately, there ultimately will be no safe, remote places left anywhere. The Pacific Northwest's coniferous forests are expected to last longer than boreal forests, as rising temperatures turn the glacial moraine into a frying pan, but with climate itself affected, everything - everywhere - is affected. The skies and air and water of even Walden Pond are already degraded and slipping further. If the sudden global heating we have triggered does indeed activate an ice age, there will be no place in the entire northern hemisphere to hide. In the worst-case situation, a runaway greenhouse effect, there would be no place on Earth, period. The fantasy of escaping to an organic farm is no longer a reasonable, let alone viable, option. A better, more realistic hope, by the time my grandson is my age, will be to head out into space. Good luck making the final crew list, Dexter.

### A2 Handguns not key

#### Handgun sales are high now – they are generating most of the growth in the gun market because of their concealability and self-defense benefits

Smith 12/9

[Smith, Aaron. Writer for CNN Money]. “Handguns, not AR-15s, are driving the gun market”. 12/9/15. <http://money.cnn.com/2015/12/09/news/companies/handgun-sales/> Accessed Febuary 23, 2016.

But the majority of weapons that Americans are stocking up on are handguns, not rifles.

Gun sales are surging -- Smith & Wesson posted a quarterly sales jump of 32% on Tuesday, and CEO James Debney said handguns account for three quarters of the company's sales.

"We view the growth in the handgun portion of the market as a longstanding trend," said Debney.

The hottest handguns are compact, the company said, so they're designed for concealed carry.

"You could put one into a suit jacket and you wouldn't even know it," said Brian Ruttenbur, gun industry analyst for BB&T. "This is something you literally drop into the makeup compartment of your purse."

More people than ever are buying guns to protect themselves, thanks to new state laws that make it easier for people to get a concealed carry permit.

"That's brought a significant number of first time buyers to the firearms market, especially women," said Rommel Dionisio, gun industry analyst for Wunderlich Securities.

### A2 Mult Alt Causes – Bio-d in other places

#### Methods used by the national park system spill over globally – our sister park system promotes global initiatives to address environmental problems, solves the international crisis

NPS 2/23/16

[National Park Service. US government agency]. “Connecting the World Through Parks”. 2/23/16. [http://www.nps.gov/subjects/internationalcooperation /sister-parks-program.htm](http://www.nps.gov/subjects/internationalcooperation%20/sister-parks-program.htm) Accessed Febuary 23, 2016.

It is widely accepted that most national parks are simply too small to fulfill their mission of preserving natural and cultural resources on their own. Park managers know that to fulfill their mandate, they cannot manage a protected area as an isolated island, but must seek opportunities to partner with neighboring land owners and the local community. National parks around the world are all ultimately linked together by a variety of natural and cultural phenomena. Migratory species such as birds, butterflies, sea turtles, whales and other marine life that breed in parks in North America and Europe migrate through and spend the winter in protected areas throughout Central and South America, Africa and Asia. Air pollution created in one country causes environmental damage to parks in other countries even thousands of miles away.

Non-native invasive species wreak havoc on native flora and fauna. Diseases such as "Mad Cow Disease" are transported around the world in a matter of hours. Many U.S. national parks also preserve and interpret important aspects of the cultural heritage of the various peoples who settled the nation, such Mesa Verde, the Statue of Liberty and New Orleans Jazz.

Several NPS sites have established "sister park" relationships in the last few years with national parks in other countries. These partnerships increase information sharing and direct park-to-park contacts to address many of the common issues mentioned above, primarily through improved telecommunications technologies. Sister Park partnerships, while driven largely by the interests of the individual parks themselves, should only be developed after close consultation with the NPS Office of International Affairs, which will provide advice and guidance.

### Parks Stuff

#### Biodiversity needs to be protected-parks must be established

National Park Service, November 07, 2011, National Park Service establishes many parks and tries to protect nature, “Preserving Biodiversity,” http://www.nature.nps.gov/biology/biodiversity/  
The National Park Service began because people—explorers, artists, politicians, and everyday citizens—recognized something valuable in the vast wildlands of undeveloped America. Today, we recognize the value of not only our lands, but the biodiversity that thrives upon them, as well. Biological diversity (or biodiversity) includes all the living organisms on earth, and in our parks we are finding plants and animals that have disappeared in other parts of the world due to development, habitat fragmentation, climate change, invasive species, and other threats. National parks and other protected places are samples of the world's natural variety, often the last bastion of the earth's wild wealth. They are vital to our future well-being. The values of biodiversity in parks are legion: the value of nature for its own sake, a source of wonder and enjoyment; the value of learning about the workings of nature in places largely free of human influence, for comparison with landscapes dominated by humans; the survival value of multitudes of wild species that flourish as natural systems helping regulate climate, air quality, and cycles of carbon, nitrogen, oxygen, mineral elements, and water—all fundamental to life on Earth. There is economic value in these same plants and animals. They are potential sources of food, medicine, and industrial products. Parks protect the species and their communities that underlie these values—serving if necessary as reservoirs of seed stock for restoring species lost elsewhere. To preserve biodiversity in parks for future generations, we must first discover the breadth of life forms that exist. In the past decade, numerous parks have teamed up with professional scientists, university students, school groups, volunteers and park partners for the purpose of biodiversity discovery. These efforts have identified species new to science, located species that have not been seen in parks in hundreds of years, and documented species that are able to survive in extreme conditions. Working to Preserve Biodiversity The National Park Service also is working to preserve biodiversity more broadly by restoring ecosystems, controlling invasive species, practicing integrated pest management, and through other conservation measures. Preserving biodiversity—from the dung beetle to the grizzly bear—allows us to ensure genetic diversity, understand how the pieces of an intact ecosystem fit together, and detect long-term changes in our environment. In preserving biodiversity we also ensure that our future citizens, artists, and explorers of science experience our lands as the founders of the parks did long ago.

#### Biodiversity parks solve

Volunteer Match, No Date, Volunteer Match tries to protect biodiversity, “National Biodiversity Parks, Inc.,” http://www.volunteermatch.org/search/org69021.jsp#reviews

National Biodiversity Parks (NBP) searches for, and acquires, ecologically valuable properties that can support sustainable, communtiy based business models. We enter negotiations and raise funds to purchase these lands via partnerships and management agreements. NBP applies for and obtaines grants to restore or improve properties for wildlife conservation and sustainability. We perform various studies of birds, reptiles, insects and plants on various lands. Our scientists, naturalists and members lead field trips to biodiverse habitats. NBP sponsors and leads adults and students on bird walks to improve their skills and expose them to nature in order to develop an environmental ethic. We participate in various conservation fundraisers such as bioblitzes, big days and the World Series of Birding. Our members write articles about various subjects. Our education and science department lead various field trips concentrating on ecology and incentive programs, designed by teachers and volunteers. The programs are intended to improve students science skills and confidence through discovery, field birding and ecology. We assist communities in identifying valuable open space assets. Mission Statement Conserve and protect open space, wildlands and the plants and animals on these lands. Provide the public, especially our youth, conservation lands for recreation, study and research. Restore and maintain properties to support maximal biodiversity.

#### Only parks can save biod

Aaron G. Bruner, Raymond E. Gullison, Richard E. Rice, and Gustavo A. B. da Fonseca, January 5, 2001, these authors write for Science Mag, “Effectiveness of Parks in Protecting Tropical Biodiversity,” http://www.sciencemag.org/content/291/5501/125.full#aff-1

Much of tropical biodiversity is unlikely to survive without effective protection (1–3). Conservationists have tried strategies ranging from establishing and maintaining parks and other strictly protected areas (henceforth “parks”), to promoting sustainable forest management and other integrated conservation and development projects. How well do parks measure up among these alternatives (4, 5)? Critics claim that in the context of growing human pressures and development needs, parks cannot protect the biological resources within their borders (6), and there is a widespread sense that parks are simply not working. The accuracy of these claims is of critical importance to policy and funding decisions. If parks are failing despite best efforts, then better options should be sought. If, on the other hand, parks are performing relatively well in a context of serious threats and limited resources, or are simply performing better than the alternatives, their level of support should be increased. Past studies of park effectiveness have focused on improving park management (7), improving protected area system design (8), and increasing local and national political support (9, 10), but none has provided a quantitative assessment of effectiveness using a large sample of parks around the world (11, 12). We used a questionnaire to collect data on land-use pressure (land clearing, logging, hunting, grazing, and fire), local conditions (e.g., presence of human communities in parks and degree of access), and management activities (e.g., number of guards and level of community involvement in management) (13). To confine our sample to parks at risk of failure, we selected regions subject to significant human land-use pressure (14, 15). From these regions, we selected only parks that have been established for at least 5 years to allow sufficient time for management activities to be reflected in park performance. We also restricted the sample to protected areas of >5000 ha in which only nonconsumptive uses were permitted (16, 17). Directors of conservation organizations and protected area agencies helped identify a representative group for this study from the 535 parks that met these criteria (18, 19) [additional information is available on Science Online (20)]. The sample comprised 93 parks (21) in 22 countries (22), covering 17% (18 million ha) of the parks that met our criteria (23). The parks in the sample varied greatly in size, primary ecosystem type, budget, management strategy, and type and degree of threats. Seventy percent had people living inside their boundaries, and 54% had residents who contested the ownership of some percentage of the park area. Two-thirds of the parks were accessible by at least one major road or river (24). Median annual funding was 1.18 USD ha−1, significantly less than the amount often recommended for effective management (25). Finally, respondents judged that many park staff were lacking in critical training and equipment. We assessed the effectiveness of these parks from three perspectives: land clearing within the boundaries of parks since establishment, current condition of parks compared with the condition of their surroundings, and factors correlated with effective park protection. We assessed the effectiveness of parks at preventing land clearing by comparing the current extent of clearing with clearing at the time of park establishment (Fig. 1). We found that 43% of the parks have had no net clearing since establishment. In an additional 40% of parks, land formerly under cultivation was incorporated into park boundaries, and had been able to recover, leading to an actual increase in vegetative cover. Eighty-three percent of parks were therefore fully holding their borders against agricultural encroachment. Only 17% of the parks experienced net clearing since establishment. This is a substantial achievement, given that the median age of the parks in our sample is 23 years. Change in the area of natural vegetation since establishment for 86 tropical parks. The majority of parks have either experienced no net clearing or have actually increased natural vegetative cover. Median park age is 23 years. To test effectiveness over a wider range of threats, we compared anthropogenic impacts in the 10-km belt surrounding parks with the level of impacts within park boundaries for five different threats (Fig. 2). This comparison shows that the parks in our sample are under great pressure from clearing, hunting, and logging, and to a lesser extent, fire and grazing. A comparison of the conditions inside the parks with the surrounding area shows that for all five threats, parks were in significantly better condition than their surrounding areas (Mann-Whitney U-test, medians significantly different atP < 0.006 for all five impacts). Because we used relatively few response categories to represent the entire range of outcomes (e.g., four categories were used to classify the abundance of game animals, ranging from pristine levels of abundance to absent), any differences found between the parks and their surroundings are great. Comparison of the condition of parks to the surrounding 10-km belt. For all five anthropogenic impacts, parks were in significantly better condition than their surrounding areas (Mann-Whitney U-test) (A) Clearing: P = 0.000; (B) logging: P = 0.000; (C) hunting: P = 0.000; (D) fire:P = 0.000; and (E) grazing:P = 0.006. Parks are more effective at mitigating some impacts than others. Parks are in far better condition than their surroundings with respect to land clearing, with the majority of parks being intact or only slightly cleared. Parks were more heavily impacted by logging and hunting, but these impacts were still reduced considerably compared with their surroundings. Finally, although parks were still in significantly better condition than their surroundings with respect to damage from fire and grazing, the differences were less pronounced. The previous comparison treats the sample of parks as a group. We also compared individual parks with their own surroundings to determine what percentage of individual parks are functioning (Table 1). Virtually all parks in our sample are under pressure from clearing, grazing, fire, hunting, and logging, and the majority of parks are effective at least to some degree in mitigating these threats. More than 80% of the individual parks were in better condition than their surroundings for clearing, logging, and fire, including 97% for clearing. About 60% of the parks were in better condition than land outside their borders with respect to hunting and grazing. Park effectiveness against anthropogenic threats. Shown for each threat is the percentage of parks surveyed that are either in better condition (“functioning”) than the surrounding 10-km belt or in equal or worse condition (“not functioning”). Also shown is the percentage of parks with no presence of each threat in the surrounding area (“untested parks”). We also investigated which management activities and local conditions correlated with effectiveness, which we defined as the difference between illegal impacts inside the park and the surrounding 10-km belt. Because units and scales differed among the threats, we rescaled each threat to a value ranging from 1 to 4, and then averaged the effectiveness among the five threats. Average effectiveness was then tested for correlation with management activities and local conditions by means of a nonparametric test (26). Park effectiveness correlated most strongly with density of guards (Table 2). The median density of guards in the 15 most effective parks was more than eight times higher than in the 15 least effective parks (3 guards per 100 km2 in the 15 most effective parks compared with 0.4 guards per 100 km2 in the least effective). However, enforcement capacity (a composite variable of training, equipment, and salary) was not found to correlate with effectiveness, suggesting that these characteristics are less important than the presence of guards. Spearman rank correlations of variables with park effectiveness. Variables that are significantly correlated with effectiveness are shown in bold in the upper portion of the table. Where sample size and type of data permitted, the ratio of the 15 most effective to 15 least effective parks is included to illustrate the difference in magnitude. Effectiveness was also significantly correlated with the level of deterrents to illegal activities in the park. Deterrents were measured as the product of the probability of apprehending violators when guards detected a violation (either in progress or after-the-fact) by the probability of the violator receiving a significant sanction if apprehended. Deterrents against clearing and logging correlated with park effectiveness, whereas deterrents against hunting did not. The degree of border demarcation and the existence of direct compensation programs to local communities (Table 2) were also found to correlate significantly with management effectiveness. Other factors potentially related to park success did not correlate significantly with effectiveness, including number of people living in the park, accessibility, local support, percentage of the park area contested, budget, number of staff working on economic development or education, and local involvement of communities in park management. The findings of this study suggest three basic conclusions. First, the claim that the majority of parks in tropical countries are “paper parks”—i.e., parks in name only—is not substantiated. Tropical parks have been surprisingly effective at protecting the ecosystems and species within their borders in the context of chronic underfunding and significant land-use pressure. They have been especially effective in preventing land clearing, arguably the most serious threat to biodiversity. Second, despite their successes, there is a clear need to increase support for parks to improve effectiveness against all threats, perhaps especially against hunting. Finally, these findings suggest that parks should remain a central component of conservation strategies. Both creating new parks and addressing the tractable problem of making existing parks perform better will make a significant contribution to long-term biodiversity conservation in the tropics.

## zOld

#### Revenues go to Wildlife Restoration funds

Corn and Gravelle 13 [M.Lynne and Jane G. Specialists in Natural Resources/Economic Policy. “Guns, Excise Taxes, and Wildlife Restoration” Congressional Research Service. <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R42992.pdf>. March 12, 2013. 1/12/16] KK

The revenues from these excise taxes go into a special account called the Wildlife Restoration Fund or P-R Fund, administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) in the Department of the Interior.5 Amounts are available for expenditure in the year following their collection. Appropriations from the fund are mandatory spending to the extent of receipts; FWS may deduct administrative expenses from the receipts. There is currently a limit of 3% specified in law for administrative expenses, and the law limits the types of administrative expenses that may be charged to the fund.6 Any interest that may accrue on moneys in the fund before they are spent is allocated to the North American Wetlands Conservation Fund (NAWCF), rather than being retained in the P-R Fund. Distribution of moneys in the fund is by formula. First, $8 million is set aside for Enhanced Hunter Education, which provides for the construction or maintenance of public target ranges, with limits on the maximum and minimum amounts a state or territory may receive. States and territories must match at least 25% of the cost of a project, although the match requirement may be waived for some territories.7 In some cases, states provide more than the minimum match. Second, $3 million is set aside to supplement projects that involve cooperation between or among states. Third, one-half of the excise tax on pistols, revolvers, bows, and arrows (but not firearms) is to be set aside for Basic Hunter Education. In FY2013, this amount is estimated at $71.5 million.8 This portion is also allocated according to a formula among the states and territories, with the same minimum matching requirements. The remaining amount forms the bulk of the program. A small percent of the remainder is allocated first to the territories of American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and Northern Mariana Islands. Then the remainder of the fund is divided in half, with one half allocated in proportion to the area of the state, and the other half in proportion to the number of paid hunting licenses in the state relative to paid hunting licenses in the entire country.9 Together, the Basic Hunter Education program and the Wildlife Restoration grants were $388.2 million in FY2012, and are estimated at $533.8 million in FY2013, again not accounting for the effect of sequestration. (See Figure 1.) A preliminary apportionment is made to the states and territories each October based on early data concerning receipts; a final apportionment of the remainder is made in the following February. With reports of surges in gun sales due to current controversies over guns rights and gun-related violence,10 substantially more funds seem likely to be available in FY2014.