## 2NC Impact Overview

Causes Extinction

Major David N. Diner is a JAG for the US Army, Winter 1994 [Military Law Review <http://www.stormingmedia.us/14/1456/A145654.html>]

By causing widespread extinctions, humans have artificially simplified many ecosystems.   As biologic simplicity increases, so does the risk of ecosystem failure.   The spreading Sahara Desert in Africa, and the dustbowl conditions of the 1930s in the United States are relatively mild examples of what might be expected if this trend continues. Theoretically, each new animal or plant extinction, with all its dimly perceived and intertwined effects, could cause total ecosystem collapse and human extinction.   Each new extinction increases the risk of disaster. Like a mechanic removing, one by one, the rivets from an aircraft's wings, mankind may be edging closer to the abyss.

#### Failure to act within the next couple of years makes warming irreversible

Graeme Taylor, Master’s degree in Conflict Analysis and Management, Coordinator of BEST Future, 2008[“Evolution’s Edge: The Coming Collapse and Transformation of Our World,” Pomegranate Press, pg. 39]

The UN’s Human Development Report 2007/2008was blunter: “There is now overwhelming scientific evidence that the world is moving towards the point at which irreversible ecological catastrophe becomes unavoidable …. There is a window of opportunity for avoiding the most damaging climate change impacts, but that window is closing: the world has less than a decade to change course.”39 In reality we probably do not have even 10 years to stop catastrophic global warming — recent authoritative studies indicate that global warming is accelerating three times faster than the worst forecasts of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.40For example, American studies indicate that rather than sea levels rising by around 15.75” (40 cm) by 2100 as predicted by the IPCC, the true rise may be as much as 78” (2 meters) — an amount that will inundate islands and major coastal cities around the world. Dr. James Hansen, the director of NASA’s Goddard Institute for Space Studies said, “[T]he Earth is getting perilously close to climate changes that could run out of control.”41 This is serious stuff. The evidence not only indicates that climate change will do massive environmental and economic damage in the coming decades, but that the survival of most life on Earth is threatened by runaway global warming.

#### b)Intervening actors check back war- you can negotiate with rational political leaders but you can’t reason with the environment. Any leader trying to launch nuclear weapons would be assassinated.

**Walsh 85** (Edward, Lieutenant Colonel in the United States Air Force, “Nuclear War Opposing Viewpoints, p. 51)

No president or dictator, madman or otherwise would take it upon himself [sic] to launch an all out nuclear attack without due consultation with his [sic] staff. It is a natural human phenomenon that there would be certain members of this staff with an invincible sense of survival who would resort to assassination before allowing themselves and their nation to be subjected to a retaliatory holocaust.

#### We control magnitude-

#### Nuclear deterrence prevents great power wars.

G. John Ikenberry, Professor of Politics at Princeton, 11 [Albert G. Milbank Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University, “A World of Our Making”, Issue #21, Summer 2011, http://www.democracyjournal.org/21/a-world-of-our-making-1.php?page=all]

There are four reasons to think that some type of updated and reorganized liberal international order will persist. First, the old and traditional mechanism for overturning international order—great-power war—is no longer likely to occur. Already, the contemporary world has experienced the longest period of great-power peace in the long history of the state system. This absence of great-power war is no doubt due to several factors not present in earlier eras, namely nuclear deterrence and the dominance of liberal democracies. Nuclear weapons—and the deterrence they generate—give great powers some confidence that they will not be dominated or invaded by other major states. They make war among major states less rational and there-fore less likely. This removal of great-power war as a tool of overturning international order tends to reinforce the status quo. The United States was lucky to have emerged as a global power in the nuclear age, because rival great powers are put at a disadvantage if they seek to overturn the American-led system. The cost-benefit calculation of rival would-be hegemonic powers is altered in favor of working for change within the system. But, again, the fact that great-power deterrence also sets limits on the projection of American power presumably makes the existing international order more tolerable. It removes a type of behavior in the system—war, invasion, and conquest between great powers—that historically provided the motive for seeking to overturn order. If the violent over-turning of international order is removed, a bias for continuity is introduced into the system.

#### And No nuclear winter or extinction.

**Nyquist**, 5/20/**1999** (J.R. – contributing editor and author of Origins of the Fourth World War, Is Nuclear War Survivable, p. http://www.antipas.org/news/world/nuclear\_war.html)

The truth is, many prominent physicists have condemned the nuclear winter hypothesis. Nobel laureate Freeman Dyson once said of nuclear winter research, “It’s an absolutely atrocious piece of science, but I quite despair of setting the public record straight.” Professor Michael McElroy, a Harvard physics professor, also criticized the nuclear winter hypothesis. McElroy said that nuclear winter researchers “stacked the deck” in their study, which was titled “Nuclear Winter: Global Consequences of Multiple Nuclear Explosions” (Science, December 1983). Nuclear winter is the theory that the mass use of nuclear weapons would create enough smoke and dust to blot out the sun, causing a catastrophic drop in global temperatures. According to Carl Sagan, in this situation the earth would freeze. No crops could be grown. Humanity would die of cold and starvation. In truth, natural disasters have frequently produced smoke and dust far greater than those expected from a nuclear war. In 1883 Krakatoa exploded with a blast equivalent to 10,000 one-megaton bombs, a detonation greater than the combined nuclear arsenals of planet earth. The Krakatoa explosion had negligible weather effects. Even more disastrous, going back many thousands of years, a meteor struck Quebec with the force of 17.5 million one-megaton bombs, creating a crater 63 kilometers in diameter. But the world did not freeze. Life on earth was not extinguished. Consider the views of Professor George Rathjens of MIT, a known antinuclear activist, who said, “Nuclear winter is the worst example of misrepresentation of science to the public in my memory.” Also consider Professor Russell Seitz, at Harvard University’s Center for International Affairs, who says that the nuclear winter hypothesis has been discredited. Two researchers, Starley Thompson and Stephen Schneider, debunked the nuclear winter hypothesis in the summer 1986 issue of Foreign Affairs. Thompson and Schneider stated: “the global apocalyptic conclusions of the initial nuclear winter hypothesis can now be relegated to a vanishingly low level of probability.” OK, so nuclear winter isn’t going to happen. What about nuclear fallout? Wouldn’t the radiation from a nuclear war contaminate the whole earth, killing everyone? The short answer is: absolutely not. Nuclear fallout is a problem, but we should not exaggerate its effects. As it happens, there are two types of fallout produced by nuclear detonations. These are: 1) delayed fallout; and 2) short-term fallout. According to researcher Peter V. Pry, “Delayed fallout will not, contrary to popular belief, gradually kill billions of people everywhere in the world.” Of course, delayed fallout would increase the number of people dying of lymphatic cancer, leukemia, and cancer of the thyroid. “However,” says Pry, “these deaths would probably be far fewer than deaths now resulting from ... smoking, or from automobile accidents.” The real hazard in a nuclear war is the short-term fallout. This is a type of fallout created when a nuclear weapon is detonated at ground level. This type of fallout could kill millions of people, depending on the targeting strategy of the attacking country. But short-term fallout rapidly subsides to safe levels in 13 to 18 days. It is not permanent. People who live outside of the affected areas will be fine. Those in affected areas can survive if they have access to underground shelters. In some areas, staying indoors may even suffice. Contrary to popular misconception, there were no documented deaths from short-term or delayed fallout at either Hiroshima or Nagasaki. These blasts were low airbursts, which produced minimal fallout effects. Today’s thermonuclear weapons are even “cleaner.” If used in airburst mode, these weapons would produce few (if any) fallout casualties.