# **Framework**

### 

#### **I value morality, as the word ought in the resolution implies a moral obligation.**

#### **Thus, the value criterion must be maximizing well-being for everyone.**

# 

# 

# 

# **Thus, I negate the resolution**

# **Resolved: In a democracy, a free press ought to prioritize objectivity over advocacy.**

# **First, Some Definitions:**

## **Advocacy, in the context of journalism, is defined as:**

**Oxford Encyclopedia 19**, Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication, 6-25-2019, "Advocacy Journalism," https://oxfordre.com/communication/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228613-e-776/sjjy

A contested term with defenders and critics, advocacy journalism refers to a genre of journalism that combines reporting with a point of view. With roots as far as the origins of journalism itself, as a contemporary practice it can be found—to varying degrees—in all kinds of media outlets across the globe. Its key premise is that journalists participate in the mass-mediated public sphere and that their work deliberately and transparently stands for specific perspectives, with stories actively championing for certain ideas and values. While some authors have labeled advocacy as the binary opposite of objective (factual) reporting, in recent decades several journalism scholars and practitioners have argued that this is not the case, and that advocacy and informing are not necessarily mutually exclusive. At the core of this discussion are normative considerations of how journalism should be, the role of objectivity in news reporting, and professional models shaping news cultures and news content in different regions. Ethical concerns are also common arguments in this debate.

## 

# **DA: Colombian Conflict**

## **Colombian peace reforms have achieved unprecedented success - continued support is key to long lasting peace.**

**United Nations 21**, United Nations Security Council, July 13, 2021, "Nearly Five Years into Colombia’s Historic Peace Agreement, Unprecedented Strides in Justice Marked alongside Lingering Violence, Experts Tell Security Council," United Nations, https://www.un.org/press/en/2021/sc14579.doc.htm/sjjy

Colombia has notched unprecedented achievements in transitional justice as the fifth anniversary of its landmark peace agreement approaches, the senior United Nations official in the country told the Security Council today, as delegates noted both strides and lingering challenges that led recently to large-scale protests across the country.

Carlos Ruiz Massieu, the Secretary-General’s Special Representative and Head of the United Nations Verification Mission in Colombia, briefed the Council on the Secretary-General’s latest report (document [S/2021/603](http://undocs.org/S/2021/603)), noting that the peace process in Colombia stands at a critical juncture nearly five years after the signing of its Final Peace Agreement — which formally ended more than fifty years of civil conflict — in 2016. The reconciliation process achieved a new milestone in April, when former combatants from the now-defunct Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia-Ejército del Pueblo (FARC-EP) armed group accepted responsibility for crimes against humanity and war crimes involving hostage-taking and other serious deprivations of liberty.

He also noted that the Special Jurisdiction for Peace indicted 11 former army officials and a civilian for crimes involving assassination and forced disappearances presented as deaths in combat. Further, hundreds of victims’ bodies have been found thanks to information provided by former guerrillas, paramilitary actors and State agents, which has given their families “tranquillity after years of painful uncertainty”. He said all of those developments — which were unthinkable in Colombia until recently — have been possible thanks to the Final Peace Agreement.

It will take time, he continued, to disarm the structure and identities inherited from the five-decades-long conflict and achieve reconciliation. Noting that the Verification Mission plays an important role in ensuring compliance with sentences handed down by the Special Jurisdiction for Peace, which is Colombia’s transitional justice mechanism, he voiced concern over continued violence against former FARC-EP members and members of the new FARC political party ahead of 2022 elections. In that context, he urged Colombian society and institutions to view the Final Peace Agreement as an opportunity to help tackle the longstanding issues facing the country.

## **Advocacy for peace is critical to sustained Columbian reconstruction efforts. Peace Journalism solves threats to continued reform.**

**Assaf 18**, Maria Assaf, 23 February 2018, "Conflict transformation through peace journalism in Colombia," Oxford Brookes University, https://radar.brookes.ac.uk/radar/file/b2b20fe4-94aa-40c8-9a98-4b1f276aa97f/1/Peace%20Journalism%20an%20opportunity%20for%20Colombian%20conflict%20transformation.pdf/sjjy

Peace journalism, as defined by scholar Vladimir Bratic, is a revolutionary movement in conflict and international reporting that appeared as a result of the increasingly destructive nature of post-Cold War conflicts during the last decade of the 1900s. Ethnic conflicts, such as the Yugoslav genocide in the post Cold War period caused many to challenge the until then sacrosanct ideas of press objectivity, which sustain that the media should never take a political stance. The term peace journalism became popularised when at the end of the 1990s, Martin Bell, a former BBC war correspondent, shocked the world by saying that a certain type of journalism should emerge that should no longer be purely objective. Instead, it should be engaged and attached (Bratic-Ross-Kang-Graham, 2008). In the case of Colombia, peace journalism needs to promote a pro-peace agenda. The ideal role of peace journalists in a conflict situation In Colombia, peace journalism should highlight issues of conflict transformation, promote a cultural exchange among conflicting ethnic and socio-economic groups, and denounce and combat the discrimination and stigmatisation of those who have suffered the most during this civil conflict: the indigenous, the afro-Colombians and the “campesinos” or peasants. These populations are most of the 5.3 million internally displaced people in the country (ABColombia, 2012). As key actors in any conflict, as outlined in Reporting the World, it is not illogical to ask the journalistic profession to play a positive role even if it is political. “The news is already involved, it is argued, as a factor in calculations influencing the behaviour of parties to a conflict, whether its practitioners welcome it or not. The choices are about the ethics of that involvement.” (Lynch, 2002 p.6). In the case of Colombia, both the national and international media should aim to portray accurately and sensitively the marginal voices that have been misinterpreted or censored for centuries. A 1984 UNESCO-funded MacBride Report, Many Voices One World, reminded the international media of its role in peacekeeping: “… beyond national interests, there is the supreme interest of humanity in peace”. (Carruthers, 2000, p. 27). A pro-peace attitude by the media is particularly important if the country is to effectively move toward a post-conflict sphere. Despite the hope that the peace agreement brought, many challenges remain. New armed groups are emerging in the margins of the peace process, such as the right-wing Army Against Land Restitution (Movice, 2015). One of the main issues in the Colombian conflict has been the lack of accurate historical accounts about what has happened during the 50 years of the conflict. This has been in part due to the harassment and killings of reporters who touched the subject of the war. There are particular gaps in Colombia’s official history about the role of the government in the war and its historical collaboration with paramilitary armies and narco-traffic groups. Reporting on these issues is of utmost importance. Lynch (2002, p. 11) outlined the important role of the media when he wrote: “… every time a reporter reports the facts, it adds another layer to the collective understanding of how reporters are likely to report similar facts in the future. That understanding in turn feeds into the actions of parties to a conflict, concerned to hold the public’s interest on their own terms and prepared to calibrate their policies in order to do so”. Lynch (2002, p. 11). The peace agreement and the international interest it brought to Colombia may be the shield Colombian reporters had been missing in the past. Instances of adequate historical recollection are beginning to take place in areas of Colombia in which the fighting has subsided. In Trujillo, a town in Valle del Cauca that rose to public notoriety for the terrible massacres that took place there throughout the 1980s, a victims’ association named AFAVIT, created a museum to honour their lost love ones (AFAVIT, 2010). Their efforts are joined by national initiatives that seek to honour the memories of survivors, such as the Centro Nacional de Memoría Histórica. In today’s context, the survivors have gone from being casualty numbers that the national audiences had grown insensitive to, into becoming actors of change. However well or badly, the media at a national level is beginning to cover issues about the peace process, land restitution and victim reparation (El Tiempo, 2014). This is a positive development considering the decades-long denial that a civil conflict was taking place.

**Objective Journalism would escalate conflicts - 3 warrants**

**McGoldrick 06**, [Annabel McGoldrick is an experienced reporter and producer in television and radio news. She has reported from conflict zones in Indonesia, the Philippines, the Middle East, Thailand and Burma. She has led training courses for professional editors and reporters in many countries, and has taught postgraduate students at the universities of Sydney and Queensland, Australia. Her film, News from the Holy Land (2004) and book, Peace Journalism (2005) are published by Hawthorn Press. She is also a trained psychotherapist specialising in trauma and the reporting of conflict.] 2006, "War Journalism and ‘Objectivity’" Regener, https://regener-online.de/journalcco/2006\_2/pdf/mcgoldrick.pdf/sjjy

Journalism matching these criteria lent itself to being marketed in a consumer society (Bagdikian 2000), because it avoided putting off potential consumers among the educated classes.

But what to do about the subjective aspects of the job? The choices facing reporters and editors are endless. Why this story, and not another? Then, once you have decided that, why interview this person, or use that organisation as a source of information and not another? This issue was defused, as the methods of Objective Journalism hardened into industry conventions, by the habit of indexing – projecting such basic decisions onto an external frame of reference that was not, apparently, of the journalist’s own making. Indexing Official Sources

In practice, that often meant tracking the agenda set by official sources – governments, the police and courts, financial authorities and so on. Leading, say, the television evening news, or the front page of the New York Times, with a report of a speech by President Bush on Iraq, need not be taken to mean that the programme or the paper agrees with him. His comments can be presented as newsworthy – whatever he actually says – because he’s the President, and the most pow- erful man in the land. Still a subjective interpretation, of what constitutes the most meaningful fact of that particular day – but one chosen on a seemingly ‘neutral’ basis, and one which is deeply embedded in the structures and practices of news:

“Journalism’s criteria of newsworthiness and factuality, and its routines of newsgathering anchored in bureaucratic institutions with des- ignated spokespeople and prescheduled routines, are mutually constitutive. Taken together, they tend to ensure routine and privileged access for bureaucrats and agency officials, who provide the “hard facts”, credible claims and background information for Objective reporting” (Hackett and Zhao 1998, p. 78).

For these reasons, a bias in favour of official sources is probably still the single most widespread convention in global news. Go to any capital city in the world, pick up a copy of the main newspaper, and there’s a good chance that the deeds and pronouncements of that country’s political leaders will be on or near the front page.

Lynch and McGoldrick argue that there are three ways in which news said to be Objective fuels further violence.

“Three conventions of Objective reporting, in particular, are predisposed towards War Journalism. Their ‘natural drift’, as it were, is to lead us – or leave us – to over-value violent, reactive responses to conflict, and under-value non-violent, developmental ones:

• A bias in favour of official sources • A bias in favour of event over process • A bias in favour of ‘dualism’ in reporting conflicts” (Lynch and McGoldrick 2005, p. 209).

The problem is that news is, by its very nature, preoccupied with change, yet it has a very fixed and one-dimensional un- derstanding of how change comes about. Built into it is an orientation in favour of realism and ignores the insights of Peace and Conflict Studies, which argue that there are many ways to bring about change in a conflict, many ‘levers’ to pull. Later I will suggest that anyone working to intervene in the Cycle of Violence, for example, can be regarded as a ‘change agent’.

But the Objectivity conventions mean we hear relatively little about them, compared with official sources – a category topped by leaders of national states. Max Weber provided a well-known definition: the state is “a human community that (successfully) claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory” (Weber 1946, p.78). We- ber’s argument was that a state could only be defined in terms of means rather than ends. States could not be said to be for anything, necessarily; they were better conceived in terms of their observable characteristics than assumptions about their purpose.

Weber’s formulation has been seen as neutral, even normative – the word, ‘legitimate’ has seemed, to some, to suggest a benign hand, guaranteeing security for all citizens. But these are concepts later interrogated and revised by researchers in Peace and Conflict Studies. What if the effect of state action favours the interests of some citizens, and not others? In the words of veteran Australian peace researcher, John W Burton, the very notion of ‘conflict resolution’ is only admissible if conflict is understood as attributable not to “inherent human aggressiveness” but to “the emergence of inappropriate social institutions and norms that reasonably would seem to be well within human capacities to alter, to which the person has problems in adjustment” (Burton 1998).

Perhaps Burton’s cardinal insight is that there is more to human relations than power – there are also human needs, in- cluding the basics of food, drinking water and shelter from the elements, certainly, but also intangibles such as identity, recognition and respect. If the institutions and norms of a state entrench power relations of a kind that deny these human needs to any or all of its citizens, ‘the person’ will inevitably resist them. In those circumstances, what Burton calls the ‘deterrent strategies’ of the state take on an altogether more sinister aspect.

Once deterrent strategies – such as the $560bn Pentagon budget – are put in place, they inevitably alter the nature of power relations. Missiles have to be fired and replaced in order to maintain ‘defence capacities’ – rich and powerful interests are not served by allowing military hardware to gather dust. Prisons have to be filled to generate orders for correctional corporations to build more. So norms and institutions come to be influenced in favour of wars overseas and punitive criminal justice policies at home – variants on what President Dwight D Eisenhower called the “military-industrial complex” (Eisen- hower, 1960).

Then the number of levers under the control of the leaders of national states has diminished in recent times. Industry has globalised, public services have been marketised and/or privatised and economic policy-making has become increasingly contingent on events elsewhere. Hence there may be more emphasis on the levers they do control, including the ability to set the news agenda and also the deployment of armed forces.

British Prime Minister Tony Blair has pitched the UK into more armed conflicts than any other – Kosovo, Sierra Leone, Iraq, Afghanistan – and is said to admire the armed forces for their “professionalism” (Brogan 2003). Their stock-in-trade being, of course, to follow orders, in marked contrast to Blair’s experience with other areas of the public sector where change has to be negotiated and efforts at reform had left him with “scars on his back” (Watt 1999).

It all means that a reliance on official sources may, of necessity, predispose the coverage of conflict towards War Journal- ism. Military deployment always seems to move, as if by osmosis, on to the news agenda. Calls for collaborative effort to enforce international law, or building solidarity at the level of civil society – even, latterly, accepting as final the will of the UN – always seem to have to be justified afresh from first principles.

A bias in favour of event over process

A news story is supposed to answer six basic questions: • Who? • What? • When? • Where? • Why? • How?

Most stories only deal superficially – if at all – with the ‘why’. Many journalists argue that that it would make the story too long. But people can only begin to think themselves out of a conflict if they understand the underlying issues. The important thing to note here is that without some exploration of underlying causes, violence can be left to appear, by default, as the only response that ‘makes sense’. Wars remain opaque, in the sense that we are given no means to see through the vio- lence to problems that lie beneath. It therefore makes no sense to hear from anyone wanting those problems to be ad- dressed and set right, as a contribution to ending or avoiding violence.

A bias in favour of dualism

One safe way to insulate oneself against allegations of bias is to ‘hear both sides’. It means the journalist cannot be seen as ‘the voice of any particular party or sect’. By tradition, classic BBC reporting, for instance, is said to adopt the formula:

“On the one hand ... on the other ... in the end, only time will tell” (Kampfner 2003).

But this inscribes a paradigm of dualism that frames out multiparty initiatives, complex causes and win-win situations. Du- alism is a key part of Objectivity but also, for these reasons, a major contributory factor in the way in which it escalates a conflict, by turning it into a tug of war in which each party faces only two alternatives – victory or defeat. Their words and deeds must be unequivocally ‘winning’ if they are not to risk being reported as ‘losing’, ‘backsliding’ or ‘going soft’.

Findings from researchers in Peace and Conflict Studies provide abundant evidence that this dualistic model of conflict is seldom, if ever, the whole picture; there are always third (or more) parties whose involvement may be hidden; and within the parties, there are fault lines and differentiations which open up the scope for more creative conceptualisations of the issues at stake (Francis, 2002).

## 

## 

## 

## **Without peace reforms, Colombian civil war draws in Venezuela**

**Ebus 21**, Bram Ebus, 28 Apr 2021, "A rebel playing field: Colombian guerrillas on the Venezuelan border," ReliefWeb, https://reliefweb.int/report/venezuela-bolivarian-republic/rebel-playing-field-colombian-guerrillas-venezuelan-border/sjjy

In the early hours of 21 March, the screech of combat aircraft overhead sounded the alarm that Venezuela has become a theatre in Colombia’s decades-long internal conflict. That morning, the Venezuelan military launched its first large-scale operation against a dissident faction of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) active inside Apure, a Venezuelan state hugging the Colombian frontier from the Andes in the west, along the Meta River, to the Orinoco River in the east. This action kickstarted a series of skirmishes that so far have reportedly claimed the lives of at least eight Venezuelan troops – with an unspecified number of additional losses reported last weekend – and nine alleged Colombian guerrillas. Relations between the two countries, already poor, have declined a notch further as leaders in Bogotá and Caracas swap insults and blame each other for the civilians displaced by the fighting. Meanwhile, both are dispatching reinforcements to border posts. The events in Apure have at times dominated headlines in both countries, drawing attention to what is happening more quietly along much of the border: Colombian guerrillas are penetrating deeper into Venezuelan territory.

Bouts of violence have long been the norm along the 2,200km Colombia-Venezuela border. The last few years, however, have marked a perilous escalation, dragging in more rebel and military forces, as well as an array of traffickers and criminals. On one side of the border, Venezuela is suffering the worst economic and humanitarian crisis in its history. On the other, Colombia is saddled with the remnants of over 50 years of conflict, which the government’s 2016 peace accord with the FARC was meant to end. Although the FARC disarmed under the deal, some former members now fight as part of dissident groups formed in its wake.

## **Venezuela is key to Russian ambitions in Latin America - Russia would intervene in war.**

**Torres 22**, Guido L. Torres, 1-24-2022, "Nonlinear Warfare: Is Russia Waging a Silent War in Latin America?," No Publication, https://smallwarsjournal.com/jrnl/art/nonlinear-warfare-russia-waging-silent-war-latin-america/sjjy

While the U.S. and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) support Ukraine and many Eastern European countries in the region, Russia is obliged to look for counterbalances in areas where it feels it can compete effectively. Latin America is one of those regions where Russia has profound historical partnerships, such as Cuba, while growing ones where they can stage and compete with America (e.g., Venezuela). The complete deterioration of Venezuela under the Hugo Chavez, and now, Nicolas Maduro regimes provide Russia with bargaining prospects in terms of U.S.-Ukraine relations (Sitenko 2016). Moreover, Russia seeks to undermine the U.S. at any opportunity that presents itself. Gaining influence in America’s near-abroad allows Russia to weaken developing democracies and create dilemmas for U.S. policymakers. Arguably, no partnership is more valued to the U.S. in Latin America than Colombia, where the two nations have battled cartels, paramilitaries, guerrillas, and drug traffickers for nearly 40 years. As a result, Colombia is the model for U.S. influence and support in the hemisphere. The success of U.S. Special Operations irregular warfare investments has projected Colombian SOF as a regional powerhouse. The nation has grown into a flourishing democracy and is now even an exporter of security in the region. Still, Colombia is riddled with battle scars from its challenges with guerillas, human rights, and socioeconomic disparity. These volatilities create the ideal scenario for Russian interference and its nonlinear warfare strategy. Understanding Russia’s approach to Colombia can illuminate their methodology in the hemisphere against U.S. allies and partners, allowing the development of indicators to detect similar activities throughout the region.

## **Russian action in Venezuela would prompt a sharp US response - goes nuclear**

**Courtney 19**, William Courtney 19,January 8, 2019, "In Venezuela, a Potential U.S.-Russian Crisis?," RAND, https://www.rand.org/blog/2019/01/in-venezuela-a-potential-us-russian-crisis.html/sjjy

In December, two supersonic nuclear-capable Russian bombers visited Venezuela, the third such excursion for the warplanes since 2008. Might Moscow intend to pose a threat, perhaps even nuclear, to the Western Hemisphere? If so, how could Washington respond?

Washington is paying attention to Russia's actions in Venezuela, but perhaps not how Moscow intends. Of the flight of Tu-160s, Secretary of State Mike Pompeo tweeted, “the Russian and Venezuelan people should see this for what it is: two corrupt governments squandering public funds, and squelching liberty.”

The Kremlin may have wanted the flight to send a more intimidating message, as Russian news sources have stated. The show of force came just after Venezuela's leftist president Nicolas Maduro met with President Vladimir Putin in Moscow.

Russian Defense Minister Sergei Shoigu promised additional aircraft and warship visits to Venezuela during Maduro's trip to Moscow.

Each of Russia's roughly 18 Tu-160s can carry up to 24 nuclear- and conventionally armed missiles. In 2015, several Tu-160s flew a flashy 8,000-mile route from Russia around Europe and over the Mediterranean Sea to fire missiles into Syria. A newer version of the Tu-160 is in the works.

Putin's nuclear rhetoric raises further concerns. In 2015, Putin said he was ready to bring nuclear forces into play in the 2014 Crimea operation. Last March he spoke of new, “invincible” nuclear missiles, showing a video graphic of an attack on Florida.

On Dec. 20, Putin warned of a rising threat of nuclear war, and a week later oversaw a flight test of a new hypersonic missile. He called it an “excellent” New Year's gift.

How might the U.S. respond to any increased Russian military activity in Venezuela?

Continued, infrequent combat aircraft or warship visits to Venezuela might not raise anxiety. As an example, in 2008, a Russian guided missile cruiser and anti-submarine warfare ship visited Venezuela.

More frequent visits of combat aircraft or warships, or the stationing of large numbers of Russian military personnel, might spur a sharper reaction. Washington could consider mobilizing Latin American pressures, expanding sanctions, limiting imports of Venezuelan oil or boosting U.S. naval presence in the region.

Some in Washington might argue that any greater Russian military presence in Venezuela could trigger a tougher response under President James Monroe's proclamation in 1823 that the U.S. would regard as hostile any European attempt to oppress or control a state in the hemisphere.

But the meaning today of the Monroe Doctrine is in doubt. In 2013, Secretary of State John Kerry said it had come to an end, but last year (2018) Secretary of State Rex Tillerson said it was “as relevant today” as the day it was written.

If any expanded Russian presence in Venezuela were to have a possible nuclear dimension, Washington's response could be stronger. This might happen if there were a near-constant presence in Venezuela of aircraft or warships of a type associated with a nuclear mission, such as long-range bombers or submarines.

The appearance of infrastructure, such as command and control systems that in Russia support aircraft or warships associated with a nuclear mission, would also cause great concern. Other examples could be security cordons or storage bunkers akin to those in Russia associated with nuclear weapons.

Some in Washington could view any such moves as violating the ban on introducing offensive (meaning nuclear) forces into the region, as stipulated in the Kennedy-Khrushchev Understanding that ended the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis.

Although the understanding did not reference other countries, some in Washington could argue its relevance. Since 1962, Moscow has continued occasional visits to the Western Hemisphere by ships and planes associated with a nuclear mission.

But if Russia were to seek to station nuclear forces or infrastructure in the hemisphere, a major diplomatic military crisis could develop.

## **Nuke war causes extinction AND outweighs other existential risks**

**PND 16**. internally citing Zbigniew Brzezinski, Council of Foreign Relations and former national security adviser to President Carter, Toon and Robock’s 2012 study on nuclear winter in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, Gareth Evans’ International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament Report, Congressional EMP studies, studies on nuclear winter by Seth Baum of the Global Catastrophic Risk Institute and Martin Hellman of Stanford University, and U.S. and Russian former Defense Secretaries and former heads of nuclear missile forces, brief submitted to the United Nations General Assembly, Open-Ended Working Group on nuclear risks. A/AC.286/NGO/13. 05-03-2016. http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/images/documents/Disarmament-fora/OEWG/2016/Documents/NGO13.pdf //Re-cut by Elmer

Consequences human survival 12. Even if the 'other' side does NOT launch in response the smoke from 'their' burning cities (incinerated by 'us') will still make 'our' country (and the rest

of the world) uninhabitable, potentially inducing global famine lasting up to decades. Toon and Robock note in ‘Self Assured Destruction’, in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists 68/5, 2012, that: 13. “A nuclear war between Russia and the United States, even after the arsenal reductions planned under New START, could produce a nuclear winter. Hence, an attack by either side could be suicidal, resulting in self assured destruction. Even a 'small' nuclear war between India and Pakistan, with each country detonating 50 Hiroshima-size atom bombs--only about 0.03 percent of the global nuclear arsenal's explosive power--as air bursts in urban areas, could produce so much smoke that temperatures would fall below those of the Little Ice Age of the fourteenth to nineteenth centuries, shortening the growing season around the world and threatening the global food supply. Furthermore, there would be massive ozone depletion, allowing more ultraviolet radiation to reach Earth's surface. Recent studies predict that agricultural production in parts of the United States and China would decline by about 20 percent for four years, and by 10 percent for a decade.” 14. A conflagration involving USA/NATO forces and those of Russian federation would most likely cause the deaths of most/nearly all/all humans (and severely impact/extinguish other species) as well as destroying the delicate interwoven techno-structure on which latter-day 'civilization' has come to depend. Temperatures would drop to below those of the last ice-age for up to 30 years as a result of the lofting of up to 180 million tonnes of very black soot into the stratosphere where it would remain for decades. 15. Though human ingenuity and resilience shouldn't be underestimated, human survival itself is arguably problematic, to put it mildly, under a 2000+ warhead USA/Russian federation scenario. 16. The Joint Statement on Catastrophic Humanitarian Consequences signed October 2013 by 146 governments mentioned 'Human Survival' no less than 5 times. The most recent (December 2014) one gives it a highly prominent place. Gareth Evans’ ICNND (International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament) Report made it clear that it saw the threat posed by nuclear weapons use as one that at least threatens what we now call 'civilization' and that potentially threatens human survival with an immediacy that even climate change does not, though we can see the results of climate change here and now and of course the immediate post-nuclear results for Hiroshima and Nagasaki as well.