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### Advantage

#### The Advantage is Indopak war

#### First, Health Infrastructure in India is collapsing due to lack of accessibility to vaccines – the second wave of pandemic is spreading to neighbors and newer variants exploit every problem
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The **covid-19 crisis in India** is a massive setback for the entire world. The scale of the nation’s surge is a warning not only for its neighboring countries, which are also experiencing **sharp increases in cases**, but also for countries around the globe. If we do not heed this warning and work on vaccine equity, we risk a forever pandemic with long-term cycles of lockdowns, economic damage and constant fear. India is reporting more than 380,000 cases and 3,500 deaths daily. Both are underestimates. The **Indian health-care system** is **completely overwhelmed**. It is **impossible to find hospital beds**. **Supplies** such as oxygen **are** incredibly **scarce**, and there is a huge backlog with diagnostic testing. Many people with sick family members and friends in India — including us — are checking in on them. This time around, younger people are sick and, as is always the case, the poor are hit the hardest. The **devastating second wave** in India **is** the **result of** a perfect storm: a failure to plan for a second wave; premature relaxation of public health measures; large gatherings; **insufficient vaccination** coverage; and newer variants such as B.1.1.7 and B.1.617 that are highly transmissible and potentially more severe. India has 95,000 intensive care beds and 48,000 ventilators. By mid-May, it is projected that the country will need 340,000 beds and more than 700,000 ventilators. Rural India has few of these and is already hit hard. India needs the global community’s support to survive this crisis. Even as India struggles to get the second wave under control, **cases are surging among India’s neighbors**, including Nepal, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka. While the exact variant driving the new surges among India’s neighbors is unclear, the B.1.617 variant has already spread to more than 18 countries. Other **countries in South Asia have** far **less resources** and medical infrastructure **compared with India**. Nepal, for example, has 1,486 ICU beds and 634 ventilators , and Nepal’s health ministry is anticipating a need to treat 15,000 ICU patients by July. Bangladesh, home to 163 million people, has only 1,134 covid-19 ICU beds. Pakistan, the fifth-largest country in the world, has fewer than 4,000 ventilators. India’s neighbors can ill afford the kind of devastation India is experiencing. **Vaccination coverage** in these countries **is too low to prevent surges**. Pakistan, Bangladesh and Nepal have vaccinated 1 percent, 3.5 percent and 7 percent of their populations, respectively, with a single dose. And vaccination numbers are not likely to ramp up soon, given that India is now prioritizing domestic vaccination efforts. India’s vaccine supply to Covax, the World Health Organization’s initiative to send vaccines to developing countries, is now in jeopardy. Another truly frightening scenario is the **spread of the more transmissible** and **lethal variants** to low-income countries, especially on the South American and African continents. The uncontrolled outbreak in Brazil (driven by the aggressive P.1 variant) has already posed a threat for many South American countries. Most countries in Africa have **limited health infrastructure** and **cannot** possibly **deal with** the severe disease typical of the **newer variants**. As the variant that emerged in South Africa has shown, the continent has limited capacity for such surges. It is estimated that there are fewer than 2,000 ventilators across 41 African countries. Ten African countries have none at all. Only about 2 percent of the vaccine doses administered to date globally have been in Africa, and poorer countries might not be vaccinated until 2024. The entire continent is therefore highly vulnerable to the newer variants that are causing havoc in Asia and South America. If African leaders and the general public give up on public health measures, they might see the kind of devastating surge that South Asia is experiencing. No country is safe. It has become painfully clear that newer variants of the virus have transformed the nature of this pandemic. We cannot just vaccinate rich countries and hope that we will be safe. The only way to end this pandemic is to end it everywhere. Otherwise, we will forever play whack-a-mole with a constantly mutating virus. History will not be kind to us if we do not ensure global access to covid-19 vaccines. The rollout of highly effective vaccines in record time is one of the greatest triumphs of science. But the **hoarding of vaccines and** roadblocks around sharing **raw materials** and information on how to make these vaccines globally **will be** seen as our biggest **strategic mistake**. **Global leaders must** collaborate, **waive intellectual property rights**, share technology, and allow and support more countries **to manufacture vaccines**. Sharing of the mRNA vaccine recipe is critical, since these vaccines can be quickly redesigned to keep up with the newer variants. India is a cautionary tale for the world. It is proof that we cannot fight this pandemic country by country. By the time we put out one fire, we will have to fight another. World leaders must think beyond their borders and do the right thing for all of humanity.

#### And this Covid surge has spelt economic disparity where India’s instability is escalating tensions and sparking standoffs which could explode due to deteriorating relations with China sparking worry, miscalculation and escalation
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Last week, as the magnitude of the second wave of India’s coronavirus surge became increasingly clear to the world, U.S. policymakers soon began to appreciate the strategic implications of India’s national trauma. Over the weekend, President Joe Biden and his top officials [publicly pledged](https://twitter.com/POTUS/status/1386401947729633280?s=20) their commitments to send medical supplies, including oxygen, vaccine materials, and therapeutics to India, while seeking additional ways to address India’s crisis. **COVID-19** already inflicted a **crushing blow to India’s economy** last year. A national lockdown instituted by Prime Minister Narendra Modi at the early stages of the global pandemic was intended to relieve the stresses on Indian’s inadequate healthcare system, but it also delivered a [24 percent contraction in the economy](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/08/31/world/asia/india-economy-gdp.html) and led millions of migrant day laborers to flee India’s cities for lack of work. Through the late fall and winter, it seemed that somehow India would escape the worst of the pandemic, but that hope has now been dashed by a **devastating** combination of **new viral strains** and inadequate public health preparations**. India** now **faces** this wave of the virus exhausted and depleted. The Biden administration clearly [appreciates](https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/covid-19-india-is-going-through-very-terrible-situation-says-dr-anthony-fauci/articleshow/82229075.cms) that the magnitude of India’s crisis turns it into a **global crisis**. With over **1.3 billion people**, India alone counts for one-sixth of humanity. And India’s crisis will not be contained within its borders. New viral strains out of India could worsen the **health threat** to all. Other second-order economic consequences will follow; at the very least, India’s lost economic productivity will **hurt global trade** and investment. Yet the geopolitical implicationsof India’s tragedy must also be keenly felt by the new Biden administration. After his election, the president’s top national security officials quickly established the aim of closer partnership with New Delhi as a cornerstone in the U.S. strategy for competition with Beijing. India’s role was highlighted by President Biden’s decision to host a virtual “[leaders’ summit](https://www.nbcnews.com/news/world/biden-set-first-summit-quad-leaders-u-s-steps-efforts-n1260721)” of the Quad in March, and by U.S. Secretary of Defense Lloyd Austin’s three-day [visit](https://thediplomat.com/2021/03/us-defense-secretary-austins-visit-to-india-a-sign-of-closer-india-us-security-ties/) to India shortly thereafter. **Hav**ing made a **strategic bet** on **India as** an important Asian **counterweight to China**, U.S. concerns about Indian health, economic growth, and **political stability** are not purely altruistic or humanitarian. As a number of prominent Indian foreign policy [analysts](https://carnegieindia.org/2021/04/23/to-friends-in-united-states-facilitate-global-vaccine-manufacturing-pub-84392) observed in the days before the Biden administration announced its plans to assist India, the promise of U.S. partnership would be severely **undermined** from India's perspective if Washington were to fall short in such a time of need. In the midst of **immense suffering**, it is tempting to assume that India’s situation could not get worse. However, the reality is that India was already facing an entirely different, daunting threat to its national security prior to this new viral wave: [a year of **heightened tensions**](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-53062484) and unusual levels of violence along its contested border with China. Many of the causes of **deteriorating relations** between India and China remain unaddressed. The two sides have taken some initial steps to disengage **from** their **border conflict** in the Himalayas in early 2021, but in recent weeks their bilateral military dialogues have [stalled](https://www.financialexpress.com/defence/china-refuses-to-vacate-four-friction-points-in-ladakh-heres-everything-you-need-to-know-about-gogra-and-hot-springs/2236611/) without progress. If **Beijing** were **to seek** a **territorial advantage from India’s** ongoing **health emergency**, the compounding of multiple **crises** would **complicate New Delhi’s decision-making and** would **increas**e the **potential for** policy **miscalculation**s **and** otherwise **avoidable** **armed escalation**. The Biden administration should help India here too. As I argue in an [update of an earlier CFR Contingency Planning Memorandum](https://www.cfr.org/report/preparing-heightened-tensions-between-china-and-india) on the **risk of armed conflict** between China and India, the United States has a strong interest in preventing military escalation along their border. Through carefully calibrated defensive assistance to India, the United States can help it deter China without taking steps that make conflict more likely. Other diplomatic and economic measures can improve India’s defenses and resilience in the face of Chinese aggression, lessen regional tensions, and prepare U.S. policymakers in the event of another Himalayan standoff this year.

#### Second India is weaponizing the COVID crisis and healthcare collapse for political gain which brings tensions to the brink, exploiting groups and spiraling instability
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If you relied on most **Indian** news channels and central government announcements, you might think nothing was amiss in the country, with the only event of consequence being the election in West Bengal. Yet the deluge of social media posts and footage from India as well as international news coverage paint a far starker picture of people dying outside of hospitals and in the streets while waiting on care. They report that cremation furnaces’ grills have melted from overuse, while others are forced to cremate their loved ones in parking lots. Even as India continues to shatter COVID-19 records, experts warn that the true figure is multitudes higher than official counts. The **second wave is** **bringing** even New Delhi and other cities with the nation’s most developed **healthcare** systems **to the brink**. Some have questioned why the Biden administration took so long to publicly address and pledge medical aid (via the Department of Defense and other channels) **for** a calamity affecting such an important ally and the world’s largest vaccine manufacturer. The Biden administration likely needed time to navigate the Trump administration-era contracts with vaccine manufacturers prohibiting the donation of vaccines. But another likely factor is perhaps that the central Indian governmentitself doesn’t want to draw international attention to this national **catastrophe**. The Indian people, by contrast, are desperate from relief. Nothing short of active medical assistance, such as Moscow’s COVID-19 diplomacy, is likely to pique their interest. Given the central government’s lack of prioritization or ability to successfully manage the crisis, it is all the more important for foreign governments, international bodies, the private sector, NGOs and publics to assist however they can. Indeed, it is becoming clear that **India**’s central government has **failed to** adequately **prepare** for this second wave. Instead, the central government declared victory earlier this year and reopened businesses and allowed public gatherings, including massive religious festivals. There has been a veil of secrecy around the “PM Cares Fund,” with $1.2 billion that the **Modi** government **solicited** and earmarked for pandemic **preparedness** reportedly unaccounted for. **Despite** being the world’s largest vaccine manufacturer, **only** about **20 million Indians** have reportedly been **vaccinated**. Even once the scope and scale of the second wave – and the **dangers** it poses for the **entire country** – became clear, the central government’s response has been catatonic and detached. Instead of rectifying policy errors and prioritizing the second wave response, the **BJP** – keen on potentially unseating one of its most ardent critics in West Bengal – has busied itself with organizing multiple political rallies in West Bengal. Prime Minister Narendra Modi himself appeared in one of these rallies, without a mask. Although Modi has since backed out of delivering a final in-person campaign speech in West Bengal, the government refused to postpone elections as millions went to the polls in one of India’s most populous states. This singular focus on campaigning and sloganeering has alienated even ardent BJP and Modi supporters, as evident from netizens responses. Indian NGOs have also reported that police have restricted their abilities to deliver oxygen supplies. Senior BJP members have mocked the opposition’s offers to cooperate on a COVID-19 response, and there are reports that both BJP and Congress-ruled states have restricted donations of oxygen and other medical supplies from states ruled by the other party. That marks a **dangerous politicization of humanitarian aid** and public health coordination **under dire circumstances.** These public health failures are **rooted in** and contextualized by a range of broader **shortcomings** on the part **of** the **Modi** government. There has been a significant trend of authoritarianism, which includes **consolidation of power** by the ruling party at the federal level, centralization of power **by** the federal **executive branch** (including curbing the power of the judiciary), and limitations of civil rights and liberties including restrictions on NGOs and the press. There continue to be significant limitations on civil rights and liberties as well as a range of human rights abuses, especially in Kashmir, large parts of India’s northeastern states, and in the “Maoist corridor.” The **ruling party** and their allies have permanently **weaponized** communal **issues for political gains**, **leading to** both **state violence** and vigilante lynchings **against Muslims**, Dalits, Christians, **and** other **vulnerable groups**. There has also been significant tension between the federal government and various state governments, including sharp objections to the National Registration Act and, most recently, the status of Burmese refugees. Farmers continue to oppose the central government’s commitment to re-regulating the agricultural sector in perhaps the largest protests in human history. Likewise, the central government has overseen sluggish economic growth since 2019, which has been **exacerbated by** the **COVID-19** pandemic. The main silver lining is that not all is doom-and-gloom with regards to India’s pandemic response. The southern states seem to be fairing much better than their central counterparts. Kerala particularly continues to serve as a model of public health readiness, such as through its surplus production and sharing of oxygen supplies. However, the public health catastrophes in other states may lead to further travel restrictions between states and even within among different municipalities in the same state. The pandemic perhaps drive home a stark reality: Indian publics actually live in “multiple Indias,” with vast disparities with regards to the quality of governance, economic opportunities, wealth inequality, workers’ rights, educational opportunities, public health, civil rights and liberties, and a range of other social development indicators. These **disparities**, and the fallout **of the pandemic**, may **exacerbate tensions** between states and contribute **to increased social conflict and political instability** – with potentially lasting and even permanent ramifications for the Indian federation.

#### Third with the economic collapse of India leading to more religious violence has led to cyber violence escalating tensions with Pakistan while Pakistan is trying to better posture with US so India is making it harder for Pakistan to better their perception
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Coincidence or careful **strategic** planning? The timing of these **violent protests** was interesting as these took place in the wake of six major regional and national developments which need to be analyzed together to understand the big picture. First, the US announcement of its troop’s departure from Afghanistan. Second, the improving security cooperation between Arab countries and Israel. Third, the recent South Asian visit of Russian Foreign Minister in which Indian Prime Minister did not meet him while the Russian leader reportedly offered Pakistan all possible cooperation. Fourth, Pakistan’s return to seeking IMF program. Fifth, the forthcoming Federal Budget, and sixth the FATF review. If these **geopolitical**, geoeconomics **and geostrategic developments** can be pieced together then it seems that this **crisis was built** up at a time **when** the **US needed Pakistan’s** good **offices** in the talks with the Afghan Taliban and **to help** facilitate a peaceful **US military departure**, the Russian interest in improving relations with Islamabad is greater than ever since the 1970s, while the Chinese commitment towards Pakistan and recently interest in Iran is also on the rise. This **indicates** a possible **Indian motive**, which does not favorably view Pakistan’s growing positive relevance with important global and regional powers. Amidst this geostrategic environment, the **revival of religious violence**, in the context of the **growing Indian clout** over the US and FATF, should be seen as providing the ideal instrument **to shape Pakistan’s** domestic **environment** in a manner that can help build a case that why Pakistan does not deserve easy terms for the IMF bailout, a FATF good grade, international trust, and significant foreign investment. Moreover, it also shakes the public confidence in the present government and **revitalizes** the **political opposition**. In addition, according to former Foreign Secretary Jalil Abbas Jilani, who has also served in Brussels, France along with Germany, virtually enjoy veto power over the decision of the European Union regarding awarding GSP Plus status to any country. Therefore, demanding Pakistan to expel the French Ambassador will badly damage good relations with the European Union and sabotage whatever goodwill Islamabad has earned through its economic diplomacy to develop France as a growing export market. Moreover, social unrest harms the national economic activity which will further reduce the government’s ability to meet the direct and indirect tax revenue targets before the upcoming Federal budget and will increase Pakistan’s reliance on external borrowing, which does not come freely or cheaply. Simply put, **social chaos harms** the **national economy**, hurts investor confidence, and makes the country more vulnerable to external economic coercion. Indian support? Furthermore, notwithstanding **the violent protestors** on the rampage **on** the streets of **Lahore**, what was most interesting was the extraordinary international support that they received from more than 380 Indian WhatsApp groups in the cyber world. An initial analysis of **400,000 hostile tweets** related to the TLP protests revealed that more than 70 percent of these were **generated from fake accounts**. Now let us unemotionally look at the main narrative of these 400,000 tweets. The meta narrative of most of these tweets had nothing to do with the love of religion or the last Prophet (PBUH), who according to the Holy Quran was sent as divine mercy for the entire universe, but aimed **to maximize** the **social chaos** through terms such as ‘Civil War in Pakistan’ etc. This indicates that those supporting the street protestors in the cyber world were neither merely local ragtag sympathizers, illiterate madrassa students nor religiously motivated individuals but a large force of dedicated cyber professionals who had carefully planned and intended **to strategically exploit** the environment shaped on the ground in Lahore and internationally present **Pakistan as** an **unstable country**. Earlier, some very irresponsible remarks about **Pakistan’s** missile and **nuclear program** were also made at similar rallies. Such statements from any person, particularly those **seen in** the **religious context** by the general public, also help those who intend to internationally shape a perception that **Pakistan’s nuclear arsenal** is not safe and could fall **in**to **irresponsible hands**. Lessons **from** the **crisis** and the way forward The government and the relevant national security institutions must carefully evaluate all the dimensions of this crisis and its specific dynamics **in** each **domain of national interest**. In the political domain, the government should interpret national security in a comprehensive manner and transcend beyond a silo-based approach towards foreign policy, national security policy, internal security, external security, economic security, human security, and national defense. National security should be conceptualized on the basis of 21st-century environment and national interests rather than the structures or institutions that evolved during the 20th Century and individually pursue these interests. For example, in order to deal with a situation like this, our Law Enforcement Agencies (LEA) should develop modern crisis management capabilities and regularly wargame emerging and likely internal security scenarios that should include learning how to negotiate during delicate hostage situations. It should not merely be left to the political leadership to negotiate with such situations unless they are professionally trained for it. Secondly, our institutions must develop professional capacity and skills to timely and tactically defuse a local law and order situation beyond the traditional options of buying time, offering compensation, or arresting them, before it escalates into a national crisis that forces the national leadership to take the nation into confidence. The kinetic response should always be the last resort after all options have been evaluated, tried and exhausted, because it is always politically costly for the government, weakens the public trust, and erodes investor confidence. A country that aims to become a trading nation by offering a viable and secure regional CPEC corridor cannot afford its bureaucracy and law enforcement agencies not to be public service-oriented and maintain its colonial culture. Tackling the **hybrid warfare** Our several relevant institutions regularly monitor the cyber and media trends but these also need to be comprehensively seen in the context of their co-relation and implications for other geo-economic, geo-strategic and regional geopolitical trends as well. In hybrid warfare, the physical **battleground** might be a small local neighborhood, but similar **to** the **air** and artillery support in case of a conventional land war, the psychological, media, and cyber reinforcement and support usually come from **across** the **borders**. This helps maximize, magnify and export the tactical and limited physical impact of a local incident way beyond the streets of a city, in order to psychologically disturb the entire nation, financially **disrupt** the national **economy**, **and** **shake** the **confidence** of all those around the world who have an interest or goodwill **towards Pakistan**. In short, this street protest’s somewhat crude, tactical, and local action received well-planned, extensive, and highly sophisticated international support that aimed to create the strategic impact of nationally **destabilizing and** globally **isolating Pakistan**.

**Even a limited Indo-Pak war causes extinction. Menon 19**

**Menon 19** Prakash Menon, The nuclear cloud hanging over the human race, Nov 15, 2019, [PhD from Madras University for his thesis “Limited War and Nuclear Deterrence in the Indo-Pak context”] [https://www.telegraphindia.com/opinion/the-nuclear-cloud-hanging-over-the-human-race/cid/1719608#](https://www.telegraphindia.com/opinion/the-nuclear-cloud-hanging-over-the-human-race/cid/1719608) SM

The nuclear cloud hanging over the human race Even a limited India-Pakistan nuclear conflict could pose an existential challenge to life on Earth The smoke injected into the stratosphere due to a nuclear attack would block the sunlight and result in a ‘Nuclear Winter' - freezing temperatures that pose an existential threat. One study estimates that in an India-Pakistan exchange, the immediate casualties could number 125 million lives The smoke injected into the stratosphere due to a nuclear attack would block the sunlight and result in a ‘Nuclear Winter' - freezing temperatures that pose an existential threat. One study estimates that in an India-Pakistan exchange, the immediate casualties could number 125 million lives iStock Prakash Menon | | Published 15.11.19, 08:04 PM With the recent administrative changes in Jammu and Kashmir, Indo-Pak hyphenation has come back to haunt India’s aspirations to break out of that narrow mould and be perceived as an independent player on the global stage. The clubbing of India with Pakistan is an echo of India’s political and strategic confinement to the sub-continent. Pakistan has always attempted to paint the Indo-Pak situation as a nuclear flashpoint essentially to invite international intervention in what India insists is a bilateral issue. A recent report in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists by Toon et al entitled 'How an India-Pakistan Nuclear War Could Start and have Global Consequences' provides grist to the mill of the nuclear flashpoint theory. But it also raises an issue that has yet not found its place in the public imagination nor has sufficient cognisance been taken by the political and military leadership of nuclear weapon powers – the climatic consequences of nuclear explosions. It is well known that nuclear powers have and continue to base their targeting requirements of nuclear weapons on calculations that are restricted mostly to the major but immediate effects of nuclear explosions – blast, heat and radiation. According to General Lee Butler, the former United States, Strategic Forces Commander, during the cold war, the Standard Integrated Operation Plan (SIOP) had targeted Moscow with 400 nuclear weapons and Kiev with 40. Several scientific studies of the impact of nuclear explosions since the 1980s up to the present which utilises advanced computer models, confirm the effect of smoke injected into the stratosphere that would block sunlight from reaching the earth’s surface and is described as ‘Nuclear Winter’. In essence global temperatures would plunge below freezing point thus posing threats to life support systems especially food production. In short, it threatened human existence itself. Later studies that focused on regional nuclear wars especially in the Indo-Pak context, have indicated that the impact of a nuclear exchange would have an immediate significant and catastrophic impact in terms of death and destruction. The latest Toon study, estimates that in a situation where around 350 warheads are used by India and Pakistan, the immediate casualties would vary between 50 to 125 million lives depending on the yields of the weapons used which could vary between 15-100 Kilotons. (a Kiloton being the explosive equivalent power of 1000 tons of TNT). Such scales and speeds of destruction for both parties would indeed be of an existential nature. Therefore, both India and Pakistan despite the rhetoric during times of tension have so far displayed caution and refrained from getting into situations where nuclear weapons are alerted. The speedy de-escalation after Balakot is indicative of a cautionary approach. Of course, this is no guarantee that the next round would not witness a different outcome. For as long as nuclear weapons exist in the arsenals of both countries, the possibility of use remains, however low the probability. It is now well known (but widely ignored by the strategic cognoscenti) that even a regional Indo-Pak nuclear war with hundreds of low yield nuclear explosions can also pose an existential threat at the global level. The latest study states “In the India-Pakistan scenario, we calculated a total of 16.1 TG (1 TG is equivalent of one million tons of smoke) of black carbon injected into the upper atmosphere (11 from India and 5.1 from Pakistan) for weapons with yields of 15 kilotons; 27.3 TG (19.8 from India and 7.5 from Pakistan) for 50 kiloton weapons; and 36.6 TG (27.5 from India and 9.1 from Pakistan) for 100 kiloton weapons. The smoke would be heated by sunlight and lofted high into the stratosphere, where it could remain for years, since it does not rain in the stratosphere”. The Climate Model indicates that global average temperatures and precipitation would be significantly lowered and comparisons are drawn to the ice age that prevailed thousands of years ago. Agriculture around the world would be impacted and billions of people could face starvation. In earlier studies, even 5 TG of smoke produced (which is one third of what is expected in a lower scale Indo-Pak conflict), food production would change in China and the US for specific crops causing widespread shortages at the global level. Moreover, the ozone layer would be degraded as the rising smoke absorbs the sunlight and heats up the stratosphere that would permit ultra-violet rays of greater magnitude to reach the earth causing negative effects. The political and strategic implications of the long-term impact on climate change challenges the foundations of the edifice on which nuclear weapon strategy has been constructed. It is obvious that any deliberate initiation of nuclear war has a high probability of posing an existential threat to humanity. Even with the achievement of the complete destruction of an adversary’s arsenal through a first strike, the initiator cannot itself escape the existential threat posed by long term climate change. This indicates that the First Use doctrine in the name of strengthening deterrence stands fully exposed for its incredibility and the utter stupidity of the use of nuclear weapons.

#### Plan Text: The member states of the World Trade Organization ought to adopt the IP/C/W/669 which states

WTO, 25 May 2021, <https://docs.wto.org/dol2fe/Pages/SS/directdoc.aspx?filename=q:/IP/C/W669R1.pdf&Open=True> // js69

WAIVER FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE TRIPS AGREEMENT FOR THE PREVENTION, CONTAINMENT AND TREATMENT OF COVID-19 The General Council Having regard to paragraphs 1, 3 and 4 of Article IX of the Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization ("the WTO Agreement"); Conducting the functions of the Ministerial Conference in the interval between meetings pursuant to paragraph 2 of Article IV of the WTO Agreement; Noting that the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) is a new infectious disease caused by severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-COV-2); Recalling that on 11/03/2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared the 2019–20 coronavirus outbreak to be a pandemic, and it continues to be a very high risk across the globe in all WTO Members; Noting with concern the threat to human health, safety and well-being caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, which has spread all around the globe, as well as the unprecedented and multifaceted effects of the pandemic, including the severe disruption to societies, economies, global trade and travel and the devastating impact on the livelihoods of people; Noting with great concern the continuous mutations and emergence of new variants of SARS-COV-2, which also highlights the significant uncertainties and complexities of controlling SARS-COV-2; Recognising the global need for unimpeded, timely and secure access to quality, safe, efficacious and affordable health products and technologies for all, for a rapid and effective response to the COVID-19 pandemic and consequently the urgent need to diversify and scale-up production to meet global needs and promote economic recovery; Recognizing also that the COVID-19 global pandemic requires a global response based on unity, solidarity and multilateral cooperation; Recognizing the importance of preserving incentives for research and innovation, and that these should be balanced with the public health interest; Noting that, in the light of the foregoing, exceptional circumstances exist justifying waivers from the obligations of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS Agreement); Decides as follows: 1. The **obligations of Members to implement** or apply **Sections 1, 4, 5 and 7 of Part II of the TRIPS Agreement** or to enforce these Sections under Part III of the TRIPS Agreement, **shall be waived** in relation to health products and technologies including diagnostics, therapeutics, vaccines, medical devices, personal protective equipment, their materials or components, and their methods and means of manufacture **for the prevention, treatment or containment of COVID-19.** 2. **This waiver shall be in force for at least 3 years** from the date of this decision. The General Council shall**, thereafter**, review the existence of the exceptional circumstances justifying the waiver, and if such circumstances cease to exist, **the General Council shall determine** the **date of termination** of the waiver. 3. The waiver in paragraph 1 shall not apply to the protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms (Sound Recordings) and Broadcasting Organizations under Article 14 of the TRIPS Agreement. 4. This decision is without prejudice to the right of least developed country Members under paragraph 1 of Article 66 of the TRIPS Agreement. 5. **This waiver shall be reviewed by the General Council** not later than one year after it is granted, and thereafter **annually until the waiver terminates**, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 4 of Article IX of the WTO Agreement. 6. Members shall not challenge any measures taken in conformity with the provision of the waivers contained in this Decision under subparagraphs 1(b) and 1(c) of Article XXIII of GATT 1994, or through the WTO's Dispute Settlement Mechanism.

#### The TRIPS Waiver increases medical R&D global and helps the medical systems in various countries on the verge of collapsing including the healthcare system of India on the verge of collapse which the plan solves
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Geneva, 7 June 2021-- Ahead of the next **World Trade Organization** (WTO) meeting **on** the landmark pandemic **monopoly waiver proposal** --- the 'TRIPS waiver' --- the international humanitarian organisation Médecins Sans Frontières/Doctors Without Borders (**MSF**) **denounced the** European Union (**EU**) and countries including the UK, Switzerland and Norway for employing delay tactics instead of agreeing to start formal negotiations on this critical waiverat a time when COVID-19 has already killed more than 3.5 million people across the globe and there are stark inequities in access to COVID-19 medical tools. One month ago, the US signaled its support for the waiver in a groundbreaking move. On 4 June, the **EU** published a **counter-proposal** focusing on 'compulsory licensing', which brings nothing significantly new to the table and instead **is** merely **a maneuver to stall** the waiver negotiation process. If adopted, **the waiver would provide countries with** a **critical policy space to address intellectual property** (IP) barriers **to increase** **collaboration in** **r**esearch **and d**evelopment, manufacturing, scale-up, and supply of COVID-19 medicines, vaccines and other health technologies. Waiving monopolies would help level the playing field in this pandemic and ensure access to critically important COVID-19 medical tools for everyone who needs them, regardless of where they live. "In the last few months, we all helplessly witnessed how healthcare workers in countries like **India**, Peru and Brazil **struggle**d **to provide** **care** for people with COVID-19," said Dr Maria Guevara, MSF's International Medical Secretary. "Their **healthcare systems** were **on** the **verge of collapsing** and it was very challenging to provide any supportive therapies to critically ill COVID-19 patients in hospitals, as the oxygen concentrators, ventilators and medicines remain in short supply. In addition to vaccines, the world urgently needs access to newer therapeutics and diagnostics to reduce the number of hospitalisations and deaths in this pandemic. Governments must do everything in their power to make sure that every country has the best chance to save as many lives as possible throughout this pandemic." The governments co-sponsoring the waiver proposal recently submitted [a revised proposal](https://docs.wto.org/dol2fe/Pages/SS/directdoc.aspx?filename=q:/IP/C/W669R1.pdf&Open=True%22%20%5C)to **the WTO** outlining its scope and duration, with the **objective** of progressing to formal text-based negotiations. An increasing number of countries (**63 [countries]** as of today) are **co-sponsoring the waiver** and more than 100 nations, and more recently the BRICS bloc, have come out in support and welcome the waiver overall. Brazil, however, remains reluctant to declare full support for the waiver proposal, defining its position as "open for discussion," but at the same time pushing for a longer negotiation timeline. Following the 5 May US announcement supporting the proposal and expressing willingness to engage in formal text-based negotiations, many more countries have shown an interest in moving forward with the discussions. However, **the EU has** so far **refused to engage** in productive discussions **on the proposal** and continues **to instead** **rally for voluntary measures** by pharmaceutical corporations, **which** so far **have** shown **limited success**. The EU has also been insisting that countries resort to using an existing public health measure --- 'compulsory licensing' to override patents product by product --- to facilitate production of individual COVID-19 medical tools, rather than a waiver that addresses all IP barriers up front. While MSF has long advocated for the use of compulsory licensing as needed to ensure countries benefit from the price-lowering effect of competition among generic producers to increase access to essential medicines, this route is not efficient during pandemic conditions: legal obstacles, pressure from pharmaceutical corporations and red tape make it too cumbersome, slow and complicated to address pandemic-level challenges. **The proposed TRIPS waiver would provide countries with an effective and expeditious way to remove key IP barriers in advance, rather than wait** for barriers to hit and then scramble into action. "The EU's continued insistence on the use of compulsory licensing in its counter-proposal as an excuse for opposing the original 'TRIPS waiver' is disingenuous and endangers public health globally," said DimitriEynikel,EU Policy Advisor for MSF's Access Campaign. "By focusing just on compulsory licensing, the EU is promoting a safeguard that can only bypass patents but not all IP barriers, thereby making it less effective than the proposed waiver. In this raging pandemic, countries need to have all options at their disposal to encourage the manufacturing of COVID-19 medical tools across the world. The EU and other nations opposing this waiver need to stop blocking other countries' efforts to protect their populations in a public health emergency." Meanwhile, many members of the European Parliament are making efforts to garner support for the waiver proposal. Last month, the European Parliament adopted a resolution on ending the HIV/AIDS epidemic by 2030, wherein a clear call was made to support the TRIPS waiver proposal. The European Parliament is expected to vote on a specific resolution in support of the waiver proposal between 7 and 10 June. A number of countries that continue to resist the waiver proposal are also part of the Group of 7 (G-7), whose heads of state are meeting at a summit next week. G-7 leaders should, at this critical moment in a pandemic, take concrete steps to show global solidarity and support this important waiver from monopolies to facilitate access to COVID-19 medical tools.

#### Trips waiver causes global surge of vaccine production due to waiving intellectual property rights meaning aff solves in a manageable timeframe

Thrasher 21

Thrasher, Rachel. “How Will Everyone Benefit If WTO Members Sign the TRIPS COVID-19 Waiver?” Open Access Government, 15 Feb. 2021, [www.openaccessgovernment.org/trips-covid-19-waiver/103738/](http://www.openaccessgovernment.org/trips-covid-19-waiver/103738/). [researcher with the Boston University Global Development Policy Center. She works on policy issues related to trade and investment agreements, trade law and development, economic relations between developing countries, and multilateral environmental agreements. She is the author of Constraining Development: The Shrinking of Policy Space in the International Trade Regime (Anthem, forthcoming, July 2021).] // js69

\*Brackets in original article

At the informal meeting of the Council for the Agreement of Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property (TRIPS) on February 4, the United States, together with the European Union, United Kingdom, Japan and Australia continued to block the **initiative to waive** certain World Trade Organization (**WTO**) **provisions** that potentially constrain manufacture and disbursal of COVID-19 medicines, diagnostics, medical equipment, and vaccines. What is the TRIPS COVID-19 waiver? This narrow waiver, **proposed** initially **by** **South Africa and India**, would temporarily **waive patent rights** over these products to facilitate increased production volume and more widespread manufacturing worldwide. Nevertheless, while the US and the EU push for more discussion about the facts of the current situation, South Africa, India, and others are seeking to negotiate the text of the proposed waiver. At the moment, the talks are at an impasse. At the moment, the talks are at an impasse. But evidence is mounting that signing the **TRIPS waiver** would not only be **good for** the current supporters of the initiative, but for the **whole world**, and maybe especially for the developed countries who are currently opposed to it. The financial costs to all countries during the pandemic goes far beyond paying for the research and development, treatments and vaccines **to manage COVID-19** cases. Economic impacts will be felt across the global economy through supply chain disruptions rooted in growing inequality within and between countries, likely costing around $9.2 trillion dollars, half of which would be borne by a handful of developed economies. **Economic impacts** […] likely costing **around $9.2 trillion dollars** The projected timeline for vaccinations exacerbates the financial costs. Initial predictions for vaccine rollout all over the world have proven optimistic at best and current projections suggest that many will have to wait at least three, and up to seven, years for substantial global immunity through vaccines, leaving low-income countries hopelessly behind. The **lack of manufacturing** capacity **by drugmakers** One of the main reasons the vaccines have not become **as** widely available as initially hoped is the lack of production capacity by key firms. For obvious reasons, a **small handful of corporations cannot produce enough** vaccines for the whole world population. Producing enough will depend heavily on licensing and transferring technology to more manufacturers. This reality is highlighted by a recent case in which a vaccine innovator company (Inovio) sued its own contracted biologics manufacturer (VGXI) because they refused to release their own trade secrets to other potential producers in order to ramp up capacity. These same supply capacity issues afflict other more well-known companies as well – including Novavax and Moderna. Pharmaceutical companies would prefer to rely on **voluntary licensing agreements** (VLAs) to increase production. These VLAs allow the patent holder to control who is producing their patented good and where they are able to sell the product. Gilead’s VLA to produce remdesivir is the most widely known example of such a process. While initially applauded for increasing access and to a potentially life-saving treatment for COVID-19 at affordable prices, further research showed that the agreement excluded 70 countries who would have to purchase the drug at the monopoly price. Given that cautionary tale, it is **unlikely** that VLAs would be enough **to ensure** widespread **access**. The rigid reality of the TRIPS Agreement Many countries who push back against a **TRIPS waiver** suggest that the TRIPS Agreement is already flexible in its allowance of compulsory licensing to facilitate generic manufacture of patented vaccines. The agreement allows member states to **authorise compulsory licenses** (CLs) under their own domestic law **in** cases of **extreme urgency**, as long as the scope and duration of the license is narrowly circumscribed. In ordinary circumstances, countries can impose a CL if they are unable to negotiate a voluntary license within a reasonable period of time. In both cases, the innovator is due “adequate remuneration” (Art. 31). Certainly, there has never been a case of extreme urgency like this one, and WTO members theoretically may have recourse to this provision. However, previous CLs issued by member states have met with both public and private opposition. The United States has repeatedly put pressure on India for its CL on an expensive cancer drug, claiming that India is “diluting” intellectual property rights and violating the TRIPS Agreement. Private pharmaceutical companies and U.S. lawmakers have even taken action to threaten sanctions against India through its Special 301 Report, a trade watch-list of sorts. Colombia faced similar backlash when they took the first steps toward issuing a CL for a leukemia treatment – Glivec. Both the Swiss government and Novartis, the patent holder, argued forcefully that CLs are “tantamount to expropriation” – code for exercising a sort of eminent domain through regulation. More recently, Malaysia attempted to use a CL to increase affordability of a Hepatitis C medication and once more the United States, together with its pharmaceutical industry, threatened to wield the power of sanctions through a Special 301 Report. As a result of these and other instances, countries have, understandably, been reluctant to develop more flexible domestic CL policies and are certainly out of practice in using them. A TRIPS COVID-19 waiver opens up global production Given the challenges of imposing compulsory licenses and the limits of voluntary ones, the TRIPS waiver offers another way for vaccine producers around the world to ramp up global production without the risks of contending with domestic and international IP disputes. the TRIPS **waiver offers** another way for vaccine producers around the world **to ramp up global production In** the first place, they argue, intellectual property protection is [what made these **vaccine**s possible](https://insidetrade.com/daily-news/us-others-defend-ip-rights-waiver-backers-push-text-based-talks) to begin with – undermining those rights, then could undercut the potential for future lifesaving products. The protection of intellectual property is [**certainly aimed at increasing innovation**](https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/full/10.1086/669706?casa_token=rONrWfPIP7EAAAAA%3AY7UnTSWbe2rI79fnx2KlCZ2CxOcuy9zeKeh9cPdCjfMyhoSC1g1NC-eL9KUTCKRmsZTknURuOP8&), and some studies have shown that [innovation does increase **with greater protection**](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0976399616686860?casa_token=LEX4uDS6wnAAAAAA:CHAWXha9-HMEVK8xeAMM1Gy39L6QscB22M4TfpvxKHstG9LIKXexoUfAO6C7w8ebS_wCAvZFkSXG). At the same time, other research suggests that strong IP protection could [actually discourage subsequent innovation](https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/full/10.1086/669706?casa_token=rONrWfPIP7EAAAAA%3AY7UnTSWbe2rI79fnx2KlCZ2CxOcuy9zeKeh9cPdCjfMyhoSC1g1NC-eL9KUTCKRmsZTknURuOP8&). Even without disregarding the valuable role of intellectual property protection, however, the TRIPS waiver would not dismantle our current system of innovation incentives. Rather it is a narrow, time-limited waiver aimed only at facilitating global access to COVID-19 related products. Most of the vaccine developers have already received [ample](https://grants.nih.gov/policy/natural-disasters/corona-virus.htm) [government](https://ec.europa.eu/info/live-work-travel-eu/coronavirus-response/public-health/coronavirus-vaccines-strategy_en) [support](https://www.fiercepharma.com/pharma/after-nearly-1b-research-funding-moderna-takes-1-5b-coronavirus-vaccine-order-from-u-s) for the research and development stage – diminishing the need for patent monopolies (which are supposed to make up for large up-front capital expenditure). The second argument put forward by opponents of the TRIPS waiver points out that intellectual property rights are not the real bottleneck preventing more rapid global production, at least in the case of vaccines. Rather, the manufacturing capacity of most of the world’s countries is simply [not advanced enough](https://insidetrade.com/daily-news/us-others-defend-ip-rights-waiver-backers-push-text-based-talks) to make these types of vaccines. But this argument seems to run up against the vein of the previous contention – if intellectual property rights are not the issue, if no vaccine manufacturers are going to be able to ramp up production to make any kind of real difference in distribution, then there’s no point in being concerned about temporarily waiving those rights. The current producers will still effectively benefit from their patent monopolies. The current producers will still effectively benefit from their patent monopolies. On the other hand, there is growing evidence that perhaps qualified [producers around the world stand ready](https://www.oxfam.org/en/press-releases/monopolies-causing-artificial-rationing-covid-19-crisis-3-biggest-global-vaccine) to contribute to the production of more vaccines. Despite an unknown timeline, there is a real possibility that the TRIPS waiver may make it possible for a huge increase in vaccine production, not to mention the production of other COVID-19 treatments and equipment.

### Framing

#### The standard is hedonistic utilitarianism. Prefer:

#### 1] Pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable and empirically verified by neurological tests
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In 1953, James Olds joined Donald Hebb’s laboratory at the McGill University to study neurobiology of learning. Contemporary research had identified areas which when stimulated led to aversive behavior: Just before we began our own work, H. R. Delgado, W. W. Roberts, and N. E. Miller at Yale University had undertaken a similar study. They had located an area in the lower part of the mid-line system where stimulation caused the animal to avoid the behavior that provoked the electrical stimulus. We wished to investigate positive as well as negative effects (that is, to learn whether stimulation of some areas might be sought rather than avoided by the animal).⁴ He set out to see whether stimulation of the reticular activating system would lead to reinforcement and learning of the behavior present during the stimulation. The initial discovery was due to a lucky error: We were not at first concerned to hit very specific points in the brain, and, in fact, in our early tests the electrodes did not always go to the particular areas in the mid-line system at which they were aimed. Our lack of aim turned out to be a fortunate happening for us. In one animal, the electrode missed its target and landed not in the mid-brain reticular system but in a nerve pathway from the rhinencephalon. This led to an unexpected discovery.⁵ The **correctly placed electrodes** did not **produce** the desired effect, but the mistaken one did. This exciting discovery led to a program of investigating areas of the brain that had this property. This led to 1954 path-breaking paper with Peter Milner: “**Positive Reinforcement** Produced by Electrical Stimulation of Septal Area and Other Regions of Rat Brain.” This paper already identified more than one region involved in positive reinforcement; subsequent research expanded the list. In 1956, Olds wrote a popular account of the research in Scientific American, “**Pleasure Centers in the Brain**,” and the findings became famous. **Subsequent investigation** describing repeated self-stimulation by rats to the exclusion of all else made for an even more powerful story. One might think that such experiments could never be carried out in humans, but they were, in fact, carried out by Robert Heath at Tulane University in the 1970s. One infamous experiment was aimed at curing a subject of homosexuality, patient B-19. B-19 would self-stimulate by repeatedly pressing a button connected to implanted electrodes just as the rat did. Heath stimulated the patient in conjunction with heterosexual pornography. The “cure” was completed with the help of a young female prostitute recruited from the French Quarter.⁶ Some may have been tempted to think a hedonimeter is right around the corner, **measur**ing **activity in** the **pleasure center of** the **brain**. There are several problems with this simplistic interpretation of Olds’ experiments. The first is that the areas that he identified as pleasure centers appear not to be pleasure centers at all. They are connected to desire rather than pleasure, to “wanting” or incentive salience rather than “liking.”⁷ These centers can be blocked, and a **subject** can still **experience pleasure**. But the subject will not **desire to repeat** the **experience**. To be sure, when everything is working normally there usually is **desire for pleasure**, and pleasure engenders desire. But the two systems can come apart. Olds’ rats and Heath’s Patient B-29 kept pushing that button because the brain stimulation made them want to, not because it produced pleasure (Figure 9.1). There are areas of the brain that are implicated in pleasurable experience, but they are not the ones that Olds discovered. Furthermore, there is not just one pleasure center, but rather many areas involved forming a complicated distributed pleasure system. 9.4 The “Pleasure Chemical” The **neurological** areas that Olds investigated contained a lot of **dopamine receptors**. The popular meme made dopamine the neurotransmitter responsible for pleasure. With the discovery that activity in these areas did not induce pleasure, the neurological perspective shifted. The neurotransmitters primarily responsible for pleasure now appear to be endogenous opioids and cannabinoids. So, a better meme appears to be “dopamine **for desire**, opioids for pleasure.” This, like the “pleasure center of the brain” is a gross and misleading oversimplification. As two leading neuroscientists put it: The idea that a brain hotspot or coding apex mediates pleasure or happiness can all too easily turn into phrenology if taken as a literal truth, and unconstrained chemo-phrenology poses an equal danger. Brain function is less constant than handy anatomical or chemical labels imply. Caveats, stipulations, and often even conditional (at least) retractions are sure to be needed, and if they are forgotten the effort to understand the brain will soon come to tears.⁸ The role of opioids alone is complex. Opioids are neurotransmitters that perform many functions in the nervous system (as does dopamine). There are opioid receptors all over the brain and, in fact, throughout the nervous system. Three different types of opioid receptors have been identified, called Mu, Delta, and Kappa. All of these are widely distributed, but frequency of different types varies with the anatomical region. The function of these receptors in various regions of the rodent brain has been extensively investigated using various techniques, including pharmacological blockade or potentiation, and genetic knockouts.⁹ The Mu receptors appear to be responsible for much of the pleasure generated by food and sex. To some extent the Delta receptors may also be involved in producing pleasure. But the Kappa receptors produce aversion. Different aspects of the opioid system are thus involved in both positive and negative reinforcement. Rats are complicated, but humans are arguably more complicated. There are the higher pleasures, which Bentham and the **Utilitarians** certainly did not want to neglect. There are the pleasures of listening to music and viewing works of art, not to mention the pleasures of creating music and art for those who are so capable. There are the sympathetic pleasures of causing pleasure in others. There is evidence that these pleasures involve more of the brain than the simple sensory pleasures. They appear also to involve the neocortex,1⁰ although how they do so has not been extensively studied. This would not have come as a surprise to the philosopher Immanuel Kant. See his **Observ**ations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and the Sublime.11 Addition neurotransmitters may come into play12 The picture appears to be becoming more complicated. 9.5 Pleasure and Pain Can pleasure and pain be well-represented as positive numbers on a single continuum, separated by a natural zero, in the way presupposed by Edgeworth’s hedonimeter? Common experience raises caution flags. It appears to be possible to feel both **pleasure and pain** at the same time, as in eating food with hot peppers, or feeling the pain of intense exercise. Masochists seem to cultivate the ability. This suggests that pleasure and pain should be put on different dimensions. Some neurobiology seems to point in the opposite direction. It reveals some commonalities in pleasure and pain systems. Dopamine plays a role in **anticipation of each**. Opioids are involved in each kind of **hedonic valence**. But closer inspection reveals differences between the systems as well. Both pleasure and pain systems may be active at the same time. The hedonimeter presupposes that a little pain cancels some pleasure; a little pleasure cancels some pain. Bentham thought that pleasure and pain interact additively, like adding positive and negative numbers. If this were so, the result would be a net hedonic value, which is what the hedonimeter would read out. Despite some analgesic effect of strong pleasure, this simple additivity picture is implausible. If the masochistic chili pepper eater prefers his pleasure with a little pain to pleasure without, he contradicts Bentham. In a prelude discussion to their anthology, Pleasures of the Brain, Kringelbach and Berridge put the question directly to authors in the anthology.13 The answers differ in interesting ways. Some say that **pleasure and pain** are orthogonal dimensions; others see the single dimension **as** a sometimesuseful **heuristic**.1⁴ None support the strict one-dimensional view in the sense discussed here.

#### 2] We have an obligation to prevent death a) lexical pre-requisite – bodily security allows us to make action means it’s a lexical pre-req to any other argument b) death forecloses the ability to feel future pleasure means death is bad under a utilitarian calculus

#### 3] Actor specificity – a) government actors don’t have knowledge as to the effects on specific individuals which means only aggregates can be used for calculation b) intrinsicness – focusing on intrinsic factors to policy such as aggregation is better for topics that aim to make a policy action

#### Extinction comes first – 3 warrants:

#### 1] Moral uncertainty means any risk of extinction outweighs under any framework

Bostrom 13, Nick. "Existential risk prevention as global priority." Global Policy 4.1 (2013): 15-31. (Faculty of Philosophy and Oxford Martin School University of Oxford) // Elmer recut by js69

These reflections on moral uncertainty suggest an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk; they also suggest a new way of thinking about the ideal of sustainability. Let me elaborate. Our present understanding of axiology might well be confused. **We may not now know — at least not in concrete detail — what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity**; we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. If we are indeed profoundly uncertain about our ultimate aims, then we should recognize that there is a great option value in preserving — and ideally improving — our ability to recognize value and to steer the future accordingly. **Ensuring that there will be a future version of humanity** with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely **is plausibly the best way available to us to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value. To do this, we must prevent any existential catastrophe**.

#### 2] Future improvement – extinction removes possibility for future innovation or allowing development of systems or evaluation

#### 3] Lexical pre-req – extinction removes actors ability to act which means extinction effectively kills any moral evaluation

### Underview

#### Aff gets 1ar and AC theory to deter infinite abuse

#### Interp: The negative must concede the affirmative framework if it is hedonic utilitarianism. Violation: It’s preemptive

#### 1] Time skew – the negative can propose a framework which aff offense can’t function under which moots 6 minutes off of the AC – time skew ow on reversibility because we don’t get time back and ow on quantifiability as time is the only objective way to weigh fairness

#### 2] Strat skew – neg can read a framework where my offense negates – skews my strategy – util is a very common framework who everyone preps for – means doesn’t moot neg strat

#### 3] Prep skew a) the affirmative disclosed the framework on the wiki which gives the negative plenty of time to plan a coherent strategy b) the affirmative can’t prep out infinite potential negative frameworks

#### DTD to deter future abuse – Fairness is k2 effective evaluation – CI for competitive equity – No RVI as NC could hedge 13 minutes on shell which kills aff strat

#### 1] Aff gets 1ar theory to prevent infinite abuse. DTD to set norms. CI as reasonability has no brightline. No RVI as to not chill theory. Fairness is a voter as debate requires competitive equity and absent fairness exclusionary practices are justified. Education gives us external benefit to debate.

#### Permissibility and presumption affirm: [a] We always default to assuming something true until proven false, or it would be almost impossible to make any claim at all because if the entire burden of proof is to show truth and [b] if agents had to reflect on every action they take and justify why it was a good one we would never be able to take an action because we would have to justify actions that are morally neutral ie drinking water is not morally right or wrong but if I had to justify my action every time I decided upon a course of action I would never be able to make decisions.

### Method

#### The role of the ballot of the ballot is to vote on the best affect-based policy action

#### 1] Broad scenario planning --- the future is uncertain, but scenario planning allows better analysis to create more effective policy in given conditions
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Key **decision makers**, regardless if in private life, corporations or the public sphere, **shoulder major responsibiliti**es when making crucial decisions. Many are therefore aware of the need to be dynamic and prepared to break with the status quo if they want to be future winners. However, they face an **environ-ment** that is so **fast-changing** that it is difficult for them to steer away ahead with confidence. Individually, **decision makers are only able to observe and interpret a few** of the **signposts** and indicators that can help anticipate change. Often, once they do recognise the forces at play, it is already too late for them to act and shape their playing field. They can only react on a playing field dic-tated by external conditions out of direct control. One could argue that this is quite a narrow field. However, it is not only C-level executives or high rank-ing politicians who have to make high impact decisions in conditions of **high uncertainty** caused by various factors such as **new tech**nologies and **chang-ing market**places. We all face those decisions in our everyday lives. Just think about your decision regarding a job and a career path. While some **cultural environments** are used to flexibility allowing for bold career changes, this is in many cultures a life-shaping decision, impacting a professional career of around 40 years. How can we be sure that a particular career is the best choice to reach personal and professional goals throughout our life? Our assumption is that hardly anyone can be sure that the choices they made are the best. Thus,t he decisions of a CEO to acquire another firm or invest in a plant are similar to many decisions every one of us makes. The one kind is shaping the future of a firm; the other kind is shaping the future of a person. Yet, **we have to make** some judgement **calls despite** **we don’t know how our decisions play out**. One way **to ease the burden** of our decisions is to use scenarios, or rather **apply a scenario mind-set**. Scenarios are an indispensable **strategic tool for decisionmakers** in the public, private, and non-profit spheres. They support C-level executives taking tough strategic decisions as well as anyone in a real-life situation, to cope with this dynamism and uncertainty. Strong **decisions** often **have** a **long-term impact**. Therefore, we like to avoid them and struggle from day to day, focussing on the immediate, short-term. Because of this, we are often living on the substance of the past, not laying out the harvest of the future. **Scenarios** help us **avoid** the mistake of **focussing only on immediate problems** and responses. With our focus on today’s issues, we often underes-timate the change on the horizon. It is not the question whether we want to buy a DVD with or without bonus material. The question is whether we will buy DVDs at all. For now, Netflix has answered the question with its stream-ing offering. It changed the industry landscape and paved the way for many competitors in the streaming business. This problem is famously framed by Bill Gates: We always overestimate the change that will occur in the next two years and underestimate the change that will occur in the next ten. Don’t let yourself be lulled into inaction.1 Therefore, decision makers need to pose the right questions and look through the right time lenses into the future. **While** the **future** is **uncertain**, **scenarios** help to **gain** an **insight** into a poten-tial future. They **enable decision makers to** set sails and **travel** **through** a storm of **uncertainty** and turbulence. Through this journey, scenarios help open the eyes of any organisation or individual to the possible ways that the future could play out and to the forces that will shape it. In this way they help to change our mental maps. Our mind is organized like a map, guiding our decisions. However, we are often rather like the early explorers relying on maps based on assumptions of people who have never seen a geography than being modern tourists equipped with a GPS navigator. Just imagine an explorer in the 16thor 17th century on the shores of the Americas, only equipped with a map of a Dutch mapmaker who has never seen the Americas and is basing the entire map on hearsay. Inaccurate maps are not a problem in and of itself, but it is what we do with the map that becomes the problem. As explorer this could have severe consequences, e.g., running out of water as the map would expect a river where there is no river in reality. The same happens in decision making. We base our decision making on our mental maps, and never challenge our assumptions. Yet, if we get the facts that are the basis of the map wrong, we end up with a wrong map that leads us in the wrong direction or triggers the wrong decisions and actions. And as soon as we believe the map is correct, it is really hard to change our mindset. This is the starting point of scenario planning, that challenges your mental maps. In addition, the scenario development process can bring future order to present chaos and ultimately contribute to the decisions made with confidence about the future. They help **break down** complex phenomena **into subsystems** that are **easier to analyse** and are, consequently, the tools of choice **for dynamic strategic planning**. In this way, the immediate concerns and the game changers at the horizon are both taken care of.

#### 2] IR and human nature are intertwined to explain power maximization that seen through evolutionary science

Johnson and Thayer 16

Johnson, D., & Thayer, B. (2016). The evolution of offensive realism: Survival under anarchy from the Pleistocene to the present. Politics and the Life Sciences, 35(1), 18-20. doi:10.1017/pls.2016.6 // js69

Offensive realism, more than other major theories of **international relations**, closely **matches** what we know about **human nature** from the **evolutionary science**s. Reading the literature of offensive realism can be hauntingly analogous to reading ethnographies of warfare among preindustrial societies such as the Yanomamo in the Amazon, the Mae Enga in New Guinea, or the Shuar in the Andes. An **evolutionary foundation** offers a major **reinterpretation of** the theory of offensive **realism** and **permits** its **broader** application to political **behavior across** a wide range of **actors**, domains, and historical eras. Evolutionary theory also allows realist scholars to explain the intellectual foundations of offensive realism: Why individuals and state decision-makers are egoistic and strive to dominate others when circumstances permit, and why they make strong ingroup/outgroup distinctions. These adaptations were favored by natural selection over the course of evolution and remain a significant cause of human behavior. The fundamental differences and similarities between our theory of offensive realism and Mearsheimer's are captured in Table 4. The abundance of intergroup threats, which cause the fear and uncertainty Mearsheimer identifies, are deeply rooted in human evolution **under** conditions of **anarchy** over millions of years, and not just in the anarchy of the modern state system in recent history. Thus, if theories of international relations are to accurately account for human nature, they must acknowledge how human behavior has been shaped by the ancestral environment, rather than (or as well as) contemporary international politics. The optimistic message of our argument is that understanding human nature will make efforts toward international institutions, democracy, and cooperation more effective. Cooperation and peace efforts often fail precisely because people have too rosy a view of human nature and thus fail to structure incentives effectively. Efforts to make **positive political change** may be **more effective if** **we view humans as offensive realists and intervene accordingly**. At worst, this perspective will make us err on the side of caution. No theory is perfect. None captures all salient issues. However, offensive realism is one of the most compelling current theories for explaining major phenomena across the history of international politics, such as great power rivalries and the origins of war. Part of the reason for its intuitive and explanatory success is, we suggest, its close match with human behavior. This match, in turn, should be no surprise because human behavior evolved under conditions of anarchy, which pervaded throughout our evolution as well as in international politics today. Self-help, **power maximization**, and **fear** are **strategi**es **to survive** nature, not just contemporary international politics. It is also worth noting that offensive realism may often be derided because we do not want it to be true. We prefer a more positive picture of human nature, perhaps one that accords with comfortable modern life in developed states. However, we need to see the world as it is, not as we would like it to be. When the stakes are high, such as in 1914, 1939, 1941, or 1962, or today in the Middle East, Ukraine, or the East and South China Seas, offensive realism does not seem so foreign. Indeed, the possibility of even more intense **security competition** in the Sino-American relationship, **between India and Pakistan**, and in the Middle East highlights the importance of making the theory's logic explicit and revealing and **testing** its **foundation**s. Finally, evolution may make significant contributions to other theories of international relations. Studies from an evolutionary perspective of the fundamental assumptions of neoliberalism, constructivism, poststructural approaches, Marxist and dependency theories, and other theories of international relations would be welcomed for four reasons. First, such studies would complement and critique the present study. Second, the evolutionary approach helps make a given theory's assumptions about human nature explicit, exposing them to empirical validation. Third, exploring how evolution intersects with other theories of international relations would advance the goal of consilience, fusing theoretical and empirical knowledge drawn from both the social and natural sciences. Fourth, we have argued that evolutionary insights closely match offensive realism among existing **theories** **of i**nternational **r**elations. However, if unconstrained from having to fit evolutionary insights into any particular existing school of thought, evolutionary theory may offer its own, unique theory of international relations that shares features of offensive realism (and perhaps other theories too) but is distinct from them all.

#### 3] Strategic Constructivism – affect based politics are key to calculating rational decisions and contextualizing problems to solutions for progress

Baird 18

Baird, T. (2018). Interest groups and strategic constructivism: business actors and border security policies in the European Union. Journal of Ethnic & Migration Studies, 44(1), 120-121. [https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2017.1316185 //](https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2017.1316185%20//) js69

**Strategic** (or actor-centred) **constructivism**, according to Saurugger (2013, 902), ‘**allows** both **strategic** thinking and cognitive **contextualisation** to be taken into account’ when describing the influence of ‘ideas, norms, or world views’ **on policy outcomes**. Strategic constructivism **combines** rationalist and **idealist logic**s of influence, whereby the rational calculations of actors are **social**ly embedded in **institution**s, and the objects of analysis are the processes of socially embedded rational **calc**ulation. Finnemore and Sikkink’s (1998, 910) concept of ‘strategic social construction’ elegantly captures the embeddedness of rational action, whereby ‘actors are making detailed **means**-ends calculations to **maximise** their **utilities**, but the utilities they want to maximise involve changing the other players’ utility function in ways that reflect the normative commitments of the norm entrepreneurs’. In other words, ‘actors strategize rationally to reconfigure preferences, identities, or social context’, a conceptualisation which **allows norms and rationality** to be linked through a ‘logic of appropriateness’ (Finnemore and Sikkink 1998, 888; Saurugger 2013, 891). Analysing the co-constitution of actors and structures, or rationality and contextuality, captures important dynamics of policy-making but also raises a number of issues. The first is the issue of causality, which Saurugger (2013) raises throughout her discussions of institutionalism, discourse, and co-construction. Saurugger treats ideas as causal, but not in a linear fashion linking interests and outcomes, but as co-constituted with rationality and contextuality. This logic does not consider that ideas impact policies like billiard balls, operating in a procedural logic of sequential effects, but that ideas are mutually constitutive: ideas are co-constitutive of **policy norms**, **as** ideational **constructions** are embedded **within** processes **normative change**, linked in a logic of inseparability. Preferences, identities, and **social contexts** co-**constitute policies**, and the actors involved are mutually linked through ideas, relations, materials, and practices which are not easily disentangled, but interact recursively (Finnemore and Sikkink 2001). Norms cannot be disentangled from policies in a way so that norms precede policy in a causal manner – norms and policy are mutually constituted. This logic of co-constitution I hope will capture some of the complexities involved in EU policy-making and show how the norms of business actors and the EU decision-making institutions have become aligned in policy. The second issue is related to methodology and the need in the interest group literature to openly discuss methodological challenges (Bunea and Baumgartner 2014, 1431): how to **empirically observe** strategic **social construction** in an opaque field with hard-to-reach actors who need to remain discreet? The field of border security policy is secretive and hard to access – actors may be unwilling to discuss lobbying tactics, EU representatives may be constrained in their ability to speak freely about corporate influence, tracing the mechanisms of influence through policy documents is fraught with limited paper trails, and observing actors informally is rarely feasible. Given the difficulties of accessing and representing this field of policy professionals, researchers may not be able to overcome these challenges completely. Nevertheless, I address these methodological issues through a multi-method approach, by utilising multiple sources of evidence from interviews, triangulation of policy documents, participant observation at key sites, and close readings of secondary literature. Multiple methods, while partial, allow us to integrate insights from various sources to uncover a trend or process which does not arise from one source of evidence alone in order to make a theoretical claim. In-depth interviews with actors involved in border security were conducted in order to grasp how they interpret influence, since ‘the construction of meaning must focus upon the interpretations of the subjects more than upon the observation of objects’ (Saurugger 2010, 472, citing Edelman 1985, 195). Fifteen individuals representing either EU institutions, corporations, think tanks, or industry organisations were interviewed between February and November 2015, identified through snowball sampling (see Appendix). All respondents have been anonymised, and all quotes are the personal views of respondents, not of the organisations they represent. Participant observation was conducted at four border security conferences in Europe and North America, in addition to a conference panel I participated in involving business actors. Fieldnotes and interview transcripts were coded using MaxQDA.

#### The card continues:
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First, **strategic contextualisation** norms raise the question of how to **address alternative frames** in the debate on EU border security, frames which bring into **account alternative world views** and interpretations **of social contexts** that move **beyond** the categories, logics, and practices of **business** actors. If business has enjoyed an unfair advantage in EU border security **policy-making**, by virtue of its enhanced political legitimacy, we must first determine whether or not this advantage constitutes a serious bias (Eising 2007; Lowery et al. 2015), and also question whether or not such influence results in optimal policy-making in such a territorial and securitised policy field (Coen, Grant, and Wilson 2010, 10–11). Second, strategic legitimation **raises questions of** transparency and **accountability**. While the tragedies in the Mediterranean may at first glance be far removed from the corporate lobbying tactics in Brussels, when we pierce the corporate veil we find that corporate actors play an important role in co-constituting harmful EU border security policies (Gammeltoft-Hansen 2013). If business actors play a role in the co-constitution of policies which may lead to violations of fundamental rights or to the loss of life in the Mediterranean, how are these actors implicated in such tragedies? Third, strategic communication raises questions concerning which particular communication strategies **reinforce frames and identities**, leading to the **re-shaping** of **policy norms**, and when and how such communication is successful. The evidence above points to variable forms of influence of strategic communication, but further work is needed. Alternative stakeholders may not have access to the same communication strategies as business actors, meaning that the policy priorities of alternative stakeholders may not be well communicated in the field of border security policies, leading to imbalances in the representation of information received by EU institutions.

#### 4] Discourse analysis – hegemonic struggle leads to firm ground for discourse formations
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A **discourse**–theoretical approach to policy **analysis** is based on the assumption that the differentiation between the political and the social (i.e., between those fields that are **more fluid** and open to debate and those which have become institutionalized) is **not permanent or objective**. Instead, it is a **reflection of hegemonic struggle**s, which define what must be seen as a political or a general common good. From this, it follows that the social structure of society is not the result of a natural process, but of historically antecedent social struggles: “[P]ower consists of radical acts of institution, which involve the elaboration of political frontiers and the drawing of lines of inclusion and exclusion” (Howarth, 2010, p. 310, emphasis in original). The **results** of these processes are stratified social, political, and economic structures with different layers of **sedimented discourses**. The term sedimentation stems from Husserl, and refers to the visibility of the political roots of social actions and meanings. The more a discourse becomes sedimented, the more social meanings and practices become stabilized and taken for granted, and the more difficult it becomes for change to take place. Sedimentation does not happen passively but because of political struggles that seek to **universalize** particular **interests**. The policy field, of course, is multidimensional, with crisscrossing interconnections and nodal points between the layers. Moreover, the layers are not completely fixed. Shifts and displacements regularly take place. A discourse–theoretical approach to policy analysis implies the **examin**ation of how **social** and political **relations** are changed or consolidated through and **with**in an **interest-led process**: “If such a structure is dependent upon its enunciation for its continuation, then it is at the site of enunciation that the question of its continuity is to be posed” (Butler, 1997, p. 19). The basic units of analysis are (verbal and nonverbal) articulations. An articulation is understood as a practice that establishes or reifies relations among meaningful elements with shifting meanings as a possible result (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985, p. 105). A discourse reflects the sum of articulations on a particular issue—that is, action and language—shaping the perceptions, thought processes, and practices of individuals. According to this concept of discourse, action and meaning are closely related. A hegemonic articulation is a special form of a political articulation (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985, p. 141). In contrast to mere political articulations, **hegemonic articulations** are expressed in such a way as to imply more than a specific demand or promise. They claim that once the hegemonic demand is fulfilled, an **array of other demands will** also **be fulfilled**; or even more, that the fulfillment of the **hegemonic** demand via different policy programs will lead directly to the **common good**. Accordingly, hegemonic articulation incorporates a multitude of other political articulations (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985, p. 141). Hegemonic strategies **construct** a **discourse** or project, or stabilize an already existent hegemonically structured discourse or project (see also Howarth, 2010, p. 310). They are embedded within a wider horizon of truth—stratified discourse **formations**. Different hegemonic articulations as parts of competing hegemonic projects seek to fill the notion of the common good. Within the context of the eurozone crisis since 2009, austerity is considered to be one of the most important issues (Blyth, 2013). **Austerity polici**es are professed to guarantee the stability of the eurozone and, ultimately, for solving the economic crisis. Specific policies include the fostering of flexible working arrangements (less employment protection, more wage flexibility, and fixed-term employment contracts), budget deficit reductions, public sector downsizing, massive cutbacks in social security benefits, the creation of a low wage job sector, privatization of state property, and the increase of excise duties. Hence, austerity can be conceptualized as a hegemonic articulation. Social sedimentation—the naturalization of relations of domination—involves the process of habit formation through repetition. Repetition is accordingly part of every hegemonic operation (Butler, 2000, pp. 39–41). When specific **heg**emonic articulations are rearticulated repeatedly over a certain period of time, they can become hegemonic projects. A hegemonic project “functions as a surface on which dislocations and **social demands** can be inscribed” (Laclau, 1990b, p. 63; Torfing, 1999, pp. 151–152). If successful, they constitute “a **new space of representation**” (Laclau, 1990b, p. 61), and **construct and stabilize systems of meanings**. This entails the formulation of policy programs and a political agenda that functions as a unifying principle for this specific hegemonic project (Bertramsen, 1991, p. 110). It follows that a hegemonic project involves a variety of actors who have been able to translate their particular approach to a given social, economic, or political problem into a general policy program. In most cases, the policy program already constitutes a compromise among the various actors. Social practice and hegemonic struggles are embedded in historically specific discourses— that is to say, historically specific structures, logics, and rules (Howarth/ Stavrakakis, 2000, p. 2). The term discourse formation denotes such a relatively stable spatiotemporal structure, including general concepts and values of social order (Laclau, 2000c, p. 284; Laclau & Mouffe, 1985, p. 105). The term highlights the contingent and discursive fundament of every society where meaning no longer floats freely but has become largely fixed: the horizon of possibilities is limited. A successfully stabilized discourse formation is similar to what Gramsci calls a historical bloc (Gramsci, 1971, p. 366). It is a contingent product of specific historical articulations that has been formed through hegemonic struggles (Laclau & Mouffe, 1990, p. 111). The discursive space, which is always already partially structured, constantly affects the ongoing rearrangement of the discursive elements in a selective manner: some forms of regulation or reorganization are more privileged than are others. Nevertheless, coherence is always limited and tentative. The **social order** of society can**not** be **easily transformed** into a different social order because of power relations that are deeply inscribed within the social matrix. Thus, the sedimented relations demonstrate a certain stability—temporal continuity. It follows that the social structure of a society is not neutral. Accordingly, every form of discourse formation comprises different layers of sedimented—and, therefore, more or less durable—actions and routinizations. Seen from this perspective, nothing meaningful exists outside discourses.6 At least to a certain degree, these temporal stabilizations reflect the historical relations of force.

#### 5] Representations--- Extinction isn’t white paranoia and apocalyptic reps are good

Thompson 18 [Nicole Akoukou. Chicago-based creative writer. 4-6-2018. "Why I will not allow the fear of a nuclear attack to be white-washed." RaceBaitR. http://racebaitr.com/2018/04/06/2087/#]

I couldn’t spare empathy for a white woman whose biggest fear was something that hadn’t happened yet and might not. Meanwhile, my most significant fears were in motion: women and men dying in cells after being wrongly imprisoned, choked out for peddling cigarettes, or shot to death during ‘routine’ traffic stops. I twitch when my partner is late, worried that a cantankerous cop has brutalized or shot him because he wouldn’t prostrate himself. As a woman of color, I am aware of the multiple types of violence that threaten me currently—not theoretically. Street harassment, excessively affecting me as a Black woman, has blindsided me since I was eleven. A premature body meant being catcalled before I’d discussed the birds and the bees. It meant being followed, whistled at, or groped. As an adult, while navigating through neighborhoods with extinguished street lights, I noticed the correlation between women’s safety and street lighting—as well as the fact that Black and brown neighborhoods were never as brightly lit as those with a more significant white population. I move quickly through those unlit spaces, never comforted by the inevitable whirl of red and blue sirens. In fact, it’s always been the contrary. Ever so often, cops approach me in their vehicle’s encouraging me to “Hurry along,” “Stay on the sidewalk,” or “Have a good night.” My spine stiffening, I never believed they endorsed my safety. Instead, I worried that I’d be accused of an unnamed accusation, corned by a cop who preys on Black women, or worse. A majority of my 50-minute bus ride from the southside of Chicago to the north to join these women for the birthday celebration was spent reading articles about citywide shootings. I began with a Chicago Tribute piece titled “33 people shot, seven fatally, in 13 hours,” then toppled into a barrage of RIP posts on Facebook and ended with angry posts about police brutality on Tumblr. You might guess, by the time I arrived to dinner I wasn’t in the mood for the “I can’t believe we’re all going to die because Trump is an idiot” shit. I shook my head, willing the meal to be over, and was grateful when the check arrived just as someone was asking me about my hair. My thinking wasn’t all too different from Michael Harriot’s ‘Why Black America Isn’t Worried About the Upcoming Nuclear Holocaust.” While the meal was partly pleasant, I departed thinking, “fear of nuclear demolition is just some white shit.” Sadly, that thought would not last long. I still vibe with Harriot’s statement, “Black people have lived under the specter of having our existence erased on a white man’s whim since we stepped onto the shore at Jamestown Landing.” However, a friend—a Black friend—ignited my nuclear paranoia by sharing theories about when it might happen and who faced the greatest threat. In an attempt to ease my friend’s fear, I leaned in to listen but accidentally toppled down the rabbit hole too. I forked through curated news feeds. I sifted through “fake news,” “actual news,” and foreign news sources. Suddenly, an idea took root: nuclear strike would disproportionately impact Black people, brown people, and low-income individuals. North Korea won’t target the plain sight racists of Portland, Oregon, the violently microaggressive liberals of the rural Northwest, or the white-hooded klansmen of Diamondhead, Mississippi. No, under the instruction of the supreme leader Kim Jong-un, North Korea will likely strike densely populated urban areas, such as Los Angeles, Chicago, Washington D.C., and New York City. These locations stand-out as targets for a nuclear strike because they are densely populated U.S. population centers. Attacking the heart of the nation or populous cities would translate to more casualties. With that in mind, it’s not lost on me that the most populous cities in the United States boast sizeable diverse populations, or more plainly put: Black populations. This shit stresses me out! There’s a creeping chill that follows me, a silent alarm that rings each time my Google alert chimes letting me know that Donald Trump has yet again provoked Kim Jong-Un, a man who allegedly killed his very own uncle. I’ve grown so pressed by the idea of nuclear holocaust that my partner and I started gathering non-perishables, candlesticks, a hand-crank radio, and other must-buy items that can be banked in a shopping cart. The practice of preparing for a nuclear holocaust sometimes feels comical, particularly when acknowledging that there has long been a war on Black people in this country. Blackness is bittersweet in flavor. We are blessed with the melanized skin, the MacGyver-like inventiveness of our foremothers, and our blinding brightness—but the anti-blackness that we experience is also blinding as well as stifling. We are stuck by rigged systems, punished with the prison industrial complex, housing discrimination, pay discrimination, and worse. We get side-eyes from strangers when we’re “loitering,” and the police will pull us over for driving “too fast” in a residential neighborhood. We get murdered for holding cell phones while standing in our grandmother’s backyard. The racism that strung up our ancestors, kept them sequestered to the back of the bus and kept them in separate and unequal schools still lives. It lives, and it’s more palpable than dormant. To me, this means one thing: Trump’s America isn’t an unfortunate circumstance, it’s a homecoming event that’s hundreds of years in the making, no matter how many times my white friends’ say, “He’s not my president.” In light of this homecoming, we now flirt with a new, larger fear of a Black genocide. America has always worked towards Black eradication through a steady stream of life-threatening inequality, but nuclear war on American soil would be swift. And for this reason I’ve grown tired of whiteness being at the center of the nuclear conversation. The race-neutral approach to the dialogue, and a tendency to continue to promote the idea that missiles will land in suburban and rural backyards, instead of inner-city playgrounds, is false. “The Day After,” the iconic, highest-rated television film in history, aired November 20, 1983. More than 100 million people tuned in to watch a film postulating a war between the Soviet Union and the United States. The film, which would go on to affect President Ronald Reagan and policymakers’ nuclear intentions, shows the “true effects of nuclear war on average American citizens.” The Soviet-targeted areas featured in the film include Higginsville, Kansas City, Sedalia, Missouri, as well as El Dorado Springs, Missouri. They depict the destruction of the central United States, and viewers watch as full-scale nuclear war transforms middle America into a burned wasteland. Yet unsurprisingly, the devastation from the attack is completely white-washed, leaving out the more likely victims which are the more densely populated (Black) areas. Death tolls would be high for white populations, yes, but large-scale losses of Black and brown folks would outpace that number, due to placement and poverty. That number would be pushed higher by limited access to premium health care, wealth, and resources. The effects of radiation sickness, burns, compounded injuries, and malnutrition would throttle Black and brown communities and would mark us for generations. It’s for that reason that we have to do more to foster disaster preparedness among Black people where we can. Black people deserve the space to explore nuclear unease, even if we have competing threats, anxieties, and worries. Jacqui Patterson, Director of the Environmental and Climate Justice Initiative, once stated: African American communities are disproportionately vulnerable to and impacted by natural (and unnatural) catastrophes. Our socio-economic vulnerability is based on multiple factors including our lack of wealth to cushion us, our disproportionate representation in lower quality housing stock, and our relative lack of mobility, etc.