### advantage

#### The Advantage is Indopak war

#### First, India is weaponizing the COVID crisis and healthcare collapse for political gain which brings tensions to the brink, exploiting groups and spiraling instability

Choudhury 21

Choudhury, Atif. “India's Public Health Collapse Is a Ticking Time Bomb for the Whole Region.” The Diplomat, Diplomat Media Inc., 27 Apr. 2021, thediplomat.com/2021/04/indias-public-health-collapse-is-a-ticking-time-bomb-for-the-whole-region/. // js69

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 government** itself 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.

#### Second 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**.

#### Third is extremism as the economic disparity and strategic advantages is making extremists destabilize India and Pakistan
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While this top-line picture in terms of number of attacks and casualties is clearly a positive one, the TTP has been regrouping since last summer. Various **breakaway factions** pledged [allegiance](https://www.dawn.com/news/1575010/breakaway-faction-splinter-group-join-ttp) to the group last July, and there are reports of it **making a comeback** in at least six districts in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa “[with the intimidation of locals, **targeted killings**, and **attacks on security forces**](https://gandhara.rferl.org/a/taliban-reemerges-in-former-pakistani-stronghold/30915484.html).” The TTP is [reported](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-pakistan-militancy/attacks-surge-in-northwest-pakistan-as-afghan-peace-effort-brings-shifting-sands-idUSKBN26911Y) to have **killed** at least **40 security forces** **between March and September 2020**. Official **Pakistani sources** [**blamed**](https://gandhara.rferl.org/a/taliban-reemerges-in-former-pakistani-stronghold/30915484.html) **India** as “behind” the revival. On the other end, the Pashtun Tahaffuz Movement, an [ethnic protest movement](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2020/02/07/why-is-pakistans-military-repressing-a-huge-nonviolent-pashtun-protest-movement/) that claims human rights violations against civilians by the Pakistani military during its operations against the Taliban, has alleged (without systematic proof) that “the Taliban are being allowed to return” to the tribal areas in a “secret deal with the military.” The TTP, of course, maintains ties with the Afghan Taliban and al-Qaida. Some have [speculated](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-pakistan-militancy/attacks-surge-in-northwest-pakistan-as-afghan-peace-effort-brings-shifting-sands-idUSKBN26911Y) that the TTP comeback may be linked with the Afghan peace process and Pakistan’s fencing of the border with Afghanistan, both of which threaten the group’s sanctuary in Afghanistan. (A U.N. report from July 2020 [stated](https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/asia_pacific/un-says-thousands-of-anti-pakistan-militants-in-afghanistan/2020/07/26/b8e83e94-cf2a-11ea-826b-cc394d824e35_story.html) there were 6,000 Pakistani fighters in Afghanistan, most affiliated with the TTP.) There has also been some speculation that the Afghan peace process might include, at some point, a separate Afghan-Pakistan deal, with Afghanistan denying safe haven to the TTP potentially in return for Pakistan denying sanctuary to the Haqqanis (though it is unclear whether that will be possible, or acceptable to Pakistan). Pakistan has already [raised](https://twitter.com/abdsayedd/status/1347993334472650755?s=21) questions about Afghanistan’s sanctuary for the TTP. The **Islamic State in Khorasan** (ISIS-K), which operates in Afghanistan and is the Afghan Taliban’s rival, has been responsible for recent attacks in Baluchistan, including of 11 Shia Hazara coal miners this January — **complicating Pakistan’s** already **violent** sectarian **landscape**. In discussing this attack, Pakistan’s Prime Minister Imran Khan again [**blamed**](https://www.dawn.com/news/1600800/india-backing-is-to-spread-unrest-in-pakistan-pm-imran-on-hazara-killings) **India** for “**backing ISIS**” **to “spread** **unrest**” in Pakistan. (Pakistan has also long claimed that India uses Afghan soil — on which ISIS-K is based — **to destabilize Pakistan**.) **Anti-India militant groups** continue to have a **foothold in Pakistan**, but Pakistan has begun taking action against the Lashkar-e-Taiba (LeT) in recent years, especially in the wake of its enhanced monitoring by the [Financial Action Task Force](http://www.fatf-gafi.org/countries/#Pakistan) (FATF) in 2018 for terrorism financing; it is a key goal of Khan’s government to have Pakistan removed from this “grey list,” because it hurts the country’s image and causes it financial harm. Most notably, Pakistan has [sentenced](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-51486346) Hafiz Saeed, the leader of the LeT, to 11 years in prison for terrorism financing. Another LeT leader, Zaki-ur-Rehman Lakhvi, was also recently [sentenced](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-pakistan-court/pakistan-sentences-lakhvi-to-five-years-for-terrorism-financing-idUSKBN29D16J) to five years for terrorism financing. The United States has acknowledged these steps, but has [argued](https://twitter.com/State_SCA/status/1346499492980412417?s=20) that Pakistan needs to hold these LeT leaders accountable for more than terrorism financing. **Pakistan** has **taken less action** **against** Jaish-e-Mohammad, the **terrorist** group responsible for the Pulwama attack of February 2019; its leader, Masood Azhar, is at large. Notably, Pakistan-based **militant groups** have not been responsible for any violence in Kashmir since the Pulwama attack; in an interview later in 2019, Khan [asked](https://www.thehindu.com/news/international/imran-khan-warns-pakistanis-against-jihad-in-kashmir/article29450251.ece) Pakistanis not to engage in any violence or “jihad” in India, because it would be blamed on Pakistan and would harm it. That signal seems to have worked. **Placing** the **blame on India** for terrorism in Pakistan is something the country has long done, although not always in as direct a manner as in 2020. Beyond linking the recent ISIS-K attack with India, Pakistan also linked the Baluch Liberation Army’s June 2020 [attack](https://www.aljazeera.com/economy/2020/6/29/pakistan-4-killed-in-attack-on-karachi-stock-exchange) on the Karachi Stock Exchange with its eastern neighbor (Pakistan has longed argued India supports the Baluch insurgency). In November, the Pakistani foreign minister, in a splashy press conference, released details of the “[dossier](https://www.dawn.com/news/1590441)” Pakistan has compiled **linking India to** funding, arming, and **training terrorists** (including the TTP) against Pakistan. Only the summary — not the full dossier — discussed in that meeting has been made public. It found a receptive audience in a Pakistani population already wary of the Narendra Modi government for its actions in Kashmir and the alarming rise in intolerance toward Muslims in India. The Pakistani government says it has shared the dossier with the U.N. and various governments, but those parties have not publicly acknowledged it. Pakistan’s strategy toward militant groups has long been two-pronged, as it were: to take overt (and successful) action against groups targeting the Pakistani state and citizenry — the TTP — without taking action against the groups it has considered “strategic assets,” including the Afghan Taliban that have sought sanctuary on its soil and anti-India militants that its intelligence agencies have covertly supported. Underlying this approach has been an effort to hedge bets: regarding the Taliban’s possible influence in Afghanistan after an international withdrawal, and regarding militant proxies who may give Pakistan parity on an otherwise lopsided conventional military footing with India. There are signs some of this is changing. For instance, Pakistan has developed a good relationship with Kabul, especially in recent months, but it also knows its leverage over the Taliban keeps it relevant to the Afghan peace process. The FATF listing has induced Pakistan to take its strictest action to date on militant groups, especially LeT. It also helps that Pakistan is keen to shed an image associated with terrorism. Yet the long-term sustainability of actions Pakistan has taken in response to pressure from FATF remains to be seen; will they be reversed when the FATF grey-listing is lifted? And what happens after the international withdrawal from Afghanistan is complete? The central issue is not one of state capacity, but an unwillingness of the Pakistani state to paint all jihadist groups with the same brush, to recognize the linkages in ideology that connect them all — and to acknowledge how those ideologies find fodder in Pakistan’s laws, educational curricula, politics, and indeed the very nature of how Pakistan has defined itself, as I detailed in my [book](https://www.brookings.edu/book/pakistan-under-siege/). This issue holds for Pakistan’s military, and also across its spectrum of major political parties, as has been demonstrated over the last 12 years with all three of them successively holding power. That lack of recognition of how terrorism and extremism are connected, and of the very **roots of extremism**, is the crux of the problem: **Militant groups** can always **find recruits**, from other groups or from the general population. Non-armed right-wing fundamentalist groups, notably the Tehreek-e-Labbaik Pakistan (TLP), share these ideologies, glorify violence (the TLP, after all, celebrated the murder of Salmaan Taseer for daring to propose reform in Pakistan’s blasphemy laws), and enjoy growing support and sympathy. For a brief time after the Peshawar school attack of 2014, there was some clarity in recognizing the homegrown nature **of** the Pakistan Taliban, and the country devised a National Action Plan to tackle extremism and terrorism. While it was incomplete and never acknowledged the **deeper** roots of **extremism**, it was a start. But it has gone by the wayside as the Pakistani state has turned back once again to blaming India for terrorism in the country. Meanwhile, the underlying roots of extremism — the country’s curricula, the way its politics works, and its laws, which have all [primed](https://www.brookings.edu/book/pakistan-under-siege/) its citizenry to buy into and sympathize with the propaganda of extremist groups — remain intact. Pakistan’s claims about India deserve to be heard and investigated, as the international community ignoring them only worsens Pakistan’s sense of victimhood, but that does not absolve the state of its own policies that have fostered extremism and allowed terror groups to proliferate on its soil. As the **Biden administration** takes office, it is worth recognizing the effectiveness of the FATF tool, and the **limited leverage** of the United States **to effect** real **change on** security matters in **Pakistan**, at least initially. Ultimately, Pakistan must be the one to connect the dots linking all the terrorist groups on its soil **and** their ideologies, acknowledge how it has **contributed to extremism** within its borders, and decide on addressing the roots of that extremism. I would argue that the best way to encourage it to do so is for America to develop a relationship with the country that is separate from Afghanistan, and separate from India: to deal with Pakistan on its own terms. Meanwhile, security concerns in Pakistan are more or less contained, with the FATF listing and the Pakistani state’s action against the TTP being the primary mechanisms for that control, and the Biden administration need not make them the center of its Pakistan policy.

#### Indopak war is likely, and tension is high and with China coming into the mix the nuclear trijunction is ready to blow – the card is long so flow for warrants
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The relations between three Asian nuclear neighbors – **Pakistan, India, and China** – plummeted to new depths in 2020, with experts foreseeing no “detente” next year either. The tumultuous year saw the first **deadly clash** between Indian and Chinese armies in the last 45 years in the mountainous Ladakh region in June. The ties between Pakistan India also remained **at odds** **amid frequent clashes along** with the disputed Jammu and **Kashmir border**. The military standoff followed **New Delhi’s unilateral decision to separate Ladakh** from disputed Jammu and Kashmir and revoke the Himalayan region’s semi-autonomous status in August last year, a move vehemently **opposed by** Beijing and **Islamabad**. **Ladakh region** which **borders China and Pakistan** serves **as** **the** world’s only “**nuclear trijunction**.” In another rare development in November Pakistan released a dossier accusing India of “actively planning, promoting, aiding, abetting, financing and execution of terrorist activities” on its soil. India, however, denied the charges and accused Islamabad of “patronizing” terrorism. Speaking to Anadolu Agency, Aizaz Ahmad Chaudhry, Pakistan’s former foreign secretary said tensions between China and India owed origin to New Delhi’s August 2019 move of carving out a separate centrally administered Ladakh region. “The year 2020 witnessed **continued tensions between Pakistan and India** as the latter remained in a disengagement mood, and did not agree to hold a dialogue on the outstanding issues,” he said. The year also saw nearly **daily clashes between** the **two militaries along** the **Line of Control** (LoC) -- a de facto border that divides the picturesque Jammu and Kashmir between the two nuclear neighbors. **Dozens** of soldiers and civilians from both sides were **killed**, while scores of others were injured in the clashes, which have taken a toll on the inhabitants of bordering areas. **Relations slide** Islamabad, **over** the past 12 months, left no stone unturned to raise alleged **human rights violations** in the disputed region, particularly **after New Delhi** **revoked constitutional special status**. Jammu and Kashmir -- a Muslim majority region -- is held by Pakistan and India in parts but claimed in full. A small silver of the territory is held by China. Several pro-freedom groups have been fighting Indian troops for either uniting with Pakistan or independence. “The slide which began in **India Pakistan relations** in August 2019, **worsened in 2020**, **and** it is **unlikely to improve** shortly,” said Sameer Patil, a fellow at the Gateway House, a Mumbai-based think tank. “**Pakistan's** frequent **attempts to highlight** the **Kashmir issue at** the **international level** have only **caused further Indian intransigence**,” he said. “**Pakistan’s** continued **greylisting** by the Financial Action task Force -- a global money-laundering watchdog -- has **given confidence to India** **that** its **strategy of pressuring and isolating Islamabad is working**,” he added. Islamabad has been on the global money-laundering watchdog's radar since June 2018, when it was placed on its gray list for terrorist financing and money laundering risks after an assessment of the country's financial system and security mechanism. Another Pakistani former Foreign Secretary, Salman Bashir said that **Indian “obsession” with Pakistan** witnessed **new escalatory measures by “intensifying active hostilities** across the LoC and propaganda blitz **extinguishing hope**s **for regional cooperation**”. He said that during the year Pakistan remained “mired” in domestic political squabbles, trying to fix governance and facing the brunt of global power play with attendant regional implications. Both Indian and Pakistani analysts do not see any possibility of a thaw in relations in near future. US tilt towards India Chaudhry, who heads the Institute of Strategic Studies (ISS), an Islamabad-based think tank, said since India does not seem to change its policies towards Kashmir and neighbors, there is hardly any scope for improvement in relations. Further, he said, **the recent US tilt towards India** has **emboldened New Delhi** to continue its “belligerent” approach towards its neighbors. Rajiv Ranjan, who teaches international relations at Shanghai University maintains that India-China relations were also at the “lowest point”. “India-China engagement is at its lowest point today. And, I expect that **frequent clashes** [between the two sides] **will be a new normal** not only along the undefined border since border infrastructures improved but inherent competition in the region and beyond to shape the regional and global politics,” he said. He added that the current deterioration in the bilateral engagement between the two countries is resultant of a combination of unsettled boundaries and strategic antagonism. He asked countries to restructure dialogue mechanisms to achieve a stable engagement. “Both countries must restructure dialogue mechanisms, settle the foundational irritants of their bilateral relationship and realign interests if they want to achieve any meaningful and stable engagement,” said Ranjan. Beijing push for globalism Chaudhry, Pakistan’s former foreign secretary, observed that Beijing is likely to continue to push for “globalism”, and “multilateralism” with an economic emphasis, mainly on its ambitious Belt and Road Initiative (BRI). “India has long been opposing the BRI, and likely to continue the same policy in years to come,” he said. Bashir, who also served as Pakistan’s High Commissioner to India from 2012-14 described 2020 as a “transformational” year as established assumptions about states, societies, and interstate conduct in South Asia were challenged. “India, suffered immense reputational loss, unprecedented economic slump, social turmoil and lost its credentials as a secular democracy with rule of law and a modicum of enlightened values and justice, “said Bashir, who also served as Pakistan’s top diplomat in China. “Pakistan deepened its relations with Russia and China and intensified efforts to stabilize Afghanistan, “he said. Bashir also referred to Islamabad’s crucial role in the ongoing reconciliation process in Afghanistan, which aims to end Washington’s longest war in recent history through a political settlement. “Three geographically contiguous nuclear powers -- India, China, and Pakistan -- must learn to live with each other and devote themselves to higher ideals and cooperation for development, “he added.

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

#### 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.

### solvency

#### The TRIPS Waiver is key to increase medical R&D global and to help 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

Gupta, June 2021

Gupta, Shailly. “EU, UK, Switzerland, Norway Must Stop Blocking Negotiations on Landmark Pandemic Monopoly Waiver - World.” ReliefWeb, OCHA, 7 June 2021, reliefweb.int/report/world/eu-uk-switzerland-norway-must-stop-blocking-negotiations-landmark-pandemic-monopoly. // js69

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

#### Skyrms and Narens 20

Skyrms, B., Narens, L. (2020). The Pursuit of Happiness: Philosophical and Psychological Foundations of Utility. United Kingdom: Oxford University Press. // js69 https://books.google.com/books?id=MNUBEAAAQBAJ&pg=PA85&lpg=PA85&dq=subsequent+research+expanded+the+list.+In+1956,+Olds+wrote+a+popular+account+of+the+research+in+Scientific+American,+%E2%80%9CPleasure+Centers+in+the+Brain,%E2%80%9D+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+%E2%80%9Ccure%E2%80%9D+was+completed+with+the+help+of+a+young+female+prostitute+recruited+from+the+French+Quarter.%E2%81%B6+Some+may+have+been+tempted+to+think+a+hedonimeter+is+right+around+the+corner,+measuring+activity+in+the+pleasure+center+of+the+brain.+There+are+several+problems+with+this+simplistic+interpretation+of+Olds%E2%80%99+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+%E2%80%9Cwanting%E2%80%9D+or+incentive+salience+rather+than+%E2%80%9Cliking.%E2%80%9D%E2%81%B7+These+centers+can+be+blocked,+and+a+subject+can+still+experience+pleasure.+But+the+subject+will+not+desire+to+r&source=bl&ots=Lh89RTbqJ9&sig=ACfU3U14rY7aLIo2CeCI5jQErcoRvh\_krw&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwiijvDHm4nzAhULJzQIHcuOBMAQ6AF6BAgCEAM#v=onepage&q=subsequent%20research%20expanded%20the%20list.%20In%201956%2C%20Olds%20wrote%20a%20popular%20account%20of%20the%20research%20in%20Scientific%20American%2C%20%E2%80%9CPleasure%20Centers%20in%20the%20Brain%2C%E2%80%9D%20and%20the%20findings%20became%20famous.%20Subsequent%20investigation%20describing%20repeated%20self-stimulation%20by%20rats%20to%20the%20exclusion%20of%20all%20else%20made%20for%20an%20even%20more%20powerful%20story.%20One%20might%20think%20that%20such%20experiments%20could%20never%20be%20carried%20out%20in%20humans%2C%20but%20they%20were%2C%20in%20fact%2C%20carried%20out%20by%20Robert%20Heath%20at%20Tulane%20University%20in%20the%201970s.%20One%20infamous%20experiment%20was%20aimed%20at%20curing%20a%20subject%20of%20homosexuality%2C%20patient%20B-19.%20B-19%20would%20self-stimulate%20by%20repeatedly%20pressing%20a%20button%20connected%20to%20implanted%20electrodes%20just%20as%20the%20rat%20did.%20Heath%20stimulated%20the%20patient%20in%20conjunction%20with%20heterosexual%20pornography.%20The%20%E2%80%9Ccure%E2%80%9D%20was%20completed%20with%20the%20help%20of%20a%20young%20female%20prostitute%20recruited%20from%20the%20French%20Quarter.%E2%81%B6%20Some%20may%20have%20been%20tempted%20to%20think%20a%20hedonimeter%20is%20right%20around%20the%20corner%2C%20measuring%20activity%20in%20the%20pleasure%20center%20of%20the%20brain.%20There%20are%20several%20problems%20with%20this%20simplistic%20interpretation%20of%20Olds%E2%80%99%20experiments.%20The%20first%20is%20that%20the%20areas%20that%20he%20identified%20as%20pleasure%20centers%20appear%20not%20to%20be%20pleasure%20centers%20at%20all.%20They%20are%20connected%20to%20desire%20rather%20than%20pleasure%2C%20to%20%E2%80%9Cwanting%E2%80%9D%20or%20incentive%20salience%20rather%20than%20%E2%80%9Cliking.%E2%80%9D%E2%81%B7%20These%20centers%20can%20be%20blocked%2C%20and%20a%20subject%20can%20still%20experience%20pleasure.%20But%20the%20subject%20will%20not%20desire%20to%20r&f=false

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

### Uv

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

#### Interpretation and Violation: All teams must disclose all previously broken positions on the NDCA 20-21 LD wiki via open-source – they don’t – screenshot in doc of wiki

#### Standards –

#### 1] Disclosure helps debaters who are newer debate including novices or small school varsity debaters and non-disclosure doesn’t help debaters anymore means the interp has no harm but big benefit to fairness and education

Zhou 16 Lawrence Zhou competed at Bartlesville HS in Oklahoma (2010-2014) in Lincoln-Douglas Debate. In high school, he was the 2014 NSDA LD National Champion. He was also a three-time finalist and two-time champion of the Oklahoma State Tournament and placed 6th at NFL Nationals his junior year. He now attends the University of Oklahoma where he is a member of the OU Ethics Bowl Team and debates on the OU Shannon Self Debate Program policy team, where he has cleared at tournaments such as CEDA. <https://www.premierdebate.com/articles/small-schools-and-disclosure-by-lawrence-zhou/> Accessed 1/8/21 // JoshDrills

Look, I get it. I really do. A small school debater disclosing prep that they worked hard to find without a lot of resources almost feels like giving away prep for free, and it opens that debater up to the potential of “prep-outs” from “big schools”. I’ve been there. But the cost of **not disclosing disproportionately harms small school debaters** even more. This argument has been made by both Nails and Bietz, but I’ll update it. Nails says that **top debaters at the 2012 TOC who did not disclose did not succeed in hiding their cases** because (by his estimation) **90% of debaters** at the TOC **knew what the non-disclosing teams were running anyways. The only people harmed were small school debaters who did not have the connections to find out what those top debaters were running.** While this example is a bit outdated since most debaters in out-rounds of the TOC in 2015 did practice disclosure, **the same logic stands: the only people hurt by non-disclosure are small school debaters.** Bietz has argued that big teams already get more flows simply by virtue of having more resources. When judging for my alma matter in Oklahoma, I’ll often send debaters from my old high school flows from debaters I judge to help them prepare for later rounds. Many if not most coaches do similar things to benefit their debaters. Because of me, my old high school has access to more information than other schools, and sometimes this makes a big difference in a close round. [1] Some might point out that the above argument is just a reason for large school debaters to disclose against small school debaters, but the same logic applies in the context of small school debaters disclosing against other small school debaters. Say small school debater A hits small school debater B. In a world **where both disclose, there is a fairly even playing field between the two debaters**. Both will know what their opponent is running by simply checking the wiki so **they can focus their limited pre-round prep-time on preparing strategies specific to the opponent**. As a result, the debate be a lot more enjoyable, contain more direct clash, and provide the participants a better educational experience.

#### 2] Evidence ethics – open source is the only way to verify before round that cards aren't miscut and it doesn’t take prep time to check links

#### 3] Clash—allows for nuanced evidence comparison as

#### 7] Accessibility: the ability to prepare to engage in the round is key to those with anxiety and stress who are overwhelmed when they hit new random offs that were not disclosed. If we care about oppression and a focus on methods to solve, I should at least be able to know how to engage with the arguments they’re going for

#### A]Fairness is a voter for competitive evaluation

#### B]Substantive engagement is a voter, which exists when debaters directly answer each other’s content instead of just avoiding it.

#### Prefer my voter to their impacts since

#### 1. It gives us the best methodologies, since both of us have to be responsive and comparative. Otherwise, we just yell in the dark and don’t compare real solutions

#### 2. Debate’s fundamental value comes from teaching us how to defend our beliefs, as that’s a skillset that applies in any context, like politics, job interviews, and everyday conversations

#### Competing interps—leads to the race to the top to find the best possible norms

#### Drop the debater to set a norm – if you lose you'll open source from now on

#### No rvis: NC can hedge 7 minutes on the shell making 1ar impossible
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