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## 1

### 1nc – t

#### Interpretation—the aff may not specify a just government

#### Indefinite singulars imply a “rules reading” where the sentence expresses a generic normative evaluation, especially true in the context of the resolution which is written normatively. Cohen 01

Ariel Cohen (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev), “On the Generic Use of Indefinite Singulars,” Journal of Semantics 18:3, 2001 <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/188590876.pdf>

\*IS generic = Indefinite Singulars

French, then, expresses the two types of reading differently. In English, on¶ the other hand, generic BPs are ambiguous between inductivist and normative¶ readings. But even in English there is one type of generic that can express only¶ one of these readings, and this is the IS generic. While BPs are ambiguous¶ between the inductivist and the rules and regulations readings, ISs are not. In¶ the supermarket scenario discussed above, only (44.b) is true:¶ (44) a. A banana sells for $.49/lb.¶ b. A banana sells for $1.00/lb.¶ The normative force of the generic IS has been noted before. Burton-Roberts¶ (1977) considers the following minimal pair:¶ (45) a. Gentlemen open doors for ladies.¶ b. A gentleman opens doors for ladies.¶ He notes that (45.b), but not (45.a), expresses what he calls “moral necessity.”7¶ Burton-Roberts observes that if Emile does not as a rule open doors for ladies, his mother could utter [(45.b)] and thereby successfully imply that Emile was not, or was¶ not being, a gentleman. Notice that, if she were to utter. . . [(45.a)] she¶ might achieve the same effect (that of getting Emile to open doors for¶ ladies) but would do so by different means. . . For [(45.a)] merely makes a¶ generalisation about gentlemen (p. 188).¶ Sentence (45.b), then, unlike (45.a), does not have a reading where it makes¶ a generalization about gentlemen; it is, rather, a statement about some social¶ norm. It is true just in case this norm is in effect, i.e. it is a member of a set of¶ socially accepted rules and regulations.¶ An IS that, in the null context, cannot be read generically, may receive a¶ generic reading in a context that makes it clear that a rule or a regulation is¶ referred to. For example, Greenberg (1998) notes that, out of the blue, (46.a)¶ and (46.b) do not have a generic reading:¶ (46) a. A Norwegian student whose name ends with ‘s’ or ‘j’ wears green¶ thick socks.¶ b. A tall, left-handed, brown haired neurologist in Hadassa hospital¶ earns more than $50,000 a year.¶ However, Greenberg points out that in the context of (47.a) and (47.b),¶ respectively, the generic readings of the IS subject are quite natural:¶ (47) a. You know, there are very interesting traditions in Norway, concerning the connection between name, profession, and clothing. For¶ example, a Norwegian student. . .¶ b. The new Hadassa manager has some very funny paying criteria. For¶ example, a left-handed. . .¶ Even IS sentences that were claimed above to lack a generic reading, such¶ as (3.b) and (4.b), may, in the appropriate context, receive such a reading:¶ (48) a. Sire, please don’t send her to the axe. Remember, a king is generous!¶ b. How dare you build me such a room? Don’t you know a room is¶ square?

#### Rules readings are always generalized – specific instances are not consistent. lCohen 01

Ariel Cohen (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev), “On the Generic Use of Indefinite Singulars,” Journal of Semantics 18:3, 2001 https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/188590876.pdf

In general, as, again, already noted by Aristotle, rules and definitions are not relativized to particular individuals; it is rarely the case that a specific individual¶ forms part of the description of a general rule.¶ Even DPs of the form a certain X or a particular X, which usually receive¶ a wide scope interpretation, cannot, in general, receive such an interpretation in the context of a rule or a definition. This holds of definitions in general, not¶ only of definitions with an IS subject. The following examples from the Cobuild¶ dictionary illustrate this point:¶ (74) a. A fanatic is a person who is very enthusiastic about a particular¶ activity, sport, or way of life.¶ b. Something that is record-breaking is better than the previous¶ record for a particular performance or achievement.¶ c. When a computer outputs something it sorts and produces information as the result of a particular program or operation.¶ d. If something sheers in a particular direction, it suddenly changes¶ direction, for example to avoid hitting something.

#### That outweighs—only our evidence speaks to how indefinite singulars are interpreted in the context of normative statements like the resolution. This means throw out aff counter-interpretations that are purely descriptive

#### Violation—they specified India

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Precision – if we win definitions the aff is not topical. The resolution is the only predictable stasis point for dividing ground—any deviation justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### 2] Predictable limits—specifying a just government offers huge explosion in the topic since they get permutations of hundreds of just governments in the world depending on their definition of just government. Neg positions like the Economy DA, Advantage CPs, etc. are jettisoned when the aff specifies a country that we don’t have specific ev to. Limits explodes neg prep burden and draws un-reciprocal lines of debate, where the aff is always ahead, turns their pragmatics offense. PICs are a nonstarter – just read 1AR theory and doesn’t justify preemptive abuse

**3] TVA solves – read the aff as advantage – most authors advocate for a change in a strike writ large**

#### Topicality is a voting issue that should be evaluated through competing interpretations – it tells the negative what they do and do not have to prepare for—there’s no way for the negative to know what constitutes a “reasonable interpretation” when we do prep – reasonability is arbitrary and causes a race to the bottom, proliferating abuse

#### No RVIs—it’s your burden to be topical.

#### T before 1ar theory on normsetting – we only have a couple months to set t restrictions (esp in finals!) but can discuss condo, pics, etc. anytime.

## 2

### 1nc – k

#### Settler colonialism is the permeating structure of the nation-state which requires the elimination of indigenous life and land via the occupation of settlers. The appropriation of land turns Natives into ghosts and chattel slaves into excess labor.

Tuck and Yang 12

(Eve Tuck, Unangax, State University of New York at New Paltz K. Wayne Yang University of California, San Diego, Decolonization is not a metaphor, Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society Vol. 1, No. 1, 2012, pp. 1-40, JKS)

Our intention in this descriptive exercise is not be exhaustive, or even inarguable; instead, we wish to emphasize that (a) decolonization will take a different shape in each of these contexts - though they can overlap - and that (b) neither external nor internal colonialism adequately describe the form of colonialism which operates in the United States or other nation-states in which the colonizer comes to stay. Settler colonialism operates through internal/external colonial modes simultaneously because there is no spatial separation between metropole and colony. For example, in the United States, many Indigenous peoples have been forcibly removed from their homelands onto reservations, indentured, and abducted into state custody, signaling the form of colonization as simultaneously internal (via boarding schools and other biopolitical modes of control) and external (via uranium mining on Indigenous land in the US Southwest and oil extraction on Indigenous land in Alaska) with a frontier (the US military still nicknames all enemy territory “Indian Country”). The horizons of the settler colonial nation-state are total and require a mode of total appropriation of Indigenous life and land, rather than the selective expropriation of profit-producing fragments. Settler colonialism is different from other forms of colonialism in that settlers come with the intention of making a new home on the land, a homemaking that insists on settler sovereignty over all things in their new domain. Thus, relying solely on postcolonial literatures or theories of coloniality that ignore settler colonialism will not help to envision the shape that decolonization must take in settler colonial contexts. Within settler colonialism, the most important concern is land/water/air/subterranean earth (land, for shorthand, in this article.) Land is what is most valuable, contested, required. This is both because the settlers make Indigenous land their new home and source of capital, and also because the disruption of Indigenous relationships to land represents a profound epistemic, ontological, cosmological violence. This violence is not temporally contained in the arrival of the settler but is reasserted each day of occupation. This is why Patrick Wolfe (1999) emphasizes that settler colonialism is a structure and not an event. In the process of settler colonialism, land is remade into property and human relationships to land are restricted to the relationship of the owner to his property. Epistemological, ontological, and cosmological relationships to land are interred, indeed made pre-modern and backward. Made savage. In order for the settlers to make a place their home, they must destroy and disappear the Indigenous peoples that live there. Indigenous peoples are those who have creation stories, not colonization stories, about how we/they came to be in a particular place - indeed how we/they came to be a place. Our/their relationships to land comprise our/their epistemologies, ontologies, and cosmologies. For the settlers, Indigenous peoples are in the way and, in the destruction of Indigenous peoples, Indigenous communities, and over time and through law and policy, Indigenous peoples’ claims to land under settler regimes, land is recast as property and as a resource. Indigenous peoples must be erased, must be made into ghosts (Tuck and Ree, forthcoming). At the same time, settler colonialism involves the subjugation and forced labor of chattel slaves, whose bodies and lives become the property, and who are kept landless. Slavery in settler colonial contexts is distinct from other forms of indenture whereby excess labor is extracted from persons. First, chattels are commodities of labor and therefore it is the slave’s person that is the excess. Second, unlike workers who may aspire to own land, the slave’s very presence on the land is already an excess that must be dis-located. Thus, the slave is a desirable commodity but the person underneath is imprisonable, punishable, and murderable. The violence of keeping/killing the chattel slave makes them deathlike monsters in the settler imagination; they are reconfigured/disfigured as the threat, the razor’s edge of safety and terror. The settler, if known by his actions and how he justifies them, sees himself as holding dominion over the earth and its flora and fauna, as the anthropocentric normal, and as more developed, more human, more deserving than other groups or species. The settler is making a new "home" and that home is rooted in a homesteading worldview where the wild land and wild people were made for his benefit. He can only make his identity as a settler by making the land produce, and produce excessively, because "civilization" is defined as production in excess of the "natural" world (i.e. in excess of the sustainable production already present in the Indigenous world). In order for excess production, he needs excess labor, which he cannot provide himself. The chattel slave serves as that excess labor, labor that can never be paid because payment would have to be in the form of property (land). The settler's wealth is land, or a fungible version of it, and so payment for labor is impossible.6 The settler positions himself as both superior and normal; the settler is natural, whereas the Indigenous inhabitant and the chattel slave are unnatural, even supernatural. Settlers are not immigrants. Immigrants are beholden to the Indigenous laws and epistemologies of the lands they migrate to. Settlers become the law, supplanting Indigenous laws and epistemologies. Therefore, settler nations are not immigrant nations (See also A.J. Barker, 2009). Not unique, the United States, as a settler colonial nation-state, also operates as an empire - utilizing external forms and internal forms of colonization simultaneous to the settler colonial project. This means, and this is perplexing to some, that dispossessed people are brought onto seized Indigenous land through other colonial projects. Other colonial projects include enslavement, as discussed, but also military recruitment, low-wage and high-wage labor recruitment (such as agricultural workers and overseas-trained engineers), and displacement/migration (such as the coerced immigration from nations torn by U.S. wars or devastated by U.S. economic policy). In this set of settler colonial relations, colonial subjects who are displaced by external colonialism, as well as racialized and minoritized by internal colonialism, still occupy and settle stolen Indigenous land. Settlers are diverse, not just of white European descent, and include people of color, even from other colonial contexts. This tightly wound set of conditions and racialized, globalized relations exponentially complicates what is meant by decolonization, and by solidarity, against settler colonial forces. Decolonization in exploitative colonial situations could involve the seizing of imperial wealth by the postcolonial subject. In settler colonial situations, seizing imperial wealth is inextricably tied to settlement and re-invasion. Likewise, the promise of integration and civil rights is predicated on securing a share of a settler-appropriated wealth (as well as expropriated ‘third-world’ wealth). Decolonization in a settler context is fraught because empire, settlement, and internal colony have no spatial separation. Each of these features of settler colonialism in the US context - empire, settlement, and internal colony - make it a site of contradictory decolonial desires7. Decolonization as metaphor allows people to equivocate these contradictory decolonial desires because it turns decolonization into an empty signifier to be filled by any track towards liberation. In reality, the tracks walk all over land/people in settler contexts. Though the details are not fixed or agreed upon, in our view, decolonization in the settler colonial context must involve the repatriation of land simultaneous to the recognition of how land and relations to land have always already been differently understood and enacted; that is, all of the land, and not just symbolically. This is precisely why decolonization is necessarily unsettling, especially across lines of solidarity. “Decolonization never takes place unnoticed” (Fanon, 1963, p. 36). Settler colonialism and its decolonization implicates and unsettles everyone.

#### The Indian government is embedded in settler colonialist logics, even if they look different than they do in the United States. Their validation of the Indian settler state is an act of violence against the Kashmir people.

#### Pal20

Looking into settler colonialism through india’s occupation of kashmir by subhajit pal, <https://www.inversejournal.com/2020/06/02/looking-into-settler-colonialism-through-indias-occupation-of-kashmir-by-subhajit-pal/>, 2020, LHP BT + AM

**Since 1947, Kashmir has occupied a distinct place in the national imagination of India. The claim over its territory has seen three wars being fought between India and Pakistan, without a plebiscite being held and postponed further towards impossibility.****[[11]](https://www.inversejournal.com/2020/06/02/looking-into-settler-colonialism-through-indias-occupation-of-kashmir-by-subhajit-pal/" \l "_edn11)** As the only Muslim majority territory and state**, Kashmir became a fixation for India’s first Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, to bolster India’s image and fabric as a secular land** (Guha 2007). Since then, **Kashmir has become a site for the exercise of power and implementation of policies for the Indian government.** Over the years, whenever the Indian state has sensed any form of non-conformity initially amongst Kashmir leaders, these have been put behind bars or under house arrest. The Indian Prime Minister, Indira Gandhi, after the subsequent accords in Shimla tried to put the demand of self-determination to rest. First by bifurcating the territory without any input from the Kashmiri populace. Then by installing out-of-jail leader Sheikh Abdullah under the condition that the question of self-determination would be left out of question. Even though popular protests (like the ones post-1990, 2008, 2016) or mass agitations before the 1980s are not recorded in mainstream Indian history, the discontent for the lack of basic rights and slow marginalisation was evident, particularly in the writings and historiography by key Kashmiri figures. **Even during the 1994 parliamentary resolution on Kashmir, India maintained its claim on the complete territory of Kashmir. The will and the aspirations of the Kashmiri people, according multiple sources, never entered the discussion.** In the post-1990 scenario, the territorial autonomy of the Kashmiris was constitutionally bypassed in placing Kashmir under a military occupation facilitated by the DAA (Disturbed Areas Act and Armed Forces Special Powers Act), requiring huge masses of land to be allocated for military camps and structures of control for the most heavily militarised zone in the world. To quote an example, in “Pattan tehsil alone, the Army has occupied 378.25 acres of land owned by 515 families. Official records suggest that 30 percent of the land taken over by security forces is being used to construct barracks” while various other places have been taken over to build camps and barracks.[[12]](https://www.inversejournal.com/2020/06/02/looking-into-settler-colonialism-through-indias-occupation-of-kashmir-by-subhajit-pal/" \l "_edn12) **The camps along with heavy militarisation have been the instruments of the Indian state since 1990 to carry out governance over Kashmir within the constitutional framework established via the Instrument of Accession. These infrastructural establishments within the indigenous Kashmiri experience embody “structures of violence” aimed at maintaining control over the indigenous, particularly in instances where the indigenous population has resisted**. In such an academic contextualisation, **the military personnel represent the settlers, whereas the immediate structures they occupy spread from the metropoles to the countryside creating a spatial displacement of the locals**. Even under the shroud of Article 35A such displacement materialised with the privileged freedom of movement for the Indian Armed Forces, while contrarily the Kashmiri population was subject to displacement from public spaceor containment within very insular familial spaces that could not afford the freedom to move under a heavily militarised state apparatus. According to the Hilal Mir, who reported in an event of KSDS, “there used to be 2400 kanals of land Under SKUAST but now only 800 kanals of land are left under them, resulting in an illegal land grab by the forces. There was a Cattle Research Station under SKUAST that unfortunately landed under military occupation.”[[13]](https://www.inversejournal.com/2020/06/02/looking-into-settler-colonialism-through-indias-occupation-of-kashmir-by-subhajit-pal/" \l "_edn13) The narrative articulated from the Indian side justifies the heavy militarisation as part of measures against counter-terrorism based on procedures of “national security” and “national integrity” with attempts to normalise the military presence in civilian spaces through health camps, counselling centres, schools and other activities conducted by the Indian Armed Forces in the valley.  Peer Ghulam Nabi and Jingzhong Ye (2015) argue that the interventionist presence of the Indian Armed Forces in the valley will not win the hearts of the people.[[14]](https://www.inversejournal.com/2020/06/02/looking-into-settler-colonialism-through-indias-occupation-of-kashmir-by-subhajit-pal/" \l "_edn14) **They continue to explain that these techniques of governance through armed force would not legitimise the occupation, nor would it be possible for the military occupation to assimilate into the populace. As such, the crisis that is fuelled by clashing political identities, nationalist and self-determinist aspirations and ideological differences could not be solved by such a token ‘developmental’ approach. With the rise of the right wing in India, the demand for Indians to settle in Kashmir continuously grows stronger, culminating into different attempts by the Indian government to transfer land away from the Kashmiri Muslim majority or allocating acres of land meant for public use to specific state and government proscribed uses. Such attempts have earlier led to violent protests across Kashmir valley.** In 2008, the Amarnath land transfer row kicked up huge protests, which were brutally crushed by the Indian Armed Forces.[[15]](https://www.inversejournal.com/2020/06/02/looking-into-settler-colonialism-through-indias-occupation-of-kashmir-by-subhajit-pal/" \l "_edn15) **Rights** **The Constitution of India, and Article 370 in particular, gave Kashmiris the right to be citizens of India, but at the cost of giving up their identity based on a core political history of their own. Unlike the settler societies of America in the 19th century, on official terms, such citizenship rights were bestowed but, at ground level, the surrender of a distinct Kashmiri identity was the cost to bear. As India tightened its grip over Kashmir’s territory, until the 1980s, the portrayal of Kashmir in mainland India was characterised along the lines of an exotic destination,** as Ananya Jahanara Kabir reiterates through her readings of Indian popular culture in its relation to Kashmir.[[16]](https://www.inversejournal.com/2020/06/02/looking-into-settler-colonialism-through-indias-occupation-of-kashmir-by-subhajit-pal/" \l "_edn16) In the aftermath of the 1980s, generations of young Kashmiris, in invoking Maqbool Bhat, had attempted to come to the forefront and demand the return of the then erased autonomy that in part allowed democratically elected parties to govern. According to multiple historical sources, the Indian state and its apparatuses of control, both incited such agitations and mobilisationsand then implemented force for their containment. The rigged elections of 1987, which triggered the outbreak of insurgency, were not only a betrayal in electoral politics but a whistle-blower phenomenon that unmasked the Indian government manipulations of democracy, at that time under the Congress party’s rule. **In order to dominate the strong indigenous group under the banner of the Muslim United Front, which had planned to bring back the constitution of Kashmir, the Indian government collaborated with the National Conference (the same party that was founded and run by the Abdullahs) to establish a ground-level government in favour of India**. In consulting a wide range of academic, journalistic and historiographical research, it can be ascertained that political parties like the National Conference and the later formed People’s Democratic Party are not considered rightful representatives of Kashmir by a wide majority of Kashmiris. The material basis of such observations can be drawn from the minimal voter turnout in the elections organised by India since 1984. The turnout in 1987 was significant and when the MUF lost, it was evident that the elections had been rigged, a fact corroborated by multiple sources, official and independent. Later such sabotaging of the democratic process was even confirmed by several Congress leaders. Looking at minimal voter turnouts since then inversely reflects the increasing number of Kashmiri people participating in the protests, election boycotts, and *hartals* in Kashmir, primarily when comparing such numbers with those few actually participating in India-organised elections. **The safeguarding and preservation of rights enshrined in the Indian constitution and their omission in the case of Kashmir is exposed when Kashmiris have demanded their rights within and far beyond the constitutional scope and framework**. It has consistently been at the cost of state policy establishing a different set of standards to treat them differently within constitutional articulations such as DAA, AFSPA, etc, in their political identity being marked by conflicted, contested and incomplete citizenship within the nationalist Indian agenda, with inclusion dependent on surrendering their particular cultural and political identity. **Similarities can be observed in the brutal force employed on native Americans to ensure they let go of their tribal identity in order to survive within an imposed American national identity, particularly in the way the American state’s occupation of the Cherokee and their land operated in colonial and post-independence North America. Another aspect to consider is the violation of basic human rights through the violence inflicted on Kashmiris by the armed forces. Multiple reported and documented instances of *fake encounters*, massacre, all forms of sexual violence on both females and males, custodial killings and torture indicate that such methods have been naturalised in the Kashmir valley**.[[17]](https://www.inversejournal.com/2020/06/02/looking-into-settler-colonialism-through-indias-occupation-of-kashmir-by-subhajit-pal/" \l "_edn17) The right to justice when wrongs are committed is denied by clauses of the AFSPA (in a majority of the cases filed), which gives the Armed Forces impunity and immunity from prosecution, where legal action is not driven by civilian courts, but rather army tribunals.[[18]](https://www.inversejournal.com/2020/06/02/looking-into-settler-colonialism-through-indias-occupation-of-kashmir-by-subhajit-pal/" \l "_edn18) In other cases, the Indian courts deny or delay justice for years. For example, during the then American president Bill Clinton’s visit to India in 2000, members of the Indian army allegedly killed five innocent Kashmiri villagers, and in the aftermath of such killings, the corpses of these villagers were presented to the international media as “Pakistani terrorists”, claimed to be the unidentified gunmen who had gunned down 35 Sikhs hours before Clinton’s landing in India. The case known as the “Prathibal fake encounter”, later investigated by the CBI during the UPA rule, termed the events of that day as murder or homicide.[[19]](https://www.inversejournal.com/2020/06/02/looking-into-settler-colonialism-through-indias-occupation-of-kashmir-by-subhajit-pal/" \l "_edn19) It took twelve years for the Supreme Court to decide that trials against the army officials involved were to be initiated. However, the legal framework allowing the army court to take on the case further in the legal process to the point of leading to the dismissal of the chargesheet filed by the CBI, even before trials had begun.[[20]](https://www.inversejournal.com/2020/06/02/looking-into-settler-colonialism-through-indias-occupation-of-kashmir-by-subhajit-pal/" \l "_edn20) This is just one such case among scores of others, where the heinous crimes against Kashmiris (breaching multiple UN resolutions and conventions) are denied basic and fundamental acknowledgement of having been perpetrated. The Kunan-Poshpora mass rape of women is another such case where the government denied the happening of such war crimes.[[21]](https://www.inversejournal.com/2020/06/02/looking-into-settler-colonialism-through-indias-occupation-of-kashmir-by-subhajit-pal/" \l "_edn21) A larger body of work by academics, journalists, documentarians, human rights advocates, writers and professionals within the multidisciplinary field of Kashmir Studies have asserted the view that **Kashmir has been converted into an open prison where the state works with a self-proscribed impunity to seize or dilute basic and fundamental human rights, while the Indian state is trying to coax assimilatory participation of the common people.** Such assimilatory participation materialises, for instance, through a monopoly on employment opportunities to cash incentives in crushing varying degrees of dissent and protest, both armed and unarmed. That territory-wide control by the state and its various institutions is countered through years of survival, persistence and resistance against the state’s operations over Kashmiri lives. In the case of Kashmir, the positionality of the land is different from that of other settler societies. In Kashmir, the land is not required to make a new nation altogether but to complete the idea of an India still settling the scores of partition, if nation-statist discourses are to be studied and evaluated according to Indian nationalist perspective. **The idea of India politically mobilised and integrated according to set ideological principles in the Indian mainland has obfuscated the nakedness of the actual *settling in*, where, in order to complete an ancient idea of India, Kashmir’s territory is required to make permanent an official a map, that is contested by other nation states, and especially by a multitude of Kashmiris themselves.** Fundamentally, such settler-colonial patterns are also different from the American settler societies where the United States assimilated the territory through strategic and systematic violence, for a specific vision of the country as a whole. In the case of Kashmir, differences from the Israeli strategies towards Palestine standout as well, where the complete mythical and political homeland of the Jewish peoples was created and projected into the Palestinian territory, encroaching upon it to the point of rendering the Palestinians homeless, stateless, invisible and in perpetual exile. **In the case of Kashmir, territorially, I would call it a settler extension of the Indian state’s vision that at once considers the territory as integral yet has to deal with its historical status as an autonomous state of its own,** one that is still waiting for UN intervention. In the case of fundamental rights and their denial, settler colonies mostly deal with similar kinds of denial that incites grounds for cross-border solidarities. **Elimination of the Indigenous Identity** The logic of elimination of the native, as studied by Wolfe (2006), resonates in all settler colonies, with their main objective best articulated by Veracini’s (2011) words as “you [the indigenous] go away**”. Taking cues from the strategies of elimination of the native identity and native subject specified by Wolfe, it can be clearly ascertained that Kashmir has seen such strategies employed since the last thirty years.** The killings of civilians and dissenting subjects, approximately 8,000 to 10,000 enforced disappearances, imprisonment without bail, detentionswithout warrant, rape as a weapon of war, fake encounters and enforced assimilation have been standardised practices within the constitutional framework of Kashmir as a Disturbed Area within the larger prism of “national security” where the Armed Forces Special Powers Act sets the rule of law. In the context of the revocation of autonomy (Aug 5), the renaming of places has also started to look starkly similar to the renaming via appropriation of Jerusalem and its neighbouring territories. For example, the Sher-e-Kashmir Stadium was recently renamed after Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel and reported by press articles appearing in The Wire, Newsclick, Deccan Herald, among several others**. As Wolfe studies elucidate, through the framework of a state, settlers tried to affect every aspect of the native life, from religion, speech, political freedom to economic liberty, cultural diversity, nomenclature and naming conventions, etc., with each of these being verifiably affected in the everyday life of the indigenous and native, who within the scope of this paper are the Kashmiris themselves**. Conversely, in the aftermath of 9/11, the Indian state targeted Kashmiri Muslims on various folds, in an attempt to integrate itself into the globalised western discourse and narrative of “War on Terror”. The illegal detention of people such as Gulzar Ahmad Wani, S.A.R Geelani, and the hanging of Afzal Guru (on the pretext of “satisfying the collective conscience of the nation”) are few examples of India’s treatment of Kashmiri Muslims within the constructed prism of “national security**.” As such, the political freedom of Kashmiris has long been minimised and curtailed since 1947. The freedom to protest and express dissent has been degraded overtime through imposition of curfews and disruption of protests through the use of guns, pellets and tear gas to disperse gathering crowds**. Although Kashmir has a better per capita compared to India, the economic liberty of Himalayan territory has been severely crippled, with the state maintaining a monopoly on employment, while private industry and enterprise have had to work within very limited frameworks. There have been instances when vital transport lines were closed during periods of public protest in order to restrict the valley economically. According to reports, the siege of Kashmir after August 5 this year, has resulted in loss of more than one billion dollars[[22]](https://www.inversejournal.com/2020/06/02/looking-into-settler-colonialism-through-indias-occupation-of-kashmir-by-subhajit-pal/" \l "_edn22).  Along with such practices, the pluralism of the land has been affected by the Indian intervention in Kashmiri society. It is seasonally debated that the advent of heavy militarisation in Kashmir in the early 90s involved the then governor Jagmohan, who facilitated the exodus of Pandits from the valley. Much has been written about the manner in which the forced migration of the Kashmiri Pandits was weaponised, discursively as well as militarily, to establish a new order of brutal suppression. Such strategies again revalidate settler colonial tendencies to establish justification in affecting and treating the native identity and its subjects to eliminate and criminalise certain native discourses and narratives until the last straw.**How Settler Colonialism Comes Closest to Describing Kashmir** The study of other forms of colonialism has also been applied to define the occupation of Kashmir, but in a greater trajectory of scholarship, certain studies remain limited in entirely coming up with a perfect definition or description that fits, given the vast complexities of contemporary Kashmir as a zone of conflict and a militarised and policed territory. For example, Partha Chaterjee in earlier work attempted to equate the happenings in Kashmir as “internal colonialism”,[[23]](https://www.inversejournal.com/2020/06/02/looking-into-settler-colonialism-through-indias-occupation-of-kashmir-by-subhajit-pal/" \l "_edn23) but such articulations met with criticism given the multiple instances of Indian scholars, writers, and critics repeatedly contextualising Kashmir from their own Indian nationality or their identity as Indian citizens. The major criticism formulated in such cases emerged in regard to the position of Kashmir in context to India**. If concepts such as “internal colonialism” were used to describe Kashmir, then such academic elaborations would also mean not only delegitimising, but completely negating the discourse of self-determination of the Kashmiris**. In a parallel mode, settler colonialism in its existing framework also falls short, albeit in different areas. The traditional definition of a settler state is predicated upon the understanding of settlers entering into a particular territory and geography to form a *new state* altogether. Examples studied widely include the case of Australia, United States of America, multiple locations in colonial Latin America and modern-day Israel. **However, in the case of Kashmir, the Indian state occupies the territory and rules over its subjects not in order to form any new state, rather to annex the territory and establish a new order that permeates into many aspects of Kashmiri life, while having severe impact on Kashmir’s historically distinct identity.** In this case, the logic and process of elimination varies to an extent, where the native discourse was important in Australian or American cases for selective appropriation and building of a national imagination based on key concepts such as symbolic inclusiveness and (token) diversity. In the case of Israel, the erasure of the native discourse is the end and the means, while in the case of Kashmir the same is applicable, even if the native discourse is not only diminished but invisibilised  such that the Indian imaginary appropriates the place to present the popular Indian cultural representation of Kashmir as *Jannat* (a Himalayan paradise), as an ideal Bollywood honeymoon and touristic destination and a target for various religious pilgrimages served to its larger citizenry and the greater world beyond South Asia. Other studies can assess, as Ananya Jahanara Kabir suggests, how the representation of Kashmir has changed, decade by decade, in the Indian imaginary and particularly from the angle of literary, popular to mass mediatised constructions. Multiple operations and procedures in the treatment of Kashmiris, such as the ones highlighted previously, create a space where native and culture-specific identities are more susceptible to elimination or disappearance, which is a prime requirement for settlement to the extreme of displacement. The classical form of settlement as studied in other places can be dispensed in Kashmir since the idea of private labour has long been disposed of and employment has been articulated from an Indian and national integration framework (that then expansively erases a distinct Kashmiri identity). As a result, within this settler colonialist paradigm, the survival of Kashmiris, their way of life, tradition and culture are manifest through multiple modes of resistance as self-assertion, which the Kashmiris have actively been participating in, and that(given the overreach of the Indian state) include engagement with the state establishment for the sake of their survival and continuity (Veracini 2011). Tremblay refers to this phenomenon while observing the complex form of resistance of Kashmiris, where they “have at times resisted state power and embraced goals of the secessionist/nationalist groups, while at other times […] sided with the governmental institution that promised them material benefits and personal security” (Tremblay 2018). In the greater complexities of Kashmir as an occupied territory and Kashmiris as a peoples occupied through a settler colonial framework, a lot more research will have to be conducted and verified to posit Kashmir also as a settler extension of Indian state’s overreach since post-partition and more specifically throughout the 90s. In such studies, research by Kashmir scholars will be instrumental in understanding Kashmir discretely from a settler colonial framework, taking into consideration the classical forms described and studied by scholars around different parts of the world. **At the same time, a reformulation of such studies can also be essential in understanding Kashmir as a settler extension given the history of Kashmir’s landlocked engagement with India as an entry and exit port at multiple levels and considering the great power and presence that India as a nation state holds in Kashmir since the times of Dogra rule, particularly in the aftermath of Partition.**

#### The aff’s spectacle of a progressive policy that rectifies working conditions is cruel optimism – it grounds settler workers’ politics in a defense of indigenous dispossession and necessitates settler expansion – independently decks equality and turns the case.

Englert 20 (Sai Englert (lecturer @ Universiteit Leiden), 2020, “Settlers, Workers, and the Logic of Accumulation by Dispossession,” Antipode, Vol. 0, No. 0, doi:10.1111/anti.12659, rc HKR-RM

The history of settler colonialism underscores the conspicuous absence of involvement by settler working classes (as opposed to individuals or limited networks) in mass, sustained challenges against the process of settlement and indigenous dispossession.3 In fact, more often than not, settler labour movements fought for the intensification of settler expansion and racial segregation (see “An Alternative Reading: Settler Colonies and the Exploitation of the Native” above), through colour bars, boycott campaigns and demands for expulsion. In the process, bitter confrontations emerged between settler labour and capital, when the latter attempted to increase its profit margins through the exploitation of indigenous labour—for example in the context of the white labour movements in Australia and South Africa.4 Yet these conflicts can be resolved, especially while the settler colony continues to expand, by intensifying the dispossession of indigenous populations in order to improve the material conditions of settler workers (see “Case Studies” below). Here, the question of accumulation by dispossession returns to the fore. If settler workers are exploited as workers within the settler colony, they remain settlers. As such they participate in the processes of accumulation by dispossession through the occupation of lands, the elimination or exploitation of indigenous peoples, and the extraction of expropriated resources. For example, at a very basic level, their houses, workplaces, and basic infrastructure such as roads, railways, etc., are all premised on the capture and control of indigenous land. Settler workers are both exploited by settler bosses and their co-conspirators in the dispossession of indigenous peoples. As such, class struggle within a settler society has a dual character: it is waged over the distribution of wealth extracted from their labour as well as over the colonial booty. In the case of Zionism in Palestine, the current associated with the publication Matzpen (“Compass”) developed a class analysis of Israeli society. They came to the conclusion that because the Israeli economy was heavily subsidised from the outside (first primarily by Britain, then by the US) and that this subsidy was not simply going into private hands but was used by the Labour Zionist bureaucracy to organise the development of the Israeli economy and infrastructure, class antagonisms were diverted within its society. Hangebi et al. (2012:83) wrote: The Jewish worker in Israel does not receive his share in cash, but he gets it in terms of new and relatively inexpensive housing, which could not have been constructed by raising capital locally; he gets it in industrial employment, which could not have been started or kept going without external subsidies; and he gets it in terms of a general standard of living, which does not correspond to the output of that society ... In this way the struggle between the Israeli working class and its employers, both bureaucrats and capitalists, is fought not only over the surplus value produced by the worker but also over the share each group receives from this external source of subsidies. If this analysis was essentially correct, it underplayed, however, the consequences of an important aspect of Israeli wealth creation (which Matzpen otherwise recognised): the Israeli state, its infrastructure, and its economy were made possible by colonial expansion, land confiscation, the expulsion of Palestinians and the expropriation of their wealth and property. Affordable housing, for example, an issue discussed further below, was not only possible because of the subsidies the Israeli state received from abroad. It was possible because the land on which new houses were built, as well as existing Palestinian houses, had been confiscated by the Israeli army, Palestinians had been expelled in their hundreds of thousands, and the spoils were re-distributed amongst settlers. It was—and remains—the collective dispossession of the indigenous population by the Israeli population as a whole, which ties the settler community together, despite internal class, ethnic, and political divisions. The settler class struggle is fought over the distribution of wealth extracted from settler labour power as well as over the share each group receives from the process of accumulation by dispossession. This dual class and colonial relationship helps explain the relative absence of settler workers’ resistance against settler colonial expansion or alliances with Indigenous peoples.5 This tendency can be understood as “settler quietism”: even if working-class settlers are exploited by their ruling classes, overthrowing the settler state would mean overthrowing a system in which they share, however unequally, in the distribution of the colonial loot. Participating in the process of dispossession and fighting for a greater share of the pie leads to more important and immediate material gains. It also follows, as many anti-colonial thinkers and activists, not least among them Fanon (2001) in the Wretched of the Earth, have argued that indigenous people face the settler population as a whole in their struggle for de-colonisation. This is not to say that individual settlers or specific settler organisations cannot or have not supported struggles for decolonisation. It is however to point out that this is not the case for the majority of the settler working class, while it continues to depend on the continued dispossession of the natives for the quality of its living standards. Whether the settler colony is organised on the basis of an eliminatory or an exploitative model, what remains constant is that the entirety of the settler polity will participate in the process of accumulation by dispossession, and that the different settler classes will struggle both against the natives to impose and maintain this dispossession, as well as amongst themselves in order to determine the nature of its internal distribution. More than that, the specific structural forms of settler rule over the indigenous population is best understood as the outcome of struggle, both between settler classes and between settlers and indigenous populations. This paper now turns to two brief case studies demonstrating this process in the context of Zionism in Palestine.

#### Thus, the only alternative is decolonization. The role of the ballot is to center indigenous resistance-- any ethical commitment requires that the aff place themselves in the center of Native scholarship and demands.

Tuck and Yang 12

(Eve Tuck, Unangax, State University of New York at New Paltz K. Wayne Yang University of California, San Diego, Decolonization is not a metaphor, Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society Vol. 1, No. 1, 2012, pp. 1-40, JKS)

An ethic of incommensurability, which guides moves that unsettle innocence, stands in contrast to aims of reconciliation, which motivate settler moves to innocence. Reconciliation is about rescuing settler normalcy, about rescuing a settler future. Reconciliation is concerned with questions of what will decolonization look like? What will happen after abolition? What will be the consequences of decolonization for the settler? Incommensurability acknowledges that these questions need not, and perhaps cannot, be answered in order for decolonization to exist as a framework. We want to say, first, that decolonization is not obliged to answer those questions - decolonization is not accountable to settlers, or settler futurity. Decolonization is accountable to Indigenous sovereignty and futurity. Still, we acknowledge the questions of those wary participants in Occupy Oakland and other settlers who want to know what decolonization will require of them. The answers are not fully in view and can’t be as long as decolonization remains punctuated by metaphor. The answers will not emerge from friendly understanding, and indeed require a dangerous understanding of uncommonality that un-coalesces coalition politics - moves that may feel very unfriendly. But we will find out the answers as we get there, “in the exact measure that we can discern the movements which give [decolonization] historical form and content” (Fanon, 1963, p. 36). To fully enact an ethic of incommensurability means relinquishing settler futurity, abandoning the hope that settlers may one day be commensurable to Native peoples. It means removing the asterisks, periods, commas, apostrophes, the whereas’s, buts, and conditional clauses that punctuate decolonization and underwrite settler innocence. The Native futures, the lives to be lived once the settler nation is gone - these are the unwritten possibilities made possible by an ethic of incommensurability.*when you take away the punctuation he says of lines lifted from the documents about military-occupied land its acreage and location you take away its finality opening the possibility of other futures* -Craig Santos Perez, Chamoru scholar and poet (as quoted by Voeltz, 2012)

Decolonization offers a different perspective to human and civil rights based approaches to justice, an unsettling one, rather than a complementary one. Decolonization is not an “and”. It is an elsewhere.

#### Our interpretation is that the judge ought to evaluate the 1ac as a research project – they don’t get to weigh the case - The role of the neg should be to disprove the various meanings of that object. Plan focus restricts the debate to a ten second statement and leaves the rest of the aff unquestioned. They should be responsible for the way their knowledge is constructed and used because that produces the best model for activism and ethics in the context of their aff which is a unique education net benefit to our interpretation

## 3

### 1nc – cp

Next – Future Gens CP

#### India should establish an independent, fourth body–comprised of randomly-selected representative samples of the population and experts, and that solicits petitions to challenge government action dedicated to protecting the interests of succeeding generations. The body should have the stated mandate and authority over the right to strike for workers.

#### Allocating authority trades off with future generations – only the cp solves by creating a new branch responsible for the plan whose sole responsibility is overseeing the interests of future generations

Tremmel 13 [Joerg Chet Tremmel is a Professor for "intergenerationally just policies" at the University of Tuebingen. He is Editor-in-chief of the Intergenerational Justice Review and a visiting lecturer at the Johann-Wolfgang-Goethe-University Frankfurt, the University of Stuttgart and the Heinrich-Heine-University in Dusseldorf, Germany. An extended separation of powers model as the theoretical basis for the representation of future generations. July 26, 2013. https://www.futurejustice.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Paper\_Future-Branch\_Tremmel.pdf]

And rightly so. The absence of representation of future generations means that conflicts of interest are decided by the majority of eligible voters, not the majority of those affected by the decision. Future people that are relevantly affected by a decision don’t have any influence over it. This ‘representation gap’ is fundamentally different from deficiencies in the participatory rights of other social minorities or interest groups for which representation is also lacking (e.g. women, the elderly, or foreigners). These groups are present here and now; they can take part in political discourse, write opinion-editorials, appear on talk-shows and in many cases participate in elections. None of these options are available to future generations. “The future is another country”, states Posner,8 paraphrasing that the welfare of future generations is as low on the agenda of political incumbents as the welfare of a foreign country.

If future citizens could assert their interests in the political decision-making process, majority outcomes in important political decisions of the present would be different. Energy policy is a good example: Energy production of present generations, which relies heavily on fossil fuels, provides a high standard of living today, but at the expense of creating serious disadvantages for the medium-term future of fifty to a hundred years. Post-1990 - the year in which the IPCC’s First Assessment Report assessed a connection between anthropogenic carbon dioxide emissions and climate change with a 90 per cent probability- presently living generations can no longer legitimately claim ignorance of the consequences of their actions. Scientific analyses indicate that current energy policy intensifies the natural greenhouse effect and causes the global average temperature to rise.9 Let’s assume that the future individuals born in the next 200 years could partake in the next general election, in the present. The consequence would be that all parties would rewrite their official party positions on today’s energy policy and implement a much more rapid decline in carbon dioxide emissions. The same effect could be achieved if a future branch were implemented in the set-up of democracies as a fourth power in the separation of powers model.

Especially with regard to environmental matters, the effects of current actions extend far into the future and have the potential to seriously negatively influence the quality of life of numerous future generations, as figure 1 shows.10

In light of these facts, a prolongation of the legislative session seems appropriate. However, election periods cannot even come close to corresponding to the time span in which the effects of political decisions are felt without restricting voters’ influence in such a way that would endanger the very essence of democracy.

Problems posed by the short-sightedness of democracies are not limited to ecological issues. Long before the emergence of modern environmental movements, excessive national debts were considered a prime example of carelessness with regard to the future. As early as 1816 Thomas Jefferson discussed potential solutions to this problem.11 Insufficient investments in education or failing to adjust pay-as-you-go social security systems are further examples of lacking long-term orientation in political systems.

#### Discounting future generations causes extinction, especially over emerging tech – only formalizing a mechanism to weight their concerns solves

Jones et al 18 [Natalie Jones, Mark O'Brien, and Thomas Ryan, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom. Representation of future generations in United Kingdom policy-making. Futures Volume 102, September 2018, Pages 153-163. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016328717301179#sec0005]

Global catastrophic and existential risks pose central challenges for intergenerational justice and the structure of our current democracy. The Global Challenges Report 2016 defines global catastrophic risk as risk of an ‘event or process that, were it to occur, would end the lives of approximately 10% or more of the global population, or do comparable damage’ (Global Challenges Foundation & Global Priorities Project, 2016). A subset of catastrophic risks are ‘existential’ risks, which would end human civilisation or lead to the extinction of humanity (Global Challenges Foundation & Global Priorities Project, 2016). Catastrophic and existential risks may be categorised in terms of ongoing risks, which could potentially occur in any given year (e.g. nuclear war; pandemics), versus emerging risks which may be unlikely today but will become significantly more likely in the future (e.g. catastrophic climate change; risks stemming from emerging technologies). Ongoing risks have existed for some time now and are generally well-understood. However, emerging risks, particularly those arising from technological developments, are less understood and demand increasing attention from scientists and policymakers. These technological developments include advances in synthetic biology, geoengineering, distributed manufacturing and artificial intelligence (AI) (Global Priorities Project, Future of Humanity Institute, Oxford Martin School, Centre for the Study of Existential Risk, 2014). Although the impact of these technologies is still very uncertain, expert estimates suggest a non-negligible probability of catastrophic harm.

In this article we rely on two main premises. The first is that future generations are under-represented in current political structures partly due to political ‘short-termism’ or ‘presentism’ (Thompson, 2010). Governments primarily focus on short-term concerns, which mean that they may systematically neglect global catastrophic risks and, accordingly, future generations (Global Priorities Project et al., 2014). The problem of presentism transcends political divisions: people across the political spectrum are concerned about its effects, and should care about mitigating global catastrophic risks. This situation is exacerbated in that the good of mitigating global catastrophic and existential risks is typically global. Individual political actors (even whole countries) bear many costs in providing for such goods, whereas the benefits are dispersed globally. In addition to the benefits of mitigating existential risks being global, many of the beneficiaries are future people who do not exist presently and as such have no voice in the political process. There is a clear lack of incentives to mitigate such risks, and market failure should be expected (Beckstead, 2013).

The second key assumption is that we as a society consider the rights and interests of future generations to be important. It is beyond the scope of this paper to present a complete account of the philosophical arguments on this matter. It is sufficient to note that although significant philosophical problems have been pointed out, chiefly due to the fact that the actions of present people have a causal impact on the values, number and identity of future individuals (Parfit, 1984), there are several theories of intergenerational justice that may support this assumption (Gosseries, 2008).

The need to include explicit pathways in governance structures for accountability to the rights and needs of future generations has been noted (Global Priorities Project et al., 2014). Some thought has been put into how future generations may be represented in relation to environmental risks such as climate change, resource depletion and biodiversity loss; this research is reflected in the sustainable development literature (Brown Weiss, 1990). However, this problem has not been explored in relation to society’s burgeoning awareness of technology-related catastrophic and existential risks. In addition, such pathways have not been fully explored in the United Kingdom (UK) context. This policy paper hopes to fill this gap in the literature.

#### Intergenerational governance challenges can arise from any policy area – err neg to build resilience to black swan events, because the aff’s concrete approach prevents future adaptation

Boston 14 [Jonathan Boston, Professor of Public Policy, School of Government, Victoria University of Wellington, Fulbright Fellow, American University. Governing for the Future: How to bring the long-term into short-term political focus. November 5, 2014. https://www.american.edu/spa/cep/upload/jonathan-boston-lecture-american-university.pdf]

Further, the problem under consideration is fundamentally one of ‘governance’ and how it can be improved. It is about societal steering and prioritization, especially steering and prioritization over extended periods of time. It is about how democratic societies can shape, ‘weave’ or ‘navigate’ the future in desirable directions (Dror, 2003), implement coherent and sustained efforts to address long-term challenges (Lempert, 2007a), minimize foreseeable, yet avoidable, damages, and prepare for the unexpected - such as ‘wild cards’ (Fukuyama, 2007) and ‘black swan’ events (Taleb, 2007). Accordingly, it is not a narrow policy problem; nor is it limited to a particular policy domain or even a specific category or class of policy issues; and nor is it primarily about finding once-and-for-all solutions to major long-term policy problems. Such problems, after all, are frequently highly complex and require a never-ending series of efforts to address. And even if complete and durable solutions can be found, new and equally difficult problems are constantly emerging. The dilemma of how to govern well for the long-term, therefore, is enduring and relentless; it confronts each and every generation of policy-makers; it is not limited to one particular epoch. To be sure, the precise contours and the specific manifestations will be constantly evolving, thereby posing fresh, novel and distinctive challenges for each successive generation. But the broad structure of the problem - namely, of how best to encourage prudent intertemporal decision-making - remains the same.

#### The perm creates overlapping authority for enforcing the plan – that prevents modifications and tailoring enforcement with future generations in mind because the plan’s durably fiatted which is a functional veto over any decision – inherent uncertainty means that guts solvency

Thompson 10 [Department of Government, Harvard University. Representing Future Generations: Political Presentism and Democratic Trusteeship. Critical Review of International and Political Philosophy, 2010. https://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/9464286/Representing%20Future%20Generations-Barry%20final.pdf?sequence=1]

The argument from uncertainty has considerable force, and militates against any theory or principle that would try to specify a wide range of the needs and wants of future generations, and instruct representatives to pursue policies to satisfy them. But in the radical form in which it is often stated, it is not plausible. We can be fairly confident about some of the harms we are causing or to which we are contributing. Even in the remote future, we can reasonably assume that citizens will not want to live with toxic chemicals, foul air, and chronic disease.3 More importantly for the conception of representation I suggest below, we can assume that future generations will need a way of deciding collectively how they want to cope with these harms, and what rights and goods they want to pursue or forgo under these conditions.

The argument from uncertainty, then, may cast doubt on any approach that would promote the welfare or the rights of future generations across the whole range of welfare or rights, but it does not justify ignoring all of their potential claims. More positively, it provides a reason to protect their capacity for making their own collective decisions. The very uncertainty that warrants doubts about what their needs will be supports an obligation to try to make sure that they have a process for deciding together what their needs are and how they should be met.

#### It competes. Ought means certain action

OED – (Oxford English Dictionary, “ought, v.”, accessed 10-20-18, HKR-AM)

\* Expressing duty or obligation of any kind; originally used of moral obligation, but also in various more general senses, expressing what is proper, correct, advisable, befitting, or expected. Orig. and chiefly in past tense form (indicative or subjunctive), which may be either past or present in meaning. (The only current use in standard English.) The subject is properly the person (or thing) bound by the obligation. The latter is expressed by a following infinitive (with, formerly also without, to), sometimes only implied from the context. With a non-personal subject, or followed by a passive infinitive, it expresses obligation on the part of an agent who is not specified in the clause but contextually implied (the subject in the case of the passive construction being the person, etc., to whom the obligation is due); e.g. the hearth ought to lie level = it is advisable that one builds the hearth level; parents ought to be honoured = one has a duty to honour parents.

## 4

### 1nc – cp

#### India should recognize the ability of the workers to strike absent legal or judicial restrictions.

#### 1. Rights discourse creates a hiearchy of eurocentric exceptionalism

**Evans 2k** Citizenship and Human Rights in the Age of Globalization. By:, Tony, Lecturer in International Politics at the University of Southampton. Alternatives: Global, Local, Political, 03043754, Oct-Dec2000, Vol. 25, Issue 4 ebsco

Third, proponents of civil society and citizenship acknowledge that the new "politics of recognition demands new expressions of sensitivity to difference and new possibilities for expanding the range of permissible disagreements."[80] This is the virtue of tolerance, which is a fundamental principle of social pluralism. However, proponents of civil society do not intend that tolerance should be extended to all groups, ideas, and values. Instead, tolerance is extended to those who accept the general purposes of civil society by adopting its values and following the "correct" procedures for realizing their particular vision of the "good life." Those who attempt to challenge the general principles of the dominant economic, social, and political order are tolerated only insofar as they "do not seek to make the transition from word to deed, from speech to action.[81] In Marcuse's view, this produces the condition of "repressive tolerance," which is little more than a "market-place of ideas" in which notions of the "good life" compete for attention within the confines of a particular version of civil society.[82] However: The norms of behaviour demanded of members of civil society are dedicated to preserving this economic, cultural, and ideological marketplace. Thus, the inequalities of liberal civil society are depoliticized, despite the serious social consequences of such inequality. The individual who enters these civil spaces is expected to adopt a certain stance towards his or her own person and towards others.[83] Those perceived as a threat to the principles manifest in civil society are marginalized, either by labeling them "mad" and therefore not worthy of "rational" consideration or by mobilizing official violence if that fails.[84] Tolerance and civility are therefore concerned with the preservation and management of a particular form of civil society, a narrowing of the political agenda, and the exclusion of actors whose voices appear as a threat. In neoliberal societies, tolerance is practiced by legitimating a set of civil liberties and freedoms that are granted to all citizens, regardless of "race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status."[85] Against this expression of formal equality and tolerance, however, is the actual practice of tolerance, which cannot be divorced from power relations that determine what will or will not be tolerated. For Marcuse, in the face of repressive tolerance and inequality "the idea of available alternatives evaporates into an utterly utopian dimension" unless society is free of "indoctrination," "manipulation," and "extraneous authority."[86]

#### The discourse of rights and freedoms is the substrate for neoimperialism – it produces the conditions for global interventions

Ferreri 14 [Ferreri, Masters Candidate at SUNY Brockport, Education and Human Development Master's Thesis, January, “Challenging American Exceptionalism in the 21st Century”]

Another claim of the Bush administration was that “by removing the dictator Saddam Hussein democracy would bloom in Iraq” (Schmit and Williams 2007). The White House wanted to use a humanitarian argument, stating that by invading Iraq they would be spreading democracy to those who desperately needed it because of the oppressive leadership of Saddam Hussein. According to the neoconservative view that the creation of “Iraqi democracy will succeed, and that success will send forth news form Damascus to Tehran, that freedom can be the future of every nation. Promoting democracy and freedom in the Islamic world, by force if necessary was viewed as a crucial element of the overall strategy of countering radical extremism and terror” (Bush, 2003). Barry Munslow and Tim O’Dempsey agree with Schmit, Williams and Parados, declaring “gross policy miscalculations were directly the result of the ideologically driven neoconservative agenda, adopting a missionary zeal to spread a neoconservative American version of freedom and democracy to the Middle East by military force” (Munslow and O’Dempsey 2009). They highlight Paul Pillar who stated in 2006 that “in the wake of the Iraq war, it has become clear that official intelligence analysis was not relied on in making even the most significant national security decisions, that intelligence was misused publicly to justify decisions already made” by the administration, who repeatedly ignored information that was contrary to their exceptionalist policies and ideology (Pillar 2006). One effect, Munslow and O’Dempsey describe is that Iraq “has had serious implications for humanitarianism world wide…the great gains in the development of humanitarianism, pioneered by Western enlightenment values, have been undermined by the Bush government’s categorization of, and strategic implementation of, a war on terror. The means used to fight the war defeated the very principles and humanitarian values that the West has developed and propounded over time, undermining the credibility of the project” (Munslow and O’Dempsey 2009). These views are also apparent in Francis Fukuyama and Michael McFaul’s analysis: “the years since the September 11 attacks, the rhetorical attention devoted to promoting freedom, liberty and democracy has greatly outpaced actual progress in advancing democracy. To date, democracy has failed to take hold in the two countries in which Bush ordered the forcible ouster of autocratic regimes, Afghanistan and Iraq” (Fukuyama and McFaul 2008). These actions and policies of the United States have created an environment in the Middle East where “autocratic regimes in the region have used the excuse of terrorism (Egypt and Pakistan) or the alleged threat of U.S. invasion (Iran) to tighten autocracy” (Fukuyama and McFaul 2008).

#### 2. Rights discourse shuts down political discussion – it creates a framework of moral absolutism that breaks down democratic participation

Glendon 91 [Mary Ann Glendon is the Learned Hand Professor of Law, emerita, at Harvard University, and a former U.S. Ambassador to the Holy See. "RIGHTS TALK: THE IMPOVERISHMENT OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE." http://www.thesocialcontract.com/pdf/two-one/Glendon.pdf]

This book argues that the prominence of a certain kind of rights talk in our political discussions is both a symptom of, and a contributing factor to, this disorder of the body politic. Discourse about rights has become the principal language that we use in public settings to discuss weighty questions of both right and wrong, but time and again it proves inadequate, or leads to a standoff of one right against another. The problem is not, however, as some contend, with the very notion of rights, or with our strong rights tradition. It is with a new version of rights discourse that has achieved dominance over the past thirty years.

Our current American rights talk is but one dialect in a universal language that has developed during the extraordinary era of attention to civil and human rights in the wake of World War II. It is set apart from rights discourse in other liberal democracies by its starkness and simplicity, its prodigality in bestowing the rights label, its legalistic character, its exaggerated absoluteness, its hyperindividualism, its insularity, and its silence with respect to personal, civic, and collective responsibilities. "Our rights-laden political discourse does provide a solution of sorts to the communications problems that beset a heterogeneous nation whose citizens decreasingly share a common history, literature, religion or customs. But the `solution' has become part of the problem."

This unique brand of rights talk often operates at cross-purposes with our venerable rights tradition. It fits perfectly within the ten-second formats currently preferred by the news media,3 but severely constricts opportunities for the sort of ongoing dialogue upon which a regime of ordered liberty ultimately depends. A rapidly expanding catalog of rights — extending to trees, animals, smokers, nonsmokers, consumers, and so on — not only multiplies the occasions for collisions, but it risks trivializing core democratic values. A tendency to frame nearly every social controversy in terms of a clash of rights (a woman's right to her own body vs. a fetus' right to life) impedes compromise, mutual understanding, and the discovery of common ground. A penchant for absolute formulations ("I have the right to do whatever I want with my property") promotes unrealistic expectations and ignores both social costs and the rights of others. A near-aphasia concerning responsibilities makes it seem legitimate to accept the benefits of living in a democratic social welfare republic without assuming the corresponding personal and civic obligations.

As various new rights are proclaimed or proposed, the catalog of individual liberties expands without much consideration of the ends to which they are oriented, their relationship to one another, to corresponding responsibilities, or to the general welfare. Converging with the language of psychotherapy, rights talk encourages our all-too-human tendency to place the self at the center of our moral universe. In tandem with consumerism and a normal dislike of inconvenience, it regularly promotes the short-run over the long-term, crisis intervention over preventive measures, and particular interests over the common good. Saturated with rights, political language can no longer perform the important function of facilitating public discussion of the right ordering of our lives together. Just as rights exist for us only through being articulated, other goods are not even available to be considered if they can be brought to expression only with great difficulty, or not at all.4

My principal aim in the chapters that follow has been to trace the evolution of our distinctive current rights dialect, and to show how it frequently works against the conditions required for the pursuit of dignified living by free women and men. With stories and examples drawn from disputes over flag-burning, Indian lands, plant closings, criminal penalties for homosexual acts, eminent domain, social welfare, child support, and other areas, I have endeavored to demonstrate how our simplistic rights talk simultaneously reflects and distorts American culture. It captures our devotion to individualism and liberty, but omits our traditions of hospitality and care for the community. In the images of America and Americans that it projects, as well as in the ideals to which it implicitly pays homage, our current rights talk is a verbal caricature of our culture — recognizably ours, but with certain traits wildly out of proportion and with some of our best features omitted.

Our rights-laden political discourse does provide a solution of sorts to the communications problems that beset a heterogeneous nation whose citizens decreasingly share a common history, literature, religion, or customs. But the "solution" has become part of the problem. The legal components of political discourse, like sorcerers' apprentices, have taken on new and mischief-making connotations when liberated from their contexts in the speech community of lawyers. (A person has no duty to come to the aid of a "stranger.") With its non-legal tributaries rapidly dwindling, political rhetoric has grown increasingly out of touch with the more complex ways of speaking that Americans employ around the kitchen table, in their schools, workplaces, and in their various communities of memory and mutual aid.

#### Condo against new affs is uniquely good –

#### 1) Their interp artificially insulates them from competition- kills cost-benefit analysis- innovative research needs to be tested against the 1ar to check expertise gap- their assessment of the plan relative to a germane opportunity cost is arbitrarily confined. Especially with a new aff where we come into the round blind, the neg is forced to read multiple positions and go for the least covered one since clearly they don’t want clash.

#### 2) Critical thinking- condo forces strategic 1ar choices to adapt the strategy against a new aff- goal of debate is to respond to an intellectual challenge- answer the CPs and quit whining- forcing them off blocks and making in-round choices is what makes debate distinct from essay contests.

#### PICs that compete of the plan text are good –

They incentivize detailed plan writing – that narrows the debate to technical details, those are key on an arms control topic and guarantee built in solvency deficits about vagueness and compliance, AND it ensures there is a limited number of good pics, which solves their offense

## Case

### Uv

#### Drop the arg + reasonability on 1ar theory

#### 1) irresolvable -r equires intervention

#### 2) err neg – they have the 2ar to respond

#### 3) 1ac uv solves their offense

#### 4) I have to split btw substance and theory for the 2nr which moots 2nr time

#### 5) eval the theory debate after the 2nr to prevent late-breaking 2ar theory args

### Framing

#### Their extinction first args are bad. No reason why existential therats first. They didn’t read pummer

#### 1. Risk of extinction focus paralyzes action – any action has a risk of causing extinction but so does not acting – we’d have to listen to a random person who told us to jump out of the building right now or else extinction would happen

#### 2. This assumes we don’t know what’s ethically bad but we don’t need more time to morally figure out that structural violence like racism is wrong – if there’s a high risk of that vote NEG

#### 3. This is another link – it justifies the 1% risk cheney doctrine of intervening in the middle east for a false threat, which was a worse political solution and caused massive suffering – this is the exact fear based politics that all of the K criticizes

#### 4. This assumes rational utilitarian ways of calculating body count but that calculative thought is impossible – state actors aren’t purely rational decision making machines – they’re influenced by subjective standpoints

#### 5. Value to life impact outweighs – we can’t experience ethical value in the first place if people are ontologically excluded by the calculative thought of security

#### 6. Links are offense – we have indicts of every single one of their scenarios that affect the consequences of their policy and the way it’s implemented. This implicates every piece of aff solvency and means they don’t solve extinction and just further participate in genocidal structures.

### Advantage

#### No ! to nuke war –better models prove- their science is bad

Seitz 11, Harvard University Center for International Affairs visiting scholar, (Russell, “Nuclear winter was and is debatable,” Nature, 7-7-11, Vol 475, pg37, accessed 9-27-11, CMR)

Alan Robock's contention that there has been no real scientific debate about the 'nuclear winter' concept is itself **debatable** (Nature 473, 275–276; 2011). This potential climate disaster, popularized in Science in 1983, rested on the output of a one-dimensional model that was later shown to overestimate the smoke a nuclear holocaust might engender. More refined estimates, combined with advanced three-dimensional models (see http://go.nature.com.libproxy.utdallas.edu/kss8te), have dramatically reduced the extent and severity of the projected cooling. Despite this, Carl Sagan, who co-authored the 1983 Science paper, went so far as to posit “the extinction of Homo sapiens” (C. Sagan Foreign Affairs 63, 75–77; 1984). Some regarded this apocalyptic prediction as **an exercise in** mythology. George Rathjens of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology protested: “Nuclear winter is the worst **example of the** misrepresentation of science **to the public** in my memory,” (see http://go.nature.com.libproxy.utdallas.edu/yujz84) and climatologist Kerry Emanuel observed that the subject had “become notorious for its lack of scientific integrity” (Nature 319, 259; 1986). Robock's single-digit fall in temperature is at odds with the subzero (about −25 °C) continental cooling originally projected for a wide spectrum of nuclear wars. Whereas Sagan predicted darkness at noon from a US–Soviet nuclear conflict, Robock projects global sunlight that is several orders of magnitude brighter for a Pakistan–India conflict — literally the difference between night and day. Since 1983, the projected worst-case cooling has fallen from a Siberian deep freeze spanning 11,000 degree-days Celsius (a measure of the severity of winters) to numbers so unseasonably small as to call the very term 'nuclear winter' into question.

#### wages high and rising

Patti Domm 21—CNBC Markets Editor. (“Workers’ wages are rising at the fastest pace in years. Companies’ profits could take a hit,” May 22, 2021, from CNBC, https://www.cnbc.com/2021/05/22/wages-rise-at-the-fastest-pace-in-years-firms-profits-could-take-a-hit.html)

Workers are getting higher wages, but at some point that could bite into companies’ profits.

As the economy reopens, costs are climbing for everything from packaging and raw materials to shipping. In addition to these expenses, companies are also paying more to get workers to come in the door.

But the disparity between labor costs and profits has been so wide for so long, that employers should be able to increase pay if they can raise prices for goods and services or improve productivity.

McDonald’s said last week that it was boosting wages for the 36,500 hourly workers at company-owned stores by 10%, and Chipotle announced it will raise wages to an average of $15 an hour by the end of June. Bank of America said it would raise minimum wages for its hourly workers to $25 an hour, from the current $20, by 2025.

Sports equipment company Under Armour also announced it would boost the minimum hourly wage for its retail and distribution workers to $15 from $10.

“It’s some of the strongest wage growth we’ve seen in a quarter century,” said Mark Zandi, Moody’s Analytics chief economist. He said the 3% wage growth for private workers in the first quarter was the strongest since the 1990s and productivity has picked up at the same time.

“All the anecdotes we were getting in the last few months would suggest it’s continuing,” he said.

#### Unions don’t solve inequality – they’re too weak and tons of alt causes

Epstein 20 [Richard A. Epstein Peter and Kirsten Bedford Senior Fellow @ the Hoover Institution. "The Decline Of Unions Is Good News." https://www.hoover.org/research/decline-unions-good-news]

So what then could justify this inefficient provision? One common argument is that unions help reduce the level of income inequality by offering union members a high living wage, as seen in the golden age of the 1950s. But that argument misfires on several fronts. Those high union wages could not survive in the face of foreign competition or new nonunionized firms. The only way a union can provide gains for its members is to extract some fraction of the profits that firms enjoy when they hold monopoly positions.

When tariff barriers are lowered and domestic markets are deregulated, as with the airlines and telecommunications industries, the size of union gains go down. Thus the sharp decline in union membership from 35 percent in both 1945 and 1954 to about 15 percent in 1985 led to no substantial increase in the fraction of wealth earned by the top 10 percent of the economy during that period. However, the income share of the top ten percent rose to about 40 percent over the next 15 years as union membership fell to below 10 percent by 2000.

But don’t be fooled—that 5 percent change in union membership cannot drive widespread inequality for the entire population, which is also affected by a rise in the knowledge economy as well as a general aging of the population. The far more powerful distributive effects are likely to be those from nonunion workers whose job prospects within a given firm have been compromised by higher wages to union workers.

#### Unions cause protectionism – that slows growth and causes tariffs

Epstein 16 [Richard A. Epstein Peter and Kirsten Bedford Senior Fellow @ the Hoover Institution. "The Rise of American Protectionism." https://www.hoover.org/research/rise-american-protectionism]

This point explains why the American labor movement has historically opposed free trade. The essence of unionism is, and always will be, the acquisition of monopoly power. There is no way for a union to obtain that monopoly power in the marketplace. It can only secure it through legislation. The first step in that process was the exemption of unions from the antitrust laws under Section 6 of the Clayton Act of 1914. The second major step was the legitimation of collective bargaining under the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, which gave the union the exclusive bargaining rights against the firm once it was successful in a union election. These major statutory benefits strengthened private sector unions and imposed inefficiencies on unionized firms. This, in turn, opened the field for new firms, like the Japanese automobile companies, to organize outside the union envelope. In response, labor’s strategy went one step further. It pushed hard on trade and tariff barriers to keep out foreign imports, and exerted political influence to encourage local zoning boards to exclude new businesses that do not use union labor. Add to these issues the aggressive rise of minimum wage laws and other mandates like Obamacare and family leave statutes, and you construct a regulatory fortress that defeats the corrective forces of free trade and renders the nation less economically resilient and productive than before.

#### Indian soft power is shot, can’t check China, and their foreign policy is to disruptive for space to matter

Mukherjee 18 [Assistant Professor Rohan Mukherjee received his PhD in Politics (International Relations) from Princeton University. He holds a Master’s in Public Affairs (MPA) from the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University, and a B.A. in Philosophy, Politics, and Economics from the University of Oxford. Prior to joining Yale-NUS College, he was a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) and a non-resident visiting fellow at the United Nations University (UNU) in Tokyo. "THE FALSE PROMISE OF INDIA’S SOFT POWER." https://www.researchgate.net/publication/256057428\_The\_False\_Promise\_of\_India's\_Soft\_Power]

India’s shortcomings on this front are due to three factors. First, its soft power resources are not as abundant as proponents of the idea might suggest. India’s cultural influence abroad, while significant, pales in comparison to the cultures of the West already in circulation around the globe, and increasingly in comparison to Chinese culture in circulation in Asia and beyond. Official and semi-official Indian modes of cultural dissemination are also relatively few. For many decades, organizations such as the Peace Corps, Alliance Francaise, the British Council, the Goethe Institut and the Japan Foundation have been promulgating the respective cultures of the great powers around the world. They have most recently been joined by China’s Confucius Institutes, which numbered 322 in 2011 (Na 2012). Although the Indian Council for Cultural Relations (ICCR) has been around since 1950 with the aim of conducting activities similar to the organizations already mentioned, as of January 2013 it did not have more than 35 centers in foreign countries (ICCR 2013). Moreover, it was only in 2004 that India established its Ministry of Overseas Indian Affairs to better leverage the presence of millions of Indians abroad, and only in 2006 that India’s Ministry of External Affairs established a division dedicated to public diplomacy (Suri 2011). In the realm of non-governmental cultural dissemination, Bollywood has been a major force and yet despite producing more films than Hollywood annually, the size of the former remains considerably smaller than that of the latter: Hollywood’s 2010 worldwide box office receipts alone were estimated at $US 31.8 billion (Verrier 2011), whereas Bollywood’s entire industry size in 2010 was estimated at $US 1.8 billion (FICCI-KPMG 2011). Moreover, Bollywood’s international diffusion is not as strong as many analysts argue – in 2011, overseas theatrical sales constituted only eight percent of total industry revenue (Fig. 6 in Appendix).

Although Indian culture, which is based largely on universalist and assimilationist Hindu principles, is a potent source of attraction, India’s domestic institutions and foreign policy have mitigated this effect on the perceptions of outsiders. In the domestic realm, India has done a much poorer job of lifting its population out of poverty when compared to China. Although growth has been impressive, India’s per capita income leaves it in the ranks of countries such as Sudan, Ghana, the Solomon Islands, and Nigeria. Although the government has made major strides in liberalizing the economy, many sectors remain highly regulated. India’s public institutions are rife with corruption, inefficiency, patronage and nepotism. In Transparency International’s 2012 Corruption Perceptions Index, India ranked 94 out of 174 countries, tied with Benin, Colombia, Greece, Moldova, Mongolia, and Senegal (China ranked 80). In the words of one analyst (Malone 2011, p. 38), “no amount of cultural promotion can undo the damage internationally caused by spectacular corruption scandals” of the sort that India has recently been witness to, and that have given rise to an anti-state social movement that made international front page news in 2011. In the international realm, India has not pursued the types of cooperative and conciliatory policies required to garner soft power resources. Particularly in the realm of global governance, India has been accused of being a spoiler on issues as diverse as trade, nuclear nonproliferation, and humanitarian intervention. On trade, India was held responsible to a great extent for blocking the efforts of the great powers to rescue the Doha Round in 2009 (Blustein 2009). On nuclear non-proliferation and testing, India continues to be a non-signatory to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), despite having received official recognition as a nuclear power via the 2008 agreement with the US on civilian nuclear cooperation. On humanitarian intervention, India’s approach to crises in Libya and Syria during its recent term on the UN Security Council invited much criticism from the West (Kelemen 2011). As with China – which itself is struggling to increase its stock of soft power – Western observers are frequently heard asking if India can be a “responsible stakeholder” in the international system (Dormandy 2007). All these factors point to major obstacles in the way of India’s soft power ambitions, obstacles that might have been irrelevant had India been more powerful.

#### Their internal link to soft power’s wrong ---

#### GPC does not say India soft power solves China war --- it says the US and China seem set up for conflict, and other countries will need to think differently about how to participate. The “unless a third country enters” line is from another sentence and NOT EVEN ABOUT INDIA! --- insert Yellow

GPC 17 – Greater Pacific Capital, investing institution designed to identify and develop investing opportunities in and between India and other international economies, 7/17/17, “Path to Power: India’s Great Opportunity in the Changing World Order,” https://greaterpacificcapital.com/path-to-power-indias-great-opportunity-in-the-changing-world-order/

Last month’s Sign of the Times highlighted what appear to be a series of US retreats from global leadership positions. With the geopolitical cards apparently being reshuffled across a wide range of defence, political and economic areas, America’s apparent withdrawal is creating opportunities for countries seeking to fill the resulting void, with China currently taking the most proactive steps among the potential contenders. Beijing has already made clear its intent to play a more active role in matters of globalisation, international trade and climate change, global issues that also align well with China’s domestic agenda and where it can leverage significant political and financial assets. Despite China’s head start over others and its apparent desire to lead, its efforts will likely face not only resistance from the West but also competition from a number of countries, both within Asia and abroad. Further, China’s inability to lead on a broader set of issues related to matters such as human rights or regional security acts as a counter-weight to its leadership efforts and provides opportunities for other countries to fill the gaps being left by the United States. Among potential contenders for regional and international leadership, India, as the world’s fastest growing economy, the largest democracy and (potentially[1]) the most populous country, clearly has critical assets to leverage across a number of spheres. Bringing these to bear though will require India to be far more bold and strategic in handling both international affairs and in making strong domestic progress, both are matters that have proved elusive to date. However, if India can achieve this, it has the potential to create a virtuous circle of domestic development and international leadership similar to the one that has underwritten US prosperity for over two generations. The Need for Renewed Leadership One of the most dangerous geo-political circumstances is a power vacuum and America’s actions in the last six months in particular, suggest that the execution of the Trump Administration’s ‘America First’ vision is creating vacuums across an increasingly broad range of fields. These are further being exacerbated by the accompanying weakening of (formerly US-led) international and multi-lateral institutions that have until recently underwritten the global order. This order consisted of, among other things, a shared commitment to liberal capitalism, clear rules of engagement in trade, policy and war, a high-level security architecture focused on nuclear non-proliferation, a recognition of states’ fundamental sovereignty and shared access to the earth’s global commons. A number of the key elements of this order were already under attack before America’s current retreat. In fact, the recent withdrawal by the US from what has historically been a muscular international leadership is in many ways a reaction to its own domestic challenges and the global economic, political and security issues that have built up over the past few decades. As pointed out in a previous Sign of the Times[2], many of these challenges are the direct consequences of the current world order, including, the lack of international and national policies to compensate for the uneven nature of growth based on globalisation which while being the key driver of the unprecedented rise in prosperity has also created increasing income divides and continued to cause massive environmental impacts from mass industrialisation. Among the challenges facing the world today are a number of issues of global scope and scale that will require coordinated international action, and that is unlikely to be achieved in the absence of clear leadership by either one country or a small group of tightly aligned countries. The issues, which require this vision and leadership, include: 1. Trade Protectionism and Fairness. The continued growth of global industrial trade is being threatened by increasing protectionism (e.g. a 51% increase in G20 country trade protectionist measures from 2010-15) and major withdrawals by countries from trade frameworks (e.g. the US withdrawal from the TPP and the UK’s Brexit). While this is based on a perception of the unfairness of trade or an infringed sovereignty, it is clear that the countries that have voted for more isolationist leaders and policies have been among free trade’s biggest historic beneficiaries with their economies still reliant on its continued growth.[3] 2. Income Inequality. The gaps between the have and the have nots globally is sharpening across a number of key dimensions, with the traditional north-south divide between countries being exacerbated by growing inequality within nations, too, with the GINI coefficient, a traditional measure of inequality rising by 10% across OECD countries and the ratio of top income decile to bottom income decile reached its highest level in 30 years. [4] 3. Climate Change and Rising Pollution. The global fight against climate change and greenhouse gas emissions, which have increased by 80% since 1970, and has been damaged by the US withdrawal from the Paris Climate Change Accord. 4. Food and Water Security.5bn people today lack adequate access to sanitation, and of the 3bn people projected to be added to the world’s population by 2050, most will be born in countries facing severe food and water shortages. 5. Cross-Border Terrorism. Cross-border terrorism is at an all-time high today, causing nearly 40,000 deaths per year, and creating an urgent need for global co-operation on intelligence and security. 6. Cyber-Crime. Cyber-crime, with over 45m+ incidents annually, is an increasingly critical threat to the global economic and political order. 7. Displacements and Increasing Refugee Flows. Collective action is required to effectively process and integrate refugees and economic migrants around the world, which today total 65m – the highest number in human history. As pointed out in previous Sign of the Times papers, these issues are interrelated, with the feedback loop between them accelerating the demise of the current US led world order and its governance framework underwritten by multilateral institutions. As the single most powerful nation on earth, America’s current unwillingness or inability to reinvent the rules and institutions that have failed to solve the world’s issues satisfactorily to date creates an opening for other countries to either reform and save or to reinvent these institutions based on a set of new values. China has clearly recognised the importance of the major issues facing the world and shown an interest in leading across a number of them, in particular in the areas of climate change and free trade. However, China’s willingness to lead is neither comprehensive in nature nor universally welcomed, particularly by the established participants of the current global order who fear that increases in China’s influence would come at a cost to their own positions. While unipolar world orders (such as the Pax Britannica in the 19th century or the shorter Pax Americana post the collapse of the Soviet Union) can underpin periods of peace and prosperity, most countries today lean towards preferring one led by a pre-Trump America or a multi-polar order to one dominated by China. However, where ambitious nations form the leadership of a multipolar order, their competitiveness can drive conflict and instability, whereas in a unipolar world, the rivalry is kept in check. Despite the US having built a broader armoury of hard and soft power than China, the two countries seem set up for conflict across a number of issues. So, unless a third country seeks to also enter this fray and create a three-way tug of war, new entrants to the power game will need to think differently about how to participate. It would seem though that given the diversity of global issues today there is space for multiple leaders employing multiple approaches. In terms of who the new power players might be, while some of the world’s major western countries in theory might partially fill America’s shoes, most will likely be held back by a combination of domestic and geopolitical issues, even if they were able to overcome their fundamental and long-standing lack of willingness to lead. The EU needs more time to recover from its separation from the UK, the UK has been in increasing political and economic turmoil since the Brexit referendum, France is beginning its own domestic political revival and Germany and Japan remain mostly unwilling to be overt leaders for a combination of historic reasons. Having said that, Germany is positioning and being welcomed as a voice of reason by many in favour of salvaging the best of the current liberal world order. However, none of these countries are yet able to provide a credible alternative to China’s bids for leadership or stem its increasing influence and, in the face of American withdrawal, they may have no choice but to welcome another power player. In the absence of credible alternatives from established economies, there are few with the positioning to play a more central role in world affairs. Among these, India stands out clearly due to its size, growth and most importantly its potential. The country has been an important part of the United States’ ‘Asia Pivot’ strategy, is growing rapidly with an increasingly outward foreign and trade policy, has embarked on an aggressive security and defence programme, has established strong relationships with major Asian countries and is committed to the principles of democracy. In the absence of a renewed American interest in world leadership, which one should certainly not rule out, India alone has the scope and scale to offer credible alternatives to China’s leadership bids across a number of fronts. Moreover, given the imbalance in power that a US withdrawal would leave in the Asia-Pacific region, India will have little choice but to play a more active role in the region and the world if it is to achieve its ambitions. However, while India’s potential to become a more important voice on the international stage is unlikely to be questioned, its actions to date are not yet in line with a country that has global leadership aspirations.

But their card admits India doesn’t have the strategic resolve in the status quo -- Harker inserts blue

GPC 17 – Greater Pacific Capital, investing institution designed to identify and develop investing opportunities in and between India and other international economies, 7/17/17, “Path to Power: India’s Great Opportunity in the Changing World Order,” <https://www.greaterpacificcapital.com/thought-leadership/path-to-power-indias-great-opportunity-in-the-changing-world-order>

Last month’s Sign of the Times highlighted what appear to be a series of US retreats from global leadership positions. With the geopolitical cards apparently being reshuffled across a wide range of defence, political and economic areas, America’s apparent withdrawal is creating opportunities for countries seeking to fill the resulting void, with China currently taking the most proactive steps among the potential contenders. Beijing has already made clear its intent to play a more active role in matters of globalisation, international trade and climate change, global issues that also align well with China’s domestic agenda and where it can leverage significant political and financial assets. Despite China’s head start over others and its apparent desire to lead, its efforts will likely face not only resistance from the West but also competition from a number of countries, both within Asia and abroad. Further, China’s inability to lead on a broader set of issues related to matters such as human rights or regional security acts as a counter-weight to its leadership efforts and provides opportunities for other countries to fill the gaps being left by the United States. Among potential contenders for regional and international leadership, India, as the world’s fastest growing economy, the largest democracy and (potentially[1]) the most populous country, clearly has critical assets to leverage across a number of spheres. Bringing these to bear though will require India to be far more bold and strategic in handling both international affairs and in making strong domestic progress, both are matters that have proved elusive to date. However, if India can achieve this, it has the potential to create a virtuous circle of domestic development and international leadership similar to the one that has underwritten US prosperity for over two generations. The Need for Renewed Leadership One of the most dangerous geo-political circumstances is a power vacuum and America’s actions in the last six months in particular, suggest that the execution of the Trump Administration’s ‘America First’ vision is creating vacuums across an increasingly broad range of fields. These are further being exacerbated by the accompanying weakening of (formerly US-led) international and multi-lateral institutions that have until recently underwritten the global order. This order consisted of, among other things, a shared commitment to liberal capitalism, clear rules of engagement in trade, policy and war, a high-level security architecture focused on nuclear non-proliferation, a recognition of states’ fundamental sovereignty and shared access to the earth’s global commons. A number of the key elements of this order were already under attack before America’s current retreat. In fact, the recent withdrawal by the US from what has historically been a muscular international leadership is in many ways a reaction to its own domestic challenges and the global economic, political and security issues that have built up over the past few decades. As pointed out in a previous Sign of the Times[2], many of these challenges are the direct consequences of the current world order, including, the lack of international and national policies to compensate for the uneven nature of growth based on globalisation which while being the key driver of the unprecedented rise in prosperity has also created increasing income divides and continued to cause massive environmental impacts from mass industrialisation. Among the challenges facing the world today are a number of issues of global scope and scale that will require coordinated international action, and that is unlikely to be achieved in the absence of clear leadership by either one country or a small group of tightly aligned countries. The issues, which require this vision and leadership, include: 1. Trade Protectionism and Fairness. The continued growth of global industrial trade is being threatened by increasing protectionism (e.g. a 51% increase in G20 country trade protectionist measures from 2010-15) and major withdrawals by countries from trade frameworks (e.g. the US withdrawal from the TPP and the UK’s Brexit). While this is based on a perception of the unfairness of trade or an infringed sovereignty, it is clear that the countries that have voted for more isolationist leaders and policies have been among free trade’s biggest historic beneficiaries with their economies still reliant on its continued growth.[3] 2. Income Inequality. The gaps between the have and the have nots globally is sharpening across a number of key dimensions, with the traditional north-south divide between countries being exacerbated by growing inequality within nations, too, with the GINI coefficient, a traditional measure of inequality rising by 10% across OECD countries and the ratio of top income decile to bottom income decile reached its highest level in 30 years. [4] 3. Climate Change and Rising Pollution. The global fight against climate change and greenhouse gas emissions, which have increased by 80% since 1970, and has been damaged by the US withdrawal from the Paris Climate Change Accord. 4. Food and Water Security.5bn people today lack adequate access to sanitation, and of the 3bn people projected to be added to the world’s population by 2050, most will be born in countries facing severe food and water shortages. 5. Cross-Border Terrorism. Cross-border terrorism is at an all-time high today, causing nearly 40,000 deaths per year, and creating an urgent need for global co-operation on intelligence and security. 6. Cyber-Crime. Cyber-crime, with over 45m+ incidents annually, is an increasingly critical threat to the global economic and political order. 7. Displacements and Increasing Refugee Flows. Collective action is required to effectively process and integrate refugees and economic migrants around the world, which today total 65m – the highest number in human history. As pointed out in previous Sign of the Times papers, these issues are interrelated, with the feedback loop between them accelerating the demise of the current US led world order and its governance framework underwritten by multilateral institutions. As the single most powerful nation on earth, America’s current unwillingness or inability to reinvent the rules and institutions that have failed to solve the world’s issues satisfactorily to date creates an opening for other countries to either reform and save or to reinvent these institutions based on a set of new values. China has clearly recognised the importance of the major issues facing the world and shown an interest in leading across a number of them, in particular in the areas of climate change and free trade. However, China’s willingness to lead is neither comprehensive in nature nor universally welcomed, particularly by the established participants of the current global order who fear that increases in China’s influence would come at a cost to their own positions. While unipolar world orders (such as the Pax Britannica in the 19th century or the shorter Pax Americana post the collapse of the Soviet Union) can underpin periods of peace and prosperity, most countries today lean towards preferring one led by a pre-Trump America or a multi-polar order to one dominated by China. However, where ambitious nations form the leadership of a multipolar order, their competitiveness can drive conflict and instability, whereas in a unipolar world, the rivalry is kept in check. Despite the US having built a broader armoury of hard and soft power than China, the two countries seem set up for conflict across a number of issues. So, unless a third country seeks to also enter this fray and create a three-way tug of war, new entrants to the power game will need to think differently about how to participate. It would seem though that given the diversity of global issues today there is space for multiple leaders employing multiple approaches. In terms of who the new power players might be, while some of the world’s major western countries in theory might partially fill America’s shoes, most will likely be held back by a combination of domestic and geopolitical issues, even if they were able to overcome their fundamental and long-standing lack of willingness to lead. The EU needs more time to recover from its separation from the UK, the UK has been in increasing political and economic turmoil since the Brexit referendum, France is beginning its own domestic political revival and Germany and Japan remain mostly unwilling to be overt leaders for a combination of historic reasons. Having said that, Germany is positioning and being welcomed as a voice of reason by many in favour of salvaging the best of the current liberal world order. However, none of these countries are yet able to provide a credible alternative to China’s bids for leadership or stem its increasing influence and, in the face of American withdrawal, they may have no choice but to welcome another power player. In the absence of credible alternatives from established economies, there are few with the positioning to play a more central role in world affairs. Among these, India stands out clearly due to its size, growth and most importantly its potential. The country has been an important part of the United States’ ‘Asia Pivot’ strategy, is growing rapidly with an increasingly outward foreign and trade policy, has embarked on an aggressive security and defence programme, has established strong relationships with major Asian countries and is committed to the principles of democracy. In the absence of a renewed American interest in world leadership, which one should certainly not rule out, India alone has the scope and scale to offer credible alternatives to China’s leadership bids across a number of fronts. Moreover, given the imbalance in power that a US withdrawal would leave in the Asia-Pacific region, India will have little choice but to play a more active role in the region and the world if it is to achieve its ambitions. However, while India’s potential to become a more important voice on the international stage is unlikely to be questioned, its actions to date are not yet in line with a country that has global leadership aspirations. **HARVARD WESTLAKE ENDS** Five Pre-requisites for Positioning India for Leadership “Essentially, India faces a growing up moment. To lead, India would need to demonstrate to the rest of the world that is has the political, economic and military maturity and sophistication to exert influence on the global. stage to help solve some of the world’s most pressing issues, much like the United States did in the post-war era.” For the majority of its post-independence history, India has stuck to a policy of international non-alignment, limiting its global interventions to situations where it has been directly impacted. Clearly, if India has global leadership aspirations, this needs to change quickly and this will be challenging given the depth to which this belief has been driven through the Indian policy and bureaucratic apparatus. To put the challenge into context, simply building out its own economy to be the fastest growing in the world or developing its military capabilities in order to secure its borders will not suffice if India is to be a positive force in the region, much less the world. Essentially, India faces a growing up moment. To lead, India would need to demonstrate to the rest of the world that is has the political, economic and military maturity and sophistication to exert influence on the global stage to help solve some of the world’s most pressing issues, much like the United States did in the post-war era. And in doing so, India will need to leverage its democratic traditions to secure a significant soft power advantage over competing governments, including China and Russia whose authoritarian leadership models lend themselves to tougher and quicker decisions but also create an aversion among the world’s more liberal nations. Clearly, executing on such a strategy requires a significant degree of stability and alignment at home. A country preoccupied with overwhelming issues domestically has neither the bandwidth nor the will-power to lead abroad, as America’s own current withdrawal from leadership is demonstrating.

#### No US-China war – nor accidental escalation

Timothy Heath 17, senior international defense research analyst at the nonprofit, nonpartisan RAND Corporation and member of the Pardee RAND Graduate School faculty, and William R. Thompson, Distinguished and Rogers Professor at Indiana University and an adjunct researcher at RAND, "U.S.-China Tensions Are Unlikely to Lead to War", National Interest, https://nationalinterest.org/feature/us-china-tensions-are-unlikely-lead-war-20411?page=0%2C1

Graham Allison's April 12 article, “ How America and China Could Stumble to War ,” explores how misperceptions and bureaucratic dysfunction could accelerate a militarized crisis involving the United States and China into an unwanted war. However, the article fails to persuade because it neglects the key political and geostrategic conditions that make war plausible in the first place. Without those conditions in place, the risk that a crisis could accidentally escalate into war becomes far lower. The U.S.-China relationship today may be trending towards greater tension, but the relative stability and overall low level of hostility make the prospect of an accidental escalation to war extremely unlikely. In a series of scenarios centered around the South China Sea, Taiwan and the East China Sea, Allison explored how well-established flashpoints involving China and the United States and its allies could spiral into unwanted war. Allison’s article argues that given the context of strategic rivalry between a rising power and a status-quo power, organizational and bureaucratic misjudgments increase the likelihood of unintended escalation. According to Allison, “the underlying stress created by China’s disruptive rise creates conditions in which accidental, otherwise inconsequential events could trigger a large-scale conflict.” This argument appears persuasive on its surface, in no small part because it evokes insights from some of Allison’s groundbreaking work on the organizational pathologies that made the Cuban Missile Crisis so dangerous. However, Allison ultimately fails to persuade because he fails to specify the political and strategic conditions that make war plausible in the first place. Allison’s analysis implies that the United States and China are in a situation analogous to that of the Soviet Union and the United States in the early 1960s. In the Cold War example, the two countries faced each other on a near-war footing and engaged in a bitter geostrategic and ideological struggle for supremacy. The two countries experienced a series of militarized crises and fought each other repeatedly through proxy wars. It was this broader context that made issues of misjudgment so dangerous in a crisis. By contrast, the U.S.-China relationship today operates at a much lower level of hostility and threat. China and the United States may be experiencing an increase in tensions, but the two countries remain far from the bitter, acrimonious rivalry that defined the U.S.-Soviet relationship in the early 1960s. Neither Washington nor Beijing regards the other as its principal enemy. Today’s rivals may view each other warily as competitors and threats on some issues, but they also view each other as important trade partners and partners on some shared concerns, such as North Korea, as the recent summit between President Donald Trump and Chinese president Xi Jinping illustrated. The behavior of their respective militaries underscores the relatively restrained rivalry. The military competition between China and the United States may be growing, but it operates at a far lower level of intensity than the relentless arms racing that typified the U.S.-Soviet standoff. And unlike their Cold War counterparts, U.S. and Chinese militaries are not postured to fight each other in major wars. Moreover, polls show that the people of the two countries regard each other with mixed views —a considerable contrast from the hostile sentiment expressed by the U.S. and Soviet publics for each other. Lacking both preparations for major war and a constituency for conflict, leaders and bureaucracies in both countries have less incentive to misjudge crisis situations in favor of unwarranted escalation. To the contrary, political leaders and bureaucracies currently face a strong incentive to find ways of defusing crises in a manner that avoids unwanted escalation. This inclination manifested itself in the EP-3 airplane collision off Hainan Island in 2001, and in subsequent incidents involving U.S. and Chinese ships and aircraft, such as the harassment of the USNS Impeccable in 2009. This does not mean that there is no risk, however. Indeed, the potential for a dangerous militarized crisis may be growing. Moreover, key political and geostrategic developments could shift the incentives for leaders in favor of more escalatory options in a crisis and thereby make Allison’s scenarios more plausible. Past precedents offer some insight into the types of developments that would most likely propel the U.S.-China relationship into a hostile, competitive one featuring an elevated risk of conflict. The most important driver, as Allison recognizes, would be a growing parity between China and the United States as economic, technological and geostrategic leaders of the international system. The United States and China feature an increasing parity in the size of their economies, but the United States retains a considerable lead in virtually every other dimension of national power. The current U.S.-China rivalry is a regional one centered on the Asia-Pacific region, but it retains the considerable potential of escalating into a global, systemic competition down the road. A second important driver would be the mobilization of public opinion behind the view that the other country is a primary source of threat, thereby providing a stronger constituency for escalatory policies. A related development would be the formal designation by leaders in both capitals of the other country as a primary hostile threat and likely foe. These developments would most likely be fueled by a growing array of intractable disputes, and further accelerated by a serious militarized crisis. The cumulative effect would be the exacerbation of an antagonistic competitive rivalry, repeated and volatile militarized crisis, and heightened risk that any flashpoint could escalate rapidly to war—a relationship that would resemble the U.S.-Soviet relationship in the early 1960s. Yet even if the relationship evolved towards a more hostile form of rivalry, unique features of the contemporary world suggest lessons drawn from the past may have limited applicability. Economic interdependence in the twenty-first century is much different and far more complex than in it was in the past. So is the lethality of weaponry available to the major powers. In the sixteenth century, armies fought with pikes, swords and primitive guns. In the twenty-first century, it is possible to eliminate all life on the planet in a full-bore nuclear exchange. These features likely affect the willingness of leaders to escalate in a crisis in a manner far differently than in past rivalries. More broadly, Allison’s analysis about the “Thucydides Trap” may be criticized for exaggerating the risks of war. In his claims to identify a high propensity for war between “rising” and “ruling” countries, he fails to clarify those terms, and does not distinguish the more dangerous from the less volatile types of rivalries. Contests for supremacy over land regions, for example, have historically proven the most conflict-prone, while competition for supremacy over maritime regions has, by contrast, tended to be less lethal. Rivalries also wax and wane over time, with varying levels of risks of war. A more careful review of rivalries and their variety, duration and patterns of interaction suggests that although most wars involve rivalries, many rivals avoid going to war. Misperceptions and strategic accidents remain a persistent feature of international politics, and it may well be that that mistakes are more likely to be lethal in periods of adjustment in relative power configurations. Rising states do have problems negotiating status quo changes with states that have staked out their predominance earlier. Even so, the probability of war between China and the United States is almost certainly far less than the 75 percent predicted by Allison. If the leaders of both countries can continue to find ways to dampen the trends towards hostile rivalry and maintain sufficient cooperation to manage differences, then there is good reason to hope that the risk of war can be lowered further still.