# UNLV R6

## 1

**Interp: The affirmative must defend private entities as a general principle, not specify a subset**

**Private entities is a bare plural–that’s generic**

**Byrd** [“Generic Meaning,” Georgia State University, Transcript of lecture given by Pat Byrd, Department of Applied Linguistics & ESL]

Here are some things that we do know about these generic noun phrase types when they are used in context:1. The + singular: The computer has changed modern life This form is considered more formal than the others--and is not as likely to be used in conversation as the plural noun: Computers have changed modern life. Master (1987) found in the samp.le that he analyzed that this form with the was often used to introduce at topic--and came at the beginning of a paragraph and in introductions and conclusions.2. Zero + plural: Computers are machines. Computers have changed modern life. Probably the most common form for a generalization. It can be used in all contexts--including both conversation (Basketball players make too much money) and academic writing (Organisms as diverse as humans and squid share many biological processes). Perhaps used more in the hard sciences and social sciences than in the humanities. 3. A + singular: A computer is a machine. This generic structure is used to refer to individual instances of a whole group and is used to classify whatever is being discussed.The form is often used for definitions of terms. It is also often used to explain occupations. My sister is a newspaper reporter. I am a teacher. Use is limited to these "classifying" contexts. Notice that this form can't always be subtituted for the other: \*Life has been changed by a computer. \*A computer has changed modern life. 4. Zero + noncount: Life has been changed by the computer. The most basic meaning and use of noncount nouns is generic--they are fundamentally about a very abstract level of meaning. Thus, the most common use of noncount nouns is this use with no article for generic meaning. Zero Article and Generic Meaning: Most nouns without articles have generic meaning. Two types are involved.1. Zero + plural: Computers are machines. Computers have changed modern life.2. Zero + noncount: Life has been changed by the computer.

**1–Precision outweighs - anything outside the res is arbitrary and unpredictable because the topic determines prep, not being bound by it lets them jettison any word.**

**2–Limits and Ground - decimates clash by exploding limits to infinite private entities and combinations, each with different astrological fields of science, political and economic conditions, and goals which makes contesting the aff with unifying neg ground impossible and means they can always pick the most aff skewed slice of the res.**

**3–TVA – read your aff as an advantage under whole res – we still get your content education and sufficient aff ground by switching up aff advantages, frameworks, implementation, etc. But, 1ar theory checks pics and they incentivize more of them cuz nothing but cheaty generics link**

## 2

**Interpretation: Affirmatives must not defend the implementation of a policy action**

**Violation: They aren’t just describing why appropriation is unjust, but prescribing a policy action we should take**

**1–Precision–res is asking if appropriation is unjust–that’s descriptive–even if their interp is good, we couldn’t predict it cuz it’s not in the res**

**Merriam Webster n/d** <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/is> //SR

present tense third-person singular of BE

**2–Limits and Ground–makes the aff extra T–the premise that appropriation is unjust can lead to infinite different conclusions of how to resolve that and let them pick the most obscure implementation to spike neg ground and go outside the res–it’s about what their model justifies**

## 3

**Interp: The affirmative must define appropriation with a delineated text in the 1AC**

**Pershing 19**, Abigail D. "Interpreting the Outer Space Treaty's Non-Appropriation Principle: Customary International Law from 1967 to Today." Yale J. Int'l L. 44 (2019): 149. (Robina Fellow at European Court of Human Rights. European Court of Human Rights Yale Law School)//Elmer

Though the Outer Space Treaty flatly prohibits national appropriation of space,150 it leaves unanswered many questions as to what actually counts as appropriation. As far back as 1969, scholars wondered about the implications of this article.151 While it is clear that a nation may not claim ownership of the moon, other questions are not so clear. Does the prohibition extend to collecting scientific samples?152 Does creating space debris count as appropriation by occupation? While the answers to these questions are most likely no, simply because of the difficulties that would be caused otherwise, there are some questions that are more difficult to answer, and more pressing. As commercial space flight becomes more and more prevalent,153 the question of whether private entities can appropriate property in space becomes very important. Whereas once it took a nation to get into space, it will soon take only a corporation, and scholars have pondered whether these entities will be able to claim property in space.154 Though this seems allowable, since the treaty only prohibits “national appropriation,”155 allowing such appropriation would lead to an absurd result. This is because the only value that lies in recognition of a claim is the ability to have that claim enforced.156 If a nation recognized and enforced such a claim, this enforcement would constitute state action.157 It would serve to exclude members of other nations and would thus serve as a form of national appropriation, even though the nation never attempted to directly appropriate the property.158 Furthermore, the Outer Space Treaty also requires that non-governmental entities must be authorized and monitored by the entities’ home countries to operate in space.159 Since a nation cannot authorize its citizens to act in contradiction to international law, a nation would not be allowed to license a private entity to appropriate property in space.160 While this nonappropriation principle is great for allowing free access to space, thereby encouraging research and development in the field, it makes it difficult to create or police a solution to the space debris problem. A viable solution will have to work without becoming an appropriation. There is, however, very little substantive law on what actually counts as appropriation in the context of space.161 So, the best way to see what is and is not allowed is to look both at the general international law regarding appropriations and to look at the past actions of space actors to see what has been allowed (or at least tolerated) and what has been prohibited or rejected.

**The net benefit is shiftiness – vague plan wording wrecks Neg Ground since it’s impossible to know which arguments link given different types of appropriation like mining, space col, satellites, and tourism – the 1AR dodges links by saying they don’t affect particular types of appropriation, or they don’t reduce private appropriation enough to trigger the link. Cx doesn’t check–it’s non verifiable and skews preround prep–they get away with abuse no risk justifying infinite abuse BUT no regress since the interp is grounded in the lit and limited words in the res mean limited interps**

**Fairness and education are voters – debate’s a game that needs rules to evaluate it and it teaches portable skills that we use lifelong**

**Drop the debater–severance kills 1NC strat construction—1AR restart favors aff since it’s 7-6 time skew and they get 2 speeches to my one**

**No rvi–shouldn’t win for being fair**

**Competing interps–reasonability is arbitrary and causes a race to the bottom–finding the best model of debate is key to preserve the most substantive norms in the long terms but no frivolous race to the top since limited words in the res mean limited interps**

**NC theory first–NC abuse was reactive so they were the root cause and T uniquely first since only 2 months to discuss it–can discuss 1ar theory any time**

## 4

**The metaethic is practical reason. Prefer:**

**[1] Regress – Ethical theories must have a basis. We can always ask why we should follow the basis of a theory, so they aren’t morally binding because they don’t have a starting point. Practical reason solves – When we ask why we should follow reason, we demand a reason, which concedes to the authority of reason itself, so it’s the only thing we can follow**

**[2] Action Theory – Every action can be broken down to infinite amounts of movements, i.e. me moving my arm can be broken down to the infinite moments of every state my arm is in. Only reason can unify these movements because we use practical reason to achieve our goals, means all actions collapse to reason**

**Practical reason means we all have a unified perspective: What can be justified to me can be justified to everyone who is a practical reasoner. If I can conclude that 2+2 is 4, then I understand not only that I know 2+2 is 4, but that everyone around me can arrive at the same conclusion. These things are temporally consistent: I know that me adding two numbers now and taking that sum will not result in me adding the same two numbers in the future and getting a different sum. Our unified perspective does not change but rather stays consistent.**

**But, willing an action that violates the freedom of others is a contradiction: If I decide to kill someone, that action is not universalizable because that would justify other people killing me too. If I die, I cannot exercise my freedom to kill someone else. This is a contradiction: I both justify extending my freedom to kill others and limiting my own freedom.**

**Thus, the standard is respecting freedom. Acquisition of property can never be unjust – to create rights violations, there must already be an owner of the property being violated, but that presupposes its appropriation by another entity.**

**Feser**, (Edward Feser, 1-1-2005, accessed on 12-15-2021, Cambridge University Press, "THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS AN UNJUST INITIAL ACQUISITION | Social Philosophy and Policy | Cambridge Core", Edward C. Feser is an American philosopher. He is an Associate Professor of Philosophy at Pasadena City College in Pasadena, California. [https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/social-philosophy-and-policy/article/abs/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-unjust-initial-acquisition/5C744D6D5C525E711EC75F75BF7109D1)[brackets](https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/social-philosophy-and-policy/article/abs/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-unjust-initial-acquisition/5C744D6D5C525E711EC75F75BF7109D1)%5bbrackets) for gen lang]//phs st

There is a serious difficulty with this criticism of Nozick, however. It is just this: **There is no such thing as an unjust initial acquisition of resources;** therefore**, there is no case** to be made **for** redistributive taxation on the basis of **alleged injustices in initial acquisition.** This is, to be sure, a bold claim. Moreover, in making it, I contradict not only Nozick’s critics, but Nozick himself, who clearly thinks it is at least possible for there to be injustices in acquisition, whether or not there have in fact been any (or, more realistically, whether or not there have been enough such injustices to justify continual redistributive taxation for the purposes of rectifying them). But here is a case where Nozick has, I think, been too generous to the other side. Rather than attempt —unsatisfactorily, in the view of his critics—to meet the challenge to show that initial acquisition has not in general been unjust, he ought instead to have insisted that **there is no such challenge to be met in the first place.** Giving what I shall call “the basic argument” for this audacious claim will be the task of Section II of this essay. The argument is, I think, compelling, but by itself it leaves unexplained some widespread intu- itions to the effect that certain specific instances of initial acquisition are unjust and call forth as their remedy the application of a Lockean proviso, or are otherwise problematic. (A “Lockean proviso,” of course, is one that forbids initial acquisitions of resources when these acquisitions do not leave “enough and as good” in common for others.) Thus, Section III focuses on various considerations that tend to show how those intuitions are best explained in a way consistent with the argument of Section II. Section IV completes the task of accounting for the intuitions in question by considering how the thesis of self-ownership itself bears on the acqui- sition and use of property. Section V shows how the results of the previ- ous sections add up to a more satisfying defense of Nozickian property rights than the one given by Nozick himself, and considers some of the implications of this revised conception of initial acquisition for our under- standing of Nozick’s principles of transfer and rectification. II. The Basic Argument **The reason there is no such thing as an unjust initial acquisition of resources is that there is no such thing as either a just or an unjust initial acquisition of resources.** The concept of **justice**, that is to say, simply does not apply to initial acquisition. It **applies only after initial acquisition has already taken place.** In particular, **it applies only to transfers of property** (and derivatively, to the rectification of injustices in transfer). This, it seems to me, is a clear implication of the assumption (rightly) made by Nozick that **external resources are initially unowned.** Consider the following example. **Suppose an individual A seeks** to acquire **some previously unowned resource R. For** it **to be the case that A commits an injustice in acquiring R, it would also have to be the case that there is some individual B** (or perhaps a group of individuals) **against whom A commits the injustice. But for B to have been wronged by A’s acquisi- tion of R, B would have to have** had a rightful claim over R, **a right to R.** By hypothesis, **however, B did not have a right to R, because** no one had a right to it—**it was unowned**, after all. **So B was not wronged and could not have been**. In fact, **the** very **first person who could conceivably be wronged by anyone’s use of R would be**, not B, but **A himself,** since A is the first one to own R. **Such a wrong would in the nature of the case be an injustice in transfer**—in unjustly taking from A what is rightfully his—**not in initial acquisition. The same thing**, by extension, **will be true of all unowned resources**: it is only after some- one has initially acquired them that anyone could unjustly come to possess them, via unjust transfer. **It is impossible,** then, **for there to be any injustices in initial acquisition**.7

## 5

**CP: Ukraine ought to:**

* **End exports of space technology to the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea**
* **Ban private space companies from accepting Chinese investment**
* **Move all nuclear reactors offline, dismantle nuclear reactors, and entomb them in concrete deep underground**

**Plank 1 solves advantage 1 – they said NoKo ballistic missile capabilities are dependent on the Ukrainian space industry but we end supply**

**Planks 2 and 3 solve advantage 2 – Ukraine not taking Chinese investment means no US alienation which preserves Biden’s support AND lack of nuclear reactors takes out the terminal impact**

## 6

**Security is a psychological construct—the aff’s scenarios for conflict are products of paranoia only targeting the symptoms and project our violent impulses onto the other**

**Mack ’91** Doctor of Psychiatry and a professor at Harvard University (John, “The Enemy System” http://www.johnemackinstitute.org/eJournal/article.asp?id=23 \*Gender modified)

The threat of nuclear annihilation has stimulated us to try to understand what it is about (hu)mankind that has led to such self-destroying behavior. Central to this inquiry is an exploration of the adversarial relationships between ethnic or national groups. It is out of such enmities that war, including nuclear war should it occur, has always arisen. Enmity between groups of people stems from the interaction of psychological, economic, and cultural elements. These include fear and hostility (which are often closely related), competition over perceived scarce resources,[3] the need for individuals to identify with a large group or cause,[4] a tendency to disclaim and assign elsewhere responsibility for unwelcome impulses and intentions, and a peculiar susceptibility to emotional manipulation by leaders who play upon our more savage inclinations in the name of national security or the national interest. A full understanding of the "enemy system"[3] requires insights from many specialities, including psychology, anthropology, history, political science, and the humanities. In their statement on violence[5] twenty social and behavioral scientists, who met in Seville, Spain, to examine the roots of war, declared that there was no scientific basis for regarding (hu)man(s) as an innately aggressive animal, inevitably committed to war. The Seville statement implies that we have real choices. It also points to a hopeful paradox of the nuclear age: threat of nuclear war may have provoked our capacity for fear-driven polarization but at the same time it has inspired unprecedented efforts towards cooperation and settlement of differences without violence. The Real and the Created Enemy Attempts to explore the psychological roots of enmity are frequently met with responses on the following lines: "I can accept psychological explanations of things, but my enemy is real. The Russians [or Germans, Arabs, Israelis, Americans] are armed, threaten us, and intend us harm. Furthermore, there are real differences between us and our national interests, such as competition over oil, land, or other scarce resources, and genuine conflicts of values between our two nations. It is essential that we be strong and maintain a balance or superiority of military and political power, lest the other side take advantage of our weakness". This argument does not address the distinction between the enemy threat and one's own contribution to that threat-by distortions of perception, provocative words, and actions. In short, the enemy is real, but we have not learned to understand how we have created that enemy, or how the threatening image we hold of the enemy relates to its actual intentions. "We never see our enemy's motives and we never labor to assess his will, with anything approaching objectivity".[6] Individuals may have little to do with the choice of national enemies. Most Americans, for example, know only what has been reported in the mass media about the Soviet Union. We are largely unaware of the forces that operate within our institutions, affecting the thinking of our leaders and ourselves, and which determine how the Soviet Union will be represented to us. Ill-will and a desire for revenge are transmitted from one generation to another, and we are not taught to think critically about how our assigned enemies are selected for us. In the relations between potential adversarial nations there will have been, inevitably, real grievances that are grounds for enmity. But the attitude of one people towards another is usually determined by leaders who manipulate the minds of citizens for domestic political reasons which are generally unknown to the public. As Israeli sociologist Alouph Haveran has said, in times of conflict between nations historical accuracy is the first victim.[8] The Image of the Enemy and How We Sustain It Vietnam veteran William Broyles wrote: "War begins in the mind, with the idea of the enemy."[9] But to sustain that idea in war and peacetime a nation's leaders must maintain public support for the massive expenditures that are required. Studies of enmity have revealed susceptibilities, though not necessarily recognized as such by the governing elites that provide raw material upon which the leaders may draw to sustain the image of an enemy.[7,10] Freud[11] in his examination of mass psychology identified the proclivity of individuals to surrender personal responsibility to the leaders of large groups. This surrender takes place in both totalitarian and democratic societies, and without coercion. Leaders can therefore designate outside enemies and take actions against them with little opposition. Much further research is needed to understand the psychological mechanisms that impel individuals to kill or allow killing in their name, often with little questioning of the morality or consequences of such actions. Philosopher and psychologist Sam Keen asks why it is that in virtually every war "The enemy is seen as less than human? He's faceless. He's an animal"." Keen tries to answer his question: "The image of the enemy is not only the soldier's most powerful weapon; it is society's most powerful weapon. It enables people en masse to participate in acts of violence they would never consider doing as individuals".[12] National leaders become skilled in presenting the adversary in dehumanized images. The mass media, taking their cues from the leadership, contribute powerfully to the process.

**Voting negative problematizes their representation for conflict and endorses the development of empathy instead - addresses the root cause of their impacts and prevents serial policy failure**

**Byles ‘3** (Joanna, Professor of English in the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, University of Cyprus, 1/1/04; “Psychoanalysis and War: The Superego and Projective Identification,” http://www.psyartjournal.com/article/show/montgomery\_byles-psychoanalysis\_and\_war\_the\_superego\_and\_)

War tramples in blind fury on all that comes in its way, as though there were to be no future and no peace among men after it is over. It cuts all the common bonds between the contending peoples, and threatens to leave a legacy of embitterment that will make any renewal of those bonds impossible for a long time to come. Freud to Einstein, "Why War?" The problem of warfare which includes genocide, and its most recent manifestation, international terrorism, brings into focus the need to understand how the individual is placed in the social and the social in the individual. Psychoanalytic theories of superego aggression, splitting, projection, and projective identification may be useful in helping us to understand the psychic links involved. It seems vital to me writing in the Middle East in September 2002 that we examine our understanding of what it is we understand about war, including genocide and terrorism. Some psychoanalysts argue that war is a necessary defence against psychotic anxiety (Fornari xx; Volkan), and Freud himself first advanced the idea that war provided an outlet for repressed impulses. ("Why War?"197). The problematic of these views is the individual's need to translate internal psychotic anxieties into real external dangers so as to control them. It suggests that culturally warfare and its most recent manifestation, international terrorism and the so-called ''war on terrorism," may be a necessary object for internal aggression and not a pathology. Indeed, Fornari suggests that "war could be seen as an attempt at therapy, carried out by a social institution which, precisely by institutionalizing war, increases to gigantic proportions what is initially an elementary defensive mechanism of the ego in the schizo-paranoid phase" (xvii-xviii). In other words, the history of war might represent the externalization and articulation of shared unconscious fantasies. This idea would suggest that the culture of war, genocide, and international terrorism provides objects of psychic need. If this is so, with what can we replace them? If cultural formations and historical events have their sources in our psychic functioning that is to say, in our unconscious fears and desires, and culture itself provides a framework for expressing, articulating, and coming to terms with these fears and desires, then psychoanalysis may help to reveal why war seems to be an inevitable and ineradicable part of human history. SUPEREGO AS AN AGENT OF AGGRESSION In "The Ego and the Id," Freud formulated a seemingly insoluble dilemma in the very essence of the human psyche; the eternal conflict between the dual instincts of eros, the civilizing life instinct, and the indomitable death instinct (thanatos). He also identified some aspects of the death instinct with superego aggression, suggesting that the superego was the agent of the death instinct in its cruel and aggressive need for punishment and that its operative feeling was frequently a punitive hatred, while other aspects of the superego were protective. As we know, Freud thought the source of the superego was the internalization of the castrating Oedipal father. In chapter seven of Civilization and its Discontents, he theorized that when de-fusion or separation of the dual instincts occurred, aspects of aggression frequently dominated and that it was the purpose of the ego to find objects for eros and/or aggression either in phantasy or reality. The role phantasy plays in projective identification is something to which I shall return. Other theorists, such as Melanie Klein, trace the beginning of the superego back to early (infant) oral phantasies of self-destruction, which is a direct manifestation of the death instinct. Klein transformed the oedipal drama by making the mother its central figure and thus playing a vital role in object-relations theory, about which I shall say more later in this essay. Although Klein's work relied on the dual instinct theory postulated by Freud, she re-defined the drives by emphasizing the way in which the destructive instincts attached themselves to the object, in particular the good-bad breast. Thus for Klein, the site of the superego is derived from oral Incorporation of the good/bad breast, contrary to Freud, for whom the site of the superego is the paternal law. Although the formation of the superego is grounded on the renunciation of loving and hostile Oedipal wishes, it is subsequently refined, by the contributions of social and cultural requirements (education, religion, morality). My argument in this paper is three-fold: (1) These social and cultural requirements in which the superego is grounded may be used by the superego of the state and/or its leader to mobilize aspects of the individual's aggression during war-time in a way that does not happen in peace-time. (2) Klein's theory of splitting and projective identification plays an important role in the concept of difference and otherness as enemy. (3) Bion's development of Klein's theory into what he called the "container" and the "contained" may offer some way out of the psychic dangers of projective identification by suggesting that we may be able to access our internal psychic world as a transformative power to combat violence both internal and external. In an early attempt to define war neuroses, or how war mentally traumatizes the psyche, Freud wrote of the conflict "between the soldier's old peaceful ego and his new warlike one" becoming acute as soon as the peace-ego realizes what danger it runs in losing its own life to the rashness of its newly formed parasitic double" (SE 17 209). Accepting the violence that is within ourselves as well as in the other, the so-called enemy, is a difficult lesson to learn, and learning to displace our instinctual destructive aggression peacefully is enormously more difficult. To the extent the individual superego is connected to society, which assumes its functions particularly in wartime, the problem of war brings into focus the psychoanalytic problem of the partial defusion (separation) of eros and psychic aggression brought about by war through specifically social processes. These social processes involve the mechanisms by which aspects of the violent and aggressive social superego of the State mobilizes and appropriates some of the dynamic aspects of the individual's superego aggression: the need to hate, and to punish, for its own purposes, such as genocide or so-called "ethnic cleansing," and for territorial and economic reasons. Many of these actions are often masked as defending civilization, or an idealized State and/or its leader. This is also true of the "holy jihads" that are rapidly becoming an enormous threat to the world. In his book Enemies and Allies, Vamik Volkan suggests that the individual may see the superego of the State as his/her own idealized superego. And indeed, this may in turn help to explain how during war-time the social superego is placed in the individual and how in turn the individual is positioned in the social. In Civilization and its Discontents, to which I have already referred, Freud wrote about the ways in which the regulations and demands of a civilized society harbor the risk of the death instinct (aggression) being released at any favorable opportunity, especially when combined with Eros i.e., under the pretext of idealism and patriotism. This is especially true when there is a leader who elicits strong emotional attachments from a group or nation. Of course, I am not arguing that there are not some important aspects of the social superego that are beneficial, for example the ethical and moral laws which shape society and protect its citizens; nevertheless, in wartime and its most recent manifestation, international terrorism, it is precisely these civilizing aspects of the social superego that are ignored or repressed. It seems to me that the failure of civilization historically to control the aggression, cruelty, and hatred that characterize war urgently requires a psychoanalytic explanation. Of course, I am speaking of psychic, not biological (survival of the fittest), aggression. In wartime the externalized superego of the state sanctions killing and violence that is not allowed in peace-time (in fact, such violence against others during peacetime would be considered criminal) sanctions, in fact, the gratification of warring aggression, thus ensuring that acts of violence need not incur guilt. Why do we accept this? Psychoanalysis posits the idea that aggression is not behavioral but instinctual; not social but psychological. To quote Volkan, who follows Freud, "It is man's very nature itself." Obviously, it is vital that humanity find more mature, less primitive ways of dealing with our hatred and aggression than war, genocide, and international terrorism. The most characteristic thing about this kind of violence and cruelty is its collective mentality: war requires group co-operation, organization, and approval. Some theorists argue that one of the primary cohesive elements binding individuals into institutionalized human association is defence against psychotic anxiety. In Group Psychology Freud writes that "in a group the individual is brought under conditions which allow him to throw off the repressions of his unconscious instinctual impulses. The apparently new characteristics he then displays are in fact the manifestation of this unconscious, in which all that is evil in the human mind is contained as a predisposition" (74). Later in the same essay, when speaking of the individual and the group mind, Freud quotes Le Bon : "Isolated, he may be a cultivated individual; in a crowd, he is a barbarian that is, a creature acting by instinct. He possesses the spontaneity, the violence, the ferocity, and also the enthusiasm and heroism of primitive beings" (77). War is a collective phenomenon that mobilizes our anxieties and allows our original sadistic fantasies of destructive omnipotence to be re-activated and projected onto "the enemy." Some critics have argued that we "need" enemies as external stabilizers of our sense of identity and inner control. It has also been argued that the militancy a particular group shows toward its enemies may partly mask the personal internal conflicts of each member of the group, and that they may therefore have an emotional investment in the maintenance of the enmity. In other words, they need the enemy and are unconsciously afraid to lose it. This fits in with the well known phenomenon of inventing an enemy when there is not one readily available. The individual suicide bomber, or suicide pilot, is just as much part of this group psychology each bomber, each terrorist, is acting for his/her group, or even more immediately his or her family, from whom he/she derives enormous psychic strength and support. Just as importantly, she/he is acting in the name of his/her leader. All of these identifications require strong emotional attachments. Freud writes, "The mutual tie between members of a group is in the nature of an identification, based upon an important emotional common quality. . . . This common quality lies in the nature of the tie to the leader" (Group 1078). In Learning from Experience, Bion theorizes that a social group functions to establish a fixed social order of things (the establishment), and that the individual has to be contained by the establishment of the group. Sometimes the rigidity of me system crushes the individual's creativity; alternatively, certain special individuals erupt in the group, which goes to pieces under their influence (Bion cites Jesus within the constraints of Israel). A final possibility is the mutual adaptation of one to the other, with a development of both the individual and the group. The development of a sense of self, its integration, its separation, and its protection all begin, or course, in early childhood. Psychoanalyses like Klein, Winnicott, and Bion have explored these ideas in what is known as object relations theory. Volkan writes that the concepts of enemy and ally and the senses of ethnicity and nationality are largely bound up with the individual's sense of self, and that individuals within an ethnic or national group tend to see their group as a privileged "pseudo-species" (Erikson) and enemy groups as subhuman (262). Of course enemies are threatening and do generate a reactive need for defenses; however, a basic psychoanalytic question might be to what extent the degree of defensiveness characteristic of war behavior represents personal, emotional needs of individuals for an enemy to hate, so that they can keep their conflicted selves together, and to what extent the State superego plays a role here. Our capacity for splitting and projection plays an important part in how we see others and feel about others, and through the process of projective identification, how we make others feel about ourselves and themselves. Projective identification involves a deep split, displacing onto and into others the hateful, bad parts of ourselves, and frequently making them feehateful to themselves through their own introjection of our hatred. This hatred is often racial or religious, frequently both. Moreover, in the process of projective identification, parts of the self are put into the other, thus depleting the ego. (This process can be a vicious circle, and it is a profoundly disturbing and characteristic pathology, often involving envy and/or rivalry, both corrosive, poisonous forces.) These Kleinian ideas, developed by other theorists, such as Winnicott and Bion, are hugely relevant to the problem of war and genocide, and most recently, of terrorism. Klein argues that in the paranoid schizoid position there is a splitting of good and bad objects, with the good being introjected and the bad being externalized and projected out into someone or onto something else. As with the infant and child, so with the adult, mechanisms of splitting and protection play upon negative and feared connotations of the other, of the enemy, and of difference; projection prevents warring nations from exploring and thus understanding what it is that actually divides them; it prevents mutual response and recognition by promoting exclusivity. As already mentioned, analysts such as Volkan and Erikson have written about the processes by which an enemy is dehumanized so as to provide the distance a group needs from its perceived enemy. First the group becomes preoccupied with the enemy according to the psychology of minor differences. Then mass regression occurs to permit the group to recover and reactivate more primitive methods. What they then use in this regressed state tends to contain aspects of childish (pre-oedipal) fury. The enemy is perceived more and more as a stereotype of bad and negative qualities. The use of denial allows a group to ignore the fact that its own externalizations and projections are involved in this process. The stereotyped enemy may be so despised as to be no longer human, and it will then be referred to in non-human terms. History teaches us that it was in this way that the Nazis perceived the Jews as vermin to be exterminated. As I write, Al Qaeda terrorist groups view all Americans as demons and infidels to be annihilated, and many Americans are comforted by demonizing all of bearded Islam. Many Israelis consider most Palestinians as dirt beneath their feet subhuman and most Palestinians think of most Israelis as despoilers of the land they are supposed to share. In other words, the problem of the mentality of war and of terrorism mobilizes our anxieties in such a way so as to prevent critical reality testing. If we could learn the enormously difficult and painful task of re-introjection, of taking back our projections, our hatreds, anxieties, and fears of the other and of difference, long before they harm the other, there might be a transition, a link, from the state sanctioned violence of war back to individual violence. We might learn to subvert negative projective identification into a positive identification as a means of empathizing with the other and thus containing difference. The violence of the individual could then be contained and sublimated in peaceful ways, such as reconciling and balancing competing interests by asking what exactly these opposing interests are and exploring what the dynamics, conscious and unconscious, are for the hatred of deep war-like antagonisms. In other words, we would need to change our relationship with the other, giving up the dangerously irresponsible habit of splitting, projective identification, and exclusivity by recognizing difference not antagonistically but through an inclusive process that recognises the totality of human relationships in a peaceful world. We might substitute for the libidinal object-ties involved in projective identification the re-introjection of the object into the ego, and thus reach a common feeling of sharing, of being part of the other, of empathy, in short. As Freud pointed our, the ego is altered bv introjection, as suggested by his memorable formulation: "The shadow of the object has fallen on the ego." In his book Second Thoughts, Bion theorizes that in the infant as in the adult, re-introjection can be dangerous if the dominance of projective identification confuses the distinction between self and the external object, since this awareness depends on the recognition of a distinction between subject and object. But Bion's theory of the pairing group, or the container and the contained, provides a way out of this predicament, suggesting that the outcome of such pairing is either detrimental to the contained, or to the container, or mutually developing to both. This idea is germane to my argument in this paper that the reciprocity of the container and the contained relationship, through both positive projective identification (empathy) and introjection or re-introjection, results in a positive allowance of difference in other words, a healthy acceptance of and adaptation to the other within the self and the self within the other. It is here of course that language plays an important role in imagining the other, the other within the self, and the other as self, as well as the enormously influential visual images each group can have of the other. In the need to emphasize similarity in difference, both verbal and visual metaphor can play a meaningful role in creating a climate for peaceful understanding, and this is where literature, especially the social world of the drama and of film, but also the more private world of poetry, can be immensely significant. Of course not all literature is equally transparent. In conclusion, war, in all its manifestations, is a phenomenon put into action by individuals who have been politicized as a group to give and receive violent death, to appropriate the enemy's land, homes, women, children, and goods, and perhaps to lose their own. As we have seen, in wartime the splitting of the self and other into friend and enemy enormously relieves the normal psychic tension caused by human ambivalence when love and hate find two separate objects of attention. Hence the soldier's and terrorist's willingness to sacrifice her/his life for "a just cause," which may be a Nation, a Group, or a Leader with whom he has close emotional ties and identity. In this way s/he does not feel guilty: the destructive impulses, mobilised by her/his own superego, together with that of the social superego, have projected the guilt s/he might feel at killing strangers onto the enemy. In other words, the charging of the enemy with guilt by which the superego of the State mobilizes the individual's superego seems to be of fundamental importance in escaping the sense of guilt which war provokes in those engaged in the killing; yet the mobilization of superego activities can still involve the individual's self-punitive mechanisms, even though most of his/her guilt has been projected onto the enemy in the name of his own civilization and culture. As we all know, this guilt can become a problem at the end of a war, leading to varying degrees of misery and mental illness. For some, the killing of an enemy and a stranger cannot be truly mourned, and there remains a blank space, an irretrievable act or event to be lived through over and over again. This dilemma is poignantly expressed in Wilfred Owen's World War One poem "Strange Meeting" the final lines of which read as follows: I am the enemy you killed, my friend. I knew you in this dark: for so you frowned Yesterday through me as you jabbed and killed. I parried; but my hands were loath and cold. Let us sleep now. ... (Owen 126) The problem for us today is how to create the psychological climate of opinion, a mentality, that will reject war, genocide, and terrorism as viable solutions to internal and external situations of conflict; to recognize our projections for what they are: dangerously irresponsible psychic acts based on superego hatred and violence. We must challenge the way in which the State superego can manipulate our responses in its own interests, even take away our subjectivities. We should acknowledge and learn to displace the violence in ourselves in socially harmless ways, getting rid of our fears and anxieties of the other and of difference by relating and identifying with the other and thus creating the serious desire to live together in a peaceful world. What seems to be needed is for the superego to regain its developmental role of mitigating omniscient protective identification by ensuring an intact, integrated object world, a world that will be able to contain unconscious fears, hatred, and anxieties without the need for splitting and projection. As Bion has pointed out, omnipotence replaces thinking and omniscience replaces learning. We must learn to link our internal and external worlds so as to act as a container of the other's fears and anxieties, and thus in turn to encourage the other to reciprocate as a container of our hatreds and fears. If war represents cultural formations that in turn represent objectifications of the psyche via the super-ego of the individual and of the State, then perhaps we can reformulate these psychic social mechanisms of projection and superego aggression. Here, that old peace-time ego and the reparative component of the individual and State superego will have to play a large part. The greater the clash of cultural formations for example, Western Modernism and Islamic Fundamentalism the more urgent the need. "The knowledge now most worth having" is an authentic way of internalizing what it is we understand about war and international terrorism that will liberate us from the history of our collective traumatic past and the imperatives it has imposed on us. The inner psychic world of the individual has an enormously important adaptive role to play here in developing mechanisms of protective identification not as a means of damaging and destroying the other, but as a means of empathy, of containing the other, and in turn being contained. These changes may be evolutionary rather than revolutionary, gradual rather than speedy. Peace and dare I say it contentment are not just an absence of war, but a state of mind. Furthermore, we should learn not to project too much into our group, and our nation, for this allows the group to tyrannize us, so that we follow like lost sheep. But speaking our minds takes courage because groups do not like open dissenters. These radical psychic changes may be evolutionary rather than revolutionary, gradual rather than speedy; however, my proposition that understanding the other so that we can reduce her/his motivation to kill requires urgent action. Peace is not just an absence of war, but a state of mind and, most importantly, a way of thinking.

## 7

#### Ukraine-China relations motivated by space cooperation – the Aff makes that impossible – that spills-over into other aspects of the relationship.

**Ma and Soroka 20** Ma, B., and L. Soroka. "The Cooperation between China and Ukraine in Space Exploration: Genesis and Development. Advanced Space Law, 5, 58-70." (2020). (Ph.D. in Law, Professor, Guangdong University of Petrochemical Technology)//Elmer

**Critical outcomes of bilateral China-Ukraine relations in space** China and Ukraine do not provide complete open official information on aircraft and missile science, which complicates the analysis, including the analysis of trends and opportunities for further cooperation between China and Ukraine. However, available open sources enable to summarize some of the outcomes. In the space segment of bilateral cooperation, the developments should be highlighted as follows (Badrak, et al., 2009: 63): a) the exchange of information on the technical parameters of the Chinese Environment-1B project and the Ukrainian Sich-2 project to establish mutually beneficial cooperation in the field of space data exchange; b) delivery to China of a laboratory facility (including the transfer of production technology) for manufacturing non-plasma engines for spacecraft; c) closeness and interchangeability of the Ukrainian **UNOSAT project** and the **Chinese** seismic electromagnetic **satellite project** give the possibility of establishing mutually beneficial cooperation on these projects. According to the Agreement between Ukraine and China, Kharkiv Military University has started training Chinese air defense specialists (Training Aviation Command began operating in the military town “Rogan-1” near Kharkiv). It is possible that in the future Ukraine will begin to train cadets-pilots from the PRC, as well as provide medical support for the training of astronauts, which is especially important for the implementation of the Chinese Space Program “Project 921” (921 Project, 2020). To date, Ukraine’s position in the space sector is the strongest in the **launch services** market. While China is interested in developing its satellite navigation system, Ukraine is interested in acquiring microelectronics technology and investing. Therefore, constant and promising cooperation between the PRC and Ukraine can be established and stabilized in these sectors. However, nowadays, Ukraine should be more actively involved in projects within the framework of cooperation with China on legal, clearly stipulated contractual bases with the maximum contract validity to enhance its capabilities in this sector and gain competitive advantages in international markets. Promising forms of **scientific and technical cooperation**, such as the creation of technoparks, incubators, engineering and technology transfer, etc., are being implemented between China and Ukraine. Moreover, in the People’s Republic of China, the first industrial zones were established back in 1980. Currently, there are 54 technoparks in the country that provide about 10% of GDP and accumulate 30% of FDI. In Ukraine, 12 industrial parks are registered, and only a few of them are under construction. The rest is not functioning (Natalushka, 2017). The creation of technoparks will provide potential foreign investors with new opportunities for preferential taxation, as it has been done in Singapore. With such technoparks, the owner will be able to draw up all the necessary permits for Chinese investor companies, eliminating the need to run around the offices of officials. Along with the positive points in bilateral relations between China and Ukraine, factors that hinder the development of interstate partnerships remain and need to be addressed. First, these are a narrow foreign policy orientation of the Government of Ukraine to the countries of Europe and the USA, the inaction of the Ukrainian side in holding official meetings, visits to China with the participation of the first persons of the State, the absence of political continuity (every time after a change of power, a new plan, a new strategy of development occur) and the presence of corrupt schemes in legal regulation (Natalushka, 2017). Second, insufficient explanatory work on the meaning and ultimate purpose of socio-political transformation in Ukraine (for example, the Chinese will understand de-sovietization as a rejection of the negative heritage of the USSR and will not understand decommunization, because communism remains the official ideology of the PRC) (Goncharuk et al., 2016: 38). Third, the difficulty of a Ukrainian visa for the PRC citizens remains a huge obstacle to establishing effective relations with China, and there are problems with guaranteeing the safety of Chinese living in Ukraine, their businesses, and property. **At the present stage, China and Ukraine have every opportunity to realize** a **considerable potential of bilateral cooperation in science, technology**, and education, to be in close relation with the international scientific and technological community, and to participate in creating an innovative global society (Joint, 2018). Cooperation **China’s role in the world** **becomes more significant**. Expanding political, economic, cultural, and other relations with this country is one of the critical areas of Ukraine’s foreign policy. Before the declaration of independence in 1991, **Ukraine**, as part of the USSR, had been **building its relations** with the People’s Republic of China within the framework of the all-Union foreign policy doctrine. Only after the collapse of the USSR and the proclamation of its independence an independent policy became possible. Ukraine and the PRC are known to have much in common. This concerns geopolitics, which broadly defines the role and place of Ukraine and the PRC not only in the Eurasian region but also in the broader, global geopolitical context. The countries have **mutual economic interests and close positions on** the key problems of contemporary world **political development**. Both states face similar internal socio-economic issues. In both countries, a transition to a market economy occurs, a desire for a policy of openness exists. Both countries are in the Eurasian region, are neighbors of Russia, and are in the interests of the United States of America. The foreign policy of both countries is based on a realistic consideration of their national interests. Ukraine is an essential factor in European and world politics. It is respectful of the PRC’s growing role in contemporary international relations. Ukraine and the PRC have been productively and consistently working and coordinating their policies at the UN and other international organizations. According to Meng Hin, despite a great interest of politicians and the public regarding the issue of China-Ukraine cooperation in the 1990s of the twentieth century, it remains studied incompetently. However, for the first time in the history of the two countries, their relations have begun to develop on a broad legal basis (Meng, 2005). This requires an in-depth study of the various strands of relations between Ukraine and the PRC. The study of this issue will enable us to understand the main trends in the development of relations between the States and to offer recommendations on the implementation of comprehensive cooperation. Therefore, considering the benefits of scientific and technical cooperation, and existing areas of cooperation, the authors propose the following **strategic approaches to expanding science and technology-based relationships**, which **form an overall strategy for long-term cooperation in space that could**, in the long run, **bring China and Ukraine to a new level of development**, **increase** their **competitiveness** in the world markets: **joint research and development**; exchange of scientific and technical information and documentation, samples of products and materials, as well as the exchange of know-how and licenses on a compensatory basis; organization of scientific-technical seminars, symposia and scientific conferences, etc. Besides, the **successful commercialization of space exploration** products **requires** **to develop** and adopt regulatory acts promptly to create the necessary legal platform **to realize the prospects for both China and Ukraine.** In conclusion, some truths are eternal. Ancient Chinese philosopher Confucius said: “Those who do not care about their future will be in trouble soon.” If Ukraine had perceived the recommendation of its first president, “science can wait” as a ridiculous joke. Our current “famine of science” might not have occurred, or, as our Western colleagues say, “innocide” instead of innovation (Driga, 2017: 61).

#### That cements the BRI – Ukraine is a critical partner in Europe for China Trade.

**Zeneli and Haluhan 19** Valbona Zeneli and Nataliia Haluhan 10-4-2019 "Why China is Setting its Sights on Ukraine"<https://thediplomat.com/2019/10/why-china-is-setting-its-sights-on-ukraine/> (Dr. Valbona Zeneli is the Chair of the Strategic Initiatives Department at the George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies. Ms. Nataliia Haluhan is the Chief Consultant, National Institute for Strategic Studies (Ukraine). She is a former Marshall Center scholar.)//Elmer

As **China** continues to assert itself as an **emerging world power**, **Europe remains a very important target.** While Chinese investment has significantly increased, by 50 times in the last decade, the current figures underestimate the true scope of Beijing’s ambitions in the old continent. **To achieve its goals**, every European country is important for China: economically, geographically, or politically. **Ukraine** is no exclusion from the rule. Beijing’s multifaceted interests in Ukraine **mainly relate to its strategic geographic location.** It is **highly attractive as a** **logistic transit hub within the** Belt and Road (**BRI**) initiative **that links China with** European Union (**EU) markets**. Other attractive factors are its rich natural resources, opportunities for new **infrastructure** projects and its **agricultural** industry. These factors are all in line with the Chinese expansionist agenda in Europe. A member of OBOR since 2017, the business community and political leaders in Ukraine have shown increased interest in deepening cooperation with China. To serve this purpose, the “**Belt and Road**” Trade and Investment Promotion **Center** was **established in Kyiv**, **seeing BRI as a tool to improve infrastructure**, **attract foreign investment from China, invest in energy projects and modernize agricultural technology**. To date, there has been a lot of conversation, but projects are not clearly defined, nor transparent. Being attracted by the promises of the **BRI** as an **opportunity for their country to unlock** the potential of it being **an “entrepot” to Europe**, Ukrainian politicians had earlier expressed their willingness to deeper institutionalize relations with Beijing in offering to join the “16+1” mechanism, a platform created by Beijing to increase trade and economic relations with Central and Eastern Europe.

#### Solves Central Asian and South Asia War.

**Muhammad et Al 19**, Imraz, Arif Khan, and Saif ul Islam. "China Pakistan Economic Corridor: Peace, Prosperity and Conflict Resolution in the Region." (Lecturer, Department of Political Science, University of Buner)//Elmer

In the twenty first century, the geostrategic importance of South Asia is rising because of the China Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) which is the important component of the **o**ne **b**elt **o**ne **r**oad initiative (BRI). CPEC, started point is Gawadar a deep water port connects to the China‘s province of Xinjiang. Being part of the BRI, once CPEC is completely started functioning, it **will improve** the **political, social and economic situation** of the regional states and will raise the geo-strategic importance. CPEC is the priority of both states China and Pakistan, for Pakistan, CPEC pass through Pakistan‘s geography, is outlet for the landlocked countries and provides access to the supply and demands market to regional countries, while it is very short route for China, CPEC replace 13000 km only into 2500 km to reach to Middle East.1 So both the states have an instinct desire to continue it irrespective of change in the government. Not only this, CPEC will **boost** up the **regional** states‘ **economy**, **ensure peace** and prosperity in the region. Political, social and economic degradation in South Asia, created a hurdle in the cooperation among the regional countries. Security issues, terrorism, over population, economic disparities, lacking of education and modern inventions, lacking of health facilities, poor economic setup, water issues etc. devastated the life style and hindered the progress, development and peace in the region. CPEC is a turning point in the history of Asians‘ countries, it is not only a game changer and a target for Pakistan and China but a project for the whole region. Goal of this project is to promote commerce and trade culture, integrate the regional states for the development of economy, agriculture and industries. Furthermore, it is a source of peace, prosperity and conflicts resolutions in the region through economic development, economic dependence and regional integration. CPEC is a sign of peace and affluence for the whole region as for Pakistan. Being economic zone it will bring political, social and especially economic growth in the region. However, this research work deals with analyse the CPEC role in bringing peace and prosperity on the one hand and led to conflict resolution in South Asia on the other hand. What is CPEC? The CPEC is the part of one belt, one road has featuring of common advantages and prosperity, containing on complimentary interest, cooperation and collaboration and mutual benefits. A widespread transport corridor, industrial and trade cooperative rout between China and Pakistan, having the potential of people to people contact and communication, sources of cultural diffusion and exchange. Additionally, CPEC has the ability of political, social and economic growth, bringing peace, prosperity and security in region2 The CPEC covers the areas starting from a muslim majority province Xinjiang Uygur in China and almost all provinces Pakistan. Main areas through which CPEC passes are Kashgar, Atushi, Tumshuq, Shule, Shufu, Akto, Tashkurgan Tajik, Gilgit, Peshawar, Dera Ismail Khan, Islamabad, Lahore, Multan, Quetta, Sukkur, Hyderabad, Karachi and Gwadar. Furthermore, the CPEC will comprise one belt, three passageways, and two axes and five functional zones. Peace, Prosperity and Conflict Resolutions Narrowly peace is defined as the passivity and acceptance of injustice and cruelty without showing reaction.3 It may also be turn as the complete absence of war which simply fall in the negative peace category, but actually **peace** is more than that, it is **based on the political,** social **and economic development** of society and elimination of the injustice, and violations of the human rights.4 More elaborately, peace focused on the modern concept of democracy, liberalism and postmodern society, which is really related to the deconstruction of the parochial society, snatch powers from single body and share with rest of the society, where there is popular democracy is observed. Where there is no exploitation of the individual and restriction on the abusive use of the authorities.5 Nonviolence, the philosophy of Gandhi and Bacha Khan, is the part of positive peace, where there is no violation of the law, demand for rights under the shadow of law, no threats are used during protest and strikes. So, by this way there is risk for the conflicts, violations and war. Demand for right by using violence fall under the umbrella of negative peace. Jonathan Schell fruitfully summarised the dilemma of non-violence as cooperation, collective action consist on the mutual consent against abusive and parochial power and compel those actions which are taken against them.6 However, it is a very emotive term which has many heads and tails has not absolute end, in short the think tankers are in seeking to find easy way to bring cooperation, consensus, mediations, resolutions and more effective ways to resolve the issues and disputes, and transform the causes of war into peace. Perpetual peace is possible in resolving the conflicts, but due to anarchy in the international community, there is conflict. Disagreements, irrational demands, denial and counter claim leads to conflicts. So, prevention of the conflicts, mediation, management and resolution fascinated the international community, because the cost of war and conflicts is higher. For the conflict resolution, various methods are used as the tactics of good offices, arbitration, enquiry, negotiation, problem setting workshop, second track diplomacy, reconciliation and judicial settlement.7 However, conflict resolution depends upon clear assurance from all parties. CPEC Role in Bringing Peace and Prosperity & Peace through Economic Growth & Regional Integration: Political, social and economic interdependence society, reduce the chances of conflicts and war. Liberal thinkers probe out that **free trade and** economic **interdependence** flourish peace and **eliminate** the risk of **militancy**. The theory of Economic Opportunity Cost Hypothesis investigated that economic interdependence increase the level of integration among nations, consequently there is the eruption of peace and alleviated the condition of war8 . Economically weak states, where is economically disintegrated states are mostly enhanced in conflicts with each other. So, it is the benefits of trade globalization which decreases conflicts among nations. The theory of Neo-Functionalism which discussed norms and values of the Europe integration, has focused that cooperation and harmonization in one sector open the routes of another for the cooperation.9 Where, further expansion of the chain of integration, cooperation and as a result peace enhances in society. Like European states, Afghanistan, Iran, India, **Pakistan**, China **and** other **central Asian states** **have** the **capacity of regional integration** through CPEC. The CPEC has the potential of cooperation, integration, economic growth, and forged unity among regional states. According to the norms of NeoFunctionalism, CPEC provides an opportunity of free trade, economic dependence, transportation and regional integration through functional cooperation. **South Asia** is the **most exacerbated region** in the world, because of militancy, conflicts, overpopulation, less development, lacking of education and specially the arm race among nations. Terrorism in the region (Afghanistan and Pakistan) created security dilemma and furthermore the conflicts of Pakistan and India over Kashmir worsen the situation, which disturb the economic chain in the region for a long time. **CPEC** **bestowed the best opportunity to resolve the conflicts** and created peace through geo-economics and geo-politics. This corridor has the capacity to create economic interdependence in the region and regional integration because of functional cooperation based on common interest and needs.10 CPEC network connected the regional and extra-regional countries through, economic trade, liberalization of economy, free policies and open membership, to get advancement in commerce and trade on global level.11 Being part of the of the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), CPEC has the capacity to **interconnect** China, **Pakistan**, Iran, **India**, Afghanistan, **Central Asia**, West Asia, not only this other states of the Central Asia are also may connected with this corridor through India. After Passing through Asia, CPEC enter into Europe through ―One Belt, One Road‖ strategy.12 By this way CPEC created cooperation among adjacent and de-adjacent countries, and lead to peace and prosperity through economic dependence, as the China‘s Assistant Foreign Minister opined that peace, prosperity and economic development of CPEC not only limited to China and Pakistan but to the whole region.13 Similar view has been presented by the Ex-PM Nawaz Sharif during his visit to Turkmenistan, CPEC would be beneficial for everyone in the region in the socio-economic perspective, as he said that ―CPEC will offer opportunities for hundreds of millions of people.‖ But it is necessary to promote peace in the region because without peace, development remains just words on the tongue, as he further mentioned that peace and prosperity are connected with each other. Furthermore, flourishing the popular concept of happiness and prosperity Nawaz Sharif added, that my government will ensure Regional integration and connectivity. It will help us to work together towards pursuing our common objective of strengthening peace and bringing development in our region. In fact CPEC is an opportunity where Pakistan and other countries of the region have to work for the betterment of our people.‖14 So, through integration of the regional states, CPEC has a great role in the flourishing of the peace, prosperity and development in the region. The issue of terrorism, militancy, Kashmir disputes, crimes as piracy, human trafficking and problems around the Indian Oceans, are created severe affection over the region regarding international trade and commerce, crumpling of economy and security threats. These issues also devastating the security and economic situation of Pakistan, therefore, responding to these devastating issues is one of the foremost priorities of Pakistan and China. ChinaPakistan adopted joint struggle for the fortification of their maritime security to bring peace and stability in the region and secure the CPEC from insecurity.15