# 1NC NDCA Round 5

## 1

### Theory

#### Interpretation: Debaters must disclose all constructive positions on open source with highlighting on the 2020-21 NDCA LD wiki after the round in which they read them.

#### Violation – screenshots in the doc prove I do, and they don’t

#### Their wiki: (They’ve disclosed before but chose not to for a majority of rounds)

Graphical user interface, application

Description automatically generated

Graphical user interface, application

Description automatically generated

#### My wiki:

Graphical user interface, application, table

Description automatically generated

Graphical user interface, application, table

Description automatically generated

#### Standards:

#### 1] Evidence ethics – open source is the only way to verify pre-round that cards aren’t miscut or highlighted or bracketed unethically. That’s a voter – maintaining ethical ev practices is key to being good academics and we should be able to verify you didn’t cheat

#### 2] Depth of clash – it allows debaters to have nuanced researched objections to their opponents evidence before the round at a much faster rate, which leads to higher quality ev comparison – outweighs cause thinking on your feet is NUQ but the best quality responses come from full access to a case.

#### Paradigm Issues:

#### Fairness is a voter—it’s a gateway issue to the ballot.

#### Drop the debater to deter future abuse.

#### CI- Reasonability is arbitrary and we don’t know the brightline while prepping. Collapses since it uses an offense/defense paradigm to win it.

#### No RVIs- A] Illogical- you don’t win for being fair B] Encourages baiting theory which proliferates abuse C] Chills checking abuse for fear of the RVI

## 2

### DA

#### India Soft Power is high now – space is key.

Amaresh 21 Preethi Amaresh 8-6-2021 "The rise of India as a global soft power" <https://www.bridgeindia.org.uk/the-rise-of-india-as-a-global-soft-power/> (political scientist and an author of the books, "Nihonomics" and "Nanmin". She is pursuing her doctoral degree in International Relations from Geneva School of Diplomacy, Switzerland.)//Elmer

More innovative uses of soft power more recently Soft power has been expanded in diverse forms by succeeding governments in India. The government of Narendra Modi at present has been creating innovative trends in the realm of Indian diplomacy by blending contemporary elements of soft power. Today, the state has used specific soft power assets of India such as Diaspora, Yoga, Buddhism and economic support for accomplishing diplomatic triumphs and advancing the nation’s national interests. India’s Ministry of External Affairs (MEA) has determined to promote a “soft power matrix” to measure the effectiveness of the country’s soft power outreach. The goal of the MEA is going to be an indispensable test condition in the aforementioned regard. Initiatives such as ‘Destination India’ and ‘Know India’ have likewise been launched. Cultural centers like the Indian Council for Cultural Relations (ICCR) even organized a national convention ‘Destination India’ initiative for the first time in 2019 which believes that India can move up fast to be a leader of the global knowledge society. ‘Namaste diplomacy’ and ‘Medical diplomacy’ of India today has become the talk post-COVID-19. India’s supremacy in space statesmanship and technology is an added principally induced soft power means with endless prospects. India’s regional diplomacy has reached outer space with the nation launching its GSAT-9, also known as the South Asia Satellite, that aimed to bestow South Asian countries with space-enabled services. As an ancient civilization, India has a throbbing democracy, the largest in the world, a secular spirit and a speedily developing marketplace that grew to become the 5th most booming economy in 2019, overtaking the United Kingdom and France. India, to boost its communication, tourism, culture and soft power, on the whole, will have to forge multilateral and bilateral collaborations with different nations by enhancing its foreign policy and diplomacy. Due to the attractiveness of India’s culture, social values, and foreign policies in addition to the nation’s economic and military might, India will be better placed to join the rank of Asia’s great powers. India, which is expected to become a superpower by 2025, also possesses soft power advantage having a democratic system compared to China’s communist belligerent system. Since the last ten years, India has likewise elevated its indispensable resources in public diplomacy, by applying traditional and innovative channels to create and anchorage its soft power.

#### Concede 1AC Gill – Private Space Industry key to India’s Space Sector writ-large – “The push for private sector participation in the space sector is a strategic necessity”.

#### Space amplifies other aspects of India’s Soft Power Projection.

Kathayat 20 Sarthak Kathayat 11-1-2020 "Soft Power and India’s Space Diplomacy" <https://niice.org.np/archives/6420> (Media graduate from Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University)//Elmer

In international relations, soft power is the ability of any country to persuade other countries to do what it wants without the use of force. According to Joseph Nye Jr., soft power is – getting others to want the outcomes that you want – co-opts people rather than coerces them. As compared to hard power, soft power takes relatively longer to built as its intangible resources develop over a long time. Soft power tends to change other party’s attitude to the end where she acts voluntarily in a way which is different to her usual behaviour. Several characteristics of the current world order like globalisation driven economic interdependence, rise of transnational actors, resurgence of nationalism in weak states, the spread of military technology and the changed nature of international political problems have significantly reduced the effectiveness of hard power strategies. The most noteworthy example of a foreign policy misadventure based solely on hard power strategies is the 2003 US invasion of Iraq. Soft power also has its own weakness. However, the ineffectiveness of soft power strategies is an exception. In longer-term, soft power strategies appear to be more effective in the contemporary world order than the hard power. One such tool of soft power is the space technology and space diplomacy. Space technology are increasingly viewed as a crucial instrument of soft power as states have now understood the direct relation between the technological feats and global prestige that follows. Expertise in rocket science puts a state on a higher pedestal than the countries who are still struggling in the domain. Moreover, expertise in rocket science ensues significant strategic implications. The output delivered has noteworthy social and economic relevance with a massive growth potential. In a broadening concept of security that encompasses other dimensions such as economic, environmental and political, Indian space programme has been distinctive and lucid in the way it simultaneously addresses the requirements of the Indian citizenry and the state collectively in all the dimensions. Despite being challenged by numerous embargoes and technology denial regimes during Cold War, Indian space programme has emerged as the most cost-effective and successful space programme in the world. India’s space programme has been a tremendous achievement for a developing country which despite being faced with many challenges used space as a crucial mechanism to lift its people out of poverty through education, social and economic programmes. With the course of time, India’s space policy has become an intrinsic part of India’s foreign policy to strengthen India’s position as a dominant power in South Asia. Indian Space Programme India’s space programme has been seen making efforts in projecting soft power which is especially evident through its new commitment to planetary exploration and human spaceflight. The Chandrayaan-1 and Mangalyaan-1 mission cleared the fact that India now looks at space as a standard of global standing. India’s soft power has witnessed a progression with an increasingly successful participation in global space economy through ISRO’s commercial arm, Antrix Corporation. India’s growing influence on the global space economy has been an indication of its changing stature in international arena. India has also been involved in capacity building initiatives. It has successfully established itself as a leader in terms of healthcare provisions through satellite-based telemedicine. India hosts the largest telemedicine network in South Asia which has also expanded to the African continent. A non-profit Indian organisation named Apollo Telemedicine Networking Foundation has been involved in telemedicine services with dedicated centres in Iraq, Yemen, Kazakhstan and Myanmar. India’s Space Diplomacy Further using space for diplomacy in order to project its soft power across the globe, India has assisted countries like Colombia in launching its satellite which boosted India-Colombia relations. Many Latin American countries are often dependent on the US for space and military matters. However, after the launch, many countries like Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Mexico, Nicaragua and Venezuela have reached out to ISRO for launching or developing satellites. Similarly, India’s PSLV also launched Israel’s TecSar satellite in 2008 for remote sensing purposes. The launch boosted the political and strategic relations with Israel. Once a recipient of space technology from developed countries, India has demonstrated the robustness of its own space programmes by setting up joint projects and even providing assistance at the time of disaster to a number of countries. ISRO’s Oceansat-2 satellite played a pertinent role in monitoring Hurricane Sandy and helping the authorities to implement timely disaster mitigation and rescue strategies. Adding more feathers to its hat, ISRO has also launched dozens of satellites for US, Europe and Britain based companies. The recent launches of British reconnaissance satellites, NovaSAR and S1-4 are a sign of what could come next. Britain is one of the EU’s biggest spender in space sector. After Brexit, the dispute over Britain’s continued access to the European Union’s Galileo satellite navigation project will inevitably lead Britain look for alternatives and India’s space ambitions could offer a tempting proposition within the ambit of wider bilateral cooperation. As a part of India’s efforts in space diplomacy, ISRO undertook another capacity building initiative ‘Unispace Nanosatellite Assembly and Training (UNNATI)’. Under UNNATI, ISRO planned to train 45 countries in making Nano-satellites. Closer to home, India proposed a SAARC satellite in 2014 for the overall development of the region. The proposal was welcomed by SAARC nations but unfortunately the proposal couldn’t materialise as envisioned initially due to Pakistan’s backing out from the project. However, three years later, in 2017, ISRO launched the South Asia satellite or GSAT-9 to help India’s neighbouring countries in space communication. The idea of South Asia satellite ensured no political impediment as with the case of SAARC satellite. The positive spill over effect of the satellite’s launch on India’s “neighbourhood first” diplomacy was well demonstrated by the warm responses given by the leaders of South Asian countries. India’s space diplomacy with neighbours also extends on a bilateral basis. For instance, in Afghanistan, India included remote sensing satellite transmitters for acquiring space-based data in a USD 1.2 billion aid package. It is evident that soft power strategies are more relevant than the hard power strategies, especially in the contemporary world order. The rise of China as an emerging superpower is backed with its economic and military might leave less avenues for other developing nations such as India to contest China. However, soft power strategies open up another dimension for the interaction of the nations. India has utilised space as a tool of its soft power effectively in order to expand its clout. That space being an intrinsic part of India’s foreign policy has brought numerous achievements to the country, and is expected to remain an essential element for future course of India’s foreign policy.

#### Successful India Soft Power solves Extinction

Kamdar 7, Mira. Planet India: How the fastest growing democracy is transforming America and the world. Simon and Schuster, 2007. (Bernard Schwartz Fellow at the Asia Society in 2008)//Elmer

**No other country matters more to the future of our planet than India**. There is no challenge we face, no opportunity we covet where India does not have critical relevance. **From combating global terror to finding cures for dangerous pandemics, from dealing with the energy crisis to averting the worst scenarios of global warming**, from rebalancing stark global inequalities to spurring the vital innovation needed to create jobs and improve lives—**India is now a pivotal player**. The world is undergoing a process of profound recalibration in which the rise of Asia is the most important factor. India holds the key to this new world. India is at once an ancient Asian civilization, a modern nation grounded in Enlightenment values and democratic institutions, and a rising twenty-first-century power. With a population of 1.2 billion, India is the world’s largest democracy. It is an open, vibrant society. India’s diverse population includes Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Christians, Buddhists, Jains, Zoroastrians, Jews, and animists. There are twenty-two official languages in India. Three hundred fifty million Indians speak English. India is the world in microcosm. Its geography encompasses every climate, from snowcapped Himalayas to palm-fringed beaches to deserts where nomads and camels roam. A developing country, India is divided among a tiny affluent minority, a rising middle class, and 800 million people who live on less than $2 per day. India faces all the critical problems of our time—extreme social inequality, employment insecurity, a growing energy crisis, severe water shortages, a degraded environment, global warming, a galloping HIV/AIDS epidemic, terrorist attacks—on a scale that defies the imagination. India’s goal is breathtaking in scope: transform a developing country of more than 1 billion people into a developed nation and global leader by 2020, and do this as a democracy in an era of resource scarcity and environmental degradation. The world has to cheer India on. If India fails, there is a real risk that **our world will become hostage to political chaos, war over dwindling resources, a poisoned environment, and galloping disease**. Wealthy enclaves will employ private companies to supply their needs and private militias to protect them from the poor massing at their gates. But, if India succeeds, it will demonstrate that it is possible to lift hundreds of millions of people out of poverty. It will prove that multiethnic, multireligious democracy is not a luxury for rich societies. It will **show us how to save our environment, and how to manage in a fractious, multipolar world**. India’s gambit is truly the venture of the century.

## 3

### CP

#### CP Text: The Republic of India should

#### End all joint missions in outer space and outer-space related activities with the United States.

#### De-militarize its space assets.

#### The Counterplan solves 100% of the Case – 1] It solves Advantage 1 since the Aff is about how India utilizes its space operations in a bad way w/ interactions w/ the US NOT about why it’s intrinsically bad in existing – the CP ends any relation w/ the US space agency which doesn’t trigger Sino-India Tensions and 2] It solves Advantage 2 since it de-militarizes India’s space assets which means that it no longer has any incentive to attack to protect them.

## 4

### CP

#### The Republic of India creating significant subsidies for private entites to create terrestrially accessible blockchain verification computing centers and cryptocurrency mining centers on the Moon is just. The appropriation of outer space by private entities in the Republic of India for all other purposes is unjust.

#### The plan would destroy the basic value of crypto by making property rights reliant on government approval, which nukes adoption and value – appropriation is key

Rule & LeClair 21 [Dylan LeClair And Sam Rule Bitcoin Magazine. "Bitcoin’s Private Property Rights." https://www.nasdaq.com/articles/bitcoins-private-property-rights-2021-09-28]

Bitcoin’s Superior Private Property Rights For the first time in history, bitcoin offers us a property option that does not rely on a local authority or legal system to enforce or protect it. It’s protected by the natural incentives of those participating in the network. “Satoshi Nakamoto has created a form of property that can exist without relying on the state, centralized authority, or traditional legal structures.” - Eric D. Chason,"How Bitcoin Functions As Property Law" It provides us with a store of value and savings technology where no government, central institution or voting bloc can seize, freeze or access it through violence or force when properly secured. Anyone in the world with an internet connection can secure this property without permission, and no other person or institution may take it away or erode its value. Whether it’s real estate, cash, equities, bonds, or gold, no other asset on the market provides this level of assurance and security. What we know of strong, well-defined property rights is that they are the basis of human cooperation and economic activity. When private property rights flourish, so do the people. When we look at the nations of the world with the lowest ranking of property rights, we also find some of the key regions where bitcoin is making its mark.

#### Climate-motivated terrestrial mining regulations kill crypto now – those don’t get applied to space because of unique environments – that saves crypto with sufficient private investment

Greene 21 Greene, Tristan. Tristan covers human-centric artificial intelligence advances, quantum computing, STEM, Spiderman, physics, and space stuff. As far as I can tell his highest level of education was that he was in the Navy for a while. "What happens to Bitcoin when billionaires build cryptocurrency miners on the Moon?" TNW | Hardfork, 8 June 2021, thenextweb.com/news/bitcoin-billionaires-build-cryptocurrency-miners-on-moon-bitcoin.

Space exploration and exploitation have traditionally been nationalist endeavors. But the rise of the 12-digit billionaire has suddenly made outer space look like open territory. The players Jeff Bezos is stepping down from his position as the CEO of Amazon after 25 years ahead of his imminent launch into space aboard one of his own Blue Origin spaceships. This will be the future of fintech 6 trends that will dominate fintech in 2022 While it’s easy to imagine the long-time leader retiring to live out a childhood fantasy, there’s nothing in Bezos’ history as an incredibly ambitious person and businessman to indicate his he’ll just blast off into the sunset to live a life of quiet leisure. Simply put, Bezos’ interest in the space sector likely won’t end with offering consumer thrill rides. While it’s impossible to know where the soon-to-be-former CEO might take his ambition, it’s likely Amazon and/or Blue Origin is already looking for ways to exploit the space sector for profit. But, obviously, Bezos isn’t the only private citizen with a spaceship company. Elon Musk’s SpaceX has spent the last decade becoming the belle of NASA’s ball and he’s already all-in on the idea of sending humans to Mars. And we can’t forget Richard Branson. He may only be worth a paltry $5 billion (lol), but his Virgin Galactic company’s been banking on making some money in space tourism for a long time. Let’s also not forget that Virgin’s dabbled in everything from railroad technology to record labels. And the list goes on. Anyone with a few billion dollars has business options and opportunities that extend beyond our planet’s surface. Space for profit In the past, we’ve discussed the idea of mining space asteroids for profit. Some experts believe there are unimaginable fortunes floating around in space in the form of resource-rich asteroids. In fact, you can even get a degree in asteroid mining. And even Goldman Sachs has considered getting in on the action. But, at the end of the day, we still have to figure out where these resources are, build machines capable of extracting them, and get them safely to somewhere they can be useful. Right now, there’s not much value in investing in asteroid mining futures because the technology either doesn’t exist or isn’t ready yet. However, there’s more than one kind of mining you can do in space. Enter cryptocurrency and the future Elon Musk recently got involved in a friendly space race, but this time it has nothing to do with competition over rockets or government contracts. He’s racing against BitMEX, a cryptocurrency exchange and derivative platform, to see who can get a cryptocurrency on the Moon first. If you’re curious about how that works, here’s a snippet from BitMEX’s official announcement: BitMEX will mint a one-of-a-kind physical bitcoin, similar to the Casascius coins of 2013, which will be delivered to the Moon by Astrobotic. The coin will hold one bitcoin at an address to be publicly released, underneath a tamper-evident hologram covering. The coin will proudly display the BitMEX name, the mission name, the date it was minted and the bitcoin price at the time of minting. According to BitMEX, this isn’t just a ceremonial or token delivery. The coin itself is a hardware wallet containing an actual Bitcoin, so its value will change with the value of the BTC here on Earth. In other words, BitMEX is sending a literal treasure to the Moon for anyone brave (or rich) enough to retrieve it. Per the company’s blog post: A moon surface background with text superimposed, quote below Credit: BitMEX Come and Get It. When the physical coin lands, it will remain on the Moon until anyone deems it worthy of retrieval. Decades from now, what will it be worth? It’s a great question. Some experts have predicted a single bitcoin will one day be worth $100K, $1M, or even more. But an even better question is this: What’s the end game for cryptocurrency in space? Billionaires want to be trillionaires Back in 1999 Wired ran a feature about the imminent rise of the world’s first trillionaire. At the time, everyone assumed the richest man in the world, Microsoft CEO Bill Gates, would be the first trillionaire by a long shot. Here’s a quote from that article: The value of Bill’s Microsoft stake has grown from $233.9 million at the time of Microsoft’s 1986 IPO to $72.2 billion as of June 15, 1999 (disregarding stock sales). At this rate – 58.2 percent a year – he will become a trillionaire in March 2005, at age 49, and his Microsoft holdings will be valued at $1 quadrillion in March 2020, when he is 64. Of course, we still haven’t seen a trillionaire in modern history. As of the time of this writing, the richest person in the world is France’s Bernard Arnault, whose $193.6 billion empire edges out Jeff Bezos’ $189 billion. At some point, if Bezos wants to pull away with it or Elon Musk wants to close the widening gap between his $151.4 billion and a first place finish, the world’s richest people are going to have to do more than squeeze terrestrial markets for every last drop of profit. That’s why many experts view Elon Musk’s heavy involvement in cryptocurrency as the potential difference maker. On any given day the Tesla, SpaceX, and Neuralink founder’s total worth can skyrocket or plummet by tens of billions of dollars based on how his cryptocurrency holdings are performing. When you consider that market movements can be directly tied to Musk’s social media statements, the power proposition for billionaires holding cryptocurrency is unbridled. Simply put: Elon Musk has more control over the so-called “volatile” world of cryptocurrency than most. Putting a cryptocurrency in space, much like firing a Tesla off into the galaxy, is a PR move meant to generate interest in the burgeoning cryptomarket. But that’s not the only purpose they serve. These acts remind us that people like Musk and Bezos can do anything they want. If they want to put a coin on the Moon, they have the means to do it. And, for example, if Musk or Bezos suddenly wanted to solve the biggest problems with cryptocurrency mining – power consumption, carbon footprint, developing powerful-enough hardware – they’re in a unique position to do so. In space, no one can hear you mine Arguably, one of the biggest things stopping an apex whale like Elon Musk from spending a fair portion of his billions on cryptomining centers is the fact that such an operation would almost certainly draw universal condemnation for its potential effect on the global climate crisis. But the Moon’s atmosphere isn’t necessarily as fragile as the Earth’s. Hypothetically speaking, there’s nothing to stop a billionaire from building a facility on the Moon to mine cryptocurrency. They would, of course, need to be able to build their own batteries, have experience with artificial intelligence and supercomputers, and already have their own satellite network set up in space – all boxes Elon Musk can tick today. And, in the near-future, as we perfect deep space transmission technology, what’s to stop a billionaire from putting a supercomputer on a satellite and sending it somewhere in deep space to mine cryptocurrency 24/7 at near absolute-zero temperatures? All of this is conjecture, but the writing is on the wall. Cryptocurrency enthusiasts fear what the experts are consistently warning: regulation is coming. Eventually, it’s possible cryptocurrency mining could become regulated with harsh policies designed to keep mining operations from further damaging the environment. This could seriously hinder the market. If humanity walks away from terrestrial mining to save the planet, we’ll be leaving unfathomable amounts of money on table. Billionaires don’t become billionaires by doing that. The only logical path forward, barring some unknown new green mining technology, may be moving the cryptocurrency industry to space.

#### Cryptocurrency reach a wide rollout---that builds resilience to survive inevitable existential filters.

Alex McShane 21, Writer and Head of Video for Bitcoin Magazine, BA from the University of Iowa, Degree from the University College Dublin, Degree from Kirkwood Community College, “Bitcoin and Existential Risk”, Bitcoin Magazine, 9/5/2021, https://bitcoinmagazine.com/culture/bitcoin-and-existential-risk-alex-mcshane

TL;DR - An existential risk is the possibility of an event or series of events that could drastically curtail humanity’s potential. A hypothetical global catastrophe could be anthropogenic or non-anthropogenic and internal or external in nature. The adoption of Bitcoin will better position us to address these risks as a society. EXTERNAL NON-ANTHROPOGENIC A catastrophic collision with an astronomical object, such as an asteroid impact would be an external non-anthropogenic risk. This has already occurred here several times. During the Permian Triassic period (ending 250 million years ago) an astronomical impact killed 90 percent of the species on Earth. It took tens of millions of years for life on Earth to repopulate and Earth’s intelligence potential to recover. One interesting external non-anthropogenic risk is Earth’s reflected light, which could be measured by an external intelligence who then come to extinguish us. (The topic of our own signal bringing about this death by misadventure is discussed further below.) What does this have to do with Bitcoin? Generally, hard money facilitates greater innovation and technological process. At this point one might argue that if we do not migrate to some degree from Earth as a species, and are subsequently wiped out by an astronomical object impact or a super-volcanic event, the risk becomes anthropogenic in nature. We are a centralized species on a grand scale, and at this point one could say we have through consensus chosen to remain vulnerable to a single vector of attack by staying here. Bitcoin is not only the hardest money known to man, it is the most responsible from this standpoint. Bitcoin as it currently operates is currency that can provide a monetary framework on which humans can achieve greater capital growth, collaboration, resource allocation, and therefore technological progress. Because the terminal supply of Bitcoin is capped, we can store value in it indefinitely as a society. 66 Million years ago the Cretaceous-Paleogene Extinction Event extinguished the life and intelligence potential of the non-avian dinosaurs. This series of events was external, and broadly non-anthropogenic in the sense that no form of life on Earth at the time contributed to its own demise, but more specifically, at the time of those astronomical impacts the first humans hadn’t split from chimpanzee lineages. This split is thought to have occurred between between 4 and 8 million years ago. An important distinction between astronomical impacts or super-volcanic events of the past and such events if they were to happen today is that one could argue that our intelligence potential is now mature enough to tackle certain of the external existential risks. Today, the risk posed by an asteroid impact or something similar would still be external in its origin, but at what point does the burden of responsibility to migrate off of the planet fall upon our population? We can surely solve for some external existential risks, and in any case, no one is going to do it for us. You could say that failing to collectively pursue a solution when technically we could have would recategorize a civilization-extinguishing asteroid impact as an external but anthropogenic risk. At what point do innovation dampening authoritarian states and their mandated broken money cause society to stall at a local optimum? Surely the government has already caused this. It’s only a matter of time before another object strikes the Earth with devastating consequence. I would argue it is irresponsible to continue life here with government money. Government money is an existential risk. Bitcoin is not only a solution, it is a societal responsibility. INTERNAL ANTHROPOGENIC Nuclear war is one example of an internal anthropogenic risk. That is, should nuclear war arise, it would be both self destructive, and relatively self contained on a cosmic scale. It follows that biological warfare is an internal anthropogenic risk, the reality of which we as a species can surely understand now. If I were to hazard a guess I would say virtual emergencies and cyber pandemics are next. These self constructed catastrophes are the government’s misguided attempts at proof of work. This is a topic for another time. Do not surrender your ability to think and speak freely. The second law of thermodynamics can summed thus, processes that involve the transfer or conversion of heat energy are irreversible. The law indicates we have not observed a spontaneous transfer of energy from cold to hot. Another way to think of this is that there is no such thing as cold, only lesser degrees of hot. Nothing cannot transfer. So broadly, within a closed system, the second law of thermodynamics would indicate that all differences tend to level out. So what has this got to do with Bitcoin? Well firstly, all hardware is subject to entropy. The distributed nature of the blockchain increases the probability that it will survive centralized entropy. At Bitcoin’s inception, imagine a failure because Satoshi’s computer randomly crashed. Distributed networks are inherently hedged against this particular centralized form of existential risk. The second law of thermodynamics also suggests that on a grander scale, relatively isolated (centralized) systems will degenerate more and more into disordered states. Proof of work, and network growth are two ways Bitcoin fights against falling into disrepair. Bitcoin uses proof of work to stave off entropy. The system cannot stay dormant. It must continue to use proof of work to advance the state of the chain, and to fight entropy to secure the monetary value all of the users have stored in the network. The U.S. dollar, as many have pointed out, relies on proof of war, or distributed political energies to maintain dominance. Its methodology can be described as haphazard at best. INTERNAL NON-ANTHROPOGENIC One internal non-anthropogenic risk is that of a super-volcanic eruption, provided it wasn’t humans who brought about the eruption. Just like with external non-anthropogenic risks, Bitcoin alone cannot prevent them, but it can help humans prepare for them such that we may survive these relatively small intelligence filters the universe throws our way. Bitcoin allows for fundamental capital accumulation and human innovation, and promotes collaboration to such a degree that we will find an increased collective problem solving power as humans the further Bitcoin adoption spreads. It is worth mentioning that Bitcoin also maintains and appreciates wealth to such a degree that often those of us to chose to live our lives on a Bitcoin standard will experience relatively greater freedoms, and vastly greater amounts of free time than our peers who chose to continue their lives on a fiat standard, and are perpetually working to outpace their chronic debt. Many Bitcoiners will likely forego that newfound free time to work and continue to provide value to others in whatever area interests them, because Bitcoin incentivizes the collaborative accumulation of capital but also the responsible reallocation of it. EXTERNAL ANTHROPOGENIC An external anthropogenic risk has the least probability of occurring. This is a problem of reach. Imagine human intelligence being sent into the cosmos and signaling or generally causing an external intelligence or astronomical object to come back to extinguish us. This is a most improbable extinction by misadventure. The probability that we send messages of consequence into the cosmos that in turn cause some other far-flung intelligence, with knowledge enough to reach us, to come and bring about our own destruction is next to zero, but it isn’t zero. I would posit that the probability increases every day that Bitcoin survives, with each person that chooses to hold Bitcoin over fiat, because on a fiat standard we are again, stuck at a local optimum at best, and each day the global monetary system devolves further into chaos. The fiat world may continue to be habitable chaos, but our technological progress and our greatest capacity for innovation cannot be achieved on a fiat standard. A Bitcoin standard is not only our current best bet, it is the only monetary vehicle that will take us from here, or enable us to build technology that can effectively communicate with places in the universe where other intelligence has emerged. The other reason this fatal miscommunication is unlikely to occur is that once through a Bitcoin standard we have manage to build a society that can effectively reach and communicate at greater depths of the cosmos we will at that time have already become a multi-planetary, if not transitory, if not multi-solar system species. The topic of Bitcoin in space and planetary interoperability will be discussed in a later essay. The most distant human made object from the earth is the Voyager 1, which is over 13 billion miles away. (For perspective, Apha Centuri, the nearest star system to Earth, is 25 trillion miles away.) Human radio signals have announced our presence and our intelligence to the cosmos since around 1900. The first human radio signals have all ready traveled 114 light years, that is 681,920,540,000,000 miles. Although the reach of our radio signals is very great, the probability of us being heard and subsequently extinguished is negligible. External anthropogenic risks are the least of our concerns at the moment. As Bitcoin adoption grows, it serves to promote advances in artificial intelligence and nanotechnology. External anthropogenic risks will become more relevant to human intelligence at a much later time. External non-anthropogenic risks are similarly out of our hands for the time being. That is, at the moment there is nothing we can do to prevent the Sun from becoming a red giant star and subsuming the Earth. But we do already have the monetary technology upon which to engineer solutions to some of these problems. We have the potential as humans to prevent internal global catastrophes, both those set on by us and not. Survival and longevity is arguably our greatest task as a species. Adopting Bitcoin, and protecting this network is proceeding with diligence and a long eye toward the future in all of our political and scientific affairs. The existential risks of living are great, though it is human nature for our ambitions to out pace our current abilities. The only evidence of life is change. To change is to exit fiat currency, it is to use Bitcoin instead.

## Case

### 1NC - India-US Alliance

#### Turn:

#### Concede India Space is key to US-India Alliances – yes there’s a Link to spill-over – they’ve defended spill-over – proven that they have only one card about Space.

#### US-India coop staves off Chinese and Russian revisionism, Middle East instability, econ decline, and authoritarianism.

Rao 18—(India's former Foreign Secretary, former Ambassador to the United States, China and Sri Lanka for India, former Fellow at the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs (Harvard University), written with Richard Verma who was the U.S. ambassador to India from 2015 to 2017). Nirupama Rao. “America and India Must Forge a Strong Democratic Partnership,” The Hill. 1/16/18. https://thehill.com/opinion/international/369067-america-and-india-must-forge-a-strong-democratic-partnership.

The world is changing. China is ascending as a superpower looking to upend existing rules. European unity is under threat. Russia is playing a more destabilizing role abroad than it has since the Cold War. Unrest in the Middle East is tearing the region apart. At the same time, new technology and other economic dynamics are fueling income inequality and job losses, making it more and more difficult to spur widely shared and sustainable growth. While global dynamics are changing rapidly, at least one trend has remained constant in recent years: the upward trajectory of the U.S.-India relationship. Amidst geopolitical and economic uncertainty, the United States and India can be indispensable democratic partners and pillars of peace, prosperity, and democracy. The potential for the U.S.-India relationship cannot be overstated: They are the world’s two largest democracies, two of the world’s largest economies, and two of the world’s strongest militaries. The decisions the United States and India make will have far-reaching repercussions when it comes to global security, prosperity, and sustainable development. As new challenges strain the international system, it will be even more important for like-minded partners to cooperate to advanced shared interests. By working together, the United States and India can exponentially increase their ability to build a better world. Over the past year, we co-chaired a Center for American Progress task force on U.S.-India relations to unearth opportunities to further strengthen the relationship, looking ahead to the challenges and opportunities our two countries will have in this century. For too long, the relationship has underperformed, but those days appear to be over thanks to the effort over successive administrations in Delhi and Washington. This task force was a bilateral effort composed of 20 experts from the United States and India, covering diverse fields such as foreign policy, energy, business, and government accountability. Through the research and conversations conducted by the group, we were able to craft paths forward that we believe could help this critical relationship achieve its full potential. Our task force explored five areas for accelerated cooperation between the two countries: creating jobs and economic opportunities, building a clean energy future from the bottom up, creating a joint security advantage in Asia, strengthening democratic institutions at home and around the world, and fostering ties between their peoples. Despite our different histories and geographies, our shared future together encompasses so many of the same concerns, dreams and aspirations by our citizens. We are, in fact, natural allies, as so many leaders have pointed out in years past, and our recommendations seek to ensure that remains the case well into the future.

#### Middle East turmoil goes nuclear.

Silverstein 4/23 “Iran-Israel tensions: The threat of nuclear disaster looms large,” Richard Silverstein [writes the Tikun Olam blog, devoted to exposing the excesses of the Israeli national security state], 23 April 2021 <https://www.middleeasteye.net/opinion/iran-israel-tensions-threat-nuclear-war-looms-large> SM

Israel had a near-miss of potentially catastrophic proportions on Thursday. As it has done hundreds of times in the past decade, the Israeli air force attacked Iranian bases inside Syria. In response, Syrian forces fired anti-aircraft missiles of a rather primitive Soviet model, one of which overflew its target and landed some 30 kilometres from Israel’s Dimona nuclear reactor. Israel said recently that it was bolstering its defences around Dimona for just such an eventuality. Although an Iranian general taunted Israel, implying that Iran had some responsibility for the attack, that doesn’t appear to be the case. But the missile landing inside Israel does show that if Iran wanted to attack Dimona, it has the capacity. And despite Israel’s best efforts, an Iranian missile could hit its target. With that, one of the worst nuclear disasters in the region’s history could unfold, including a Chernobyl-type radioactive leak that could endanger not only all of Israel, but also many of its neighbours.A US general has assured a Senate committee that the Syrians weren’t intending to attack Israel. Rather, a misguided missile meant to target an Israeli warplane overshot its target. He blamed it on “incompetence”, as if that was supposed to be somehow reassuring; rather, it only reinforces how easy it is even for a mistake to cause a nuclear disaster.Campaign of terror Certainly, if either Israel or Iran wanted to bomb each other’s nuclear facilities, they could do so successfully. An Israeli attack would probably cause less catastrophic damage, but only because Iran’s nuclear programme is not nearly as developed as Israel’s. An Iranian direct hit on Dimona would cause incalculable damage due to the plutonium reactor at the facility. Nor does this happen in a vacuum: Israel has maintained a decade-long campaign of terror attacks on Iranian military bases and nuclear scientists. Most recently, it bombed the Natanz nuclear facility, destroying the power generation source and damaging older-generation centrifuges. It also attacked an Iranian Revolutionary Guard spy ship off the Yemeni coast this month. Iran has responded in its own limited way, restrained by its need to maintain good relations with nuclear-deal signatories. For Israel, the attacks are a low-risk proposition. It defies US opposition (if there is any) with a wink and a nod, and the attacks look good on Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu’s résumé. To weather his corruption trial and retain public support, he needs external enemies (and internal enemies, but that’s a different story). Iran provides these in spades.Eliminating Israeli leverage The US could exert control over this scenario by eliminating Israeli leverage. If it agreed to lift sanctions in exchange for Iran’s return to low levels of uranium enrichment, as designated in the nuclear deal negotiated by the Obama administration, Israel’s rejectionist approach would become moot. The problem is that US President Joe Biden is running scared from Republican opposition to any nuclear deal with Iran. Besides, he has designated the Middle East a low priority for his administration. There is some faint hope in the US announcement that it is ready to lift a partial set of sanctions. However, the list on offer is quite limited, and will certainly not satisfy the Iranians. Such half-measures present an example of the limitations of the Biden approach. He should instead make a full-throated commitment to end this dithering once and for all. Israel is mounting a full-court press this coming week as it sends its Mossad and military intelligence chiefs, along with its army chief of staff, to Washington in an attempt to influence nuclear negotiations as they enter what may be a final stage. According to Haaretz, army chief of staff Aviv Kochavi “will also raise other issues, including Iran’s military expansion in Syria and the instability of Lebanon. Israel is concerned about the possibility that Hezbollah will try to … [foment] conflict with Israel.” The hypocrisy of Israel’s refusal to acknowledge its own massive military interventions in Lebanon, Syria, Gaza and even Iraq, while decrying Iran’s involvement in Syria, is almost breathtaking. There is next to no chance that any of this will enter into the considerations of negotiators in Vienna. Unlike Israel, they are interested in doing a nuclear deal, not engaging in wishful thinking. Combustible Middle East mix Returning to the Biden administration’s global goals, the Middle East doesn’t care about presidential priorities. It contains a combustible mix of corrupt elites and overbearing dictators who do not shirk from causing mayhem in their domains. And one of them, perhaps a desperate Israeli prime minister or an ageing ayatollah eager to preserve his honour and legacy, could inadvertently (or intentionally) set the entire region aflame. If Biden doesn’t act quickly and decisively, there is a sizeable risk that another missile from one country or the other will hit a target and cause devastation. That would mark a point of no return, like the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo in 1914, which led to World War One. The difference is that in 1914, armies fought with guns, bayonets and artillery. Today, they will fight with F-35s, ballistic missiles and possibly nuclear weapons.

#### Authoritarianism causes Nuclear War.

Diamond 19, Larry. Ill winds: Saving democracy from Russian rage, Chinese ambition, and American complacency. Penguin Books, 2019. (professor of Sociology and Political Science at Stanford University, PhD in Sociology)//Elmer

The most obvious response to the ill winds blowing from the world’s autocracies is to help the winds of freedom blowing in the other direction. The democracies of the West cannot save themselves if they do not stand with democrats around the world. This is truer now than ever, for several reasons. We live in a globalized world, one in which models, trends, and ideas cascade across borders. Any wind of change may gather quickly and blow with gale force. People everywhere form ideas about how to govern—or simply about which forms of government and sources of power may be irresistible—based on what they see happening elsewhere. We are now immersed in a fierce global contest of ideas, information, and norms. In the digital age, that contest is moving at lightning speed, shaping how people think about their political systems and the way the world runs. As doubts about and threats to democracy are mounting in the West, this is not a contest that the democracies can afford to lose. Globalization, with its flows of trade and information, raises the stakes for us in another way. Authoritarian and badly governed regimes increasingly pose a direct threat to popular sovereignty and the rule of law in our own democracies. Covert flows of money and influence are subverting and corrupting our democratic processes and institutions. They will not stop just because Americans and others pretend that we have no stake in the future of freedom in the world. If we want to defend the core principles of self-government, transparency, and accountability in our own democracies, we have no choice but to promote them globally. It is not enough to say that dictatorship is bad and that democracy, however flawed, is still better. Popular enthusiasm for a lesser evil cannot be sustained indefinitely. People need the inspiration of a positive vision. Democracy must demonstrate that it is a just and fair political system that advances humane values and the common good. To make our republics more perfect, established democracies must not only adopt reforms to more fully include and empower their own citizens. They must also support people, groups, and institutions struggling to achieve democratic values elsewhere. The best way to counter Russian rage and Chinese ambition is to show that Moscow and Beijing are on the wrong side of history; that people everywhere yearn to be free; and that they can make freedom work to achieve a more just, sustainable, and prosperous society. In our networked age, both idealism and the harder imperatives of global power and security argue for more democracy, not less. For one thing, if we do not worry about the quality of governance in lower-income countries, we will face more and more troubled and failing states. Famine and genocide are the curse of authoritarian states, not democratic ones. Outright state collapse is the ultimate, bitter fruit of tyranny. When countries like Syria, Libya, and Afghanistan descend into civil war; when poor states in Africa cannot generate jobs and improve their citizens’ lives due to rule by corrupt and callous strongmen; when Central American societies are held hostage by brutal gangs and kleptocratic rulers, people flee—and wash up on the shores of the democracies. Europe and the United States cannot withstand the rising pressures of immigration unless they work to support better, more stable and accountable government in troubled countries. The world has simply grown too small, too flat, and too fast to wall off rotten states and pretend they are on some other planet. Hard security interests are at stake. As even the Trump administration’s 2017 National Security Strategy makes clear, the main threats to U.S. national security all stem from authoritarianism, whether in the form of tyrannies from Russia and China to Iran and North Korea or in the guise of antidemocratic terrorist movements such as ISIS.1 By supporting the development of democracy around the world, we can deny these authoritarian adversaries the geopolitical running room they seek. Just as Russia, China, and Iran are trying to undermine democracies to bend other countries to their will, so too can we contain these autocrats’ ambitions by helping other countries build effective, resilient democracies that can withstand the dictators’ malevolence. Of course, democratically elected governments with open societies will not support the American line on every issue. But no free society wants to mortgage its future to another country. The American national interest would best be secured by a pluralistic world of free countries—one in which autocrats can no longer use corruption and coercion to gobble up resources, alliances, and territory. If you look back over our history to see who has posed a threat to the United States and our allies, it has always been authoritarian regimes and empires. As political scientists have long noted, no two democracies have ever gone to war with each other—ever. It is not the democracies of the world that are supporting international terrorism, proliferating weapons of mass destruction, or threatening the territory of their neighbors.

#### US-Indo Coop is key to stabilize the Indian Ocean

Mishra 17 Sylvia Mishra Fellow with Observer Research Foundation and Center for Nonproliferation Studies, PONI Nuclear Scholar and MSc in International Relations from London School of Economics, BA in Political Science from the University of Delhi, "Nuclear Weapons and Capabilities in the Indian Ocean: An Indian Perspective", CSIS Next Generation Nuclear Network, 9/25/2017, (<https://nuclearnetwork.csis.org/nuclear-weapons-and-capabilities-in-the-indian-ocean-an-indian-perspective/>)//babcii

With strategic competition in South Asia shifting to the maritime space and nuclear weapon states increasingly relying on sea power, the Indian Ocean region (IOR) has become a theatre for trilateral security competition between India, Pakistan, and China. Developments over the past several years showcase the complicated nature of the situation in the IOR, and lead to a number of difficult questions about strategic stability. What are the drivers of nuclear escalation in the Indian Ocean region (IOR), as well as the implications for peace and stability in the region? Will changing threat perceptions in the IOR, especially as China’s People’s Liberation Army-Navy (PLA-N) demonstrates increased capabilities, lead New Delhi to forge stronger naval ties with the United States? As states in the IOR contest for naval nuclear supremacy and project newly developed capabilities, this article examines the risk of friction and misperceptions that challenges the stability of the Indian Ocean. In 2015, China [carried out a flight test](http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2015/feb/18/inside-the-ring-china-tests-nuclear-missile-for-su/) of its long-range sea-based nuclear deterrent: the JL-2. With an [estimated range](https://www.defense.gov/Portals/1/Documents/pubs/2016%20China%20Military%20Power%20Report.pdf) of up to 7,200km, the JL-2 can target assets in continental India from Chinese waters. Moreover, Chinese nuclear submarines continue to [patrol the Indian Ocean](https://www.wsj.com/articles/chinas-submarine-fleet-adds-nuclear-strike-capability-altering-strategic-balance-undersea-1414164738), exemplifying Beijing’s willingness to project power in the IOR. China uses advanced military assets, such as attack submarines (SSNs), for ‘[piracy operations](http://www.ndtv.com/world-news/chinese-submarine-fighting-pirates-in-indian-ocean-shows-up-in-malaysia-1646247)’ in the IOR. However, the presence of SSNs, which are not appropriate for anti-pirate missions, intensify regional misperceptions. Beijing’s support to Pakistan’s [nuclear](https://www.usnews.com/news/world/articles/2009/01/02/why-china-helped-countries-like-pakistan-north-korea-build-nuclear-bombs) and [ballistic missile program](http://www.nti.org/learn/countries/pakistan/delivery-systems/) ([M-11 missile](http://calhoun.nps.edu/bitstream/handle/10945/40814/102paul.pdf?sequence=1) technology transfers), and its recent announcement to [provide Pakistan with eight diesel-electric attack submarines](http://thediplomat.com/2016/10/china-confirms-export-of-8-submarines-to-pakistan/) have alarmed India’s strategic community, which fears that these sales will bolster [Pakistan’s sea-denial strategy](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09700160208450064?journalCode=rsan20). Furthermore, Beijing’s naval assertiveness in the South China Sea (SCS) has raised [concerns](http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/trend-lines/15890/china-s-neighbors-are-wary-of-its-assertiveness-in-the-south-china-sea) with Indian officials, who see a correlation between aggressive Chinese patrolling in the SCS and increasing deployments in the IOR. Some believe [China might use its bases](http://www.idsa.in/idsacomments/why-india-south-china-sea-stand-matters_asingh_190816) in the SCS to project power in the Indian Ocean. The prospect of active patrols by [nuclear-armed Chinese submarines](http://thediplomat.com/2015/07/game-changers-chinese-submarines-in-the-indian-ocean/) has intensified India’s surveillance. The challenge to New Delhi’s domination in the Indian Ocean has led New Delhi to bolster its maritime partnership with the United States. The [US-India Joint Strategic Vision](http://www.mea.gov.in/bilateral-documents.htm?dtl/24728/USIndia_Joint_Strategic_Vision_for_the_AsiaPacific_and_Indian_Ocean_Region) for Asia-Pacific and the Indian Ocean serves as a roadmap for bilateral cooperation on safeguarding maritime security and preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. On India’s other border, Pakistan [tested the Babur-3](http://thediplomat.com/2017/01/pakistans-tests-new-sub-launched-nuclear-capable-cruise-missile-what-now/) submarine-launched cruise missile (SLCM) in early 2017. Babur-3 is reportedly capable of carrying a nuclear payload and designed [for integration with the Agosta 90B](https://southasianvoices.org/hot-takes-pakistan-test-fires-babur-3/) diesel electric submarine. These developments augment the shifts in Pakistan’s military and nuclear force structure, which was traditionally [dominated by the army](http://carnegieendowment.org/2016/06/30/pakistan-s-nuclear-force-structure-in-2025-pub-63912). As Pakistan’s navy develops a submarine-based nuclear deterrent, there are clear indications of accommodating the navy within Pakistan’s command and control (C2). However, questions arise regarding Islamabad’s ability to safely and reliably manage a submarine-based nuclear force given the [doubts raised over the robustness](https://my.nps.edu/documents/104111744/106151936/9+Nuclear+Learning_Mujaddid.pdf/ab328d1a-2d07-4e15-af91-332192882e6e) of Pakistan’s command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, information, surveillance, and reconnaissance (C412SR) systems. [Analysts](https://my.nps.edu/documents/104111744/106151936/9+Nuclear+Learning_Mujaddid.pdf/ab328d1a-2d07-4e15-af91-332192882e6e) have suggested that a balanced and effective nuclear C2 system faces challenges in Pakistan. When Pakistan’s military leadership took the reins of presidential power in 1999, the country’s civilian institutions and other services came under the army’s political control. This meant that the air force and navy chiefs could no longer contribute their views on an equal footing with the army chief. Therefore, the lack of an effective C2 has highlighted discernible [doubts](http://thediplomat.com/2017/01/pakistans-tests-new-sub-launched-nuclear-capable-cruise-missile-what-now/) regarding Pakistan’s ability to communicate with the Agosta submarines to put negative controls on weapons. Pakistan’s [stated policy of “first-use”](http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/watch-out-india-pakistan-ready-use-nuclear-weapons-13284) of nuclear weapons against India coupled with a weak C2 has exacerbated India’s security concerns. India views Islamabad’s attempt to acquire second-strike capabilities as attempts to gain strategic technological and capabilities parity with India, giving impetus to the action-reaction cycle. Given security threat perceptions in IOR, Indian [naval planners and strategists](https://www.idsa-india.org/an-apr-2.01.htm) are convinced that nuclear submarines will provide the most reliable deterrent. India’s pursuit of a sea-based nuclear force is thus a logical step in its desire to achieve assured retaliatory capabilities. Few [analysts argue](https://twq.elliott.gwu.edu/sites/twq.elliott.gwu.edu/files/downloads/TWQ_Fall2016_Wueger.pdf) that India’s new K-4 nuclear-capable SLBM, coupled with India’s nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarine program could lead to further destabilization and conflict in the region. There is little merit in such an argument. India’s ballistic missile submarine (SSBN) force will not only improve the operational capabilities of India’s sea-based leg of its triad but also enable New Delhi to maintain balance of power in the IOR. To maintain a credible minimum deterrent vis-à-vis China and Pakistan and to ensure its arsenal’s survivability against a preemptive first strike, New Delhi must focus on developing submarine launched ballistic missiles (SSBM) technology and SSBN capabilities. The primary objective of India’s Arihant-class SSBNs is to deter conflict and coercion against India by its adversaries. [India’s 2015 maritime security strategy document](https://www.indiannavy.nic.in/sites/default/files/Indian_Maritime_Security_Strategy_Document_25Jan16.pdf) re-prioritized & reformulated deterrence as India’s first priority and war fighting as the second. Therefore, India’s SSBN force should be seen as a critical enabler of its no-first use policy. As China, India, and Pakistan employ nuclear weapons at sea, the India Ocean is slipping from a [‘Zone of Peace’](http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/34/a34res80.pdf) to a hotbed of nuclear politics. To help reduce tensions, India and the United States have engaged in cooperative [discussions about India opening up its military bases](http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/Indian-bases-to-open-doors-to-US-warships-planes/articleshow/51802543.cms) to the United States in exchange for access to weapons technology to help it narrow the gap with China. The two sides will also hold [talks on anti-submarine warfare](http://www.reuters.com/article/us-india-usa-submarines-idUSKCN0XS1NS) (ASW), an area of sensitive military technology and tactics. The process of India-US security-burden sharing in the IOR should serve as a building block for an enduring navy-to-navy relationship that should grow into a shared ASW capability. At a time of a qualitative reordering of the Asia-Pacific, stability in the Indian Ocean region hinges on collaborative efforts by India and the United States to keep the seas open and peaceful.

#### Indian Ocean goes Nuclear

Colin Crawford 11. J.D. Wake Forest University School of Law. “Green Warfare: An American Grand Strategy for the 21st Century.” Wake Forest Journal of Business and Intellectual Property Law. p. Lexis.

[\*248] In addition to the potential for economic growth, even the most ardent climate change skeptics will concede that the United States' dependence on fossil fuels has implications for national security and foreign policy. Security analysts have made the case for framing this debate in terms of "natural security," as the scarcity of natural resources will inevitably affect the United States' foreign policy calculus for years to come. n24 Despite the fact that the U.S. imports most of its oil from Canada and Latin America n25 - not the Middle East - many emerging markets are just beginning their love affair with the sticky, black hydrocarbon. n26 The corresponding increase in demand from emerging economies will continue to drive up energy prices, necessitating importation of oil from countries with less friendly dispositions toward the United States. n27 It is important to note how energy policy intersects with virtually all other aspects of governance. Not only will increased prices constrain U.S. fiscal policy and make it more expensive to project American power around the globe, they create pressures that will heavily influence American foreign policy in the coming decades, whether through resource wars or climate-induced humanitarian crises. n28 International trade and maritime policy in particular will be [\*249] greatly affected. Because "90 percent of global commerce and two thirds of all petroleum supplies travel by sea," and global energy demand will continue its inexorable rise, the Indian Ocean - already heavily used by "nuclearized" powers such as Pakistan, India, China, and Israel - will dramatically increase in strategic importance to the world's great powers. n29 The proximity of nuclear states in the Asia-Pacific region, along with increased pressures commensurate with rising energy demand, are already heightening military tensions among the major players in the region, including China and Russia in particular. n30 Geopolitical constraints will become increasingly difficult to manage as fuel prices continue to rise, and intervention will be needed to combat piracy and protect merchant shipping. n31 Make no mistake, the United States' continued dependence on fossil fuels poses significant problems for the national interest. The strategic implications are clear as U.S. foreign policy throughout entire regions is framed in the context of energy. n32

#### US-India coop key to telehealth and future disease management – key to developing emerging market countries

Mukherjee 21, Anit [Adjunct Fellow (Non-resident), Wadhwani Chair in U.S.-India Policy Studies] “US-India Healthcare Cooperation” CSIS, Feb 11, 2021, <https://www.csis.org/blogs/adapt-advance-refreshed-agenda-us-india-relations/us-india-healthcare-cooperation> TG

Co-creating Innovative Products and Technologies: The Covid-19 pandemic has set the stage for a quantum leap in new health products and technologies. Doctors’ visits are moving online, increasing the demand for remote diagnostic tools, data warehousing, and patient management platforms. Personal health monitoring is now commonplace through easy-to-use devices that will increasingly be connected to virtual health providers with access to the data. Creating innovative products will require large reservoirs of data, which in turn would require regulation on medical data use and privacy protection.

Digital health technologies provide a significant opportunity for U.S.-India cooperation. On its part, India will benefit from more intensive use of technology in healthcare, both in terms of expanding access to public health services as well as reducing the cost of prevention and treatment of common diseases. At the same time, U.S. companies can have access to India’s highly skilled technical personnel, as well as domain knowledge of appropriate health services in emerging markets. And while India’s consumer base provides a data-rich environment to test product innovations, it could draw on U.S. expertise vis-à-vis consumer and data protection regulatory frameworks that can foster innovative health technologies over the long term.

#### Future pandemics cause extinction

Diamandis 21 [Eleftheriosi, biochemist specializing in clinical chemistry, Prof and Head of Clinical Biochemistry in the Dept of Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology at the University of Toronto] “The Mother of All Battles: Viruses vs Humans. Can Humans Avoid Extinction in 50-100 Years?” Preprints, April 13, 2021, <https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202104.0397/v1> TG

The recent SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, which is causing COVID 19 disease, has taught us unexpected lessons about the dangers of human extinction through highly contagious and lethal diseases. As the COVID 19 pandemic is now being controlled by various isolation measures, therapeutics and vaccines, it became clear that our current lifestyle and societal functions may not be sustainable in the long term. We now have to start thinking and planning on how to face the next dangerous pandemic, not just overcoming the one that is upon us now. Is there any evidence that even worse pandemics could strike us in the near future and threaten the existence of the human race? The answer is unequivocally yes. It is not necessary to get infected by viruses of bats, pangolins and other exotic animals that live in remote forests in order to be in danger. Creditable scientific evidence indicates that the human gut microbiota harbor billions of viruses which are capable of affecting the function of vital human organs such as the immune system, lung, brain, liver, kidney, heart etc. It is possible that the development of pathogenic variants in the gut can lead to contagious viruses which can cause pandemics, leading to destruction of vital organs, causing death or various debilitating diseases such as blindness, respiratory, liver, heart and kidney failures. These diseases could result in the complete shutdown of our civilization and probably the extinction of human race. In this essay, I will first provide a few independent pieces of scientific facts and then combine this information to come up with some (but certainly not all) hypothetical scenarios that could cause human race misery, even extinction. I hope that these scary scenarios will trigger preventative measures that could reverse or delay the projected adverse outcomes.

#### LBL:

#### AT Pollard – U/Q overwhelms the Link – either a] Single Issues are possible to overcome – proven by the plan overcoming the Sino-India Border Conflict OR b] Border Conflict is SO prevalent that it makes every other issue insignificant.

#### AT Mizokami –

#### 1] No Sino-Indian Conflict to escalate – 1AC Hicket doesn’t say it would cause a conflict, just said “stirring tensions” but doesn’t come close to an all-out war scenario – means they can’t access the External Impact of Nuclear War since no conflict would occur – they’ve read a card for why it’s bad, not why it would happen.

#### 2] No Sino-India War.

Max Fisher 14, Foreign Affairs Correspondent – Washington Post, M.A. in Security Studies – Johns Hopkins University, Former International Editor – The Atlantic, “The study that shows why China and India probably won’t clash over border dispute”, The Washington Post, 2014, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/worldviews/wp/2013/05/03/the-study-that-shows-why-china-and-india-probably-wont-clash-over-a-border-dispute/

Either way, we can probably breathe easy on this one, and not just because neither China nor India would be served by a conflict. China, despite its sometimes-bellicose rhetoric and its otherwise deep interest in territorial integrity, has actually shown remarkable flexibility in resolving border disputes, according to a fascinating 2005 study by the scholar M. Taylor Fravel. Fravel, who published his research in the journal International Security, found that China has "frequently used cooperative means to manage its territorial conflicts, revealing a pattern of behavior far more complex than many portray. Since 1949, China has settled seventeen of its twenty-three territorial disputes. Moreover, it has offered substantial compromises in most of these settlements, usually receiving less than 50 percent of the contested land." China has not used its power advantages to bargain hard over contested land, especially with its weaker neighbors. Nor has it become less willing to offer concessions over disputed territory as its power has increased. Instead, China compromised in eight disputes as its power grew rapidly in the 1990s. For constructivists, the legacy of “unequal treaties” that ceded land to foreign powers in the 19th century and the central role of national unification in modern Chinese history suggest that conflicts over territory should be highly salient for China’s leaders and basically nonnegotiable. In its many compromises, however, China has accepted the general boundaries that these treaties created, except in the cases of Hong Kong and Macao. Fravel also found that "China offered many concessions despite clear incentives that its simultaneous involvement in multiple conflicts created to signal toughness and resolve, not conciliation." In other words, just because China might have wanted to project a tough image – something still true today with its island disputes in the Pacific – did not actually make it any more assertive in individual disputes. And he notes that China actually proposed a plan in 1960 to resolve Aksai Chin with India by divvying it up, along with another territory. The proposal "failed spectacularly," but the point is that China was interested in seeking a peaceful, negotiated agreement. Though China's island disputes have been in the news a lot lately, Fravel points out that these have been contested for decades and that China has not made new territorial claims even as the nation has grown in power. This is surprising because you might expect that a stronger China would become more aggressive in pushing for new or disputed territory, it would do so. But it hasn't, suggesting China is a "status quo" rather than a "revisionist" power, meaning it's happy with the current state of territorial affairs, those islands aside. All of which should **calm** any **fears** that a border dispute between India and China could devolve into something worse. Fravel's study concluded that China is more likely to compromise territorial disputes when it's worried about internal stability, and that doesn't seem to be the case right now. That suggests that the latest Aksai Chin dispute isn't likely to achieve a full resolution just yet, even if it also isn't going to lead to a conflict. Here's Fravel: Regime insecurity best explains China’s pattern of cooperation and delay in its territorial disputes. China’s leaders have compromised when faced with internal threats to regime security—the revolt in Tibet, the instability following the Great Leap Forward, the legitimacy crisis after the Tiananmen upheaval, and separatist violence in Xinjiang. The timing of compromise efforts, official documents, and statements by China’s leaders demonstrate that internal threats, not external ones, account for why and when China pursued cooperation.

### 1NC - IndoPak

#### Indian counterforcing destroys Pakistan’s arsenal without retaliation.

Vipin Narang 17, Professor @ Department of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, "Plenary: Beyond the Nuclear Threshold: Causes and Consequences of First Use", https://fbfy83yid9j1dqsev3zq0w8n-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Vipin-Narang-Remarks-Carnegie-Nukefest-2017.pdf

Everybody thinks they know the likeliest pathway to nuclear first use in South Asia. It is called a conventional wisdom for a reason. It starts with a terrorist attack presumed to be from Pakistan on an Indian metropole that kills scores of civilians. Unable to exercise restraint anymore due to domestic political pressures baying for blood, the Government of India orders the mobilization of its three main strike corps and commences offensive operations across the international border, not limiting its response to the Jammu and Kashmir sector and the Line of Control. The deepest thrust is undertaken by XXI Corps and its supporting elements in the desert sector. XXI Corps threatens to bisect Pakistan’s northsouth communications, putting Pakistani conventional forces on its heels. Unable to slow down XXI Corps, Pakistan flushes out Nasr tactical nuclear weapons batteries or Abdali missiles and its Strategic Plans Division (SPD) authorizes their use either in demonstration shots, against concentrated XXI Corps armored divisions, or bridgeheads and logistics behind the main thrust to slow down the Indian offensive. India then promises what most presume is massive countervalue retaliation against Pakistani cities, leaving aside how credible or incredible that might be. This is how nuclear first use would unfold in South Asia, right? Well, maybe not so fast. There is increasing evidence that India will not allow Pakistan to go first. And that India’s opening salvo may not be conventional strikes trying to pick off just Nasr batteries in the theater, but a full ‘comprehensive counterforce strike’ that attempts to completely disarm Pakistan of its nuclear weapons so that India does not have to engage in iterative tit-for-tat exchanges and expose its own cities to nuclear destruction. This thinking surfaces not from fringe extreme voices such as Bharat Karnad or retired Indian Army officers frustrated by the lack of resolve they believe their government has shown in multiple provocations, but from no less than a former Strategic Forces Command C-in-C Lt Gen BS Nagal and, perhaps more importantly and authoritatively, from the highly respected and influential former National Security Advisor Shivshankar Menon in plain sight in his recent 2016 book Choices: Inside the Making of Indian Foreign Policy. In short, we may be witnessing what I call a ‘decoupling’ of Indian nuclear strategy between China and Pakistan. The force requirements India needs in order to credibly threaten assured retaliation against China may allow it to pursue more aggressive strategies—such as escalation dominance or a ‘splendid first strike’—against Pakistan. We may be seeing the emergence of this decoupling, or at least 2 serious mainstream thinking about it, with the intention being a disarming strike against Pakistan.

#### It's successful and wipes out Pakistan’s nukes – circumvents BMDs.

Christine Leah 18, visiting fellow at the Centre for International Strategic Studies (CISS), working on conventional arms sales and conventional and nuclear arms control in South Asia, “Counterforce to counter what?”, https://nation.com.pk/31-Jan-2018/counterforce-to-counter-what

With India developing its indigenous defence industry, and acquiring technology from the West as well, it seems to be on a track to gain an edge over its South Asian neighbors, especially Pakistan. This includes the acquisition/development with other countries on technology such as cruise missiles, Airborne Warning and Control Systems (AWACS), and strike aircraft. Of these, inciting concern is India’s growing air combat and ground strike capacity based on Su-30 MKI, Mirage-2000H, Jaguar strike aircraft, Tu-22M backfire bombers, and more recently, C-295 transport aircraft, and the French Rafale which augment its capacity to go after its counterforce targets. Moreover, major arms sales to India in the last decade include U.S. F-16s and guided bombs for Jaguar aircraft. From France, the sales include 36 French-built Rafale planes, six Scorpene submarines, upgrades to 49 Mirage-2000-5, air-to air missiles for these planes and a huge sale of 126 multi-role medium combat aircraft. Similarly, Russia has exported combat aircraft such as 270 Su-30s, 45 naval Mig-29Ks, 150 Mi-17 transport helicopters and ten Ka-31 helicopters. In 2006, the DRDO and a Russian venture jointly developed the BrahMos cruise missile — a supersonic missile that combines Russian propulsion technology and new Indian guidance technology. BrahMos cruise missile can reach supersonic speed and thus bypass surface-to-air missile defense systems. Israel has also transferred electronic warfare technology and precision-guided munitions. The Indian-Israeli arms trade amounts to more than $2 billion annually. In 2004, the British company BAE Systems won a deal to sell advanced jet trainers to the Indian Air Force. In 2007, India paid the United States $50 million for the amphibious USS Trenton, and in 2009, Boeing won a $2 billion order for eight P-8 maritime reconnaissance aircraft and Lockheed Martin won a $1 billion contract for six C-1301J transport aircraft. Together with former U.S. President Barack Obama also offered to sell C-17 and F-414 aircraft. More so, India’s inclusion into the Missile Technology Control Regime gives it access to technology that is normally restricted for non-members. By stark contrast, the Pakistan Air Force has been denied state of the art aircraft acquisitions for two decades, and has been limited to refurbishing older high-performance aircraft. India is also expanding its naval capabilities, including a sea-based strike force as the logical step in its quest for an assured retaliatory capability. In turn, Pakistan’s naval nuclear developments are fueled by nuclear developments on the Indian side, an understandable reaction but one which has drawn considerable criticism. The drone technology which has been easily accessible to India is another controversial issue. Recently, the U.S. made a sales agreement with New Delhi for naval drones. It has been reported that Washington does not deem its sale of naval drones to India to be threatening for Pakistan, as it considers that these are not armed but are only intended for surveillance across the Indian Ocean. However, AWACS, drones, and other sophisticated surveillance and reconnaissance capabilities make India’s conventional strikes more effective, as well as enabling it to achieve air superiority more quickly. The accumulation of all this has increased threat to the survivability of Pakistani nuclear delivery systems. Indeed, it is capabilities like precision-guided munitions/guided bombs, in this particular strategic context, that make Pakistan more vulnerable to an Indian pre-emptive strike.

#### Timeframe is key – waiting lets Pakistan acquire workable supersonic missiles and makes BMD irrelevant. Key developments are occurring in 2021.

Vishnu Som 19, "Game-Changing Chinese Missile To Pak Could Dent Navy's BrahMos Advantage", NDTV, https://www.ndtv.com/india-news/game-changing-chinese-missile-to-pakistan-could-dent-navys-brahmos-advantage-1975148

A game-changing Chinese anti-ship missile, capable of flying at three times the speed of sound, could erode a key missile advantage the Indian Navy has enjoyed over the Pakistani Navy since 2005. An export variant of the YJ-12 missile, the CM-302, is likely to be the primary weapon on board four new Chinese frigates being built for the Pakistan Navy at the Hudong-Zhonghua shipyard in Shanghai. The CM-302 matches both the supersonic speed and the range of the Indian Navy's BrahMos anti-ship cruise missiles, which have been deployed on several front-line frigates and destroyers of the Navy. Senior defence officials monitoring the sale of new generation Chinese Type 054 frigates to Pakistan have told NDTV that the ships are likely to come armed with the CM-302, which they identify as a "new threat which represents a new capability." But these officers also tell NDTV that "there is a long way to go for these missiles to become a credible threat for the Indian Navy" since the Pakistan Navy still lacks long-range sensors which need to target Indian platforms before a CM-302 can actually be fired. "Possessing accurate targeting data, surveillance capability, and having the ability to penetrate a dense [Indian Navy] electronic counter-measures environment are a part of a complex matrix" that the Pakistan Navy's new frigates would need to overcome before they can attempt a missile launch. Still, the acquisition of the CM-302 onboard the new Chinese-built frigates that will be inducted from 2021 means a lethal new capability for the Pakistan Navy.

#### AND Pakistan would retaliate with countervalue attacks

Sadia Tasleem 16, lecturer at Quaid-i-Azam University’s Department of Defense and Strategic Studies, "Pakistan’s Nuclear Use Doctrine", Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, https://carnegieendowment.org/2016/06/30/pakistan-s-nuclear-use-doctrine-pub-63913

India and Pakistan have fought at least three wars and had five major military crises in the past sixty eight years. Some scholars argue that though there may not be any formal mechanism for escalation control in South Asia, the region’s history and culture indicates an implicit tendency toward restraint from escalation. They further argue that the restraint shown by India and Pakistan in their wars of 1965 and 1971—choosing not to attack each other’s industrial complexes and irrigation dams—reflected a tacit understanding of each other’s vulnerabilities. However, the presence of nuclear weapons has fundamentally altered some of these ground realities. For instance, given Pakistan’s existing countervalue-targeting strategy, which does not distinguish between civilian and military targets, it might be hard to integrate restraint into the larger context of military strategy. A close look at the crises that erupted and were successfully managed between the nuclear-armed neighbors, though, may offer some insights about the dynamics of escalation control between India and Pakistan.

#### That’s the only thing that causes nuke winter

Stuart Arsmtrong 12, James Martin Research Fellow, Future of Humanity Institute, University of Oxford, 3/16/12, “Old threats never die, they fade away from our minds: nuclear winter,” http://blog.practicalethics.ox.ac.uk/2012/03/old-threats-never-die-they-fade-away-from-our-minds-nuclear-winter/

In 1983, scientists published a paper on nuclear winter. This boosted the death toll of all-out nuclear war from ‘only’ 200-500 million to the very real possibility of the complete extinction of the human race\*. But some argued the report was alarmist, and there did seem to be some issues with the assumptions. So – a military phenomena that might cause megadeaths, possibly true but requiring further study, and a huge research defense budget that could be used to look into this critical phenomena and that was already spending millions on all aspects of nuclear weapons – can you guess what happened next? Correct – the issue was ignored for decades. For over twenty years, there were but a tiny handful of papers on the most likely way we could end our own existence, and a vague and persistent sense that nuclear winter had been ‘disproved’. But in 2007, we finally had a proper followup - with the help of modern computers, better models and better observations, what can we now say? Well, that nuclear winter is still a major threat; the initial fear was right. Their most likely scenario was: A global average surface cooling of –7°C to –8°C persists for years, and after a decade the cooling is still –4°C [...]. Considering that the global average cooling at the depth of the last ice age 18,000 yr ago was about –5°C, this would be a climate change unprecedented in speed and amplitude in the history of the human race. The temperature changes are largest over land [...] Cooling of more than –20°C occurs over large areas of North America and of more than –30°C over much of Eurasia, including all agricultural regions. Also, precipitation would be cut in half and we’d lose most of the ozone layer. But there was a more worrying development: it also seems that a small-scale nuclear war could generate its own mini nuclear winter. It’s important to understand that nuclear winter would not be a direct consequences of the nuclear explosions, but of the burning of our cities in the wake of the war (given enough heat, even roads and pavements will burn), generating clouds of very black smoke that rise into the stratosphere. The clouds do need to reach these heights: any lower and they’ll get rained out. This is what happened during the burning of the Kuwaiti oil wells in 1991: Carl Sagan, one of the fathers of the theory, predicted a nuclear winter-like scenario. But he wasn’t paying attention to the climate models: as they predicted, the local damage was severe, but the smoke didn’t reach the stratosphere, and global damage was avoided.

#### Otherwise, Pakistan’s nukes are vulnerable – global nuclear war

William Pitt 9, a New York Times and internationally bestselling author of two books: "War on Iraq: What Team Bush Doesn't Want You to Know" and "The Greatest Sedition Is Silence”, “Unstable Pakistan Threatens the World,” http://www.arabamericannews.com/news/index.php?mod=article&cat=commentary&article=2183

But a suicide bomber in Pakistan rammed a car packed with explosives into a jeep filled with troops today, killing five and wounding as many as 21, including several children who were waiting for a ride to school. Residents of the region where the attack took place are fleeing in terror as gunfire rings out around them, and government forces have been unable to quell the violence. Two regional government officials were beheaded by militants in retaliation for the killing of other militants by government forces. As familiar as this sounds, it did not take place where we have come to expect such terrible events. This, unfortunately, is a whole new ballgame. It is part of another conflict that is brewing, one which puts what is happening in Iraq and Afghanistan in deep shade, and which represents a grave and growing threat to us all. Pakistan is now trembling on the edge of violent chaos, and is doing so with nuclear weapons in its hip pocket, right in the middle of one of the most dangerous neighborhoods in the world.The situation in brief: Pakistan for years has been a nation in turmoil, run by a shaky government supported by a corrupted system, dominated by a blatantly criminal security service, and threatened by a large fundamentalist Islamic population with deep ties to the Taliban in Afghanistan. All this is piled atop an ongoing standoff with neighboring India that has been the center of political gravity in the region for more than half a century. The fact that Pakistan, and India, and Russia, and China all possess nuclear weapons and share the same space means any ongoing or escalating violence over there has the real potential to crack open the very gates of Hell itself. Recently, the Taliban made a military push into the northwest Pakistani region around the Swat Valley. According to a recent Reuters report: The (Pakistani) army deployed troops in Swat in October 2007 and used artillery and gunship helicopters to reassert control. But insecurity mounted after a civilian government came to power last year and tried to reach a negotiated settlement. A peace accord fell apart in May 2008. After that, hundreds — including soldiers, militants and civilians — died in battles. Militants unleashed a reign of terror, killing and beheading politicians, singers, soldiers and opponents. They banned female education and destroyed nearly 200 girls' schools. About 1,200 people were killed since late 2007 and 250,000 to 500,000 fled, leaving the militants in virtual control. Pakistan offered on February 16 to introduce Islamic law in the Swat valley and neighboring areas in a bid to take the steam out of the insurgency. The militants announced an indefinite cease-fire after the army said it was halting operations in the region. President Asif Ali Zardari signed a regulation imposing sharia in the area last month. But the Taliban refused to give up their guns and pushed into Buner and another district adjacent to Swat, intent on spreading their rule. The United States, already embroiled in a war against Taliban forces in Afghanistan, must now face the possibility that Pakistan could collapse under the mounting threat of Taliban forces there. Military and diplomatic advisers to President Obama, uncertain how best to proceed, now face one of the great nightmare scenarios of our time. "Recent militant gains in Pakistan," reported The New York Times on Monday, "have so alarmed the White House that the national security adviser, Gen. James L. Jones, described the situation as 'one of the very most serious problems we face.'" "Security was deteriorating rapidly," reported The Washington Post on Monday, "particularly in the mountains along the Afghan border that harbor al-Qaeda and the Taliban, intelligence chiefs reported, and there were signs that those groups were working with indigenous extremists in Pakistan's populous Punjabi heartland. The Pakistani government was mired in political bickering. The army, still fixated on its historical adversary India, remained ill-equipped and unwilling to throw its full weight into the counterinsurgency fight. But despite the threat the intelligence conveyed, Obama has only limited options for dealing with it. Anti-American feeling in Pakistan is high, and a U.S. combat presence is prohibited. The United States is fighting Pakistan-based extremists by proxy, through an army over which it has little control, in alliance with a government in which it has little confidence." It is believed Pakistan is currently in possession of between 60 and 100 nuclear weapons. Because Pakistan's stability is threatened by the wide swath of its population that shares ethnic, cultural and religious connections to the fundamentalist Islamic populace of Afghanistan, fears over what could happen to those nuclear weapons if the Pakistani government collapses are very real. "As the insurgency of the Taliban and Al Qaeda spreads in Pakistan," reported the Times last week, "senior American officials say they are increasingly concerned about new vulnerabilities for Pakistan's nuclear arsenal, including the potential for militants to snatch a weapon in transport or to insert sympathizers into laboratories or fuel-production facilities. In public, the administration has only hinted at those concerns, repeating the formulation that the Bush administration used: that it has faith in the Pakistani Army. But that cooperation, according to officials who would not speak for attribution because of the sensitivity surrounding the exchanges between Washington and Islamabad, has been sharply limited when the subject has turned to the vulnerabilities in the Pakistani nuclear infrastructure." "The prospect of turmoil in Pakistan sends shivers up the spinesof those U.S. officials charged with keeping tabs on foreign nuclear weapons," reported Time Magazine last month. "Pakistan is thought to possess about 100 — the U.S. isn't sure of the total, and may not know where all of them are. Still, if Pakistan collapses, the U.S. military is primed to enter the country and secure as many of those weapons as it can, according to U.S. officials. Pakistani officials insist their personnel safeguards are stringent, but a sleeper cell could cause big trouble, U.S. officials say." In other words, a shaky Pakistan spells trouble for everyone, especially if America loses the footrace to secure those weapons in the event of the worst-case scenario. If Pakistani militants ever succeed in toppling the government, several very dangerous events could happen at once. Nuclear-armed India could be galvanized into military action of some kind, as could nuclear-armed China or nuclear-armed Russia. If the Pakistani government does fall, and all those Pakistani nukes are not immediately accounted for and secured, the specter (or reality) of loose nukes falling into the hands of terrorist organizations could place the entire world on a collision course with unimaginable disaster. We have all been paying a great deal of attention to Iraq and Afghanistan, and rightly so. The developing situation in Pakistan, however, needs to be placed immediately on the front burner. The Obama administration appears to be gravely serious about addressing the situation. So should we all.