### 1AC—framework – util(short)

**Standard is maximizing expected well being**

**Pleasure and pain are intrinsic value and disvalue**
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Kenneth Blum, 1Department of Psychiatry, Boonshoft School of Medicine, Dayton VA Medical Center, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, USA 2Department of Psychiatry, McKnight Brain Institute, University of Florida College of Medicine, Gainesville, FL, USA 3Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Keck Medicine University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA 4Division of Applied Clinical Research & Education, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC, North Kingstown, RI, USA 5Department of Precision Medicine, Geneus Health LLC, San Antonio, TX, USA 6Department of Addiction Research & Therapy, Nupathways Inc., Innsbrook, MO, USA 7Department of Clinical Neurology, Path Foundation, New York, NY, USA 8Division of Neuroscience-Based Addiction Therapy, The Shores Treatment & Recovery Center, Port Saint Lucie, FL, USA 9Institute of Psychology, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary 10Division of Addiction Research, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC. North Kingston, RI, USA 11Victory Nutrition International, Lederach, PA., USA 12National Human Genome Center at Howard University, Washington, DC., USA, Marjorie Gondré-Lewis, 12National Human Genome Center at Howard University, Washington, DC., USA 13Departments of Anatomy and Psychiatry, Howard University College of Medicine, Washington, DC US, Bruce Steinberg, 4Division of Applied Clinical Research & Education, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC, North Kingstown, RI, USA, Igor Elman, 15Department Psychiatry, Cooper University School of Medicine, Camden, NJ, USA, David Baron, 3Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Keck Medicine University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA, Edward J Modestino, 14Department of Psychology, Curry College, Milton, MA, USA, Rajendra D Badgaiyan, 15Department Psychiatry, Cooper University School of Medicine, Camden, NJ, USA, Mark S Gold 16Department of Psychiatry, Washington University, St. Louis, MO, USA, “Our evolved unique pleasure circuit makes humans different from apes: Reconsideration of data derived from animal studies”, U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, 28 February 2018, accessed: 19 August 2020, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6446569/>, R.S.

**Pleasure** is not only one of the three primary reward functions but it also **defines reward.** As homeostasis explains the functions of only a limited number of rewards, the principal reason why particular stimuli, objects, events, situations, and activities are rewarding may be due to pleasure. This applies first of all to sex and to the primary homeostatic rewards of food and liquid and extends to money, taste, beauty, social encounters and nonmaterial, internally set, and intrinsic rewards. Pleasure, as the primary effect of rewards, drives the prime reward functions of learning, approach behavior, and decision making and provides the **basis for hedonic theories** of reward function. We are attracted by most rewards and exert intense efforts to obtain them, just because they are enjoyable [10]. Pleasure is a passive reaction that derives from the experience or prediction of reward and may lead to a long-lasting state of happiness. The word happiness is difficult to define. In fact, just obtaining physical pleasure may not be enough. One key to happiness involves a network of good friends. However, it is not obvious how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to an ice cream cone, or to your team winning a sporting event. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure [14]. Pleasure as a hallmark of reward is sufficient for defining a reward, but it may not be necessary. A reward may generate positive learning and approach behavior simply because it contains substances that are essential for body function. When we are hungry, we may eat bad and unpleasant meals. A monkey who receives hundreds of small drops of water every morning in the laboratory is unlikely to feel a rush of pleasure every time it gets the 0.1 ml. Nevertheless, with these precautions in mind, we may define any stimulus, object, event, activity, or situation that has the potential to produce pleasure as a reward. In the context of reward deficiency or for disorders of addiction, homeostasis pursues pharmacological treatments: drugs to treat drug addiction, obesity, and other compulsive behaviors. The theory of allostasis suggests broader approaches - such as re-expanding the range of possible pleasures and providing opportunities to expend effort in their pursuit. [15]. It is noteworthy, the first animal studies eliciting approach behavior by electrical brain stimulation interpreted their findings as a discovery of the brain’s pleasure centers [16] which were later partly associated with midbrain dopamine neurons [17–19] despite the notorious difficulties of identifying emotions in animals. Evolutionary theories of pleasure: The love connection BO:D Charles Darwin and other biological scientists that have examined the biological evolution and its basic principles found various mechanisms that steer behavior and biological development. Besides their theory on natural selection, it was particularly the sexual selection process that gained significance in the latter context over the last century, especially when it comes to the question of what makes us “what we are,” i.e., human. However, the capacity to sexually select and evolve is not at all a human accomplishment alone or a sign of our uniqueness; yet, we humans, as it seems, are ingenious in fooling ourselves and others–when we are in love or desperately search for it. It is well established that modern biological theory conjectures that **organisms are** the **result of evolutionary competition.** In fact, Richard Dawkins stresses gene survival and propagation as the basic mechanism of life [20]. Only genes that lead to the fittest phenotype will make it. It is noteworthy that the phenotype is selected based on behavior that maximizes gene propagation. To do so, the phenotype must survive and generate offspring, and be better at it than its competitors. Thus, the ultimate, distal function of rewards is to increase evolutionary fitness by ensuring the survival of the organism and reproduction. It is agreed that learning, approach, economic decisions, and positive emotions are the proximal functions through which phenotypes obtain other necessary nutrients for survival, mating, and care for offspring. Behavioral reward functions have evolved to help individuals to survive and propagate their genes. Apparently, people need to live well and long enough to reproduce. Most would agree that homo-sapiens do so by ingesting the substances that make their bodies function properly. For this reason, foods and drinks are rewards. Additional rewards, including those used for economic exchanges, ensure sufficient palatable food and drink supply. Mating and gene propagation is supported by powerful sexual attraction. Additional properties, like body form, augment the chance to mate and nourish and defend offspring and are therefore also rewards. Care for offspring until they can reproduce themselves helps gene propagation and is rewarding; otherwise, many believe mating is useless. According to David E Comings, as any small edge will ultimately result in evolutionary advantage [21], additional reward mechanisms like novelty seeking and exploration widen the spectrum of available rewards and thus enhance the chance for survival, reproduction, and ultimate gene propagation. These functions may help us to obtain the benefits of distant rewards that are determined by our own interests and not immediately available in the environment. Thus the distal reward function in gene propagation and evolutionary fitness defines the proximal reward functions that we see in everyday behavior. That is why foods, drinks, mates, and offspring are rewarding. There have been theories linking pleasure as a required component of health benefits salutogenesis, (salugenesis). In essence, under these terms, pleasure is described as a state or feeling of happiness and satisfaction resulting from an experience that one enjoys. Regarding pleasure, it is a double-edged sword, on the one hand, it promotes positive feelings (like mindfulness) and even better cognition, possibly through the release of dopamine [22]. But on the other hand, pleasure simultaneously encourages addiction and other negative behaviors, i.e., motivational toxicity. It is a complex neurobiological phenomenon, relying on reward circuitry or limbic activity. It is important to realize that through the “Brain Reward Cascade” (BRC) endorphin and endogenous morphinergic mechanisms may play a role [23]. While natural rewards are essential for survival and appetitive motivation leading to beneficial biological behaviors like eating, sex, and reproduction, crucial social interactions seem to further facilitate the positive effects exerted by pleasurable experiences. Indeed, experimentation with addictive drugs is capable of directly acting on reward pathways and causing deterioration of these systems promoting hypodopaminergia [24]. Most would agree that pleasurable activities can stimulate personal growth and may help to induce healthy behavioral changes, including stress management [25]. The work of Esch and Stefano [26] concerning the link between compassion and love implicate the brain reward system, and pleasure induction suggests that social contact in general, i.e., love, attachment, and compassion, can be highly effective in stress reduction, survival, and overall health. Understanding the role of neurotransmission and pleasurable states both positive and negative have been adequately studied over many decades [26–37], but comparative anatomical and neurobiological function between animals and homo sapiens appear to be required and seem to be in an infancy stage. Finding happiness is different between apes and humans As stated earlier in this expert opinion one key to happiness involves a network of good friends [38]. However, it is not entirely clear exactly how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to a sugar rush, winning a sports event or even sky diving, all of which augment dopamine release at the reward brain site. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure. Remarkably, there are pathways for ordinary liking and pleasure, which are limited in scope as described above in this commentary. However, there are **many brain regions**, often termed hot and cold spots, that significantly **modulate** (increase or decrease) our **pleasure or** even **produce the opposite** of pleasure— that is disgust and fear [39]. One specific region of the nucleus accumbens is organized like a computer keyboard, with particular stimulus triggers in rows— producing an increase and decrease of pleasure and disgust. Moreover, the cortex has unique roles in the cognitive evaluation of our feelings of pleasure [40]. Importantly, the interplay of these multiple triggers and the higher brain centers in the prefrontal cortex are very intricate and are just being uncovered. Desire and reward centers It is surprising that many different sources of pleasure activate the same circuits between the mesocorticolimbic regions (Figure 1). Reward and desire are two aspects pleasure induction and have a very widespread, large circuit. Some part of this circuit distinguishes between desire and dread. The so-called pleasure circuitry called “REWARD” involves a well-known dopamine pathway in the mesolimbic system that can influence both pleasure and motivation. In simplest terms, the well-established mesolimbic system is a dopamine circuit for reward. It starts in the ventral tegmental area (VTA) of the midbrain and travels to the nucleus accumbens (Figure 2). It is the cornerstone target to all addictions. The VTA is encompassed with neurons using glutamate, GABA, and dopamine. The nucleus accumbens (NAc) is located within the ventral striatum and is divided into two sub-regions—the motor and limbic regions associated with its core and shell, respectively. The NAc has spiny neurons that receive dopamine from the VTA and glutamate (a dopamine driver) from the hippocampus, amygdala and medial prefrontal cortex. Subsequently, the NAc projects GABA signals to an area termed the ventral pallidum (VP). The region is a relay station in the limbic loop of the basal ganglia, critical for motivation, behavior, emotions and the “Feel Good” response. This defined system of the brain is involved in all addictions –substance, and non –substance related. In 1995, our laboratory coined the term “Reward Deficiency Syndrome” (RDS) to describe genetic and epigenetic induced hypodopaminergia in the “Brain Reward Cascade” that contribute to addiction and compulsive behaviors [3,6,41]. Furthermore, ordinary “liking” of something, or pure pleasure, is represented by small regions mainly in the limbic system (old reptilian part of the brain). These may be part of larger neural circuits. In Latin, hedus is the term for “sweet”; and in Greek, hodone is the term for “pleasure.” Thus, the word Hedonic is now referring to various subcomponents of pleasure: some associated with purely sensory and others with more complex emotions involving morals, aesthetics, and social interactions. The capacity to have pleasure is part of being healthy and may even extend life, especially if linked to optimism as a dopaminergic response [42]. Psychiatric illness often includes symptoms of an abnormal inability to experience pleasure, referred to as anhedonia. A negative feeling state is called dysphoria, which can consist of many emotions such as pain, depression, anxiety, fear, and disgust. Previously many scientists used animal research to uncover the complex mechanisms of pleasure, liking, motivation and even emotions like panic and fear, as discussed above [43]. However, as a significant amount of related research about the specific brain regions of pleasure/reward circuitry has been derived from invasive studies of animals, these cannot be directly compared with subjective states experienced by humans. In an attempt to resolve the controversy regarding the causal contributions of mesolimbic dopamine systems to reward, we have previously evaluated the three-main competing explanatory categories: “liking,” “learning,” and “wanting” [3]. That is, dopamine may mediate (a) liking: the hedonic impact of reward, (b) learning: learned predictions about rewarding effects, or (c) wanting: the pursuit of rewards by attributing incentive salience to reward-related stimuli [44]. We have evaluated these hypotheses, especially as they relate to the RDS, and we find that the incentive salience or “wanting” hypothesis of dopaminergic functioning is supported by a majority of the scientific evidence. Various neuroimaging studies have shown that anticipated behaviors such as sex and gaming, delicious foods and drugs of abuse all affect brain regions associated with reward networks, and may not be unidirectional. Drugs of abuse enhance dopamine signaling which sensitizes mesolimbic brain mechanisms that apparently evolved explicitly to attribute incentive salience to various rewards [45]. Addictive substances are voluntarily self-administered, and they enhance (directly or indirectly) dopaminergic synaptic function in the NAc. This activation of the brain reward networks (producing the ecstatic “high” that users seek). Although these circuits were initially thought to encode a set point of hedonic tone, it is now being considered to be far more complicated in function, also encoding attention, reward expectancy, disconfirmation of reward expectancy, and incentive motivation [46]. The argument about addiction as a disease may be confused with a predisposition to substance and nonsubstance rewards relative to the extreme effect of drugs of abuse on brain neurochemistry. The former sets up an individual to be at high risk through both genetic polymorphisms in reward genes as well as harmful epigenetic insult. Some Psychologists, even with all the data, still infer that addiction is not a disease [47]. Elevated stress levels, together with polymorphisms (genetic variations) of various dopaminergic genes and the genes related to other neurotransmitters (and their genetic variants), and may have an additive effect on vulnerability to various addictions [48]. In this regard, Vanyukov, et al. [48] suggested based on review that whereas the gateway hypothesis does not specify mechanistic connections between “stages,” and does not extend to the risks for addictions the concept of common liability to addictions may be more parsimonious. The latter theory is grounded in genetic theory and supported by data identifying common sources of variation in the risk for specific addictions (e.g., RDS). This commonality has identifiable neurobiological substrate and plausible evolutionary explanations. Over many years the controversy of dopamine involvement in especially “pleasure” has led to confusion concerning separating motivation from actual pleasure (wanting versus liking) [49]. We take the position that animal studies cannot provide real clinical information as described by self-reports in humans. As mentioned earlier and in the abstract, on November 23rd, 2017, evidence for our concerns was discovered [50] In essence, although nonhuman primate brains are similar to our own, the disparity between other primates and those of human cognitive abilities tells us that surface similarity is not the whole story. Sousa et al. [50] small case found various differentially expressed genes, to associate with pleasure related systems. Furthermore, the dopaminergic interneurons located in the human neocortex were absent from the neocortex of nonhuman African apes. Such differences in neuronal transcriptional programs may underlie a variety of neurodevelopmental disorders. In simpler terms, the system controls the production of dopamine, a chemical messenger that plays a significant role in pleasure and rewards. The senior author, Dr. Nenad Sestan from Yale, stated: “Humans have evolved a dopamine system that is different than the one in chimpanzees.” This may explain why the behavior of humans is so unique from that of non-human primates, even though our brains are so surprisingly similar, Sestan said: “It might also shed light on why people are vulnerable to mental disorders such as autism (possibly even addiction).” Remarkably, this research finding emerged from an extensive, multicenter collaboration to compare the brains across several species. These researchers examined 247 specimens of neural tissue from six humans, five chimpanzees, and five macaque monkeys. Moreover, these investigators analyzed which genes were turned on or off in 16 regions of the brain. While the differences among species were subtle, **there was** a **remarkable contrast in** the **neocortices**, specifically in an area of the brain that is much more developed in humans than in chimpanzees. In fact, these researchers found that a gene called tyrosine hydroxylase (TH) for the enzyme, responsible for the production of dopamine, was expressed in the neocortex of humans, but not chimpanzees. As discussed earlier, dopamine is best known for its essential role within the brain’s reward system; the very system that responds to everything from sex, to gambling, to food, and to addictive drugs. However, dopamine also assists in regulating emotional responses, memory, and movement. Notably, abnormal dopamine levels have been linked to disorders including Parkinson’s, schizophrenia and spectrum disorders such as autism and addiction or RDS. Nora Volkow, the director of NIDA, pointed out that one alluring possibility is that the neurotransmitter dopamine plays a substantial role in humans’ ability to pursue various rewards that are perhaps months or even years away in the future. This same idea has been suggested by Dr. Robert Sapolsky, a professor of biology and neurology at Stanford University. Dr. Sapolsky cited evidence that dopamine levels rise dramatically in humans when we anticipate potential rewards that are uncertain and even far off in our futures, such as retirement or even the possible alterlife. This may explain what often motivates people to work for things that have no apparent short-term benefit [51]. In similar work, Volkow and Bale [52] proposed a model in which dopamine can favor NOW processes through phasic signaling in reward circuits or LATER processes through tonic signaling in control circuits. Specifically, they suggest that through its modulation of the orbitofrontal cortex, which processes salience attribution, dopamine also enables shilting from NOW to LATER, while its modulation of the insula, which processes interoceptive information, influences the probability of selecting NOW versus LATER actions based on an individual’s physiological state. This hypothesis further supports the concept that disruptions along these circuits contribute to diverse pathologies, including obesity and addiction or RDS.
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#### Status quo Indian news *threat constructs* Pakistan

Knoop et al 21[ Joseph Knoop is a free lance writer for PC Gamer. PC Gsmer “Indian news channel uses Arma 3 gameplay footage to claim Pakistan bombed Afghanistan” September 8 2021 [https://www.pcgamer.com/arma-3-pakistan-footage/]//aaditg](https://www.pcgamer.com/arma-3-pakistan-footage/%5d//aaditg)

\*news footage is from video games

\*anchors accused Pakistani airforce of air strikes

In a bizarre development, some Indian news broadcasts claimed that the Pakistani airforce attacked the Panjshir valley, an Afghanistan mountain province home to about 170,000 people, which is currently the last major holdout of anti-Taliban forces. The only problem? The footage used to report the supposedly pro-Taliban airforce attack came from the popular military simulation game Arma 3. The footage first appeared on Indian news channels including Republic TV, Times Now Navbharat, Zee Hindustan, and TV9 Bharatvarsh. The original video was credited to a source called "Hasti TV" on Facebook, which has since been deleted. These Indian news sources claimed the video showed a military jet attempting a bombing run on Panjshir. See more In fact, the footage came from this January Arma 3 video from the YouTube channel Compared Comparison, which has now been viewed 23 million times. The gameplay shows players engaging in a ground-to-air battle between a jet and a vehicle-mounted anti-air turret with tracer rounds seen firing through the sky at the jet. In a statement to PC Gamer, a representative for Arma 3 developer Bohemia Interactive confirmed that the original footage does indeed come from the game. "Strangely, we've seen this particular game footage be used several times by certain media outlets in support of their real-life news coverage," the Bohemia Interactive rep said. "We know this because we've been previously approached regarding similar occurrences by fact-checkers from organizations such as Agence Frrance-Presse, Check Your Fact, PolitiFact, and if I remember correctly, also Reuters." Bohemia Interactive added that the game footage used in the erroneous Indian news broadcasts may also have come from two other Arma 3 gameplay clips. "The clip in the [original viral tweet] is so cropped and low-res that I find it hard to compare and say for sure which it is, but I'm confident it is Arma 3 footage," Bohemia Interactive's rep said. It's easy to see how the deceptive edit was made. In Compared Comparison's YouTube video, zoomed-in shots of the attacking aircraft do look moderately convincing, at least until the video zooms out to show the digital anti-air vehicle firing and later blowing up in a not-so-realistic fashion. During Republic TV's broadcast, the anchor can be heard repeating the claim that the Pakistani airforce performed an airstrike in Panjshir. The claim was originally recognized as fraudulent by Boom, a group that calls itself India's "first and leading fact checking website and initiative," and is a member of the Poynter Institute's International Fact-Checking Network initiative. Republic TV meanwhile has a sordid history of far right-wing reporting and supporting India's prime minister Narendra Modi's Hindu nationalist policies, according to Aljazeera. Vikas Khanchandani, CEO of ARG (owner of Republic TV) was arrested in December 2020 for allegedly rigging ratings in order to charge advertisers more.

#### Status quo News *falsifies* Chinese events *threat constructing* them *by emboldening*

Paudyal 20 [ Mahabir Paudyal is the contributor for Republica. July 27, 2020 01:35 PM NPT “Fake news can destroy Nepal's relations with India, China and the US” My Republica <https://myrepublica.nagariknetwork.com/news/fake-news-can-destroy-nepal-s-relations-with-india-china-and-the-us/> ]//aaditg
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A document claiming Nepali land encroachment by China. Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Development on June 25 issued a statement saying that such a report has never been published by the ministry and the news reports based on this bear no truth in them. All news reports on encroachment story have cited this document as evidence. It’s hard to trace when it actually began (blogger Salokya has done a good study on it and I derive some information for this article from his blog), but it comes out firston May 31, 2019, in Nepal News, which is quickly followed by Hamrakura.com on June 2. For about four months, this issue almost disappears. On November 7, 2019, however, it reappears in Khabarhub.com which states that China has encroached upon around 36 hectares of Nepali land in Nepal’s Sankhuwasabha, Rasuwa, Sindhupalchowk and Humla districts. “China, too, has encroached upon Nepali land,” says the headline citing “survey department.”On November 8, it appears again in Thahakhabar, followed up by Pahilopost on November 14, with additional information of Nepalis launching protest against China for encroachment of Nepali land. On November 8, 2019, online version of Nagarik carried this report, followed by Annapurna Post on November 9 (Nagarik removed this ‘inadvertently published content’ from its online page, as explained by its editor Gunaraj Luitel). On November 10, the same online newspaper (Khabarhub) gave a ‘backoffChina’ twist to the encroachment subject. It said that social media including Twitter and Facebook are flooded with “BackOffChina” hashtag and that Nepal Students Union, a student wing of Nepali Congress, also chanted slogans against China and India in Kathmandu. By November 13, according to Khabarhub, protests against China were intensifying in Nepal “against the encroachment of Nepali land by China.” In a protest staged in Kapilvastu, Chinese President Xi Jinping’s effigy was burnt, it said. It further said “the protest comes after a survey report recently released by the Survey Department stated that China has encroached upon 36 hectare land of Nepal.” This went all over India too. On November 8, 2019, ANI published the news which was republished in several other outlets. Citing this report, The New Indian Express reiterated the same message on its November 8 news. The Hindustan Times, too, did the same on its November 12, 2019 news, followed by The Times of India’s coverage on November 13. On November 12, 2019,The South China Morning Post also published it. The month November is significant here because it was on November 2 that India had published the new political map including territories of Lipulekh, Limpiyadhura and Kalapani into it and this had become a major irritant in Nepal-India relations. Across the country, sentiments were building up against Indian government and Indian move was being seen as an act of cartographic aggression. ‘Fake’ news returns The report of alleged encroachment of Nepali land by China, based, again, on the same leaflet-like page ‘issued’by Ministry of Agriculture makes a comeback in June. On June 21, Annapurna Post published the report that China has been occupying entire Rui village of Gorkha district for the last 60 years. This news was quickly picked by Khabarhub.com on the same day. “Rui Gaun: Nepal’s land under Chinese control. The land is under Chinese control for more than 60 years,” it said.

#### Indo- china tensions uniquely high right now – relations shouldn’t be allowed to sink

**Pollard 21** [ Ruth Pollard is a columnist and editor with Bloomberg Opinion. Bloomberg “China and India Relations Shouldn't Be Allowed to Sink Any Lower” 10-11 – 21 <https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2021-10-11/china-india-and-pakistan-are-raising-temperatures-along-their-disputed-borders> ] //aaditg

To be facing tension on both fronts — and with no diplomatic levers left to pull — is not a great place for India to find itself coming out of a punishing second Covid-19 wave and the accompanying economic slowdown. Despite a couple of high-profile summits, the last one in 2019 in the southern Indian state of Chennai, Prime Minister Narendra Modi and President Xi Jinping have failed to find common ground. Instead, notes Ian Hall, deputy research director at the Griffith Asia Institute and author of a book on India’s foreign policy under Modi, China continues to apply more and more pressure, both along the border, and in regular online onslaughts critical of New Delhi’s military stance and its deepening ties with Washington. **Nothing Modi has done to try to change that dynamic has worked.** However, India is not alone. Hall says Japan, Taiwan, Australia and, of course, the U.S., are all dealing with the challenge of an increasingly assertive China. Foreign Minister Subrahmanyam Jaishankar told his Chinese counterpart Wang Yi last month that bilateral ties will only move forward once there’s troop disengagement from the border areas. But each time India pushes back, China responds with fresh incursions. Opinion. Data. More Data. Get the most important Bloomberg Opinion pieces in one email. Email Enter your email Sign Up By submitting my information, I agree to the Privacy Policy and Terms of Service and to receive offers and promotions from Bloomberg. Just last week, there was a minor face-off between the two sides in Arunachal Pradesh. **Though the situation was quickly resolved, it added to the tensions in the lead up to Sunday’s unsuccessful talks.** In August, more than 100 Chinese soldiers briefly entered Indian territory in the Himalayan state of Uttarakhand. Military experts say that as both sides expand their troop numbers and aggressively patrol, the chances of a miscalculation leading to another set of deadly clashes increases. **Beijing’s abandonment of decades of established protocols agreed with New Delhi along its disputed border is contributing to alarm across the Indo-Pacific.** Other episodes in the region include the increasing sorties into Taiwan’s air-defense-identification zone and the expanded deployment of ships into disputed areas of the South China Sea. **No one has found the magic formula for dealing with China’s expansionism while maintaining restraint.** India is just the latest nation to be tested, and the jury is out on whether relations have hit their lowest point since the border war of 1962 or if there’s still further to fall.

#### That causes nuclear prolif

Abraham 09 [ Itty Abraham is Associate Professor of Southeast Asian Studies at the National University of Singapore and the former director of the South Asia Institute, the Marlene and Morton Meyerson Centennial Chair, and former associate professor of government and Asian studies and edited the book this card is from. Indiana University Press “SOUTH ASIAN CULTURES OF THE BOMB: Atomic Publics and the State in India and Pakistan” https://muse.jhu.edu/book/3857]//aaditg

The last interconnected area is the threat of the external Others, specifically China and Pakistan. the nuclear race was accelerated by the fear that neighboring countries would avail themselves of military technology to harm Indian national interests.The mechanism of “threat construction” has underpinned these fears, whether it is China in the 1960s or the later status of Pakistan. Previous wars, border skirmishes, and the threat of invasion and iniltration involving these two countries have provided grist to India’s nuclear mill. The notion of the Other sitting right outside the door is a constant reminder of India’s precarious geopolitical position, and provides an extra boost to nuclear armament. But the Other is also a changing category that has both internal and external constituents, and where other countries can switly become enemies in the vagaries of shiting alliances: “blaming the others (be they Muslims, China, Western hypocrisy, or whatever) has found powerful resonance.”23 Thus this vigilant awareness is supplemented with a penumbra of other nations that are against India’s aspirations to go nuclear. The West, or perhaps more to the point, countries already in the nuclear club, have come under repeated attack as Indian politicians appeal for equality in the world of nuclear treaties. But this tension is also complemented with a desire to be like Raminder Kaur · them. So whereas with long-term enemies such as Pakistan the Indian government’s desire is to expunge and control , in relation to other nuclear countries its desire is to mimic and attain a comparable international ranking. We now turn to examine how all these discursive elements are invoked in Ganapati Festival displays and narratives among working- and lower-middle-class residents of Mumbai.25 Each of the following festival tableaux presents a creative and selective combination of the discourses described above.26 he tableaux not only reproduce elements of the discourses, they re-produce them. the hairline hyphen in re-production alludes to the fact that every practice or display becomes itself a production, not a facsimile copy. Mandal members, in their creation of tableaux, select, reject, and recombine elements of these discourses in an interactive and innovative way.27 Occasionally the re-production leads to some notable ambiguities which we explore below.

#### Nuclear Proliferation causes Nuclear War.

Kroenig 15(Matthew Kroenig; Associate Professor and International Relations Field Chair in the Department of Government and School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University; 2015, “The History of Proliferation Optimism: Does It Have a Future?”; *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Volume 38, Issue 1-2)//Re-cut by Elmer

The spread of nuclear weapons poses at least six severe threats to international peace and security including: nuclear war, nuclear terrorism, global and regional instability, constrained US freedom of action, weakened alliances, and further nuclear proliferation. Each of these threats has received extensive treatment elsewhere and this review is not intended to replicate or even necessarily to improve upon these previous efforts. Rather the goals of this section are more modest: to usefully bring together and recap the many reasons why we should be pessimistic about the likely consequences of nuclear proliferation. Many of these threats will be illuminated with a discussion of a case of much contemporary concern: Iran’s advanced nuclear program. Nuclear War The greatest threat posed by the spread of nuclear weapons is nuclear war. The more states in possession of nuclear weapons, the greater the probability that somewhere, someday, there will be a catastrophic nuclear war. To date, nuclear weapons have only been used in warfare once. In 1945, the United States used nuclear weapons on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, bringing World War II to a close. Many analysts point to the 65-plus-year tradition of nuclear non-use as evidence that nuclear weapons are unusable, but it would be naïve to think that nuclear weapons will never be used again simply because they have not been used for some time. After all, analysts in the 1990s argued that worldwide economic downturns like the Great Depression were a thing of the past, only to be surprised by the dot-com bubble bursting later in the decade and the Great Recession of the late 2000s.48 This author, for one, would be surprised if nuclear weapons are not used again sometime in his lifetime. Before reaching a state of MAD, new nuclear states go through a transition period in which they lack a secure-second strike capability. In this context, one or both states might believe that it has an incentive to use nuclear weapons first. For example, if Iran acquires nuclear weapons, neither Iran, nor its nuclear-armed rival, Israel, will have a secure, second-strike capability. Even though it is believed to have a large arsenal, given its small size and lack of strategic depth, Israel might not be confident that it could absorb a nuclear strike and respond with a devastating counterstrike. Similarly, Iran might eventually be able to build a large and survivable nuclear arsenal, but, when it first crosses the nuclear threshold, Tehran will have a small and vulnerable nuclear force. In these pre-MAD situations, there are at least three ways that nuclear war could occur. First, the state with the nuclear advantage might believe it has a splendid first strike capability. In a crisis, Israel might, therefore, decide to launch a preventive nuclear strike to disarm Iran’s nuclear capabilities. Indeed, this incentive might be further increased by Israel’s aggressive strategic culture that emphasizes preemptive action. Second, the state with a small and vulnerable nuclear arsenal, in this case Iran, might feel use them or lose them pressures. That is, in a crisis, Iran might decide to strike first rather than risk having its entire nuclear arsenal destroyed. Third, as Thomas Schelling has argued, nuclear war could result due to the reciprocal fear of surprise attack.49 If there are advantages to striking first, one state might start a nuclear war in the belief that war is inevitable and that it would be better to go first than to go second. Fortunately, there is no historic evidence of this dynamic occurring in a nuclear context, but it is still possible. In an Israeli–Iranian crisis, for example, Israel and Iran might both prefer to avoid a nuclear war, but decide to strike first rather than suffer a devastating first attack from an opponent. Even in a world of MAD, however, when both sides have secure, second-strike capabilities, there is still a risk of nuclear war. Rational deterrence theory assumes nuclear-armed states are governed by rational leaders who would not intentionally launch a suicidal nuclear war. This assumption appears to have applied to past and current nuclear powers, but there is no guarantee that it will continue to hold in the future. Iran’s theocratic government, despite its inflammatory rhetoric, has followed a fairly pragmatic foreign policy since 1979, but it contains leaders who hold millenarian religious worldviews and could one day ascend to power. We cannot rule out the possibility that, as nuclear weapons continue to spread, some leader somewhere will choose to launch a nuclear war, knowing full well that it could result in self-destruction. One does not need to resort to irrationality, however, to imagine nuclear war under MAD. Nuclear weapons may deter leaders from intentionally launching full-scale wars, but they do not mean the end of international politics. As was discussed above, nuclear-armed states still have conflicts of interest and leaders still seek to coerce nuclear-armed adversaries. Leaders might, therefore, choose to launch a limited nuclear war.50 This strategy might be especially attractive to states in a position of conventional inferiority that might have an incentive to escalate a crisis quickly to the nuclear level. During the Cold War, the United States planned to use nuclear weapons first to stop a Soviet invasion of Western Europe given NATO’s conventional inferiority.51 As Russia’s conventional power has deteriorated since the end of the Cold War, Moscow has come to rely more heavily on nuclear weapons in its military doctrine. Indeed, Russian strategy calls for the use of nuclear weapons early in a conflict (something that most Western strategists would consider to be escalatory) as a way to de-escalate a crisis. Similarly, Pakistan’s military plans for nuclear use in the event of an invasion from conventionally stronger India. And finally, Chinese generals openly talk about the possibility of nuclear use against a US superpower in a possible East Asia contingency. Second, as was also discussed above, leaders can make a ‘threat that leaves something to chance’.52 They can initiate a nuclear crisis. By playing these risky games of nuclear brinkmanship, states can increase the risk of nuclear war in an attempt to force a less resolved adversary to back down. Historical crises have not resulted in nuclear war, but many of them, including the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, have come close. And scholars have documented historical incidents when accidents nearly led to war.53 When we think about future nuclear crisis dyads, such as Iran and Israel, with fewer sources of stability than existed during the Cold War, we can see that there is a real risk that a future crisis could result in a devastating nuclear exchange. Nuclear Terrorism The spread of nuclear weapons also increases the risk of nuclear terrorism.54 While September 11th was one of the greatest tragedies in American history, it would have been much worse had Osama Bin Laden possessed nuclear weapons. Bin Laden declared it a ‘religious duty’ for Al- Qa’eda to acquire nuclear weapons and radical clerics have issued fatwas declaring it permissible to use nuclear weapons in Jihad against the West.55 Unlike states, which can be more easily deterred, there is little doubt that if terrorists acquired nuclear weapons, they would use them.56 Indeed, in recent years, many US politicians and security analysts have argued that nuclear terrorism poses the greatest threat to US national security.57 Analysts have pointed out the tremendous hurdles that terrorists would have to overcome in order to acquire nuclear weapons.58 Nevertheless, as nuclear weapons spread, the possibility that they will eventually fall into terrorist hands increases. States could intentionally transfer nuclear weapons, or the fissile material required to build them, to terrorist groups. There are good reasons why a state might be reluctant to transfer nuclear weapons to terrorists, but, as nuclear weapons spread, the probability that a leader might someday purposely arm a terrorist group increases. Some fear, for example, that Iran, with its close ties to Hamas and Hizballah, might be at a heightened risk of transferring nuclear weapons to terrorists. Moreover, even if no state would ever intentionally transfer nuclear capabilities to terrorists, a new nuclear state, with underdeveloped security procedures, might be vulnerable to theft, allowing terrorist groups or corrupt or ideologically-motivated insiders to transfer dangerous material to terrorists. There is evidence, for example, that representatives from Pakistan’s atomic energy establishment met with Al-Qa’eda members to discuss a possible nuclear deal.59 Finally, a nuclear-armed state could collapse, resulting in a breakdown of law and order and a loose nukes problem. US officials are currently very concerned about what would happen to Pakistan’s nuclear weapons if the government were to fall. As nuclear weapons spread, this problem is only further amplified. Iran is a country with a history of revolutions and a government with a tenuous hold on power. The regime change that Washington has long dreamed about in Tehran could actually become a nightmare if a nuclear-armed Iran suffered a breakdown in authority, forcing us to worry about the fate of Iran’s nuclear arsenal. Regional Instability The spread of nuclear weapons also emboldens nuclear powers, contributing to regional instability. States that lack nuclear weapons need to fear direct military attack from other states, but states with nuclear weapons can be confident that they can deter an intentional military attack, giving them an incentive to be more aggressive in the conduct of their foreign policy. In this way, nuclear weapons provide a shield under which states can feel free to engage in lower-level aggression. Indeed, international relations theories about the ‘stability-instability paradox’ maintain that stability at the nuclear level contributes to conventional instability.60 Historically, we have seen that the spread of nuclear weapons has emboldened their possessors and contributed to regional instability. Recent scholarly analyses have demonstrated that, after controlling for other relevant factors, nuclear-weapon states are more likely to engage in conflict than nonnuclear-weapon states and that this aggressiveness is more pronounced in new nuclear states that have less experience with nuclear diplomacy.61 Similarly, research on internal decision-making in Pakistan reveals that Pakistani foreign policymakers may have been emboldened by the acquisition of nuclear weapons, which encouraged them to initiate militarized disputes against India.62 Currently, Iran restrains its foreign policy because it fears major military retaliation from the United States or Israel, but with nuclear weapons it could feel free to push harder. A nuclear-armed Iran would likely step up support to terrorist and proxy groups and engage in more aggressive coercive diplomacy. With a nuclear-armed Iran increasingly throwing its weight around in the region, we could witness an even more crisis prone Middle East. And in a poly-nuclear Middle East with Israel, Iran, and, in the future, possibly other states, armed with nuclear weapons, any one of those crises could result in a catastrophic nuclear exchange.

**Nuclear war causes extinction through winter, firestorms, EMP blasts, ozone damage, and meltdowns**

-Immediate death -Climate destruction spurring an ice age (Nuclear winter) via nuclear firestorms and smoke -Ozone collapses -2 Billion insta-die in famine -kills biodiversity -Meltdowns and grid collapse via EMPs -Remaining fallout

**Starr 14** {Steven, Senior Scientist for Physicians for Social Responsibility, Director of the Clinical Laboratory Science Program (Missouri), commentator in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists and the Strategic Arms Reduction, Associate member of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, “The Lethality of Nuclear Weapons: Nuclear War has No Winner,” Global Research: Centre for Research on Globalization, 6/5, http://www.globalresearch.ca/the-lethality-of-nuclear-weapons-nuclear-war-has-no-winner/5385611}

Nuclear war **has no winner**. Beginning in 2006, several of the world’s **leading climatologists** (at Rutgers, UCLA, John Hopkins University, and the University of Colorado-Boulder) published a series of studies that evaluated the long-term environmental consequences of a nuclear war, including baseline scenarios fought with **merely 1%** of the explosive power in the US and/or Russian launch-ready nuclear arsenals. They concluded that the consequences of even a “small” nuclear war would include **catastrophic disruptions** of global climate[i] and **massive destruction** of Earth’s protective ozone layer[ii]. These **and more recent studies** predict that global agriculture would be so negatively affected by such a war, a global famine would result, which would cause up to **2 billion people to starve to death**. [iii]¶ These **peer-reviewed** studies – which were analyzed by the **best scientists in the world** and found to be without error – also predict that a war fought with less than half of US or Russian strategic nuclear weapons would **destroy the human race**.[iv] In other words, a US-Russian nuclear war would create such extreme long-term damage to the global environment that it would leave the Earth **uninhabitable** for humans and most animal forms of life.¶ A recent article in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, “Self-assured destruction: The climate impacts of nuclear war”,[v] begins by stating:¶ “A nuclear war between Russia and the United States, **even after the arsenal reductions** planned under New START, could produce a nuclear winter. Hence, an attack by either side could be **suicidal**, resulting in self-assured **destruction**.”¶ In 2009, I wrote an article[vi] for the International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament that summarizes the findings of these studies. It explains that nuclear firestorms would produce millions of tons of smoke, which would rise above cloud level and form a global stratospheric smoke layer that would **rapidly encircle the Earth**. The smoke layer would remain for at least a **decade**, and it would act to destroy the protective ozone layer (vastly increasing the UV-B reaching Earth[vii]) as well as block warming sunlight, thus creating Ice Age weather conditions that would last **10 years** or longer.¶ Following a US-Russian nuclear war, temperatures in the central US and Eurasia would fall below freezing every day for one to three years; the intense cold would **completely eliminate growing seasons for a decade** or longer. No crops could be grown, leading to a famine that would **kill most humans and large animal populations**.¶ Electromagnetic pulse from high-altitude nuclear detonations would destroy the integrated circuits in all modern electronic devices[viii], including those in commercial nuclear power plants. Every nuclear reactor would almost **instantly** meltdown; every nuclear spent fuel pool (which contain many times more radioactivity than found in the reactors) would boil-off, releasing vast amounts of **long-lived** radioactivity. The fallout would make most of the US and Europe **uninhabitable**. Of course, the survivors of the nuclear war would be **starving to death anyway.** Once nuclear weapons were introduced into a US-Russian conflict, there would be little chance that a **nuclear holocaust** could be avoided. Theories of “limited nuclear war” and “nuclear de-escalation” are **unrealistic**.[ix] In 2002 the Bush administration modified US strategic doctrine from a retaliatory role to permit preemptive nuclear attack; in 2010, the Obama administration made only incremental and miniscule changes to this doctrine, leaving it essentially unchanged. Furthermore, Counterforce doctrine – used by both the US and Russian military – emphasizes the need for preemptive strikes once nuclear war begins. Both sides would be under immense pressure to launch a preemptive nuclear first-strike once military hostilities had commenced, especially if nuclear weapons had already been used on the battlefield.

#### Hindu Nationalism causes BJP support

Vaishnav 19 [Milan Vaishnav’s primary research focus is the political economy of India, and he examines issues such as corruption and governance, state capacity, distributive politics, and electoral behavior. “Religious Nationalism and India’s Future” Apfil 5,2019 Carnegie Endowment for International Peace https://carnegieendowment.org/2019/04/04/religious-nationalism-and-india-s-future-pub-78703]//aaditg

India is not alone in facing the challenges that accompany religious nationalism: many democracies worldwide are witnessing a rise in such political movements. The widespread use of religiously inspired political appeals can be detected in places as diverse as Turkey, Latin America, Western Europe, and the post-Soviet states.2 For instance, in the 2018 Costa Rican presidential runoff election, voters for evangelical populist candidate Fabricio Alvarado reportedly rallied behind the mantra that “if a man of God can’t govern us, then nobody can.”3 In his recent successful bid for the Brazilian presidency, right-wing populist candidate Jair Bolsonaro similarly campaigned on the slogan, “Brazil before everything, and God above all.”4 In Indonesia, meanwhile, Islamic nationalists allied with anti-Chinese xenophobes and economic nationalists to oust Jakarta’s Christian governor Basuki Tjahaja Purnama and convict him on blasphemy charges.5 While religious nationalist movements exhibit considerable variation, they appear to share many common attributes. First, most religious nationalist parties possess a puritanical streak that colors their electoral platforms—and subsequent methods of governance—with a moral cadence. Second, in many countries, religious nationalists use moral appeals and rhetoric to advocate for economic austerity or draconian anticorruption measures. Third, religious politics often betrays a majoritarian nationalism, which seeks to redefine the basis of national identity in a manner that excludes or marginalizes religious minorities.. In the case of India, the commingling of religion and politics is hardly novel. This mixing first began with state patronage of the Brahminical Vedic tradition in which state backing of religion ensured that clerical leaders would, in turn, protect the state.6 In India’s earliest state formations, the rajas (kings) wielded political power but were reliant on the legitimation of brahmins (priestly caste) whom they compensated with guarantees of safety and material resources. One unique aspect of India’s development is the degree of moral authority brahmins enjoyed independent of the power of the state—a stark contrast to China, for instance, where religious authorities were subservient to elites possessing coercive and economic power.7 When India obtained independence following the ouster of the British Raj in 1947, the country’s new constitution established a secular republic that did not feature a strict church-state separation, as in many Western democracies, but rather a “principled distance” between religion and the state.8 The government, under this rubric, endeavored to maintain a measured embrace of India’s disparate religious communities without unduly favoring any one group. The BJP’s electoral resurgence of late has once more brought an alternative nationalism to the fore, one based not on secular principles but rather on the premise that Indian culture is coterminous with Hindu culture. Over the decades, politicians frequently have violated this (admittedly blurry) line, often cynically and out of calculated political compulsion. The leadership of the Indian National Congress (or Congress Party), which ruled India for much of the postindependence period, traditionally has championed its commitment to secular nationalism. But, in practice, the Congress Party often has invoked religious sentiments to suit its changing political interests—a tendency that grew in intensity under the reign of former prime minister Indira Gandhi. Since the late 1990s, India’s electoral milieu has seen a surge of religious content with the electoral success of the Hindu nationalist Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP). Although the BJP’s star dimmed for much of the 2000s, it has undergone a renaissance over the past five years under Prime Minister Narendra Modi. The BJP’s electoral resurgence of late has once more brought an alternative nationalism to the fore, one based not on secular principles but rather on the premise that Indian culture is coterminous with Hindu culture. This departure from India’s secular tradition, which itself was initially damaged by the self-inflicted wounds of the Congress Party, raises difficult questions about India’s political future and its long-standing commitment to the credo of “unity in diversity.”9 DUELING NATIONALISMS A key axis of political and cultural conflict in modern India pertains to competing visions of nationalism within the overarching framework of India’s democratic governance. When India’s constitution was being drafted, and even before, there was a robust debate about India’s national identity and the values and norms that should underpin the “idea of India.”10 Thanks to the political dominance of the Congress Party and with due deference to the country’s extraordinary diversity, secular nationalism came to define India’s post-1947 identity. Under the tutelage of the country’s inaugural prime minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, India’s postcolonial leadership embarked on an ambitious project of nation-building by refusing to privilege any one religion above all others—as they feared that favoring one religious group could upend India’s nascent social compact.11 Because India’s secularists achieved such a dominant victory in the early years of the republic, it is easy to forget that there was a dueling nationalism that may have been defeated, but which hardly disappeared from the scene entirely. The alternative conception of India’s identity, Hindu nationalism, has a lineage that actually pre-dates its secular competitor, and today Hindu majoritarianism is ascendant.12 According to political scientist Ashutosh Varshney, three competing themes have fought for political dominance since the emergence of the Indian national movement. First, there is the territorial notion of India, which emphasizes the fact that the land between the Indus River to the west, the Himalaya Mountains to the north, and the seas to the south and east comprise India’s “sacred geography.”13 A second conception, the cultural notion, is the idea that Indian society is defined by the values of tolerance, pluralism, and syncretism. The final theme stresses religion, which is to say that the land known as India is originally the homeland of the Hindu community. While different religious communities may call India home, proponents of this third viewpoint see India as fundamentally belonging to the Hindu majority.14

#### Increased BJP support uniquely increases tensions with Pakistan

**Tehsin et al 19**, Muhammad, Asif Ali, and Ghulam Qumber [Muhammad Tehsin Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan. Asif Ali National Defence University Islamabad, Pakistan. Ghulam Qumber National Defence University Islamabad, Pakistan. “Strategic Stability in South Asia: Pakistan and the Challenges of Nuclear Deterrence,” (June 2019) South Asian Studies A Research Journal of South Asian Studies]anop

The re-election of right-wing Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) in 2019 **signaled a new trend** in Indian politics with implications for South Asia‟s strategic stability (Corbridge, 1999). Indian foreign policy of nuclear competition and regional arms race **pose a threat to crisis stability** and peacekeeping in a nuclear South Asia. A chronological view of the four crises since 1998 reveals that Indian policy of force mobilization in Kargil and Mumbai has now been replaced with claims of surgical strikes in Pathankot and Uri. The Kargil war appeared to be the first successful instance of the viability of nuclear deterrence. India was militarily stronger than Pakistan, but it chose to de-escalate the conflict due to the rational deterrence factor. The phenomenon of military restraint repeated itself during crises in 2001-02 standoff, as well as the Mumbai attacks in 2008. But a significant change can be discerned in the Kargil-Mumbai episodes versus the **Pathankot-Uri crises**. The Indian stance toward Pakistan went through a shift in the aftermath of the Kargil-Mumbai episodes, which had an impact on the regional patterns of crisis management. In 2016, Pathankot and Uri attacks were the two subsequent crises that threatened regional peace. The Indian army claimed, “surgical strike” in Pakistani Kashmir and that it destroyed six to eight “launch pads of militants” (Khan, 2016). It further informed that the militants were preparing to enter inside India from the Pakistani territory for another attack. The Indian army‟s statement described the Indian surgical strike to be in response to the recent attack by alleged Pakistani backed militants in Indian-held Kashmir. India frequently accuses Pakistan Army and intelligence services of **supporting militants** and anti-Indian activities (Ganguly & Kraig, 2005). For Pakistan, the Indian discourse about military attack inside its territory after Pathankot and Uri points to a future Indian proclivity to **favor cross border intrusions**. It should be noted, after all, that the need for quick mobilization and capacity for surgical strike is the area wherein lie the origins of the CSD. Hence Pakistani statements strongly hint that any **ingress beyond the LoC** and along the international border **would result in** crisis **escalation** (Monrow & Bipindra, 2017). This includes the development of claiming military operations inside Pakistani territory. Coupled with a reduction in US influence post-Afghan drawdown and increasing Russo-Chinese interest in the region, the BJP government‟s foreign policy has brought a marked shift in patterns of regional crisis management (Korybko, 2016). For instance, the Indian Prime Minister Mr. Narendra Modi opined that the Uri attack would not go unpunished. Mr. Modi further said that he would isolate Pakistan in the world because of its support for terrorism. In the Pakistani view, the flawed approach of the Modi government toward crisis management has placed the regional security in danger, and tensions could escalate. The key to preserving the precarious stability in the region is to tackle the roots of regional tensions i.e. Kashmir issue (Khan & Khan, 2016). Only after this pre-condition is met then the Pakistani state would be armed with the political capital to take decisive action against the phenomenon of extremism and Muhammad Tehsin, Asif Ali & Ghulam Qumber 340 A Research Journal of

#### Future Indo-Pak conflict *goes nuclear*.

**Dalton and Kalwani 19** [Dalton, Toby and Kalwani, Gaurav. Toby Dalton is co-director and a senior fellow of the Nuclear Policy Program at the Carnegie Endowment. An expert on nonproliferation and nuclear energy, his work addresses regional security challenges and the evolution of the global nuclear order. Fourth-year Gaurav Kalwani has been named a junior fellow for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and will have a unique opportunity to explore his interests in public service and nuclear policy.War on the Rocks. “Might India Start the Next South Asia Crisis?,” November 1, 2019. https://warontherocks.com/2019/11/might-india-start-the-next-south-asia-crisis/.]//anop

As with all historical cases, there are limitations in drawing inferences for contemporary conditions. As compared to 2001, India and Pakistan now have two decades of experience with crises under the nuclear overhang, even as both continue to build out their nuclear arsenals and adapt postures accordingly. India is slowly realizing its global aspirations, giving it more leverage in international politics. China is a more important actor in the region today than 20 years ago, whereas U.S. interests in the region are in flux as Washington seeks to wind down its presence in Afghanistan. Yet, fundamentally, the cases underscore that India can be revisionist in its aims with respect to the Line of Control, whether for political or military reasons. Under the right circumstances, it is conceivable India may opt to challenge the status quo again. How might a crisis initiated by an Indian cross-border operation differ from the pattern of the past couple of decades? Most critically, it would shift the onus of decision-making to Pakistan. As the aggrieved party, and as the smaller power, Pakistani leaders would face immense pressure to restore **deterrence through escalation**. Whereas Indian leaders have sought to manage escalation by targeting militant groups and their infrastructure, Pakistan would have no choice but to attack Indian forces directly in order to evict them from what Pakistan perceives as its territory. A calibrated response might be an insufficient demonstration of Pakistan’s resolve to impose high costs on India and prevent further encroachment. Pakistan might therefore attack not just Indian forces over the Line of Control, but could also carry out longer-range strikes on more valuable military targets in India. Pakistan could also escalate in ways that invite greater risk of engaging nuclear weapons in the conflict, which has been an important element of its strategy in previous episodes. For instance, it might decide to cross an important symbolic threshold by using ballistic or cruise missiles against military targets in India. It could also try to test Indian resolve by dispersing short-range nuclear weapons in the field in an attempt to manipulate Schelling’s “**threat that leaves something to chance**.” In this regard, it is notable that Pakistani strategists seem to have drawn quite different lessons from the 2019 crisis than their Indian counterparts. Pakistani officials believe they won the last conflict by successfully **escalating** in response to India’s airstrike, leading to the downing of an Indian MiG-21 aircraft and capture of its pilot. They might also conclude that nuclear signaling — calling a meeting of the National Command Authority in response to Indian threats to carry out missile strikes — succeeded in deterring Indian escalation. If Pakistani leaders believe that escalate-to-deescalate worked in 2019, **it is likely they would implement** the **same strategy** in the next crisis. A crisis initiated by India is also **likely to escalate far more quickly.** Notably, in the 2016 and 2019 crises, India waited a week or more following the instigating terror attack to prepare and calibrate its responses. But if India commenced a cross-border operation, Pakistan likely would not wait even **hours** to launch a counter-offensive to disrupt Indian efforts to consolidate its hold on captured territory. In this context, de-escalation and conflict termination also **become** far more **complex**. The peak of the crisis following the 2019 Pulwama attack played out in the span of a few days, and arguably de-escalated mostly due to the lucky stroke of Pakistan capturing alive the Indian MiG pilot whom it was able to return. Captured soldiers are considerably easier to give back **than territory**, and the more aggressive an opening land grab, the more difficult it will be to de-escalate in a **condensed time frame**. The stakes of a crisis like this would also **be** much **greater**. India would be loath to return any captured territory in the name of de-escalation, especially if the offensive is framed or justified in terms of **expanding India’s control** over disputed territory. Given rising Indian nationalism, coupled with historical disdain for third-party meddling in Kashmir, outside efforts to arrest the crisis **are less likely to result in** Indian **restraint**. For Pakistan, hyped fears of an existential threat from India are likely to **reinforce risk-taking** to reclaim territory it sees as sovereign**. It is unclear that there are any non-military options Pakistan could exercise to incentivize India to return the territory.** This could lead to a situation in which both countries find themselves unable to back down and without peaceful paths to resolve the dispute. Of course, India may not attempt an operation as audacious as its 1984 occupation of the Siachen Glacier, or as risk-acceptant as its planned 2001 cross-border capture of Pakistani guard posts. Even so, there are ample reasons for analysts to question the standing assumptions about how the next South Asia crisis might begin. Doing so is a necessary first step toward thinking through the full range of possible crises and how states might prepare for them. With that in mind, scholars and policymakers should analyze and debate several questions: What are the different types of crisis catalysts and how might escalation pathways vary by type? What are the beliefs on each side about crisis management and control, and are there shared ideas about escalation thresholds? And, how are changes in military, surveillance, and other relevant technologies affecting crisis calculations? These are all questions without easy answers, but they demand attention. Preparing for the next crisis on the basis of the last one runs the same risks as planning to fight the next war in the same way as the previous one. Both India and Pakistan, as well as third parties interested in trying to facilitate crisis de-escalation and termination, would be wise to plan for a range of contingencies. Crisis management in South Asia is hugely consequential. A limited nuclear exchange between India and Pakistan would be disastrous for people in the region, but the effects could spread well beyond South Asia. Preventing the next crisis from escalating to a point at which nuclear weapons might be used is therefore a global imperative. It is far better that the next South Asia crisis be managed, to the extent possible, with careful planning and preparation, rather than counting on luck to see it through.

### Solvency

#### Plan text : In the Republic of India, a free press should prioritize objectivity over advocacy.

Express News Service 98 [ Express News Service is a subset of Indian Express. Nov 18 1998 Indian Express “Journalists should strive for objectivity”https://indianexpress.com/article/news-archive/journalists-should-strive-for-objectivity/lite/ ] // aaditg

\*solvency advocate

SURAT, Nov 18: Journalists should constantly strive for objectivity and always stick to the truth. This was stated by senior journalist and noted litterateur Bhagwati Kumar Sharma, while speaking at `Media Discussion’ organised by the District Information department for students of the Journalism faculty of the South Gujarat University at the University campus on Wednesday. Entitled `National Issues and the Role of Media’, speakers spoke on a number of topics and problems faced by the country at present. During the discussion, Sharma stressed on the causes and origin of a number of major burning issues and how journalism could be used to solve these. Commenting on the credibility of news, the senior journalist who has spent about 50 years in the profession, told the aspiring journalists that one must beware the pitfalls while in the field. He added that a feeling for welfare of the society along with a deep sense of responsibility were essential in everyone aspiring to be in the field, though he regretted the decline in sincerity and values among the journalistic fraternity in the past few years. Acting vice-chancellor of the university R N Shelat, in his speech said that the aspiring journalists could take up issues like illiteracy, health, unemployment, poverty and do whatever possible to help in solving these national problems. Also speaking on the occasion, Daksha Vamdatt, head of Journalism and English Literature departments in the SGU strongly criticised vulgarity being portrayed through the print and electronic media and said that journalists ought to be very careful as they influenced a large number of readers and viewers. Kalpana Rao, a lecturer at the journalism department said that students should rather focus on developmental journalism than sensationalising news. She sharply criticised the role of newspapers in creating “communally sensitive situations” by printing provocative stories. Earlier Deputy Information Director Narhari Barot cited examples of social themes being taken up by journalism students of Ahmedabad. The vote of thanks was offered by Assistant Information Director Cecil Christie.

#### Objectivity *deconstructs* threat construction

Qadri 20 [ Nasser Qadr has a Ph.D., PMP and is Director of Data Science. ‘Framing terrorism and migration in the USA: the

role of the media in securitization processes.” 2020 University of Glasgow <https://theses.gla.ac.uk/77872/1/2020QadriPhD.pdf>] //aaditg

The wide audience that the press commands, the high level of engagement between the public and the press (as discussed in section 1.4.1), and the press’ powerful role as a mediator between political elites and the public makes it a particularly indispensable part of the securitization process. Per Entman (2004: 3), political elites may have the upper hand in shaping the domains of security discourse, but they are “conditioned in part by how fully the media cooperate.” The general public’s reliance on mass media – particularly accessible and low cost formats like television, print and radio news for political learning (Page et al., 1987: 24) – as the primary source of information on political content (Iyengar & Kinder, 1987; Krosnick & Kinder, 1990; McCombs & Shaw, 1972; Zaller, 1992) is likely intensified for security issues given that “[i]n times of crisis, citizens turn to political leaders and the media to make sense of new and frightening events” (Gadarian, 2010: 469). This layer of mediation between political elites and the public, however, can transform messages through partisan filters, as well as selection, emphasis and omission of certain features and frames, thus shaping audience evaluations and influencing voters’ political preferences (Dalton, Beck, & Huckfeldt, 1998; Page et al., 1987). In a democratic environment, these influences can trickle back up to shape “the public policy agenda, including the response to events by government officials and the security services” (Norris et al., 2003: 13). While other non-state actors – NGOs, religious elites, corporations, lobbyists – may have similar influences, their influence is constrained to specific domains and issue areas, and thus

#### Objective news *increases* democracy and brings awareness to rise of Hindu nationalism

Stockman 2/1 [Ms. Stockman is a member of the editorial board. 2/1/2022 “What an All-Women News Network in India Shows Us About Democracy” NYT <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/02/01/opinion/all-women-newspaper-india.html>] //aaditg

It started out as a literacy project. Dalit women, formerly known as untouchables, hand-wrote a newsletter about issues that mattered to them: Broken water pumps. Unpaved roads. Known rapists walking free. In 2002 they started a newspaper that covered everything from illegal mining to murders. Perhaps because Dalits make up about 20 percent of the population of the Indian state of Uttar Pradesh, some government officials started paying attention. Roads got paved. Toilets got built. Hospitals got stocked with medicines. “Almost every month, our reporting brings justice to people,” Kavita Devi, the paper’s editor in chief, told me in an email originally written in Hindi. Today the paper, Khabar Lahariya, whose name in Hindi means “news waves,” is a digital-first rural news network with its own talk shows and nearly 550,000 subscribers on YouTube. The publication ran up against the many familiar hurdles that can make news gathering as difficult as it is essential to the success of democracy. Reporters were intimidated and belittled. It was hard to get taken seriously in a country where media giants often hire high-caste men from big cities who kowtow to the party in office. The powerful don’t like pushback. And for a group of women who were viewed as powerless by virtue of their gender and caste, the power of the press was their only option. Democracy, their story shows us, requires not just courage and hard work but also constant vigilance and ingenuity in the face of change. The story of how newly literate rural women became investigative journalists is chronicled in a new documentary, “Writing With Fire,” which made the Academy Awards shortlist this year. If it wins, it will make history as the first film about India directed by Indians to receive an Oscar. It will also give a boost to democracy’s unsung champions at a time when democratic norms are under threat around the world. The movie opens with Meera, the chief reporter, interviewing a woman who recounts being raped in her home on six separate occasions in a single month. The woman’s husband tried to file a complaint, but police officers refused to take it. In the film, Meera walks into the police station and demands an explanation. “Journalism is the essence of democracy,” she says afterward. “When citizens demand their rights, it is us journalists who can take their demands to the government.” The married team that made the film, Sushmit Ghosh and Rintu Thomas, who are not Dalit, began shooting footage in 2016, the year Khabar Lahariya’s reporters made the leap to digital news. In the film, women, some of whom don’t have electricity in their homes, unwrap boxes of brand-new cellphones gingerly, like bricks of dynamite. By the end of the film, Meera and her colleagues are pushing through crowds at political rallies with their cellphone cameras rolling. Although the staff members are from marginalized groups — Dalits, tribal people and the so-called backward castes — they don’t see themselves as part of any political movement. First and foremost, they are reporters who claim objectivity and independence as core values. “A lot of people say: ‘Where do you think they get this crazy courage from? Is it that they have nothing to lose?’” Ms. Thomas told me. “I don’t see it like that. Each one of them is so aware of how rare it was to have had access to education and how much it means to people whose voice they have become. They know that if they don’t show up reporting that story, nobody else will.” Editors’ Picks? One Couple Made Their Choice in the San Fernando Valley. “Writing With Fire” is a road map of sorts for how to stand up for democracy even in the face of great danger. In 2017, Yogi Adityanath, a Hindu monk who once announced that he was preparing for a religious war, took the helm as chief minister in Uttar Pradesh. Members of the Hindu Youth Brigade, an organization he founded, brandished swords in the streets, vowing to protect Hindus and punish Muslims. Khabar Lahariya’s reporters created a game plan for how to cover the rise of Hindu nationalism. They tread carefully, assigning only the most experienced reporters. In the film, Meera interviews a leader of the Hindu Youth Brigade and gets him to explain his vision for the country. “My absolute priority is to protect our holy cows,” he tells her. Meera doesn’t have to add commentary to display the truth: In a place where women must beg for protection from rape, aspiring politicians were making a name for themselves by pledging to protect cows. Some high-caste journalists expressed shock at how quickly the political culture in India turned. In a matter of just a few years, people once considered extremists were suddenly running large swaths of the country. But reporters at Khabar Lahariya saw it coming. “They seem to know how to respond to the times we are in,” Mr. Ghosh said.

## Underview

#### [1] aff RVIs – 1) Skew – there’s no 2AC to develop carded offense and the 1AR has to over-cover since the 6 minute 2NR is devastating which encourages them to under-develop T in the NC and over-develop in the NR – need the RVI to develop good, in-depth T offense, 2)

**[2] Extinction comes first under any framework.**

**Pummer 15** [Theron, Junior Research Fellow in Philosophy at St. Anne's College, University of Oxford. “Moral Agreement on Saving the World” Practical Ethics, University of Oxford. May 18, 2015] AT

There appears to be lot of disagreement in moral philosophy. Whether these many apparent disagreements are deep and irresolvable, I believe there is at least one thing it is reasonable to agree on right now, whatever general moral view we adopt: that it is very important to reduce the risk that all intelligent beings on this planet are eliminated by an enormous catastrophe, such as a nuclear war. How we might in fact try to reduce such existential risks is discussed elsewhere. My claim here is only that we – whether we’re consequentialists, deontologists, or virtue ethicists – should all agree that we should try to save the world. According to consequentialism, we should maximize the good, where this is taken to be the goodness, from an impartial perspective, of outcomes. Clearly one thing that makes an outcome good is that the people in it are doing well. There is little disagreement here. If the happiness or well-being of possible future people is just as important as that of people who already exist, and if they would have good lives, it is not hard to see how reducing existential risk is easily the most important thing in the whole world. This is for the familiar reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. There are so many possible future people that reducing existential risk is arguably the most important thing in the world, even if the well-being of these possible people were given only 0.001% as much weight as that of existing people. Even on a wholly person-affecting view – according to which there’s nothing (apart from effects on existing people) to be said in favor of creating happy people – the case for reducing existential risk is very strong. As noted in this seminal paper, this case is strengthened by the fact that there’s a good chance that many existing people will, with the aid of life-extension technology, live very long and very high quality lives. You might think what I have just argued applies to consequentialists only. There is a tendency to assume that, if an argument appeals to consequentialist considerations (the goodness of outcomes), it is irrelevant to non-consequentialists. But ***that is a huge mistake.*** Non-consequentialism is the view that there’s more that determines rightness than the goodness of consequences or outcomes; ***it is not the view that the latter don’t matter***. Even John Rawls wrote, “All ethical doctrines worth our attention take consequences into account in judging rightness. One which did not would simply be irrational, crazy.” ***Minimally plausible versions of deontology and virtue ethics must be concerned in part with promoting the good***, from an impartial point of view. They’d thus imply very strong reasons to reduce existential risk, at least when this doesn’t significantly involve doing harm to others or damaging one’s character. What’s even more surprising, perhaps, is that even if our own good (or that of those near and dear to us) has much greater weight than goodness from the impartial “point of view of the universe,” indeed even if the latter is entirely morally irrelevant, we may nonetheless have very strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Even egoism, the view that each agent should maximize her own good, might imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. It will depend, among other things, on what one’s own good consists in. If well-being consisted in pleasure only, it is somewhat harder to argue that egoism would imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk – perhaps we could argue that one would maximize her expected hedonic well-being by funding life extension technology or by having herself cryogenically frozen at the time of her bodily death as well as giving money to reduce existential risk (so that there is a world for her to live in!). I am not sure, however, how strong the reasons to do this would be. But views which imply that, if I don’t care about other people, I have no or very little reason to help them are not even minimally plausible views (in addition to hedonistic egoism, I here have in mind views that imply that one has no reason to perform an act unless one actually desires to do that act). To be minimally plausible, egoism will need to be paired with a more sophisticated account of well-being. To see this, it is enough to consider, as Plato did, the possibility of a ring of invisibility – suppose that, while wearing it, Ayn could derive some pleasure by helping the poor, but instead could derive just a bit more by severely harming them. Hedonistic egoism would absurdly imply she should do the latter. To avoid this implication, egoists would need to build something like the meaningfulness of a life into well-being, in some robust way, where this would to a significant extent be a function of other-regarding concerns (see chapter 12 of this classic intro to ethics). But once these elements are included, we can (roughly, as above) argue that this sort of egoism will imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Add to all of this Samuel Scheffler’s recent intriguing arguments (quick podcast version available here) that most of what makes our lives go well would be undermined if there were no future generations of intelligent persons. On his view, my life would contain vastly less well-being if (say) a year after my death the world came to an end. So obviously if Scheffler were right I’d have very strong reason to reduce existential risk. ***We should also take into account moral uncertainty.*** What is it reasonable for one to do, when one is uncertain not (only) about the empirical facts, but also about the moral facts? I’ve just argued that there’s agreement among minimally plausible ethical views that we have strong reason to reduce existential risk – not only consequentialists, but also deontologists, virtue ethicists, and sophisticated egoists should agree. But even those (hedonistic egoists) who disagree should have a significant level of confidence that they are mistaken, and that one of the above views is correct. Even if they were 90% sure that their view is the correct one (and 10% sure that one of these other ones is correct), they would have pretty strong reason, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, to reduce existential risk. Perhaps most disturbingly still, even if we are only 1% sure that the well-being of possible future people matters, it is at least arguable that, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, reducing existential risk is the most important thing in the world. Again, this is largely for the reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. (For more on this and other related issues, see this excellent dissertation). Of course, it is uncertain whether these untold trillions would, in general, have good lives. It’s possible they’ll be miserable. It is enough for my claim that there is moral agreement in the relevant sense if, at least given certain empirical claims about what future lives would most likely be like, ***all minimally plausible moral views would converge on the conclusion that we should try to save the world***. While there are some non-crazy views that place significantly greater moral weight on avoiding suffering than on promoting happiness, for reasons others have offered (and for independent reasons I won’t get into here unless requested to), they nonetheless seem to be fairly implausible views. And even if things did not go well for our ancestors, I am optimistic that they will overall go fantastically well for our descendants, if we allow them to. I suspect that most of us alive today – at least those of us not suffering from extreme illness or poverty – have lives that are well worth living, and that things will continue to improve. Derek Parfit, whose work has emphasized future generations as well as agreement in ethics, described our situation clearly and accurately: “We live during the hinge of history. Given the scientific and technological discoveries of the last two centuries, the world has never changed as fast. We shall soon have even greater powers to transform, not only our surroundings, but ourselves and our successors. If we act wisely in the next few centuries, humanity will survive its most dangerous and decisive period. Our descendants could, if necessary, go elsewhere, spreading through this galaxy…. Our descendants might, I believe, make the further future very good. But that good future may also depend in part on us. If our selfish recklessness ends human history, we would be acting very wrongly.” (From chapter 36 of On What Matters)