# 1nc

**1NC PTX**

**Obama is winning on Iran, but pc is key**

**Rubin, 2/10/14** – columnist for the Washington Post (Jennifer, Washington Post, “Obama’s got no plan B on Iran” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/right-turn/wp/2014/02/10/obamas-got-no-plan-b-on-iran/>)

In a rare public move, AIPAC’s … Capitol Hill. This will likely be the first, and maybe only, issue discussed with lawmakers.

**Plan crushes PC and USPTO doesn’t shield**

Lee 11 – Timothy, covers technology policy, including copyright and patent law, telecom regulation, privacy, and free speech, 9/8/11, “Mostly pointless patent reform bill goes to Obama for signature,” http://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2011/09/mostly-pointless-patent-reform-bill-goes-to-obama-for-signature/)//DR. H

Weak sauce

Congress has been wrestling with … almost all the serious reform ideas wound up on the cutting room floor.

**Sanctions bill causes Israeli strikes**

**Perr, 12/24/13 -** B.A. in Political Science from Rutgers University; technology marketing consultant based in Portland, Oregon. Jon has long been active in Democratic politics and public policy as an organizer and advisor in California and Massachusetts. His past roles include field staffer for Gary Hart for President (1984), organizer of Silicon Valley tech executives backing President Clinton's call for national education standards (1997), recruiter of tech executives for Al Gore's and John Kerry's presidential campaigns, and co-coordinator of MassTech for Robert Reich (2002).(Jon, “Senate sanctions bill could let Israel take U.S. to war against Iran” Daily Kos, [http://www.dailykos.com/story/2013/12/24/1265184/-Senate-sanctions-bill-could-let-Israel-take-U-S-to-war-against-Iran#](http://www.dailykos.com/story/2013/12/24/1265184/-Senate-sanctions-bill-could-let-Israel-take-U-S-to-war-against-Iran)

As 2013 draws to close, the negotiations over the Iranian nuclear program have entered

AND

these costs and lead, potentially, to all-out regional war.

**An Israeli strike fails, but causes global war**

**Reuveny, 10** – professor in the School of Public and Environmental Affairs at Indiana University (Rafael, “Unilateral strike could trigger World War III, global depression” Gazette Xtra, 8/7, - See more at: <http://gazettextra.com/news/2010/aug/07/con-unilateral-strike-could-trigger-world-war-iii-/#sthash.ec4zqu8o.dpuf>)

A unilateral Israeli strike on Iran’s nuclear …World War III.

**1NC T**

**Tech assistance is definitely not topical – economic engagement is restricted to trade promotion and aid – the plan is not economic**

**Resnik, 1** – Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yeshiva University (Evan, Journal of International Affairs, “Defining Engagement” v54, n2, political science complete)

A REFINED DEFINITION OF ENGAGEMENT

In order to establish a more effective framework for dealing with unsavory regimes, I propose that we define … means rather than ends, does not delimit the types of states that can either engage or be engaged, explicitly encompasses contacts in multiple issue-areas, allows for the existence of multiple objectives in any given instance of engagement and, as will be shown below, permits the elucidation of multiple types of positive sanctions.

**1NC CP**

Text: **The Office of the United States Trade Representative should reform the Special 301 to include provisions for robust limitations and exceptions in IP agreements.**

**Solves the trade advantage**

**1ac author Rangnath 11** – (Rashmi, prior to joining Public Knowledge as a Staff Attorney and Director of PK's Global Knowledge Initiative, Rashmi Rangnath was a part time Law Clerk for special projects as well as a student Intern, working on copyright and patent law issues. Ms. Rangnath has also worked at the Association of Research Libraries as a student intern. “PK tells USTR: Adopt a More Rational Trade Policy” on Public Knowledge pg online at [http://publicknowledge.org/blog/pk-tells-ustr-adopt-more-rational-trade-polic//sd](http://publicknowledge.org/blog/pk-tells-ustr-adopt-more-rational-trade-polic/sd))

Today, we filed two sets of comments with the Office of the United States

AND

learn from the ACTA experience and adopt a more open and inclusive approach.

**1NC K**

**Representations of Middle East conflict are the root cause of policy failures and violence**

**Bilgin 05** – PhD International Politics, University of Wales, Aberystwyth, Department of International Relations Bilkent Univ (Pinar, Regional Security in the Middle East, p. 12-15)

Reflecting upon the history of US engagement with the Middle East, Douglas **Little identifies**

**AND**

**how they think security should be sought in this part of the world.**

**economic threat predictions will cause the US to manipulate regimes in a non-democratic fashion---link turns the whole case and empirically kills millions**

Neocleous, Prof of Gov, 8 [Mark Neocleous, Prof. of Government @ Brunel, *Critique of Security*, p95-]

In other words, the new international order moved very quickly to reassert the connection

AND

liberty’, and the beneﬁts to liberty of the security strategy proposed.111

**Our response is to interrogate the epistemological failures of the 1ac – debate is an academic forum and your job is to inculcate valuable understanding – having a coherent intellectual position is more important than specific political battles**

**Jones 99** – Professor International Politics @ Aberystwyth University (1999, Richard Wyn, Security, Strategy, and Critical Theory, p. 155-163)

The central political task of the intellectuals is to aid in the construction of a

AND

should act as both an inspiration and a challenge to critical security studies.

**1NC CO-OP**

**IPR dampens innovation – profit maximization creates stagnation – turns the AFF**

**Boldrin and Levine 08** – Michele Boldrin and David Levine, 1/2/2008. Joseph G. Hoyt Distinguished Professor of Economics in Arts and Sciences at Washington University in St. Louis and John H. Biggs Distinguished Professor of Economics in Arts and Sciences at Washington University in St. Louis. “Innovation Under Competition,” Against Intellectual Monopoly, <http://www.dklevine.com/general/intellectual/against.htm>.

We have just seen numerous examples showing the frenetic pace of creation in the absence

AND

example, where imitation is cheap and there is lots of fierce competition.

**LDC turn –**

**IPR prevents tech innovation in LDCs – that’s key to growth**

**UNCTAD 07 –** 9/7/2007. UN Conference on Trade and Development. “STRINGENT INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PROTECTION HAMPERS TECHNOLOGICAL PROGRESS IN THE WORLD´S POOREST COUNTRIES,” <http://www.unctad.org/Templates/webflyer.asp?docid=8593&intItemID=1528&lang=1>.

Obtaining technology is critical for LDCs. Intellectual property regimes need to be tailored to

AND

low innovation capacities onto a low-technology path, the report warns.

**Economic failure in developing nations triggers US economic collapse and state failure**

**Sachs 01 –** Jeffrey Sachs, 2001. Professor International Economic Development at Harvard. “The Strategic Significance of Global Inequality,” Washington Quarterly 24.3, Project Muse.

While the United States enjoyed rapid economic growth during the past 20 years, many

AND

because they are seen as the cause of the poor economic circumstances." 10

**Failed states trigger terrorism and great power wars**

**Yoo 05** – professor of law at UC Berkeley School of Law, visiting scholar at AEI (John, Northwestern University International Colloquium, “Failed states”, http://www.law.northwestern.edu/colloquium/international/Yoo.pdf, WEA)

Failed states pose perhaps the most dangerous threat to both American national security and international

AND

lack of economic development requires some answers to the problem of failed states.

**Extinction**

**Rhodes 09** – affiliate of the Center for International Security and Cooperation at Stanford University, Former visiting scholar at Harvard and MIT, and author of “The Making of the Atomic Bomb” which won the Pulitzer Prize in Nonfiction, National Book Award, and National Book Critics Circle Award (12/14, Richard, “Reducing the nuclear threat: The argument for public safety”, http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/op-eds/reducing-the-nuclear-threat-the-argument-public-safety)

The response was very different among nuclear and national security experts when Indiana Republican Sen

AND

nothing to do with those attacks in the name of sending a message.

**Disease turn** –

**Specifically turns disease – IPR protects Big Pharma profits at the expense of actually solving disease**

**Bello 04 –** Walden Bello, 7/14/2004. PhD in sociology from Princeton University, senior analyst at Focus on the Global South and the Transnational Institute, and columnist for Foreign Policy in Focus. “Big Pharma: Part of the Problem or Part of the Solution,” Focus on the Global South, <http://www.tni.org/detail_page.phtml?page=archives_bello_pharma>.

Estimates o–n the accelerating rate of HIV infection underline the scale of the

AND

&D paradigm that is not hostage to corporate waste and corporate profits.

**IPR turns biotech – decreases innovation**

**Boldrin and Levine 08** – Michele Boldrin and David Levine, 1/2/2008. Joseph G. Hoyt Distinguished Professor of Economics in Arts and Sciences at Washington University in St. Louis and John H. Biggs Distinguished Professor of Economics in Arts and Sciences at Washington University in St. Louis. “The Evil of Intellectual Monopoly,” Against Intellectual Monopoly, <http://www.dklevine.com/general/intellectual/against.htm>.

A recent “innovation” in patent law has been the enormous expansion in the types of “ideas” that can be patented. A case in … variety protection. We could go on the rest of the book talking about this subject, which is of utmost importance not just for the future of hundreds of millions of farmers in underdeveloped countries, but also for us, the mostly non-farmers living in developed countries. Still, this would take as too far astray from the IP-inefficiency topic that is the concern of this chapter.

**Extinction is not inevitable – biological improvements in the biosphere are unnecessary**

**Sagoff 97** – Mark, Senior Research Scholar – Institute for Philosophy and Public policy in School of Public Affairs – U. Maryland, William and Mary Law Review, “INSTITUTE OF BILL OF RIGHTS LAW SYMPOSIUM DEFINING TAKINGS: PRIVATE PROPERTY AND THE FUTURE OF GOVERNMENT REGULATION: MUDDLE OR MUDDLE THROUGH? TAKINGS JURISPRUDENCE MEETS THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT”, 38 Wm and Mary L. Rev. 825, March, L/N

Note – Colin Tudge - Research Fellow at the Centre for Philosophy at the London School of Economics. Frmr Zoological Society of London: Scientific Fellow and tons of other positions. PhD. Read zoology at Cambridge.

Simon Levin = Moffet Professor of Biology, Princeton. 2007 American Institute of Biological Sciences Distinguished Scientist Award 2008 Istituto Veneto di Scienze Lettere ed Arti 2009 Honorary Doctorate of Science, Michigan State University 2010 Eminent Ecologist Award, Ecological Society of America 2010 Margalef Prize in Ecology, etc… PhD

Although one may agree with ecologists such as Ehrlich and Raven that the earth stands

AND

sense, good for mankind. The most valuable things are quite useless.

**No disease can cause extinction**

**Posner 05 –** (Richard A., Judge U.S. Court of Appeals 7th Circuit, Professor Chicago School of Law, January 1, 2005, Skeptic, Altadena, CA, Catastrophe: Risk and Response, http://goliath.ecnext.com/coms2/gi\_0199-4150331/Catastrophe-the-dozen-most-significant.html#abstract)

Yet the fact that Homo sapiens has managed to survive every disease to assail it

AND

through gene splicing into a far more lethal pathogen than smallpox ever was.

**1NC TRADE**

**Deterioration of multilateral trade fosters benign protectionism NOT hostile trading blocs – prevents economic collapse**

**Hines 12** – co-director of Finance for the Future, Associate of the International Forum on Globalisation, former Co-ordinator of Greenpeace International's Economics, contributing reporter for The Guardian (Colin, “ Welcome to progressive protectionism,” The Guardian, 4/20/12, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/apr/20/progressive-protectionism>, //JPL)

Progressive protectionism by contrast would instead allow countries to **wean themselves off export dependence**

AND

then campaign for it. The time to start that debate is now.

**That causes global war**

**Royal, 10** – Jedediah Royal, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense (Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises, Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-215)

Less intuitive is how periods of **economic decline** may **increase the likelihood of** external **conflict**

AND

such, the view presented here should be considered ancillary to those views.

**Dis-incentivizing free trade will jumpstart south-south regional integration which spurs bilateral trade**

**James 08 –** Deborah James, 8/21/2008. Director of International Programs at Center for Economic and Policy Research. “Impasse: Are We Nearing the End of the Corporate Globalization Era?” AlterNet, <http://www.alternet.org/audits/95799/impasse:_are_we_nearing_the_end_of_the_corporate_globalization_era/?page=3>

Many fear that the collapse of the multilateral talks will lead to increased pressure for

AND

society does not keep working to ensure that the negotiations do not resume.

**Bilateral trade prevents war but multilateral trade causes it – both theoretical and empirical evidence goes neg**

**Martin, Mayer, and Thoenig 05 –** Philippe Martin, Thierry Mayer and Mathias Thoenig, September 2005. All at the Centre for Economic Policy Research, researcher at Ecole Nationale des Ponts et Chaussées, researcher at Université Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne, and Centre for Economic Policy Researcher and Department of Political Economics at the University of Geneva. "Make Trade not War?" CEPR Discussion Paper No. 5218 Available at SSRN: http://ssrn.com/abstract=822824.

This paper analyzes theoretically and empirically the relationship between trade and war. We show

AND

conflict. However, multilateral trade costs do not increase significantly with conflict.

**Emissions turn –**

**Dis-incentivizing free trade is key to prevent massive CO2 emissions — success accelerates emissions from transportation**

**Bello 08 –** Walden Bello, 7/31/2008. PhD in sociology from Princeton University, senior analyst at Focus on the Global South and the Transnational Institute, and columnist for Foreign Policy in Focus. “Derail Doha, Save the Climate,” GNN, <http://www.gnn.tv/articles/3788/Derail_Doha_Save_the_Climate>.

There’s something surreal about the ongoing World Trade Organization talks in Geneva, which aim

AND

-effects, like biofuels’ … what the New Economics Foundation describes as “free trade’s free ride on the global climate.”

**Unrestrained CO2 emissions cause extinction**

\*CO2 acidification is an independent impact scenario isolated from the warming debate – even if warming is past the tipping point, de-development still radically alters and stops CO2 emissions which solves ocean acidification

\*ocean acidification causes extinction – oceans absorb CO2 and acidify kills biodiversity and base of aquatic life which destroys the food chain and the complex interrelationships of species which makes life possible

**Sify** **10** – Sydney newspaper citing Ove Hoegh-Guldberg, professor at University of Queensland and Director of the Global Change Institute, and John Bruno, associate professor of Marine Science

at UNC (Sify News, “Could unbridled climate changes lead to human extinction?”, http://www.sify.com/news/could-unbridled-climate-changes-lead-to-human-extinction-news-international-kgtrOhdaahc.html

The findings of the comprehensive report: 'The impact of climate change on the world's

AND

warned, according to a GCI release. These findings were published in Science

**US-India relations are resilient – cooperation is occurring in every important area**

**Blake, 3-21-13 –** [Robert O., Assistant Secretary, Bureau of South and Central Asian Affairs, “The U.S.-India Partnership in the Asian Century,” <http://www.state.gov/p/sca/rls/rmks/2013/206539.htm>]

President Obama and Prime Minister Singh agreed to expand the Strategic Partnership further by establishing

AND

**, and strategic ties**. Let me describe some specific areas of engagement.

**No risk of India-Pakistan war – their evidence is fear-mongering**

**Mutti 09** – over a decade of expertise covering on South Asia geopolitics, Contributing Editor to Demockracy journal (James, 1/5, Mumbai Misperceptions: War is Not Imminent, http://demockracy.com/four-reasons-why-the-mumbai-attacks-wont-result-in-a-nuclear-war/)

Writer Amitav Ghosh divined a crucial connection between the two messages. “When commentators repeat the metaphor of 9/11, they are in effect pushing the Indian government to mount a comparable response.” Indeed, India’s opposition Hindu nationalist BJP has blustered, “Our response must be close to what the American response was.” Fearful of imminent … to resolve the situation without resorting to war. India and Pakistan have been warned by the US, Russia, and others not to let the situation end in war. India has been actively recruiting Pakistan’s closest allies – China and Saudi Arabia – to pressure Pakistan to act against militants, and the US has been in the forefront of pressing Pakistan for action. Iran too has expressed solidarity with India in the face of the attacks and is using its regional influence to bring more diplomatic pressure on Pakistan.

# 2nc

**CP**

**2NC CONDO – 1 K, 1 CP (0:43)**

**Conditionality is good – first our OFFENSE:**

**1. nuanced advocacy** – **conditionality enforces ideological flexibility which is the lynchpin of democratic deliberation – outweighs your offense**

**Hanson and Marcus 10** — Russell L. Hanson, Professor of Political Science at Indiana University, holds a Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of Minnesota, and George E. Marcus, Professor of Political Science at Williams College, holds a Ph.D. in Political Science from Northwestern University, 2010 (“Introduction: The Practice of Democratic Theory,” *Reconsidering the Democratic Public*, Edited by George E. Marcus and Russell L. Hanson, Published by Penn State Press, ISBN 0271042923, p. 14-15)

Hence, for citizens to engage in … and **ambivalence**, and a willingness to **explore problematic issues** with fellow citizens—all of which suggests that democratic citizens must be more like foxes than the hedgehogs of political philosophy and democratic revisionism.

**IP**

**2NC INNOVATION TURN (2:24)**

**b. sequencing – benefits to IPR only apply in the short-term – eliminating existing patents now increases innovation**

**Boldrin and Levine 08** – Michele Boldrin and David Levine, 1/2/2008. Joseph G. Hoyt Distinguished Professor of Economics in Arts and Sciences at Washington University in St. Louis and John H. Biggs Distinguished Professor of Economics in Arts and Sciences at Washington University in St. Louis. “Does Intellectual Monopoly Increase Innovation?” Against Intellectual Monopoly, <http://www.dklevine.com/general/intellectual/against.htm>.

Further, theoretical considerations also suggest that the response of innovation to the strengthening of

AND

while – by reducing the cost of innovation – increases innovation as well.

**b. creates an intellectual monopoly which stifles innovation – pharmaceuticals prove**

**Boldrin and Levine 08 –** Michele Boldrin and David Levine, 1/2/2008. Joseph G. Hoyt Distinguished Professor of Economics in Arts and Sciences at Washington University in St. Louis and John H. Biggs Distinguished Professor of Economics in Arts and Sciences at Washington University in St. Louis. “The Evil of Intellectual Monopoly,” Against Intellectual Monopoly, <http://www.dklevine.com/general/intellectual/against.htm>.

Economists and decent citizens alike are suspicious of monopoly. There are many good reasons

AND

enormous. That is IP- inefficiency at work on a global scale.

**c. increases trade secrecy – turns innovation**

**Boldrin and Levine 08 –** Michele Boldrin and David Levine, 1/2/2008. Joseph G. Hoyt Distinguished Professor of Economics in Arts and Sciences at Washington University in St. Louis and John H. Biggs Distinguished Professor of Economics in Arts and Sciences at Washington University in St. Louis. “Defenses of Intellectual Monopoly,” Against Intellectual Monopoly, <http://www.dklevine.com/general/intellectual/against.htm>.

A common argument in favor of patent law is that in order to get a

AND

with many CD players and in some cases, physically damaging to computers.

**IPR can’t boost innovation, we’ll win terminal defense –**

**a. business surveys prove patents not key to innovation**

**Boldrin and Levine 08 –** Michele Boldrin and David Levine, 1/2/2008. Joseph G. Hoyt Distinguished Professor of Economics in Arts and Sciences at Washington University in St. Louis and John H. Biggs Distinguished Professor of Economics in Arts and Sciences at Washington University in St. Louis. “Innovation Under Competition,” Against Intellectual Monopoly, <http://www.dklevine.com/general/intellectual/against.htm>.

Patenting is high and growing by …- legal means are still quite effective in appropriating rents.

**b. TFP data proves**

**Boldrin and Levine 08 –** Michele Boldrin and David Levine, 1/2/2008. Joseph G. Hoyt Distinguished Professor of Economics in Arts and Sciences at Washington University in St. Louis and John H. Biggs Distinguished Professor of Economics in Arts and Sciences at Washington University in St. Louis. “The Evil of Intellectual Monopoly,” Against Intellectual Monopoly, <http://www.dklevine.com/general/intellectual/against.htm>.

The second half of the 1990s witnessed an extraordinary increase in the number of new

AND

proportion to the continuing increase in the number of patents. Neither happened.

**c. empirics also prove**

**Boldrin and Levine 08** – Michele Boldrin and David Levine, 1/2/2008. Joseph G. Hoyt Distinguished Professor of Economics in Arts and Sciences at Washington University in St. Louis and John H. Biggs Distinguished Professor of Economics in Arts and Sciences at Washington University in St. Louis. “Does Intellectual Monopoly Increase Innovation?” Against Intellectual Monopoly, <http://www.dklevine.com/general/intellectual/against.htm>.

The issue, then, is the one we posed at the outset: does

AND

to well defined but altogether ‘standard’ property rights in competitive markets.4

**2NC DISEASE TURN (0:29)**

**IPR blocks cheap drugs – increases AIDS deaths**

**NYT 05** – New York Times, 1/18/2005. “India's Choice,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2005/01/18/opinion/18tues2.html?_r=1&oref=slogin>.

For an AIDS patient in a poor country lucky enough to get antiretroviral treatment,

AND

the generic competition that drives down the cost of brand-name drugs.

**2NC BIOTECH TURN (0:17)**

**IPR for biotech prevents development in poor countries – turns case**

**Boldrin and Levine 08 –** Michele Boldrin and David Levine, 1/2/2008. Joseph G. Hoyt Distinguished Professor of Economics in Arts and Sciences at Washington University in St. Louis and John H. Biggs Distinguished Professor of Economics in Arts and Sciences at Washington University in St. Louis. “The Evil of Intellectual Monopoly,” Against Intellectual Monopoly, <http://www.dklevine.com/general/intellectual/against.htm>.

Back to economic development. The agricultural sector is a small fraction of national income

AND

of the US government, to claim property rights on the original varieties.

# 1nr

**DEFENSE**

**Law of economic exchange prove no conflict from protectionism**

**Ikenson 12 –** [March 5th, Daniel, [Daniel Ikenson](http://www.cato.org/people/daniel-ikenson) is director of the Herbert A. Stiefel Center for Trade Policy Studies at the Cato Institute, <http://www.cato.org/publications/free-trade-bulletin/trade-policy-priority-one-averting-uschina-trade-war>]

An emerging narrative in 2012 is that …based system of trade. And that suggests that the **kerfuffle is containable** and **the recent trend reversible**.1

**2NC WAR TURN (1:11)**

**The theory of trade costs post-war prove bilateral trade solves war while multilateral trade causes it**

**Martin, Mayer, and Thoenig 05 –** Philippe Martin, Thierry Mayer and Mathias Thoenig, September 2005. All at the Centre for Economic Policy Research, researcher at Ecole Nationale des Ponts et Chaussées, researcher at Université Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne, and Centre for Economic Policy Researcher and Department of Political Economics at the University of Geneva. "Make Trade not War?" CEPR Discussion Paper No. 5218 Available at SSRN: http://ssrn.com/abstract=822824

Testable implication 1: An increase in bilateral imports of i from j, as

AND

is indeed either small or **insignificant** in the post World War II period.

**Multilateral trade doesn’t solve war, more reasons –**

**a. they conflate correlation with causation**

**Van de Haar 10 –** ( Edwin van de Haar, PhD in political science and MSc from the London School of Economics in IR, June 2010, “The Liberal Divide over Trade, Peace and War”, International Relations 24: 132, <http://ire.sagepub.com/content/24/2/132)FS>

A second point for further elaboration is that Hume and Smith note that international trade

**AND**

are to be found in combined research into risk factors and context.143

**b. economic nationalism is inevitable**

**Goldstone 07** – PhD candidate in the Department of Political Science and a member of the Security Studies Program at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He is a non-resident research fellow at the Center for Peace and Security Studies, Georgetown University (P.R.,”Does Globalization Bring War or Peace?”. September 25. http://www.alternet.org/audits/62848/?page=entire)

American policymakers should beware claims of globalization's axiomatic pacifying effects. Trade creates vested interests in peace, but these … it may prove no more than a **placebo**.

**c. best quantitative studies flow negative**

**Pevehouse 04** – political science professor at U Wisconsin (Jon, The Journal of Politics, 66.1, “Interdependence Theory and the Measurement of International Conflict”, JSTOR, WEA)

Conclusions Although the results presented here are certainly not the final answer to the question

AND

panacea for the vagaries of nor is it a blight on interstate relations.

**d. last 100 years disproves their theory**

**Ebeling 02 –** (Richard M., Ludwig von Mises Professor of Economics Hillsdale College in Hillsdale, Michigan and an adjunct scholar of the Mises Institute, 3/18, pg. <http://www.mises.org/story/915>)

In the post-Soviet era, and in spite of the end of the

AND

all aspects of social and economic life subservient to the ends of war.

**INDOPAK DEFENSE**

**XT – INDIA RELS INEV**

**Defense ties inevitable – and that outweighs the internal link**

**Carter 4-10-13 –** [Ashton, Deputy Defense Secretary, “DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ASHTON B. CARTER DELIVERS REMARKS AT THE CENTER FOR STRATEGIC AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES ON THE U.S. DEFENSE REBALANCE TO ASIA,” <http://www.militaryaerospace.com/news/2013/04/10/deputy-secretary-of-defense-ashton-b-carter-delivers-remarks-at-the-center-for-strategic-and-interna.html>]

CARTER: The thing I'd point to -- there's much you could point to in

AND

power and capability of the Indian military, but bring us closer together.

**No risk of India-Pakistan war – their evidence is fear-mongering**

**Mutti 09** – over a decade of expertise covering on South Asia geopolitics, Contributing Editor to Demockracy journal (James, 1/5, Mumbai Misperceptions: War is Not Imminent, http://demockracy.com/four-reasons-why-the-mumbai-attacks-wont-result-in-a-nuclear-war/)

Writer Amitav Ghosh divined a crucial connection between the two messages. “When commentators repeat the metaphor of 9/11, they are in effect pushing the Indian government to mount a comparable response.” Indeed, India’s opposition Hindu nationalist BJP has blustered, “Our response must be close to what the American response was.” Fearful of … to resolve the situation without resorting to war. India and Pakistan have been warned by the US, Russia, and others not to let the situation end in war. India has been actively recruiting Pakistan’s closest allies – China and Saudi Arabia – to pressure Pakistan to act against militants, and the US has been in the forefront of pressing Pakistan for action. Iran too has expressed solidarity with India in the face of the attacks and is using its regional influence to bring more diplomatic pressure on Pakistan.

**The war won't escalate or cause extinction**

**Dyer 02 –** (5/24, Gwinette, Hamilton Spectator, "Nuclear war a possibility over Kashmir", Lexis, WEA)

For those who do not live in the subcontinent, the most important fact is that the damage would be largely confined to the region. The Cold War is over, the … wider world from fallout.

People over 40 have already lived through a period when the great powers conducted hundreds of nuclear tests in the atmosphere, and they are mostly still here.

**XT – NO WAR**

**Their impact card is wrong**

**Quinlan 2005** – Consulting Senior Fellow in the IISS South Asia Programme, former Permanent Under-Secretary of State for Defence 1988–92 and Director of the Ditchley Foundation (Michael, Survival, Volume 47 Issue 3, "India-Pakistan deterrence revisited", Informaworld, WEA)

It is impossible to reduce to a single ‘sound-bite’ any overall judgement

AND

in principle of being done collaboratively – to enhance stability and reduce danger.

**No interest in fighting on either side—empirically proven**

**Ali 2005** – Balsillie Fellow at the Centre for International Governance Innovation (11/13, Asim, with The Record, Centre for International Governance Innovation, "India goes soft on Pakistan to please the U.S.", http://www.cigionline.org/articles/2005/11/india-goes-soft-pakistan-please-us, WEA)

After a series of co-ordinated bomb blasts in New Delhi that killed 62 people and injured hundreds, India has restrained from blaming its arch-rival … on the main parliament building in New Delhi.

The diplomats said this reflected progress in the peace process.