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# Impact China Environment Worsening

### Too Many Barriers to Environmental Solvency in China

#### So-called ecological consciousness is irrelevant: Chinese economic goals ensure continued eco-degradation

Zhihe Wang, professor of philosophy at Harbin Institute of Technology, and director of the Institute for Postmodern Development of China, et al, November 2014

"The Ecological Civilization Debate in China," Monthly Review, http://monthlyreview.org/2014/11/01/the-ecological-civilization-debate-in-china/ (accessed 5/15/2016)

China is facing many serious environmental issues, including pollution in the air, groundwater, and soil. These problems have increased since China surpassed Japan as the world’s second-largest economy—and in spite of the Chinese government’s 2007 proposal to build an “ecological civilization,” and writing “ecological civilization” into the Chinese Communist Party’s (CCP) constitution in 2012. Take air pollution as an example; not long ago, cities such as Beijing, Tianjin, and Shanghai witnessed record-breaking smog. Concentrations of fine particulate matter (PM 2.5) reached more than forty times recommended safety levels. In China, up to half a million die each year because of air pollution, according to Chen Zhu, the former health minister of China.

#### Rules of standing prevent legal solutions for environmental damage

Liu Jianqiang, Beijing editor of China Dialogue, February 7, 2013

"New environmental protection law would exacerbate pollution in China," China Dialogue, https://www.chinadialogue.net/blog/6171-New-environmental-protection-law-would-exacerbate-pollution-in-China/en (accessed 5/15/2016)

But according to China's Civil Procedure Law, in order to have the right to sue one must have "a direct connection with the case". This means that to instigate a civil dispute one must be someone whose personal or property rights have been directly damaged by illegal behaviour. This stipulation puts the affected person at a great disadvantage because environmental damage is mainly indirect or intangible, as in the case of the many "cancer villages" caused by chemical pollution, where those affected find it difficult to come up with clear proof that the disease is related to the pollution from a particular factory. This is even more the case for the majority of damaged rivers, animals and forests which do not have so-called "directly affected people" who can speak on their behalf.

### Too Many Barriers to Environmental Solvency in China

#### China has no eco-consciousness; their policymakers have an anthropocentric wordview that prevents them from true environmental solvency

Zhihe Wang, professor of philosophy at Harbin Institute of Technology, and director of the Institute for Postmodern Development of China, et al, November 2014

"The Ecological Civilization Debate in China," Monthly Review, http://monthlyreview.org/2014/11/01/the-ecological-civilization-debate-in-china/ (accessed 5/15/2016)

The influence of the anthropocentric worldview and values on modern China is so deep that even the purpose of the Environmental Protection Laws is defined as “safeguarding human health and facilitating the development of Socialist modernization.”28 It is clear then that intrinsic to the law is an anthropocentric worldview, which “can no longer fulfill the needs of environmental protection.”29 It cannot undertake the extremely important task of creating an ecological civilization.

#### Chinese anti-pollution laws are ineffective and irrelevant

Zhihe Wang, professor of philosophy at Harbin Institute of Technology, and director of the Institute for Postmodern Development of China, et al, November 2014

"The Ecological Civilization Debate in China," Monthly Review, http://monthlyreview.org/2014/11/01/the-ecological-civilization-debate-in-china/ (accessed 5/15/2016)

However, since September 13, 1979 (when the Environmental Protection Law was passed by the Standing Committee of the National People’s Congress), China has enacted many harsh laws against pollution—“some even stricter than in the United States.”6 Wang Canfa, one of China’s top environmental lawyers, says, “In the past 30 years, China’s modern environmental law has developed from nothing to an independent and important section of China’s law system.” Few areas of the law have grown more rapidly.7 During this period, China enacted nine laws on environmental protection (such as the Water Pollution Prevention Law, the Solid Waste Pollution Prevention and Control Law, and the Radioactive Pollution Prevention and Control Law) and seventeen laws on resource efficiency (including the Renewable Energy Law, the Cleaner Production Promotion Law, and the water law). To this can be added fifty relevant administrative laws and regulations on environmental protection. In addition, 660 local government regulations and 800 national standards related to environmental protection were enacted. According to an official in the Environmental Protection Ministry, Li Xuan, environmental law is unique in that there is a priority to enact environmental law every year, and in fact with “several environmental laws and regulations…issued within one year.”8 China’s environmental law has made huge progress, and is in many ways unprecedented in history. China should be indebted to the world, especially the environmentalists and environmental legal professionals in the West, for enabling this accomplishment, given that they helped “guide and open the progress of China’s environmental law.” But, ironically, the effect of those laws and regulations are very limited, even “useless” in the judgment of Wang Jin, a Peking University professor and expert in environmental law.10 Although many may not agree with Wang’s judgment, the ineffectiveness of China’s green laws is a fact and can hardly be denied. Environmental legislation has been unable to prevent the environmental situation from deteriorating. In recent years, “the disputes caused by environmental pollution have increased 20% yearly but less than 1% of them chose litigation to resolve these disputes.”

### Chinese Infrastructure Kills the Environment

#### Dams kill fish

Jason Lee, staffwriter for china.org, April 20, 2016

"Hydroelectric power stations affect fish migration," China.org, http://www.china.org.cn/environment/2016-04/20/content\_38286610.htm

The amount of fish fries in the Yangtze River is less than one three-hundredth of what it was in the 1950s, and some rare fish are even dying out, according to the Chinese Academy of Sciences. The main reason is hydroelectric dams built upstream in the river's tributaries. Upstream in the Daning River in southwest China's Chongqing, torrential torrents disappear, giving way to dry riverbed. The hydroelectric dam blocks not only water, but also migrating fish.

#### Massive desertification now

Marijn Nieuwenhuis, Teaching Fellow in International Relations and East Asia, University of Warwick, May 16, 2016

"China’s desertification is causing trouble across Asia," The Conversation, http://theconversation.com/chinas-desertification-is-causing-trouble-across-asia-59417 (accessed 5/16/2016)

Creeping desertification in China is swallowing thousands of square kilometres of productive soil every year. It’s a challenge of gigantic and unprecedented proportions. The rate of desertification increased throughout the second half of last century and, although this trend has since stabilised, the situation remains very serious. More than a quarter of the entire country is now degraded or turning to desert, thanks to “overgrazing by livestock, over cultivation, excessive water use, or changes in climate”.

### Policy Reforms Fail

#### Pollution is unsolvable with current government

Richard Smith, author of To Save the Planet, Turn the World Upside Down, June 21, 2015

"China's Communist-Capitalist Ecological Apocalypse," Truthout, http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/31478-china-s-communist-capitalist-ecological-apocalypse (accessed 5/15/2016)

A year after Xi Jinping launched his "war on pollution," the official press describes Beijing as "all but unlivable." A study released in February 2015 declared that living in China's cities is "as deadly as smoking." (87) The government's ambitious plans to improve water quality and safety have likewise failed. The 12th Five-Year Plan goal of "completely solving rural drinking water issues" by the end of 2015 "will not be met, and some villages are going backward because of scarcity and pollution." Urban water safety has not improved and even bottled water is often contaminated. (88) Moreover, the center itself is conflicted about enforcing its own pollution regulations because the central government, as much as local governments, needs to maximize growth to meet its plan targets and maintain employment to keep the peace. So while it talks about cracking down on pollution, more often than not Beijing also has to prioritize job creation over environmental protection. (89) Therefore, so long as there is no real separation of powers, these trends can be expected to continue and China's pollution problems will remain essentially unsolvable.

#### Policy reforms are too little too late

The Economist, August 10, 2013

"The East is Grey," The Economist, http://www.economist.com/news/briefing/21583245-china-worlds-worst-polluter-largest-investor-green-energy-its-rise-will-have (accessed 5/15/2016)

The “airpocalypse” injected a new urgency into local debate about the environment—and produced a green-policy frenzy a few months later. In three weeks from the middle of June, the government unveiled a series of reforms to restrict air pollution. It started the country’s first carbon market, made prosecuting environmental crimes easier and made local officials more accountable for air-quality problems in their areas. It also said China—meaning companies as well as government—would spend $275 billion over the next five years cleaning up the air. Even by Chinese standards that is serious money, equivalent to Hong Kong’s GDP or twice the size of the annual defence budget. Is this China’s turning-point? Many environmentalists, both in the country and outside, fear it is too little, too late. A study released by America’s National Academy of Sciences in July found that air pollution in the north of China reduces life expectancy by five-and-a-half years. The rivers are filthy, the soil contaminated. The government has long known this and attempted to clean things up. Yet still the smog comes.

#### Anti-pollution controls massively increase carbon emissions

William J. Kelly, correspondent for Inside Climate News, February 13, 2014

"China's Plan to Clean Up Air in Cities Will Doom the Climate, Scientists Say," Inside Climate News, http://insideclimatenews.org/news/20140213/chinas-plan-clean-air-cities-will-doom-climate-scientists-say (accessed 5/15/2015)

China is erecting huge industrial complexes in remote areas to convert coal to synthetic fuel that could make the air in its megacities cleaner. But the complexes use so much energy that the carbon footprint of the fuel is almost double that of conventional coal and oil, spelling disaster for earth's climate, a growing chorus of scientists is warning.

### Chinese Economic Growth Degrades Environment

#### China still prioritizes growth over the environment

The Economist, August 10, 2013

"The East is Grey," The Economist, http://www.economist.com/news/briefing/21583245-china-worlds-worst-polluter-largest-investor-green-energy-its-rise-will-have (accessed 5/15/2016)

So far, though, tinkering with the promotion system has not worked. According to a study for America’s National Bureau of Economic Research, mayors who spent money on environmental projects (pollution-treatment plants and the like) in 2000-09 had a lower chance of promotion than those investing in infrastructure that boosted the economy, such as roads. Growth remains the main consideration locally and it is not yet clear that the centre can change this.

#### Growth inevitably trades off with environmental protection and is China’s central approach to policymaking

Junjie Zhang, Assistant Professor, School of International Relations & Pacific Studies, University of California, San Diego, September 2012

"Delivering Environmentally Sustainable Economic Growth: The Case of China," Asia Society, http://asiasociety.org/files/pdf/Delivering\_Environmentally\_Sustainable\_Economic\_Growth\_Case\_China.pdf (accessed 5/15/2016)

The Chinese government considers economic growth to be its central task, so much so that economic performance is linked to the career advancement of government officials. Incentivized by both financial rewards and political futures, policy makers have a vested interested in, and unparalleled enthusiasm for, growing the economy. Pro-growth policies have contributed to China’s dramatic economic expansion. However, this rapid economic growth has created a series of social and environmental problems. Environmental problems have been prevalent since the beginning of China’s modern industrialization (Zhang, 2000). From 1958 to 1960, the “Great Leap Forward”—a collectivization campaign aimed at transforming the natural environment to achieve rapid industrialization—caused severe damage to China’s environment and natural resources. Because Chairman Mao Zedong regarded steel and grain as the two pillars of the economy, an overemphasis on iron and steel production stimulated the construction of numerous backyard steel furnaces, resulting in deforestation, pollution, and waste. Likewise, the high target of grain production led to the massive construction of dams, overexploitation of groundwater, extinction of wildlife, and destruction of vegetation. Ignorance of the environmental effects of industrial growth during China’s collective economy period demonstrated that pollution and ecological degradation are not uniquely capitalist or market-created phenomena.

### Chinese Economic Growth Degrades Environment

#### All sources of economic growth in China deplete resources and damage the environment

Junjie Zhang, Assistant Professor, School of International Relations & Pacific Studies, University of California, San Diego, September 2012

"Delivering Environmentally Sustainable Economic Growth: The Case of China," Asia Society, http://asiasociety.org/files/pdf/Delivering\_Environmentally\_Sustainable\_Economic\_Growth\_Case\_China.pdf (accessed 5/15/2016)

The Chinese economy is heavily dependent on secondary industry, which accounted for 46.8 percent of GDP in 2010. It has the highest volume of production in the world for major industrial products, including crude steel, coal, electricity, cement, fertilizer, and woven cotton fabrics. Its crude petroleum production was ranked as fourth globally (National Bureau of Statistics of China, 2012). In addition, medium- and small-sized enterprises that have stimulated the economic boom have a low environmental performance and require a high use of raw materials. Urbanization and transportation systems have caused the environmental quality in cities to decline. Coal mining, transportation, and combustion have also degraded the ecosystem and polluted rural and urban areas. Rapid industrial development has relied on increasing inputs of energy, natural resources, and environmental services. As a consequence, resource depletion and environmental pollution have become serious problems that require the rethinking of governmental policies.

#### China relies on foreign investment, sparking an inevitable race-to-the-bottom in environmental protection

Junjie Zhang, Assistant Professor, School of International Relations & Pacific Studies, University of California, San Diego, September 2012

"Delivering Environmentally Sustainable Economic Growth: The Case of China," Asia Society, http://asiasociety.org/files/pdf/Delivering\_Environmentally\_Sustainable\_Economic\_Growth\_Case\_China.pdf (accessed 5/15/2016)

The “race to the bottom” hypothesis posits that international trade and investment create downward pressure on environmental regulations in host countries. As different jurisdictions compete to chase investment and raise competitiveness, they tend to lower environmental standards to reduce costs of production. The consequence is that international trade and investment will lead to deterioration of the environment. This effect may also occur at the subnational level. Local Chinese governments have great incentives to attract FDI, which is factored into governmental employees’ performance reviews. Although environmental standards are set at the national level, local governments can achieve different de facto regulations by relaxing or tightening environmental enforcement. These incentives partly explain why environmental quality has significant spatial heterogeneity, even if the same environmental standard is enacted across the country. This concern is particularly worrisome for the least developed regions that lack other capacities to attract investment besides environmental quality. These regions are mostly in western China and are ecologically sensitive, which makes the possible race to the bottom effect even more detrimental.

### Environmental Problems Kill Chinese Economy

#### Environmental degradation kills Chinese growth

Eleanor Albert and Beina Xu, online writer/editors for Council on Foreign Relations, January 18, 2016

"China's Environmental Crisis," Council on Foreign Relations Backgrounder, http://www.cfr.org/china/chinas-environmental-crisis/p12608 (accessed 5/15/2016)

Environmental degradation threatens to undermine the country’s growth and exhausts public patience with the pace of reform. It has also bruised China’s international standing and endangered domestic stability as the ruling party faces increasing scrutiny and public discontent.

#### China’s global partners face disincentives to cooperate with China based on pollution

Eleanor Albert and Beina Xu, online writer/editors for Council on Foreign Relations, January 18, 2016

"China's Environmental Crisis," Council on Foreign Relations Backgrounder, http://www.cfr.org/china/chinas-environmental-crisis/p12608 (accessed 5/15/2016)

The damage has also affected China’s economic prospects as it continues to pursue extractive resources abroad, such as oil and other fossil fuels. Its economic partners, particularly in the developing world, face costly environmental burdens attached with doing business with China, write CFR’s Economy and Michael Levi in By All Means Necessary, their book on China’s quest for resources.

### Government Can’t Move Away from Growth Paradigm

#### CCP has to prioritize growth over the environment to create jobs and stay in power

Richard Smith, author of To Save the Planet, Turn the World Upside Down, June 21, 2015

"China's Communist-Capitalist Ecological Apocalypse," Truthout, http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/31478-china-s-communist-capitalist-ecological-apocalypse (accessed 5/15/2016)

The Chinese Communist Party is locked in a death spiral. It can't rein in corruption because the party is built on corruption, thrives on corruption and can't police itself. It can't rein in ravenous resource consumption and suicidal pollution because, given its dependence on the market to generate new jobs, it has to prioritize growth over the environment like capitalist governments everywhere.

#### China’s export industries are inevitably unsustainable

Richard Smith, author of To Save the Planet, Turn the World Upside Down, June 21, 2015

"China's Communist-Capitalist Ecological Apocalypse," Truthout, http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/31478-china-s-communist-capitalist-ecological-apocalypse (accessed 5/15/2016)

Most of China's coastal export industries are geared to producing unsustainable, disposable products, as noted above. There is just no way to have a sustainable economy in China or anywhere if we don't abolish the throwaway repetitive-consumption industries in China and around the world.

#### China’s claim to reduce carbon emissions is a sham—would have to impose across-the-board economic contraction to do it

Richard Smith, author of To Save the Planet, Turn the World Upside Down, June 21, 2015

"China's Communist-Capitalist Ecological Apocalypse," Truthout, http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/31478-china-s-communist-capitalist-ecological-apocalypse (accessed 5/15/2016)

Climate scientists tell us that, given all the failed promises to date, the backpedaling and soaring carbon dioxide emissions, we now face a "climate emergency." On present trends we're on course to a 4 to 6-degree Celsius warming before the end of this century: If we don't radically suppress fossil fuel burning over the next few decades to keep the warming below the 2-degree Celsius threshold, planetary heating will accelerate beyond any human power to stop it and global ecological collapse will be unavoidable. To have a chance of staying below 2 degrees, the industrialized nations and China must cut carbon emissions by 40 to 70 percent globally by 2050 as compared to 2010, which would require cuts on the order of 6 to 10 percent per year. (99) China would have to cut its industrial emissions by 30 to 90 percent as compared to 2010, the variance depending upon expected growth rates and other assumptions. The only way China could suppress its greenhouse gas emissions by anything like that amount would be to impose a drastic across-the-board economic contraction, including radical retrenchments and shutdowns of most of the industries that have been built up in the last three decades of market mania.

### Environmental Degradation Sparks Unrest

#### Threats to public health spurring massive unrest

Richard Smith, author of To Save the Planet, Turn the World Upside Down, June 21, 2015

"China's Communist-Capitalist Ecological Apocalypse," Truthout, http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/31478-china-s-communist-capitalist-ecological-apocalypse (accessed 5/15/2016)

China's Communist Party seems all-powerful and unassailable. But it's not. It's frightened, desperate and disintegrating. It faces unprecedented threats: near daily industrial strikes; militant and often violent protests over land grabs, chemical plants, incinerators, power plants and the like; "terrorist" attacks from Xinjiang; and even worse, subversive thought that just can't be stopped by the Great Firewall. Chai Jing's Under the Dome had 300 million downloads before the government took it down off the web after a week and a half. Who knows what spark will light the next social explosion? Resistance is growing as pollution and public health worsen, as it becomes harder to sustain that 8 percent growth rate to stave off unrest, as Xi Jinping's war on corruption only serves to publicize the unregenerate character of the entire Communist Party and underscore its incapacity to solve any of China's huge problems.

#### Pollution is number one reason for unrest

Michael Graham Richard, staffwriter for Treehugger, March 8, 2013

"Pollution Now #1 Cause of Unrest in China," Treehugger, http://www.treehugger.com/environmental-policy/pollution-now-1-cause-social-unrest-china.html (accessed 5/15/2016)

This has been building up for years, as China rapidly industrialized and urbanized without much regard for the air, water, and land on which the life of its citizens depend. Chen Jiping, a former leading member of the party’s Committee of Political and Legislative Affairs, recently told the media that pollution has now replaced land disputes as the main cause of social unrest in the middle kingdom.

# Impact China Environment Improving

### Chinese Leadership Has Developed Ecological Consciousness

#### Chinese leadership has developed environmental consciousness and is incorporating ecology into economic planning

Kelsie Defrancia, Program Manager for the Earth Institute's Research Program on Sustainability Policy and Management, July 8, 2015

"Embracing a New Environmental Era in China," State of the Planet, http://blogs.ei.columbia.edu/2015/07/08/embracing-a-new-environmental-era-in-china/ (accessed 5/15/2016)

As China incorporates environmental considerations into its economic planning process, its government appears to be carefully examining the relationship between sustainability and broader development goals. China’s government has been ambitious in setting environmental targets and the importance of sustainable development is widely accepted in China.

#### New Chinese leadership philosophy strives for ecological civilization

Catherine Brahic, Features Editor at New Scientist, June 11, 2014

"China battles to be first ecological civilisation," New Scientist, https://www.newscientist.com/article/mg22229733-400-china-battles-to-be-first-ecological-civilisation/ (accessed 5/15/2016)

So you want to live in a country that is guided by a philosophy of “ecological civilisation”, run by people with the vision to implement policies that will benefit their children even if it costs more in the short term? Move to China. Not convinced? Last week, news circulated that China is considering limiting its greenhouse gas emissions so that they peak in 2030, followed by an orchestrated fall. It was one man’s view, expressed at a Beijing conference, not an official announcement. But He Jiankun is chairman of China’s Advisory Committee on Climate Change, and his words are in line with actions China is now taking to address global warming.

### Chinese Leadership Has Developed Ecological Consciousness

#### China has built ecovillages, wind power, and is mass producing electric vehicles

Douglas Todd, columnist and author of Cascadia: The Elusive Utopia, May 3, 2016

"Can China save us from ecological destruction?" Vancouver Sun, http://vancouversun.com/opinion/columnists/can-china-save-canada-from-ecological-destruction (accessed 5/15/2016)

He backs the authors of Organic Marxism in noting the rise of model “eco-villages” throughout rural China. China has also extensively developed wind power, and he says it could be working on mass-producing electric cars. Cunningham is also impressed by how China has “gone further than any other Western country” in constructing ecological buildings. China now creates energy from the wind tunnels formed by skyscrapers (which often create havoc in downtown Toronto).

#### China is embracing green tech

Elena Fedichinka and Evegny Shvarts, staff members of World Wildlife Federation Russia, May 13, 2016

"Will Chinese Factories Pollute the Russian Far East?" Russia Beyond the Headlines, http://rbth.com/opinion/2016/05/13/will-chinese-factories-pollute-the-russian-far-east\_592659 (accessed 5/15/2016)

Last year, the government adopted a new program, titled ‘The Integrated Reform for Ecological Progress,’ which was scheduled for the thirteenth 5-year plan commencing this year. To clean up the environment, China’s economy will go through a green shift: embracing new and green technologies, restructuring in favor of knowledge-based sectors and manufacturing of high added-value products.

### New Laws and Policies Solve Environment

#### New laws allow unlimited fines, presenting existential threat to businesses that pollute

Jost Wubbeke, head of Programme Economy & Technology of the Mercator Institute for China Studies, April 25, 2014

"The three-year battle for China’s new environmental law," China Dialogue, https://www.chinadialogue.net/article/show/single/en/6938-The-three-year-battle-for-China-s-new-environmental-law (accessed 5/15/2016)

The best parts of the new law: Three provisions can serve to illustrate the particular robustness of the law. The most forceful instrument it entails is a day-based punishment system. The law of 1989 allows environmental authorities only to impose one-time penalties on polluting enterprises. The maximum amount is very low, so the penalty does not represent a serious threat to enterprises if they refuse to comply. The revision now enables the Environmental Protection Bureaus to fine polluting enterprises on a daily basis as long as they fail to bring their operations in line with environmental regulations. As there is no maximum limit for the fine, environmental authorities can now pose an existential threat to non-compliant enterprises. If this provision holds up in implementation, it can become a game changer for the power dynamic between environmental agencies and polluters.

#### Plan is comprehensive—economic incentives, property rights for nature, law enforcement

Jun Mai, Senior China reporter at South China Morning Post, September 11, 2015

"Beijing approves masterplan to protect environment after decades of breakneck economic development," South China Morning Post, http://www.scmp.com/news/china/policies-politics/article/1857440/beijing-approves-masterplan-protect-environment-after (accessed 5/15/2016)

Beijing has approved a masterplan for environmental protection reforms that deals with economic incentives, property rights for natural resources, land planning, officials' performance appraisals, and law enforcement.

#### Shift to service economy will solve pollution problems

The Economist, August 10, 2013

"The East is Grey," The Economist, http://www.economist.com/news/briefing/21583245-china-worlds-worst-polluter-largest-investor-green-energy-its-rise-will-have (accessed 5/15/2016)

Against that, and more importantly, the structure of the economy will change. Services account for 43% of GDP, a much lower proportion than in other middle-income countries. China can reasonably expect to increase the share of services, which are far less polluting, over the next 20 years.

### New Laws and Policies Solve Environment

#### Emissions falling now

Liu Qin, editor in China Dialogue's Beijing office, October 30, 2015

"China’s cadres ready 'greener' Five Year Plan," The Third Pole, https://www.thethirdpole.net/2015/10/30/chinas-cadres-ready-greener-five-year-plan/ (accessed 5/15/2016)

Chen Jining said earlier this month that China’s environment has benefitted from the changes brought in during the 12th FYP. According to a report from the minister, from 2011 to 2014 emissions of the key pollutants ammonia, sulphur dioxide and nitrogen oxides fell 9.8%, 12.9% and 8.6% respectively.

#### China has changed its dam-building policy to reflect ecological concerns

Stuart Leavenworth, freelance writer for National Geographic, May 12, 2016

"China May Shelve Plans to Build Dams on Its Last Wild River," National Geographic, http://news.nationalgeographic.com/2016/05/160512-china-nu-river-dams-environment/ (accessed 5/15/2016)

Conservationists have had little to celebrate amid China’s dam-building boom of the last half century. In the Nu River gorge, they appear to be on the cusp of a rare victory. Yunnan’s provincial secretary recently announced a halt to small hydroelectric projects on tributaries of the Nu. He also advocated the creation of a national park in the region. Many think that announcement signals the shelving of plans for the Nu dams, which would displace thousands of villagers and forever alter the gorge’s natural scenery. Much has changed since the dams were proposed, says Yu Xiaogang, leader of Green Watershed, an environmental group based in Kunming, Yunnan’s capital. Geologists have documented the threat of earthquakes in the region. China’s anti-corruption campaign has swept up Yunnan officials supportive of the China Huadian Corp., the company planning the dams. Possibly even more influential, new laws are prompting China to consider the full impacts of megaprojects like those proposed for the Nujiang, which means “angry river.”

#### China has significantly empowered its Ministry of Environmental Protection

China Daily, May 13, 2016

"Green teams to inspect all provinces in pollution fight," China.org, http://www.china.org.cn/china/2016-05/13/content\_38444250.htm (accessed 5/15/2016)

The Ministry of Environmental Protection will be China's second national authority, after the Central Commission for Discipline Inspection, to have the power to send inspection teams and hold discussions with provincial leaders. Fourteen more provinces will be subject to central government inspection this year after a pilot mission was completed in heavily industrialized Hebei province, Liu Changgen, head of the National Environmental Protection Inspection Office, said in a web interview.

### China Is Drastically Reducing CO2

#### China will reduce CO2 up to 65 percent by 2030

Elena Fedichinka and Evegny Shvarts, staff members of World Wildlife Federation Russia, May 13, 2016

"Will Chinese Factories Pollute the Russian Far East?" Russia Beyond the Headlines, http://rbth.com/opinion/2016/05/13/will-chinese-factories-pollute-the-russian-far-east\_592659 (accessed 5/15/2016)

In addition, the Chinese government has taken new and bold international climate change obligations, to reduce C02 emission intensity by 60-65 per cent by 2030, which will imply the reduction in industrial pollution and energy production based on coal.

#### Massive carbon sequestration will be in place by 2020

William J. Kelly, correspondent for Inside Climate News, February 13, 2014

"China's Plan to Clean Up Air in Cities Will Doom the Climate, Scientists Say," Inside Climate News, http://insideclimatenews.org/news/20140213/chinas-plan-clean-air-cities-will-doom-climate-scientists-say (accessed 5/15/2015)

"It's hard to see that changing anytime soon," said Barry Jones, general manager of the Global Carbon Capture and Storage Institute in Australia, an energy industry-funded organization that promotes CCS technology. He thinks that cleaning up coal by capturing and sequestering the carbon emissions ultimately is needed, yet admits efforts are nascent. If all goes well, by some estimates, by 2020, China will be able to sequester about 10-20 million of the more than 8 billion tons of carbon dioxide it emits annually today.

### Chinese Economic Growth Doesn't Require Environmental Degradation

#### China is abandoning the idea of unlimited growth

Liu Qin, editor in China Dialogue's Beijing office, October 30, 2015

"China’s cadres ready 'greener' Five Year Plan," The Third Pole, https://www.thethirdpole.net/2015/10/30/chinas-cadres-ready-greener-five-year-plan/ (accessed 5/15/2016)

China will take a three-step approach to a greener, more modern economy, such as the reduction consumption of energy and resources; lowering emissions of pollutants and removing the link between pollution and economic growth, said Hu Angang, head of Tsinghua University’s School of Public Policy and Management. Hu has participated in the drafting FYPs since the early 2000s.

#### Correct policies will overcome tension between environment and economy

Junjie Zhang, Assistant Professor, School of International Relations & Pacific Studies, University of California, San Diego, September 2012

"Delivering Environmentally Sustainable Economic Growth: The Case of China," Asia Society, http://asiasociety.org/files/pdf/Delivering\_Environmentally\_Sustainable\_Economic\_Growth\_Case\_China.pdf (accessed 5/15/2016)

As the Chinese economy continues to expand rapidly within the next decade, although no longer at a double-digit growth rate, the future of the environment may not be as gloomy as predicted by some environmental groups. The bottom line is that if the correct policies are implemented, China does not have to slow down economic growth in order to avoid environmental deterioration.

#### Government has successfully embraced sustainable development

Junjie Zhang, Assistant Professor, School of International Relations & Pacific Studies, University of California, San Diego, January 10, 2013

"Is Environmentally Sustainable Economic Growth Possible in China?" The Diplomat, http://thediplomat.com/2013/01/is-environmentally-sustainable-economic-growth-possible-in-china/ (accessed 5/15/2016)

Recognizing the unsustainability of its growth model, the Chinese government has called for a major policy shift to address the environmental impacts of economic growth. In fact, China claims it is one of the first developing countries to propose and implement sustainable development as a national strategy. The government has achieved substantial advancements in sustainable development, including poverty reduction and population control. These efforts are not pure political slogans; they are important policy experiments in sustainable development.

### Chinese Economic Growth Doesn't Require Environmental Degradation

#### Tech innovation and industrial shifts solve the tension between environment and economy

Yue Wang, China contributor for Forbes, January 2, 2014

"Why Economic Growth Could Be The Solution To China's Pollution," Forbes, http://www.forbes.com/sites/ywang/2014/01/02/why-economic-growth-could-be-the-solution-to-chinas-pollution/ (accessed 5/15/2016)

According to Zhang, the number of polluting industries will be reduced as the economy grows. China has pledged to tackle overcapacity in the steel, cement, glass and shipbuilding sectors, which are responsible for discharging a good deal of the country’s pollutants. Zhang said the country will eventually get rid of the majority of those industries and shift to a growth model fueled by more innovative and high-technology products. He said at that stage, the environment will get better with economic development.

#### Five year plans solve environment with economically viable models

Bart Kolodziejczyk, Research Fellow at Carnegie Mellon University, and Peter Smith, Regional Chair for Oceania at the IUCN Commission on Ecosystem Management, November 25, 2015

"Will China become a global environment leader?" World Economic Forum, https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2015/11/will-china-become-a-global-climate-leader/ (accessed 5/15/2016)

There is hope that the next five-year plan will include even more ambitious goals. The signs are positive: in a meeting with UNEP in June, the vice-premier of China stated that “the 13th five-year plan covers a crucial period in China’s economic and social development. Environmental protection and low-carbon development will top priority considerations during that period.” It is hoped that the next five-year plan, to be released in 2016, will include an ecosystem approach to environmental management and measures to promote the use of green technologies. Environmentally friendly economic policies and green finance, along with ambitious goals for environmental conservation, would also be very encouraging.

### Chinese Leadership Solves Global Climate Transitions

#### China has taken a global leadership position on climate change policy

East Asia Forum, November 30, 2015

"Global Climate Change Leadership from...China?" Economy Watch, http://www.economywatch.com/features/Global-Climate-Change-Leadership-from-China1130.html (accessed 5/15/2016)

However, a new paradigm of low-carbon economic growth could be the answer. Consistent with China’s own national interests, concerns other than climate change, drives the paradigm that emphasises technology. In the lead-up to the UN’s 2015 climate change conference in Paris, China has taken a global leadership position on climate change policy. China’s submission to the Paris negotiations still urges developed countries to do more on climate change. However, it also says that China ‘will promote global green low-carbon transformation and development path innovation’.

#### China reducing carbon and is the global leader in solar power

Geoffrey Henderson, ChinaFAQs Project Specialist at World Resources Institute, et al, March 18, 2016

"5 Questions: What Does China’s New Five-Year Plan Mean for Climate Action?" World Resources Institute, http://www.wri.org/blog/2016/03/5-questions-what-does-chinas-new-five-year-plan-mean-climate-action (accessed 5/15/2016)

China has already made substantial progress under the 12th Five-Year Plan, surpassing its targets for energy intensity (down 18.2 percent) and carbon intensity (down 20 percent), according to official figures. Services’ share of China’s economy has risen in recent years, eclipsing manufacturing’s share in 2013. Consumption of coal leveled off in 2014, and output in heavy industries like steel and cement has begun to decline. Further, China is investing in clean energy and installing wind and solar power at world-record levels, making the country the global leader in solar power capacity last year.

#### China is about to outstrip the U.S. on solar power and is producing more energy with less carbon

Matt Baker, program officer at Hewlett Foundation's Environment Program, December 7, 2015

"China Steps Up on Climate Change Leadership: What’s Different This Time," Work in Progress, http://www.hewlett.org/blog/posts/china-steps-climate-change-leadership-what%E2%80%99s-different-time (accessed 5/15/2016)

To begin with, China has found ways to produce more energy to support its economic growth with less carbon. In the run up to the Copenhagen conference, China was building three coal-fired plants a week. China burned 60 percent of the world’s coal. Last year, China's consumption and production of coal declined for the first time in decades. China’s total coal consumption dropped by 2.9 percent in 2014 and we’ll probably see a 4 percent decline this year. At the same time, China’s wind energy production has increased tenfold since 2009. This year alone, the country will add as much solar energy capacity as currently exists across the entire United States—and China expects to add even larger amounts in the years ahead.

# Impact Hegemony Good

## Hegemony Good Frontline

#### US Hegemony is sustainable – China cannot overpower

Rishi Gillman Smith, Economy and Current World Politics Researcher and Writer, April 19, 2016, “The Era of the US Hegemony Continues,” <http://themarketmogul.com/the-era-of-the-us-hegemony-continues/> (Accessed 4/29/2016)

The United States undoubtedly has the largest global political influence than any other country, which in turn results in more power for the United States. One form of political persuasion that many countries use is foreign aid, which in 2013 was $31.5 billion from the United States to other countries, in comparison to Britain which had the second highest foreign aid of around half of the US budget. This foreign aid handed out by the United States can be transformed into cooperation from the countries receiving the aid; this can be done in many ways. One way is for the countries receiving aid to purchase American products or to buy food produced via American farmers that has been processed from the United States, or to obtain arms and components to build arms from the United States. Furthermore, this adds to the bolstering economy of the United States, whilst gaining allies which in the long term will support the US in the economic/political arena, assisting the US’s hegemonic status. The West, and in particular the US, is seen as a more attractive proposition, to live and invest in compared to anywhere else, due to its democratic diplomatic soft power, pluralist political culture and freedom of speech. As a result, people from all over the world seek to move to the United States. A comparison of that can be made with China where there is a state-ruled communist regime that does not necessarily promote the type of diplomatic soft power as that of the West, particularly for example as the United States. This liberal culture, coalesced with a strong educational system and high standard of living gives rise to the draw of people with various capabilities from around the world. Specifically from two Asian countries within the BRICs, China and India; who make up over 40% of the international student enrollment into universities in the United States. The students that are coming to study at these world-renowned American universities are the cream of the crop with regards to academics and are wealthy enough to afford the high tuition fees. This migration of students from countries across the world implies that the United States is able to arguably gain future leaders; pioneers and entrepreneurs from around the world whom inevitably end up contributing to the economic success of the United States, hence further contributing to assisting the US to retain its hegemonic leadership in the global economic system. In conclusion, even though countries such as China boast powerful economies themselves, they are not able to overtake that of the United States. The United States does not only have an outright powerful economy, but it contains steady and solid political systems that enable its economy to continue growing. The strong dollar and the steady growth of the US economy remain attractive to investors all over the world, hence continuing the era of US hegemonic leadership of the global economic system.

#### US withdrawal will lead to regional power conflicts

Robert Kagan, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, January 21, 2016, “Why America Must Lead” <http://www.foreignpolicyi.org/content/why-america-must-lead> (Accessed 5/4/2016)

Finally, there is the matter of American hard power. What has been true since the time of Rome remains true today: there can be no world order without power to preserve it, to shape its norms, uphold its institutions, defend the sinews of its economic system, and keep the peace. Military power can be abused, wielded unwisely and ineffectively. It can be deployed to answer problems that it cannot answer or that have no answer. But it is also essential. No nation or group of nations that renounced power could expect to maintain any kind of world order. If the United States begins to look like a less reliable defender of the present order, that order will begin to unravel. It remains true today as it has since the Second World War that only the United States has the capacity and the unique geographical advantages to provide global security. There can be no stable balance of power in Europe or Asia without the United States. And while we can talk about soft power and smart power, they have been and always will be of limited value when confronting raw military power. Despite all of the loose talk of American decline, it is in the military realm where U.S. advantages remain clearest. Even in other great power’s backyards, the United States retains the capacity, along with its powerful allies, to deter challenges to the security order. But without a U.S. willingness to play the role of providing balance in far-flung regions of the world, the system will buckle under the unrestrained military competition of regional powers.

#### US primacy ensures world order and peace

Lamont Colucci, Chair of politics and government at Ripon College, a former Fulbright scholar to the Diplomatic Academy of Vienna, January 14, 2016, “The Twin Dynamos of National Security,” <http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/world-report/articles/2016-01-14/our-next-president-should-emphasize-energy-security-and-military-primacy> (Accessed 5/2/2016)

Primacy. The United States took a long road to military primacy, which has ensured world order, world commerce and world peace. It has achieved all three more than any territorial empire in the past and any international treaty or organization of the present or future. This not only means maintaining, and most likely expanding, the 11 Carrier Task Forces but all branches of the military, intelligence and even diplomatic services. The stability of the international relations system is entirely dependent on U.S. military primacy and the Pax Americana. It must be the permanent strategy of the United States to ensure this primacy continues and expands. Linked to primacy is the development and deployment of a multilayered national missile defense that should ultimately cover our allies. There must also be permanence to the American way of war and a resurrection of the Weinberger Doctrine concerning overwhelming force. American national security at home, during violent riots and looting, and abroad, during war, is served best by swift and massive force. This always results in lower casualties for both U.S. troops and civilians.

## Uniqueness Extensions

### Hegemony is Inevitable

#### US hegemony is inevitable

Michael Payne, social, economic, political and foreign policy writer and independent progressive activist, June 14, 2015, “US Global Hegemony Knows No Bounds,” <http://www.nationofchange.org/2015/06/14/u-s-global-hegemony-knows-no-bounds/> (Accessed 5/4/2016)

It’s everywhere, it covers the world. No nation can escape its vast reach. It’s America’s agenda of hegemony that continues without letup. Hegemony, which some would refer to as the militaristic subsidiary of imperialism, is the “Aggressive expansionism by large nations in an effort to achieve world domination.” Yes, that is a very accurate description of how the U.S. government is operating in today’s world. None of the other major world powers, including Russia or China, could be accused of engaging in such an agenda of world domination at this time. The relentless bombing of Iraq and Syria continues non-stop. It’s no great surprise that President Obama has just announced that he will soon send more U.S. troops into Iraq in order to train additional Iraqis to fight against ISIS, the jihadist element that continues to control a substantial part of that country. How long might it be before the U.S. troops currently there, plus thousands more, hit the ground and reignite the Iraq War? One thing that we can say for certain is that the U.S. military empire, the foundation of this hegemony, is alive and well and deployed in every region of the world. We should remember that there are still some U.S. troops in Afghanistan. Supposedly, all remaining troops are to exit that country by the end of 2016. Anyone wish to place a bet that this will actually happen?

### Hegemony High – Geography

#### US is the world superpower – geographic advantages

Denali Marsh, History and Political Analyst with the Global State, January 10, 2015, “Why is the United States the World’s Most Powerful Country?” <http://theglobalstate.com/geopolitics/why-is-the-united-states-the-most-powerful-country-in-the-world/> (Accessed 5/2/2016)

The United States is the world’s only superpower, dominating the world’s economic and political systems. With the strongest military and economy, the United States is capable of global power projection, giving it significant influence worldwide. Few countries dare to oppose America’s political agenda. But how did the United States rise to global preeminence over traditional European powers, such as the United Kingdom or France? Why aren’t other nations with large natural resources reserves and populations, like Russia, China, or Brazil able to compete with the United States? The answer is geography. The power of the United States has its roots in the American control of the Pacific and Atlantic oceans, the most used trade routes in the world. This strategic positioning gives it natural geographical advantages. Competent and aggressive American policies further capitalize on these advantages and secure the United States in a position of economic, military and political strength.

### A2 China – US Hegemony Sustainable

#### China’s rising is hype – does not have necessary sustainability like the US

Salvatore Babones, associate professor of sociology and social policy at the University of Sydney and an associate fellow at the Institute for Policy Studies, August 5, 2015, “Why China's Massive Military Buildup Is Doomed,” <http://nationalinterest.org/feature/why-chinas-massive-military-buildup-doomed-13494> (Accessed 5/5/2016)

With confrontation looming in the South China Sea, all eyes are turned to China's military expansion. News that China is building massive naval docking facilities [4] and transforming its new South China Sea island into a mid-ocean air force base [5] is scaring the whole region into arming up [6]. The message is clear: after 200 years of western domination, China is back [7]. Or is it? Contrary to the prognostications of western doomsayers [8], China is not facing imminent political collapse. Its economic growth is inevitably slowing [9] down but its economy is relatively healthy [10] compared to those of its peers. But claims (or fears) of Chinese global domination are clearly overblown. The budget numbers just don't add up. The 2015 headline expansion [11] in China's military spending is 10.1 percent, continuing two decades of double-digit growth [12]. Astute economists have pointed out [13] that these figures are rarely adjusted for inflation. Worse, they do not take into account the fact that wages (the PLA's largest expenditure category) are rising much faster [14] than inflation in China. It may still be a lot of money, but 741 billion yuan just doesn't go as far as it used to. Corruption And then there's corruption. Though America has had its share of procurement scandals, generalized corruption is not institutionalized in the United States Armed Forces. In China it is integral to the functioning of all state bureaucracies. The military is no exception, as the Chinese government [15] itself admits. In mid-January the government announced the names of 16 senior military officers [16] who were placed under investigation for corruption in 2014, including a parade of former logistics officers [17]. Then came the bombshell: reported investigations [18] of 4,024 senior officers (including 82 generals) for corruption and other financial irregularities. No one knows what proportion of China's double-digit military spending increases of the last two decades has been frittered away in corruption. But it is suggestive that the beginning of China's military spending boom roughly coincided with the government's 1998 decision to close down [19] the PLA's civilian business operations. Denied the opportunity to make a little money on the side, it could be that the PLA's officers shifted their business model from selling widgets to stealing directly from the public coffers. The PLA's bloated command structure is divided into seven military regions, creating a plethora of top officials administering their own budgets. This creates an environment that is positively primed for corruption. Even low-level bureaucrats in China have been known to siphon off fortunes running into the tens of millions of yuan. Given the scale of corruption in China, it is no surprise that PLA officers routinely pay bribes [20] to secure promotion, in effect purchasing commissions. This may or may not compromise China's military readiness [21]. But it certainly inflates military budgets—and in a big way. Budgetary trends Today China's (acknowledged) military spending is rising roughly in line with GDP growth and is stable at about 1.3 percent of GDP, according to official figures from the China Statistical Yearbook [22]. China acknowledges spending another 1.4 percent of GDP on internal security. This includes paramilitary units but also ordinary law-and-order policing. China offers no more detailed breakdown. Western analysts sometimes lump these two figures together to conclude that China spends nearly 3 percent of GDP on defense, but this is clearly inappropriate. More than 80 percent of the internal security budget is spent by local government units. China's government may be opaque to outsiders, but one thing we can be sure of is that China is not allowing its provinces to develop their own military capabilities. The Unites States does spend more than 3 percent of its GDP on defense, one of the highest rates [23] of defense spending in the world. Considering that the United States also has the world's largest economy, the world's most advanced technology, and a web of globe-spanning military alliances, it doesn't have much to fear from China. A careful analysis of budgetary trends suggests that it never will. As China approaches middle-income status, its government expenditures for social welfare are rising faster than GDP. China is expanding public education to better serve its rural population and considering extending urban welfare benefits to all urban residents, even those who lack official urban household registration [24] (hukou). At the same time, China's population is rapidly aging, placing enormous pressure on health and pension systems. The proportion of the population that is aged 65 and over is expected to rise from 10 percent today to more than 20 percent in 2035. Elder care will increasingly strain Chinese government budgets in the decades to come. Just as the United States faces tensions between domestic and military spending priorities, so too does China. The difference is that the United States is already rich and is not facing demographic collapse. The United States also has a flexible and (relatively) effective system of progressive income taxes that can easily be raised in times of crisis. China does not. Like most middle income countries, China relies mainly on indirect sources of revenue (consumption taxes, corporate taxes, value added taxes, and land sales) to make ends meet. These kinds of taxes tend to rise more slowly than income. Thus, as China continues to develop, its tax revenues will grow more slowly than its economy as a whole. Pity the PLA As a result, China's military spending will be caught between a rock and a hard place. The PLA may be able to maintain some fiscal momentum by improving efficiency and reducing corruption, but the days of double-digit budget increases are over. Soon the Chinese government will be asking the PLA to "do more with less." American generals may come to sympathize with their Chinese peers. This is bad news for corrupt officers at all levels of the PLA, many of whom will have paid premium prices for their jobs at the top of the military market bubble. But it is good news for China's neighbors and the security of the Asia-Pacific region [25]. The South China Sea may not break out in peace overnight, but China simply will not be able to sustain the current pace of its buildup in the region. One of the most advanced weapons in the arsenals of developed liberal democracies like the United States, Japan, and Australia is their fiscal capacity. Corrupt, authoritarian states like China and Russia can make impressive short-term military gains but they do not have the fiscal staying power to compete in the long game of history. China seems unlikely to become a developed liberal democracy any time soon. If it does not become one, it will never possess the fiscal resources required to threaten its neighbors or the United States. And if China does somehow manage to become a developed liberal democracy, its neighbors and the United States will have nothing to fear from the new China.

#### United States military power surpasses all

Denali Marsh, History and Political Analyst with the Global State, January 10, 2015, “Why is the United States the World’s Most Powerful Country?” <http://theglobalstate.com/geopolitics/why-is-the-united-states-the-most-powerful-country-in-the-world/> (Accessed 5/2/2016)

For decades, the United States has been institutionalizing its power by placing itself at the head multiple economic and security apparatuses. With many nations dependent on the United States for economic and military purposes, America is only becoming more entrenched in their position of global geopolitical superiority. Over the past century, the United States has established a global economic system that needs them to survive. Direct American control over major international banking institutions such as the World Bank and International Monetary Fund have made America irreplaceable in the modern day economic system. United States can oversee military action worldwide as a permanent member of the UN Security council and the Americans have strategic alliances in order to maintain power. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization protects American military interests in Europe, encircling Russia and effectively neutralizing the once powerful Soviet Union. With a comprehensive system of alliances and the leading role in the international markets, the United States is positioned to remain the most powerful country in the world. Any potential superpower must cooperate with the United States for access to the global market, and any hypothetical confrontation between the two would see America economically strangle its opponent. Through their massive military spending and strategic alliance forging, no nations can hope to compete with the United States militarily. While many people see an economically surging China, a resource rich Brazil, or a militaristic Russia and predict American downfall, they underestimate the global influence of the United States. Through the Americans strategic geographic positioning in the center of major trade routes that funds a enormous economy which in turn supports a massive military, the United States is secure on its throne of international power.

## Hegemony is Real

#### United States hegemony is real and here to stay

Salvatore Babones, Associate Professor of Sociology and Social Policy at the University of Sydney and an Associate Fellow at the Institute for Policy Studies, June 11, 2015, “American Hegemony is Here to Stay”, <http://nationalinterest.org/feature/american-hegemony-here-stay-13089?page=1> (Accessed 5/4/2016)

American Hegemony Is Here to Stay. U.S. hegemony is now as firm as or firmer than it has ever been, and will remain so for a long time to come. Is retreat from global hegemony in America’s national interest? No idea has percolated more widely over the past decade—and none is more bogus. The United States is not headed for the skids and there is no reason it should be. The truth is that America can and should seek to remain the world’s top dog. The idea of American hegemony is as old as Benjamin Franklin, but has its practical roots in World War II. The United States emerged from that war as the dominant economic, political and technological power. The only major combatant to avoid serious damage to its infrastructure, its housing stock or its demographic profile, the United States ended the war with the greatest naval order of battle ever seen in the history of the world. It became the postwar home of the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. And, of course, the United States had the bomb. America was, in every sense of the word, a hegemon. “Hegemony” is a word used by social scientists to describe leadership within a system of competing states. The Greek historian Thucydides used the term to characterize the position of Athens in the Greek world in the middle of the fifth century BC. Athens had the greatest fleet in the Mediterranean; it was the home of Socrates and Plato, Sophocles and Aeschylus; it crowned its central Acropolis with the solid-marble temple to Athena known to history as the Parthenon. Athens had a powerful rival in Sparta, but no one doubted that Athens was the hegemon of the time until Sparta defeated it in a bitter twenty-seven-year war.

## Impact Extensions

### Hegemony Good – General

#### US credibility ensures global order

Jon Kyl, Attorney and former Republican Whip, and Joseph Lieberman, former United States Senator from Connecticut, December 3, 2015, “Why American Leadership Still Matters,” <http://www.aei.org/publication/why-american-leadership-still-matters/> (Accessed 5/6/2015)

The security of the United States and its people is our first responsibility and serves as the raison d’être for active US engagement abroad. Although different circumstances require different approaches, active global military leadership is always a prerequisite to success. In the security realm, not only does US engagement—including the forward deployment of US troops—deter aggression, but in the event of conflict, it also enables the US to meet threats far from its shores quickly and in time to prevent losses that would be costly to regain. America’s allies across the globe also help identify and address challenges at their root, provide crucial support during periods of conflict, and contribute to the general stability of the international system. Committed, democratic partners allow the US to achieve its security goals for mutual benefit; the building of such partnerships should be a priority, therefore, of US foreign policy. US engagement abroad, however, constitutes far more than just military action. Military force is but one tool of international engagement and should never be the first option. Too often, we tend to overlook America’s crucial hand in waging peace, dampening rivalries, and helping to resolve conflict. We similarly tend to underappreciate the importance of some of the bedrock tools of international engagement including American diplomacy, foreign assistance, economic assistance, people-to-people programs, and public-private partnerships. These tools all help to ensure that military force remains an option of last resort. U.S. Army Pvt. Richard Mitchell, Provincial Reconstruction Team Zabul, visits with children of a village in northern Qalat, May 16, 2012. US Army | Flickr US Army Pvt. Richard Mitchell, Provincial Reconstruction Team Zabul, visits with children of a village in northern Qalat, May 16, 2012. US Army | Flickr The vibrant international economic system represents one such historic, yet often overlooked, achievement that strong US global leadership has made possible. Recognizing the growing link between the American domestic economy and foreign markets, US policymakers saw an opportunity after World War II to increase the welfare of those at home and abroad through the formalization of a rules-based, nondiscriminatory international economic system. America led the effort to establish key economic institutions like the International Monetary Fund and the organizations that would evolve into the World Bank and the World Trade Organization. In doing so, we helped create a global economic order that has enabled many hundreds of millions—in the US and abroad—to climb the ladder of opportunity.

#### US Hegemony key to trade, democracy, and conflict prevention

Ivo Daalder, U.S. ambassador to NATO from 2009 to 2013, and Robert Kagan, Senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, April 22, 2016, “The U.S. can’t afford to end its global leadership role” <https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/the-us-cant-afford-to-end-its-global-leadership-role/2016/04/22/da297be0-062a-11e6-b283-e79d81c63c1b_story.html> (Accessed 5/6/2016)

The economic, political and security strategy that the United States has pursued for more than seven decades, under Democratic and Republican administrations alike, is today widely questioned by large segments of the American public and is under attack by leading political candidates in both parties. Many Americans no longer seem to value the liberal international order that the United States created after World War II and sustained throughout the Cold War and beyond. Or perhaps they take it for granted and have lost sight of the essential role the United States plays in supporting the international environment from which they benefit greatly. The unprecedented prosperity made possible by free and open markets and thriving international trade; the spread of democracy; and the avoidance of major conflict among great powers: All these remarkable accomplishments have depended on sustained U.S. engagement around the world. Yet politicians in both parties dangle before the public the vision of an America freed from the burdens of leadership.

#### US Hegemony encourages peace and international law reducing global tensions

Salvatore Babones, Associate professor of sociology and social policy at the University of Sydney and an associate fellow at the Institute for Policy Studies, June 11, 2015, “American Hegemony is Here to Stay,” <http://nationalinterest.org/feature/american-hegemony-here-stay-13089> (Accessed 4/30/2016)

A more responsible (and consequently more effective) United States would subject itself to the international laws and agreements that it expects others to follow. It would genuinely seek to reduce its nuclear arsenal in line with its commitments under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. It would use slow but sure police procedures to catch terrorists, instead of quick but messy drone strikes. It would disavow all forms of torture. All of these policies would save American treasure while increasing American power. They would also increase America’s ability to say “no” to its allies when they demand expensive U.S. commitments to protect their interests abroad. Such measures would not ensure global peace, nor would they necessarily endear the United States to everyone across the world. But they would reduce global tensions and make it easier for America to act in its national interests where those interests are truly at stake. Both the United States and the world as a whole would be better off if Washington did not waste time, money and diplomatic capital on asserting every petty sovereign right it is capable of enforcing. A more strategic United States would preside over a more peaceful and prosperous world. In pondering its future course, Washington might consider this tale from the ancient world: When Cyrus the Great conquered the neighboring kingdom of Lydia, he allowed his army to loot and pillage Lydia’s capital city, Sardis. The deposed Lydian king Croesus became his captive and slave. After Cyrus taunted Croesus by asking him how it felt to see his capital city being plundered, Croesus responded: “It’s not my city that your troops are plundering; it’s your city.” Cyrus ordered an immediate end to the destruction.

#### American withdrawal too costly – needed to combat threats

Ivo Daalder, U.S. ambassador to NATO from 2009 to 2013, and Robert Kagan, Senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, April 25, 2016, “Commentary: US Disengagement Would be Costly” <http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/opinion/commentary/ct-united-states-disengagement-foreign-policy-20160425-story.html> (Accessed 5/6/2016)

Many Americans no longer seem to value the liberal international order that the United States created after World War II and sustained throughout the Cold War and beyond. Or perhaps they take it for granted and have lost sight of the essential role the United States plays in supporting the international environment from which they benefit greatly. The unprecedented prosperity made possible by free and open markets and thriving international trade; the spread of democracy; and the avoidance of major conflict among great powers: All these remarkable accomplishments have depended on sustained U.S. engagement around the world. Yet politicians in both parties dangle before the public the vision of an America freed from the burdens of leadership. What these politicians don't say, perhaps because they don't understand it themselves, is that the price of ending our engagement would far outweigh its costs. The international order created by the United States today faces challenges greater than at any time since the height of the Cold War. Rising authoritarian powers in Asia and Europe threaten to undermine the security structures that have kept the peace since World War II. Russia invaded Ukraine and has seized some of its territory. In East Asia, an increasingly aggressive China seeks to control the sea lanes through which a large share of global commerce flows. In the Middle East, Iran pursues hegemony by supporting Hezbollah and Hamas and the bloody tyranny in Syria. Islamic State controls more territory than any terrorist group in history, brutally imposing its extreme vision of Islam and striking at targets throughout the Middle East, North Africa and Europe. None of these threats will simply go away. Nor will the United States be spared if the international order collapses, as it did twice in the 20th century. In the 21st century, oceans provide no security. Nor do walls along borders. Nor would cutting off the United States from the international economy by trashing trade agreements and erecting barriers to commerce.

### Hegemony Good – War

#### Hegemony prevents war – decline of great power war shows

Jon Kyl, Attorney and former Republican Whip, and Joseph Lieberman, former United States Senator from Connecticut, December 3, 2015, “Why American Leadership Still Matters,” <http://www.aei.org/publication/why-american-leadership-still-matters/> (Accessed 5/6/2015)

In sum, American leadership has helped ensure stability and security throughout the globe and has bestowed immeasurable benefits on the American people. The fact that the era of American leadership has corresponded with the decline of great-power war is not a coincidence. Moving forward, US engagement and leadership will remain as crucial to security, stability, and prosperity today as in past decades. The arguments advanced by those advocating a retreat from America’s traditional international role do not stand up under scrutiny. Still, these arguments need to be addressed. To be sustainable, US international engagement needs to be realistic and results oriented. There is plenty of room to debate how best the US could play a 21st-century leadership role. But the key word here is how, not whether, it should play such a role. The choice before the United States is whether it will help shape the world or allow others to fill the vacuum created by its absence. The foundation for American leadership—and the prosperity and security that derive from it—lies in the insurmountable power of its military. Speaking to the British House of Commons in 1982, Ronald Reagan stated, “Our military strength is a prerequisite to peace.”[15] The US military is the best trained, best equipped, and most capable in the world, and to maintain the peace, the United States must ensure that this continues to be the case. Military strength is an essential element of national strength, but it is not the only tool in America’s tool kit. To finish Reagan’s thought, “We maintain this [military] strength in the hope it will never be used.” The United States should thus rely on diplomatic and economic levers as tools of first resort in its interactions with other countries. It should meet its obligations to its allies and expect its allies to meet their obligations to the United States. International engagement and leadership are often equated with military intervention, but engagement across other fronts will often preclude the need to resort to violence. “The foundation for American leadership lies in the insurmountable power of its military.” The security, diplomatic effectiveness, and economic vitality of the American people are inextricably intertwined, and the absence of security imperils the other two. President John F. Kennedy understood this truism when he stated in 1961, “Diplomacy and defense are not substitutes for one another.”[16] Today, the links between diplomacy and defense are still frequently lost in public conversations about the importance of maintaining a ready and capable force; too often, providing for the common defense is construed as an end unto itself rather than as a means to protect the interests of all Americans. In fact, maintaining our military power, and the ability to project it, may be more important in today’s interconnected world than at any time in our history.

### Hegemony Good – Terrorism

#### US Hegemony is necessary to combat terrorism – smart power key

Joseph Nye, American Political Scientist and former Dean of Harvard's Kennedy School of Government, March 3, 2016, “5 Surprising Truths About Terrorism” <http://www.juancole.com/2016/03/5-surprising-truths-about-terrorism.html> (Accessed 5/2/2016)

Terrorism is like jiu jitsu. The smaller actor uses the larger actor’s strength to defeat it. No terrorist organization is as powerful as a state, and few terrorist movements have succeeded in overthrowing one. But if they can outrage and frustrate citizens of the state into taking self-defeating actions, they can hope to prevail. Al-Qaeda succeeded in luring the US into Afghanistan in 2001. ISIS was born in the rubble of the subsequent US-led invasion of Iraq. Smart power is needed to defeat terrorism. Smart power is the ability to combine hard military and police power and the soft power of attraction and persuasion. Hard power is needed to kill or capture die-hard terrorists, few of whom are open to attraction or persuasion. At the same time, soft power is needed to inoculate those on the periphery whom the die-hards are trying to recruit. That is why attention to narrative and how US actions play on social media is as important and as necessary as precision air strikes. Antagonistic rhetoric that alienates Muslims and weakens their willingness to provide crucial intelligence endangers us all. That is why the anti-Muslim posturing of some of the current presidential candidates is so counterproductive. Terrorism is a serious issue, and it deserves to be a top priority of our intelligence, police, military, and diplomatic agencies. It is an important component of foreign policy. And it is crucial to keep weapons of mass destruction out of terrorists’ hands.

#### US military power necessary to stop emerging terrorist threats

James Phillips, Senior Research Fellow for Middle Eastern Affairs, February 29, 2016, “Terrorist Plots Getting Down and Dirty,” <http://www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2016/2/terrorist-plots-getting-down-and-dirty> (Accessed 5/6/2016)

These efforts may have gotten a boost in June 2014, when ISIS seized the Al Muthanna State Establishment, the former center of Saddam Hussein’s chemical warfare program. Although the chemical munitions stored there were reportedly decaying and unfit for military use, ISIS may have found a way to transport and use them. U.S. troops discovered more than 4,500 chemical munitions in Iraq after invading in 2003, although all of them appeared to have been manufactured before the 1991 Gulf War. It will take relentless work to keep weapons of mass destruction out of the hands of terrorists. The U.S. and its allies must: crack down on the smuggling of weapons and dual-use technologies; conduct sting operations to take buyers and sellers out of circulation, and help vulnerable governments — particularly those in the former Soviet bloc and Pakistan — to bolster security around their nuclear, chemical, and biological facilities. But the best defense would be to eradicate ISIS and other terrorist organizations as soon as possible, or at least to eliminate sanctuaries where they can develop increasingly dangerous forms of these horrific weapons.

### Hegemony Good – Asian Stability

#### Decline of American hegemony will collapse Asian stability

Robert Kagan, Senior Fellow, Project on International Order and Strategy at the Brookings Institution, Winter 2016, “Why America Must Lead,” <http://www.bushcenter.org/catalyst/leadership/why-america-must-lead.html> (Accessed 5/8/2016)

If the United States begins to look like a less reliable defender of the present order, that order will begin to unravel. It remains true today as it has since the Second World War that only the United States has the capacity and the unique geographical advantages to provide global security. There can be no stable balance of power in Europe or Asia without the United States. And while we can talk about soft power and smart power, they have been and always will be of limited value when confronting raw military power. Despite all of the loose talk of American decline, it is in the military realm where U.S. advantages remain clearest. Even in other great power’s backyards, the United States retains the capacity, along with its powerful allies, to deter challenges to the security order. But without a U.S. willingness to play the role of providing balance in far-flung regions of the world, the system will buckle under the unrestrained military competition of regional powers.

### Hegemony Good – Energy Production/Dependence

#### Growth of US Hegemony and energy come hand in hand – decreased dependence supports

HDN, Hurriyet Daily News, April 14, 2016, “The geopolitics of energy resources,” <http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/the-geopolitics-of-energy-resources.aspx?PageID=238&NID=97774&NewsCatID=468> (Accessed 5/4/2016)

Energy has been the defining factor in human development and determining factor in the hegemonic structure of world politics. The fundamental role of coal and steam, as key ingredients of the Industrial Revolution, and global control of their trade in the 18th and 19th century by the British Empire led the way for its hegemony in international politics. In the 20th century, oil has become the defining raw material, and control of its production and trade jump-started U.S. hegemony. Recent developments and technical innovations in the energy realm require a reassessment of the situation. The current trend in energy supply and demand still favors fossil fuels – i.e. coal, oil and natural gas- with 80 percent of global energy use. This dominance is expected to continue for the foreseeable future even though investments in nuclear, hydro and renewable energy sources are increasing. BP Energy Outlook predicts that fossil fuels will protect their current share in energy production and use by 2035. The most striking developments in recent years have been the discovery of shale formations across the world and the transformation of natural gas into its liquefied form (LNG). Gas has been the fastest growing fossil fuel in the last 20 years. In comparison, oil continues to have steady growth while coal production has declined. Even though the conventional production and usage of gas still dominates today’s markets, the flexible and practical LNG trade is likely to surpass it by 2035. The discovery of shale petroleum, on the other hand, has already started to change the patterns in global markets. Energy is a highly strategic determinant beyond its commercial and economic aspects. As a result, great powers have been competing each other to sustain their strategic interests and political gains. While the U.S. has successfully positioned itself as the guardian of the free flow of energy since the Arab oil embargo of 1973, Russia has become more aggressive in recent years in using its energy card for political leverage. The U.S. is an important actor in both energy production and consumption, and it has been trying hard to be self-sufficient since the 1970s. The recent discoveries of shale resources have enabled it to attain such a position, should it wish to have it. It is now also possible that the U.S. could become a major energy exporter. The U.S.’ decreasing dependency on imported hydrocarbons has already produced results in global politics, allowing it to focus more on Southeast Asia instead of the Middle East for the first time in decades. The results so far are mixed, but the trend is unmistakable. Although it still emphasizes its commitment for the free flow of energy, especially considering the huge imported energy dependency of its allies, the changing policy line is already showing its effects in world politics: Look at Syria-Iraq and Ukraine. As one of the leading producers/exporters of energy, it is integral part of the Russian economy, regime, foreign policy and strategic calculations. Thus Russia is active in playing the energy card as a geopolitical tool to extend and/or maintain its influence in its near abroad. With its strategic positioning and infrastructure, Russia controls huge natural gas markets across in Europe and Eurasia. Western sanctions following Russian occupation of Crimea and a decline in oil prices negatively affected Russia. Moreover, the U.S. outstripped it as producer with its recent discovery of shale gas, but Russia was still markets with recent agreements with China and India, balancing the U.S. in the global energy market. No doubt, the increasing demand of India and China, as well as their policies, will be decisive in the future positioning of Russia and the U.S., in addition to shaping the global energy market.

### Hegemony Good – ICT Development

#### Hegemony key to ICT development – furthers health care and gender equality

Stuart N. Brotman, nonresident senior fellow in the Center for Technology Innovation within Governance Studies at Brookings, May 6, 2016, “Asserting American leadership in shaping the global information society,” <http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/techtank/posts/2016/05/06-american-leadership-2016-wsis-forum-brotman> (Accessed 5/8/2016)

This week, the United Nations is convening a new World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) Forum in Geneva, Switzerland. The WSIS Forum builds upon U.N. General Assembly Resolution 70/125, an overall review of the implementation of previous WSIS outcomes. This resolution recognized the necessity of holding the forum on an annual basis and called for a close alignment between WSIS and the U.N.’s Sustainable Development Goals (SDG). A quick review of SDG focus areas underscores the role that information and communications technology (ICT) plays in advancing U.N. objectives for the year 2030. For example, rural development, education, sustainable cities, transportation, health care, and gender equality will all be enhanced through better and more widespread ICT capabilities. The United States promises to lead the global community in bringing the potential of ICT to the entire world. In a period when our domestic political debate seems to criticize U.S. leadership for ineffectively projecting power on the international stage, the WSIS forum may become a real-time case study to test the accuracy of that perception. Significantly, the WSIS Forum now under way is chaired by Ambassador Daniel Sepulveda, deputy assistant secretary of state and U.S. coordinator for international communications and information policy. More than symbolic, this position is viewed as the convening leader, with substantial input in shaping both its agenda and potential outcomes. Sepulveda notes the success that may follow will be the product of careful advance planning: “We had to construct language that we could all support, bridging different philosophies of governance and economics, as well as differing experiences in how people from various nations were reaping the benefits of the digital age or not, over the last ten years. Non-governmental stakeholders were vital [participants]. We benefited from their inputs and expertise through written contributions to the process, as well as their hard work deploying and developing information and communications technologies over the last decade.” Instead of a series of high level statements delivered without exchange, which often is the mode for U.N. conferences, Sepulveda has expressed the hope that this year’s forum will be more dynamic, interactive, and inclusive. A critical aspect of this goal will be how well the U.S. can manage a complex process in a short amount of time, and then maintain post-Forum momentum for any initiatives that develop. In addition to various U.N. agencies that are involved (e.g., the International Telecommunication Union and the United Nations Development Program), it will be important to engage various outside interests such as the World Intellectual Property Organization and the International Labor Organization. These groups, dubbed WSIS Action Line Co-facilitators, are important for coordinating multi-stakeholder implementation activities, information exchange, forming new ideas, and sharing best practices. They can also assist in developing multi-stakeholder and public-private partnerships to advance ICT development goals over time. In the long run, the success of the WSIS Forum may well be judged by a standard that Sepulveda has articulated: “Government and the UN system are only part of the team of actors and stakeholders critical to the construction of a global information society. We as governments should ask and aim to support the efforts of industry, civil society, academia, and technologists in fulfilling their missions and goals for themselves and others. We must stay true to our focus on implementing the action lines assigned to the various U.N. bodies to facilitate and remember our call to service.” More immediately, this standard also may be useful to evaluate our nation’s considerable leadership skills on the world stage.

### Hegemony Good – Laundry List

#### Hegemony solves Laundry List – HST scholars

Subhasish, International Issues Consultant citing HST Scholars, May 13, 2015, “Benefits of hegemonic stability theory,” <http://benefitof.net/benefits-of-hegemonic-stability-theory/> (Accessed 5/4/2016)

One of the most notable scholar who is closely associated with the Hegemonic Stability Theory is Charles P. Kindleberger, who is also regarded by many as the father of HST. In 1973 Charles Kindleberger argued in his famous book “The World in Depression: 1929-1939’, that the economic disorder that happened between the World War I and II which eventually lead to the Great Depression, happened partially because there was an absence of a world leader with an dominant economy during those times. Apart from the so called father of HST, Kindleberger, some of the other notable scholars those who are key figures in development of this theory are Stephen Krasner, Modelski, Robert Keohane, Robert Gilpin and others. Some of most essential benefits of HST which has been noted by these much reputed scholars are. Stable international free trade It has been observed that the presence of a hegemon, leads to the provision of a stable international regime of free trade, as hegemon provides necessary leadership for the emergence of international regimes in several areas of business and economic growth. Preservation of stability and peace In a research work done by Gilpin on the analysis of war and hegemonic stability, it has been noted that HST which advocates hegemonic power, is central to the preservation of peace and stability in the international system. Growth and development in military and para-military industries Since it is utmost essential that a hegemon must have all the necessary military force and national power to forge new international laws and organizations, it has been noted that hegemonic nations spends a large sum of money for honing and developing their military and para-military skills, that leads to the growth and prosperity of industries those who caterer to such skills. Prevents the rise of anarchy It has been theoretically assessed that the existence of a hegemon according to the HST, helps in preventing the rise of anarchy in other states that have accepted the hegemonic rule. It so happens because hegemony helps the ruling nation to dictate its rules on smaller states and thus abolish anarchy in those nations that is governed by the hegemonic rule. Counter Terrorism According to HST scholars like Mearsheimer, Doyle and Fukuyama, it has been argued that hegemony is conducive for diminishing terrorist activities in states which follows the hegemonic rule. This happens because hegemon restores the balance of power in all the states that is ruled by the hegemon which in turn helps in resolving terrorist activities.

### Soft Power Good – Terrorism/Climate Change/Pandemics

#### Soft power solves terrorism, climate change and prevents pandemics

Diogenes Digest, Political Discussion, January 25, 2016, “Carbon Taxes II: Problems and Solutions” <https://diogenesdigest.wordpress.com/2016/01/25/carbon-taxes-ii-problems-and-solutions/> (Accessed 5/6/2016)

First, it’s important to remember that the United States is by far the strongest power on the face of the Earth. It’s certainly possible that the US would be strong enough to endure such a tax. On the other hand, however, if such a bet were wrong, disastrous consequences would ensue. But second, a more green military force would likely be better in the long term for American security, by allowing for a more efficient fighting force. Third, by increasing long term domestic innovation in energy, the tax could actually reduce the dependence on foreign fuels. Fourth, a carbon tax would likely improve the United States’ soft power. Soft power, a term coined by Harvard professor Joseph Nye, can be roughly defined as a country’s ability to persuade others by possessing attractive values and policies. By making very visible progress in this field of global concern, American soft power capabilities will improve. Why is this important? Well, many argue that, in today’s day of transnational threats, a strategy based primarily on coercion and military might (hard power) is simply not practical. Instead, it is believed that securing allies using a soft power strategy would better allow the US to combat today’s relevant problems, like terrorism, climate change, pandemics, and other threats that affect many nations.

# Impact Hegemony Bad

## Hegemony Bad Frontline

#### Hegemony Unsustainable – China is a growing threat to US primacy

Aaron Kliegman, Media Analyst for the Washington Free Beacon and Prior to joining the Free Beacon, Aaron worked as a Research Associate for the Center for Security Policy, February 22, 2016, “Report: U.S. Aircraft Carriers May Be Losing Military Primacy as Chinese, Russian Capabilities Grow,” ­<http://freebeacon.com/national-security/report-u-s-aircraft-carriers-losing-primacy-chinese-russian-capabilities-grow/> (Accessed 5/3/2016)

This military advantage for the U.S. may be coming to a close, however, as some countries – most notably China, Russia, and, to a lesser extent, Iran – have been investing in military capabilities to effectively counter American aircraft carriers, according to a report published Monday by the Center for a New American Security, a national security think tank based in Washington, D.C. The report, titled “Red Alert: The Growing Threat to U.S. Aircraft Carriers,” argues that the U.S. faces an ultimatum amid growing threats abroad: either “operate its carriers at ever-increasing ranges … or assume high levels of risk in both blood and treasure.” The main threat to U.S. carriers, according to the report, is China’s ongoing effort to bolster its anti-access/area denial, or A2/AD, capabilities. A2/AD is a military strategy meant to deny the adversary freedom of movement on the battlefield, and while few militaries will ever be able to match the size and strength of the U.S. carrier fleet, they can strengthen their A2/AD tools to make it as inhospitable as possible for the U.S. military to operate in certain areas, including its aircraft carriers. China is pursuing such a strategy by investing in advanced air defense systems, anti-ship cruise and ballistic missiles, submarines, and (less powerful) aircraft carriers to keep the U.S. out of the western Pacific, including the South and East China Seas. Of particular concern is China’s growing focus on long-range anti-ship missiles, known as carrier killers. “Beijing’s technological sophistication and emphasis on long-range anti-ship missile procurement qualify it as the pacing threat,” the report says. But China is not the only country focusing on A2/AD to counter American carrier dominance. Russia has anti-ship missiles and air defense systems at its Kaliningrad naval base in the Baltics and has been building up A2/AD capabilities around Syria, where the Kremlin has deployed advanced anti-aircraft systems. Moreover, several Chinese weapons systems are Russian-made, indicating the technological capabilities that Moscow possesses. As U.S. adversaries have acquired longer-range weapons, American carriers have reduced their ability to conduct long-range strikes, putting them more at risk. The report explains how operating its carriers “in the face of increasingly lethal and precise munitions will thus require the United States to expose a multi-billion dollar asset to high levels of risk in the event of a conflict. Indeed, under such circumstances, an adversary with A2/AD capabilities would likely launch a saturation attack against the carrier from a variety of platforms and directions. Such an attack would be difficult – if not impossible – to defend against.”

#### US dominance in Asia will cause a nuclear collision with China

John Glaser, He has been published in Newsweek, Washington Times, The National Interest, Reason and The American Conservative, among others, May 28, 2015, “The US and China can avoid a collision course – if the US gives up its empire,” <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/may/28/conflict-us-china-not-inevitable-empire> (Accessed 5/5/2016)

The US and China can avoid a collision course – if the US gives up its empire. The problem isn’t China’s rise, but rather America’s insistence on maintaining military and economic dominance right in China’s backyard. To avoid a violent militaristic clash with China, or another cold war rivalry, the United States should pursue a simple solution: give up its empire. Americans fear that China’s rapid economic growth will slowly translate into a more expansive and assertive foreign policy that will inevitably result in a war with the US. Harvard Professor Graham Allison has found: “in 12 of 16 cases in the past 500 years when a rising power challenged a ruling power, the outcome was war.” Chicago University scholar John Mearsheimer has bluntly argued: “China cannot rise peacefully.” But the apparently looming conflict between the US and China is not because of China’s rise per se, but rather because the US insists on maintaining military and economic dominance among China’s neighbors. Although Americans like to think of their massive overseas military presence as a benign force that’s inherently stabilizing, Beijing certainly doesn’t see it that way. According to political scientists Andrew Nathan and Andrew Scobell, Beijing sees America as “the most intrusive outside actor in China’s internal affairs, the guarantor of the status quo in Taiwan, the largest naval presence in the East China and South China seas, [and] the formal or informal military ally of many of China’s neighbors.” (All of which is true.) They think that the US “seeks to curtail China’s political influence and harm China’s interests” with a “militaristic, offense-minded, expansionist, and selfish” foreign policy. China’s regional ambitions are not uniquely pernicious or aggressive, but they do overlap with America’s ambition to be the dominant power in its own region, and in every region of the world. Leaving aside caricatured debates about which nation should get to wave the big “Number 1” foam finger, it’s worth asking whether having 50,000 US troops permanently stationed in Japan actually serves US interests and what benefits we derive from keeping almost 30,000 US troops in South Korea and whether Americans will be any safer if the Obama administration manages to reestablish a US military presence in the Philippines to counter China’s maritime territorial claims in the South China Sea. Many commentators say yes. Robert Kagan argues not only that US hegemony makes us safer and richer, but also that it bestows peace and prosperity on everybody else. If America doesn’t rule, goes his argument, the world becomes less free, less stable and less safe. But a good chunk of the scholarly literature disputes these claims. “There are good theoretical and empirical reasons”, wrote political scientist Christopher Fettweis in his book Pathologies of Power, “to doubt that US hegemony is the primary cause of the current stability.” The international system, rather than cowering in obedience to American demands for peace, is far more “self-policing”, says Fettweis. A combination of economic development and the destructive power of modern militaries serves as a much more satisfying answer for why states increasingly see war as detrimental to their interests. International relations theorist Robert Jervis has written that “the pursuit of primacy was what great power politics was all about in the past” but that, in a world of nuclear weapons with “low security threats and great common interests among the developed countries”, primacy does not have the strategic or economic benefits it once had. Nor does US dominance reap much in the way of tangible rewards for most Americans: international relations theorist Daniel Drezner contends that “the economic benefits from military predominance alone seem, at a minimum, to have been exaggerated”; that “There is little evidence that military primacy yields appreciable geoeconomic gains”; and that, therefore, “an overreliance on military preponderance is badly misguided.”

## Uniqueness Extensions

### Hegemony Unsustainable

#### US Hegemony unsustainable – rising powers

Seth Cropsey, Director at Center for American Seapower, April 13, 2016, “New American Grand Strategy,” <http://www.hudson.org/research/12409-new-american-grand-strategy> (Accessed 4/30/2016)

New threats have ended this brief period of America’s benevolent international leadership. Three competitors are at odds with the American-led international system. The sum of their ambitions is to undermine U.S. global power. A resurgent Russia aims to reclaim its previous glory, and capitalize on the current U.S. administration’s idea that a small America translates into a more secure world. The European refugee crisis and potential destabilization in the European Union challenge the American alliance system in Europe – the cornerstone of American security policy since the end of World War II. America’s remaining allies show little resolve. Meager European defense budgets make matters worse. In Asia, a rising China focuses on cultivating its economic resources and marshalling them to develop its military power. China’s island-building campaign that seeks to extend its territorial claims into international waters directly confronts the international order. As Admiral Harry Harris, commander of U.S. forces in the Pacific recently told Congress, “China has unilaterally changed the (region’s) status quo.” Beijing combines its land reclamation campaign with high-tempo presence operations, conducted by the PLAN and coast guard in contested areas of the South and East China Seas. The Chinese are also accelerating their ability to project naval power and control the seas by constructing troop transports, large surface combatants, and a second aircraft carrier. This situation bears a resemblance to the world America faced before World War II when Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan initially overwhelmed the European powers that had refused to rearm following World War I. But the semblance is passing. America faces not two aspiring hegemons, but three. The Middle East is the critical link between Europe and Asia. Its oil-rich states supply a large amount of the world’s energy resources, and facilitate exchange between the two hemispheres. With the Red Sea and Persian Gulf/Arabian Sea in the South, the Mediterranean to the West, and the Caspian and Black Sea to the North, the Middle East is more like an island than a contiguous land mass. On this island Iran attempts to assert its dominance. Russia aids Iran with weapons transfers and its support of Iranian proxy Bashar al-Assad. Relieved of sanctions, the Islamic Republic has begun to receive massive financial inflows, and has actively directed some of its profits towards obtaining dual-use military technology like jet engines. Iranian Special Forces, known as the Quds Force, conduct paramilitary operations in Iraq and Syria, expanding Tehran’s influence over its neighbors. Although America’s adversaries have worked with one another in the past, the current degree of cooperation between China, Russia, and Iran is a strategic terra incognita. Iranian oil shipped into Chinese ports generates financial resources that the Islamic Republic uses to purchase advanced weapons from Russia. Russia helps Iran fight its proxy wars while Iran supports growing Russian influence in the Eastern Mediterranean. America’s three strategic competitors oppose the U.S. in similar ways. China, Russia, and Iran understand the lessons of the First Gulf War. Since the Cold War’s end, America’s style of warfare has been to build coalitions, amass men and resources in neighboring countries, and launch combined arms assaults that overwhelm the enemy technologically and operationally. The American-led coalition in the First Gulf War of nearly one million soldiers eviscerated an entrenched Iraqi army of over 1.5 million. However, without neighboring Saudi Arabia’s willingness, the U.S. would have been unable to conduct the operation. A naval assault would have been smaller, and Kuwait’s crowded coastline could have meant high casualties. The First Gulf War suggested a clear strategy to counter the U.S. Deny American forces access to a region, and the U.S. loses power. Chinese, Russian, and Iranian efforts have all focused on denying America access to their respective regions. As it turns up the heat on the Baltic States, Russia is proscribing options for a rapid buildup by deploying long-range air defense and strike missiles at NATO’s borders. This is consistent with U.S. European Command commander General Philip Breedlove’s late February statement to Congress that “President Putin has sought to undermine the rules-based system of European security and attempted to maximize his power on the world stage.” China’s land reclamation campaign, increasing naval power, and anti-ship missiles aim to keep American forces at a distance from which effective combat power cannot readily be applied. Iran’s low-cost missile boats, midget subs, large numbers of ballistic and cruise missile as well as mines, and its influence at the Strait of Hormuz seek to offset American escalation. Instability in Iraq and the U.S.’s shaky relations with Pakistan further restrict staging points for an American attack. Declining U.S. military budgets and a shrinking force combined with poor treatment of critical allies have made things worse calling into question the US’ ability to honor its commitments. The current administration’s abrogation of ballistic missile defense agreements with Poland and the Czech Republic; its prolonged interruption of defensive arms sales to Taiwan; and its failure to keep the Saudis informed about last year’s deal with Iran are examples of treating allies shabbily. As a result, the U.S. is less able to rely on adequate basing rights where they are needed both to deter and if necessary to fight.

### Hegemony Low – Economy

#### US Hegemony is collapsing – economic instability

Mac Slavo, Editor of SHTFPlan.com, April 21, 2016, “The Economy: “Is This The End Of The U.S Dollar? Geopolitical Moves ‘Obliterate U.S Petrodollar Hegemony’“ http://beforeitsnews.com/opinion-liberal/2016/04/the-economy-is-this-the-end-of-the-u-s-dollar-geopolitical-moves-obliterate-u-s-petrodollar-hegemony-2527017.html (Accessed 5/6/2016)

“It seems the end really is nigh for the U.S. dollar. And the mudfight for global dominance and currency war couldn’t be more ugly or dramatic. The Saudis are now openly threatening to take down the U.S. economy in the ongoing fallout over collapsing oil prices and tense geopolitical events involving the 9/11 cover-up. The New York Times reports: “Saudi Arabia has told the Obama administration and members of Congress that it will sell off hundreds of billions of dollars’ worth of American assets held by the kingdom if Congress passes a bill that would allow the Saudi government to be held responsible in American courts for any role in the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks.” China has been working for years to establish global currency status, and will strengthen the yuan by backing it with gold in moves clearly designed to cripple the role of the dollar. Zero Hedge reports: “China’s shift to an official local-currency-based gold fixing is “the culmination of a two-year plan to move away from a US-centric monetary system,” according to Bocom strategist Hao Hong. In an insightfully honest Bloomberg TV interview, Hong admits that “by trading physical gold in renminbi, China is slowly chipping away at the dominance of US dollars.” Putin also waits in the shadows, making similar moves and creating alliances to out-balance the United States with a growing Asian economy on the global stage. This video reports on the breaking news of both China and Saudi Arabia making geopolitical moves that could cause a U.S economic collapse and obliteration of the U.S hegemony petrodollar. We go over China’s new gold backed yuan that cannot be traded in U.S dollars and rising tension with Saudi Arabia threatening economic blackmail if their role in 911 is exposed. Luke Rudkowski of WeAreChange asks “Is This The End of the U.S. Dollar?” in the video below:The Federal Reserve, Henry Kissinger, the Rockefellers and their allies created the petrodollar and insisted upon the world using the U.S. dollar to buy oil, placing debt in American currency and entire countries under the yoke of the West. But that paradigm has been crumbling as world order shifts away from U.S. hegemony. It is a matter of when – not if – these events will change the U.S. financial landscape forever. As SHTF has warned, major events are taking place, and no one can say if stability will be here tomorrow. Stay vigilant, and prepare yourself and your family as best as you can.”

### Hegemony Low – Budget Cuts

#### US Hegemony is low – defense budget cuts

Justin T. Johnson, Senior Policy Analyst for Defense Budgeting Policy at Center for National Defense, April 19, 2016, “We Must Get the Defense Budget Right” <http://www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2016/4/we-must-get-the-defense-budget-right> (Accessed 5/6/2016)

It doesn’t matter if it’s the Golden State Warriors, the Denver Broncos, or the U.S. Women’s National Team, the world’s best sports teams are built on three basic things: the best people, the best training, and the best equipment. The same is true of defense forces: people, training and equipment are the three legs of a strong and ready military. Unfortunately, devastating budget cuts have left the U.S. military short of all three. Consequently, our armed forces are rapidly losing their ability to win. Here are three pillars of a championship team and world class military 1. People Since 2011, the U.S. defense budget has been cut by 25 percent in real terms. Imagine what would happen to the Denver Broncos if the team’s budget was cut by the same amount. You would have to cut personnel. You might start with trimming your front office staff and dropping an assistant coach or two. But ultimately, you’re going to have to drop players, too.

### Hegemony Low – Hard Power Declining

#### Hard power is declining – corrective measures won’t be timely

James Jay Carafano, Heritage Foundation’s Vice President, Foreign and Defense Policy Studies, E. W. Richardson Fellow, and Director of the Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for International Studies, and Bridget Mudd, Research Assistant, April 26, 2016, “How Private Charity Can Help National Security,” <http://www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2016/4/how-private-charity-can-help-national-security> (Accessed 5/8/2016)

Americans have big hearts. They give more than $360 billion every year to good causes. Yet very little of that goes to keeping themselves, their families, communities or country safe from our nation’s enemies. Most Americans figure that defense is the government’s job. And if Washington is not up to the task, well, they don’t imagine that donations can do much to match the hundreds-of-billions the Pentagon spends. They are wrong. Targeted philanthropy can deliver significant competitive advantages to the U.S.—and that support will be vital to rebuilding our national defense. By objective measures America’s hard power is declining. Even if the next administration is committed to reversing the decline, it will take time and resources that are in short supply. Future presidents will have to balance rebuilding military power with concurrent efforts to rein in federal spending and the debt. At the same time, they will need to reassert American influence in multiple critical parts of the world.

## Impact Extensions

### Hegemony Bad – Nuclear War Impact

#### Hegemony creates a high probability for nuclear war – normalization of weapons

Mark Taliano, Global Research Writer and Activist, April 27, 2016, “Media Disinformation and America’s Wars: Liars Versus Truthers. The “Progressive Left” Has Been Coopted,” <http://www.globalresearch.ca/media-disinformation-and-americas-wars-liars-versus-truthers-the-progressive-left-has-been-coopted/5522078> (Accessed 4/30/2016)

The consensus of ignorance is sustained by what Michel Chossudovsky describes as an “American Inquisition”. Beneath the protection of this psychological operation, the engineered enemy is Islam, and the Global War On Terrorism (GWOT) has become a brand to disguise imperial wars of aggression as “humanitarian”. Thus, huge sums of public monies are diverted from worthwhile, domestic projects such as healthcare schools and roads, to support a criminal Project for a New American Century (PNAC) that is globalizing death, poverty, and destruction as the U.S led empire tries to impose a unilateral model of control over the world. The U.S is said to be “exceptional”, and therefore the rightful ruler. Manifest Destiny writ large. Dissent is suppressed within the framework of corporate media monopolies. Predominant narratives are supported by corrupt “NGOs” – totally bereft of objectivity — and intelligence agency “fronts”. Real investigative journalism offering historical context and legitimate evidence are relegated to the fringes, far outside the domain of the broad-based “consensus of misunderstanding.” The “Progressive Left” has been co-opted. So-called “progressives” (presumably unwittingly) support Canada’s close relationships with Wahabbi Saudi Arabia, Apartheid Israel, and even the foreign mercenaries currently invading Syria (ie ISIS and al Nursra Front/al Qaeda). The source upon which the pretexts for war are built and perpetrated are taboo topics, despite longstanding evidence that the official narratives explaining the crimes of 9/11 – and the subsequent “Gladio B” operations — are flawed. The truth is seen as “heresy”, and fact-based narratives are derided as “conspiracy theories”. Thus, a firm foundation of lies that serves as a sanctified justification for global war and terror, remains strong. But the stakes are high, as Western hegemony presses us closer and closer to a real prospect of widespread nuclear war. Already, the use of nuclear weapons is being “normalized” through the introduction of “mini-nukes” into the equation, and the blurring of lines between conventional and nuclear war.

### Hegemony Bad – US-China Relations

#### US Hegemony threatens US-China relations

Jack A. Smith, editor of the Hudson Valley Activist Newsletter and is former editor of the (U.S.) Guardian Newsweekly, May 31, 2015, “The Hegemony Games: The United States of America (USA) vs. The People’s Republic of China (PRC),” <http://www.globalresearch.ca/tthe-hegemony-games-the-united-states-of-america-usa-vs-the-peoples-republic-of-china-prc/5452656> (Accessed 5/1/2016)

The Obama Administration is not pleased with China’s more forward stance. Relations between Washington and Beijing are cooling quickly but both countries have a mutual desire to prevent this situation from getting out of hand. The key difference, and it is of great significance to both parties, is that China opposes hegemony in principle, and the U.S. is determined to remain the global hegemon. Contradiction is ever present in U.S. foreign/military policy, and things are rarely as they seem to an American people largely uninformed or misinformed about the realities of international affairs. This observation is occasioned by the extremes to which U.S. policy and interference around the world are being taken by the Obama Administration and its Republican congressional alter ego, obstructive on domestic matters but complicit with President Obama’s principal international monomania — the retention of Washington’s unilateral global hegemony. The Obama Administration appears to be preoccupied day and night gallivanting throughout the world issuing dictates, administering punishments, rewarding friends, undermining enemies, overthrowing governments, engaging in multiple wars, subverting societies not to its liking, conducting remote control assassinations, listening to every phone call and examining the daily contents of the Internet lest someone get away with something, jailing honest whistleblowers, upgrading its nuclear stockpile and delivery systems, moving troops and fleets here and there, and that’s only the half of it. This is happening for one main reason. The U.S. has arrogated world rule to itself, without authority, competition, or oversight, since the implosion of the Soviet Union nearly 25 years ago. There is nothing more important to America’s ruling elite. Every possible danger to Washington’s hegemony must be neutralized. And looming in East Asia is the cause of Washington’s worst anxieties — China.

### Hegemony Bad – China Encirclement

#### US primacy in Asia contributes to China feeling encircled and is unsustainable

S.I. News, Sputnik International News, February 1, 2016, “US Media In 'Battle' Over American 'Strategy of Primacy' in Asia,” <http://sputniknews.com/world/20160102/1032607954/us-asia-primacy-strategy.html#ixzz480TiR14D> (Accessed 5/4/2016)

The author also quotes other experts who say that “the notion that unequivocal US predominance in the Western Pacific constitutes the only basis for long-term stability and prosperity across the Asia-Pacific is a dangerous, increasingly obsolete concept” that is “deeply rooted in both American exceptionalism and beliefs about the benefits of hegemonic power in the international order” that do not stand up to scrutiny.” A B-52 Stratofortress is refueled in-flight over the Pacific Ocean. © FLICKR/ US AIR FORCE Washington's Gamble: US Causes 'Chaos in Asia' by Trying to Counter China And further insists that many scholar see China’s foreign policy as fundamentally defensive, mostly from that of the US. “For the present strategy against China to be effective —or, for that matter, coherent—there must be an explanation of how we expect containment to work,” Glaser opposes. “In what scenario can we imagine China, whose relative power in the international system is rising, to give up its regional ambitions, overcome its fears of encirclement, and cede regional hegemony to the United States, whose relative power is declining?” He then quotes Professor of Political Science, John Mearsheimer as questioning in one of his articles “why would a powerful China accept US military forces operating in its backyard?” The answer so far has not been provided.

### Hegemony Bad – China War

#### US Hegemony targets China making war inevitable

Jack Smith, Liberation News Staff Writer, June 2, 2015, “The Hegemony Games,” <https://www.liberationnews.org/hegemony-games/> (Accessed 5/4/2016)

The U.S. government is recklessly flailing its arms and interfering in all the global regions to impose its will in order to indefinitely continue enjoying unilateral domination and the sensation of luxuriating in the extraordinary advantages derived from being the world’s top cop, top judge, only jury, mass jailer and executioner extraordinaire. If you doubt it, just look about at the human, structural and environmental anguish created in the last 15 years by the action or inaction of Bush-Obama world leadership. Think about the trillions of U.S. dollars for destruction and death, and the paucity of expenditures for construction and life. A better world can only emerge from a better and more people-friendly political and economic global order. Obama’s policy of enhanced American “leadership” has created havoc these last six years as a result of the collusion between the Democratic White House and the Republican Congress — partners in the projection of American armed power around the world. The main target — despite all the elbowing and ranting about Russia, Putin, Ukraine, Syria, Iraq, Libya, Saudi Arabia, Israel, Iran, Yemen, Islamic State, ad infinitum — is and will remain China. The U.S. does not want a war with China, though one is certainly possible in time. It would prefer warm, friendly and mutually beneficial relations, under one condition: The U.S. is boss, and leads, while China — rich and powerful if it wishes — is subordinate, and follows, even in its own natural sphere of influence. Beijing does not seek hegemony, but it will not kowtow to the United States.

#### Tipping point – China sees US primacy as a threat

David M. Lampton, George and Sadie Hyman Professor and Director of China Studies at the Johns Hopkins Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies and Chairman of The Asia Foundation, May 11, 2015, “A Tipping Point in U.S.-China Relations is Upon Us”, <http://www.uscnpm.org/blog/2015/05/11/a-tipping-point-in-u-s-china-relations-is-upon-us-part-i/> (Accessed 5/8/2016)

Assessments of relative power in both countries for much of the last four decades created few incentives in either society to rethink fundamental policy. Chinese seemingly were resigned to “live with the hegemon,” as one respected Chinese professor put it, and Americans were secure in their dominance and preoccupied with conflicts elsewhere. After the 9/11 attacks on America, China was seen as non-threatening, indeed willing to use some of its resources in the “War on Terror.” In a reflective moment after the 9/11 attacks, then Ambassador to China Sandy Randt delivered a speech to Johns Hopkins–SAIS in which he said, “We have seen the enemy, and it is not China.” In the economic realm, expectations for growth in each society created common interests that subordinated many underlying frictions, whether economic or human rights. The positive balance between hope and fear tipped behavior toward restraint and patience. Things unfortunately have changed dramatically since about 2010. The tipping point is near. Our respective fears are nearer to outweighing our hopes than at any time since normalization. We are witnessing the erosion of some critical underlying supports for predominantly positive U.S.-China ties. Though the foundation has not crumbled, today important components of the American policy elite increasingly are coming to see China as a threat to American “primacy.” In China, increasing fractions of the elite and public see America as an impediment to China’s achieving its rightful international role and not helpful to maintaining domestic stability.

### Hegemony Bad – Russia War

#### US hegemony is at a tipping point for war against Russia and China

Paul Craig Roberts, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Economic Policy, May 5, 2016, “Somnolent Europe, Russia, and China,” <http://www.paulcraigroberts.org/2016/05/05/somnolent-europe-russia-and-china-paul-craig-roberts/> (Accessed 5/8/2016)

Perhaps you have wondered how it was possible for small countries such as Iraq, Libya, Syria, Yeman, and Venezuela to be threats to the US superpower. On its face Washington’s claim is absurd. Do US presidents, Pentagon officials, national security advisors, and chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff really regard countries of so little capability as military threats to the United States and NATO countries? No, they do not. The countries were declared threats, because they have, or had prior to their destruction, independent foreign and economic policies. Their policy independence means that they do not or did not accept US hegemony. They were attacked in order to bring them under US hegemony. In Washington’s view, any country with an independent policy is outside Washington’s umbrella and, therefore, is a threat. Venezuela became, in the words of US President Obama, an “unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States,” necessitating a “national emergency” to contain the “Venezuelan threat” when the Venezuelan government put the interests of the Venezuelan people above those of American corporations. Russia became a threat when the Russian government demonstrated the ability to block Washington’s intended military attacks on Syria and Iran and when Washington’s coup in the Ukraine failed to deliver to Washington the Russian Black Sea naval base. Clearly Venezuela cannot possibly pose a military threat to the US, so Venezuela cannot possibly pose an “unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security of the US.” Venezuela is a “threat” because the Venezuelan government does not comply with Washington’s orders. It is absolutely certain that Russia has made no threats whatsoever against the Baltics, Poland, Romania, Europe, or the United States. It is absolutely certain that Russia has not invaded the Ukraine. How do we know? If Russia had invaded Ukraine, the Ukraine would no longer be there. It would again be a Russian province where until about 20 years ago Ukraine resided for centuries, for longer than the US has existed. Indeed, the Ukraine belongs in Russia more than Hawaii and the deracinated and conquered southern states belong in the US. Yet, these fantastic lies from the highest ranks of the US government, from NATO, from Washington’s British lackeys, from the bought-and-paid-for Western media, and from the bought-and-paid-for EU are repeated endlessly as if they are God’s revealed truth. Syria still exists because it is under Russian protection. That is the only reason Syria still exists, and it is also another reason that Washington wants Russia out of the way. Do Russia and China realize their extreme danger? I don’t think even Iran realizes its ongoing danger despite its close call. If Russia and China realize their danger, would the Russian government permit one-fifth of its media to be foreign owned? Does Russia understand that “foreign owned” means CIA owned? If not, why not? If so, why does the Russian government permit its own destabilization at the hands of Washington’s intelligence service acting through foreign owned media? China is even more careless. There are 7,000 US-funded NGOs (non-governmental organizations) operating in China. Only last month did the Chinese government finally move, very belatedly, to put some restrictions on these foreign agents who are working to destabilize China. The members of these treasonous organizations have not been arrested. They have merely been put under police watch, an almost useless restriction as Washington can provide endless money with which to bribe the Chinese police. Why do Russia and China think that their police are less susceptible to bribes than Mexico’s or American police? Despite the multi-decade “war on drugs,” the drug flow from Mexico to the US is unimpeded. Indeed, the police forces of both countries have a huge interest in the “war on drugs” as the war brings them riches in the form of bribes. Indeed, as the crucified reporter for the San Jose Mercury newspaper proved many years ago, the CIA itself is in the drug-running business. In the United States truth-tellers are persecuted and imprisoned, or they are dismissed as “conspiracy theorists,” “anti-semites,” and “domestic extremists.” The entire Western World consists of a dystopia far worse than the one described by George Orwell in his famous book, 1984. That Russia and China permit Washington to operate in their media, in their universities, in their financial systems, and in “do-good” NGOs that infiltrate every aspect of their societies demonstrates that both governments have no interest in their survival as independent states. They are too scared of being called “authoritarian” by the Western presstitute media to protect their own independence. My prediction is that Russia and China will soon be confronted with an unwelcome decision: accept American hegemony or go to war.

### Hegemony Bad – US-Russia Relations Impact

#### US hegemony tactics threaten the US-Russia relationship – could lead to war

PTV, Press TV quoting Eric Draitser, Geopolitical Analyst, April 30, 2016, “US provocation of Russia could trigger world war: Analyst,” <http://www.presstv.ir/Detail/2016/04/30/463331/US-Russia-fighter-jet-Baltic-Sea/> (Accessed 5/1/2016)

It was “another provocation from NATO, from the United States, right up against Russia’s border,” Eric Draitser, founder of stopimperialism.org, said in an interview with Press TV on Saturday. “It is of course completely ignoring the elephant in the room that the United States is engaging in what amount to spying missions and deliberate provocations right up against Russian airspace, and that Russia is responding militarily in the way that I think any military power would when its territory is either encroached upon or is being deliberately provoked,” he said. Draitser believes that through intercepting the US jet, Moscow sent a clear message to Washington that “the United States cannot treat Russia in the way that it treats other countries.” “When we hear that this US jet had turned off its transponder, in other words refusing to identify itself electronically, and it’s flying essentially right up against Russian airspace, I think that the obvious response from Russia is exactly what they did; namely to intercept the aircraft to send a message to Washington that you cannot engage in princely this sort of provocation,” he added. Draitser said such provocation could have broader implications. “We have a global situation now in Syria, in Ukraine, in many other places in the South China Sea and elsewhere where seemingly one false move, one blunder of significant proportions, could lead the world into a global catastrophe.” He stressed that an armed confrontation “between the super powers of the United States and the nuclear power of Russia, the growing financial and of course military power of China; this could lead to world war.” Relations between the United States and Russia are at their lowest point since the end of the Cold War, largely due to the crisis in eastern Ukraine and Russia’s air campaign in Syria. Draitser concluded that Washington keeps on with its “military provocation tactic” which is “an absolutely dangerous and insane path,” because “this is how the US sees it will expand and maintain its hegemony.”

### Hegemony Bad – Economy/Trade

#### US economic hegemony damages trade – equal participation and non-hegemonic participation key

China Daily, May 5, 2016, “US Economic Hegemony Against World Reality,” <http://www.chinadailyasia.com/opinion/2016-05/05/content_15427810.html> (Accessed 5/7/2016)

Should all the trade deals involving any country follow the US' interests in this increasingly globalized world? Obviously Obama believes they should, and further, any trade deal should be operating in favor of the US' interests. This belief is based on the US' deep-rooted mentality of economic hegemony, which is totally contrary to the reality of today's world, at least in terms of economic development. It is a pity that the US president chose to ignore the interests of all other people on Earth. It is all but impossible for a single country to write the rules of trade for the development of a region or the world just to feather its own nest without ever taking into consideration the interests of its trade partners. China has never pursued such a scenario and is strongly against such economic hegemony. Instead, China, at which Obama pointed his finger, believes that the core principle for economic cooperation with other countries is for all parties involved to benefit on an equal basis. The balanced and sustainable development of the global economy depends on a more equal and fair world economic order, which requires the participation of all major economies in its governance, not just the developed nations. The G20's transition from a gathering of financial ministers and central bankers to that of the leaders of the world's major economies epitomizes the changes occurring in global economic governance. It also points to the fact that the day is gone when a single country could dominate the world economic order.

### Hegemony Bad – Japanese Militarism

#### Experts agree US Hegemony facilitates Japanese militarism

Zhang Tao, Editor China Military Online and The cited author is Hu Wenlong, executive governor of Chinese Military Culture Society (CMCS) and researcher with the Academy of Military Sciences (AMS), January 5, 2016, “Expert: US Hegemony Accelerates Revival of Japanese Militarism,” <http://english.chinamil.com.cn/news-channels/pla-daily-commentary/2016-01/05/content_6844783.htm> (Accessed 5/6/2016)

Expert: U.S. hegemony accelerates revival of Japanese militarism. As Japan's new security bills will officially come into force before the end of March this year, we need to make objective strategic judgment of the "revival of Japanese militarism" and make necessary preparations. This is a topic directly concerning world peace and development. The author believes that the revival of Japanese militarism is the inevitable outcome of America's Cold War mindset. As long as the U.S. doesn't give up its pursuit for world hegemony and the Cold War thinking, the Japanese militarism will always revive and at an ever faster pace. How can Japanese militarism revive? The old militaristic culture has never been eradicated in Japan and has been carried on by some people. Japan is currently trying to break away from the restriction of the Peace Constitution and make the Article 9 that prohibits Japan from having its own army and engaging in war invalid, and it is close to realizing this goal as it has lifted the ban on the right of collective self-defense and passed the new security bills. Next, Japan will enter the stage of abolishing the "Peace Constitution" in order to thoroughly shake off its restriction, and it will finally come to the stage of strengthening the military at a faster rate. While, the U.S. shifted its strategic focus to Asia Pacific and implemented the "rebalancing" strategy in 2010, hoping to maintain its hegemony in the world while containing the development of communism. Such a typical Cold War thinking in the new era, which clearly targeted China, Russia and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), without any doubts provided a rare strategic opportunity for the revival of Japanese militarism.

### Hegemony Bad – Terrorism

#### Terrorism is a direct result of American Hegemony

WTSA, What They Say About the USA – originally posted on 7or.am by Tara Cashrjan staff writer, January 25, 2016, “Obama Showed Why People Love Trump,” <http://whattheysayaboutusa.com/politics/20160125/122252/obama-trump-elections-2016.html> (Accessed 5/4/2016)

Obama's address was shot-through with the rhetoric of confrontation, domination, intolerance and isolationism. The underlining thesis was that of American Exceptionalism, without the slightest concept of democracy – because democracy involves cooperation, tolerance, and fair competition. The world would be a far safer place if only the US could learn to cooperate with Russia, China, the EU, Iran, and other world centers – instead of confronting them. Peace and stable development are only possible in a multi-polar world. The experience of the past 25 years shows what the results are, when one of the world's nations grabs a monopolistic position in international affairs. The situation in the Middle East typifies the results of the monopolistic, irresponsible, cynical, acquisitive and short-sighted policies of the United States. The gestation of the Islamic State, and other extremist terrorist groups is a direct result of American hegemony. Of course, nobody in Washington wanted any of that to happen, which is why they are rapidly trying to change course – and battle more with Russia, than with terrorism. The more they drone on about American Exceptionalism, the US's destiny of supremacy, and their confrontation with Russia, the greater terrorism will flourish, and the more frequent will be the occurrence of atrocities that discredit the entire idea of American democracy. It's no coincidence that Soviet leaders, too, loved to talk about the unique role of the USSR and its leading role in the international arena. They too talked of Afghanistan as their “international responsibility,” and inveighed against the US in exactly the way the US now browbeats Russia. Washington defends Kiev and its other 'client states' and harangues Moscow – while Obama carelessly named Ukraine as a 'client state' in his Congress address.

### A2 – Soft Power is Different

#### Soft Power contributes to propping up hegemony and hard power

Melissa Nisbett, Senior Lecturer in Arts and Cultural Management, March 13, 2016, “Who Holds the Power in Soft Power?” <https://theartsjournal.net/2016/03/13/nisbett/> (Accessed 5/7/2016)

Soft power has always involved the export of cultural goods, of course. For example, The Beatles, once referred to as the Prime Minister’s “secret weapon” received an MBE (a distinguished medal awarded by the Queen in recognition of contributions to the arts and sciences) for their “services to export” (British Broadcasting Corporation 2015). This was connected to the “British invasion”, which refers to the phenomenon in the 1960s where British musicians and popular music gained enormous popularity in the United States (ironically by rehashing American black music such as rock and roll, and blues). So, none of this is new. However, due to globalization and the accompanying stronghold that neoliberalism has across the globe, with the rise of Western corporate power, the growth of the Internet and shifting patterns of cultural production and consumption, soft power has transcended mere influence to become a significant factor in a state’s ability to generate income and boost its wealth. Any notions of intercultural understanding and cooperation have been at best, forgotten, and at worst, abandoned. I have also argued that, to a large extent, soft power can be bought. The trajectory of world history means that the wealthy western nations will always have the monopoly on soft power, since they have long established networks of influence, an infrastructure that enables vast cultural production, and the longstanding and proven channels through which these cultural goods can be distributed across the world. This means that soft power is simply a way of renewing, refreshing, and replicating existing power structures. It is one of the remaining weapons through which traditionally powerful nations can attempt to resist or slow down the shifting world order. It has become a means by which the existing hegemony can be reimagined, repackaged, and reaffirmed.

### A2 – Hard Power Good

#### Hard power trades off with domestic growth

Luke A. Drabyn, Blog Manager for Charged Affairs, August 11, 2015, “AS DIPLOMACY LIES DYING: WHY U.S. RELIANCE ON HARD POWER LEAVES THE 21ST CENTURY LESS SAFE” <http://chargedaffairs.org/us-reliance-on-hard-power/> (Accessed 5/5/2016)

Early last week, for instance, U.S. Air Force General Paul Selva argued that nuclear-armed Russia, not ISIS, is the biggest national security threat to the United States. The most up-to-date nuclear stockpile estimates, conducted by the Ploughshares Fund, show that Russia still has the largest number of nuclear weapons in the world, at 7,500—or 48 percent of the global total. Should Russian President Vladimir Putin play the nuclear card, as he has subtly hinted at within the past few months, media coverage of terrorists roaming throughout Syria and Iraq would disappear rather quickly. Yet at the moment, most U.S. citizens—lacking an informed understanding of global politics and relying on the media’s ratings-driven interpretations—severely misjudge the gravest threats to U.S. national security. Without more emphasis on education and international exchange, distrust, fear, and misunderstanding will increasingly inform and harm U.S. foreign policy. Unless and until the United States stops relying on hard power through its bloated defense budget to promote peace and U.S. national interests globally, the world will actually become more unstable. If U.S. lawmakers act now, they may still be able to redistribute funds toward programs that will incentivize students to increase language enrollment in more strategic languages and promote international exchange to more exotic locales.

### A2 – Hegemony Key to Stability

#### The costs of American hegemony outweigh the benefits – tarnishes stability

Stephen M. Walt, Robert and Renée Belfer professor of international relations at Harvard University, September 4, 2015, “What Do Politicians Really Mean by “Global Leadership?” <http://foreignpolicy.com/2015/09/04/what-do-politicians-really-mean-by-global-leadership/> (Accessed 5/4/2016)

For instance, one could argue that global leadership is necessary to “preserve stability” in key regions like Europe, Asia, or the Persian Gulf. There’s a solid case for that, but notice that in recent years the United States has been a leading source of instability in some of these places. It has done an especially good job of destabilizing the Middle East (see under: Iraq, Libya, Yemen, Gaza, etc.), and the initially successful effort to stabilize Europe by expanding NATO backfired when we (and the Europeans) got greedy and went too far east, thereby triggering the current crisis with Russia. If one of the candidates wants to make the “stability” argument, they need to say a lot more about exactly how the United States can reinforce regional peace instead of pouring gasoline on regional conflicts. Alternatively, more hawkish contenders might argue that “global leadership” is necessary to maintain U.S. credibility, which in turn is allegedly linked to the reliability of the U.S. deterrent. This is an old chestnut that never goes out of fashion: no matter how many times the United States demonstrates its willingness to blow stuff up, any hint of restraint (or good judgment) leads hawks to complain loudly that U.S. credibility is collapsing, our enemies are on the march, and key allies are about to make other arrangements. I get the logic here too, but there’s precious little evidence to support it. The perennial concern for “credibility” is mostly an excuse that lets allies free ride on Uncle Sucker, or a rationale that leads America to fight for things that don’t matter in the hope of persuading foes that we will fight for things that do. It’s also a completely circular argument: we need to exercise global leadership or otherwise our position as a global leader might be challenged. Got that? U.S. global leadership — and especially its military primacy — can also be justified as key to defending the “global commons” (freedom of navigation, international law, the global environment). I agree with this broad rationale, but notice that it has little to do with some of the extravagant and ill-fated initiatives the United States has undertaken in recent decades. Invading Iraq, trying to nation-build in Afghanistan, or playing Whac-a-Mole with terrorists using drones and special forces isn’t “protecting the global commons,” and as some senior officials have warned, these activities tarnish the U.S. image and may make some extremist movements more popular, not less. So if you’re going to defend U.S. leadership on this basis, you still need to explain what actions should be undertaken and what actions should be avoided. Perhaps “global leadership” really means defending and promoting a set of core values, such as freedom, democracy, human rights, etc.? I’m all for all of these, but neither Republicans nor Democrats seem to have done a very good job with any of these goals in recent years. Democracy is backsliding world-wide, human rights are progressing slowly if at all, and many U.S. actions — from its ill-advised military interventions to its reflexive support for serial human rights violators like Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Israel — suggest America’s “global leadership” on these issues is more rhetorical than real. Or maybe what some candidates have in mind is a return to the first Bush administration’s abortive “Draft Defense Guidance,” which called for the United States to prevent the emergence of peer competitors anywhere in the world. Needless to say, this basic concept has been a key element of the entire neoconservative worldview and was central to the first term foreign policy of George W. Bush. In this conception, “global leadership” really means global primacy: the United States maintains global military dominance, declines to be hamstrung by international institutions, tells its allies what to do and when to do it, and gives adversaries the choice of surrendering to our dictates or being overthrown. One can easily understand the appeal of this idea — at least to Americans — which is why candidates like to tell voters that if elected, they will sweep our enemies away like so many dust mites. If that’s what people like Cruz, Graham, Rubio, Jeb Bush, or even Trump have in mind, one wishes they would just come right out and say so. But of course they won’t, because we’ve run this particular social science experiment and it didn’t work well at all. Instead of coercing and compelling adversaries and winning the support and deference of our allies, the neoconservative recipe for U.S. dominance via endless war led inevitably to unwinnable quagmires, alienated important allies, and made the terrorism problem much worse. Telling voters that you’ll make the whole world behave might make for a great stump speech, but we’ve seen how well it works in the real world. Lastly, one could argue that “global leadership” is desirable because the United States gets tangible benefits from it — such as economic concessions from the allies we help defend — or because some degree of leadership is necessary to get other states to pitch in on common problems like the environment, migration, global public health, and the like. There is something to both arguments, but neither is incontrovertible. As Dan Drezner and Thomas Oatley have argued, the economic benefits of U.S. primacy are often overstated and the costs may be greater than we think. In particular, Oatley argues that paying for U.S. military buildups with borrowed money (which the United States has done repeatedly) creates asset bubbles and thus leads to subsequent financial crisis (such as the 2008 crash). If he’s right, than there is a cost to “global leadership” that most Americans haven’t recognized.

### A2 – Hegemony Creates Peace

#### Hegemony and peace are incompatible

Paul Craig Roberts, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Economic Policy and associate editor of the Wall Street Journal, May 7, 2016, “A Dire Future,” <http://www.globalresearch.ca/a-dire-future/5524042> (Accessed 5/8/2016)

One might think that by now even Americans would have caught on to the constant stream of false alarms that Washington sounds in order to deceive the people into supporting its hidden agendas. The public fell for the lie that the Taliban in Afghanistan are terrorists allied with al Qaeda. Americans fought a war for 13 years that enriched Dick Cheney’s firm, Halliburton, and other private interests only to end in another Washington failure. The public fell for the lie that Saddam Hussein in Iraq had “weapons of mass destruction” that were a threat to America and that if the US did not invade Iraq Americans risked a “mushroom cloud going up over an American city.” With the rise of ISIS, this long war apparently is far from over. Billions of dollars more in profits will pour into the coffers of the US military security complex as Washington fights those who are redrawing the false Middle East boundaries created by the British and French after WW I when the British and French seized territories of the former Ottoman Empire. The American public fell for the lies told about Gaddafi in Libya. The formerly stable and prosperous country is now in chaos. The American public fell for the lie that Iran has, or is building, nuclear weapons. Sanctioned and reviled by the West, Iran has shifted toward an Eastern orientation, thereby removing a principal oil producer from Western influence. The public fell for the lie that Assad of Syria used “chemical weapons against his own people.” The jihadists that Washington sent to overthrow Assad have turned out to be, according to Washington’s propaganda, a threat to America. The greatest threat to the world is Washington’s insistence on its hegemony. The ideology of a handful of neoconservatives is the basis for this insistence. We face the situation in which a handful of American neoconservative psychopaths claim to determine the fate of countries. Many still believe Washington’s lies, but increasingly the world sees Washington as the greatest threat to peace and life on earth. The claim that America is “exceptional and indispensable” is used to justify Washington’s right to dictate to other countries.

# Aff Afghanistan

## Solvency

### US is Key

#### U.S engagement key to getting China on track with resolving instability in Afghanistan

Thomas Zimmerman, Master’s Candidate at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy. He previously served as a Senior Program Officer at Center on International Cooperation at New York University (CIC) and as a Visiting Scholar at the Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences (SASS), October, 2015, “The New Silk Roads: China, the U.S., and the Future of Central Asia ,” New York University, Center on International Cooperation, <http://cic.nyu.edu/sites/default/files/zimmerman_new_silk_road_final_2.pdf> (accessed 8/12/16)

It is also in the U.S. interest to engage China in its planning around the NSRI. China has laid out plans for significant investment in Central Asia. As the U.S. has voiced concerns about entrenching corruption, bad governance, and weakened environmental standards, it must ensure open lines of communication with Beijing to discourage policies that undermine standards. The U.S. has encouraged China’s growing role in Afghanistan, and cooperation there between both countries has been one of the highlights of their bilateral relationship in recent years. It is of mutual benefit to connect Afghanistan to Beijing’s broader regional efforts.

#### China’s exclusion from the TPP has stifled cooperation between China and regional neighbors on OBOR- U.S. involvement in project can affront these challenges

 Juan José Alarcón, June, 2016, “The Chinese “One Belt, One Road” Initiative,” RGNN, <http://rgnn.org/2016/06/17/the-chinese-one-belt-one-road-initiative/> (accessed 8/12/16)

As we can see, religious extremism and Jihadism is spreading throughout the very same region where the Economic Belt has to be developed. Having in account that religious extremism and Islamist terrorism are being fueled by America’s imperialism and funded by Saudi Arabia’s money, they are undoubtedly a real challenge to the Chinese “One Belt, One Road” project. United States and its allies spread violence and destabilization where China wants to promote peace and create prosperity. THE “ONE ROAD” FACES ITS CHALLENGES TOO The 21st-century Maritime Silk Road is the contemporary version of the maritime route taken by Admiral Zheng He’s fleet six hundred years ago. It is an initiative aimed at promoting investment and cooperation in Southeast Asia, the Indian Ocean and East Africa, recreating the route once used by Admiral Zheng He to reach East Africa. There is a caveat, however. That ancient route past through the strategic Strait of Malacca, which nowadays is controlled by USA and its allies. To avoid that bottleneck, China has come with the idea of constructing the Kra Canal in Thailand. Curiously enough, the south of Thailand is predominantly Muslim and since recent years religious extremism and separatism are arising in that region too, just south where the Canal will be constructed. And let’s not forget the Karen rebellion in in Myanmar (Burma), northwest to the location of the would-be Thai canal. Other challenges are the maritime disputes between China and its neighbors in the East China Sea and the South China Sea. These territorial disputes involve a great deal of regional countries plus United States. They have the potential of harming bilateral relations between China and its neighbors. Yet another issue that could further disrupt the development of the “One Road” is the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), a regional project promoted and directed by Washington from which China has been excluded, making more difficult cooperation and understanding between regional countries and China.

### 2AC – Solvency: Cooperation Solves Afghanistan

#### Mutual engagement makes OBOR effective and their combined interests and experience in the region resolves instability

Thomas Zimmerman, Master’s Candidate at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy. He previously served as a Senior Program Officer at Center on International Cooperation at New York University (CIC) and as a Visiting Scholar at the Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences (SASS), October, 2015, “The New Silk Roads: China, the U.S., and the Future of Central Asia ,” New York University, Center on International Cooperation, <http://cic.nyu.edu/sites/default/files/zimmerman_new_silk_road_final_2.pdf> (accessed 8/12/16)

China’s push to invest in economic integration with its neighbors to the west and southwest comes as the U.S. is winding down its military involvement in Afghanistan. The OBOR initiative has the potential to integrate Afghanistan into the regional economy in ways the U.S. has sought to do for years, and, in that regard, the U.S. should be supportive of China’s efforts in Central Asia. It would be a missed opportunity if the two countries let their mutual suspicion get in the way of cooperation that could advance their common interests. It is important for the United States to engage with China on OBOR, but if it is to be effective, Washington needs to be conscious that Beijing still perceives its activities in the region as intended to contain China. U.S. initiatives in Central Asia, which are frequently conceived with little consideration given to the Sino-U.S. bilateral relationship, are often perceived in Beijing as part of a broader U.S. strategy aimed at hindering China’s economic and military rise. Beijing believes that the U.S. and its allies have worked to prevent China from playing a role in the region commensurate with its size and economic clout. The U.S. has reinforced this perspective in recent months through its failure to pass IMF reform and subsequent opposition to the AIIB. While the Silk Road initiatives have been envisioned as inclusive and adaptive frameworks, they were also conceived, in part, as a way to address this perceived imbalance. Thus, it is unlikely that Beijing will see a significant role for the U.S. China has an interest in building stronger relations with its neighbors. The scale of investment Beijing is currently discussing could have an immensely positive impact in a number of underdeveloped economies. At the same time, Beijing should resist the impulse to dismiss U.S. actions and commentary as an attempt to subvert Chinese influence. Beijing will face real challenges in implementing many of its Silk Road proposals, but a number of those challenges can be mitigated through early transparency and engagement. Similarly, the U.S. government’s experiences over the past two decades make it a potentially productive partner in areas where the two countries’ interests align. This is particularly true in Afghanistan. While Beijing has historically been content to watch the U.S. ensnare itself in conflicts that kept Washington’s focus away from the Asia-Pacific region, instability resulting from the draw down of U.S. forces over the next two years poses a direct threat to a number of China’s core interests. The U.S. continues to pursue opportunities to connect Afghanistan to its neighbors in ways that closely align with China’s stated objectives. China’s recent attempts to play a greater role in Afghanistan, particularly in promoting a political settlement, have been positive and should be expanded. The U.S. should welcome this development and encourage engagement between China and American allies in the region that may be suspicious of Chinese intentions. Through cooperation and transparency, the U.S. and China have the potential to be meaningful partners in promoting growth and stability across Central Asia.

#### United States cooperation with China key to stabilize Afghanistan

 Alonso Villaseñor, and Balder Hageraats, Villaseñor is an Associate Researcher and head of Project Coordination at RESET (Centre for Research on Security and Transnational Governance) in Madrid, specialized in geopolitics and global security, Hageraats is a Founding Partner of RESET (Centre for Research on Security and Transnational Governance) in Madrid, researcher and author of several books and other publications on global security, development cooperation and related topics, 2012, “Changing Places: Sino-American Rivalry and Cooperation in Central Asia,” Centre for European and North Atlantic Affairs, <http://cenaa.org/analysis/changing-places-sino-american-rivalry-and-cooperation-in-central-asia/> (accessed 8/12/16)

At the regional level of Central Asia, the United States and China have a lot to gain from cooperation rather than competition. They both benefit from a stabilized Afghanistan, and could complement each other in dealing with regional actors. China could use its special relationship with Pakistan to improve counter-insurgency and anti-terrorist efforts, while the American relations with India and ex-Soviet republics could prove valuable to China. As Evans eloquently puts it, “for both the United States and China, the realities of independent strategic power are disciplined by East Asian geopolitical bipolarity, the possession of nuclear arsenals, and the reality of intersecting economic-financial interests” (2009, 128).

#### U.S. cooperation with China on OBOR is a win-win and key to stabilizing Central Asia

Chen Weihua, July, 2016, China Daily, “Fostering China-US cooperation,” <http://usa.chinadaily.com.cn/epaper/2016-07/08/content_26016178.htm> (accessed 8/12/16)

Morrison, an expert on economic integration in the Asia-Pacific region, believes that China and the US are approaching the same issues, such as the One Belt One Road (OBOR) and Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), in different ways. The Americans concentrate on the legal framework, such as in making WTO and TPP very legalistic agreements. But he said China focuses on connectivity, on building things. "Both are good," he said. While the initial US opposition to the China-led Asia Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) has further reinforced the thinking among many Chinese that the Americans intend to curtail China's rise, Morrison said the US was right to push for the standards, but added that the US perhaps made a mistake "to appear to oppose the whole idea (of AIIB)". Despite Washington's opposition, virtually all of its major allies in Europe and Asia except Japan have joined the AIIB, which focuses on badly needed infrastructure-financing in the region. The soft-spoken Morrison said that many Americans aren't too worried about One Belt One Road. "One Belt One Road in a sense may help stabilize some of the Central Asian states we are very worried about," he said. Many thought-leaders, such as Robert Zoellick, the former World Bank president and former US deputy secretary of state, hold similar views that China's One Belt One Road initiative also serves US interests, and therefore the US should cooperate more closely with China in the program. Morrison believes that as long as One Belt One Road operates on good principles, such as on environmental protection, it could be positive for the region. "I think the way Americans and Chinese deal with each other should be very frank and blunt, but (they should) try to figure out how to use our resources as best we can to cooperate in (areas where) we have common interests, and over time, expand those common interests," he said.

### 2AC – Solvency: China Says Yes

#### China says yes- low-hanging fruit for cooperation

Hua Shengdun, April, 2016, “One Belt, One Road raise hopes,” China Daily, <http://usa.chinadaily.com.cn/us/2016-04/20/content_24679525.htm> (accessed 8/12/16)

The One Belt One Road (OBOR) initiative can play a role on a variety of fronts, from creating diplomatic ties to fighting terrorism in the Middle East and providing opportunities for China-US cooperation, experts said. "I see the OBOR as low hanging fruit for US-China cooperation, because there is no conflict of interest," said Yves Tiberghien, director of the Institute of Asian Research at University of British Columbia. "If anything, it's going to help stabilize Afghanistan and the Middle East." Tiberghien was one of several experts gathered at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) in Washington on Monday to discuss China's One Belt One Road initiative and China-US relations. Zhao Minghao, research fellow at the China Center for Contemporary World Studies, IDCPC, said the most important thing is that OBOR will provide people in the Middle East with jobs. "President Xi Jinping visited the Middle East in January this year, and there were lots of economic agreements between the Chinese government and local governments. One of them was about promoting industrialization in Middle Eastern countries," Zhao explained. One of the reasons so many young people are joining Jihadist organizations is because of the lack of employment opportunities, according to Tiberghien. "If this OBOR is able to create development, it will be a game changer, and of mutual interest for the US and Europe," he said.

#### China says yes- converged interests over Afghanistan

Andrew Small, Transatlantic Fellow, German Marshall Fund of the United States Testimony before the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission Hearing: Looking West: China and Central Asia, March, 2015, “China, the United States, and the question of Afghanistan,” <http://www.uscc.gov/sites/default/files/Small%20Testimony_Revised%20as%20of%203.23.15.pdf> (accessed 8/12/16)

Nowadays that aversion has gone. In the period since 2011, China and the United States have become more closely aligned in their interests and objectives, and cooperation has moved forward to such an extent that it is perhaps the foreign policy issue on which the two sides are in closest sync. China’s foreign minister has publicly described Afghanistan as a “new highlight” of Sino-US cooperation. There have been some symbolic bilateral initiatives, such as a program for joint training of Afghan diplomats, but these are of far less importance than the discreet pattern of coordination that has emerged between the two sides. This is symbolized by the fact that a new US-China-Afghanistan trilateral, agreed during President Obama’s visit to Beijing for the APEC meeting in November, will be the only such trilateral of its nature that exists between the United States and China. Chinese officials have met regularly with US counterparts to exchange information, and coordinate on important meetings and policy initiatives, including China’s push on the reconciliation issue. The two sides have a basic level of agreement on the need to see a stable outcome in Afghanistan after the drawdown of US troops, and the need to ensure that the Taliban do not play a dominant role in the country’s future. While in the past the nominally shared interest in “stability” was only one of a number of Chinese objectives, which might be trumped by Beijing’s interest in seeing a US exit from Afghanistan, this is no longer the case. Even when it comes to US troop presence, China actively encouraged former President Karzai to sign the Bilateral Security Agreement with the United States, and has - if anything - been seeking to ensure that the drawdown does not take place with undue haste.

#### China says yes- they know it’s in their interest to work together with the U.S. to stabilize Central Asia

Franz-Michael Mellbin, the European Union’s Special Representative in Afghanistan, and Ashish Kumar Sen, October 2015, “In Afghanistan, an Opportunity for the United States to Work with China and Iran,” Atlantic Council, <http://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/new-atlanticist/in-afghanistan-an-opportunity-for-the-united-states-to-work-with-china-and-iran> (accessed 8/12/16)

Mellbin: It is very clear that China seeks a close cooperation with the US on Afghanistan and sees a merit in pursuing that. It is not an easy equation because there is a wider, more complex relationship between the US and China that could get in the way if it is not managed. I think the two sides should see this as a positive opportunity and pursue it diligently, and certainly the EU and myself will try to support that because we believe that the US and China acting together will be very powerful to convince other regional partners to engage in a positive way when it comes to finding solutions in Afghanistan. The Iranians have also sent clear signals that they want to work together with the US and China on Afghanistan, but of course the domestic situation in the US makes it very difficult for the US currently to engage. The EU has, and will continue to have, increasingly close discussions with Iran on Afghanistan and we will continue to share the content and direction of those conversations with the US side so that can bridge part of the gap. Ideally, once domestic politics allows it in both Iran and the US for the two countries to have a discussion on Afghanistan, it is the foreign policy issue where the two countries are most likely to be able to find common ground because the key objective of both countries is short-term peace and stability in Afghanistan.

#### China says yes to Afghan cooperation- it perceives Afghanistan stability as in its interests

Zabihullah Mudabber, May 03, 2016, “Where Does Afghanistan Fit in China’s Belt and Road?,” The Diplomat, <http://thediplomat.com/2016/05/where-does-afghanistan-fit-in-chinas-belt-and-road/> (accessed 8/12/16)

China, as an economic power in Asia, has consistently been involved in Afghanistan, from investments projects (like the Mes Aynak copper mine) to supporting peace talks with Taliban as part of the Quadrilateral Coordination Group (comprising Afghanistan, China, Pakistan, and the United States). At different regional summits, Afghan leaders have always insisted on the key role that China can play in resolving Afghanistan’s political and economic challenges. In his remarks at the 2015 Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) summit in Ufa, President Ashraf Ghani sought to create a local push to resolve Afghanistan’s problems. Clearly, the Afghan government believes China should play a decisive role in the issues of Afghanistan rather than being an observer. Despite of a strong military and economic presence in Afghanistan by the United States and its allies, China has two specific reasons to become involved in Afghan issues, especially by investing in Afghanistan. First, China wants to contribute to the reconstruction of Afghanistan’s economy and sees economic engagement as China’s main contribution to Afghan and regional stability. Second, China is concerned that any new instability in Afghanistan may spread to South Asia and Central Asia and have serious impact on the stability and security of its western province, Xinjiang. Though OBOR is primarily aimed at expanding China’s economic power and finding new markets for Chinese goods, it will also bring significant economic opportunities for countries in the region, including Afghanistan. Afghanistan’s integration into OBOR will give the country the ability to pursue economic stability by improving trading opportunities, connecting with regional rail and road networks, emerging as an important partner in regional energy market, and fighting the regional narcotics trade.

### 2AC – AT: OBOR Hedges Against TPP

#### TPP and OBOR are not inherently conflictual with one another- they enable space for cooperation

Patrick Mendis, Harvard University and Dániel Balázs, Tongji University, April, 2016, “When the TPP and One Belt, One Road meet,” East Asia Forum, <http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2016/04/26/when-the-tpp-and-one-belt-one-road-meet/> (accessed 8/12/16)

The OBOR could easily be seen as a rival agenda to the US’ Asia Pivot strategy, in which the TPP plays a central role. Despite repeated requests from the Obama White House not to join the AIIB, many of the US’ closest allies have signed on, signalling the gravity of Beijing’s global power. But the two initiatives may be more prone to cooperation than competition. Although China is excluded from the TPP at the moment, Beijing’s bilateral economic agenda shows striking convergence with the US-led trade package. Beijing has signed bilateral investment treaties with several TPP members, including Australia and South Korea, and there are on-going trade negotiations with Japan. A US–China bilateral investment treaty is also in the making, while the forward-looking, newly-established Shanghai Free Trade Zone attempts to make the Hong Kong financial district history. From a strictly commercial point of view, China’s entrance into the TPP would be an act with mutual benefits. Beijing would significantly increase the gains of the TPP through technology proliferation while also providing advantages in the US market for Chinese exports and investment opportunities. This could be a decisive factor in favour of cooperation if both China and the US choose to prioritise commerce above political complications. Certainly, the history of hegemonic shifts in international relations projects gloomy times ahead for Sino–American relations. It would be naive to expect China and the United States to avoid collision out of pure benevolence. Yet it may not be inherently conflictual for the two countries to act according to their self-interest, if these interests lie in economic growth. If we add the growth of commercial bonds between the United States and China to the international trade puzzle, it becomes plausible that political ideologies will be trumped in favour of commercial prosperity. Given the commercial interdependence of China and the United States, and their national commitments to economic growth, the TPP and OBOR are likely to be drawn under a common scheme for mutually assured prosperity. In such a scheme, cooperative growth will matter more than the political ideologies of the past.

### 2AC – AT: New U.S. President Rolls Plan Back

#### No they won’t- OBOR too lucrative for Western nations to turn down

Daniel Allen, 2015, “New Opportunities in China’s “One Belt One Road” Initiative,” East West Bank, <https://www.eastwestbank.com/ReachFurther/News/Article/New-Opportunities-In-Chinas-One-Belt-One-Road-Initiative> (accessed 8/12/16)

As OBOR develops, markets along its routes will open up and diversify. Barriers to trade will come down and business environments will become more conducive to overseas investment. Western firms offering consulting, management and other professional services will see demand for their services increase, while industrial sectors such as telecommunications, finance and energy will all require Western technology and expertise. On the flip side, working with many Chinese companies is likely to remain a challenge. In many of China's companies, especially state-owned enterprises, decision-making structures and incentives remain opaque. Competition with Chinese firms in many areas will be stiff, as they can often operate in riskier environments at lower costs. It is the Chinese government's stated aim to generate an additional US$2.5 trillion in trade with OBOR countries over the course of the next decade. With a more developed OBOR region creating a bigger economic pie for everyone, the economic incentives for Western firms to get involved are clear. As the initiative moves from rhetoric to reality, such firms will need to position themselves well to win business in a range of demanding markets. "Right now, Western companies should be lobbying their governments to engage in OBOR through related institutions and mechanisms," says Dragan Pavlićević, contributing analyst at Wikistrat, a geostrategic consultancy company. "Synchronisation and synergy between development policies and financing platforms will allow them to benefit far more from the initiative."

## Stability

### 2AC – UQ: Afghanistan Unstable Now

#### Afghanistan unstable now- violent outbreaks and political instability rising

Lt. Gen. Kamal Davar, July 26, 2016, “Afghanistan: In the grip of spiraling instability,” South Asia Monitor, <http://southasiamonitor.org/detail.php?type=sl&nid=18457> (accessed 8/12/16)

Violence-stricken Afghanistan continues to find itself being helplessly crushed under the weight of spiraling political instability and mindless killings, which are often sponsored from across the border, with no peaceful end in sight. Just two days ago, the Islamic State – a Sunni terrorist outfit - targeted a peaceful procession of the minority Shia Hazaras, killing over 80 and injuring over 200 That the masterminds behind most of these attacks remain in neighbouring Pakistan is universal knowledge; a country that zealously seeks an elusive “strategic depth” against India for itself in the land of Hindu Kush. Pakistan, in its undying obsession for a pliant regime in Kabul, continues supporting the Afghan Taliban, Haqqani network (HQN), whilst also giving to leaders of these Afghan terror networks safe havens in North Waziristan and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. For the first time since the launch of Operation Enduring Freedom by the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in 2001 (now dubbed as Operation Resolute Support after the NATO troops drawdown in December 2015), American drones targeted Afghan Taliban leaders inside Pakistan in May 2016 killing their leader, Mullah Akhtar Mansour, generating a flicker of hope for the beleaguered Afghan government in Kabul. Pakistan, apart from some not so obvious rumblings and not overtly protesting the maiden US intrusion into North Waziristan, showed the double dealings of the Pakistanis. In the Country Reports on Terrorism 2015, the US State Department had also administered a scathing rebuke to Pakistan for its failure to police various terror groups in the Waziristan region, opining that “Pakistan did not take substantial action against the Afghan Taliban or HQN or substantially limit their ability to threaten US interests in Afghanistan”.

### 2AC – UQ: ISIS Threat High

#### ISIS threat in Afghanistan high now- recent attacks

Steve Visser and Masoud Popalzai, July 24, 2016, “ISIS claims Afghanistan explosion that kills dozens,” CNN, <http://www.cnn.com/2016/07/23/asia/afghanistan-explosion/> (accessed 8/12/16)

(CNN)ISIS is claiming responsibility for a joint suicide bombing Saturday that killed dozens of people during a peaceful demonstration by a minority group in Kabul, Afghanistan. "I saw tens of people laying down in blood around me and hundreds of people running away from the scene," said Fatima Faizi, an Afghan freelance journalist. So far, 80 bodies and more than 260 wounded people were taken to hospitals in Kabul, according to Ismail Kawoosi, a spokesman for the Afghan Health Ministry. Sayed Hamed, 30, attended the protest but left before the explosions. He was about two kilometers (1.2 miles) away. "As I was watching (from my hotel) and some (people) were running toward the scene and some were crying coming from the scene," he wrote in an email to CNN. "It was a very sad situation, and everyone was trying to find their relatives or friends." The attack, the worst in months in terms of casualties, drew attention to ISIS instead of the Taliban, which had been blamed for recent bombings.

#### ISIS threat in Afghanistan now- recent attacks demonstrating expansion into region

Mujib Mashal and Zahra Nader, July 23, 2016, “ISIS Claims Deadly Bombing at Demonstration in Kabul, Afghanistan,” The New York Times, <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/24/world/asia/kabul-afghanistan-explosions-hazaras-protest.html?_r=0> (accessed 8/12/16)

KABUL, Afghanistan — The Islamic State claimed a bombing that left at least 80 people dead Saturday at a peaceful demonstration in the Afghan capital of Kabul, raising fears that the group may be extending its reach beyond the country’s eastern pockets, where it generally operates. The Afghan Interior Ministry, in a statement, said the attack on thousands of Hazaras, an ethnic minority group staging the protest, had been a suicide mission. “The attack was carried out by three suicide bombers: The first person carried out a blast, the second one failed at his detonation, and the third terrorist was killed in shooting by the security forces,” the ministry said. The second assailant was presumed to be at large, a security official said, speaking on the condition of anonymity as he was not authorized to discuss intelligence matters. At least 231 people at the protest were wounded. The demonstrators had gathered in the west of Kabul to demand that a proposed electricity transmission line be routed through Bamian, a Hazara-dominated province in central Afghanistan. The Islamic State, in a statement on the group’s Amaq News Agency, claimed the carnage as a “martyrdom attack” on Shiites.

### 2AC – UQ: Uighur Threat High Now

#### Uighur threat high now

James Duglous Crickton, August 11, 2016, “Uyghur militancy becomes transnational threat to China,” OpEd News, <http://www.opednews.com/articles/Uyghur-militancy-becomes-t-by-James-Duglous-Cric-Al-Qaeda_Balochistan_China-Internet-Censorship_China-Politics-160811-293.html> (accessed 8/12/16)

The Uighur Islamists operate from safe havens provided by the Pakistani Taliban in the North Waziristan belt, using the Gilgit-Kashgar corridor to mount attacks on their home targets. Pakistan Army's Operation 'Zarb-e-Azb' has spared them both since the Pakistani Taliban are good terrorists, according to the classification of the ISI, which nurtures terrorists of various hues in furtherance of State policy. Uighur Islamists, under the banner of the Turkistan Islamic Party, TIP, ( also known as the East Turkistan Islamic Movement or ETIM), have forged close ties with al-Qaeda, and ISIS, with which the Taliban, was associated from Day One, first as a trainer, and then as a recruitment centre. Terrorism expert, Nodirbek Soliev (Senior Analyst at the International Centre for Political Violence and Terrorism Research, ICPVTR, a constituent unit of the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies, RSIS, Singapore) estimates that nearly 1,000 Uighur fighters and their families from China's Xinjiang province have joined al-Qaeda's Syrian affiliate, al-Nusra Front, and its rival, ISIS, in the Middle East. The number of Uyghur militants in Afghanistan is put at around 300-500 as part of the IS-Taliban axis. TIP's Syrian branch, known as the Turkistan Islamic Party in the Levant (TIP-L), is a close ally of al Nusrah Front and part of "Jaish al Fatah" ('Army of Conquest'), the new coalition of jihadists that has been fighting against the government forces in Syria. All this helped the Uighur Islamists to spread their wings and mobilize jihadi support to make China bleed, and hurt its economic interests globally either on its own or with the help of allies like al-Shabaab, Al Qaeda's branch in Somalia, the Haqqani Network in Afghanistan, and the Lashkar-e-Taiba (LeT) of Pakistan.

### 2AC – UQ: Terror Coop Low

#### Cooperation over terrorism low now due to ideologically divisions, but new threats create space for increased cooperation in their future

World Politics Review and Jeffrey Payne, the Manager of Academic Affairs at the Near East South Asia Center for Strategic Studies, August 1, 2016, “Ideological Differences Limit U.S.-China Counterterrorism Cooperation,” <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/trend-lines/19537/ideological-differences-limit-u-s-china-counterterrorism-cooperation> (accessed 8/12/16)

WPR: How extensive is counterterrorism cooperation between the U.S. and China, and in what areas are they trying to expand cooperation? Jeffrey Payne: China and the United States do not cooperate to any substantial degree on counterterrorism. However, countering violent extremism and counterterrorism are becoming more significant elements of bilateral security conversations. National Security Adviser Susan Rice’s recent visit to China featured frank conversations over concerns relating to the so-called Islamic State and other violent extremist organizations, reflecting a trend of China taking greater interest in such groups as its engagements throughout Africa and Asia have deepened. Besides discussions to enhance information-sharing devices between both countries, most progress in the realm of countering violent extremism and counterterrorism has focused on particular countries where U.S. and Chinese interests largely correspond. Afghanistan is a prominent example, where the U.S. has encouraged China to invest economically and to provide nonmilitary-related training and aid to the Afghan government and where China has taken the initiative to initiate talks between conflicting factions. In Iraq, where both countries have invested various resources, there is a similar effort to construct agreement on how both countries can assist the Iraqi government. Efforts at cooperation are complicated by the fact that the United States primarily focuses its resources toward the security and political realms, while China, hesitant to become an active participant in any foreign conflict, prefers to operate in the economic arena. Overall, the increased amount of conversations regarding countering violent extremism and counterterrorism is a positive development and could lead to cooperation on specific projects if trends continue.

## Relations

### 2AC – Uniqueness: Relations on Brink

#### U.S.-China relations on the brink now- GOP China-bashing

Patrick Winn, July, 2016, “As the GOP trashes China, Beijing warns of potential war with US,” PRI, <http://www.pri.org/stories/2016-07-20/gop-trashes-china-beijing-warns-potential-war-us> (accessed 8/12/16)

There’s never an ideal time to antagonize the world’s largest army. But this week — when China is seething over perceived American aggression — is a particularly bad moment to rile up Beijing. Yet that’s exactly what the US Republican Party is doing. At its ongoing convention in Cleveland, led by nominee Donald Trump, the party is doubling down on China bashing. According to the new Republican platform, China is guilty of “cultural genocide,” “barbaric population control” and a state-backed “hostile takeover” of American businesses. Worse yet, China’s military is growing more intimidating thanks to — you guessed it — the “complacency of the Obama regime.” This bluster comes at an extremely tense moment in US-China relations.

## Econ

### 2AC – UQ: China Econ Low

#### China’s economy low now- plan key

Kuwait Times, August 13, 2016, “IMF warns on China’s low economic growth, Press Reader, <http://www.pressreader.com/> (accessed 8/13/16)

Beijing: China must take “urgent” action to reform its economy or risk “permanently lower growth”, the International Monetary Fund said in a report yesterday, citing mounting corporate debt as a major concern. While near-term growth prospects remain good, Beijing’s failure to move on long-promised reforms is raising the chances of a medium-term hard landing in the world’s second-largest economy, it said. China is seeking to restructure its economy to make the spending power of its nearly 1.4 billion people a key driver for growth, instead of massive government investment and cheap exports. But the transition has caused growth to sputter. The Asian giant’s economy expanded at 6.7 percent in the AprilJune period, the same as the first three months of the year and slowing from 6.9 percent in 2015 – its weakest annual rate in a quarter of a century.

#### China’s Economy low now and expected to continue slowing

BBC News, August 12, 2016, “China's economic slowdown deepens,” <http://www.bbc.com/news/37055873> (accessed 8/12/16)

Both industrial output and retail sales fell short of expectations for the month of July. The figures underline China's difficulty of transforming the economy away from factories and exports. The data come just as economic growth had ever so slightly improved in the second quarter. Earlier this week though, China's latest trade data had also pointed to a further slowdown. A spokesman for the National Statistics Bureau said on Friday that the country's economy was still in a period of adjustment and facing downward pressure. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) expects China's GDP to grow by 6.6% this year, close to the low end of China's own official forecast of between 6.5% to 7%. The IMF also warned China against setting annual growth targets rather than projections, which it claimed fostered "an undesirable focus on short-term, low quality stimulus measures". In a report, the Fund said it expected China's economic growth to slow towards 5.8% by 2021.

#### China’s reliance on exports means even if it looks stable, it’s incredibly vulnerable to external shocks

Nurluqman Suratman, August 11, 2016, Posted by Matt Weber, “China Economy Faces Downside Risks from Brexit Jitters,” Elsevier, <https://chemical-materials.elsevier.com/chemical-rd/china-economy-faces-downside-risks-from-brexit-jitters/> (accessed 8/12/16)

China posted a 6.7% GDP growth in the second quarter, unchanged from the first quarter and in line with the government’s full-year target of about 7.0%. On a quarter-on-quarter basis, the country’s GDP expanded by 1.8% in the April-June period. While retail sales suggested that private consumption was broadly stable in the second quarter of this year, investment among state-sponsored companies soared in the same period, which partially compensated for “poor dynamics” in investment from private firms, according to Barcelona-based research firm Focus Economics. Meanwhile, monthly consumer price inflation in the country have stayed at around 2.0% in January to June 2016, recovering from a six-year low of 1.4% in 2015, according to official data. Wholesale prices, on the other hand, remained in a deflationary mode, falling by 2.6% in June, but markedly lower than the full-year average decline of 5.2% in 2015. But China’s reliance on exports for growth makes it vulnerable to external shocks like Brexit. Slumping exports amid the global economic downturn caused the Chinese economy to weaken steadily, and is now on its sixth year of slowdown. It posted its lowest GDP growth in a quarter century in 2015 at 6.9%.

# Neg Afghanistan

### 1NC – Solvency: Squo Solves

#### Status quo solves- already multilateral cooperation over Afghanistan, U.S. not key

Zhao Huasheng, 2016, “Afghanistan and China’s new neighbourhood diplomacy,” International Affairs 92, Chatham House, <https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/files/chathamhouse/publications/ia/INTA91_4_ZhaoHuasheng.pdf> (accessed 7/22/16)

While engaging in bilateral cooperation with Afghanistan, China has taken a number of initiatives in the region to facilitate regional cooperation in support of Afghanistan’s transition and transformation. For this purpose, it has launched bilateral and trilateral talks with the key players in the region, Pakistan, Russia, India and Iran, each of which plays an indispensable role in the resolution of issues related to peace and stability in Afghanistan, and it has created mechanisms to discuss the Afghan question in collaboration with them: bilateral mechanisms with Pakistan and Iran, and trilateral mechanisms with Russia and India, Russia and Pakistan, and Afghanistan and Pakistan. At the time of writing, both bilateral mechanisms have held talks twice; the China–Russia–Pakistan trilateral mechanism once; the China–Russia–India trilateral mechanism twice; and the China– Afghanistan–Pakistan trilateral mechanism four times. In February 2015, the Chinese–Afghan–Pakistani talks were elevated to the status of trilateral strategic dialogue, with the first dialogue being held in Kabul.56

### 1NC – Solvency: China Says No

#### China says no- they don’t trust U.S. involvement

Maral Noori, Daniel Jasper, and Jason Tower, August 24, 2015, “Overcoming Barriers to U.S.-China Cooperation,” United States Institute of Peace, <http://www.usip.org/publications/2015/08/24/overcoming-barriers-us-china-cooperation> (accessed 7/22/16)

In late 2011, the Obama administration announced plans to "pivot" toward Asia, and in late 2012, shortly after taking office, Chinese president Xi Jinping expressed his desire for "a new type of relationship between major countries in the twenty-first century."1 Chinese interpretations of these relations usually highlight a greater voice in global governance and sharing power with the United States. Yet many in Washington think that Beijing’s true intentions are to challenge the U.S. presence in Asia at a time when Washington intends to consolidate its regional leadership. Many U.S. analysts point to Chinese initiatives such as the One Belt One Road or the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) to argue that China is pushing to reshape international institutions and responding aggressively to Washington’s initiatives. Chinese experts point to U.S. diplomatic efforts to undermine Chinese initiatives and argue that Washington is trying to contain China in Asia. They also question U.S. policies, which they insist exacerbate tensions over regional maritime disputes. Both nations’ directives leave ample room for interpretation and have added to mounting tensions. Because misunderstandings abound, identifying common ground is imperative.

### 2NC – Solvency: China Says No

#### China says no- they made OBOR to hedge against the U.S.

Kyle Churchman, Resident Junior Fellow at the Center for the National Interest in Washington, D.C. , December, 2015, “China’s Vision for a New Asian Economic and Political Order,” The National Bureau of Asian Research, <http://nbr.org/research/activity.aspx?id=637> (accessed 7/22/16)

Geostrategic motivations also drive the OBOR initiative, with the overarching one being the desire to circumvent U.S. encirclement in the Western Pacific. U.S. political and military influence in the regions west of China is considerably weaker than around China’s eastern rim, giving Beijing incentive to “go west” as Washington rebalances to the Asia-Pacific. The construction of new pipelines linking China with hydrocarbon-rich Central Asian states and the transport of Middle Eastern oil through Pakistan instead of the South China Sea will improve Chinese energy security. Currently, more than 70% of China’s oil imports from the Middle East and Africa pass through the Strait of Malacca—a chokepoint between the Malay Peninsula and Sumatra that is vulnerable to a U.S. blockade. A further geostrategic motivation is focused on soft power: China hopes to win the goodwill of OBOR nations by providing billions of dollars in financing for infrastructure projects that will likely benefit their economies.

#### China says no- they don’t want to be perceived as interventionist

Michael Clarke, October 12, 2015, “Afghanistan: An Opportunity for U.S.–China Cooperation?,” The National Interest, <http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/afghanistan-opportunity-us%E2%80%93china-cooperation-14052> (accessed 7/21/16)

Speculation that China would actively consider a more overt security presence or engagement in Afghanistan, however, ignores the reputational costs this would impose on Beijing. Much of Beijing’s diplomatic success throughout Eurasia over the past decade has been built not only on its undoubted economic weight but also its ability to counter-pose its doctrine of ‘non-intervention’ to that of the West’s recent record of direct intervention into the affairs of others. The continued strength of this particular peculiarity of Chinese diplomacy has been most recently exhibited in Beijing’s response to the NATO-led intervention in Libya and its approach to the ongoing Syrian crisis.

#### China says no- it wants economic hegemony over the U.S. and there’s no perception that either side will cooperate

Stephanie Goche, Research Analyst, Northern Australia and Land Care, July 7, 2016, “China’s One Belt One Road Policy: Can History Repeat Itself?,” Future Directions, <http://www.futuredirections.org.au/publication/chinas-one-belt-one-road-policy-can-history-repeat/> (accessed 7/22/16)

One question that has recently come to the forefront is whether this policy is China’s form of retaliation from being excluded from the TTP. It is no secret that the United States and China are part of a not so silent competition to claim the title of world economic superpower, it is understandable that some are sceptical of China’s intentions. The successful implementation of the scheme would see China accrued increased influence that would conceivably bring them to parity with the United States as a superpower, at least economically. The US has not been shy to state its discontent with the policy and has urged many of its allies to refrain from supporting the AIIB and signing on to the OBOR. Professor John Mearsheimer in a CCT interview predicted that China’s increased presence in the Indian Ocean would induce conflict between China and the US. He was quoted stating that in this instance China will most likely be met by the US and Indian Navy, creating fear amongst many that this policy will increase the tension amongst some major states. China has of course denied these claims but the fact remains that there are still sceptics. It will be difficult for China to remove the suspicion that the OBOR is a geopolitical strategy to ‘rebalance’ its presence against the US in Asia and increase its influence across the Eurasian land mass. Despite the political tension, however, the United States has the opportunity to utilise this policy as a means of enhancing its affiliations with china in a positive manner.

### 1NC – AT: Relations

#### U.S.-China cooperation over OBOR won’t happen- U.S. doesn’t want to cooperate

Chas Freeman, Ambassador Freeman chairs Projects International, Inc. He is a retired U.S. defense official, diplomat, and interpreter, July 23, 2015, “China and the Economic Integration of Europe and Asia,” <http://chasfreeman.net/china-eurasia-integration/> (accessed 7/22/16)

The “one belt, one road” project has barely registered in official Washington. It is not taken seriously by many within the Beltway. Nor, as I vividly recall, was Deng Xiaoping’s 1978 announcement of his vision of “reform and opening.” Now, as then, there are lots of China specialists who dismiss China’s aspirations as unlikely to produce much. There are many skeptics in China itself. But China’s leaders are betting that the “one belt, one road” project can bring about a second major advance in their country’s long march toward wealth and power. They believe that their vision has the potential to be as transformative as Deng’s “reform and opening” has been over the past thirty-seven years. These are early days in the development of a program conceived to span three or more decades. But slighting China’s latest effort to boost its wealth and power or its potential strategic implications strikes me as very likely a big mistake. In any event, while Washington works itself into a lather over Chinese pave-overs of reefs in the South China Sea, Beijing is focused on much bigger things. Chinese spokespersons are careful to describe their country’s Silk Road initiatives in purely economic terms. Still, if these initiatives work at all, they will have enormous geopolitical impact. Beijing has indicated a willingness to commit as much as $1.4 trillion to its “one belt, one road” strategy. To put this in perspective, it is more than ten times Washington’s historic commitment to the Marshall Plan, which totaled $120 billion in today’s dollars. China has already deployed at least that amount of new money to its vision of Eurasian economic integration.

### 1NC – AT: Central Asian Instability

#### Status quo solves AND China says no to playing by United States’ rules

Michael Schaefer, Wei Shen, and André Loesekrug-Pietri, September 7, 2015, “China's "One Belt, One Road" Europe’s Strategic Interest to Drive the New Silk Road,” BMW Foundation, <http://www.bmw-stiftung.de/en/people-ideas-views/chinas-one-belt-one-road/> (accessed 7/22/16)

Third and most important: the core of this initiative lies in its strategic and geopolitical importance. China seeks to build a cordon sanitaire of regional stability. China’s leadership firmly believes economic prosperity is the only way to maintain peace in its fragile neighbourhood, from volatile Central Asia via a fragmented Pakistan and war-torn Afghanistan to the terror belt in MENA. The Chinese Government has resisted the idea of labelling the ‘Belt and Road’ project as its own Marshall Plan - but in the mind-set of Chinese leaders, the commonality of economic interests with the corridor nations and a sound infrastructure bond will be the best way to prevent regional conflicts and a viable way to export China’s model of development – the right to develop irrespective of political systems. China is ready to take a greater role Strategically, the ‘Belt and Road’ concept and the establishment of the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB), the Silk Road Fund and other related initiatives send out a clear signal: China is ready to take a greater role in regional and global governance. Over the past decades, China’s was an ‘agenda-follower’ rather than ‘agenda setter’. A key principle of China’s foreign policy has been a ‘peaceful rise with a low profile’. Accordingly, China initially accepted and integrated into the existing system of global governance. This phase is coming to an end. China’s economic power and political weight are strong arguments for Beijing that its development must not continue to be subject to rules mainly decided by industrialized nations. Beijing intends to be more pro-active in protecting its national interests.

### 1NC – AT: Afghan Instability

#### China-India cooperation over OBOR sufficient- U.S. cooperation not necessary

Sarah Lain, Research Fellow at RUSI. Sarah Lain’s research looks at Russia and the former Soviet states. In particular, she focuses on China and Russia’s relations with the five Central Asian states, and Raffaello Pantucci, Senior Research Fellow and Director of International Security Studies at RUSI. His research focuses on counter-terrorism as well as China’s relations with its western neighbours, 2016, “China’s Belt and Road A View From Delhi,” The Royal United Services Institute, <https://rusi.org/sites/default/files/20160629_chinas_belt_and_road_final.pdf> (accessed 7/22/16)

The first major issue to be discussed in the context of the stability and security of Afghanistan was the situation at the national level. Apart from the fragmentation of the Taliban (the discussions in Delhi took place before Mullah Mansour’s death), which has led to a surge in violence, and the appearance of Daesh in certain regions, the stability of the country is further complicated by the strong influence of outside powers. One participant described this as a return to ‘great game politics’ noting that many of the roots of the problems in Afghanistan are ‘across the border’. The use of Afghanistan as a site for a proxy war between different countries and groups further complicates the ability to stabilise the situation; in turn, this deters investment. Despite efforts by NATO, the continued lack of capacity within the Afghan National Security Forces has made the country more vulnerable. NATO’s withdrawal has left a security vacuum that undermines both defence and the credibility of the central government. Divisions within the state institutions are causing people to ‘hedge’ and ‘secure their own positions’ within government, which in turn ‘saps the state of vitality’ and can exacerbate corruption. China and India could each do more on a bilateral basis with Afghanistan, as well as trilaterally, to train Afghan forces, provide equipment and co-operate on counter-terrorism. This would need to be delivered according to a systematic and co-ordinated approach. India and China could cooperate more through the various multilateral formats for peace proposals in Afghanistan. The Collective Security Treaty Organization, the SCO, the Heart of Asia process and the most recent Quadrilateral Contact Group (QGC) talks including the US, China, Pakistan and Afghanistan all recognise that Afghanistan needs support for its stability. However, there has been considerable scepticism as to whether such discussions lead to action; simply using multilateral discussion formats will have limited impact. Many Indian participants, in particular, were sceptical of Pakistan’s role in the quadrilateral talks, as it is seen to legitimise the country’s role as a facilitator for the Taliban in Afghanistan.

### 2NC – AT: Afghan Instability

#### Status quo solves Afghanistan instability, and stability makes OBOR successful, not the other way around

Taylor Butch holds a Masters in Middle East and Mediterranean Studies from King's College London. He is a contributing analyst at Wikistrat and an inaugural fellow at China Cooperative, January 11, 2016, “Is the risk for China in Afghanistan worth the reward?,” China Cooperative, <http://www.china-cooperative.com/#!Is-the-risk-for-China-in-Afghanistan-worth-the-reward/ht21m/5693793e0cf263fc5a83c155> (accessed 7/22/16)

In a positive step, however, Afghanistan, Pakistan, the U.S., and China, will partake in quadrilateral talks on Monday in Islamabad to discuss peace. One party, the Taliban, will not be attending the talks. This progress is certainly welcomed by Beijing, whose special envoy for Afghanistan, Deng Xijun, articulated the significance peace in Afghanistan holds for China and the region. 'A sustainable solution [for peace in Afghanistan] can only be achieved through political means,' Deng told the The Express Tribune in November 2015. 'It is not only in the national interest of Afghanistan, but also in the national interest of China and Pakistan, and it will also benefit the entire region, especially economic development of regional countries,' he added. Although Beijing and Kabul share a small border, China has kept notice of the Taliban and other terrorist groups operating out of Afghanistan. China fears that these groups may cross into the north-west province of Xinjiang via a weak boarder. From Beijing’s perspective, this is a security concern. It has labeled Xinjiang a melting pot for the Eastern Turkmenistan Islamic Movement (ETIM) terrorists, who want to break away from China. Xinjiang, home to a Muslim majority, has experienced a growing number of terrorist attacks in recent years. Certainly with the first killing of a Chinese citizen by ISIS last November, and the growing number of ISIS terrorists in Afghanistan, Beijing has a much larger stake in the game than it once did to protect its citizens, secure its borders, and uphold domestic stability. economic implications Stability in Afghanistan further benefits Beijing's 'One Belt-One Road' strategy, a system of railways and highways by land and sea connecting the Middle Kingdom to Central Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Europe. If greater unrest were to overwhelm Afghanistan, or move into neighboring countries, it might have a costly and negative impact on China's grand plan. Massive economic projects scattered throughout central Asia, including Afghanistan, might be disrupted. It is therefore in Beijing’s best interest to ensure Kabul’s stability.

#### China India cooperation solves

Sarah Lain, Research Fellow at RUSI. Sarah Lain’s research looks at Russia and the former Soviet states. In particular, she focuses on China and Russia’s relations with the five Central Asian states, and Raffaello Pantucci, Senior Research Fellow and Director of International Security Studies at RUSI. His research focuses on counter-terrorism as well as China’s relations with its western neighbours, 2016, “China’s Belt and Road A View From Delhi,” The Royal United Services Institute, <https://rusi.org/sites/default/files/20160629_chinas_belt_and_road_final.pdf> (accessed 7/22/16)

There is a wealth of business knowledge in India on Afghanistan. The economic strengths and weaknesses of the country, and areas where it needs to develop its economy, such as increasing export volumes, are well understood. Both sides could co-operate on advising Afghanistan on how to build up parts of its economy to improve the investment climate. For example, exporting from Afghanistan is not easy in terms of time and costs – on average, documentary compliance for export from Afghanistan takes 243 hours, compared to the South Asia regional average of 80 hours.13 China and India could also create joint ventures under the SREB funding mechanisms. Particular areas they might co-operate on that were identified include: freight; trucking; production of small parts; metalworking; operations and maintenance support in the mining industry; and transport. Focusing on renewable energy and the construction of oil and gas pipelines was another. Micro-finance is another area that Afghanistan would certainly benefit from, which both China and India could find monies to contribute towards.

#### Status quo solves- China has already invested in infrastructure development via OBOR

Jeffrey Mankoff, July 30, 2015, “Searching for a Silk Road: The United States in Central Asia,” Aljazeera Center for Studies, <http://studies.aljazeera.net/en/reports/2015/07/2015730105241426649.html> (accessed 7/22/16)

China meanwhile was busy articulating its own vision of Eurasian integration, which President Xi Jinping first announced at a speech in Astana, Kazakhstan in September 2013.(9) China’s Silk Road Economic Belt is an ambitious scheme to improve connectivity across the vast Eurasian landmass, creating an infrastructure network tying East and South Asia to Europe. Building new trade and transit infrastructure across Eurasia fits in with China’s focus on economic development in its restive western regions, particularly Xinjiang. Beijing’s approach to Central Asia is similar; concerned about the rise of extremism on its borders and the potential for instability when the current generation of strongmen passes from the scene, Beijing views its promotion of infrastructure and trade as an investment in security over the longer term. Critically, Beijing has the resources to make its vision a reality. China has already invested more than $50 billion in Central Asia, much of it on new road, rail, and pipeline infrastructure. In October 2014, Xi announced that China would establish a $40 billion investment fund to build the infrastructure underpinning the Silk Road Economic Belt and the related Maritime Silk Road across Southeast Asia—what Beijing now collectively calls “One Belt One Road."(10) Similarly, the new Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB), whose $100 billion initial capitalization includes nearly $30 billion from China, will focus much of its lending on large-scale infrastructure projects.(11) As their respective relations with the United States have grown more tense in recent years, Russia and China have begun exploring cooperation in Eurasia, even though Beijing’s vision of transcontinental trade has little in common with Russia’s plans for post-Soviet political and economic integration. This past May, Xi and Putin agreed to establish a dialogue forum through the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) on combining the Eurasian Economic Union and Silk Road Economic Belt schemes. Under the plans being discussed, Moscow would be able to tap into Chinese investment capital, while Beijing would benefit from new transit opportunities and reduced customs controls between its own western border and Europe.(12)

### 1NC – Solvency: Terrorism

#### More Chinese involvement causes blowback and increases terror risks

Michael Clarke, October 12, 2015, “Afghanistan: An Opportunity for U.S.–China Cooperation?,” The National Interest, <http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/afghanistan-opportunity-us%E2%80%93china-cooperation-14052> (accessed 7/21/16)

Afghanistan, in particular, is deeply problematic for China in terms of the security of Xinjiang, its geopolitical interests and its reputation. China’s aloof approach to the country since the U.S. and NATO intervention began, as Andrew Small has noted, has been dictated by a conflicted mindset: “China sat out the conflict in Afghanistan. It wanted neither a Western victory that might entrench a U.S. military presence in its backyard, nor a Taliban victory that would pose risks to Xinjiang and the wider region. As a result, its financial and political contributions to Afghanistan were at best tokenistic, the minimum necessary to avoid alienating anyone.” Greater Chinese security engagement in Afghanistan promises not only to make it a more overt target for radical Islamists, impacting negatively in the security of Xinjiang, but also to damage Beijing geopolitically by bringing it into conflict with its ‘all weather’ friend, Pakistan. Beijing has emerged as an active proponent of a negotiated political settlement between the Taliban and Kabul—even brokering secret negotiations between the two—in the interests of ‘stability’, while Pakistan “has been keener to see a level of consistent instability in Afghanistan” rather than a secure and independent Kabul. The scope for this divide between the ‘all weather’ friends to widen was underlined by the multiple bomb attacks in the Afghan capital on August 10 and 12. The Ghani government explicitly blamed the attacks on Pakistan and Beijing offered to extend greater security assistance to Kabul in response.

#### U.S.-China coop doesn’t solve terror- empirics prove their cooperation over terror ineffective

South China Morning Post, April, 2016, “China boosts security role in Afghanistan to counter growing terrorism threat,” <http://www.scmp.com/news/china/diplomacy-defence/article/1935410/china-boosts-security-role-afghanistan-counter-growing> (accessed 7/22/16)

China has joined the United States and Pakistan in seeking to broker talks between Ghani’s government and the Taliban, which has made gains as American troops hand over security responsibilities to Afghan forces. Those efforts have produced little to date, mostly due to Taliban infighting following the revelation last year that founder Mullah Omar had died. At the same time, security on the ground is worsening. Groups swearing allegiance to the Islamic State have popped up and the Taliban reportedly control more territory than at any point since 2001, prompting the United States to alter its timetable for withdrawing troops from a conflict that has killed 2,300 American soldiers and cost more than $700 billion.

### 2NC – AT Solvency: Terrorism

#### OBOR doesn’t solve terror- too many obstacles

Stratfor, March, 2016, “China's Security Ambitions in South and Central Asia,” <https://www.stratfor.com/analysis/chinas-security-ambitions-south-and-central-asia> (accessed 7/19/16)

But proposing a counterterrorism mechanism is not the same as establishing one. Many institutional obstacles and geopolitical constraints could impede China's efforts to see its proposal through. For one thing, the project — like many of Beijing's previous security initiatives — will be a learning experience; it will not become an effective institution overnight. Because of this, its members would probably start by sharing intelligence and enhancing cross-border counterterrorism capabilities, rather than increasing their direct involvement in joint counterterrorism operations. Given time, though, the group could boost coordination in border areas in support of counterterrorism operations led by Afghanistan and Pakistan.

### 1NC – AT: ISIS

#### ISIS is not a threat- lack of cohesion and military expertise

John Mueller, political scientist at Ohio State University and a Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, Mark Stewart, engineer and risk analyst at the University of Newcastle in Australia, May, 2016, “ISIS Isn't an Existential Threat to America,” <http://reason.com/archives/2016/05/27/isis-isnt-an-existential-threat-to-ameri> (accessed 7/22/16)

However, although the vicious group certainly presents a threat to the people under its control and in its neighborhood, and although it can contribute damagingly to the instability in the Middle East that has followed serial intervention there by the American military, it scarcely presents an existential threat to the United States. Actually, in fact, it seems to be in considerable decline. Its coun­terproductive brutalities, such as staged beheadings of hostages, summary executions of prisoners, and the rape and enslavement of female captives have left it without allies and outside support—indeed, it is surrounded by enemies. ISIS's ability to behead defenseless hostages certainly should not be taken to suggest its military might. And its major military advance, the conquest of Mosul in 2014, was essentially a fluke. Its idea was to hold part of the city for a while in an effort, it seems, to free some prisoners. The defending Iraqi army, trained by the American military at enormous cost to U.S. taxpayers, simply fell apart in confusion and disarray, abandoning weaponry, and the city, to the tiny group of seeming invaders even though it greatly outnumbered them—even taking into account the fact that many soldiers had purchased the right to avoid showing up for duty by paying half their salary to their commanders. The fall of a smaller city a few weeks earlier was similar. As the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff put it, the Iraqi forces weren't "driven out of Ramadi." Rather, "they drove out." After its advances of 2014, however, the group's momentum has been substantially halted, and its empire is currently under a form of siege. And, by holding territory, it presents an obvious and clear target for airstrikes and other methods by military opponents. Even by late 2014, it was being pushed back from a strategically-located area in northern Syria, and was finding that its supply lines were overstretched and its ranks of experienced fighters were being thinned. In late 2015, it tried to push back by launching three badly coordinated offensives in Northern Iraq using, among other things, "armored bulldozers." The offensives were readily beaten back. By 2016, it had lost some 40 percent of its territory overall, 65 percent of its territory in Iraq. After a string of failures, ISIS is now in retreat in many areas, and frontline commanders are observing of ISIS that "They don't fight. They just send car bombs and then run away. And when we surround them they either surrender or infiltrate themselves among the civilians….Their leaders are begging them to fight, but they answer that it is a lost cause. They refuse to obey and run away." One local tribal leader says, "Every week they execute four or five members because they refuse to obey orders or try to turn against their leaders." More generally, concludes one analyst, "They are starting to fall apart. They're a small movement. If you bring them under pressure on half a dozen battlefields at the same time, they can't do it."

### 2NC – AT: ISIS

#### ISIS not a threat- it’s waning organizationally and militarily

Mary Dejevsky, December, 2015, “Why Isis won't actually be the huge threat of 2016,” <http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/why-isis-wont-actually-be-the-huge-threat-of-2016-a6791256.html> (accessed 7/22/16)

Such a picture, however, ignores its weaknesses. The ideology behind Isis is medieval, even pre-medieval. Many of its ways are barbaric. Developed countries are happy to have left them behind; many others are fighting to do the same. Ancient and modern can only be combined so far. Is it realistic to believe – still less fear – that Isis will endure? And how cohesive is Isis anyway? How wide its actual reach? Isis did not, in fact, claim the Charlie Hebdo massacre last January – a Yemeni al-Qaeda affiliate demanded the “honours” here. Does Isis have a command structure that is capable of directly ordering such atrocities as the Paris attacks? And what of the supposed groups subordinate to its authority in Libya, Tunisia, even Kenya? Perhaps the dreaded “Isis”, like al-Qaeda before it, is more of a label that extremist groups adopt to be feared in the timorous West? Its fanatical ideology may not, importantly, even be its chief source of appeal. Isis prospered in Iraq, largely as a result of Western failures. The US and UK left widespread disorder after they toppled Saddam Hussein; Isis moved in offering security, albeit of a primitive kind. The US and UK dispossessed the once-dominant Sunnis; Isis offered them a way back. Similarly in Syria and elsewhere, the appeal of Isis, such as it is, reflects a quest for order and revenge quite as much as a religious idea. Which suggests where the limits of Isis’s power might lie. If it cannot keep order, if it cannot delegate power when it moves on, then its authority may wane. Military force is not necessarily the key to its defeat, just as it was not the only key to its victory. When Mosul changed hands in 2014, it was reported to be largely by consent.

### 1NC – AT: Uighurs

#### Uighur threat low- travel restrictions and inaccurate data over-hype the threat

Bethany Allen-Ebrahimian, July 20, 2016, “Report: More Than 100 Chinese Muslims Have Joined the Islamic State,” Foreign Policy, <http://foreignpolicy.com/2016/07/20/report-100-chinese-muslims-have-joined-isis-islamic-state-china-terrorism-uighur/> (accessed 7/22/16)

But despite Chinese claims of radical Islamist and ETIM involvement, it’s been difficult to verify what is truly transpiring on the ground, due mostly to strict information control and online censorship. Unconfirmed rumors of police massacres of civilians have swirled among Uighur expat groups. It’s also been extremely difficult to verify how many Uighurs have left China to join the Islamic State. In December 2014, citing unnamed sources, state-run Global Times reported in that 300 Chinese Uighurs were fighting alongside the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria. U.S.-based experts have previously disputed that number as “implausibly high.” Uighurs within China are subject to travel restrictions, with local authorities confiscating passports and refusing to issue new passports. Even so, Uighurs seem to have left China in large numbers over the past two years as Chinese authorities have cracked down in Xinjiang. Since 2014, thousands of Uighurs have arrived in Turkey, many through human smuggling networks in Southeast Asia. In a 2015 interview in Istanbul with FP, Seyit Tumturk, the vice president of World Uighur Congress, a foreign-based Uighur organization that opposes Chinese rule in Xinjiang, said that some Uighurs in Xinjiang are desperate to flee, and that sometimes the only help they can find comes from extremist organizations.

### 2NC – AT: Uighurs

#### Uighurs not a national security threat- no impact

Jacob Zenn, January 25, 2016, “China’s Counter-Terrorism Calculus,” The Jamestown Foundation, <http://www.jamestown.org/programs/chinabrief/single/?tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=45018&cHash=16a6b065541866ce8c4181ecb2ccb35f#.V5PkyUYrIfE> (accessed 7/22/16)

Despite the increasing numbers of attacks by networks of Uighur militants in China, the threat to China from such attacks remains an issue of human security—not national security. The rising death toll of Chinese citizens in these attacks are “only” in the several hundreds each year. Even if they were in thousands, however, this would hardly lead China to yield to the demands of groups like the TIP and ETESA for the construction of an Islamic state and ending, among other policies: · The migration of Han Chinese from eastern China to Xinjiang; · Use of Chinese language in schools in Xinjiang; · Encouragement of inter-marriage between Han and Uighurs and job offers for Uighur women in eastern China (where presumably they would assimilate or marry Han Chinese); · Restrictions on offspring (Uighurs and most Chinese minorities have, however, had fewer restrictions as part of the former “one-child policy” than Han families); and · Testing of nuclear weapons in Xinjiang (Militant Leadership Monitor, December 30, 2011) Beyond attacks in China, what also could place pressure on China are actions by states. Thus, TIP, ETESA and other Islamist organizations have adopted a “Palestine strategy” of framing China’s rule in Xinjiang as an “occupation,” delegitimizing Chinese sovereignty, and ultimately seeking an international referendum on Xinjiang’s status (presumably parts of northwestern Xinjiang where Han already far outnumber Uighurs would not be included in such a vote). [1] This strategy may be of greater relevance to China as a state than the human security losses as resulting from Uighur militancy (China Brief, May 23, 2014). While the prospects of any such referendum occurring in the near-term future is highly unlikely, there is some evidence that this narrative is finding sympathetic ears: · Then Turkish Prime Minister Tayyip Erdogan called Chinese rule in Xinjiang a “genocide” in 2009 (Hurriyet, July 14, 2009); · The TIP held territory in northwestern Syria as part of the coalition with Jabhat Al-Nusra with support from Turkey or Turkey-based organizations, which furthered support and recognition of the TIP from supporters of Jabhat Al-Nusra around the Muslim world; [2] and · The prospect of re-shaping the borders in the Middle East that could lead to new conceptions of sovereignty and statehood—not only in that region but elsewhere throughout the Islamic World, including Central Asia and Xinjiang

### 1NC – AT: Econ

#### United States involvement in OBOR not key- several other nations involved in OBOR and facilitating economic growth with China

 Chas Freeman, Ambassador Freeman chairs Projects International, Inc. He is a retired U.S. defense official, diplomat, and interpreter, July 23, 2015, “China and the Economic Integration of Europe and Asia,” <http://chasfreeman.net/china-eurasia-integration/> (accessed 7/22/16)

In addition to its impressive physical dimensions, the “one belt, one road” project seeks to build institutional linkages and to break down barriers to cooperation between China and the various economic communities that populate the “world island.” These communities include ASEAN, the Russian-led Eurasian Economic Union, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, the EU, the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC), and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation. A key building block in this effort is the so-called “regional comprehensive economic partnership” or RCEP. This will create a free trade area (FTA) embracing China, ASEAN, Australia, India, Japan, south Korea, and New Zealand. The target for concluding RCEP is the end of this year. In January, China agreed an FTA with south Korea. China’s Ministry of Commerce then announced its intention to use the China-Korea FTA as a model for additional FTAs with sixty-five countries along the Silk Road economic corridors. China has set a goal of $2.5 trillion in trade with Silk Road countries by 2025. In support of this, China seeks to inspire mergers, acquisitions, and green-field investments to create what might be called “multinational companies with Chinese characteristics,” some with headquarters in Europe or elsewhere outside China. The current surge of Chinese merger and acquisition activity in the EU – much of it involving the German Mittelstand – reflects this objective. As the “one belt, one road” concept is implemented, the EU and China should draw ever closer commercially. The same, for other reasons, is true of China and Russia, and of China and Iran.

### 2NC – AT: Econ

#### One Belt One Road not key to China’s economy

Chandra Muzaffar, September 21, 2015, “Initiatives for Transforming the Global Economy. China’s “One Belt One Road, ” Global Research, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/initiatives-for-transforming-the-global-economy-chinas-one-belt-one-road/5477264> (accessed 7/22/16)

The ASEAN initiated Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP), negotiations for which started in early 2013, seeks to forge a pact among the 10 ASEAN members and its six free trade partners, namely, Australia, China, India, Japan, New Zealand and South Korea on trade in goods and services, investment, economic and technical cooperation, intellectual property, competition, dispute settlement and other issues. RCEP is, in a sense, a diluted version of the East Asia Economic Caucus (EAEC) proposed by former Malaysian Prime Minister, Dr. Mahathir Mohamad, in the early nineties. EAEC, confined to ASEAN and the three East Asian states, China, Japan and South Korea, had a more coherent economic, cultural, geographical and historical basis but the idea was vehemently opposed by the United States of America and to a lesser extent, by Japan. In spite of its geographical dispersion, RCEP is still a viable proposition. At its third ministerial meeting in Kuala Lumpur in August 2015, there was a determined effort to give RCEP a push. Some consensus was reached about eliminating tariffs in the goods sector. There are issues pertaining to agriculture, investments, intellectual property and dispute settlement which have yet to be resolved. A momentum of sorts has been created in Kuala Lumpur largely through the hard work of officials at the Malaysian Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI) which one hopes will be sustained through future meetings. A more significant initiative emanating from China is of course the much publicized Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB). Formed in October 2014, it is a multilateral development bank that aims to provide finance to infrastructure projects in Asia. It has been estimated that Asia requires 8 trillion US dollars’ worth of infrastructure investment from 2010 to 2020 to be able to sustain its economic development. Neither the Japan led Asian Development Bank (ADB) nor the US helmed World Bank has the capacity or the inclination to fund such a mammoth transformation. China’s willingness to respond to the challenge has been warmly welcomed by a number of countries. Besides, the Chinese leadership is also frustrated by the lack of sincerity on the part of the US and Japanese governments in reforming the World Bank and the ADB respectively to reflect the new demands and the emerging realities of the global economy. While the AIIB is an important development in itself, it is the response of a number of close allies of the US to the bank which is revealing of current and future patterns of global economic power. Sensing the shift in global economic power, Britain withstood intense pressure from the US Administration and joined the AIIB in March 2015. Three other European allies of the US — Germany, France and Italy — followed suit. US allies from West Asia, Eastern Europe and the Pacific have all signed up. The bank’s membership is rapidly approaching 70. The two major economies that have decided to stay out are the US and Japan. It is not just the AIIB that is reflective of the emerging pattern of global economic power. China has also been at the forefront of BRICS which brings together Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa. Collectively, this grouping, which held its first summit in Yekaterinburg, Russia in June 2009, represents 3 billion people. Its nominal Gross Domestic Product (GDP) stands at 16.039 trillion US dollars. BRICS emphasizes cooperation in economic and financial matters. It created a bank called the New Development Bank with a 100 billion dollar base in July 2015. There is a third Chinese initiative that has the potential for transforming a whole range of economies in both the Global South and the Global North. The One Belt One Road (OBOR) project built upon the ancient Silk Road focuses on both land and maritime routes. The aim is to invest in infrastructure development and other economic activities in Southeast Asia, parts of South Asia, Central Asia, East Africa and West Asia right up to Europe.

# Aff Zambia

### 2AC – Role of the Judge

#### The role of the judge is to reject neoliberal logic as is perpetuated in this year’s topic and debate- as an educator, your decisions have the power to stymie or create vehicles for ending neoliberal violence

Ravi Kumar and Dave Hill, Global Neoliberalism and Education and its Consequences, Ch. 2: “Neoliberalism and its Impacts,” Pgs. 19-20, accessed 8/12/16)

Glenn Rikowski’s work, such as The Battle in Seattle (2000, 2001, 2007), develops a Marxist analysis based on an analysis of labor power. With respect to education, he suggests that teachers are the most dangerous of workers because they have a special role in shaping, developing and forcing the single commodity on which the whole capitalist system rests: labor power. In the capitalist labor process, labor power is transformed into value-creating labor, and, at a certain point, surplus value—value over and above that represented in the worker’s wage—is created. Surplus value is the fi rst form of the existence of capital. It is the lifeblood of capital. Without it, capital could not be transformed into money, on sale of the commodities that incorporate value, and hence the capitalist could not purchase the necessary raw materials, means of production and labor power to set the whole cycle in motion once more. But most importantly for the capitalist is that part of the surplus value that forms his or her profi t—and it is this that drives the capitalist on a personal basis. It is this that defi nes the personal agency of the capitalist! Teachers are dangerous because they are intimately connected with the social production of labor power, equipping students with skills, competences, abilities, knowledge, and the attitudes and personal qualities that can be expressed and expended in the capitalist labor process. Teachers are guardians of the quality of labor power! This potential, latent power of teachers explains why representatives of the state might have sleepless nights worrying about the role of teachers in ensuring that the laborers of the future delivered to workplaces throughout the national capital are of the highest possible quality.5

### 2AC – Solvency: Education

#### The aff is key to create a reversal of dominant modes of knowledge production that attempt to suppress radical changes in education and to target inequality through use of critical pedagogy

William B. Stanley, 2007, Critical Pedagogy: Where are We Now? Edited by Peter McLaren, Joe Kincheloe, Ch. 20: “Critical Pedagogy Democratic Realism, Neoliberalism, Conservativism, and a Tragic Sense of Education,” Pgs. 371-372 (accessed 8/12/16)

The history of critical pedagogy is rooted in theories that recommend education as a form of countersocialization to promote democracy and social justice. Countersocialization is a necessary response to mainstream education, which functions to legitimate a social order defined by extreme disparities of wealth, income, political power, and oppression based on class, gender, ethnicity, and cultural status. In its strongest form (Brosio, 2004; Hill, McLaren, Cole, & Rikowski, 2002; Wood & Foster, 1997), critical pedagogy is shaped by a neo-Marxist critique of capitalism that views education as part of a wider effort to bring about a radical transformation of the American political and economic system. Any society will use its educational system to help preserve its institutions, values, and political structure, and the egvidence is overwhelming that mainstream education (like mainstream media) largely functions to legitimate the dominant social order. Those who control education policy at the federal and state levels are often quite explicit about their intentions (e.g., William Bennett, Clarence Paige, and Margaret Spellings). In this process, federal and state education policies and curricula generally mask and rationalize how the dominant social order contributes to political, cultural, ethnic, and economic oppression. More ominously, the recent expansion of federal executive power in response to the “war on terrorism” has created a political climate that can only further erode the democratic culture in which education functions (Drew, 2006). Not surprisingly, the impact of an education theory in direct conflict with the dominant culture’s commitment to the ideologies of individualism, capitalism, American exceptionalism, and conservative cultural traditions, has been limited. The marginalization of critical pedagogy in American educational discourse and practice is only one element of wider efforts to suppress left-liberal (particularly radical) political, cultural, and economic reform efforts since the late nineteenth century. It is worth noting, however, that many left-liberal critics have also found certain radical proposals for reform both unrealistic and ill-conceived (e.g., Dewey, 1933, 1934, 1935a, 1935b, 1937; Dewy & Childs, 1933; Niebuhr, 1933; Gitlin, 1995, 2006; Isaac, 2003; Lasch, 1989; Stanley, 1992; Whitson & Stanley, 1996), a point we will return to later.1 With justification, critical educators often lament our mainstream opponents’ failure to invest the intellectual effort required to understand critical pedagogy, and their tendency to reject any radical analysis of mainstream education out of hand. It can be exasperating to hear critics dismiss Marxism as a discredited and bankrupt theory, irrelevant to the educational problems of the twenty-first century. ?If you need proof of this, they say, just look at the collapse of Marxist governments in the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe since the end of the Cold War and China’s embrace of capitalism. The survival of the Cuban and North Korean regimes hardly serve as models for other nations. And so on.

### 2AC – Uniqueness: Education=Neoliberal Now

#### Education designed to serve neoliberal regimes now- implicates ways in which we prioritize types of knowledge and affects ability for academia to critically challenge dominant modes of thinking

Ravi Kumar and Dave Hill, Global Neoliberalism and Education and its Consequences, Ch. 2: “Neoliberalism and its Impacts,” Pgs. 18-19 (accessed 8/12/16)

The increasing subordination of education, including university education, and its commodifi cation, have been well documented (e.g., Levidow, 2002, Hill, 2001a, 2002, 2004a, b, 2007; Giroux and Myrsiades, 2001; Giroux and Searls Giroux, 2004; Ross and Gibson, 2007; Rikowski, 2007; CFHE, 2003).4 One aspect is that other than at elite institutions, where the student intake is the wealthiest and most upper-class, there is little scope for critical thought. Scholars have examined, for instance, how the British government has, in effect, expelled most potentially critical aspects of education from the national curriculum, such as sociological and political examination of schooling and education, and questions of social class, “race” and gender for what is now termed teacher training, which was formerly called teacher education. Across the globe and more so in the newly liberalized economies such as India there is a trend towards looking down upon social sciences on the grounds that they do not produce an employable population. The mantra is of job-oriented courses, which is refl ected when many universities and colleges transform their history courses into travel and tourism courses (The Hindu, 2004). The change in nomenclature is important both symbolically and in terms of actual accurate descriptiveness of the new, “safe,” sanitized and detheorized education and training of new teachers (e.g., Hill, 2001a; 2004a; 2007). Even in those parts of the world where the neoliberal processes were set in motion by the 1990s we fi nd not only that teacher education is transformed into teacher training, but that even the training period has been progressively declining (Sadgopal, 2006; Kumar, 2006c). What can be more disastrous than the systematic degeneration of the role of a teacher to a member of the informalized workforce, which lacks job security and works with a meager salary of as little as twenty-fi ve dollars per month in some of the provinces in India (Leclercq, 2003). McMurtry (2001) describes the philosophical incompatibility between the demands of capital and the demands of education, inter alia, with respect to critical thought. Governments throughout the world are resolving this incompatibility more and more on terms favorable to capital. One example in England and Wales is the swathe of redundancies/dismissals of teacher educators specializing in the sociology, politics, and contexts of education following the conforming of teacher education and the imposition of a skills-based rigidly monitored national curriculum for teacher training in 1992–1993. One dismissal was, for instance, of one of the authors (Dave Hill) himself. At a stroke, numerous critical teacher educators were removed or displaced. So too were their materials/resources—no longer wanted by the government. Thus, at the College from which I was dismissed, the Centre for Racial Equality, was closed down—its resources no longer required by the new technicist, detheorised, anticritical “teacher training” curriculum (Hill, 1997b, c, 2003). At a more general level, Mathison and Ross (2002) note that [the] university’s role as an independent institution is increasingly threatened by the interests of corporations in both subtle and obvious ways. “Globalization, “—which Bertell Ollman (2001) defi nes as “another name for capitalism, but it’s capitalism with the gloves off and on a world scale. It is capitalism at a time when all the old restrictions and inhibitions have been or are in the process of being put aside, a supremely self-confi - dent capitalism, one without apparent rivals and therefore without a need to compromise or apologize”—has transformed internal and external relations of university from teaching and research to student aid policies and pouring rights for soft drink manufacturers. Decreased funding for higher education has made universities increasingly susceptible to the in- fl uence of big money and threatens the academic freedom and direction of research.

#### We control uniqueness- neoliberalism maintains and commodifies educational practices- the aff is critical to upend these dominant power structures

Sarah E. White, SIT Graduate Institute, 2012, “Thinking Beyond Borders: Critical Pedagogy in a Neoliberal Economy,” Capstone Collection, <http://digitalcollections.sit.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3605&context=capstones> (accessed 8/12/16)

Education has long been identified as a method of assimilation (Dewey, 1916; Reidy, 2001; Strouse, 1987), serving to obviate thinking (Freire, 1970). It is an effective way to uphold the power structures of the status quo (McLaren, 2005), where “each generation is socialized into the life of the nation” (Shor, 1992). Today, this convention is the intellectual hegemony of free market fundamentalists, the neoliberal doctrine. Shor (1992) argues that “passive curricula help prepare students for life in undemocratic institutions…for the authoritarian work world and political system they will join” (p. 19). It serves the ideological intent to indoctrinate students to adapt to the world of oppression (Freire, 1970). Yet education can also be a means of liberation (Freire, 2000) and social change (Dewey, 1916; Steiner, 1997). We need to say no to the neoliberal fatalism that we are witnessing…informed by the ethics of the market, an ethics in which a minority makes the most profits against the lives of the majority. In other words, those who cannot compete, die. This is a perverse ethics that, in fact, lacks ethics. I insist on saying that I continue to be human…I embrace history as possibility [where] we can demystify the evil in this perverse fatalism that characterizes the neoliberal discourse” (Freire, 1999, p. 26).

#### Education is enveloped in neoliberal agendas for capital accumulation now- the aff key to reshape educational practices, starting in the debate community

Ravi Kumar and Dave Hill, Global Neoliberalism and Education and its Consequences, Ch. 1: “Introduction Neoliberal Capitalism and Education, pgs. 1-2 (accessed 8/12/16)

This chapter contextualizes the current anti-egalitarian education system in two ways: (a) the ideological and policy context, and (b) the global/spatial context. The restructuring of the schooling and education systems across the world is part of the ideological and policy offensive by neoliberal capital. The privatization of public services, the capitalization and commodifi cation of humanity, and the global diktats of the agencies of international capital— backed by destabilization of nonconforming governments and, ultimately, the armed cavalries of the United States and its surrogates—have resulted in the near-global (if not universal) establishment of competitive markets in public services such as education. These education markets are marked by selection and exclusion, and are accompanied by and situated within the rampant— indeed, exponential—growth of national and international inequalities. It is important to look at the big picture. Markets in education, so-called “parental choice” of a diverse range of schools (or, in parts of the globe, the “choice” as to whether to send children to school or not), privatization of schools and other education providers, and the cutting of state subsidies to education and other public services are only a part of the educational and anti-public-welfare strategy of the capitalist class. National and global capitalisms wish to cut public expenditure and have generally succeeded in doing so. They do this because public services are expensive. Cuts in public expenditure serve to reduce taxes on profi ts, which in turn increases profi ts from capital accumulation. Additionally, the capitalist class globally have: (a) a business agenda for education that centers on socially producing labor power (people’s capacity to labor) for capitalist enterprises; (b) a business agenda in education that centers on setting business “free” in education for profi t making; and (c) a business agenda for education corporations that allows edubusinesses to profit from national international privatizing activities.

### 2AC – AT: Aff Doesn’t Spill Over

#### The aff spills up- grassroots changes in educational values breeds new cultural values that affront dominants modes of neoliberal thinking

Sarah E. White, SIT Graduate Institute, 2012, “Thinking Beyond Borders: Critical Pedagogy in a Neoliberal Economy,” Capstone Collection, <http://digitalcollections.sit.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3605&context=capstones> (accessed 8/12/16)

It is this creative imagining that has the potential to spread from below, from the margins to the center, from a few to many voices. When there is dissent with the hegemony of cultural values under the current form of capitalism – absolute profitability – there is room for creativity. When young people are encouraged to think critically and understand systems of oppression, there is room to create different cultural values. When we turn learning into action with historic analysis grounded in observation and empirical reality rather than status quo normativity, it is then when transformation occurs.

### 2AC – AT: Chinese Neoliberalism Good

#### Yes Chinese neoliberalism helps support services in Zambia, BUT these are all contingent on Zambia’s ability to maximize profit and are created to serve Chinese interests in the region

Ching Kwan Lee is Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Los Angeles. A native of Hong Kong, she obtained her PhD in Sociology from the University of California at Berkeley and has previously taught at the Chinese University of Hong Kong and the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. Currently, she is a fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford University, 2014, “The Spectre of Global China,” <http://www.sociology.ucla.edu/sites/default/files/u281/nlr_2014_no._89.pdf>, pgs. 41-42 (accessed 8/11/16)

In the absence of these conditions, as the Zambian construction sector reveals, Chinese state capital can show another face. Since 2000, construction projects in Africa have received some $35bn in concessional loans from China, disbursed through the Forum on China–Africa Cooperation (focac). Of this, Zambia has received $1.2bn, far exceeding its loans from the World Bank and African Development Bank. Often touted by Beijing as a form of assistance, Chinese concessional loans actually charge higher interest rates than the World Bank (2 per cent vs 1.7 per cent), have a smaller grant element (23 per cent vs 35 per cent), shorter repayment periods (10–15 years vs 20–50 years) and are conditional upon non-competitive single sourcing from China. The reason these loans are eagerly snapped up, according to Zambian Finance Ministry officials, is because the priorities of Western lenders have shifted to capacity building—social services, education, health and poverty alleviation—rather than physical infrastructure, which is still sorely needed in many developing economies. Politicians intent on securing votes in the next election are eager to sign up for Chinese loans that will deliver infrastructural projects to their constituencies in record time. They also preferred the fact that the main criterion used by Chinese officials in assessing a loan was whether the project was a Zambian government priority, whereas the World Bank would make its own decision on the project’s benefits. Despite Chinese rhetoric about non-conditionality, in practice these loans carry the implicit condition that the Chinese side decides what gets constructed, with decisions announced at focacmeetings. In the absence of open bidding, the price is determined by Chinese contractors with good connections to the China eximBank. A senior Zambian Finance Ministry official drew an illuminating parallel between the mechanisms of Chinese loans and those of imfstructural adjustment programmes: Loans from China are supply driven. There is a well-oiled Chinese development machinery that loops in and out of the Beijing government, connecting many Chinese players. Typically, a concessional-loan infrastructure project is started by a Chinese vendor [contractor] on the ground in Zambia who wants to build a road, for example. He would go to the Road Development Agency and say, ‘I saw some roads I could do, if you gave me the contract’. He would then go to the China eximBank and tell them this would cost $200m, before any feasibility studies were done. On paper it looks as though the Zambian government has initiated the projects, but you have to do reverse engineering in order to track the process. It’s like any imfstructural adjustment reform: the imfsays you need this and that macro and micro reforms, and they identify ‘distortions’. But on paper, you would see a letter from the Zambian government saying that we have identified problems, and we need help. From the outside, it looks as though Zambia asked the imfto impose the conditions, but it is the other way around. 10

#### Even if there’s some opportunities from neoliberal policies in Zambia, those obscure the extreme costs to other Zambian citizens

Alastair Fraser, researches how Western donors, NGOs, and multinationals promote their preferred economic and social agendas in Africa and how African states and popular movements respond to these influences. His published work focuses on Southern Africa and spans topics including aid negotiations, participatory planning, mining, and African populism. Dr. Fraser is Philomathia Fellow and lecturer in politics at Trinity Hall, University of Cambridge, 2010, Zambia, Mining, and Neoliberalism, “Introduction,” <http://www.palgraveconnect.com/pc/doifinder/view/10.1057/9780230115590>, Pgs. 2-3 (accessed 8/10/16)

This series of events has been so traumatic that many imagine that Zambia has fallen victim to a grand global conspiracy. It is also often assumed that these price fluctuations explain everything about the country’s history. Although there is a little truth in both suggestions, the studies presented here portray a more complex reality. All has not been well during the booms, and the busts offer opportunities for some and costs for others. The winners are not always foreign, the losers not always Zambian. The chapters that follow describe a precarious economic, political, and moral context. Shady investors shift money in and out of towns historically defined by civic pride centered on the mine but where many now survive unemployment by “stealing” from the companies for which they used to work. Tribal chiefs, sometimes seen as relics of pre-modern history or hangovers from colonial rule, revel in their new positions as interlocutors with global mine multinationals. Meanwhile regulatory bodies scramble to define a useful role for the ‘modern’ state in managing the companies. Government mininsters and political parties appear utterly disoriented, advocating policies that oscillate between extreme deregulation and greater state interference, between increasing mining taxes and lowering them, between nationalizing mining companies and bailing out struggling private firms, and between continued dependence on Western donors and companies and a turn to new sponsors in India and China. For their part, Chinese mine managers resent their posting to a country which they perceive to be going nowhere but where frayed Zambian aspirations for development increasingly rest on continued demand from their country’s burgeoning economy. The studies presented here build on and form part of a long tradition of research designed to illuminate the structure and meanings of the global economic system through close investigations of its working in one locale. 2

#### Any good accomplished by Chinese neoliberalism in Zambia is undermined by its drive for capital accumulation

Ching Kwan Lee is Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Los Angeles. A native of Hong Kong, she obtained her PhD in Sociology from the University of California at Berkeley and has previously taught at the Chinese University of Hong Kong and the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. Currently, she is a fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford University, 2014, “The Spectre of Global China,” <http://www.sociology.ucla.edu/sites/default/files/u281/nlr_2014_no._89.pdf>, Pgs. 38-39 (accessed 8/11/16)

Nevertheless, their different imperatives—‘encompassing accumulation’ for Chinese state capital, and ‘profit maximization’ for global private capital—have led to strikingly different corporate strategies at moments of crisis. When the global financial crisis hit Zambia in autumn 2008, copper prices plummeted from a historic high of $9,000 per ton to $3,000 per ton in the first quarter of 2009. Panic spread across the Copperbelt as kcm, mcmand other major mines announced massive layoffs. In all, some 19,000 workers lost their jobs—30 per cent of the total mining work force. 7 The Luanshya mine shut down when its IsraeliBritish owner pulled out, and mcmplanned to suspend production in Mufulira. Collective bargaining was cancelled and wages frozen. In the midst of this turmoil, the Chinese nfcaannounced a ‘Three Noes’ policy: no layoffs, no production reduction, no salary cuts. Operating with a long-term interest in the stable production of ores, as opposed to reacting to market fluctuation in ore prices and share holders’ short-term financial interests, nfca’s response reflected its political and business objectives in Zambia. Invoking the official rhetoric of maintaining Sino– Zambian all-weather friendship, nfcaturned the crisis into a chance to burnish the image of the Chinese government for its stabilizing impact on the Zambian economy. cnmcalso bought the Luanshya mine, thereby extending a lifeline to a mining town of 100,000 residents. The calculation was both political and economic: while emphasizing to Zambian officials their willingness to help solve the problem of unemployment in mining townships, Chinese senior management saw the crisis as a good investment opportunity. A top cnmcrepresentative in Zambia explained: My business judgment was that copper prices would only experience a temporary setback because China was still restructuring, and would still need resources. Also, I wanted to refurbish Luanshya with new machinery to increase productivity and lower costs. Their technology was very dilapidated and old. But its open pit at Muliashi has the potential to be profitable.

#### Using the good neoliberal policies in China to justify neoliberal policies writ large guarantees the perpetuation of human rights violations and exploitation in Zambia

Brian Chama, M.A. in Human Rights Practice from Roehampton University in London United Kingdom, an M.A. in Communication for Development from the University of Zambia, and a B.A. in Philosophy from the Urban University in Rome, Italy, 2010, “Economic Development at the Cost of Human Rights: China Nonferrous Metal Industry in Zambia,” Human Rights Brief, <http://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1113&context=hrbrief> (accessed 8/12/16)

The Zambian government must cultivate a favorable climate for foreign investment.12 But, by avoiding direct confrontation with companies regarding treatment of their labor force, the Zambian government fails to protect its citizens from human rights abuses. The Zambian government is often placed in a difficult position because, while foreign businesses may exploit Zambian workers, they may also fund important development opportunities within the country. For instance, NFC has funded projects in Zambia aimed at improving ordinary citizens’ standard of living and promoting HIV/AIDS prevention and human rights awareness.13 As a result of these kinds of aid programs, in addition to the much-needed revenue from copper production, the Zambian government has been reluctant to point out human rights violations within the company’s operations. Meanwhile, NFC’s corporate social responsibility and human rights awareness programs also beg the question of where responsibility for ensuring human rights ought to be placed and how this responsibility should be enforced.

### 2AC – AT: Chinese Neoliberalism Can be Reformed

#### Even if neoliberalism has been ‘good’ for Zambia, it’s overall purpose is maximization of profit- justifies sacrificing any of the good it’s done for monetary gain

Ching Kwan Lee is Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Los Angeles. A native of Hong Kong, she obtained her PhD in Sociology from the University of California at Berkeley and has previously taught at the Chinese University of Hong Kong and the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. Currently, she is a fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford University, 2014, “The Spectre of Global China,” <http://www.sociology.ucla.edu/sites/default/files/u281/nlr_2014_no._89.pdf>, pgs. 35-36 (accessed 8/11/16)

All the major mines in Zambia are owned and run by subsidiaries of multinationals. Among these, only the Chinese nfcais state-owned; its parent company is the China Nonferrous-metal Mining Company— hereafter cnmc—the prc’s leading corporation in the nonferrous metal mining industry, with operations in twenty countries.6 As noted above, the parent-companies of the other mining firms studied here—kcm, owned by Vedanta, and mcm, a subsidiary of Glencore—are publicly traded on the London stock exchange. All three mining houses began production in Zambia in the early 2000s, as the privatizations were finalized. mcmsnapped up Mufulira, which produces particularly pure copper, and the huge Nkana mine in 2000. Vedanta acquired kcmin 2004—it was initially offered to Anglo-American, the original owners— driven by the profit potential of the Konkola Deep Mining Project, the jewel in the crown of the Zambian copper industry. Their imperatives were clear: maximization of shareholder value. It is important to underscore that Chinese state investment must also return a profit. A senior nfcaexecutive cautioned: ‘We don’t need to maximize profit, but we need to make some profit. The state won’t support us if we make losses year after year. The Chinese government gave cnmcthe initial capital but the company has to survive and expand by reinvesting its profit into production.’ Yet between profit optimization and profit maximization lies the space for achieving other types of return—political influence and access to raw materials. I will call this state-capital logic of accumulation ‘encompassing’, in contrast to the profit-maximizing logic of private capital. Encompassing accumulation gives cnmcan important role in China’s economic diplomacy, currently focused on Asia and Africa, with emphasis on the resource commodities that are in short supply in the prc: oil, copper, aluminium and iron. The Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, a key government think-tank, has identified resource security as the top priority for China–Africa economic strategy over the next ten years. nfcaproudly announces itself as ‘frontline troops for China’s overseas resource development’ in its promotional literature. The significance of copper lies both in its exchange value—i.e., making profits—and its use value, as a material input needed for Chinese industry. Today, Chinese state-owned mining companies sell copper in the international market for profit. But as a senior nfcamanager foresaw, ‘One day, if there was an embargo, then Chinese companies would of course sell only to China.’

#### Neoliberalism can’t be revived- empirics prove living in Zambia under a neoliberal regime justifies institutions using their power to cultivate prosperity of Zambia, while leaving them to crash when they aren’t lucrative

Alastair Fraser, researches how Western donors, NGOs, and multinationals promote their preferred economic and social agendas in Africa and how African states and popular movements respond to these influences. His published work focuses on Southern Africa and spans topics including aid negotiations, participatory planning, mining, and African populism. Dr. Fraser is Philomathia Fellow and lecturer in politics at Trinity Hall, University of Cambridge, 2010, Zambia, Mining, and Neoliberalism, “Introduction,” <http://www.palgraveconnect.com/pc/doifinder/view/10.1057/9780230115590>, Pgs. 8-9 (accessed 8/10/16)

In spite of (perhaps as a result of) this self-confident outlook, the sharing of the significant fruits of the mining industry continued to be subjects of serious political confrontation. In the Zambian “state capitalist” system, in which the state and multinational companies shared ownership, disciplining the unions was as important to the state as an employer as it was to the private companies. Kaunda’s ruling party, the United National Independence Party (UNIP) offered the unions a corporatist deal which shifted the locus of initiative within the union away from the grass roots and towards officials. UNIP constrained the right to strike and reduced officials’ accountability by providing a closed shop, allowing workers’ dues to be removed straight from their pay slips and increasing access for union leaders to state decision makers.19 Under these arrangements, ZCCM also supplied amenities much wider in scope than those offered to workers during the colonial period. Alongside subsidized housing and food, ZCCM, in response to union demands, provided free education for miners’ children, electricity, water, and transport in the townships, operating a “cradle-tograve” welfare system that subsidized diapers and burials. UNIP’s deal with the union leadership held only held while it was supported by relatively high global copper prices. However, soon af ter nationalization, the limits of a domestically oriented development strategy based on mineral exports started to emerge. Wages started to fall in real terms from about 1969 and commodity prices tumbled after the first global oil crisis in 1973. After the second, in 1979, a long-running decline of copper values dragged Zambia’s terms of trade and its general economic performance into a slump of unprecedented proportions right through to 2004 (see figure 1, p. xv). The Zambian state initially borrowed from a range of private Banks and bilateral donors in order to maintain the progress that had been made in social provisions. However, after the second oil crisis, interest rates shot up and the country was thrown into a severe debt crisis that lasted almost 30 years. Throughout the economic crisis, ZCCM was treated as a “cash cow,” milked without corresponding investment in machinery and prospecting ventures. No new mines were opened after 1979, and as ore bodies within the existing mines were found deeper underground, the cost of production rose. ZCCM production collapsed from a high of 750,000 tonnes in 1973 to 257,000 tonnes in 2000. 20 Between 1974 and 1994, per capita income declined by 50%, leaving Zambia the 25th-poorest country in the world. 21

### 2AC – AT: Chinese Neoliberalism Good in Other Sectors

#### Neoliberalism drives all aspects of Zambian life including even those allowed to enter the region

Hannah Postel, February 20, 2015, “Following the Money: Chinese Labor Migration to Zambia,” Migration Policy, <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/following-money-chinese-labor-migration-zambia> (Accessed 8/12/16)

All visitors require a visa to enter Zambia, with stays past 30 days requiring an additional permit. The six major permit types are: residence, visiting, study, employment, temporary, and self-employment (investor). Permitted length of stay varies from three months to ten years, with employment permits lasting for two years. Zambia does not have a separate permit for family reunion—family members enter on the same permit as the initial holder. This complicates collection of accurate statistics, as only the individual granted a permit is written into the immigration records. The Zambian government prioritizes migrants with high socioeconomic status, and does not intend to provide social welfare to new residents, as indicated by the following four tenets of Zambian immigration policy, which are that an immigrant to Zambia: must have a contribution to make in the form of skills, profession, or capital should not deprive a Zambian of employment should not be a charge on the state must be in possession of a permit. Zambia is not a traditional migration destination; ranking 141 of 187 on the United Nations’ Human Development Index, it has not historically attracted many aspiring newcomers. It therefore serves as a useful counterpoint to frequently analyzed destinations such as the United States and the United Kingdom.

### 2AC – AT: Chinese Neoliberalism Helps Zambia

#### Chinese neoliberal policies aren’t designed to help Zambia, but are used as political tools by those in power and only serve to re-entrench the cycle of debt

Ching Kwan Lee is Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Los Angeles. A native of Hong Kong, she obtained her PhD in Sociology from the University of California at Berkeley and has previously taught at the Chinese University of Hong Kong and the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. Currently, she is a fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford University, 2014, “The Spectre of Global China,” <http://www.sociology.ucla.edu/sites/default/files/u281/nlr_2014_no._89.pdf>, pgs. 42-43 (accessed 8/11/16)

Zambian officials are well aware of the risks of Chinese loans, with their hidden conditionalities, and of the political agenda that drives them. They complain about the lack of open bidding, leading to inflated prices. 11 In the long run, Chinese loans pose the threat of recreating Zambia’s debt burden, only recently relieved by the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative. But politicians find them all too tempting, partly to bolster their own political careers but also to maintain good relations with an emerging superpower. A senior Zambian Finance Ministry official explained: In most African states, the demand for concessional loans is incentivized by Chinese rent-seeking. Heads of state and ministers are given favours, and then decide to take the Chinese on board . . . There is a race to the bottom. Each one of us [African countries] wants to have an economic relationship with the Chinese. They are a major source of financing, so we don’t want to be left out in engaging them . . . When we look at the future, when we’ll be in need, the Chinese may be an option. So we cannot destroy the present relationship with the Chinese. Concessional loans therefore represent a multi-purpose tool for Beijing: a means to cultivate political influence, through the selection of recipients (countries and politicians; an investment outlet for China’s foreign reserves); and a way to open up new overseas markets for its state-owned construction companies (by all accounts, only central soes and their subsidiaries have the necessary political connections to win these lucrative contracts). 12 As well as undertaking concessional-loan projects, these central soes compete with provincial soes from Jiangxi, Henan, Gansu, Anhui and Shanghai for World Bank and Zambian government projects. Many of these provincial soes were originally sent by the Chinese government to Zambia in the 1990s to build foreignaid projects—government complexes, football stadiums, hospitals and roads. Having established a foothold in Zambia, they stayed on to exploit the newly liberalized construction market. All of them compete fiercely with private Chinese contractors for roads and building projects.13 In contrast to the strategy of ‘encompassing accumulation’ in the mining and financial sectors, the motivation of Chinese construction companies, both state-owned and private, is purely commercial, just like their counterparts from South Africa, India or Zambia itself. Most companies said that the profit margin in construction in China averages 7 per cent, but in Zambia it can be as high as 30 per cent, depending on the type of project.

### 2AC – AT: Zambia =/= Key

#### Beginning with Zambia is a critical starting point for unraveling the shambles of neoliberalism and opening up pockets of resistance

Alastair Fraser, researches how Western donors, NGOs, and multinationals promote their preferred economic and social agendas in Africa and how African states and popular movements respond to these influences. His published work focuses on Southern Africa and spans topics including aid negotiations, participatory planning, mining, and African populism. Dr. Fraser is Philomathia Fellow and lecturer in politics at Trinity Hall, University of Cambridge, 2010, Zambia, Mining, and Neoliberalism, “Introduction,” <http://www.palgraveconnect.com/pc/doifinder/view/10.1057/9780230115590>, Pg. 3 (accessed 8/10/16)

This chapter provides a historical sketch of the economic and political development of the Copperbelt and seeks to place the findings reported in the book in their historical and intellectual context. As Larmer argues in the next chapter, one should not start with the assumption that all of the trends identified in previous booms and busts are doomed to be repeated. Contemporary instabilities cannot be understood by adopting old categories and assumptions. In particular, though price fluctuations might be familiar, they now occur in a deinstitutionalized and depoliticized context. The ideological frameworks that helped previous generations make sense of an unstable world—capitalism, liberalism, socialism, nationalism, and anti-imperialism—have all been embarrassed by the lived experience of the Copperbelt. Institutions that were animated by those ideas are in crisis. Faceless institutional investors dictated to by risk-averse bankers have largely replaced the self-confident prospectors and entrepreneurs of a previous age. Zambia’s famous trade unions are shadows of their former selves, and the tribal authorities, political parties, and government agencies that framed life on the Copperbelt have lost their vital connections with society. We are left with a chaotic context in which investors arrive one year, making grand announcements about returning ghost towns to their former glories, and leave the next; in which populist political entrepreneurs forward radical new agendas, only to U-turn six months later; and in which the workforce explodes in violent protest on a relatively frequent basis but to little apparent long-term effect. The Zambian context has implications for how we think about the causes of and solutions to current global economic instabilities, about hopes for resistance to “neoliberalism,” about potential new drivers of global development such as China and India, and about the possible emergence of more dynamic and just economic models. This chapter closes with some speculations on these issues but starts by exploring the history and peculiarities of the Copperbelt.

### 2AC – AT: Shouldn’t Criticize China

#### Our affirmative isn’t an attempt to criticize China, but uses China’s differentiated policies in Zambia to exemplify the ways in which neoliberalism pervades the global order

Ching Kwan Lee is Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Los Angeles. A native of Hong Kong, she obtained her PhD in Sociology from the University of California at Berkeley and has previously taught at the Chinese University of Hong Kong and the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. Currently, she is a fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford University, 2014, “The Spectre of Global China,” [http://www.sociology.ucla.edu/sites/default/files/u281/nlr\_2014\_no.\_89.pdf pgs. 63-64](http://www.sociology.ucla.edu/sites/default/files/u281/nlr_2014_no._89.pdf%20pgs.%2063-64) (accessed 8/11/16)

 ‘Global China’ is neither the imperialist hegemon feared and condemned by the West, nor the egalitarian partner of win-win development trumpeted by Beijing. Opening the Pandora’s box of ‘varieties of capital’, this essay has argued that Chinese state capital has a peculiar logic, practices and ethos of its own, distinct from those of global private capital. The experience of Zambia over the past fifteen years suggests that Chinese state capital can be both more accommodating andmore dangerous to African development than profit-maximizing global private capital, depending on the political will of the local governing elite and the bargaining power of organized labour; the comparison between copper and construction throws into sharp relief the centrality of sectordifferentiated politics, on both sides. It is also clear that Chinese state investors have no capacity to undermine the prevailing neoliberal order, nor any interest in replacing it.

### 2AC – AT: New Regulations Solve

#### New regulations insufficient to solve mass exploitation and political shifts have not curbed the violenc

Erin Conway-Smith, November, 2011, Global Post PRI, “Chinese mine owners exploit Zambian workers, says rights group,” <http://www.pri.org/stories/2011-11-03/chinese-mine-owners-exploit-zambian-workers-says-rights-group> (accessed 8/12/16)

In interviews conducted by the New York-based group Human Rights Watch, Zambian workers recounted working 12 and even 18-hour shifts at Chinese mines, sometimes in extreme heat and contact with noxious chemicals. If workers refused to work in unsafe conditions, or tried to organize into unions, they faced being fired, according to the report released Thursday. Copper is the mainstay of Zambia’s economy, and China is the country’s biggest foreign investor, with $2 billion invested in copper, cobalt, nickel and coal mines. Zambia has seen strong economic growth, averaging 6 percent over the last three years. But in Zambia, and across Africa, Chinese employers have a reputation for low pay and poor working conditions, sparking protests by local staff and sometimes even violence. President Sata has previously taken a populist, outspoken stance critical of Chinese investment in Zambia, referring to Chinese investors as “infesters” and accusing Chinese companies of using “slave labor.” But in his election campaign this year, and since becoming president in September, he appears to have softened his views, saying that the Chinese are welcome if they follow Zambian laws. Just last weekend, Sata hosted a lunch for Chinese investors at his official residence, the State House, in Lusaka. "Foreign investment is important to Zambia and we will continue to work with foreign investors who are welcome in the country ... but they need to adhere to the labor laws," Sata declared shortly after being sworn in as president.

### 2AC – AT: No Economic Exploitation

#### Chinese neoliberal policies in Zambia guarantee continual economic exploitation via low-wages and micro-loans

Ching Kwan Lee is Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Los Angeles. A native of Hong Kong, she obtained her PhD in Sociology from the University of California at Berkeley and has previously taught at the Chinese University of Hong Kong and the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. Currently, she is a fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford University, 2014, “The Spectre of Global China,” <http://www.sociology.ucla.edu/sites/default/files/u281/nlr_2014_no._89.pdf>, pg. 61 (accessed 8/11/16)

For Zambian workers, the distinction between Chinese state capital and global private capital does not amount to much. A labour regime predicated on low-wage exploitation is no better than one driven by casualization and retrenchment. Both entail permanent precariousness, a reality that is restructuring the life-world of the Zambian working class. Hanging onto their current jobs as best they can, many copper miners—often the only wage earner in a household with six or more dependents—find their familial financial responsibilities far outweigh their earning capacity. One of the main functions of the trade unions since the privatization of the mines, and the cuts in subsidies and in-kind benefits, has been organizing micro-loans for their members. Barclays, Bayport and Finance Bank have found an eager market among the minority of Zambians with formal employment contracts. The loans come with interest rates of around 20 per cent and a repayment period tied to the length of the worker’s contract. The mining companies operate an automatic deduction system to repay the banks from workers’ pay cheques.

### 2AC – AT: No Impact

#### Neolibearlism guarantees exacerbated inequalities, sexism, racism, environmental degradation, repression, and heightened policing- turns all neg’s impacts

Ravi Kumar and Dave Hill, Global Neoliberalism and Education and its Consequences, Ch. 2: “Neoliberalism and its Impacts,” pgs. 12-13 (accessed 8/12/16)

Inequalities both between states and within states have increased dramatically during the era of global neoliberalism. Global capital, in its current neoliberal form in particular, leads to human degradation and inhumanity and increased social class inequalities within states and globally. These effects are increasing (racialized and gendered) social class inequality within states, increasing (racialized and gendered) social class inequality between states. The inequality within societies has acquired new forms. While one fi nds an increasing class-based polarization at ground level, there is an effort by the ruling classes to substitute for class, as the fundamental defi ning characteristic of social identity, different social identities such as race and caste. The efforts at rejecting the primacy of class as the primary constituent of social relations are being put forth also by some “celebrated” progressive educationists (such as Apple, e.g. 2006). Sadly enough, progressive working-class movements across the globe also fall prey to such discourses. And ultimately, they facilitate the unhindered march of neoliberal capital and the degradation and capitalization of humanity, including the environmental degradation impact primarily in a social-class-related manner. Those who can afford to buy clean water don’t die of thirst or diarrhea. Kagarlitsky has pointed out that “globalisation does not mean the impotence of the state, but the rejection by the state of its social functions, in favor of repressive ones, and the ending of democratic freedoms” (2001, quoted in Pilger, 2002, p. 5). Many commentators (e.g., Apple, 1993; Hill, 2001a) have discussed the change since the mid-1970s in many advanced capitalist economies from a social democratic/welfare statist/ Keynesian state to a neoliberal state, to what Gamble (1988) has termed The free economy and the strong state. The strong state and the repressive apparatuses of the state, have, of course, been dramatically upgraded (in terms of surveillance, control, policing in its various forms) in the wake of September 11, 2001.1

#### Neoliberal exploitation justifies violence towards Zambian citizens seeking basic human rights

Brian Chama, M.A. in Human Rights Practice from Roehampton University in London United Kingdom, an M.A. in Communication for Development from the University of Zambia, and a B.A. in Philosophy from the Urban University in Rome, Italy, 2010, “Economic Development at the Cost of Human Rights: China Nonferrous Metal Industry in Zambia,” Human Rights Brief, <http://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1113&context=hrbrief> (accessed 8/12/16)

In July 2006, four NFC mine workers were shot and wounded by the company’s Chinese management in combination with police while protesting a wage dispute.40 In 2007, police shot and killed five miners during violent protests over the working conditions at the Chambishi Mine.41 Then, in March 2008, the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) reported on the dismissal of five hundred mine workers from Chambishi.42 While negotiating for pay increases and better safety conditions, the workers clashed with Chinese foremen, and mine workers assaulted a Chinese manager.43 Chinese workers took refuge by locking themselves in their offices.44 Several buildings were burned in the violence and a protester was injured.45 The workers rioted after negotiations to improve their working conditions were delayed.46 These incidents demonstrate the Zambian government’s failure to protect its citizens’ right to life and prevent workers’ abuses by allowing Chinese corporations to commit human rights abuses with impunity. The government has clearly neglected its positive obligation47 to ensure the physical safety of its people and even, in the instance of police action in support of the company, been complicit in violating the right to life.

# Neg Zambia

### 1NC – Aff Wrong/Reductionist

#### The aff posits an over-generalization of the relationship between China and Zambia- it’s far more nuanced and total rejection of neoliberalism denies unique opportunities for Zambia-China relations

Janny Chang, Submitted in partial fulfillment of the Requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy under the Executive Committee of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, 2014, “A Matter of Trust: Three Case Studies of Chinese and Zambian Relationships at the Workplace,” (accessed 7/21/16)

The dissertation provides a snapshot of the benefits and challenges of increasing Chinese investment in Zambia. By exploring three business domains, I demonstrated the diversity of relationships between Chinese and Zambians and argued against easy generalizations about neo-colonialism or imperialism. I do not deny that these allegations hold sway in some quarters; however, as the dissertation shows, benefits and opportunities also abound. It was important for the dissertation to show that “China” and “Africa” relations is really constituted by relations between individuals – individuals who are learning to understand and communicate with each other on a daily basis. Even diplomatic relations credited for implementing policies occur at the individual level. Using a grounded anthropological approach, the dissertation contributes to the China and Africa field by showing concrete processes and relations forged in specific business settings. The grounded approach based on empirical data collected in 2007, 2008, 2010 and 2011 to 2012 provides a useful complement to research at the macrolevel conducted by up-and-coming scholars such as Jessica Achberger and Namukale Chintu. Achberger focuses on the pre-Deng period and from archival research, deduces China’s strategic attempt to lower its status in the world order beginning in 1954 to gain influence in the Third World. 159 Focusing on the post-Deng period, Chintu brings the distinct characteristics of Chinese foreign direct investment (FDI) on the African continent to the modern context and examines its divergences from western models. 160 The dissertation also adds to the growing body of work based on long-term fieldwork by anthropologists such as Conal Ho on the Cantonese-speaking Chinese community in Ghana, Di Wu on Chinese agricultural companies in Zambia, Roisin Hinds on labor conflicts among Chinese and Zambians in Kamwala market, and Arwen Hoogenbosch on Chinese language courses at the University of Zambia. 161 As the body of literature expands, our knowledge and understanding of the issue will gain depth and nuance. A more nuanced understanding of the diversity in Chinese firms, groups, and individuals will help us arrive at conditions and policies necessary for ensuring the benefits that rightfully belong to Zambians and other Africans.

### 2NC – Aff Wrong/Reductionist

#### China’s not colonialist towards Africa- history proves AND engagement good

Timothy Webster, Director of East Asian Legal Studies, and Assistant Professor of Law, Case Western Reserve University School of Law, 2013, “China’s Human Rights Footprint in Africa,” Case Western University School of Law, <http://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1619&context=faculty_publications> (accessed 7/21/16)

Western analysts frequently maintain that China is colonizing Africa. This overstates the case, I argue, and misapprehends both the nature of China’s multifaceted relationships with fifty African countries, and the underlying meaning of its presence. It is not merely the irony of London,10 Paris,11 Brussels or other former imperial powers accusing Beijing of colonialism.12 The PRC actively supported anticolonial movements in many African countries during the 1960s and 1970s.13 Instead, such criticisms overlook both the historical dimension of Sino-African relations and the current emphases of the SinoAfrican nexus. China’s developmental assistance, military support and terms of engagement hark back to the 1950s, but address Africa’s contemporary concerns and needs in ways that the West has largely overlooked. The larger point, however, is that we simplify Sino-African relations at our own risk. If we think China is simply draining Africa of natural resources while buttressing its dictators, we ignore most of China’s activity in Africa, including direly needed contributions towards Africa’s economic development. At the same time that Western countries and financial institutions dial back aid to Africa, China is actually increasing its financial, agricultural and technical assistance.14 In so doing, China has won plaudits from African dictators and democrats alike, from countries like resource-rich Sudan, but also countries without significant natural endowments like Mauritius and Mali.15 It is not just Robert Mugabe and Omar Al Bashir who like the Chinese, but a host of democratically elected leaders, such as former Prime Minister Meles Zenawi of Ethiopia,16 President Paul Kagame of Rwanda,17 former President Abdoulayeh Wade of Senegal,18 President Jacob Zuma of South Africa19 and former President Bingu wa Mutharika of Malawi.20

#### Folks in Africa overwhelmingly prefer China’s economic involvement over U.S.

David Robinson, Edith Cowan University, 2011, “The Political Economy of China in Africa: The Case of Mozambique,” Presented at the 34th AFSAAP Conference Flinders University, <http://afsaap.org.au/assets/Robinson.pdf> (accessed 7/21/16)

Much of the contemporary literature on Chinese activities in Africa advances, “[t]he stock notion that China practices neocolonialism in Africa and promotes corruption … [is] harmful to the environment ... [and conducts trade] that is damaging to African antipoverty efforts” (Sautman & Hairong, 2007: 76). However, African opinion polls have been more positive about China than the United States, and view China’s model of state-directed growth with greater esteem than the neoliberal ‘Washington Consensus’ (Kurlantzick, 2007: 9, 134). Three major interpretations of China’s role in Africa abound in the West: that of a development partner, whose operations will be mutually beneficial; an economic competitor, whose success undermines African development goals; and a coloniser, whose long-term project is to displace Western influence and enforce geostrategic control (Alden, 2007: 5-6). The choice of interpretation is often highly ideological and based on the observer’s interests. China’s modern engagement with Africa was shaped during the decolonisation period from the 1950s into the 1970s, forged heavily in the rhetoric of unity in anti-colonial struggle and solidarity between developing nations (Mohan & Power, 2008: 27-28). During the 1960s and 1970s China provided support to several African independence struggles, as well as assisting newly-independent African nations with doctors, technical experts, and infrastructure (Jakobson, 2009: 407). By the 1980s China’s activity on the continent declined as it focused on domestic reforms, and its trade with the continent shrank dramatically (Yi-Chong, 2008: 23). However, the 1989 Tiananmen Square massacre was a turning point in the relationship as African governments declined to join the West in isolating China (Jakobson, 2009: 408). The rising importance of energy resources for China’s foreign policy during the 1990s then led China to devote increasingly substantial resources towards the African continent (Mohan & Power, 2008: 30).

#### The aff’s reductionist perception of the China-Zambian relationship is wrong and denies mutual benefits between the two

Janny Chang, Submitted in partial fulfillment of the Requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy under the Executive Committee of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, 2014, “A Matter of Trust: Three Case Studies of Chinese and Zambian Relationships at the Workplace,” (accessed 7/21/16)

In the dissertation, I explored the complexities in Chinese and Zambian interactions at the workplace. I used three case studies, which highlighted Chinese and Zambian interactions on a regular basis: a Chinese telecommunications firm, a Zambian construction firm and strategic alliances between Chinese and Zambian entrepreneurs. In each case, I analyzed the role of trust, which was underscored by differences in ascribed meaning as well as a history of interactions, and challenges arising from a fairly new kind of cross-cultural communication and relationship building in the business world. By examining the concrete mechanisms of relationship building and their role in laying the foundation for future alliances among Chinese and Zambian professionals, this dissertation supplements the growing literature focused on China and African studies. Debates about China’s involvement in African countries tend to focus on resource extraction and government-endorsed enterprises. While this does raise concerns about colonial and neo-colonial endeavor, the context and specific country, industry and firm are significant variables to consider. As I have shown in Chapter VIII, the construction industry is more prone to buyer and supplier alliances due to the asymmetrical nature of information flows and the lack of quality enforcement in equipment and infrastructure. The problems are not unique to Zambia and are germane even to the United States’ construction industry. Despite the challenges, I also emphasized the interdependent relationship, albeit an unequal one, between Chinese and Zambian private construction firms. Due to requirements set forth by foreign companies and major cost constraints, Zambian firms must rely on Chinese firms to supply affordable products. Chinese firms have a competitive edge in winning bids in terms of keeping costs down. However, their vulnerable position within a political context that stresses the importance of personal connections and growing resentment against the Chinese may compel them to form joint ventures with Zambian firms. It could potentially be a mutually beneficial endeavor.

#### China isn’t the type of neoliberalism they criticize- it’s an alternative to Western regimes

Timothy Webster, Director of East Asian Legal Studies, and Assistant Professor of Law, Case Western Reserve University School of Law, 2013, “China’s Human Rights Footprint in Africa,” Case Western University School of Law, <http://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1619&context=faculty_publications> (accessed 7/21/16)

First, China emphasizes collective rights over individual ones. This runs counter to core Western assumptions about human rights, and the liberal democratic framework of international human rights law (IHRL) more generally.30 International human rights law, as created after World War II, endows the individual with rights that he may then deploy against national governments. This endowment stems from the natural rights idea that humans enjoy certain entitlements simply by virtue of being people.31 In other words, IHRL serves to check governmental authority over the individual, ideally ensuring a sphere of personal autonomy into which the state may not intrude.32 But the individual does not lie at the heart of Chinese society, either presently or in traditional China. Like other Asian countries, China stresses communitarian values, the importance of groups within society and the state’s interests over those of the individual. From a rights perspective, China would prefer to buttress the rights of the entire community, rather than permit an individual to assert rights against the state or community.33 This tendency is surely changing as greater individual autonomy bubbles up in contemporary China, with important ramifications for asserting human rights.34 But the official Chinese view privileges the group at the expense of the individual, with important implications for foreign policy and the disbursal of foreign aid. Whereas Western donors may elect to fund a project to promote democracy, entrench human rights, support civil society or enhance governance,35 China would prefer to furnish the basic subsistence needs of large groups of people.36 Both Western and Chinese sets of projects legitimately advance human rights, but the divergent goals and methods of attaining those rights leads to confusion and recrimination between China and the West.

### 1NC – Aff Impacts False/Skeptical

#### Be skeptical of their truth claims- the China-Zambia relationship is complex and requires detailed case-by-case assessments

Pengtao Li, May, 2010, “The Myth and Reality of Chinese Investors: A Case Study of Chinese Investment in Zambia’s Copper Industry,” South African Institute of International Affairs, <http://www.saiia.org.za/images/stories/pubs/occasional_papers/saia_sop_62_li_20100526.pdf> (accessed 7/22/16)

Chinese engagement in Africa is an over-scrutinised yet poorly researched issue. It is over-scrutinised because Chinese activities in Africa are increasingly in the spotlight of Western media, while slowly becoming a focus of Western academia. Chinese involvement on the African continent is attracting unprecedented attention because it is driven by China’s general resurgence in world affairs, which is most evidenced on the African continent, and by Western anxiety regarding China’s challenge to the West’s traditional engagement with Africa. However, time and again, China’s intentions, motivations and strategies in Africa are misunderstood and inaccurately contextualised. Consequently, Sino–African relations are, to a certain extent, poorly researched. A sustained effort is required to alter this trend and, therefore, deepen our understanding of the true nature of Sino–African relations. In particular, analysis of popular literature on China and Africa highlights one predominant — and dangerously inaccurate — paradigm that must be altered: that there exists a single Chinese actor dealing with a single Africa. To further the study of the general Sino–African relationship, we need to contextualise individual cases, meaning we should make sense of the connection between certain Chinese activities and the political economy of local society in Africa, connect Chinese dynamics to the African context and analyse the Chinese presence in well-grounded contexts. In other words, to accurately contextualise the Sino–African relationship, we need detailed and sustained empirical studies on the individual strands of the relationship, and it is also imperative that Chinese perspectives on this topic are taken into account.

### 1NC – Turn: China Neolib in Africa Good

#### Even if it’s not perfect, China’s neoliberal policies in Africa have been good- human rights, poverty, and medicine. Reject the aff’s reductionism of China

Timothy Webster, Director of East Asian Legal Studies, and Assistant Professor of Law, Case Western Reserve University School of Law, 2013, “China’s Human Rights Footprint in Africa,” Case Western University School of Law, <http://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1619&context=faculty_publications> (accessed 7/21/16)

China’s engagement with fifty African countries extends far beyond aiding and abetting the least savory regimes. In the 1950s, China first gained a foothold in the continent through small aid projects in thirty-six countries. In the past ten years, China has played an increasingly visible role throughout the continent, across a wide range of fields, from building schools and malaria centers to constructing roads and hydroelectric power plants. While China does not use the banner of human rights to trumpet its rice experimentation centers, medical teams or water wells, these projects have helped raise the living standards, and secure the fundamental human rights, of millions of Africans. Just as China’s unique, state-centric model of development has brought hundreds of millions of its own citizens out of poverty, its projects in Africa promise to do the same for Africans. To be sure, China’s support for a small number of “rogue states” has thwarted international sanctions, and Western plans to isolate these regimes. While unfortunate, such support is largely unrepresentative of China’s Africa footprint, which covers a much broader area than these conflict-ridden regimes. Perhaps it is now time to consider whether China’s models, activities and counterexamples can teach the West something that our own decades of developmental experience, following centuries of colonialism, have failed to illuminate.

### 2NC – Turn: China Neolib in Africa Good

#### Historically, China’s economic strategies in Zambia is what helped alleviate violent, racialized control, not the other way around

Fredrick Mutesa, 2010, The rise of China and India in Africa, edited by Fantu Cheru and Cyril Obi, Ch. 13: “China and Zambia: between development and politics ,” pgs. 167-168, [https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:285922/FULLTEXT01.pdf](https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2%3A285922/FULLTEXT01.pdf) (accessed 7/19/16)

Zambia’s support for black liberation movements in the region made it vulnerable to military and economic destabilization from the white minority regimes. This vulnerability was exacerbated by the country’s dependence on trade routes that ran through the same countries whose regimes it was opposed to. As a result, in the late 1960s Zambia requested assistance from multilateral financial institutions and Western countries to construct an alternative lifeline to the Dar es Salaam seaport, through friendly Tanzania. This request was turned down on the pretext that the project was not economically viable. It was China which stepped in to construct the 2,000-kilometre-long Tanzania–Zambia railway (Tazara), when the country’s traditional donors refused to come to its aid. The great Uhuru (freedom) railway, therefore, has remained as an enduring symbol of China’s dependability as Zambia’s ally. For its part, Zambia stood shoulder to shoulder with China in its diplomatic efforts to gain acceptance as a member of the international community. It was Zambia, for instance, which co-sponsored the United Nations General Assembly resolution in 1971 to restore China’s seat on the Security Council. Successive Zambian governments have also been consistent supporters of the one-China policy. In the course of a little over three decades since the Sino-Zambia ‘all weather’ friendship was cemented, the southern African geopolitical situation has radically changed and Chinese society has undergone great transformation. Black majority rule has come to all of southern Africa, and China has abandoned its rigid socialist economy of the first three decades of its revolution for a more robust free market economy. The collapse of the socialist bloc in the late 1980s and early 1990s has also resulted in a greatly altered global balance of forces. The world has moved on from the bipolar world of US–USSR superpower rivalry to a unipolar one in which neoliberalism has been the main ideological driving force behind the new globalism. In this, vastly different, world of the twentyfirst century, former allies, as well as antagonists, have found that they have to respond to a different logic in the manner in which they engage with each other. For the first time since Sino-Zambia diplomatic relations were established, the ‘all weather’ friendship between these two nations seems to have hit turbulence. This historical background needs to be taken into account when one considers the latest phase of Sino-African relations in general and Sino-Zambian relations in particular.

#### China’s neoliberal engagement with Zambia is good- increases standard of living and educational programs

Lusaka Times, August, 2015, “Trade between Zambia and China grows to $3.8 billion-Chikwanda,” <https://www.lusakatimes.com/2015/08/27/trade-between-zambia-and-china-grows-to-3-8-billion-chikwanda/> (accessed 7/22/16)

Finance Minister Alexander Chikwanda says bilateral trade between Zambia and China has grown from US$21 million in 1995 to $3.8billion us dollars in 2014. Speaking during the 2nd Zambia -China joint trade and economic committee meeting in Lusaka this afternoon, Mr. Chikwanda says Zambia and China share common interests and destiny and the two countries have a common desire of ensuring economic prosperity and uplifting the standards of living of their people. Mr. Chikwanda notes that Zambia and China have also enjoyed long standing cordial and warm relations guided by principles of treating each other sincerely and equally, consolidating solidarity and mutual trust, joint pursuance of inclusive growth and development and promoting innovation in practical bilateral cooperation. He adds that the Chinese Government has generously continued to support Zambia in areas of agriculture, education, health care, infrastructure, forestry and wild life protection, water and sanitation among other areas. Mr. Chikwanda however, states that even with the cherished support, there is still room for improving, broadening and widening the frontiers of the bilateral relations through enhanced dialogue.

#### China engagement in Zambia is a preferable alternative to U.S. neoliberal engagement policies

Pengtao Li, May, 2010, “The Myth and Reality of Chinese Investors: A Case Study of Chinese Investment in Zambia’s Copper Industry,” South African Institute of International Affairs, <http://www.saiia.org.za/images/stories/pubs/occasional_papers/saia_sop_62_li_20100526.pdf> (accessed 7/22/16)

Whether China’s increasing role in Africa will serve as a catalyst for African development or be just another episode of external powers pursuing narrow self-interests remains to be seen. Nevertheless, one thing is certain: for Africa, ‘the most significant dimension of Chinese engagement is that it is a potential source of investment capital and development assistance which Western sources are either uninterested in or unwilling to provide’.31 Chinese engagement with Africa provides exciting opportunities for many countries on the continent and attractive alternatives to the aid-focused and neo-liberally informed approaches traditionally favoured by the West. Perhaps, investment-centred Chinese engagement in Africa might be more efficient. The case of Chinese investment in the Zambian economy, especially in the mining sector, seems to confirm this possibility.

#### China’s neoliberal engagement with Zambia is good- improves educational opportunities

Ellie Bothwell, April 21, 2016, “What Chinese investment means for African higher education,” Times Higher Education, <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/features/what-chinese-investment-means-for-african-higher-education> (accessed 7/22/16)

And while China’s approach to “soft power” has been particularly “strategic” and considered compared with other “technologically and economically advanced countries”, it is true that China “also gives a lot of things back” to Africa, Tarrosy argues. This is demonstrated by President Xi’s proposals on education, which also include a pledge to train 1,000 African media personnel. He says that Chinese investment has improved African teaching premises and boosted human resources capacity, as well as providing research equipment. King notes that it is “very difficult to work out the long-term impact” of China’s investment in training and curriculum development. But there is no doubting that the 46 Confucius Institutes established across 32 African countries have taught Mandarin to a significant number of young Africans, he says.

#### China’s neoliberal engagement reduces poverty

CNN, and Interview with Dambisa Moyo, a Zambian economist & investment strategist, February, 2013, “Economist Dambisa Moyo: China can transform Africa,” <http://edition.cnn.com/2013/02/28/business/dambisa-moyo-africa/> (accessed 7/22/16)

In a new interview with CNN's Robyn Curnow, Moyo explains why she's optimistic about the future of Africa. She looks at the positive impact that China can have on the continent and details the key drivers that will spur Africa's economic growth. An edited version of the interview follows. CNN: The aid debate is so different from before ... Dambisa Moyo: So much has happened in the last five years -- whether you're in Africa, South America or Asia, nobody talks about aid anymore. Policy makers themselves are going out and issuing debts in the market. My own country, Zambia, did a fantastic bond, a $750 million 10-year bond, last September. The discussion is so much more about job creation and investment, which is such a fantastic story and it's obviously partly to do with the fact that the traditional donors are having a financial problem, fiscal problem, on their balance sheets. They just don't have the capital anymore to hand out cash like they did in the past. CNN: The Chinese story has been thrown into the mix, has that changed the landscape? DM: Yes, absolutely, but in a strange way it's exactly what we need in terms of delivering economic growth and meaningfully reducing poverty. We need jobs, we need investment, we need trade, we need foreign direct investment, whether investment domestically but also from the outside.

### 1NC – Zambia Likes Chinese Engagement

#### Even if neoliberalist policies contribute to disproportional wage inequalities, total rejection is wrong- are also used in Zambia to improve social conditions

Fredrick Mutesa, 2010, The rise of China and India in Africa, edited by Fantu Cheru and Cyril Obi, Ch. 13: “China and Zambia: between development and politics ,” pg. 170, [https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:285922/FULLTEXT01.pdf](https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2%3A285922/FULLTEXT01.pdf) (accessed 7/19/16)

In addition to project aid, China has also granted debt relief to Zambia. Zambia’s debt to China was said to stand at US$217 million as of 12 December 2006, making China the highest non-Paris Club provider of loans to Zambia (ibid.: 10). During his visit to Zambia in February 2007, President Hu expressed China’s willingness to cancel some of the debt owed to it by Zambia. Subsequently, an initial amount of US$11 million was cancelled, with the possibility of more to follow.2 African leaders find Chinese development assistance attractive because it is based on a ‘no strings attached’ policy, in line with Beijing’s espoused policy of ‘non-interference’ in the internal political affairs of its cooperating partners. Critics have, of course, cited this as a major weakness in Chinese development assistance because it can also serve as a smokescreen for supporting nations considered as pariah states. In the case of Zambia, as we shall see later, noninterference was breached in the country’s September 2006 presidential elections when the Chinese government openly threatened to cut economic ties with Zambia in the event of victory by the country’s leading opposition leader, Michael Sata of the Patriotic Front.

### 1NC – Counterplan: Funding/Regulations

#### Text: The Republic of Zambia should establish and implement strict labor standards including, but not limited to standard minimum wages, safety regulations, and limiting work hours. The People’s Republic of China should adhere to these standards. The People’s Republic of China should offer to fund a workshop in the Republic of Zambia informing Chinese workers of these labor laws.

#### The Counterplan solves worker exploitation and enables the best forms of Chinese neoliberalism

Janny Chang, Submitted in partial fulfillment of the Requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy under the Executive Committee of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, 2014, “A Matter of Trust: Three Case Studies of Chinese and Zambian Relationships at the Workplace,” (accessed 7/21/16)

Allegations against the Chinese for violating labor laws do need to be addressed. I refer to expert Dr. Jolly Kamwanga, a professor and researcher at the Institute of Economic and Social Sciences at the University of Zambia, and specialist in China and African relations for insight. Dr. Kamwanga offered his perspective. The new government made a lot of promises -- not just in Chinese companies, other companies too. Issues of low taxes, change from casualization to full term employment. Chinese firms are known to employ people on short-term contracts. The major issue is that they're taking advantage of the weak labor laws in the country. Even in China, the working conditions – they do not adhere to international standards. They tend to import those practices to countries like Zambia. If you have weak labor regulations, it's fertile ground for labor practices. which go against international standards to occur. China is not as forced to adhere. It's up to recipient countries to maintain stringent standards. If they don't, even South African firms, which also import labor, take advantage of those with regulations. The only difference with China is that back home, they've been accused of having same bad work condition in their workplaces even within China. The Chinese firms will shift their practices here. It's up to the local government to make sure that labor laws are strictly adhered to. Dr. Kamwanga noted the “window of opportunity” that the newly elected president had to compel Chinese firms to adhere to labor laws. During the elections, he promised to force the Chinese to leave the country. After he was elected, he realized that this was not fiscally possible, so he held a party for all the major Chinese investors to strengthen relations with them and as a gesture of apology for his rhetoric during the elections. Dr. Kamwanga’s point was reiterated by a labor inspector I interviewed in 2010. She vehemently stated that the Chinese were there to “rape” the Zambians. Her inspections occurred mostly in Kamwala market, which was heavily dominated by Chinese and Indian shopkeepers selling cheap household and clothing items purchased primarily by Zambians. In these small niches, it was apparent that Chinese shopkeepers had driven some Zambians out of business and the imported clothing posed a threat to the salaula, or second-hand clothing markets, which provided the livelihood for many Zambian women. When I talked to her again in 2011, she had toned down her statements. She mentioned that there were still labor problems, and also mentioned how poorly she was compensated, the difficulty of having transport to make repeated visits to the market and the challenges in resolving this problem. She presented one possible solution – to create a workshop that informed the Chinese who just arrived about the labor laws of Zambia and introduce them to their history and customs. Yet the major obstacle to carrying out this workshop was funding. Where would the money come from to fund the workshop?

### 1NC – Solvency: Rejection Insufficient

#### Aff can’t solve- too many institutions that implement neoliberal control beyond China and the United states for their rejection of neoliberalism to be sufficient

Firoze Manji is Kenyan and the founder and former editor-in-chief of Pambazuka News. He is Visiting Fellow at Kellogg College, Oxford University, and editor of a number of books on China in Africa including African Perspectives on China in Africa (Pambazuka Press), conversation with Stephen Chan, who is the winner of the 2010 International Studies Association award, Eminent Scholar in Global Development. His new book is Southern Africa: Old Treacheries and New Deceits (Yale University Press), October, 2012, “Is China good for Africa?,” New Internationalist, <https://newint.org/sections/argument/2012/10/01/is-china-good-for-africa/> (accessed 7/19/16)

Firoze I agree with you that the practice of private companies from China operating in Africa needs to be examined critically. But the same goes for all corporations in Africa. Despite all the publicity given to China’s intervention, the reality is that Western corporations have far more extensive operations across the African continent. And it’s true that when people talk about American or European corporations operating in Africa, they refer to the specific companies – Anglo-American, Unilever, Shell, BP, Chevron, etc – but when they refer to corporations from China, it is always ‘the Chinese’. But the operations of many private corporations, whether Western or Chinese, are heavily subsidized by the state using public funds, so we can’t let the Chinese government completely off the hook. You’re quite right to say that it is only the people who can change things. That is true of all our countries. If Chinese companies, or indeed any international corporations, get away with exploiting African labour, a large part of the blame must lie with our governments in Africa that allow such practices to continue. Do you think it is better to be exploited by private Chinese corporations than by Western international corporations? Both benefit from cheap labour and from shifting the social cost of the reproduction of labour on to women, especially peasant farmers. What is missing in the discussion is how we democratize our societies, economies and production processes so that the majority, rather than a minority, benefit. Does China’s engagement increase the likelihood of greater democratization? I think not.

### 2NC – Solvency: Rejection Insufficient

#### Capitalist systems too pervasive for the aff to overcome

Fredrick Mutesa, 2010, The rise of China and India in Africa, edited by Fantu Cheru and Cyril Obi, Ch. 13: “China and Zambia: between development and politics ,” pg. 178, [https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:285922/FULLTEXT01.pdf](https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2%3A285922/FULLTEXT01.pdf) (accessed 7/19/16)

In conclusion, it is important to put the overseas expansion of China in its historical and economic perspective. To begin with, China’s rapid economic growth has mainly been driven by its low-cost labour force. This is one of the main factors that have caused many Western multinational corporations to rush to invest in China. China runs a market economy superintended by a communist system that does not tolerate dissent from the official line. It is not surprising that China is exporting the same production relations to countries where it is spreading its economic tentacles. Naturally, this has resulted in a kind of ‘clash of cultures’. But China is not doing anything different from what other capitalist countries practised during the era of primitive accumulation. What has compounded the situation in developing countries, such as Zambia, is that recipient governments of Chinese aid and investments are desperate to augment limited domestic savings by means of external resource mobilization. In the process, most countries have extended overgenerous incentives to foreign investors which have meant that, in the short to medium term, citizens are not able to see any benefits of playing host to these investors.

### 1NC – Solvency: Marxism Ineffective/Violent

#### Resistance and alternatives to capitalism are inevitably co-opted by marketing systems making the system worse

Jason Hickel, London School of Economics and Political Science and Arsalan Khan, University of Virginia, Winter 2012, “The Culture of Capitalism and the Crisis of Critique,” Anthropological Quarterly, Volume 85, No. 1, Jstor (accessed 7/21/16)

As indicated in the title of this piece, we seek to do two things in the following pages. First, we attempt to explain the cultural logic that underwrites neoliberal capitalism today, tracing its origins from the countercultural [End Page 205] movement that came out of Berkeley in the late 1960s. We note that there was a certain strand of thinking located within the New Left that was generative of the neoliberal ethos, and that this strand has now come to dominate the politics of American progressives in particular. Second, we try to show how progressive politics today partake of and perpetuate that very same cultural logic: that the logic of capitalism and the logic of resistance against capitalism have converged. In other words, we seek to show how the critique from the left not only accepts the basic terms of neoliberal capitalism, but actually promotes “alternatives” that ultimately advance its cause. This is the effect of a double process: over the past few decades, marketing strategies have managed to co-opt dissent and package rebellion as a consumer commodity at the same time as questions of poverty and inequality have been thoroughly depoliticized by the discourse of “development.” We will demonstrate the structural parallels between these two processes, both of which—as with Stewart and Obama—tend to mystify the coercive dimensions of American capitalism and foreclose possibilities for critique.

### 2NC – Solvency: Marxism Ineffective/Violent

#### Marxist alternatives results in genocidal violence- neoliberalism better

Nigel Farndale, January 15, 2012, The Daily Telegraph, “CAPITALISM: We can rebuild it REPORT First we blamed bankers for the financial collapse, and now the system itself is under attack. But do economists have any better ideas?” Proquest (accessed 7/21/16)

But capitalism has come a long way. Speaking in its defence recently, the former Tory Cabinet minister, Michael Portillo, asked: "Is there any other system that could lift so many people out of poverty and create societies rich enough to provide welfare, health and education services?" When you put it like that, the anti-capitalists look like Monty Python's People's Front of Judea. "Apart from those capitalists who made us rich and provided welfare, health and education, what have the capitalists ever done for us?" Marx decreed that capitalism carried the seeds of its own destruction. But as the philosopher Karl Popper argued, the communism that Marx thought would replace it was even more doomed to failure - because it required the arrival of a "New Man", one who would embody freedom. And this New Man would be the end that justified the means, which, in the case of Stalinist and Maoist communism, meant not only denying freedom but committing genocide on a scale that would have made even Hitler gasp. But if capitalism's supposed nemesis failed, were there any worthwhile ideas that could be rescued from its ashes? Well, one post-communist movement is called Participatory Economics. Parecon, as it is known, has four elements: solidarity, self-management, diversity and equity. Solidarity means encouraging people to work for the benefit of others as well as themselves. Self-management means that everyone has a say in decisions which affect them. Diversity means giving people more options for how they work and what they consume. And equity is about fairness and equality - nobody should have substantially more wealth or power than anyone else. See what they did there? It all sounded reasonable, right up until equity, which is back-to-basics communism. But the other three perhaps amount to a new, more responsible capitalism, and this idea is very much in the air. David Cameron's Big Society is, after all, barking up the same tree. I ask Paul Ormerod, author of The Death of Economics, where he stands on this. "The capitalism we have today is not the same as capitalism in 1910," he says. "Then there wasn't the same idea of a welfare state or state intervention, except for defence. The great strength of capitalism is that it is not static, it's dynamic. It evolves."

#### The aff is insufficient to broaden knowledge production and their rejection is exclusionary and reductionist

(Mario Bunge, Argentine philosopher and physicist, received his Ph.D. in physico-mathematical sciences at the National University of La Plata and has been distinguished with sixteen honorary doctorates and four honorary professorships by universities from both the Americas and Europe. Bunge is a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (1984– ) and of the Royal Society of Canada (1992– ), Boston Studies in the Philosophy and History of Science, 2012, Evaluating Philosophies, Chapter 9: “Marxist Philosophy: Promise and Reality, pg. 93 (accessed 7/21/16)

Given the attachment of Marxist scholars to writings they regarded as infallible and forever topical, it should not be surprising that nearly all the great advances in the natural and social sciences during the last century occurred outside the Marxist box, and that some of them, the most revolutionary, were criticized in the name of Marxism. Thus, when ossi ﬁ ed, Marxism became a serious obstacle to the advancement of knowledge. At the same time, while the Marxists in power won sensational victories over poverty, cultural backwardness and military aggression, they did not keep the emancipatory promise of Marx and Engels, for they held all the sectors of society under their iron ﬁ st instead of fostering popular participation. It never occurred to them that their formula ‘democratic centralism’ is an oxymoron. In the face of the theoretical and practical failure of Marxism, the contemporary socialist intellectuals and politicians have only one way forward: To regard Marxism as an early phase, update the philosophy and the ideals of the radical French Enlightenment, and reinvent socialism as integral democracy guided by the social sciences and technologies (Bunge 2009 ) . In short, not Bac k to Marx !, but Forward from Marx!

#### Transition guarantees armed conflict- empirically proven

Brian Martin, Professor of Social Sciences at the University of Wollongong, 2009, Social Alternatives, “Nonviolent Strategy Against Capitalism,” January 1, 2009, Academic Search Premiere

The question is, how should capitalism be challenged? Armed struggle has been tried, but there is not a single instance in which an advanced capitalist economy has been overthrown by armed force to create a better system. In some poor countries, liberation through armed struggle has brought benefits (and costs: this is a highly contentious topic), but there is no equivalent record in challenging developed capitalist states. Soviet conquests destroyed capitalism in Eastern Europe but the resulting state socialist societies were not an attractive alternative and eventually collapsed, with nonviolent action playing a major role (Randle 1991). Nor has electoral politics had much success in challenging capitalism. Socialist parties have been elected to office but have adapted to capitalism rather than leading the way to a complete alternative (Boggs 1986). Both armed struggle and electoral politics rely ultimately on force. Their aim is to capture state power and use it — including the power of the state to coerce — to transform the economy and society.

#### Transition to socialism impossible: empirically denied and no end of capitalism in sight.

John Brueggemann, professor of sociology and Quadracci Professor in Social Responsibility at Skidmore College, 2010, “Socialism in Civil Society,” Tikkun, Project Muse (accessed 7/22/16)

The book is divided into three loosely related parts. The first offers a concise summary of the problems in capitalism, which have mostly been elucidated in his previous work. Capitalism perpetuates unnecessary human suffering, fosters consumerism, corrodes community, limits democracy, fuels militarism, and damages the natural environment. This part and those that follow are free of naiveté, hyperbole, and hysteria. Wright is diligently candid about tradeoffs and uncertainties. The second part, the most interesting in my view, delineates a number of “real utopias.” It begins by clarifying the strengths and weaknesses of Marxist theory in addressing the problems of capitalism. Among the shortcomings, we find four key predictions of Marx unfulfilled. The crisis of overproduction in capitalism is not imminent. Society has not polarized into two classes. The working class appears unwilling and/or unable to advance its own interests. Revolutionary transformation has been unsuccessful in realizing socialistic ideals. Therefore, the transition from capitalism to socialism will not unfold the way Marx suggested it might.