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# AFFIRMATIVE EVIDENCE

## Engagement Good - General

### Engagement good – General Impacts

#### Cooperation for strong relations is high now

Xinhua News, Staff Writer, February 28, 2017, “China Focus: High hopes for China-U.S. relations, 45 years after Shanghai Communique,” http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2017-02/28/c\_136091181.htm, Accessed 3-1-2017

In the phone conversation with his U.S. counterpart Donald Trump earlier this month, Chinese President Xi Jinping said that he appreciated Trump's willingness to expand China-U.S. cooperation and develop a constructive bilateral relationship that would benefit both countries and the international community. In the same month 45 years ago, U.S. President Richard Nixon made a historic visit to China. On Feb. 28, 1972, the last day of the trip, the two countries released the Shanghai Communique, laying the foundation for the two countries to resume diplomatic ties. Forty-five years on, the spirit and legacy of the historic communique continues.

#### Engagement is key. A trade war with China destroys cooperation on North Korea.

Kenneth Rogoff, Staff Writer, February 13, 2017, “Why Trump can’t bully China,” Boston Globe, https://www.bostonglobe.com/opinion/2017/02/13/why-trump-can-bully-china/tnzJHM05s3rU1Yd7myzDUP/story.html, Accessed 2-26-2017

The United States cannot “win” a trade war with China, and any victory will be Pyrrhic. The United States needs to negotiate hard with China to protect its friends in Asia and deal with the rogue state of North Korea. And the best way to get the good deals Trump says he seeks is to pursue a more open trade policy with China, not a destructive trade war.

#### Reducing US engagement in the Asia-Pacific leads to a regional instability destabilizing arms race

Jeffrey W. Hornung, Fellow for the Security and Foreign Affairs Program at Sasakawa Peace Foundation, February 1, 2017, “Attention, Japan: Trump Is Your Golden Opportunity,” The National Interest, http://nationalinterest.org/feature/attention-japan-trump-your-golden-opportunity-19279, Accessed 2-26-2017

The first is the challenge that comes with reduced U.S. regional engagement. If Trump sticks to his isolationist proclivities, then they will result in reduced U.S. engagement in the Asia-Pacific region. This, in turn, will be destabilizing, as it leaves the strategic space for regional challengers like China, North Korea and Russia to act. Such reduced U.S. engagement will be viewed in Tokyo with much trepidation and lead to grave doubt about U.S. reliability to underwrite regional security. This could lead to fundamental questions concerning Japan’s own national security and force Tokyo to consider a world where the United States no longer actively undergirds regional security. Facing a region susceptible to nineteenth-century dynamics, Japan would find itself in the uncomfortable position of having to play great-power politics. Security dilemmas, arms races and a destabilized Asia-Pacific would soon follow.

## A2: Pressure CPs

### Pressure bad – General impacts

#### A Trump hard line on China risks a trade war and Chinese expansionism

Kenneth Rogoff, Staff Writer, February 13, 2017, “Why Trump can’t bully China,” Boston Globe, https://www.bostonglobe.com/opinion/2017/02/13/why-trump-can-bully-china/tnzJHM05s3rU1Yd7myzDUP/story.html, Accessed 2-26-2017

So far, the Trump administration has only sparred with China, concentrating its early anti-trade rhetoric on Mexico. Although the North American Free Trade Agreement, which Trump reviles, has likely had only modest effects on US trade and jobs, he has attempted to humiliate Mexicans, insisting that they pay for his border wall, as if Mexico were a US colony. The United States is ill-advised to destabilize its Latin American neighbors. In the near term, Mexican institutions should prove quite robust; but in the long run, Trumpism, by encouraging anti-American sentiment, will undermine leaders otherwise sympathetic to US interests. If the Trump administration tries such crude tactics with China, it will be in for a rude surprise. China has financial weapons, including trillions of dollars of US debt. A disruption of trade with China could lead to massive price increases in the low-cost stores — for example, Walmart and Target — on which many Americans rely. Moreover, huge swaths of Asia, from Taiwan to India, are vulnerable to Chinese aggression. For the moment, China’s military is relatively weak and would probably lose a conventional war with the United States; but this situation is rapidly evolving, and China may soon have its own aircraft carriers and other more advanced military capabilities.

#### Hard line policies toward China guarantee trade and military wars

Tom Philips, Staff Writer, February 6, 2017, “Donald Trump and China on dangerous collision course, say experts,” The Guardian, https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/feb/07/donald-trump-and-china-military-confrontation-dangerous-collision-course-experts, Accessed 2-28-2017

A highly combustible cocktail of Donald Trump’s volatility and Xi Jinping’s increasingly aggressive and autocratic rule threatens to plunge already precarious US-China relations into a dangerous new era, some of the world’s leading [China](https://www.theguardian.com/world/china) specialists say in a new report. For the last 18 months a [taskforce of prominent China experts](http://asiasociety.org/center-us-china-relations/us-policy-toward-china-recommendations-new-administration), some of whom have dealt with Beijing for more than 50 years, has been formulating a series of recommendations on how the incoming White House should conduct relations with the world’s second largest economy. [The group’s report](http://asiasociety.org/center-us-china-relations/us-policy-toward-china-recommendations-new-administration), which was handed to the White House on Sunday and will be published in Washington DC on Tuesday, says ties between the two nuclear-armed countries could rapidly deteriorate into an economic or even military confrontation if compromise on issues including trade, Taiwan and the South China Sea cannot be found.

#### Chinese perception of containment guts cooperation and accelerates militarization

Tom Philips, Staff Writer, February 6, 2017, “Donald Trump and China on dangerous collision course, say experts,” The Guardian, https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/feb/07/donald-trump-and-china-military-confrontation-dangerous-collision-course-experts, Accessed 2-28-2017

However, the report cautions the White House against a “short-sighted” military buildup that it says would further inflame tensions. “If China believes the United States is simply bent on containing it militarily, then Beijing would lose any motivation to moderate its conduct and might instead double down on preparations to fight and win in a showdown,” it says. Schell said there was growing consensus among US academics, politicians and even businesspeople that since the 2008 financial crisis an emboldened China had been insufficiently challenged over protectionist trade practices, increasingly aggressive foreign policy moves and egregious human rights abuses. However, following Trump’s unexpected victory the report’s raison d’être changed.

### Pressure fails – Trump is a paper tiger

#### Pressure fails. Backtracking on One-China policy proved Trump as a paper tiger

Simon Denyer and [Philip Rucker](https://www.washingtonpost.com/people/philip-rucker/), Staff Writer, February 10, 2017, “Backing away from a fight, Trump to honor one-China policy,” Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/asia\_pacific/trump-agrees-to-honor-one-china-policy-in-call-to-xi-jinping/2017/02/10/ea6e7ece-ef4a-11e6-9973-c5efb7ccfb0d\_story.html?utm\_term=.11e8628f7991, Accessed 2-26-2017

Lawyer James Zimmerman, former head of the American Chamber of Commerce in China, said Trump never should have raised the one-China policy in the first place, and had now backed down, probably because he realized it was a “complicated, thorny issue that is simply not open for discussion.” “There is certainly a way of negotiating with the Chinese, but threats concerning fundamental, core interests are counterproductive from the get-go,” he said. “The end result is that Trump just confirmed to the world that he is a paper tiger, a zhilaohu — someone that seems threatening but is wholly ineffectual and unable to stomach a challenge.”

#### Trump is all bark. China got him to back off One-China without concessions

Brahma Chellaney, Professor of Strategic Studies at the New Delhi-based Center for Policy Research and Fellow at the Robert Bosch Academy, February 20, 2017, “Trump’s China Challenge,” Project Syndicate, https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/us-china-relations-trump-by-brahma-chellaney-2017-02, Accessed 2-26-2017

During the campaign, Trump threatened to retaliate against China for “raping” America on trade, to impose massive tariffs on Chinese imports, and to label China a currency manipulator on “day one.” Soon after his victory, Trump took a congratulatory phone call from the president of Taiwan, thereby breaking with nearly 40 years of diplomatic orthodoxy. Trump then took the matter a step further, publicly [suggesting](http://www.foxnews.com/transcript/2016/12/11/exclusive-donald-trump-on-cabinet-picks-transition-process/) that he would use the “One China” policy as a bargaining chip in bilateral negotiations over contentious economic and security issues – from import taxes to North Korea. But Trump backed down. Chinese President Xi Jinping made it clear that he would not so much as talk to Trump on the phone without assurance that the US president would pledge fidelity to the One China policy. The call happened, and Trump did exactly what Xi wanted, ostensibly without extracting anything in return. If China now perceives Trump to be all bark and no bite, he will undoubtedly find it harder to secure concessions from China on trade and security issues.

### Pressure solidifies regime power

#### Pressuring China gives the regime broad support for resistance

Tyler Roylance, staff editor at Freedom House, February 16, 2017, “The Right Way to Confront China,” The Diplomat, http://thediplomat.com/2017/02/the-right-way-to-confront-china/, Accessed 2-28-2017

The new administration’s failure to make democratic principles a core element of its foreign policy could not only weaken America’s regional ties, but also alienate the Chinese people. Washington can credibly appeal to Chinese citizens’ basic sense of justice when it pushes for reforms that will simultaneously [serve U.S. interests](https://freedomhouse.org/blog/how-beijing-s-censorship-impairs-us-china-relations) and enhance Chinese people’s fundamental rights, including freedom of speech, religious freedom, press freedom, and the rule of law. By contrast, a nakedly nationalist approach would take Washington down to Beijing’s level and drive the Chinese people closer to their own oppressive regime. Minxin Pei, an expert on Chinese politics and U.S.-China relations, has [said](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/24/world/asia/trump-us-china-trade-trans-pacific-partnership.html?_r=0) that increased hostility from the United States would “almost certainly give the Chinese government a boost in its public support.”

## A2: US-China Relations DA

### Relations low now

#### Sino-US tensions are running high now

Orville Schell, Task Force Chair & Asia Society Center on US-China Relations and Susan L. Shirk, Chair & University of California San Diego, February 2017, “US Policy Toward China: Recommendations for a New Administration,” Asia Society Task Force Report, http://asiasociety.org/files/US-China\_Task\_Force\_Report\_FINAL.pdf, Accessed 2-28-2017

Yet as the new US administration takes office, a number of worrisome new challenges now demand strategic thinking and new responses. Tensions are rising between the two countries in Asia as China asserts its maritime and territorial interests in ways that threaten the interests of the United States and our allies and partners. China’s protectionist economic policies have led to an increasingly inequitable situation in trade and investment. Authoritarian government controls have caused the relationship between US and Chinese civil society and media organizations to deteriorate, and cyberhacking has opened a new front of antagonistic contention. These new challenges now require the United States to take stock, look at what has worked in the past, reassess how the US-China relationship has changed, and then make a careful appraisal of what additional policy tools are needed to protect and advance our national interests—and hopefully restore the relationship to a more stable and mutually beneficial state. We hope that the recommendations of this task force will provide the Trump administration with some helpful concrete policy ideas, as well as a more comprehensive roadmap for navigating future US-China relations.

### General engagement/diplomacy good

#### Broad US-China diplomatic engagement is crucial to de-escalate multiple conflicts and war via miscalculation

Alex Shashkevich, Stanford News Service, February 15, 2017, “Stanford experts offer policy proposals, insights on U.S.-Asia relations,” Stanford News, http://news.stanford.edu/2017/02/15/experts-offer-insights-on-u-s-asia-relations/, Accessed 2-25-2017

If China’s national power and economy continue to expand, it will become increasingly difficult to maintain stability in the region if the U.S. does not continue to play a constructive role. Possible dangers include escalation of tensions between China and the U.S. or its allies following accidents or tactical encounters near areas over which China claims sovereignty. In the report, scholars recommend a comprehensive review of security in the region to make sure military plans are in place that prioritize management of a possible collapse of North Korea or a sudden military strike coming from the country. Other priorities should include peaceful resolution of China-Taiwan differences and ensuring military access in the South China Sea and East China Sea, wrote Karl Eikenberry, director of the U.S.-Asia Security Initiative at the Shorenstein Center. “The United States also should engage in a more long-range, exploratory strategic dialogue, first with allies and partners, and then with Beijing, to identify potential areas of mutual interest that can help prevent the unintended escalation of conflicts and reduce already dangerous levels of misperception and mistrust on both sides,” Eikenberry wrote.

#### Greater engagement is central to US-China relations. We have multiple established forums for resolving differences

Barbara Hackman Franklin, the 29th U.S. Secretary of Commerce and President and CEO of Barbara Franklin Enterprises, February 3, 2017, “A New US-China Economic Relationship?,” China-US Focus, http://www.chinausfocus.com/finance-economy/a-new-us-china-economic-relationship, Accessed 2-25-2017

It is also important that the two sides regularly engage with each other just as they have been doing these past years. There are now a multitude of governmental bilateral summits and dialogues, such as the Strategic and Economic Dialogue, the US-China Joint commission on Commerce and Trade (JCCT) and many others. These should be continued, even if the new Administration decides to restructure the U.S. side of them. There are many avenues of business to business engagement as well. The point is that these methods of engagement provide a regularized and serious way for those who lead the two largest economies in the world to communicate about and work to overcome troubling issues and disagreements. The tone for these dialogues must be set at the top, and therefore, a great deal is riding on the relationship between President Trump and President Xi Jinping. I am hopeful that the two presidents will meet and talk regularly and often, and will establish a personal relationship. They have had an introductory phone call which, from all reports, was cordial, with both expressing the desire to work together. I am hopeful that they can and will look for ways and issues on which they can work together for the good of both countries and the global economy. And where there is disagreement, I am hopeful that they would look for common ground.

### Alternate causes will drag down relations

#### Multiple factors non affected by the plan carry high risk of unravelling relations

Orville Schell, Task Force Chair & Asia Society Center on US-China Relations and Susan L. Shirk, Chair & University of California San Diego, February 2017, “US Policy Toward China: Recommendations for a New Administration,” Asia Society Task Force Report, http://asiasociety.org/files/US-China\_Task\_Force\_Report\_FINAL.pdf, Accessed 2-28-2017

The US-China relationship has always entailed elements of both cooperation and competition, but since the global financial crisis in 2008, the mix began to shift. Despite cooperative successes in areas of common concern—such as climate change, nuclear proliferation in Iran, global pandemics, military-to-military communication, and ocean sustainability—other areas are now more contentious and risk undermining the overall relationship, including regional maritime disputes, trade and investment practices, human rights, and cyberespionage. As a consequence, the Trump administration now faces the task of formulating a revised US strategy that addresses these growing concerns about China’s actions without unduly damaging the benefits the United States stands to gain from cooperating in areas where interests still converge.

## A2: US-Japan Relations DA

### Relations are unstable

#### US-Japan relations are unstable. The Trump-Abe meeting did nothing to fundamental problems

Japan News, Staff Writer, February 23, 2017, “U.S. report: ‘Uncertainty’ in relations with Japan,” http://the-japan-news.com/news/article/0003538759, Accessed 2-26-2017

A U.S. Congressional Research Service report released on Wednesday posed questions over the course of Japan-U.S. relations after the two country’s closely watched summit. The Feb. 10 meeting between Prime Minister Shinzo Abe and U.S. President Donald Trump was “seen as broadly successful,” the report said. Despite that, “questions remain about how the relationship will fare under the Trump administration,” the report also said. Although the summit “allayed some of the concerns that the [Japan-U.S.] alliance would suffer in the new administration, the meeting did not resolve what some observers see as the most contentious issues in the relationship,” according to the report by the U.S. congressional think tank.

##  (BIT) Bilateral Investment Treaty

### Status Quo fails – No progress

#### Trump is not pushing a BIT with China

Doug Tsuruoka, Staff Writer, and [Nicholas R. Lardy](https://piie.com/experts/senior-research-staff/nicholas-r-lardy), a senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics, February 16, 2017, “Trouble with US-China trade war – both sides would lose (interview),” Asia Times, http://www.atimes.com/article/trouble-us-china-trade-war-sides-lose/, Accessed 2-25-2017

Is Trump interested in getting China to liberalize its foreign investment policies? I’m not sure how interested Trump is in getting China to liberalize on investment. He seems to be in the frame of mind that when American businesses invest abroad — that means fewer jobs at home. I don’t share that view and I don’t think it’s very well supported, but that is (Trump’s) perspective. What does that mean for the possible signing of a US-China bilateral investment treaty (BIT)? I don’t think we know what’s going to happen on that front. As far as I know, Mr Trump has never uttered the words, “US-China bilateral investment treaty.” I don’t know if he has been briefed on that. The BIT negotiations (between Washington and Beijing) have been going on for three years. Has Trump taken a position on the BIT? It’s quite conceivable that he’s never heard of it. If he has a view, he certainly never said anything about it during the presidential campaign. One thing (that Trump) did say was that he likes bilateral agreements. He doesn’t like the Trans-Pacific Partnership because it’s multilateral— but he likes bilateral. At the same time, I don’t know how much pushing he would do on a bilateral investment treaty because he thinks it’s a job loser.

#### US-China BIT negotiations are in a two decade deadlock

Leon Ding, Political Science and Economics, UC Irvine (2015) and Xiaodan Wu, International Politics from Fudan University (2015), December 12, 2016, “Why China and the United States need a Bilateral Investment Treaty,” China-US Focus, http://chinafocus.us/2016/12/12/why-china-and-the-united-states-need-a-bilateral-investment-treaty/, Accessed 2-25-2017

While both Chinese and US markets have benefited from increasingly liberalized bilateral trade, the volume of active Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) was limited partly due to the aggravating national security concern and strict limitations in specific industries. According to the historical data of the Ministry of Commerce of China, the U.S. FDI in China varied from S2.7 billion to $ 3.5 billion each year during the past decade and only $2.59 billion was invested in China in 2015. This situation could have been changed by removing discriminatory investment restrictions via a Bilateral Investment Treaty (BIT). However, in the past two decades, such an agreement had never been reached because it requires reconciling divergences concerning FDI policies of two countries in their own domestic markets. One word aptly characterizes the negotiation process of Sino-US BIT: deadlock. We believe it is the biggest missed opportunity for US-China economic cooperation.

#### Trump has ignored the BIT so far, but all positions point to a departure from previous versions

Lori Wallach, director of Global Trade Watch at [Public Citizen](http://www.citizen.org/), January 31, 2017, “The paradoxes and pitfalls of Trump's trade agenda,” The Hill, http://thehill.com/blogs/pundits-blog/economy-budget/317151-the-paradoxes-and-pitfalls-of-trumps-trade-agenda, Accessed 2-25-2017

What Trump does with the live agreements he inherited, most notably the U.S.-China Bilateral Investment Treaty (BIT), will be telling. The Obama administration failed to quite finalize that deal, but at its heart are the investor protections found in [NAFTA](https://www.nafta-sec-alena.org/Home/Legal-Texts/North-American-Free-Trade-Agreement?mvid=1&secid=539c50ef-51c1-489b-808b-9e20c9872d25) and included in [TPP](https://www.mfat.govt.nz/assets/_securedfiles/Trans-Pacific-Partnership/Text/9.-Investment-Chapter.pdf) that make it easier for U.S. firms to [offshore jobs](https://www.cato.org/publications/free-trade-bulletin/compromise-advance-trade-agenda-purge-negotiations-investor-state). The pact also grants new rights for Chinese firms to acquire U.S. companies, land and more, and operate them under privileged terms. It would also empower Chinese firms operating here to sue the U.S. government outside of our court system to demand taxpayer compensation via the controversial investor-state dispute [settlement regime](https://www.buzzfeed.com/globalsupercourt) Trump says he opposes. Given the pact’s terms and China’s role as a top target of Trump trade wrath, the absence of a first-week executive order terminating these negotiations was conspicuous.

### BIT good – Improves trade & relations

#### A US-China Bilateral Investment Treaty accelerates fair trade on two levels, while improving overall relations to solve conflicts, like the S. China Seas

Leon Ding, Political Science and Economics, UC Irvine (2015) and Xiaodan Wu, International Politics from Fudan University (2015), December 12, 2016, “Why China and the United States need a Bilateral Investment Treaty,” China-US Focus, http://chinafocus.us/2016/12/12/why-china-and-the-united-states-need-a-bilateral-investment-treaty/, Accessed 2-25-2017

A successful Sino-U.S. BIT creates benefits for both parties. For China, it is conspicuous that high-quality American products will be more accessible to Chinese consumers via localization. To delve deeper, it exposes Chinese enterprises into an environment of transparent international competition, nudging these industries to be more innovative and competitive. This BIT also accelerates trade liberalization by setting standards for China’s investment policies and its relations with the US, which paves the road for China to be qualified to reach the standard of agreements such as the (now-defunct) Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP). For the United States, first, the BIT restricts China from using regulations that favor Chinese firms or providing subsidies to state-owned enterprises (SOEs) to gain an unfair competitive advantage. Second, it ensures the better protection of intellectual property of American firms by eliminating investment restrictions which require foreign firms to collaborate with Chinese partners ahead of entering into Chinese market. Apart from economic benefits, the Sino-U.S. BIT is also believed to alleviate potential inter-state conflicts (e.g. South China Sea issues) because economic interdependence makes the opportunity cost higher for decision makers to collide with each other.

#### Trump should move quickly to resolve a BIT with China. This protects US businesses and strengthens Sino-US relations

Alex Shashkevich, Stanford News Service, February 15, 2017, “Stanford experts offer policy proposals, insights on U.S.-Asia relations,” Stanford News, http://news.stanford.edu/2017/02/15/experts-offer-insights-on-u-s-asia-relations/, Accessed 2-25-2017

The new administration should also consider pushing for a quick completion of a Bilateral Investment Treaty with China – something that two previous U.S. administrations were not able to achieve. Creating this agreement would help protect things that are important to the U.S. businesses and reassure the willingness of the U.S. to deepen its relationship with China, according to Fingar. “In my view, how we’re going to establish or reestablish relations with China is key,” Shin said. “Will there be more tension? That’s really important. This affects not only the U.S., but also our allies in the region.”

#### Establishing a US-China BIT benefits both sides in the global market

Leon Ding, Political Science and Economics, UC Irvine (2015) and Xiaodan Wu, International Politics from Fudan University (2015), December 12, 2016, “Why China and the United States need a Bilateral Investment Treaty,” China-US Focus, http://chinafocus.us/2016/12/12/why-china-and-the-united-states-need-a-bilateral-investment-treaty/, Accessed 2-25-2017

However, despite the striking disagreement in specific provisions, both China and US still have a strong impetus to push through the BIT. Since President Xi Jinping took his position in 2012, the Chinese government has underlined again its will of pushing Chinese enterprises, especially Central SOEs, to explore foreign markets and invest overseas, following the “going global strategy” established in 1999. Currently, these abundant nationalized enterprises, once relying heavily on national support to survive in domestic market, aim to push their limits. The on-going Sino-U.S. BIT could thus provide liberal provisions like unrestricted access to international arbitration and most-favored-nation clause, enabling Chinese firms to be capable of competing in the global market by opening up the US market. From this perspective, this BIT is essential to the Chinese government. As for the United States, a superpower that would like to further expand its investment in the world’s largest market, there also needs to be stronger and more comprehensive procedural investment protection. The Sino-U.S. BIT does not only offer substantive policies to promote investment, but also minimizes the political risk on investor-state dispute settlement by provisions. Thus, the Sino-U.S. BIT has been placed in an imperative position for both China and the United States.

### BIT good – Climate change /clean energy

#### Establishing a BIT with China is essential to bolster the global clean energy market and fulfill the Paris Agreement

Angela Luh, co-winner of the 2016 China Focus Essay Contest and BA in international politics and economics from UC San Diego, December 23, 2016, “Filling the investment gap for US-China climate change cooperation,” China-US Focus, http://chinafocus.us/2016/12/23/filling-the-investment-gap-for-us-china-climate-change-cooperation/, Accessed 2-25-2017

The biggest missed opportunity in US-China relations has been the lack of a bilateral investment treaty (BIT). A BIT between the US and China has been in progress for eight years but has failed to come to fruition. There is opportunity in the climate space for investment that is unmatched in magnitude or absent in any other area of the relationship. With a bilateral investment treaty, there is a great potential for bolstering the clean energy market in both the US and China by lowering risks and driving investment. There is opportunity to make good on the Paris promise and for the two largest economies in the world to set a model for international climate policy. There are also grave consequences for failing to cooperate on climate policy, finance, and cross-border investment. It could mean failing to deliver on Paris. It could cause irreversible damage in developing countries where the effects of climate change are immediate. It could squander the time-sensitive need for clean energy deployment and investment. It could leave markets in the US and China dichotomized rather than complementary or even competitive. The case for a BIT is compelling. International cooperation on climate change hinges on a strong and aligned climate finance strategy from the US and China. Soon to become a net global investor, meaning outbound investment will soon exceed inbound, China is expanding its reach. Chinese firms and state-owned enterprises (SOEs) are looking all over the world to broaden their portfolios. And as its economy experiences a profound change to an era of slow growth, China will look beyond raw materials and natural resources. It will focus on establishing new technologies and acquiring market access.

#### A BIT with China would set the framework for better bilateral cooperation on climate change, boster clean energy markets and act as a buffer to smooth over other tensions

Angela Luh, co-winner of the 2016 China Focus Essay Contest and BA in international politics and economics from UC San Diego, December 23, 2016, “Filling the investment gap for US-China climate change cooperation,” China-US Focus, http://chinafocus.us/2016/12/23/filling-the-investment-gap-for-us-china-climate-change-cooperation/, Accessed 2-25-2017

A US-China BIT would provide the framework to prohibit poor energy investments. More importantly, it has the potential to drive incredible progress on climate change. It could be the policy lever for better bilateral climate cooperation and help smooth over the many other issues that currently mar the relationship. First, it would make business transactions easier. It would encourage rather than avert Chinese FDI in US energy. Chinese firms are looking for a less cumbersome process than the current one, which often involves intense scrutiny by CFIUS. American firms want smoother operations in China where they face constraints, like limited access to online publishing. Second, it could provide a platform for much-needed clean energy R&D. Energy innovation relies on intensified R&D. It would serve the world best if China and the US led by example to make their R&D complementary so that firms could explore a broader spectrum of energy possibilities. By allowing easier cross-border investment, more capital toward R&D can flow from private corporations rather than government funding. Lastly, it could help the US and China maintain better relations through steadier bilateral trade. There is a pervasive sentiment in the US, further promoted by Trump mania, that globalization and trade with China are to blame for the US’s economic and security problems. But the best way to protect against Chinese aggression is to engage China, not to block it off. The more money China invests in the US, the more committed it is to sound relations. In the other direction, US investment can offer the US a foothold in the region, where China has become increasingly assertive. On the climate front, the US needs to welcome China, and other nations, to take leadership in financing the programs needed to uphold climate change negotiations. If bilateral cooperation in climate finance is effective, the US and China could provide a model for the rest of the world to follow.

## Climate Change Cooperation

### Solvency advocate: US should engage china in climate cooperation

#### The US should take the lead on climate change and commit to cooperation with China to meet Paris obligations

Orville Schell, Task Force Chair & Asia Society Center on US-China Relations and Susan L. Shirk, Chair & University of California San Diego, February 2017, “US Policy Toward China: Recommendations for a New Administration,” Asia Society Task Force Report, http://asiasociety.org/files/US-China\_Task\_Force\_Report\_FINAL.pdf, Accessed 2-28-2017

The Trump administration should publicly commit to China and other nations that the United States intends to meet its 2025 greenhouse-gas emissions target, as pledged at the so-called COP-21 global climate change conference in Paris in 2015, as well as to play a continuing leadership role on the global clean-energy and climate-change effort. This is important because these pledges keep the United States on track to help deal with climate change and reinforce its reputation as living up to its commitments. They also affirm an important point of collaboration between the United States and China. Energy, climate, and environmental cooperation has been one of the most successful and necessary areas of US-China relations. New domestic forces within China have supported policy changes that dovetailed with US and global interests. As a result, US government agencies were able to weave together an engagement strategy that provided assistance to China to meet its own growing domestic demands for clean air and simultaneously—through a combination of enhancing China’s own domestic clean-energy production capacity and deploying a shrewd bilateral negotiation strategy—pushed Beijing to step outside its comfort zone and take on more ambitious greenhouse-gas reduction commitments in international forums. Such cooperation not only reinforced US-China collaboration but also helped rally other nations to the global challenge. The federal government has a critical role to play in the ability of the United States to achieve its 2025 greenhouse-gas reduction target under the Paris Agreement. Climate-denying campaign and post-election rhetoric has triggered doubts about the US commitment to continue leading the global effort on climate change. If the United States fails to meet its target, that will create openings for other nations, including China, to also possibly default on their pledges. US reticence may also allow China to take the lead on this global issue, leaving China to shape the contours of global climate change policies with the United States on the sidelines.

### A2: Tensions prevent coop

#### Despite diplomatic frictions elsewhere, climate change is the one area of diplomatic engagement for progress

Angela Luh, co-winner of the 2016 China Focus Essay Contest and BA in international politics and economics from UC San Diego, December 23, 2016, “Filling the investment gap for US-China climate change cooperation,” China-US Focus, http://chinafocus.us/2016/12/23/filling-the-investment-gap-for-us-china-climate-change-cooperation/, Accessed 2-25-2017

In the sea of diplomatic frictions that have dampened US-China relations, climate and environmental policy has emerged as a focal point of cooperation. Despite domestic controversy surrounding climate change, particularly in the US, climate policy now symbolizes one of the few areas of progress on the US-China front. The Paris Accord in December 2015 symbolizes this cooperation. The first-ever international agreement to lower greenhouse gases was signed by 195 nations, chief among them the US and China. Desperate for some common ground, the US and China used it as an icon of bilateral success. However, colossal promises – like keeping global warming below 2°C – come with colossal gaps to fill. For China this means, by one calculation, a shortage of $6.7 trillion to meet their Paris goals by 2030. For the US, it means overcoming an indeterminate stay on the Clean Power Plan and backlash from the most powerful industries in the US economy. In other words, both countries urgently need ways to finance that handshake in Paris. Interestingly enough, the opportunity has been there for over a decade.

## Counter-narcotics Coooperation

### China is a key source-point

#### China is the source-point for America’s opioid crisis

Chris Stewart, Staff Writer, February 11, 2017, “China shipments help to fuel local drug trade,” Dayton Daily News, http://www.mydaytondailynews.com/news/crime--law/china-shipments-help-fuel-local-drug-trade/KG6qBTc2h7LsasdDE2whRO/, Accessed 2-26-2017

The rapid rise of extremely dangerous synthetic opioids like fentanyl in America and the skyrocketing number of overdose deaths can be traced to China’s large chemical and pharmaceutical industries, according to a new report by the U.S.–China Economic and Security Review Commission. Those labs produce vast quantities of the synthetic opioid and its analogues for export with little regulatory oversight, the report says.

### Counter-narcotics cooperation - Solvency

#### Despite tense relations, anti-drug cooperation is one area ripe for cooperation

Johan van de Ven, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University and an inaugural fellow at China Cooperative, February 4, 2017, “U.S-China antidrug cooperation in the Golden Triangle,” China Cooperative, <http://www.china-cooperative.com/single-post/>2017/ 02/05/China-antidrug-cooperation-in-the-Golden-Triangle, Accessed 2-25-2017

U.S.-China relations remain tense, particularly following last summer’s Permanent Court of Arbitration ruling against Chinese territorial claims in the South China Sea. Symbols of Americanism, such as Kentucky Fried Chicken and iPhones have borne the brunt of popular protest in the aftermath. Nonetheless, there are areas that are ripe for cooperation, in particular counter-narcotics operations in the Golden Triangle. Ten years ago, the region had been close to receiving opium-free status, averaging only [5 percent](http://thediplomat.com/2015/09/solving-southeast-asias-drug-problem/)of global total opium production. Now, the drug trade is in the midst of resurgence. In 2015, 26 million methamphetamine tablets were seized in Yangon, Myanmar, and 1.5 tons of marijuana were found in a coffee shipment destined for Cambodia from Laos. Marijuana cultivation has growth threefold in Myanmar since 2006. The drug trade’s regrowth means that Myanmar and Laos are among the State Department’s most [recent](http://thediplomat.com/2015/09/solving-southeast-asias-drug-problem/) annual listing of major narcotics producers or traffickers. Reverberations are felt in China, home to an [$82 billion drug trade](https://www.thefix.com/content/china-claims-drug-abuse-costs-them-81-billion-annually) and at least 14 million drug addicts, as well as in the United States, where the domestic drug trade is worth at least [$100 billion](http://www.rand.org/pubs/research_briefs/RB9770.html)and heroin, in particular, has led to large areas of[social blight.](https://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/07/us/heroin-epidemic-increasingly-seeps-into-public-view.html) Cooperation to stem the production and flow of narcotics in the Golden Triangle would be to the benefit of all, and, for a number of reasons, would likely be welcomed by Chinese authorities.

### Counter-narcotics cooperation – Relations internals

#### Anti-drug cooperation sets the stage for greater Asia-Pacific engagement and long-term relations stability

Johan van de Ven, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University and an inaugural fellow at China Cooperative, February 4, 2017, “U.S-China antidrug cooperation in the Golden Triangle,” China Cooperative, <http://www.china-cooperative.com/single-post/>2017/ 02/05/China-antidrug-cooperation-in-the-Golden-Triangle, Accessed 2-25-2017

But the benefits of U.S.-China counter-narcotics cooperation are not limited to the Golden Triangle. Cooperation between the United States, China, Thailand, Laos and Myanmar could establish a basis for the United States and China to work with the wider ASEAN community to tackle regional issues, aiming initially at joint fisheries patrols before tackling the most challenging issues, such as resource sharing and territorial delineation in the South China Sea. By working together to address the relatively low-hanging fruit of drug production and trafficking in the Golden Triangle, the United States and China can build toward a relationship based on cooperation capable not only of alleviating social blight in the region, but also establish the mutual trust and confidence needed to pave the way for a more stable future of U.S.-China questions, even extending to the South China Sea issue.

#### Counter-narcotics cooperation provides a platform for wider engagement

Johan van de Ven, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University and an inaugural fellow at China Cooperative, February 4, 2017, “U.S-China antidrug cooperation in the Golden Triangle,” China Cooperative, <http://www.china-cooperative.com/single-post/>2017/ 02/05/China-antidrug-cooperation-in-the-Golden-Triangle, Accessed 2-25-2017

The benefits of counter-narcotics cooperation go beyond providing a platform for wider U.S. China collaboration. Reductions in drug trafficking would stabilize the Mekong security environment, promoting confidence in the river as a trade corridor and tourism destination, and result in trickle-down increases in prosperity in local communities. Reduced drug production should lead to a decline in drug consumption. This, in addition to more rehabilitation facilities, would provide a foundation for enhanced public health in the region. All these improvements start with a cooperative approach to counter-narcotics operations in the Golden Triangle.

## Energy Cooperation

### China leads renewable energy competitiveness

#### The US competitiveness is falling behind China in renewables, but there is plenty of room for cooperation

Joel Jaeger, Paul Joffe and Ranping Song, Staff Writers, January 06, 2017, “China is Leaving the U.S. Behind on Clean Energy Investment,” World Resources Institute, http://www.wri.org/blog/2017/01/china-leaving-us-behind-clean-energy-investment, Accessed 2-26-2017

In the past, the U.S. has been quick to innovate and embrace new energy opportunities: it is a global leader in natural gas and was a pioneer of renewable energy technology. But as the clean energy market matures, the United States is ceding its leadership role to China. It’s time to catch up. U.S. states and cities are looking to a clean energy future. Public support is important at all levels, from investment in research and development to tax incentives for green investment. The rewards are immense, including new jobs and cheap, clean power. The U.S. solar industry is already creating jobs – well-paying, blue-collar construction and manufacturing jobs – [12 times faster](http://www.thesolarfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/TSF-2015-National-Solar-Jobs-Census.pdf) than the overall economy. It’s not all competition between the United States and China in the clean energy market. There is plenty of cooperation going on as well. These two giant economies are collaborating government-to-government with public-private partnerships, and many U.S. businesses are engaged with Chinese clean energy. For example, GE [partnered](http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/business/2011-01/11/content_11825804.htm) with State Grid Corp., one of China’s large electric utilities, to develop standards for smart grids in China. Goldwind, a Chinese wind turbine manufacturer, [developed and financed](http://www.goldwindglobal.com/web/news.do?action=detail&id=201204160359131811) a 20-megawatt wind farm in Montana, working with state representatives. The United States is not out of the race yet, but if the trends continue, China will leave it behind. The U.S. economy stands to benefit from greater efforts. It cannot afford to miss the clean energy opportunity.

#### China is outcompeting the US in renewables

Joel Jaeger, Paul Joffe and Ranping Song, Staff Writers, January 06, 2017, “China is Leaving the U.S. Behind on Clean Energy Investment,” World Resources Institute, http://www.wri.org/blog/2017/01/china-leaving-us-behind-clean-energy-investment, Accessed 2-26-2017

As 2017 begins, China is poised to leap ahead of the United States on clean energy to become the most important player in the global market. Last year, China increased its foreign investment in renewables by 60 percent to reach a record $32 billion, according to [a new report](http://ieefa.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Chinas-Global-Renewable-Energy-Expansion_January-2017.pdf) from the Institute for Energy Economics and Financial Analysis. This includes 11 new overseas investment deals worth more than $1 billion each. China’s new Going Global strategy for renewable energy was an important instigator of its huge increase in foreign investment in 2016. This is part of a broader picture of overseas investment. Last year, China showed its regional strength by establishing the Asia Infrastructure & Investment Bank and pouring money into the BRICS’ New Development Bank, which made its [first loans](http://ndb.int/brics-bank-gives-811-million-in-first-round-green-energy-loans.php), all for renewable energy.

## Military Exchanges

### Military exchanges good – Solvency & general impacts

#### Recent conflict incidents do not undermine the efficacy of confidence building measures. We need greater military-to-military exchanges to prevent accident war and maintain stability

Jingdong Yuan, PhD & Associate Professor at the Centre for International Security Studies and the Department of Government and International Relations, the University of Sydney, January 2017, “Dragon and eagle entangled Sino-US military exchanges, 2001–2016,”

https://www.aspi.org.au/publications/dragon-and-eagle-entangled-sino-us-military-exchanges,-20012016/Dragon-and-eagle.pdf, Accessed 2-26-2017

But, as the EP-3 and Impeccable incidents demonstrate, without proper rules of the road, more such incidents could occur and risk escalation, leading to military conflicts that neither side would benefit from. In this context, the 1972 US–Soviet Agreement on the Prevention of Incidents at Sea would still be valuable. However, as the commander of US Navy Pacific Fleet suggests, there are more than philosophical differences impeding a healthy development of the military-to-military relationship. Beijing is deeply distrustful of US intentions in the region and it continues to link the Taiwan arms sale issue to the development of comprehensive US–China military ties. Granted, due to the two countries’ differences in historical experiences, threat perceptions and strategic cultures, there will be different expectations and interpretations and therefore different degrees of receptivity to developing CBMs. Nonetheless, they shouldn’t be allowed to become excuses and obstacles to developing mechanisms for the safe management of maritime operations. These developments warrant enhanced rather than reduced military-to-military contacts to manage these differences through better communication and understanding. While past incidents reflect structural changes in power relations between China and the US, their occurrence and the apparent inability and unwillingness to resolve them promptly are also indicative of a lack of ground rules. Military leaders of both countries have become increasingly aware of the potential risks of miscalculation and escalation and appear to be taking steps to address them—albeit at a slow, perhaps glacial, pace. In this context, the recent momentum to further enhance bilateral military exchanges at the senior level is a good sign. In addition, at the functional level, the two militaries can begin exploring areas of cooperation in non-traditional security, including joint anti-piracy exercises in the Gulf of Aden. Other areas of cooperation include peacekeeping, search and rescue, and military medicine.

#### Military-to-military ties are the crux of diplomatic engagement and key to regional stability

Jingdong Yuan, Staff Writer, January 31, 2017, “One Way to Keep U.S.-China Ties Going Strong: Military Exchanges,” The National Interest, http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/one-way-keep-us-china-ties-going-strong-military-exchanges-19256, Accessed 2-26-2017

US–China military exchanges constitute an important aspect of bilateral relations between the reigning superpower and a fast-rising one. Initiated in the wake of the establishment of diplomatic relations during the Cold War when the two countries were quasi-aligned against the Soviet threat, military-to-military contacts between China and the US have evolved over the years, and have by and large followed rather than defined the overall Sino–US politico-diplomatic relationship. Increasingly, however, how the People’s Liberation Army and the Pentagon view their bilateral military ties and manage their conflicts and expectations and, as far as possible, seek to better understand each other and explore areas of cooperation will have a significant impact on regional peace and stability. It will also reflect the general state of the bilateral relationship during a period of monumental changes in international politics and in particular in the Indo–Pacific.

### Military exchanges good – Solvency & general impacts

#### Despite differences, US-China military relations are fundamental to diplomatic engagement and cooperation on a variety of issues

Jingdong Yuan, PhD & Associate Professor at the Centre for International Security Studies and the Department of Government and International Relations, the University of Sydney, January 31, 2017, “One Way to Keep U.S.-China Ties Going Strong: Military Exchanges,” The National Interest, http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/one-way-keep-us-china-ties-going-strong-military-exchanges-19256, Accessed 2-26-2017

The PLA, on the other hand, has often considered and implemented bilateral exchanges as part of the broader agenda of promoting US–China relations as a ‘new type of major-power relationship’. It also seeks to demonstrate that it’s an equal of the US military while using the expansion and suspension of military ties to influence the US’s policies, including on arms sales to Taiwan, and its alliances in the region. Clearly, this deep strategic distrust and growing rivalry set limits to the depth and scope of military exchanges. Nonetheless, even as the two militaries may be preparing for the next war with each other, they have nonetheless found common interests in cooperating in a range of non-traditional security areas, such as humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, search and rescue, peacekeeping, military medicine, and anti-piracy/terrorism operations.

## North Korea Cooperation

### Engagement is key

#### Sino-US engagement is essential to diffusing the N. Korean nuclear threat and Afghan instability

Minyue Wu, Staff Writer, January 11, 2017, “Competition or cooperation: The Complicated diplomatic relationship between China and the United States,” Chicago Policy Review, http://chicagopolicyreview.org/2017/01/11/competition-or-cooperation-the-complicated-diplomatic-relationship-between-china-and-the-united-states/, Accessed 2-26-2017

The U.S. and China have vested interests in the stability of both the Asia-Pacific and Chinese periphery regions, with particularly in the Korean peninsula and Afghanistan. With the collapse of the Agreed Framework between the United States and North Korea, and the withdrawal of North Korea from the Non-Proliferation Treaty, Beijing and Washington have begun collaborating to address denuclearizing the peninsula. Additionally, North Korea’s third nuclear test has hardened China’s once-mild attitude towards the matter and has led China to act more cooperatively with the United States. Secondly, the two countries’ overlapping interests and concerns over terrorism in Afghanistan has further increased their cooperation; as the United States attempts to assist Afghanistan militarily, China supports their economy through financing and labor.

#### The only hope to denuclearize North Korea is to persuade China to shut down their economy

Patricia Kim, postdoctoral fellow at the Princeton-Harvard China and the World Program, February 27, 2017, “How to Persuade China to Squeeze North Korea’s Lifeline,” Foreign Policy, http://foreignpolicy.com/2017/02/27/how-to-persuade-china-to-squeeze-north-koreas-lifeline/, Accessed 3-1-2017

Nevertheless, Beijing holds an ultimate source of leverage that could be used to push North Korea to denuclearize: the ability to shut down the North Korean economy. North Korea’s economic lifeline runs through China, with a vast majority of its trade, both licit and illicit, flowing through Chinese territory. China is by far North Korea’s largest trading partner, accounting for about 90 percent of North Korea’s [total trade volume](https://piie.com/blogs/north-korea-witness-transformation/kotra-report?platform=hootsuite), or $5.7 billion in 2015. China is also North Korea’s [primary provider](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2017-02-21/china-can-do-more-than-stop-buying-coal-to-pressure-north-korea) of critical commodities, including oil and steel products. Finally, China serves as North Korea’s door to the outside world. Pyongyang’s illegal networks that help it evade sanctions and facilitate its cash flow are often routed through China, managed by North Koreans working for their state along with opportunistic Chinese intermediaries. Although there are signs that Beijing has taken a harder line in recent months toward North Korea by pausing its purchase of North Korean coal, and cracking down on Chinese entities that aid Pyongyang’s [illicit activities](https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/asia_pacific/china-is-putting-the-squeeze-on-north-korea-but-for-how-long/2016/11/18/752137a6-a049-11e6-8864-6f892cad0865_story.html?utm_term=.88b1158ec29d), there is still much more it could do to squeeze North Korea given the depth of their economic ties. China, thus far, has refused to use the full extent of its unique leverage against North Korea because of its well-known aversion to instability, its fears of a reunified Korean Peninsula, and its general distaste for regime change, which runs counter to its foreign-policy mantra of noninterference. To get Beijing to wield the power it has, China’s top leaders must be convinced that their interests are better served not by preserving the status quo but by quickly sending the message to Pyongyang that it cannot have both nuclear weapons and economic sustenance — and that the latter will truly be severed unless the former is relinquished.

### Engagement is key

#### North Korea proliferation is advancing rapidly. Trump should immediate engage China in a grand bargain to pressure North Korea

Orville Schell, Task Force Chair & Asia Society Center on US-China Relations and Susan L. Shirk, Chair & University of California San Diego, February 2017, “US Policy Toward China: Recommendations for a New Administration,” Asia Society Task Force Report, http://asiasociety.org/files/US-China\_Task\_Force\_Report\_FINAL.pdf, Accessed 2-28-2017

Pyongyang is rapidly developing the capability to strike the United States, as well as South Korea, Japan, and other Asian countries, with nuclear missiles. The Trump administration must make this threat its highest priority in Asia. Toward this end the members of this task force recommend that the US president immediately engage Chinese President Xi Jinping to create a new high-level channel dedicated to the joint resolution of this problem. To encourage China to use more of its economic and political leverage to convince North Korea’s leaders to halt development of their nuclear and missile programs, the Trump administration should work in close coordination with South Korea to propose an omnibus negotiation. The goal of this negotiation would be a formal peace treaty replacing the Korean War armistice and diplomatic relations between Washington and Pyongyang, in return for a verified freeze of North Korean nuclear and missile programs and a pledge to denuclearize. If Pyongyang accepts and honors such a pledge through concrete actions, the United States and its partners— drawing on the experience of the Iran nuclear deal—should then be ready to follow up with sequential sanctions relief. A critical element in gaining China’s complete cooperation in this effort will be assuring Beijing that in the future, the United States will recognize China’s legitimate security interests on the Korean Peninsula. If China fails to respond and continues to frustrate efforts to pressure Pyongyang, the Trump administration must be prepared to impose secondary sanctions on Chinese banks, firms, and individuals still doing business with North Korea.

#### Trump should extend engagement with China over N. Korea. Only China can pressure China to give up its nukes. Pressure makes this impossible

Patricia Kim, postdoctoral fellow at the Princeton-Harvard China and the World Program, February 27, 2017, “How to Persuade China to Squeeze North Korea’s Lifeline,” Foreign Policy, http://foreignpolicy.com/2017/02/27/how-to-persuade-china-to-squeeze-north-koreas-lifeline/, Accessed 3-1-2017

North Korea’s nuclear ambitions seem unstoppable. The Obama administration’s policy of “strategic patience” has failed and there are growing [calls](https://www.bloomberg.com/view/articles/2017-01-17/time-for-the-u-s-to-face-reality-in-north-korea) for President Donald Trump to reach out directly to Pyongyang. Although bilateral dialogue may result in a temporary freeze on North Korea’s nuclear program in exchange for various concessions, it will not lead to the country’s denuclearization. Pyongyang’s negotiating track record shows that it’s always ready to cheat, stall, and make unreasonable demands. The ominous reality is that North Korea is [determined](https://www.nytimes.com/2016/12/27/world/asia/thae-yong-ho-north-korea-defector.html) to be recognized as a nuclear power. The only way to push Pyongyang to give up what it sees as a vital tool for survival is to squeeze the only other thing keeping the Kim regime alive — its economic lifeline through China. The million-dollar question is how to get Beijing on board with such a task. As North Korea’s only patron and trade partner of consequence, China has long resisted fully cracking down on Pyongyang, fearing its neighbor’s collapse will bring immediate instability along its border and harm its long-term strategic interests with the loss of a buffer state and the rise of a unified Korean Peninsula under a pro-U.S. government. The Trump administration’s most urgent task, therefore, is to persuade Chinese President Xi Jinping that Beijing’s short- and long-term strategic interests are better served by swiftly cracking down on North Korea’s economic activities to force Pyongyang to give up its nuclear weapons. And getting China on board with such a plan will not be achieved by poking it in the eye, like Trump [initially tried](http://foreignpolicy.com/2017/01/03/history-shows-beijing-wont-budge-an-inch-on-taiwan) with the “One China” policy debacle, or by complaining that the Chinese are not doing enough. Rather, the Trump administration must open Beijing’s eyes to the ways the North Korean status quo, even if it doesn’t threaten China directly, is already jeopardizing its regional interests.

### Engagement is key

#### The US should work to persuade China to pressure North Korea for denuclearization

Patricia Kim, postdoctoral fellow at the Princeton-Harvard China and the World Program, February 27, 2017, “How to Persuade China to Squeeze North Korea’s Lifeline,” Foreign Policy, http://foreignpolicy.com/2017/02/27/how-to-persuade-china-to-squeeze-north-koreas-lifeline/, Accessed 3-1-2017

The time is ripe to make the case to China to crack down on the Kim regime. Beijing is already extremely frustrated with North Korea’s recent nuclear and missile tests, and the assassination of Kim Jong Nam, who reportedly had close ties with China. And now that the “One China” policy standoff has finally been put to rest, Chinese leaders are eager to get on a good footing with the new U.S. administration. Trump must use the start of his new relationship with Xi to bring North Korea to the top of the bilateral agenda and convince the Chinese leadership that Beijing’s interests are truly better served by using its unique leverage over North Korea. Although the recent suspension of North Korean coal imports is a promising sign, China will need to be persuaded to send Pyongyang an ultimatum: nuclear weapons or economic survival.

## RCEP

### China will take the lead

#### The RCEP will take the place of TPP. It’s bigger and lead by China

Joshua M. Robbins, an international lawyer at [BakerHostetler](http://www.mondaq.com/content/company.asp?article_id=565050&company_id=5131) and at the U.S. Department of State, February 3, 2017, “United States: The King (Of Asian Investment Treaties) Is Dead. Long Live The King?,” Mondaq, <http://www.mondaq.com/unitedstates/x/565050/> international+trade+investment/The+king+of+Asian+investment+treaties+is+dead+Long+live+the+king, Accessed 2-15-2017

What will take TPP's place for global companies seeking to protect their investments in Asia? One possibility is the [Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership](http://www.asean.org/storage/images/2015/October/outreach-document/Edited%20RCEP.pdf) (RCEP), a multilateral trade agreement spearheaded by China that would include the 10 member states of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) (Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam) and the six states with which ASEAN has existing free trade agreements (Australia, China, India, Japan, South Korea and New Zealand). Negotiation of the RCEP began in 2012, with the aim of providing an alternative to the TPP. In fact, the scope of its coverage would be even greater than that of the TPP, potentially including more than 3 billion people (45 percent of the world's population), and a combined GDP of about $21.3 trillion, accounting for about 40 percent of world trade.

## Space Cooperation

### China is advancing now

#### China is making rapid advancements in space technology

Marcela Ganea, Staff Writer, February 15, 2017, “A World of Progress in Space,” Geopolitical Monitor, https://www.geopoliticalmonitor.com/a-world-of-progress-in-space/, Accessed 2-25-2017

China has seen swift advancement in its space programs. The country has set records with its independent manned flight capability: the LM-2F of China and Soyuz of Russia became the only two launch vehicles that can conduct manned space missions, and China’s intensive launch capabilities – 18 launches per year – equaled NASA’s count in 2016. Yu Qi, Deputy Director-General of the Department of System Engineering in China’s National Space Administration (CNSA), presented the latest Chinese Space achievements, including: long March vehicles that greatly enhance China’s capabilities and access to space; Beidou navigation and positioning system and high-resolution earth observation systems; breakthroughs in spacecraft rendezvous and docking as well as astronauts’ mid-term stay in orbit and long-term ground mission support; the Lunar exploration project’s successful reentry and return flight test; and the first launch at the Wenchang launch site.

#### China is taking advantage of space advances now

Michael Listner, an attorney, the founder and principal of the legal and policy think-tank/consultation firm [Space Law and Policy Solutions](http://www.spacelawsolutions.com/), January 30, 2017, “Three principles to constructively engage China in outer space security,” Space Review, http://www.thespacereview.com/article/3157/1, Accessed 2-25-2017

The public version of a Trump National Space Policy will not be presented for some time, but that doesn’t stop the administration from implementing the Three Principles as part of its space policy and begin to engage China through diplomatic channels. Both nations have a vested interest in outer space and China’s growing reliance on the outer space environment provides further incentive for it to take a second look at its posturing. The fluidity of geopolitics ensures there are no solid solutions to outer space security, but approaching outer space security from defense is not the solution. Many in the national security space policy community will balk at an approach that discards passive deterrence and[insist the policy of defense will and should remain relatively unchanged](http://spacenews.com/loverro-defense-is-the-best-deterrent-against-a-war-in-space/). The unknown quantity is whether the Trump Administration will heed the advice of those who will argue for the status quo of defense, or will it seize the moment and take a bold move and adopt a new approach to realize outer space security?

### Conflicts in space are inevitable now / impacts

#### Trump will pursue an anti-China path to space dominance

Joel Achenbach, Staff Writer, February 16, 2017, “NASA, under Donald Trump, plans to compete with China's space program,”

Sydney Morning Herald, <http://www.smh.com.au/world/nasa-under-donald-trump-plans-to-compete-with-chinas-space-program-20170215-gudyru.html>, Accessed 3-1-2017

President Donald Trump has indicated that he wants to make a splash in space. During his transition, he spoke with historian Douglas Brinkley about John F. Kennedy's famous 1961 vow to go to the moon before the decade was out. Now Trump and his aides may do something very similar: Demand that NASA send astronauts to orbit the moon before the end of Trump's first term - a move that one Trump adviser said would be a clear signal to the Chinese that the US intends to retain dominance in space. NASA already has a plan to launch its new, jumbo Space Launch System rocket with an Orion capsule on top in late 2018, a mission known as EM-1. No one would be aboard. The capsule would orbit the moon and return to Earth, splashing down in the ocean.

#### Sino-US space conflicts are inevitable in the status quo

Brian Weeden, SWF Director of Program Planning, Insight - Building Stronger U.S.-China Relations in Space, February 3, 2017, Secure World Foundation, https://swfound.org/news/all-news/2017/02/insight-building-stronger-us-china-relations-in-space, Accessed 2-25-2017

Unfortunately, the tensions between the United States and China in outer space are likely to continue. The current leadership of both countries have a more nationalistic approach to foreign policy than previous governments, and there are real concerns on both sides about technological advancements and strategy instability in space. SWF, along with our partner organizations, will continue to work with both countries to try and find ways to increase awareness, promote dialogue, reduce tensions, and minimize the risk of conflict that could jeopardize the long-term sustainability of space.

#### Any conflict in space guarantees war on the ground

Paul D. Shinkman, Senior National Security Writer, February 8, 2017, “The Coming War in Space,” US News & World Report, https://www.usnews.com/news/world/articles/2017-02-08/war-in-space-how-the-us-prepares-for-the-next-battlefield, Accessed 2-26-2017

In the unlikely event that, say, a Russian or Chinese satellite attacked a U.S. satellite, the American response would not center on firing back at it, says Navy Rear Adm. Brian Brown, deputy commander of the military's Joint Functional Component Command for Space, a key headquarters for monitoring and tracking space operations based here. Retribution in this hypothetical scenario would more likely take the form of a U.S. bomber attacking the foreign base that commanded those satellites. "There's no such thing as a space war," Brown says. "There would not be a war that just stays in space. The minute a conflict extends to space … it starts to affect all domains."

# NEGATIVE EVIDENCE

## Pressure CPs Extension

### A2: Trump is a paper tiger

#### Backing down from One-China objection did not hurt US options for pressure

Brahma Chellaney, Professor of Strategic Studies at the New Delhi-based Center for Policy Research and Fellow at the Robert Bosch Academy, February 20, 2017, “Trump’s China Challenge,” Project Syndicate, https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/us-china-relations-trump-by-brahma-chellaney-2017-02, Accessed 2-26-2017

Trump himself may yet challenge China. When he agreed to abide by the One China policy, he [said](https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/02/09/readout-presidents-call-president-xi-jinping-china) that he had done so at Xi’s request, suggesting that his commitment to the policy should not be taken for granted. Moreover, even without defying the One China policy, Trump has ample room to apply pressure. He could start by highlighting increasing Chinese repression in Tibet. He could also expand political, commercial, and military contacts with Taiwan, where the One China policy has had the paradoxical effect of deepening people’s sense of national identity and strengthening their determination to maintain autonomy.

## Relations DA extension

### Relations high now

#### Relations are high now. China just reaffirmed the importance of engagement and healthy relations

Yeganeh Torbati, David Brunnstrom and Susan Heavey, Staff Writers, February 28, 2017, “U.S., China discuss 'mutually beneficial' economic relationship,” Reuters, http://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-china-idUSKBN167291, Accessed 3-1-2017

U.S. Secretary of State Rex Tillerson and Chinese State Councilor Yang Jiechi on Tuesday discussed improving and maintaining a "mutually beneficial economic relationship" between the United States and China, the State Department said. Tillerson and Yang, China's top diplomat, affirmed the importance of "regular high-level engagement" between the two countries during their meeting in Washington, and discussed North Korea's nuclear program, the State Department said in a statement. China's state news agency, Xinhua, quoted Yang as saying China was willing to work with Washington "to enhance exchanges on all levels from top down" and to broaden communication and coordination on regional and global issues, while respecting "each other's core interests and major concerns." "This will help promote sustained, steady and healthy development of the China-U.S. relations, which will benefit the peoples of not only both nations but also the whole world," Xinhua quoted Yang as saying.

### Relations high now - A2: Trump prevents good relations

#### Trump’s anti-China rhetoric is not a barrier to dialogue—follows history

Alex Shashkevich, Stanford News Service, February 15, 2017, “Stanford experts offer policy proposals, insights on U.S.-Asia relations,” Stanford News, http://news.stanford.edu/2017/02/15/experts-offer-insights-on-u-s-asia-relations/, Accessed 2-25-2017

Maintaining a peaceful, productive relationship with China should be of the utmost importance for the U.S., according to the Stanford scholars. “Managing America’s multifaceted relationship with China is arguably the most consequential foreign policy challenge facing the new administration,” Fingar said. Although President Trump’s anti-China rhetoric during his campaign made Asian countries anxious about the future, China has been criticized by many American leaders before. Ten previous U.S. presidents were critical of China during their campaigns, but once they assumed office, their tone changed and they adopted a more pragmatic view of U.S. interests in the area, Fingar wrote.

## US-Japan Relations DA Extension

### Relations / alliance strong now

#### US-Japan relations are strong now in a push to check China

Ralph Jennings, Staff Writer, February 14, 2017, “Japan And Trump Are Teaming Up To Limit China's Power,” Forbes, https://www.forbes.com/sites/ralphjennings/2017/02/14/japan-and-trump-are-teaming-up-to-contain-china/#32c1fff6e861, Accessed 2-26-2017

U.S. President Donald Trump has spoken since November to leaders of China, Taiwan and the [Philippines](http://www.forbes.com/sites/ralphjennings/2017/01/24/tense-philippine-u-s-relations-will-surge-and-then-fall-under-trump/#715c775a7b3e). He's keen to make a mark in Asia. But the visit to Trump in Washington Friday by Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe shows signs of fostering Trump's closest and strategically significant relationship in the region. That's because the two are teaming up to resist China’s expansion. The U.S. government needs Japan more than ever to buffer China’s expansion in Asia as Trump keeps a leery eye on Beijing over trade and Chinese [maritime expansion](http://www.forbes.com/sites/ralphjennings/2016/12/19/how-an-american-underwater-drone-reached-the-contested-south-china-sea/) off its south coast. Japan has its own beefs with China and needs the U.S. market, which isn’t something Trump is keen to give away per his America-first campaign pledges. The country with a developed export-dependent economy also wants to be [top dog in Asia](http://www.forbes.com/sites/ralphjennings/2017/01/15/china-and-japan-ramping-up-checkbook-diplomacy-in-asia/#1600bd8ef6e0), helping less developed parts with infrastructure in exchange for opening markets and doors for factory investment. China’s doing [much of the same](http://www.forbes.com/sites/wadeshepard/2017/01/16/the-aiib-one-year-in-not-as-scary-as-washington-thought/).

#### US-Japanese relations are high now

Deborah Fleck, Staff Writer, February 20, 2017, “U.S.-Japanese relations are strongest in years, experts say,” Dallas News, http://www.dallasnews.com/news/community-column/2017/02/20/us-japanese-relations-strongest-years-experts-say, Accessed 2-26-2017

U.S.-Japanese relations are the strongest they've been in a long time, according to several speakers at a program presented Friday by the Japan-America Society Dallas-Fort Worth. "This is the first time Japan is front and center with the United States," said Dr. Haruo Iguchi of Kwansei Gakuin University. Takeuchi added that the warm reception shown to Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe on his recent visit to Washington, D.C., demonstrates the new administration's support of Japan.

#### The US just reaffirmed the US-Japanese alliance and defense of Senkaku Islands

[Brad Lendon](http://www.cnn.com/profiles/brad-lendon), Staff Writer, February 4, 2017, “Mattis: US will defend Japanese islands claimed by China,” CNN, http://www.cnn.com/2017/02/03/asia/us-defense-secretary-mattis-japan-visit/, Accessed 2-26-2017

US Defense Secretary James Mattis on Saturday reaffirmed Washington's commitment to defending Japan, including a group of disputed islands which have been claimed by China. "I made clear that our long-standing policy on the Senkaku Islands stands -- the US will continue to recognize Japanese administration of the islands and as such Article 5 of the US-Japan Security Treaty applies," Mattis said in a press conference with Japanese Defense Minister Tomomi Inada. Article 5 of that treaty says the US will defend territories under Japanese administration, which would include the Senkakus, an uninhabited group of islands in the East China Sea called the Diaoyus by China. Tensions have flashed numerous times in recent years over the islands, [including face-offs between Japanese and Chinese air and naval forces](http://cnn.com/2016/12/12/asia/japan-china-mid-air-confrontation/)that have been termed dangerous by both sides.

#### Japan perceives the alliance as strong

Ralph Jennings, Staff Writer, February 14, 2017, “Japan And Trump Are Teaming Up To Limit China's Power,” Forbes, https://www.forbes.com/sites/ralphjennings/2017/02/14/japan-and-trump-are-teaming-up-to-contain-china/#32c1fff6e861, Accessed 2-26-2017

So when Trump called the U.S.-Japan alliance a “cornerstone of peace and stability" in Asia and vowed to bring both sides “even closer,” it made sense. The comments also came as relief for Abe, who wasn't sure how to read some of Trump's earlier harsh words about Japan's market access to outsiders followed by an upbeat call Feb. 9 to Chinese President Xi Jinping. The long-time American ally has the military might -- world No. 7 per [rankings](http://www.forbes.com/sites/ralphjennings/2016/12/28/taipei-to-hanoi-east-asias-top-5-militaries-ex-china-and-their-one-goal/#7019df473a0d) by the database GlobalFirePower.com -- to be a persuasive player in Asia. China ranks third and has militarized disputed islets off its coats.

### Relations / alliance strong now

#### Both countries see the alliance as “unshakeable”

Andrew Yeo, associate professor of politics at the Catholic University of America, February 13, 2017, “Did Trump and Abe just launch a new chapter in U.S.-Japan relations?,” Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2017/02/13/did-trump-and-abe-just-launch-a-new-chapter-in-u-s-japan-relations/?utm\_term=.f320b610e8b6, Accessed 2-26-2017

Trump’s meeting with Abe struck a different chord. After their Washington meeting last week, the two leaders issued a [joint statement](https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/02/10/joint-statement-president-donald-j-trump-and-prime-minister-shinzo-abe) to reaffirm their “unshakeable alliance.” Trump also displayed his affection for Abe during a [joint news conference](https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/02/10/remarks-president-trump-and-prime-minister-abe-japan-joint-press), stating, “I shook hands, but I grabbed him and hugged him because that’s the way we feel. We have a very, very good bond — very, very good chemistry.” And [responding](http://www.reuters.com/article/us-northkorea-missiles-idUSKBN15Q0TE) to North Korea’s missile test early Sunday, Trump stood by Abe and declared that the United States was behind “our great ally, 100 percent.” Abe, a calm and collected politician, has been intentional and strategic in his outreach to the new U.S. president. Shortly after the November election, Abe met with the president-elect at Trump Towers to “[build trust](http://www.cnn.com/2016/11/16/politics/japan-abe-trump-visit/)” and seek clarification on the future of the U.S.-Japan alliance. During his campaign, Trump called Japan a currency manipulator and accused Japan of [free-riding](https://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/22/us/politics/donald-trump-foreign-policy-interview.html?_r=0) on the U.S. security regime in Asia. And the decision to abandon the Trans-Pacific Partnership came as a blow to Abe, in particular. The trade pact would have linked the United States with Japan and 10 other nations, and Abe had invested significant political capital to move the agreement forward. Despite these hurdles, the Trump-Abe relationship seems to be on sound footing. More importantly, the boost for the U.S.-Japan alliance has been a positive development for the Trump administration.

#### The alliance is resilient and will outlast Trump

Yukari Easton, an ACE-Nikaido Fellow at the East Asian Studies Center at University of Southern California, February 14, 2017, “Japan-US Relations: Adapting to ‘New Management’,” The Diplomat, http://thediplomat.com/2017/02/japan-us-relations-adapting-to-new-management/, Accessed 2-26-2017

The Abe administration, however, did not predict Trump’s victory, and Abe did not meet with Trump during the campaign. But with Trump’s unexpected victory and the U.S. abandonment of the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), which Japan supported and ratified, it is only natural that Abe felt the need to quickly fill the gap, reassert his country’s positions, and ensure no further retrenchment. With or without the TPP, America and Japan still share many challenges, mutual concerns, and common interests. Recognizing Abe’s pragmatism essentially frames the diplomatic endeavor as a state-to-state, rather than an administration-to-administration construct.  Japan’s relations with the United States will, ultimately, long outlast the Trump presidency.

### Relations / alliance strong now (brink)

#### Relations are OK, but there is still anxiety over the alliance. We need greater dialogue to solidify relations

Jeffrey W. Hornung, Fellow for the Security and Foreign Affairs Program at Sasakawa Peace Foundation, February 1, 2017, “Attention, Japan: Trump Is Your Golden Opportunity,” The National Interest, http://nationalinterest.org/feature/attention-japan-trump-your-golden-opportunity-19279, Accessed 2-26-2017

A third challenge is the most fundamental. Will the United States remain committed to the alliance? From the Japanese perspective, Trump’s campaign rhetoric cast uncertainty over the alliance. This has been characterized as severe lack of knowledge on one of the spectrum, and disdain for Japan on the other. The result, however, is the same: deep anxieties in Tokyo. Alliance managers in Tokyo are forced to ask themselves fundamental questions regarding Japan’s security. Will the alliance endure? If it does, in what form? Are the Senkaku Islands still covered by [Article 5 of the Security Treaty](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_110496.htm)? Will a fundamental restructuring of burden sharing be necessary? What will become of U.S. [nuclear deterrence commitments](https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/advanced-conventional-weapons-deterrence-us-japan-rowberry.pdf) to Japan? If Japan is forced to consider the alliance’s survival, it naturally leads to issues that alliance managers in neither country are ready to discuss. This includes Japan’s unilateral military buildup, seeking alliance ties with other nation-states or, as Trump suggested, the pursuit of nuclear weapons. All of these issues are bound to provoke other regional states to react. These challenges are significant. This is precisely why analysis of a Trump presidency is negative. But this is not a complete analysis. Like it or not, Trump is president. As such, it is also constructive for the alliance to begin a concerted dialogue of potential opportunities that the Trump administration offers to U.S.-Japan relations.

## A2: BIT

### Pressure CP solvency (competitiveness)

#### A US-China BIT would fail to promote US competitiveness. Only pressure can solve

Derek Scissors, a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, February 8, 2017, “How Trump Can Make Trade with China Work for America,” National Review, http://www.nationalreview.com/article/444612/donald-trump-china-trade-deals-should-foster-reciprocity, Accessed 2-15-2017

The chief area of government-to-government economic cooperation with China under President Obama has been the negotiation of a bilateral investment treaty. The Obama administration believed that the rules laid out in a successful treaty would cause the PRC to treat American companies operating in China much better than previously, and that they might even set an example for how to improve other aspects of the economic relationship. But the same China that knowingly steals enormous amounts of intellectual property and refuses to allow competition with state-owned enterprises is not going to change its behavior because of a new piece of paper. Only an America that retains the ability to punish theft and invoke reciprocity can craft a valuable agreement with China.

### Renegotiate TPP CP solvency

#### Renegotiating the TPP is better than a bilateral treaty with China—retains US leadership

Jeffrey J. Schott, senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics, February 2017, “PB 17-7 US Trade Policy Options in the Pacific Basin: Bigger Is Better,” Peterson Institute for International Economics, http://upload.db.silkroad.news.cn/2017/0216/1487207064122.pdf, Accessed 2-25-2017

Furthermore, US withdrawal from the TPP effectively opens the door for China to assert a more pronounced leadership role in the region. China already is a major trade and investment partner for TPP countries—most of which are now pursuing new or enhanced pacts to strengthen bilateral and regional commercial relations. Canada and Mexico are seeking to open talks with China; Chile, Australia, New Zealand, and Malaysia are seeking to expand existing deals; and seven of the original TPP-12 are participating in RCEP negotiations. The Trump administration is worried about giving a free ride to China on auto parts imports; they are actually giving Chinese negotiators new opportunities to expand trade and investment in other TPP markets. For these reasons, a “bigger and better” deal that builds on the foundations of the TPP would better serve US interests than a limited bilateral approach. The next section discusses how improvements to the content of the deal and the inclusion of new partners could bolster US political support and increase the potential payoff from an Asia-Pacific trade pact.

## A2: Counter-narcotics coop

### Status quo solves cooperation

#### The US and China just increased anti-drug cooperation

Erika Kinetz, Staff Writer, January 6, 2017, “DEA opens shop in China to help fight synthetic drug trade,” Associated Press,

http://bigstory.ap.org/article/3630050eef274653a54cb70e46c4f72a, Accessed 2-26-2017

In a sign of improving cooperation between the U.S. and China to fight the global drug trade, the Drug Enforcement Administration will open a new office there and its top chief will visit next week for the first time in more than a decade. The DEA said acting administrator Chuck Rosenberg will visit Beijing, Guangzhou and Hong Kong Monday through Thursday, at the invitation of China's Ministry of Public Security. The last time the head of the DEA visited the country was 2005. The planned new office in the city of Guangzhou will likely be staffed with two special agents, pending final approvals, said Russell Baer, a DEA special agent in Washington. DEA maintains that China is the top source country for synthetic opioids like fentanyl and its precursors, which have been fueling the deadliest drug abuse epidemic in U.S. history. China is also emerging as a laundering destination for drug money, according to a U.S. Justice Department indictment unsealed in 2015.

## A2: Counter-terrorism Cooperation

### Fails – China has a double standard

#### China has clear double standards on counter-terrorism cooperation

Vinay Kaura, Coordinator at the Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, Jaipur, Sardar Patel University of Police, Security and Criminal Justice, January 8, 2017, “China’s double standard on counter-terrorism,” Asia Times, http://www.atimes.com/chinas-double-standards-counter-terrorism/, Accessed 2-27-2017

It has not been easy for China to navigate the relationship “with a country that is both the greatest source of China’s terrorist threat and the crucial partner in combating it”, as Andrew Small has asserted in his book, The China-Pakistan Axis: Asia’s New Geopolitics. As long as Pakistan’s security establishment continues to play a double game of pretending to fight terrorism, but in reality furthering its own strategic agenda in Afghanistan by supporting the Taliban and in Kashmir by supporting the JeM and the LeT, China’s national security interests can never be aligned with those of Pakistan. Unfortunately, it would most likely take a major terrorist attack inside China with links to Pakistan to force a change in current Chinese policy. Until that moment comes however, China’s double standards in countering terrorism will continue to cost many innocent lives in South Asia as well as undermine the security and stability Afghanistan. These already high costs further magnify the mounting perils emerging from Pakistan’s unrelenting terrorism against India and its other neighbors, not to mention the larger risks to its own security. That Xi Jinping’s China, Islamabad’s biggest benefactor and stakeholder, is reluctant to do much about these perils prolongs the bloodshed and misery in South Asia.

#### Chinese counter-terrorism targets ethnic minorities

Vinay Kaura, Coordinator at the Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, Jaipur, Sardar Patel University of Police, Security and Criminal Justice, January 8, 2017, “China’s double standard on counter-terrorism,” Asia Times, http://www.atimes.com/chinas-double-standards-counter-terrorism/, Accessed 2-27-2017

China views terrorism, separatism and extremism as posing potential threats to a wide range of national security interests that include social stability, national unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity. Terrorist incidents have risen significantly in China. While most of these incidents took place in restive Xinjiang region, major cities such as Beijing, Kunming, and Guangzhou have also suffered attacks in the past few years. China’s counter-terrorism efforts presently focus mainly on its Muslim ethnic Uighur population in Xinjiang region. China’s official use of the term ‘terrorist’ seems reserved almost exclusively for describing those tied to Xinjiang. However, some Chinese scholars and government-affiliated experts have also characterized the riots among ethnic Tibetans as terrorism.

#### India proves China will only cooperate on terrorism if it fits their agenda

Vinay Kaura, Coordinator at the Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, Jaipur, Sardar Patel University of Police, Security and Criminal Justice, January 8, 2017, “China’s double standard on counter-terrorism,” Asia Times, http://www.atimes.com/chinas-double-standards-counter-terrorism/, Accessed 2-27-2017

China seeks regional and global support for targeting Uighur Islamists but refrains from backing India’s efforts to weaken the terror groups like the Jaish-e-Mohammed (JeM) and Lashkar-e-Taiba (LeT), who are considered as Pakistani army’s ‘strategic assets’ to wage asymmetric war against India. This selective characterization poses several challenges for the success of counter-terrorism efforts in South Asia. The China-Pakistan nexus extends to shielding Pakistani terrorism at the UN as India’s attempts to get the global body to act against Pakistan-based terrorist leaders have been frustrated by Chinese intransigence.

## A2: Military exchanges

### Military cooperation fails - relations

#### Cooperation will be plagued by deep structural conflicts that undermine effectiveness of military ties

Jingdong Yuan, PhD & Associate Professor at the Centre for International Security Studies and the Department of Government and International Relations, the University of Sydney, 31, 2017, “One Way to Keep U.S.-China Ties Going Strong: Military Exchanges,” The National Interest, http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/one-way-keep-us-china-ties-going-strong-military-exchanges-19256, Accessed 2-26-2017

Deep structural constraints impose limitations on both the scope and the pace of bilateral military ties. Indeed, while Beijing and Washington have managed to expand areas of contact and maintain or repair bilateral military relations after major setbacks, they have yet to resolve their core differences. Thus, beneath pledges of cooperation and building a healthy, stable relationship lie deep rifts over a number of issues, including US arms sales to Taiwan; Chinese concerns over US strategic intentions in the Indo–Pacific; and China’s growing assertiveness in its territorial disputes with neighboring countries, among others.

## A2: North Korea

### No Solving – China won’t / can’t pressure

#### It’s too late to for Chinese cooperation on North Korea. Past failures make denuclearization a missed opportunity

Sara Lee, a co-winner of the 2016 China Focus Essay Contest, BA in political science from UC Berkeley, December 26, 2016, “North Korean Nonproliferation: A US-China Missed Opportunity,” China-US Focus, http://chinafocus.us/2016/12/26/north-korean-nonproliferation-a-us-china-missed-opportunity/, Accessed 2-25-2017

Until a few years ago, North Korea served as a critical buffer zone for China against the encroachment of American influence and advancement in Asia. However, China increasingly grows weary from its dealings with the North, while grudgingly realizing the need to cooperate with the U.S. in opposing further nuclear escalation. An unstable ‘rogue state’ armed with nuclear weapons and with limited loyalty to other countries poses a threat not only to sworn enemies such as the U.S., South Korea, and Japan, but arguably the entire international order— including China, its northern neighbor. A few decades ago, the world powers, especially through Sino-American cooperation, could have prevented North Korea from developing a nuclear program and encouraged its adjustment in the global community. However, today, the North’s nuclear armaments are a firm and grim reality as denuclearization of the Korean peninsula looms as a missed opportunity. Granted, the woes caused by the international deadlock of yore and North Korea’s zealous pursuit of nuclear weapons are blatantly clear in hindsight, but it is unreasonable to blame countries for pursuing their own near-sighted strategic interests. At the time, China faced international censure against its actions in Tiananmen Square as internal turmoil threatened the transitioning Chinese state in the late 20th century. Thus, regional stability reigned supreme, with far-sighted policy falling to the wayside. Ideologically aligned with China, North Korea provided a much-needed buffer zone against the democratic South and U.S. military forces stationed on the Korean peninsula. Meanwhile, the U.S., fiercely anti-communist and engulfed in a Cold War with the Soviets, was immersed in a conflict with Iraq and its nuclear program, which was deemed a higher priority. In such a tumultuous period, North Korea no doubt sought nuclear weapons as a guarantee against any foreign intervention such as U.S. support for anti-communist rebels in Nicaragua. To make matters worse, the sudden and chaotic collapse of the Soviet Union compounded declining Chinese support to make a nuclear deterrent against international aggressors urgent and essential for North Korea. Despite negotiations such as the Six Party Talks, the countries involved failed to meet the strategic needs of each member involved, leading to lackluster progress ending with the ultimate collapse of discussions in 2008.

#### China is done cooperating over N. Korea

Jane Perlez, Staff Writer, February 21, 2017, “Is China Pushing Trump to Talk to North Korea?,” New York Times, https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/21/world/asia/china-north-korea-trump-talks.html, Accessed 2-26-2017

For years, the United States and others have pressed China’s leaders to suspend imports of coal from North Korea to push the reclusive state to abandon its nuclear weapons program. For years, the Chinese leadership resisted — until Saturday, when it suddenly announced in a terse statement that it would do just that. But if Beijing was sending a message to North Korea, it was also directing one at President Trump, who has complained that China was not putting enough pressure on North Korea. Now President Xi Jinping of China has essentially said: We have done our part in enforcing sanctions. Over to you, Mr. Trump.

### Status quo solves

#### The US and China are engaging over N. Korea now

Jane Perlez, Staff Writer, February 21, 2017, “Is China Pushing Trump to Talk to North Korea?,” New York Times, https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/21/world/asia/china-north-korea-trump-talks.html, Accessed 2-26-2017

China would like the Trump administration to deal directly with North Korea. Beijing’s suspension of coal imports from North Korea was a signal that China was being tougher than usual, offering Mr. Trump a concession to bring Washington to the table with the North. Secretary of State Rex Tillerson has stepped up his contacts with Chinese officials in recent days. On Tuesday he spoke by telephone with Yang Jiechi, China’s top diplomat, and among the topics they discussed was how to handle North Korea.

## A2: One-China policy

### Status quo solves

#### Trump just backed off threats over One-China policy

Simon Denyer and [Philip Rucker](https://www.washingtonpost.com/people/philip-rucker/), Staff Writer, February 10, 2017, “Backing away from a fight, Trump to honor one-China policy,” Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/asia\_pacific/trump-agrees-to-honor-one-china-policy-in-call-to-xi-jinping/2017/02/10/ea6e7ece-ef4a-11e6-9973-c5efb7ccfb0d\_story.html?utm\_term=.11e8628f7991, Accessed 2-26-2017

President Trump just backed down from what could have been a serious fight with China. On Thursday evening in Washington, he appeared to shy away from confrontation with Beijing by agreeing to honor the one-China policy, during a lengthy telephone call with China’s President Xi Jinping. The move is set to ease tensions between the world’s two most powerful nations: relations had been inflamed after Trump suggested he would only commit to the one-China policy if Beijing addressed his concerns about trade and currency issues.

## A2: Pandas

### China is resolving the Panda crisis now

#### Chinese efforts are working with INGOs to save pandas now

Emanuella Grinberg, Staff Writer, September 5, 2016, “Good news and bad news for the animal kingdom,” CNN, http://www.cnn.com/2016/09/04/world/giant-panda-endangered-downgrade-gorillas-decline/, Accessed 2-13-2017

Meanwhile, partnerships between the Chinese government and international conservation nongovernmental organizations and zoos have spread research, conservation and breeding efforts. Zoo Atlanta announced Saturday that 19-year-old Lun Lun, originally from China's Chengdu Research Base of Giant Panda Breeding, [had given birth to twins](http://www.cnn.com/videos/living/2016/09/04/giant-panda-gives-birth-to-twins-vstan-orig.cnn). The improved status confirms that the Chinese government's reforestation and forest protection efforts are working, the IUCN said. But climate change still threatens to eliminate more than 35% of the panda's bamboo habitat in the next 80 years; hence the "vulnerable" designation, which means it's still at risk of extinction. "The recovery of the panda shows that when science, political will and engagement of local communities come together, we can save wildlife and also improve biodiversity," said WWF Director General Marco Lambertini.

#### Pandas are no longer endangered

Xi Wang, Staff Writer, September 28, 2016, “With Giant Panda Numbers Rising, China Still Faces Huge Challenges,” Radio Free Asia, http://www.rfa.org/english/news/china/panda-recovery-09282016144433.html, Accessed 2-13-2017

Now that China's iconic national treasure, the giant panda, has been taken off the list of endangered species, the government's wildlife protection strategy would benefit from a change in focus, campaigners have told RFA. The giant panda, native to the disappearing bamboo forests of southwestern China, was recently classified as vulnerable rather than endangered by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), in a development that was largely welcomed by campaign groups. The move came as the IUCN reported a 17 percent rise in the panda population in the decade up to 2014, when 1,864 giant pandas were found in the wild in China. But even the Worldwide Fund For Nature (WWF), which uses the panda as its logo, said the news should spur governments to further efforts to save rapidly shrinking populations of wildlife. "The recovery of the panda shows that when science, political will and engagement of local communities come together, we can save wildlife and also improve biodiversity," WWF chief Marco Lambertini said in a statement on the group's website.

#### Wild panda population in China is growing

Emanuella Grinberg, Staff Writer, September 5, 2016, “Good news and bad news for the animal kingdom,” CNN, http://www.cnn.com/2016/09/04/world/giant-panda-endangered-downgrade-gorillas-decline/, Accessed 2-13-2017

Thanks to an increase in available habitat, the population of the giant panda rose 17% from 2004 to 2014, leading the IUCN to downgrade it from endangered to vulnerable. A nationwide census in 2014 found 1,864 giant pandas in the wild in China, up from 1,596 in 2004, the IUCN [said in its report](http://www.iucnredlist.org/details/712/0) on the animal. Revered in Chinese culture, the giant panda was once widespread throughout southern China. Since the 1970s, it has been the focus of one of the most intensive, high-profile campaigns to recover an endangered species, after a census by the Chinese government found around 2,459 pandas in the world -- proof of its precarious position, according to the [World Wildlife Fund](http://wwf.panda.org/wwf_news/?13588/history-of-the-giant-panda).

#### China is resolving the panda crisis now with conservation and poaching enforcement

Los Angeles Times, Staff Writer, September 9, 2016, “Pandas removed from international endangered list, but China says they still face serious threat,” http://www.latimes.com/world/asia/la-fg-panda-endangered-20160905-snap-story.html, Accessed 2-13-2017

A leading international group has taken the giant panda off its endangered list thanks to decades of conservation efforts, but China's government discounted the move Monday, saying it did not view the status of the country's beloved symbol as any less serious. The International Union for Conservation of Nature said in a report released Sunday that the panda is now classified as a "vulnerable" instead of "endangered" species, reflecting its growing numbers in the wild in southern China. It said the wild panda population jumped to 1,864 in 2014 from 1,596 in 2004, the result of work by Chinese agencies to enforce poaching bans and expand forest reserves.

## A2: RCEP

### A2: RCEP shuts out the U.S.

#### RCEP won’t shut out U.S. investments

Joshua M. Robbins, an international lawyer at [BakerHostetler](http://www.mondaq.com/content/company.asp?article_id=565050&company_id=5131) and at the U.S. Department of State, February 3, 2017, “United States: The King (Of Asian Investment Treaties) Is Dead. Long Live The King?,” Mondaq, <http://www.mondaq.com/unitedstates/x/565050/> international+trade+investment/The+king+of+Asian+investment+treaties+is+dead+Long+live+the+king, Accessed 2-15-2017

It looks unlikely (to say the least) that the United States will either seek involvement in or be invited to join the RCEP in the near future. The same is likely true of the major European economic powers. Does that mean that companies from those countries will be shut out from the benefits of the RCEP's investment chapter, if it takes effect? Not necessarily. The draft RCEP investment chapter provides that its protections are available to an "investor of a Party," which is defined to include a "juridical person" or "enterprise" of an RCEP member state that makes an investment in another RCEP state. What is a "juridical person" or "enterprise" of an RCEP state? The various negotiating states have proposed different definitions, but it appears that they may include "any entity" that is "constituted" or "organized" under the law of an RCEP state, including a corporation, trust, partnership, joint venture, sole proprietorship, association or branch, provided it carries out business activities in that state. Thus, even a company from a non-RCEP member state (like the United States) could potentially gain protections under the RCEP by structuring its investment through an entity operating in an RCEP state. For example, a U.S. company with an operating subsidiary, joint venture or branch in Japan could invest in China through that Japanese entity, and the investment would then be covered under the treaty. If China then nationalized the investment, or discriminated against it and in favor of local competitors, or otherwise violated its rights under the RCEP, the Japanese entity could then initiate arbitration proceedings for monetary damages against the Chinese government. This approach could similarly be used with subsidiaries or branches in Singapore, Australia or other RCEP members, and would allow protection of investments in all other members, including not only China but also others such as India or Indonesia.

#### The RCEP is no guarantee. Because it has plenty of hurdles, China is pursuing bilateral treaties

Sanchita Basu Das, Fellow and Lead Researcher (economics) at the ASEAN Studies Centre and Coordinator of the Singapore APEC Study Centre, February 14, 2017, “The Future of Trade Diplomacy in East Asia,” Perspective, Issue : 2017, #9, https://www.iseas.edu.sg/images/pdf/ISEAS\_Perspective\_2017\_9.pdf, Accessed 2-25-2017

As President Donald Trump withdraws the US from the TPP, the ASEAN-led RCEP receives attention as a significant alternative. While Washington is likely to adopt bilateral trade diplomacy to match its immediate domestic interests, its decision to retreat from TPP may serve China’s strategic interest in accelerating RCEP talks and promoting the FTAAP as the trade architecture of the future. However, China’s strategic gain is not completely straightforward. RCEP has many hurdles to cross yet and an FTAAP within the APEC framework is unlikely to come to fruition anytime soon. Beijing may therefore pursue FTAAP on a bilateral basis and develop it within the context of its own Belt and Road Initiative.

## A2: Relations Advantages

### Engagement will not solve

#### Relations are fundamentally plagued by victimhood that short-circuits engagement

Richard A. Bitzinger, a Senior Fellow and Coordinator of the Military Transformations Program at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies, Nanyang Technological University, February 22, 2017, “Are China and America Destined for War?,” National Interest, http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/are-china-america-destined-war-19533?page=show, Accessed 2-26-2017

Ultimately, what could drive conflict between Xi’s China and Trump’s America is a similarly held perception in both countries being somehow victims. Beijing has long promoted the idea that it has been oppressed and constrained by foreign powers, and that this therefore entitles it to special consideration. An “official narrative” of humiliation by Western powers is particularly driving a new Chinese populist-nationalist foreign policy. But now the US, under Trump, is playing a similar victimhood card. Trump won election by arguing that the US has been made a sucker by foreign powers, and his response is to raise the country’s military profile and be more intransigent and demanding when it comes to trade and international relations. Such mutually held attitudes do not bode well for US-Chinese relations. If everyone is the victim, then no one feels the need to make concessions. Just the opposite, in fact: they feel that they deserve indulgences and dispensations. This is not a good way to avoid conflict.

## A2: Space cooperation

### Status quo solves – space coop high now

#### China is expanding its space cooperation now

Marcela Ganea, Staff Writer, February 15, 2017, “A World of Progress in Space,” Geopolitical Monitor, https://www.geopoliticalmonitor.com/a-world-of-progress-in-space/, Accessed 2-25-2017

China is also looking at enhancing its space cooperation. Since 2011, China has signed 43 space cooperation agreements or memoranda of understanding with 29 countries, space agencies, and international organizations. Among its key areas for future cooperation: construction of the Belt and Road Initiative space information department, launching BRICS remote-sensing satellite constellation, and improving exploration and technical cooperation concerning the Moon and Mars. China has already invited all space-faring countries to work on its space station, which will become operation in 2022.

### US Space dominance good – Deterrence / Hegemony

#### Losing US space dominance guts military effectiveness and undermines most facets of modern life

Paul D. Shinkman, Senior National Security Writer, February 8, 2017, “The Coming War in Space,” US News & World Report, https://www.usnews.com/news/world/articles/2017-02-08/war-in-space-how-the-us-prepares-for-the-next-battlefield, Accessed 2-26-2017

The debate centers on the 73 trillion cubic miles spanning everything from a few hundred miles above the Earth's surface to the farthest reaching satellites 22,000 miles out. It's a domain over which the U.S. claims it must continue to be the principal governing power if space is to remain a peaceful commons. And it involves both protecting orbiting U.S. assets as well as ensuring the safety of the vital military and commercial information they convey to Earth. Losing U.S. dominance in space could have wide-reaching effects, American officials fear, from limiting the ability to guide ships, foot patrols, manned jets, drones or missiles toward precision targets, to communicating with and saving wounded soldiers in the deep hinterlands of the Afghan Hindu Kush mountains, to more benign matters, like disrupting GPS systems that direct millions of American commuters and support domestic farmers who rely on them to steer combines in perfectly straight lines and maximize their crop yields.

#### US space dominance is crucial to deter Russian and Chinese aggression

Cheryl Pellerin, Staff Writer, January 26, 2017, “Hyten: Deterrence in Space Means No War Will be Fought There,” DoD News, https://www.defense.gov/News/Article/Article/1061833/hyten-deterrence-in-space-means-no-war-will-be-fought-there, Accessed 2-26-2017

Hyten said the most important element of space is geosynchronous orbit, a circular orbit 22,300 miles above the planet where satellites appear to be stationary above the surface of the earth. British science fiction writer, futurist and inventor Arthur C. Clark mathematically determined the orbit in 1947, the general said. The orbit, also called GEO, is important for communications, television and radio satellites and for critical military satellites, Hyten said. “That’s where we do our special communications, from national command-and-control communications [to] … our nuclear business,” he added. “If somebody wants to threaten that and if they do something to geosynchronous orbit because of where that orbit is, the debris that's created will be there forever.” Preventing potential aggression in space requires deterrence, Hyten said. “We have to deter bad behavior in space and we have to deter conflict in space,” he added, especially against adversaries like China and Russia that are building weapons in low earth orbit and in GEO that will deploy from the ground to these areas of space.

### A2: China advances mean they are more powerful

#### Chinese space advances make them more vulnerable to ASATs too

Elizabeth Quintana, Staff Writer, February 23, 2017, “The Asian Space Race,” Indian Defence News, http://www.indiandefensenews.in/2017/02/the-asian-space-race.html, Accessed 2-25-2017

Space underpins much of modern life, so much so that it is now considered a critical national infrastructure in some parts of the world. The sector is undergoing some dramatic changes. In the West, this change is driven by the commercial sector whereas Asian space programs still remain largely government-driven. However, the sheer range and ambition of Asian space programs is breath-taking and there is no sign that the pace of activity is slowing—quite the opposite. China is rapidly closing the gap with the US with a series of ambitious projects and demonstrating extraordinary breadth and depth of expertise in military, commercial and scientific projects. It has developed a number of anti-satellite technologies, predominantly to deter the United States, but will itself become more vulnerable to anti-satellite attacks as its space infrastructure expands.

# GENERAL EVIDENCE

## China/Economy

### Chinese economy strong now

#### China’s economy will remain resilient in 2017

Doug Tsuruoka, Staff Writer, and [Nicholas R. Lardy](https://piie.com/experts/senior-research-staff/nicholas-r-lardy), a senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics, February 16, 2017, “Trouble with US-China trade war – both sides would lose (interview),” Asia Times, http://www.atimes.com/article/trouble-us-china-trade-war-sides-lose/, Accessed 2-25-2017

Will China’s economy remain resilient in 2017 given continuing debt-to-GDP issues, capital outflows, falling forex reserves, trade and other problems? I think the Chinese economy will do fairly well. [GDP growth] is going to be somewhere in the 6.5% range. People tend make a big deal out of one-tenth of a percentage point. I don’t think it really much matters. It may matter politically or domestically in China whether its 6% or 6.5%. But in the broader context, China will remain one of the fastest growing economies this year and contribute a lot to the expansion of global GDP. The authorities are trying to slow down the growth of debt and lending, they are raising interest rates, they are increasing capital controls and are enforcing more vigorously the regulations that in the past they haven’t enforced. The fall in foreign exchange reserves has now dwindled to a fairly small amount, and it’s certainly not going to impose at this rate on economic growth.

#### China’s GDP will expand 11.5% this year

Frank Tang, Staff Writer, February 27, 2017, “China’s economic growth will be surprisingly strong, CICC says,” South China Morning Post, http://www.scmp.com/news/china/economy/article/2074371/brokerage-revises-forecast-chinas-economic-growth, Accessed 2-28-2017

A leading Chinese securities brokerage house has significantly revised up its forecasts for the country’s economic growth and its currency’s exchange rate against the dollar, painting a rosier picture of the prospects for the world’s second biggest economy. China’s headline gross domestic product is expected to rise 6.8 per cent this year, compared with a previous estimate of 6.7 per cent, according to a research note published by China International Capital Corp. The nation’s nominal GDP rate, which is not adjusted for inflation, may expand 11.5 per cent from an earlier estimate of 9.3 per cent thanks to stronger-than-expected investment in infrastructure and real estate, and the yuan may only weaken slightly to stay at 6.98 against the dollar by the end of the year, the research note said.

#### China’s economy is on a solid path for near and long-term growth

Gabriel Wildau, Staff Writer, March 1, 2017, “China economic strength allows shift from stimulus,” Financial Times, https://www.ft.com/content/dc9a3608-fe3b-11e6-96f8-3700c5664d30, Accessed 3-1-2017

China’s economy has performed strongly this year, official and private indicators showed on Wednesday, giving policymakers room to shift their attention to financial bubbles and rising debt after years of pump-priming. High quality global journalism requires investment. A flood of credit and fiscal stimulus kept factories humming and construction sites crowded last year, allowing Beijing to meet its growth target despite a slow start. The use of road, rail, electricity and water projects to support growth has also transformed China’s landscape during the past decade. The Asian Development Bank said in a report on Tuesday that China was far ahead of other low- and middle-income countries in terms of meeting infrastructure needs. But authorities are now seeking to balance support for near-term growth with efforts to address long-term risks from excessive debt. The latest data suggest they will enjoy some freedom to concentrate on managing such dangers this year.

### Chinese economy strong now

#### China’s economy is picking up steam now, making room for reforms

Financial Tribune, Staff Writer, February 28, 2017, “China Economy Remains Stable,” https://financialtribune.com/articles/world-economy/60521/china-economy-remains-stable, Accessed 2-28-2017

China’s economy remained generally steady during the Lunar New Year while sentiment readings show uncertainties over the outlook, according to the earliest private data for February. Sales managers perked up and satellite data showed activity hanging near a five-year high. Meanwhile, the financial world’s outlook for next 12 months remained in negative territory and a gloomier mood settled in over the steel sector, Bloomberg reported. The world’s No. 2 economy has picked up in recent months as trade improves, producer prices continue to rebound and manufacturers remain upbeat. That gives policy makers more breathing room as they work to contain a credit boom that’s fueled the resurgence.

#### The Chinese economy is improving due to government stimulus

Gabriel Wildau, Staff Writer, March 1, 2017, “China economic strength allows shift from stimulus,” Financial Times, https://www.ft.com/content/dc9a3608-fe3b-11e6-96f8-3700c5664d30, Accessed 3-1-2017

The central bank has recently guided money-market interest rates higher to curb leverage in the bond market. Credit flow to the real economy hit a record high in volume terms in January, but growth in debt outstanding has decelerated for several months.  In a further sign of the focus on deleveraging, Reuters reported on Tuesday that China would target growth of 12 per cent for M2 money supply in 2017. That would be lower than last year’s 13 per cent target, though still higher than the 11.3 per cent achieved.  Economists expect the government to target gross domestic product growth of 6.5 per cent this year, down from a range of 6.5-7 per cent in 2016. Growth and money-supply targets will be announced at an annual session of parliament that begins this weekend.  “There has been very strong policy stimulus since mid-2015. But as the economy is now on quite a firm path, they want to move back to risk-prevention mode,” said Jianguang Shen, China economist at Mizuho Securities in Hong Kong. “They want to control shadow banking and hike interest rates.”

### Chinese economy weak now

#### China’s economy is a paper tiger. Massive borrowing has tanked reserves, which goes underreported

Ivan Martchev, an investment specialist with institutional money manager [Navellier and Associates](https://navellier.com/), February 20, 2017, “China’s economy is dangerously close to unraveling,” Market Watch, http://www.marketwatch.com/story/chinas-economy-is-dangerously-close-to-unraveling-2017-02-18, Accessed 2-28-2017

What the official reserve data do not show is that massive borrowings outside China have accumulated over the past 15 years, bringing net reserves down to about $1.7 trillion, according to [statistics prepared by Kynikos Associates](https://s9.postimg.org/9tq2komf3/mw2.png). That much smaller reserve amount is not necessarily large enough to support the yuan exchange rate, particularly if foreign-exchange outflows accelerate again as the Chinese credit bubble has now burst, in my opinion. China has a total debt-to-GDP ratio of close to 400%, if one includes the infamous unregulated shadow banking system that is habitually omitted from official statistics. In 2000, China’s total debt-to-GDP ratio stood near 100%. As Chinese GDP grew from $1.094 trillion at the end of the 20th century to $11.75 trillion at the end of 2016, the country’s total leverage ratio ballooned. China’s economy grew 11-fold, and total credit in the financial system surged by over 40-fold. As the Chinese economy slows ([see chart](https://s1.postimg.org/5v1owr5zz/mw3.png)), the level of borrowing is accelerating, [as can be seen here](https://s9.postimg.org/6zah6gufz/mw4.png) in China’s “total social financing” data.

#### Chinese economic leverage is over. Their credit bubble is about to burst

Ivan Martchev, an investment specialist with institutional money manager [Navellier and Associates](https://navellier.com/), February 20, 2017, “China’s economy is dangerously close to unraveling,” Market Watch, http://www.marketwatch.com/story/chinas-economy-is-dangerously-close-to-unraveling-2017-02-18, Accessed 2-28-2017

More importantly, the Chinese have been using trade as a political tool as they habitually run bilateral trade deficits with many of their Asian trade partners to increase their political influence in the region. Such trade strategies are unlikely to influence the Trump administration, which is hell-bent on rebalancing the U.S.-China trade imbalance. Trump’s clash with China on the trade issue comes at precisely the wrong time for the Chinese as their epic credit bubble is unraveling. While trade frictions and financial issues in China are unrelated events, Trump’s election is like kerosene thrown on an already burning economic fire in China. What I foresee happening here is similar to the Asian crisis in 1997-1998, this time emanating from China, with the caveat that today’s Chinese GDP is much bigger than total Asian GDP in 1997.

### Economic decline won’t lead to recession

#### Economic decline in China won’t lead to a sharp downturn

Evelyn Cheng, Staff Writer, February 16, 2017, “China's economy doesn't look so wonderful when you look at the really big numbers,” CNBC, http://www.cnbc.com/2017/02/16/chinas-economy-doesnt-look-good-when-you-look-at-big-numbers.html, Accessed 3-1-2017

Besides going increasingly off the books, new loans appear to be less effective at delivering growth. Analysis from China financial data firm Wind Information showed that as of December, every yuan of GDP growth required more than three yuan in total social financing loans, close to levels not seen since the financial crisis. China reported growth of 6.7 percent in 2016, the slowest in 26 years. Most economists outside China doubt the credibility of its growth announcements. That said, China watchers are generally confident in Beijing's ability to prevent a sharp economic slowdown, and say authorities' communication in implementing policy has improved. In fact, Macquarie's Hu expects credit growth to slow down going forward, "given top leaders have set the tone for monetary policy as 'neutral.'"

## China/US Trade

### Trade relations/engagement strong now

#### The US & China have already agreed on an engagement approach to manage trade relations

Xinhua News, Staff Writer, February 14, 2017, “Trade, investment remain stability source for China-U.S. relationship: U.S.-China Business Council president,” http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2017-02/14/c\_136054523.htm, Accessed 2-15-2017

Bilateral trade and investment remain a source of stability for China-U.S. relationship, and are worth great attention by both sides, John Frisbie, President of the U.S.-China Business Council (USCBC) told Xinhua in a recent interview. Bilateral trade surged from 2.5 billion U.S. dollars in 1979 to 519.6 billion dollars in 2016, an increase of 211 times, data from China's Commerce Ministry showed. Bilateral investment also witnessed similar booming increases over the past 38 years. By the end of 2016, bilateral investment accumulated over 170 billion U.S. dollars. "Top-level communication is necessary to manage the large and complex U.S.-China relationship," said Frisbie. Chinese President Xi Jinping and U.S. President Donald Trump held a lengthy and "extremely cordial" phone conversation last Thursday on numerous topics, during which they agreed that the two sides would engage in discussions on various issues of mutual interest. "The U.S.-China Business Council is pleased the two presidents spoke by telephone regarding a range of issues in the relationship," Frisbie said. The call was the first between the leaders of the top two economies in the world since Trump's inauguration in late January.

### Trade war likely

#### The stars are aligned for a devastating US-China trade war. Trump’s economic nationalism removes 80 years of mutual restraint

Daniel Ikenson, Director of the Cato Institute’s Herbert A. Stiefel Center for Trade Policy Studies, February 6, 2017, “Into the Abyss: Is a U.S.-China Trade War Inevitable?,” CATO Institute’s Free Trade Bulletin #69, https://www.cato.org/publications/free-trade-bulletin/abyss-us-china-trade-war-inevitable, Accessed 2-15-2017

Never have the U.S. and Chinese economies been more interdependent than they are today. Never has the value of the bilateral trade and investment relationship been greater. Never has the precarious state of the global economy required comity between the United States and China more than it does now. Yet, with Donald J. Trump ascending to power on a platform of nationalism and protectionism, never have the stars been so perfectly aligned for the relationship to descend into a devastating trade war. Bilateral trade frictions are nothing new. Over the years they ebbed and flowed, but the tensions were managed well enough to avoid any major meltdowns. For the past eight years, the U.S.-China relationship has been under increasing duress, taxing patience and requiring great restraint from Washington and Beijing. Both governments imposed trade restrictions, but they did so in manners plausibly consistent with the prevailing rules of international trade. The election of the impetuous Trump, who sees trade as a zero-sum competition between countries that either win or lose, renders restraint temperamentally improbable and strategically illogical. Because the United States runs a large bilateral trade deficit with China, President Trump views Beijing as the more dependent party in the relationship with more to lose from a trade war. Perceiving the consequences of a trade war as relatively benign for the United States makes that course of action a realistic option for Trump. This thinking amounts to a major departure from over 80 years of U.S. trade policy orthodoxy.

#### US-China trade war is coming soon. Multiple issues on both sides guarantee contentious trade relations

Daniel Ikenson, Director of the Cato Institute’s Herbert A. Stiefel Center for Trade Policy Studies, February 6, 2017, “Into the Abyss: Is a U.S.-China Trade War Inevitable?,” CATO Institute’s Free Trade Bulletin #69, https://www.cato.org/publications/free-trade-bulletin/abyss-us-china-trade-war-inevitable, Accessed 2-15-2017

Trump appears to be undeterred and unconcerned about the possibility of a trade war — or worse — with China. He seems to have a mandate to do whatever he wants — “to blow things up,” as it was succinctly summarized at a recent conference. The president has been most vocal about China’s alleged currency manipulation, which has inspired his call for a 45 percent tariff across-the-board on imports from China. Of course, currency manipulation is an outdated complaint. The Chinese have not intervened in currency markets to suppress the value of the Yuan for over a decade and, in recent years, have been struggling to prop up its value in the face of rampant capital flight. There are other sources of tension in the relationship that could provoke a descent into the abyss. Discrimination against U.S. businesses in China, favoritism toward state owned enterprises, massive subsidization of industries, intellectual property theft, cyberespionage, deeper U.S. scrutiny of Chinese acquisitions in the United States, U.S. discrimination against Chinese telecommunications companies, and U.S. refusal to treat China as a market economy all remain prominent points of contention in the relationship. As President Trump and his advisers point to China’s large bilateral trade surplus as evidence of unfair trading practices and promise to take remedial actions, the Chinese government is threatening to shift its purchases of aircraft from Boeing to Airbus, and agricultural products from the United States to Australia and Canada. Surely, the Chinese are contemplating other strategic targets for retaliation — companies and industries that would be likely to exert political pressure on Congress to do something to rein in the president.

### Trade war impacts – (Good) Regime collapse internals

#### A trade war with the US fosters nationalist unity in China. The people will rally around President Xi

Daniel Ikenson, Director of the Cato Institute’s Herbert A. Stiefel Center for Trade Policy Studies, February 6, 2017, “Into the Abyss: Is a U.S.-China Trade War Inevitable?,” CATO Institute’s Free Trade Bulletin #69, https://www.cato.org/publications/free-trade-bulletin/abyss-us-china-trade-war-inevitable, Accessed 2-15-2017

But what is particularly troubling is that, from a domestic Chinese political perspective, President Xi might actually welcome a trade war with the United States. With 6.5 percent economic growth (the slowest in 25 years), popular discontent with stalling incomes, corruption, environmental degradation, and tightening media and internet restrictions, Xi might benefit politically from the distraction. The party and the Chinese people might rally to Xi’s side, as he blames U.S. trade measures for stagnation and the economic hardships that will arise. Tapping into China’s vast reservoir of nationalistic pride and purpose would provide China with the staying power to endure a long, drawn out trade war with the United States — especially as the U.S. government continues to alienate friends and make enemies in the region.

#### A trade war with the US gives the regime political cover for stability

Tyler Roylance, staff editor at Freedom House, February 16, 2017, “The Right Way to Confront China,” The Diplomat, http://thediplomat.com/2017/02/the-right-way-to-confront-china/, Accessed 2-28-2017

At the same time, China faces serious economic problems including an expanding balloon of debt, slowing growth, capital flight, poorly allocated state investment, overcapacity in many industries, and considerable labor unrest. The number of strike actions in the country doubled from 2014 to 2015 and remained at high levels in 2016, according to the [China Labor Bulletin](http://maps.clb.org.hk/strikes/en). Analysts have suggested that China’s economy could be headed for a disruptive correction or a long period of relative stagnation — either of which would be politically dangerous for a regime whose legitimacy rests in part on its ability to deliver full employment and a better quality of life. If the party were able to blame the consequences of its failed economic policies on a trade war with a hostile, vindictive United States, it could emerge stronger than before.

### Trade war impacts – (BAD)

#### A US-China trade war hurts millions of jobs and collapses both economies

Keyu Jin, a professor of economics at the London School of Economics, is a World Economic Forum Young Global Leader and a member of the Richemont Group Advisory Board, February 22, 2017, “China’s Weapons of Trade War,” Project Syndicate, https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/china-trump-trade-war-by-keyu-jin-2017-02, Accessed 2-27-2017

China exports more to the United States than the US exports to China. That makes US President Donald Trump furious – so furious, in fact, that he may be willing to start a trade war over it. Trump has leveled tough protectionist threats against China. As he attempts to consolidate his presidency, he is unlikely to back away from them. And with the Communist Party of China’s 19th National Congress set to take place in Beijing in November, Chinese leaders are unlikely to yield to US pressure. A trade war would undoubtedly hurt both sides. But there is reason to believe that the US has more to lose. If nothing else, the Chinese seem to know precisely which weapons they have available to them. China could stop purchasing US aircraft, impose an embargo on US soybean products, and dump US Treasury securities and other financial assets. Chinese enterprises could reduce their demand for US business services, and the government could persuade companies not to buy American. The bulk of numerous Fortune 500 companies’ annual sales come from China nowadays – and they already feel increasingly unwelcome. Beyond being America’s second most important trading partner, China is America’s main jobs supplier. A trade war could thus cost the US millions of jobs. If China switched from Boeing to Airbus, for example, the US would lose some 179,000 jobs. Reduction in US business services would cost another 85,000 jobs. Soybean-producing regions – for example, in Missouri and Mississippi – could lose [some 10%](https://piie.com/system/files/documents/piieb16-6.pdf) of local jobs if China halted imports. Moreover, though the US exports less to China than vice versa, it is China that controls key components in global supply chains and production networks. Consider the iPhone. While China provides just 4% of value added, it supplies the core components to Apple at low prices. Apple cannot build an iPhone from scratch in the US, so it would have to search for alternative suppliers, raising its production costs considerably. This would give Chinese smartphone businesses an opportunity to seize market share from major players. Today, 80% of global trade comprises international supply chains. Declining trade costs have allowed firms to splinter their production lines geographically, with goods processed and value added in multiple countries along the chain. If China threw a handful of sand in the gears of these chains, it could disrupt entire production networks, doing serious damage to the US (and, indeed, all the countries participating in such networks). An escalating trade war, with each side erecting symmetric import barriers, would fuel inflationary pressure in the US, potentially driving the Federal Reserve to raise interest rates higher and faster than it would otherwise. That, together with diminished growth prospects, would depress equity markets, and declining employment and household income could lead to a sizeable loss of GDP in both the US and China.

### Trade good – US leadership

#### U.S. retreat from economic globalization leadership means China fills the vacuum

Joshua M. Robbins, an international lawyer at [BakerHostetler](http://www.mondaq.com/content/company.asp?article_id=565050&company_id=5131) and at the U.S. Department of State, February 3, 2017, “United States: The King (Of Asian Investment Treaties) Is Dead. Long Live The King?,” Mondaq, <http://www.mondaq.com/unitedstates/x/565050/> international+trade+investment/The+king+of+Asian+investment+treaties+is+dead+Long+live+the+king, Accessed 2-15-2017

The RCEP's potential to displace the TPP, and China's central place in that process, highlights the striking shift in roles among the world's economic powers. While until recently the United States was a leading champion of globalization, and particularly strong protections for foreign investment, it now appears that China may be taking its place. [Recent statements](http://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2017/01/17/510219078/chinas-xi-jinping-defends-globalization-in-first-ever-speech-at-world-economic-f) by its senior officials have highlighted this point. While the steady and vast expansion of China's own overseas investments explains its side of the equation, the dramatic backlash against globalization on the U.S. side is a fairly sudden phenomenon.

## South China Seas

### Sino-US war is likely

#### The stage is set for a US-China confrontation over the S. China Seas

Katie Hunt, Staff Writer, February 2, 2017, “Trump, Tillerson and the South China Sea: What's at stake,” CNN, <http://www.cnn.com/2017/02/02/asia/us-china-south-china-sea/>, Accessed 2-26-2017

Rex Tillerson, who was sworn in as US Secretary of State Wednesday, takes responsibility for US policy in one of the world's biggest flashpoints: the South China Sea. President Donald Trump says the former Exxon CEO will bring "a clear-eyed focus to foreign affairs." He'll need it. The contested waters are a [crucial shipping route](http://www.cfr.org/asia-and-pacific/armed-clash-south-china-sea/p27883) and home a messy territorial dispute that pits multiple countries against each other. Tensions have ratcheted up since 2014 as China has turned sandbars into islands, equipping them with airfields, ports and weapons systems and warned US warships and aircraft to stay away from them. Adding fuel to this heady mix, the Trump administration looks set to take a much more confrontational stance toward China than its predecessor. During his confirmation hearing, Tillerson said China should be blocked from accessing the artificial islands it's built, setting the stage for a potential showdown.

#### The current confrontational and incoherent stance on the S. China Seas risks an accidental war

Dan De Luce, Foreign Policy’s chief national security correspondent, January 26, 2017, “[Trump’s China Policy: ‘This Is How You Stumble Into a Crisis’](http://foreignpolicy.com/2017/01/26/trumps-china-policy-this-is-how-you-stumble-into-a-crisis/),” Foreign Policy, http://foreignpolicy.com/2017/01/26/trumps-china-policy-this-is-how-you-stumble-into-a-crisis/, Accessed 2-26-2017

The Trump administration’s muddled and provocative statements about U.S. policy toward China, especially in the contested waters of the South China Sea, have confused allies and aggravated tensions with Beijing, heightening the prospects of a great power conflict. Rex Tillerson, Trump’s pick for secretary of state, [stunned](http://foreignpolicy.com/2017/01/12/from-obamas-asia-pivot-to-trumps-china-bashing-or-how-to-provoke-china-before-inauguration-day/) lawmakers and foreign governments at his Jan. 11 Senate confirmation hearing when he said that the United States would be ready to block China’s access to artificial islands it is building in the South China Sea. Seemingly just a gaffe, the White House later appeared to double down on Tillerson’s stance, which taken at face value would be tantamount to an act of war. The comments suggest President Donald Trump’s White House is eager to take an aggressive tone with Beijing, but lacks a coherent strategy to deal with China or a basic grasp of the legal and security issues at stake in the South China Sea, said former officials, diplomats, Asia experts and congressional aides. “The U.S. looks somewhere between confrontational and disoriented on the South China Sea,” said Evan Medeiros, who served as the top advisor on Asia in Barack Obama’s White House. “This is how you can stumble into a crisis.”

#### There’s high potential for an accidental war in the S. China Seas

Dan De Luce, Foreign Policy’s chief national security correspondent, January 26, 2017, “[Trump’s China Policy: ‘This Is How You Stumble Into a Crisis’](http://foreignpolicy.com/2017/01/26/trumps-china-policy-this-is-how-you-stumble-into-a-crisis/),” Foreign Policy, http://foreignpolicy.com/2017/01/26/trumps-china-policy-this-is-how-you-stumble-into-a-crisis/, Accessed 2-26-2017

But China is now a much more powerful player on the world stage, with a massive economy and an increasingly capable military equipped with ship-killing missiles that threaten the U.S. Navy’s dominance. And its political and military leaders have a growing confidence that their country’s moment has arrived. As a result, Washington and Beijing could be headed on a collision course, as both countries could be overestimating their own power and misjudging how the other side will respond, former officials and policy analysts said. That potential for misunderstanding and over-confidence makes the Trump administration’s incoherent statements on the South China Sea all the more worrisome — and dangerous.

## US-China war impacts

### US-China war goes nuclear

#### A US-China war goes nuclear

Karl Quinn, Staff Writer, February 27, 2017, “The Coming War on China: Pilger says US is real threat in the Pacific, not China,” Sydney Morning Herald, http://www.smh.com.au/entertainment/movies/the-coming-war-on-china-pilger-says-us-is-real-threat-in-the-pacific-not-china-20170209-gu96bp.html, Accessed 3-1-2017

The greatest threat to world peace may well be the military build-up in the South Pacific – but it's not China we should fear, it's the United States. That, at least, is the thesis of The Coming War on China, the latest polemic from the award-winning documentary-maker John Pilger. The military build-up in the region "is now a flashpoint for a war between China and America," 77-year-old Pilger says in the film. "The United States and China may well be on a path to war, and nuclear war is no longer unthinkable."