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# Politics Updates

## Clinton-Trump

### Clinton Winning Now

#### The FBI announcement had no effect on Clinton’s lead—She’ll win

Natalie Jackson, Senior Polling Editor, October 31, 2016, “First Poll Since James Comey Announcement Shows No Effect On Hillary Clinton — Yet,” Huffington Post, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/poll-fbi-announcement-trump-clinton_us_5816b063e4b0390e69d0e694>, Accessed 10-31-2016

Democratic presidential nominee [Hillary Clinton](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/news/hillary-clinton/) maintains the same lead over GOP opponent [Donald Trump](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/news/donald-trump/) that she had before [FBI Director James Comey announced that the bureau is investigating newly obtained emails](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/fbi-hillary-clinton-email-investigation_us_58138552e4b0990edc30cb36?d4b9yh83j7qr529) that might be relevant to Clinton’s handling of sensitive government information as secretary of state, according to a [new national poll from Politico/Morning Consult](http://www.politico.com/story/2016/10/clinton-emails-comey-poll-politico-morning-consult-230519). The poll, conducted Saturday and Sunday after the revelations, found Clinton leading Trump by 3 percentage points, 46 percent to 43 percent. That margin was unchanged (Clinton up 3 points, 42 percent to 39 percent) when Libertarian nominee Gary Johnson and Green Party nominee Jill Stein were included in the poll. On Thursday and Friday, prior to Comey’s letter to congressional leaders, polling from Politico/Morning Consult showed very similar margins: Clinton led Trump by 3 points in the four-way race and 5 points in the head-to-head matchup, within the poll’s margin of error. Nearly all poll respondents ― 89 percent ― had heard at least some about the Friday bombshell. But a 39 percent plurality said it made no difference in their vote. Another 39 percent said it made them somewhat or much less likely to vote for her, but that’s driven by nearly two-thirds of Republicans who say they’re less likely to vote for the Democratic nominee. Forty-two percent of independents said the events make them less likely to vote for Clinton. Those numbers are consistent with the [ABC News/Washington Post tracking poll](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/10/30/post-abc-poll-finds-tight-presidential-race-with-mixed-reaction-to-fbis-review-of-clinton-e-mails/) and the [CBS battleground poll](http://www.cbsnews.com/news/cbs-battleground-poll-partisans-divide-on-news-of-fbi-emails/) released Sunday, which both had some data from Friday night and Saturday that indicated the announcement might have little effect on vote choices except among those already not likely to vote for Clinton.

#### Hillary will win. She’s crushing Trump on electoral votes

Mark Zandi, SChief Economist at Moddy’s, October 30, 2016, “What are the election's economic implications?,” Philadelphia Inquirer, http://www.philly.com/philly/business/20161030\_What\_are\_the\_election\_s\_economic\_implications\_.html, Accessed 10-30-2016

This is probably because Hillary Clinton, who represents the status quo in economic and foreign policy, is widely expected to be the next president. Uncertainty is corrosive on financial markets, business investment decisions, and big consumer purchases. Donald Trump represents change in policy, and what changes he has in mind are not well-known. If it looked as if he could win, there likely would be fallout on markets and the economy. But the odds of a Trump victory appear very low. Based on the polls, Clinton has more than an 85 percent chance of winning, and my model of the Electoral College gives her 332 electoral votes to only 206 for Trump. She needs only 270 to win. A Trump victory is not inconceivable, but nearly so.

#### Clinton is winning now, but the race is tightening

Nate Silver, editor-in-chief of FiveThirtyEight, October 28, 2016, “Election Update: The FBI Is Back — This Time With Anthony Weiner,” 10-28-2016, <http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/election-update-the-fbi-is-back-this-time-with-anthony-weiner/>, Accessed 10-30-2016

We’ll return to the FBI news in a moment, but first, a quick look at where our forecast stands — and I’ll remind you that it is based on polls and won’t reflect any effect from the FBI news until the polls do. We’ve reached the point in the campaign in which there are so many polls coming in — state polls, national polls, tracking polls, one-off polls — that it’s really nice to have a model to sort out all the data. A couple of days ago, the model was beginning to detect tenuous signs that the presidential race was tightening. Now, that seems a bit clearer. Clinton’s lead over Donald Trump is now 5.7 percentage points in our polls-only model, down from 7.1 points on Oct. 17. And Trump’s chances of winning the election have recovered to 18 percent from a low of 12 percent. Trump’s chances in our polls-plus forecast are 21 percent, improved from a low of 15 percent. Almost all the tightening is happening because Trump’s numbers have improved. Clinton’s share of the vote — about 46 percent in national polls — is still as high as it’s been all campaign. But Trump seems to have brought home some Republicans who were thinking about sitting out the election or voting for a third-party candidate.

### Clinton Winning Now

#### Clinton has the Electoral College locked-down

Harry Enten, senior political writer and analyst for FiveThirtyEight, October 28, 2016, “Almost Every Swing State Is A ‘Must Win’ For Trump Now,” FiveThirtyEight, http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/almost-every-swing-state-is-a-must-win-for-trump-now/, Accessed 10-31-2016

The impact of the three presidential debates — particularly the first — has borne itself out in the polls in many ways. Hillary Clinton won the first debate [decisively](https://twitter.com/NumbersMuncher/status/781117724701392896), jumped out to a 5 or 6 percentage point lead nationally, according to the [FiveThirtyEight polls-only model](http://projects.fivethirtyeight.com/2016-election-forecast/#odds), and hasn’t dropped below that threshold since. As a result, Donald Trump’s options in the Electoral College have been significantly narrowed; Clinton’s have proliferated. You can see Trump’s deteriorating map clearly by looking at how our “must win” numbers have shifted. A [week before the first debate](http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/election-update-the-top-must-win-states-for-trump-and-clinton/), both Trump and Clinton had certain “must win” states. That is, according to our polls-only model, there were a number of swing states (as indicated by our [tipping-point calculation](http://projects.fivethirtyeight.com/2016-election-forecast/#tipping-point)) where Clinton and Trump won the election in the vast majority of cases where they won that state.

#### “Hidden voters” for Trump don’t exist or are insignificant

Steven Shepard, Staff Writer, October 28, 2016, “GOP insiders: Polls don't capture secret Trump vote,” Politico, <http://www.politico.com/story/2016/10/donald-trump-shy-voters-polls-gop-insiders-230411>, Accessed 10-31-206

“Former [Philadelphia] Mayor Frank Rizzo always outperformed his polling numbers because voters would not admit their true intentions,” a Pennsylvania Democrat said. “There is no doubt there is a sense of embarrassment and isolation for the Trump voter who is educated and lives in Philadelphia or its suburbs. And I would think the phenomena holds true in similar markets. I think this also holds true with African-American voters. There is a hidden vote for him above what the polling shows. But a hidden vote in either scenario is a few points in that subset, not enough to get him to the promised land.”

### Trump Winning Now

#### Hidden voters will turn out for Trump

[Jennifer Harper](http://www.washingtontimes.com/staff/jennifer-harper/), Staff Writer, October 27, 2016, “The ‘hidden’ Trump vote becomes a formidable force,” The Washington Times, Accessed 10-28-2016

Despite media hysteria and a daily influx of polls, a persistent conversation has emerged about the huge, hidden population of Americans who could suddenly step forward and vote for Donald Trump. It is a powerful, unknown factor with much potential — and one which makes Democratic strategists plenty nervous. There are no standard ways of measuring this demographic. They could be evangelicals, dispossessed working-class folk, or disenchanted fans of Sen. Bernie Sanders and third party candidates. They could be small business owners, doubting Democrats, active-duty military, veterans, bikers, patriots, law enforcement personnel, seniors who remember another America, or impoverished millennials. Second Amendment fans and pro-lifers are certainly part of the hidden vote. No one knows the precise demographics, though there will be insight in future exit polls. All of them, however, found something to like in Mr. Trump, and their motivation is paramount. National polls have consistently revealed that Trump voters are more passionate and engaged than those who favor Hillary Clinton. “I still think Trump may win the election. The polls are very weird. We’ve seen how off they were with Brexit and the last UK general election. A hidden Trump vote is not unimaginable at all,” writes Powerline analyst Steven Hayward.

#### Trump can still win. Assuming it’s over tanks Democrat chances to flip the Senate

[Kate Aronoff](https://www.theguardian.com/profile/kate-aronoff), Writing Fellow at In These Times, October 28, 2016, “Stop right there: assuming a Hillary Clinton victory is downright dangerous,” The Guardian, <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/oct/28/hillary-clinton-poll-assuming-win-is-downright-dangerous>, Accessed 10-28-2016

Hillary Clinton has not won the presidential election. Granted, the polls look good. The New York Times gives her a [92% chance](http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/upshot/presidential-polls-forecast.html?_r=0) at taking the White House as of Thursday morning, and more Republican elites are defecting from their party’s nominee each day. Data hub FiveThirtyEight’s numbers are a little more modest, putting Trump’s odds of victory just north of 15%. Evan McMullin – the once-laughable conservative independent candidate – [could even win](http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/polls-may-be-underestimating-evan-mcmullins-chances-in-utah/) his home state of Utah, fueled by Republican recoiling. But not every picture is so rosy. A recent [Reuters/Ipsos poll](http://www.cnbc.com/2016/10/22/trump-gains-on-clinton-poll-shows-rigged-message-resonates.html) saw Clinton with just a 4-point lead nationwide, with Trump undershooting his campaign high by just one point. That a full 15% of voters [remain undecided](http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/election-update-where-are-the-undecided-voters/) leaves a huge potential for the election to swing at the last minute. Worryingly, the candidates remain neck in neck in several swing states. By all accounts, Trump (to speak generously) has a slim hope of walking away with a win come 8 November. But that there is still any chance he could become commander in chief, America’s ambassador to the world and a central player in literally any decision about the future of the United States should inspire not just concern, but a trip to knock on doors in your nearest swing state. Mind, this isn’t a call to silence dissent about Clinton, let alone to start phone banking for her campaign. But those savvy enough to hold principled and well-founded critiques of her role in the Honduran coup and ending “welfare as we know it”, for instance, can also recognize the stakes of voting for anyone besides her in a swing state. There are more than a few good reasons to help make sure Clinton wins that have almost nothing to do with her. Anything but victory by a sizable margin will feed Trump’s omens about election “rigging”, potentially tying up the news cycle for several months in some horrific recount debacle like the one in 2000. A narrow defeat is also likely to embolden Trump’s most irascible supporters, many of whom happen to be armed. Assuming the election is over could further hit down-ballot candidates by driving down voter turnout at a time when Democrats have a real potential to flip the Senate and render Bernie Sanders chairman of the budget committee. (By fear-mongering about that possibility, Paul Ryan inadvertently helped Sanders raise [$2.4m](https://berniesanders.com/thankspaul/) to aid in down-ticket races.) So whether you want to avert open revolt, take back Congress or just be done with this hellscape marathon of an election cycle, assuming Clinton has already coasted to victory is a dangerous move.

### Trump Winning Now

#### Trump will win—Professor Norpoth and artificial intelligence prove

Michael Walsh, Staff Writer, October 30, 2016, “[The secret forces that could lead to a Trump victory](http://nypost.com/2016/10/30/the-secret-forces-that-could-lead-to-a-trump-victory/),” New York Post<http://nypost.com/2016/10/30/the-secret-forces-that-could-lead-to-a-trump-victory/>, Accessed 10-31-206

Welcome to the hidden election, where those who say they know what’s going to happen don’t, and those who do know will make their voices heard on Nov. 8. Nationally, Clinton holds 3.8 points over Trump in a four-way race that also includes Libertarian Gary Johnson and the Green Party’s Jill Stein. But polls may not be everything this year. Indeed, Hillary has suffered a major polling meltdown over the past week or so, hurtling from a 12-point lead to 4 points in the Washington Post-ABC News tracking poll. The WikiLeaks revelations about her campaign’s dirty tricks, the pay-to-play nature of the Clinton Foundation, the astonishing personal enrichment of the Clintons via politics and the electrifying news Friday afternoon that the FBI is reopening its investigation into her use of a private email server are finally taking a toll. Spurning the poll-based forecasts in favor of historical analysis, professor Helmut Norpoth at SUNY Stony Brook — who’s correctly predicted the last five presidential elections — gives the nod to Trump, 52.5-47.5 percent. Meanwhile, an artificial intelligence system developed in India that takes into account data from Google, YouTube and social media says Trump’s “engagement data” points to a GOP victory.

#### Professor Lichtman says Trump wins. He’s predicted every election for the past 32 years

Gus Lubin, Staff Writer, October 30, 2016, “Professor who correctly predicted 32 years of elections says Trump will win — but there are caveats,” Business Insider, <http://www.businessinsider.com/lichtman-predicts-trump-victory-with-caveats-2016-10>, Accessed 10-31-2016

Professor Allan J. Lichtman is sticking with his prediction that Donald Trump will win the US presidential election, but he's making some big qualifications. "By the narrowest of possible margins, the keys still point to a Trump victory," Lichtman told [Washington Post](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/10/28/professor-whos-predicted-30-years-of-presidential-elections-correctly-is-doubling-down-on-a-trump-win/). "However, there are two major qualifications. And I'm not a hedger, and I've never qualified before in 30 years of predictions." The American university professor has a 13-key system that has correctly predicted the winner of every popular vote in the US for 32 years. The system looks at true/false statements like "There is no significant third party or independent campaign" and "The incumbent administration is untainted by major scandal." If six or more statements are false, then the incumbent party loses.

#### Artificial intelligence confirms a Trump victory

Arjun Kharpal, Staff Writer, October 28, 2016, “Trump will win the election and is more popular than Obama in 2008, AI system finds,” CNBC, http://www.cnbc.com/2016/10/28/donald-trump-will-win-the-election-and-is-more-popular-than-obama-in-2008-ai-system-finds.html, Accessed 10-31-2016

An artificial intelligence system that correctly predicted the last three U.S. presidential elections puts Republican nominee [Donald Trump](http://www.cnbc.com/donald-trump/) ahead of Democrat rival [Hillary Clinton](http://www.cnbc.com/hillary-clinton/) in the race for the White House. MogIA was developed by Sanjiv Rai, founder of Indian start-up Genic.ai. It takes in 20 million data points from public platforms including Google, Facebook, Twitter and YouTube in the U.S. and then analyzes the information to create predictions. The AI system was created in 2004, so it has been getting smarter all the time. It had already correctly predicted the results of the Democratic and Republican Primaries. Data such as engagement with tweets or Facebook Live videos have been taken into account. The result is that Trump has overtaken the engagement numbers of [Barack Obama](http://www.cnbc.com/barack-obama/)'s peak in 2008 — the year he was elected president — by 25 percent. Rai said that his AI system shows that the candidate in each election who had leading engagement data ended up winning the election. "If Trump loses, it will defy the data trend for the first time in the last 12 years since Internet engagement began in full earnest," Rai wrote in a report sent to CNBC.

## Dems/GOP win House/Senate

### Dems Will Win the House/Senate

#### Democrats are in a great spot to win the Senate

Philip Rucker et al, Staff Writers, October 22, 2016, “Buoyed by rising polls, Clinton shifts to a new target: the House and Senate,” Washington Post, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/buoyed-by-rising-polls-clinton-shifts-to-a-new-target-the-house-and-senate/2016/10/22/9c717070-97c3-11e6-bb29-bf2701dbe0a3_story.html>, Accessed 10-30-2016

Democrats are well-positioned to win the Senate majority. There are nine competitive Senate races — eight of which Republicans are defending, most in presidential swing states. Democrats need to net at least four seats to control the chamber if Clinton wins the presidency, in which case Kaine would serve as the tiebreaker.

#### Dems will likely win the Senate

Josh Marshall, Editor, October 18, 2016, “Gaming Out a Democratic Senate,” Talking Points Memo, <http://talkingpointsmemo.com/edblog/gaming-out-a-democratic-senate>, Accessed 10-30-2016

History may not be the best guide this year. But ticket splitting tends to create cognitive dissonance for most people. Plenty of people do it. But if a senate race is tied and there's an 8 or 9 point spread for the presidential race, the candidate of the opposite party to the presidential leader is going to have a very hard go of it. Lots of people will split their vote. But people who are undecided or only lightly committed will tend to break for the presidential winner. There may be an additional factor as well. Presidential campaigns, national parties and individual candidates each have overlapping ground operations. But a big, big part of that mix is driven by the presidential campaign. We're accustomed to presidential races where the campaigns have at least broad parity. On any given Sunday the worst team in the NFL might beat the best. They're broadly comparable. But the Trump campaign's field operation might be more like a pro football team squaring off against a high school squad or no team at all. We just don't have any track record for a competition that mismatched. What's more, most of the key senate races are in battleground states - the places where the Clinton campaign will have invested the most resources. It's not implausible that this difference could count for a point or two or conceivably even more in the final result. Enough states are in the undecided that a number of very different scenarios are possible. But at least 50 senates for the Democrats (which would constitute a majority with a Democratic vice president) seems pretty likely and one or two more senate are possible. The big question is whether over the next three weeks we start to see signs in the polls of a Democratic wave which solidifies Democratic advantages in New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin and perhaps North Carolina.

### Dems Will Win the House/Senate

#### Dems will win. Only Obamacare and Clinton can be used to retain GOP control

Jake Novak, Staff Writer, October 27, 2016, “If the GOP wants to hold the House and Senate, it should focus on two things,” CNBC, http://www.cnbc.com/2016/10/27/if-the-gop-wants-to-hold-the-house-and-senate-it-should-focus-on-two-things-commentary.html, Accessed 10-28-2016

If the GOP wants to hold on to control of the House and the Senate, it comes down to two things: Obamacare and [Hillary Clinton](http://www.cnbc.com/hillary-clinton/). In presidential election years, members of Congress seeking re-election typically just ride the coattails of their party's presidential candidate. But, when your party's candidate is [Donald Trump](http://www.cnbc.com/donald-trump/), that's not an option. Trump just isn't popular enough with voters – even among those who plan to vote for him – for others to jump on the Trump bandwagon. That's where Obamacare and Hillary Clinton come in. These are pretty much the only topics in this crazy political season that are safe for any Republican congressional candidate to highlight in the last few days of the campaign in order to rally their troops.

#### Dems will flip the Senate with or without Clinton

Lisa Mascaro, Staff Writer, October 23, 2016, “As Trump's woes deepen, Republican fears heighten; GOP tries to prevent loss of Senate control and many House seats,” Los Angeles Times, <http://www.latimes.com/politics/la-na-pol-congress-flip-election-20161023-snap-story.html>, Accessed 10-30-2016

Republicans are prepared for a worst-case scenario, particularly in the Senate, where Democrats need to pick up four seats to flip the chamber if Clinton wins the White House, or five if she doesn't.

The math was already in the Democrats' favor because twice as many Republicans as Democrats are up for election this year. The best hope is that Republicans can stem their losses with candidates who heeded early warnings not to hitch their prospects to Trump's volatile presidential campaign. Senators such as Rob Portman in Ohio and Charles E. Grassley in Iowa have been campaigning like big-city mayors, focusing on local issues and polishing their own brands. They and others, including Sen. Marco Rubio in Florida and Sen. John McCain in Arizona, have built field operations separate from Trump's apparatus, and appear poised to keep their seats. But Republican senators who have agonized most over the nominee -- toggling between support for and distance from Trump -- are among those now seriously in jeopardy.

#### Gerrymandering won’t protect House Republicans

Michael Barber, assistant professor of political science at Brigham Young University, October 27, 2016, “How incumbency, not gerrymandering, may protect the Republican House majority,” Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/10/27/how-incumbency-not-gerrymandering-may-protect-the-republican-house-majority/, Accessed 10-30-2016

As we enter the final stretch of the 2016 campaign, Donald Trump’s struggles have led to [speculation](http://www.latimes.com/politics/la-na-pol-congress-flip-election-20161023-snap-story.html) [about](http://www.politico.com/story/2016/10/house-republicans-democrat-takeover-230006) [serious](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/powerpost/wp/2016/10/10/house-democrats-believe-trump-troubles-give-them-real-shot-at-retaking-majority/) consequences for House and Senate Republicans. Some are even suggesting that control of the House is up for grabs. The [counterargument](http://www.sltrib.com/opinion/4468182-155/albert-r-hunt-in-fight-for), however, is that House Republicans are [protected](http://www.salon.com/2016/10/22/yes-theres-a-rigged-election-the-one-that-ensures-a-republican-house-majority/) by the Republican-led [gerrymandering](http://www.vox.com/conversations/2016/10/5/13097066/gerrymandering-redistricting-republican-party-david-daley-karl-rove-barack-obama) after the 2010 Census. As the story goes, this redistricting simultaneously increased the size of the Republican House majority and made those districts incredibly safe for the GOP legislators who represent them. But how much is gerrymandering really helping House Republicans? My analysis suggests only a little bit. Incumbency appears to be the more important factor.

### Dems Will Win the House/Senate

#### Trump makes a Democrat landslide victory possible. That creates a downballot wave that sweeps the House

Stephen Wolf, Staff Writer, October 14, 2016, “[Trump could cost Republicans the House. Here's what Democrats' path to a majority might look like](http://www.dailykos.com/stories/2016/10/14/1581898/-Trump-could-cost-Republicans-the-House-Here-s-what-Democrats-path-to-a-majority-might-look-like),” Daily Kos, http://www.dailykos.com/stories/2016/10/14/1581898/-Trump-could-cost-Republicans-the-House-Here-s-what-Democrats-path-to-a-majority-might-look-like, Accessed 10-30-2016

The wheels have completely fallen off for Donald Trump’s presidential campaign following the release of an explosive video where he was seen [vulgarly bragging about sexual assault](http://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/08/us/politics/donald-trump-women.html?_r=0). Many Republican officials [have since publicly abandoned him](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/15MudzswjU45efqvus21goEqtknbsfy9w2CLaWvOa_z0/edit?usp=sharing), while House Speaker Paul Ryan even went as far as to say [he won't defend him](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/powerpost/wp/2016/10/10/paul-ryan-wont-defend-or-campaign-for-trump-ahead-of-election/) and told congressional Republicans they’re free to follow their conscience on Trump. This collapse has given downballot Democratic hopes a shot in the arm, with many analysts openly [wondering if Democrats could take the House](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/10/12/heres-how-good-a-shot-democrats-have-of-actually-winning-the-house/). Widespread Republican gerrymandering​ [requires Democrats to win the national popular vote for the House by several points](http://www.dailykos.com/story/2016/08/16/1549316/-Here-s-why-Democrats-might-need-a-7-or-8-point-popular-vote-margin-to-take-back-the-House-this-fall" \t "_blank)—probably 7 or 8—for a bare majority. That serious obstacle [helped deter strong candidates from running](https://www.scribd.com/document/321771354/Chamber-Competitiveness-Political-Polarization-And-Candidate-Decisions-to-Run-for-Office) in many districts, [leading to a number of unfortunate recruiting failures](http://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2016/10/12/13246866/donald-trump-house-democrats). As a result, few expected Democrats to flip the House early on, but a blowout Clinton presidential win completely changes the equation. While ticket-splitting will likely increase compared to 2012’s [92-year low](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2014/04/22/ticket-splitting-is-the-lowest-its-been-in-92-years/) thanks to Trump, downballot Republicans could be facing a tidal wave nonetheless big enough to wash them away, [particularly if their party’s turnout falters](http://www.politico.com/story/2016/10/donald-trump-republicans-turnout-229378) thanks to a hopeless presidential race dampening enthusiasm​.

#### Degraded Republican support means Dems have a shot at the House

Ed Kilgore, Staff Writer, October 21, 2016, “The Tough Road to a Democratic House,” New York Magazine, http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2016/10/the-tough-road-to-a-democratic-house.html, Accessed 10-30-2016

While the fight for control of the U.S. Senate has long hung fire, what’s new in the election stretch-run reckoning is the possibility that a generally bad year for Republicans is eroding the previously very high odds the GOP would maintain its majority in the House. Republicans are probably going to lose seats in any event, and that could cause some problems for Speaker Paul Ryan, whose margin of error to survive a backbench conservative revolt could be wiped out. But now it’s no longer out of the realm of possibility that Democrats could gain the 30 net seats they need to flip the lower chamber. That would be a development of enormous significance, particularly if it is in conjunction with a Democratic takeover of the Senate, which would likely happen in the kind of “wave” election that placed the House in play. A Democratic Congress could enable a President Hillary Clinton to enact major elements of her domestic agenda, from a minimum-wage increase to an Obamacare “fix” to an upper-end tax increase to pay for it all.

#### Dems can take the Senate but the race is tight

Harry Enten, senior political writer and analyst for FiveThirtyEight, October 27, 2016, “Senate Update: Rubio Is Keeping The Republicans’ Hopes Alive In The Senate,” FiveThirtyEight, http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/senate-update-rubio-is-keeping-the-republicans-hopes-alive-in-the-senate/, Accessed 10-31-2016

Democrats’ chances of taking over the Senate continue to hold relatively steady — 67 percent in [both our polls-plus](http://projects.fivethirtyeight.com/2016-election-forecast/senate/?ex_cid=2016-forecast) and [polls-only](http://projects.fivethirtyeight.com/2016-election-forecast/senate/?ex_cid=2016-forecast#polls) models. Republicans still have a real shot at keeping their majority, and one reason is that Democrats have been unable to put [Florida](http://projects.fivethirtyeight.com/2016-election-forecast/senate/florida/) in play. Most Democratic Party money [has been pulled from the state](http://www.politico.com/story/2016/10/democrats-marco-rubio-florida-senate-230298), where Sen. Marco Rubio has an 81 percent chance of beating Democratic U.S. Rep. Patrick Murphy according to polls-plus. That pullback has [frustrated Democrats](http://www.politico.com/story/2016/10/democrats-marco-rubio-florida-senate-230298) from Bill Clinton to Harry Reid. But a look at the numbers suggests that Democrats were probably right to cede Florida to the GOP.

### Dems Will Win the House/Senate (Trump drag-down)

#### Dems will win big. Trump will drive down GOP voter turnout

Matt Fuller, Staff Writer, October 25, 2016, “Donald Trump’s Get-Out-The-Vote Problem Could Cost Republicans Bigly,” Huffington Post, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/donald-trump-down-ballot-republicans_us_580e8b40e4b02444efa4f52e>, Accessed 10-30-2016

In head-to-head polls, Clinton is pulling so far ahead of Trump that voters may wonder what’s the point of voting, and donors might stop donating. “We are up against a perfect storm of spending from Democratic groups and donors who believe the presidential race is done,” Steven Law, the leader of the Republican PAC Senate Leadership Fund, told the LA Times. On top of Trump’s overall problems, his get-out-the-vote operation is severely lagging behind Clinton’s. An analysis by The Hill over the weekend showed a roughly 4-1 advantage for Democrats on paid staff in states, with Democrats employing 5,138 staffers and Republicans having 1,409. While House and Senate Republicans have their own GOTV operations, both parties rely on the top of the ticket to help get their supporters to the polls. If anything, sources told HuffPost, Republicans rely more on the national operation than Democrats. “They’re not making the same types of investments they would be if they had a robust field operation,” a Democratic aide told HuffPost. Additionally, as Trump falls, his problems ― and thus the problems of Republicans in general ― compound. If you were on the fence about Trump, why give up your ideological purity by going to support a guy who’s going to lose big anyway? If you were already uncomfortable with Trump’s ethics, how are you feeling as more women come forward to accuse Trump of sexual assault? What semblance of a message the GOP nominee does have in the closing days is basically one that won’t appeal to those iffy voters. He’s continued his old, extreme rhetoric, doubled down on his misogyny by arguing that the women accusing him of misconduct aren’t attractive enough, and added new attacks against Republicans like Speaker Paul Ryan (R-Wis.). The message that the Republican establishment is out to get him particularly does harm to both sides of the GOP; Trump supporters might skip over supporting Republicans elsewhere on the ballot, and traditional Republicans, already depressed, might just decide not to vote.

#### Trump will drag down the ticket. This flips the Senate for Democrats and shrinks GOP House margin

Lisa Mascaro, Staff Writer, October 23, 2016, “As Trump's woes deepen, Republican fears heighten; GOP tries to prevent loss of Senate control and many House seats,” Los Angeles Times, <http://www.latimes.com/politics/la-na-pol-congress-flip-election-20161023-snap-story.html>, Accessed 10-30-2016

But Republicans are increasingly worried now that the race has spun beyond their control. They're issuing pessimistic warnings that Trump has become such a down-ballot drag that the election could flip control of the Senate to Democrats and shrink the GOP's margin in the House. It's not just Trump's behavior -- including allegations of past sexual assault and his refusal to say he would accept the Nov. 8 election outcome -- that is making Republican candidates worry. Democrats have seized the opening, so confident as Hillary Clinton widens her presidential lead that her super PAC has started spending campaign cash in key Senate battlegrounds, with more being considered for the House races. Republican operatives in congressional races see no easy way to reverse the slide in the time remaining. Nonpartisan analysts agree.

### GOP Will Control House/Senate

#### GOP will retain the House. Dems have no shot at key seats

Chad Pergram, Staff Writer, October 27, 2016, “Can Republicans hold the House? What to watch for on election night,” [FoxNews.com](http://www.foxnews.com/), Accessed 10-30-2016

If Republicans retain control of the House of Representatives, the party can thank House Speaker Paul Ryan, R-Wis.; Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Ed Royce, R-Calif.; Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman Fred Upton, R-Mich.; and Small Business Committee Chairman Steve Chabot, R-Ohio -- along with senior GOPers like Reps. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, R-Fla., and Mario Diaz-Balart, R-Fla. These lawmakers are expected to win re-election. That’s precisely the point. They didn’t face substantial opposition. Donald Trump is weighing down many congressional Republicans. This makes Democrats think they can get close to the 30 seats necessary to win the House. The lawmakers listed above represent districts that hold the potential to vote Democratic under the right circumstances. Seats like these make or break a majority. But Democrats don’t stand a shot at seizing any of these right now. In addition, freshman Reps. John Katko, R-N.Y.; Lee Zeldin, R-N.Y.; and Elise Stefanik, R-N.Y., are expected to hold their seats. The GOP nabbed those seats from Democrats two years ago.

#### Dems will make gains, but no House takeover

Matt Fuller, Staff Writer, October 25, 2016, “Donald Trump’s Get-Out-The-Vote Problem Could Cost Republicans Bigly,” Huffington Post, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/donald-trump-down-ballot-republicans_us_580e8b40e4b02444efa4f52e>, Accessed 10-30-2016

Barring a massive shift in a number of states over the next two weeks, Donald Trump will lose the presidential election and it won’t even be close. The suspense now is how bad will Nov. 8 be for Republicans down-ballot, and the early indication is that ― thanks to Trump ― it could be really bad. In the final stretch, Trump’s closing argument is that the election is rigged, the media is corrupt, and other Republicans have sold him out. It’s a perfect concoction for negative GOP turnout, particularly if you add a shoddy get-out-the-vote operation. “Donald Trump’s plan to turn out Republicans is going about as well as his debate prep and early morning tweetstorms,” Meredith Kelly, the national spokeswoman for the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, told The Huffington Post on Monday. “Trump repels traditional Republicans who cannot bring themselves to vote for this unfit and unhinged man, and despite having developed a group of dedicated supporters in the Republican base, he has managed to convince them that the election is rigged and their vote won’t make a bit of difference.” “In all scenarios,” Kelly added, “Donald Trump and House Republicans lose.” Yes, Trump is headed for a loss. He even seems to know it. But a combination of factors ― generously carved out districts, for one, some Democratic recruitment failures, for another ― might stem the tide of GOP losses in the House and limit losses in the (for now) Republican-controlled Senate. Most analysts not named House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) expect Democrats to pick up somewhere between 12 and 20 seats in the House and take control of the Senate, either because they actually win a majority in that chamber or because a Vice President Tim Kaine would get to break ties. But the prospect of a wave election flipping the House still seems like a bit of a long shot. As The Washington Post’s Stuart Rothenberg put it, the generic ballot between Democrats and Republicans suggests healthy ― but not crazy ― gains for Democrats.

#### Redistricting will prevent Democrat control of the House

Margret Judson, Staff Writer, October 28, 2016, “Why Won't Democrats Take The House?,” Bustle.com, https://www.bustle.com/articles/191644-why-wont-democrats-take-the-house-election-day-probably-wont-see-a-miracle, Accessed 10-28-2016

Even though the future looks bright for Democrats, at least in comparison to their Republican counterparts — you know, their party is intact and hasn't imploded beyond recognition, their presidential candidate will likely win, and the nominee hasn't made a complete mockery of the establishment — the up ticket might get upstaged by some of the losses in the down ticket. As of late October, it looks like [Democrats won't take the House](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/09/23/democrats-may-have-more-takeover-opportunities-but-theyre-not-favored-to-take-back-the-entire-house/) as they'd once hoped to do. Particularly after the [endless scandals from Republican](http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/10/donald-trump-scandals/474726/) presidential nominee Donald Trump, [some Dems speculated](http://www.vox.com/2016/10/8/13211858/house-math-trump) that it would make for a clean sweep across the board. Right now, even speaking conservatively, it looks like Dems will win the presidency and are in the running to [possibly take the Senate](http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2016/09/15/why-it-s-impossible-for-democrats-to-win-the-house.html). At the same time, though, they would be getting ahead of themselves to think they'd be within spitting distance of the 30 seats they need to take back Congress, and there's one main reason why: redistricting.

### GOP Will Control House/Senate

#### GOP will control the House and block Clinton legislation

Mark Zandi, Chief Economist at Moody’s, October 30, 2016, “What are the election's economic implications?,” Philadelphia Inquirer, http://www.philly.com/philly/business/20161030\_What\_are\_the\_election\_s\_economic\_implications\_.html, Accessed 10-30-2016

Assuming Clinton is the next president, the makeup of Congress will determine which of her policy proposals, if any, ultimately become law. This is much tougher to handicap. Odds are good that the House will remain in Republican hands, but control of the Senate appears to be a toss-up. The Pennsylvania election battle between Democrat Katie McGinty and Republican Pat Toomey is pivotal to determining which way the Senate goes. And McGinty would likely be a close ally to the new president, considering her like-mindedness on most economic policies. Given this political backdrop, what are the implications for economic policy? The strongly held consensus view is that it likely means more stalemate. Not only wasn't there much law-making in President Obama's second term, but rancor over the federal budget got so bad that it resulted in a government shutdown.

#### Gerrymandering guarantees Democrats will not control the House

Christopher Ingraham, Staff Writer, October 28, 2016, “How to gerrymander your way to a huge election victory,” Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2016/10/28/how-to-gerrymander-your-way-to-a-huge-election-victory/, Accessed 10-30-2016

A recent analysis by political scientists John Sides and Eric McGhee suggests that Democrats are poised to [win a majority of votes in U.S. House contests but walk away with a minority of seats](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/10/21/the-democrats-are-likely-to-win-a-majority-of-house-votes-but-not-a-majority-of-house-seats-again/) — again. As I [wrote last week](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2016/10/18/heres-the-completely-legal-way-to-rig-an-election/), a big factor in this odd disparity is the way some Republican state legislatures have gerrymandered congressional districts in a way that gives them far more House seats than their popular vote totals would suggest. For a refresher on how gerrymandering happens, recall that the Constitution mandates that every 10 years, seats in the U.S. House are doled out to states according to state populations, as determined by the decennial census. In 2010, for instance, it worked out that a state got [one house seat for roughly every 710,000 inhabitants](http://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2011/dec/c2010br-08.pdf). States have to assign each of their House seats to a congressional district. This requires drawing a map that splits a state up into a number of geographic regions, each with a population of about 710,000. In most states, this process is done by the state legislature with the approval of the governor. So you see where the potential for shenanigans starts to creep in: If the statehouse and governor's mansion are controlled by the same political party, there's not much to stop them from drawing congressional districts in a way that maximizes that party's representation in the U.S. Congress.

#### Incumbency overwhelms redistricting. Neither will cost GOP House control

Michael Barber, assistant professor of political science at Brigham Young University, October 27, 2016, “How incumbency, not gerrymandering, may protect the Republican House majority,” Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/10/27/how-incumbency-not-gerrymandering-may-protect-the-republican-house-majority/, Accessed 10-30-2016

These results suggest that even if some gerrymandered districts are vulnerable to a Clinton landslide, the effect of placing Republicans incumbents in office may outweigh that vulnerability. To test this trade-off between district safety and the benefits of incumbency, I conduct the same analysis but use the 2010 district boundaries before redistricting. The picture below shows that redistricting appears to have very little effect on Republicans’ fortunes in 2016. The model that uses the pre-2011 boundaries (triangles) is nearly identical to the model that uses the current boundaries. At most, redistricting could cost Republicans only a few seats as a result of making the districts more competitive. Incumbency appears to overwhelm any effect of boundary changes.

### GOP Will Control House/Senate

#### Gerrymandering means there is no chance for 30 Dem seats in the House

Albert R. Hunt, Staff Writer, October 17, 2016, “In fight for House, GOP has Gerry, gerrymandering’s namesake, on its side,” Salt Lake Tribune, http://www.sltrib.com/opinion/4468182-155/albert-r-hunt-in-fight-for, Accessed 10-30-2016

When Republicans swept the 2010 Congressional elections, they controlled most of the power to redistrict after the census of that year. A testament to their success is that by most estimates, fewer than 10 percent of the 435 House seats are even competitive this time. Two examples illustrate the picture. In 2012, Barack Obama won a comfortable victory in Pennsylvania as did the Democratic senate candidate, Bob Casey. Yet Republicans won 13 of the 18 House seats in the state. Similarly, the top of the ticket in Michigan went strongly for the Democrats, but Republicans won nine of the 14 House districts. Some of this is due to population patterns; Democrats are more bunched together in urban and suburban districts. But much of it reflects the way Republican state legislators drew friendly congressional lines. "It's much harder to pick up 30 seats now then it was before the Republican gerrymandering after 2010," acknowledges Mark Gersh, the foremost Democratic expert on House races.

### GOP Will Control House/Senate (Coat tails answers)

#### Dems peaked too early and there’s no chance for coat tails

Chad Pergram, Staff Writer, October 27, 2016, “Can Republicans hold the House? What to watch for on election night,” [FoxNews.com](http://www.foxnews.com/), Accessed 10-30-2016

Many GOPers are desperate to decouple themselves from the virulence of Trump. In 2006 and 2008, Democrats won the House by electing conservative Democrats in “rural” districts spanning Ohio, Indiana, Iowa, North Carolina, Mississippi and Alabama. Virtually none of those “types” of districts are in the mix this round. Instead, Democrats swelled the map of potential seats in play in educated, “exurban” districts near big cities. Some of those competitive seats this cycle include Reps. Barbara Comstock, R-Va.; Kevin Yoder, R-Kan.; Darrell Issa, R-Calif.; John Mica, R-Fla.; and the retiring John Kline, R-Minn. But potentially winning those seats doesn’t propel Democrats to the majority. Democrats must complement possible exurban wins with victories in the countryside. Democrats have a chance at securing the district now held by freshman Rep. Bruce Poliquin, R-Maine, who flipped the seat two years ago. But one of the most endangered Democratic incumbents is Rep. Rick Nolan, D-Minn., who holds a marginally Democratically-leaning district sprawling across Minnesota’s Iron Range. Democrats are trying to build a “wave.” Political waves resemble ocean waves. They crash into the shore at the end. But Democrats can’t go Hawaii Five-O just yet. A bad night for Democrats means they marshal a meager 11 or 12 seats. A really good evening has Democrats securing about 22 seats. The most likely scenario is a gain of 15 to 18 seats. All these are short of the 30 needed to take control. Republicans believe their environment stabilized in recent days after Trump’s Access Hollywood tape hit the airwaves. It’s possible Democrats may have peaked too early.

#### Dems won’t get the House for 3 reasons: Incumbents are resilient, redistricting and there’s no wave of coat tail support

Jessica Taylor, Staff Writer, October 24, 2016, “House Top 40: Flipping Control Still A Tough Task For Democrats,” NPR, http://www.npr.org/2016/10/24/499082622/house-top-40-flipping-control-still-a-tough-task-for-democrats, Accessed 10-30-2016

From the outset, Democrats needed a very big-wave election to get to the 30 seats they need to win back control of the House. Then, a video of Donald Trump surfaced showing the GOP nominee making lewd comments, and later multiple women accused him of groping them. That left some wondering if these scandals could trigger that wave. But that simply hasn't happened. Some races have shifted late in Democrats' favor, particularly in Republican-held suburban districts with high levels of voters with college degrees. Still, there has not been the wholesale move in polling that the party would need, even with Hillary Clinton's gains across the electoral map. House Republicans were already going to have losses this year, having essentially maxed out their majority, hitting 247 seats after the 2014 midterms that gave them a majority the party hasn't seen since the Great Depression. And, in a presidential year when turnout leans left, Democrats were going to make gains. However, Democrats' opportunities are limited, hampered by the unfavorable map that was handed to them post-2010 redistricting. Some mid-decade, court-ordered redistricting will give Democrats a slight boost to start off. They're favored to pick up one seat (maybe two) in Florida and one in Virginia, though Republicans are favored to gain one in Florida too. From there, Democrats have 26 other seats held by Republicans that President Obama won in 2012. Those are among their prime targets, but even in those, they've left opportunities on the table. And much like some of their Senate colleagues fighting a much tougher fight to keep their majority, Republican incumbents in some of the toughest terrain have proven resilient.

### GOP Will Control House/Senate (Coat tails answers)

#### Any Democrat control of the Senate would be small and short-lived. They’ll get crushed in midterms

Chris Cillizza, Staff Writer, October 23, 2016, “Even if Democrats win the Senate in 2016, their majority is unlikely to endure,” Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/even-if-democrats-win-the-senate-in-2016-their-majority-is-unlikely-to-endure/2016/10/23/443b9bec-9930-11e6-b4c9-391055ea9259\_story.html, Accessed 10-30-2016

If we are being honest, the presidential race between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump is effectively over. Which means that the big fight over the next 15 days is for control of the Senate, where Democrats need a net gain of four seats to retake control. That prospect is looking more and more likely of late — thanks in large part to Trump’s collapse at the top of the ticket, a fall that appears to be dragging down the likes of Richard Burr in North Carolina, Kelly Ayotte in New Hampshire and Joseph J. Heck in Nevada. What few people talk about — but should — is that this could be a very short-lived majority for Senate Democrats, as the 2018 field is remarkably bad for them. The numbers for that year are stunning: 25 Democratic or Democratic-affiliated independents are up for reelection, compared with just eight Republicans. That’s as lopsided an election cycle as you will ever see. But a look inside the numbers makes the Democrats’ challenge in 2018 all the more daunting. Fully 20 percent of the 25 Democratic seats are in states that then-Republican presidential nominee Mitt Romney carried in 2012 (and even Trump is likely to carry on Nov. 8): Indiana, Missouri, Montana, North Dakota and West Virginia. All five Democratic incumbents in those states are expected to run for reelection, a prospect that gives Democrats a chance in each. But with 2018 looking almost certain to be the first midterm election of a Hillary Clinton presidency, it’s hard to see how her party avoids major losses in red states.

## Dem Control Good/Bad

### Democrat Control of House/Senate Good (Clinton Agenda)

#### A Democrat Senate majority fosters filibuster reform. This is key to securing Clinton’s agenda

David Malet, Director of Security Policy Studies and Visiting Associate Professor of International Affairs, George Washington University, October 19, 2016, “Where the action really is: control of the Senate, and the Supreme Court,” The Conversation, <https://theconversation.com/where-the-action-really-is-control-of-the-senate-and-the-supreme-court-67362>, Accessed 10-30-2016

Rather than “mission creep”, this is critical early work for any Clinton re-election campaign in 2020. Both her husband and Barack Obama suffered the loss of their political capital early in the first terms even though their party controlled both houses of Congress because of obstructionism in the Senate. To avoid this fate, Clinton needs a Senate full of new Democrats grateful for her electoral coat-tails. The prime obstacle presidents Clinton and Obama faced was a Senate procedural rule that calls for a 3/5 supermajority to end debate and proceed to a vote on legislation (cloture). This rule is not in the Constitution – it is simply an operating procedure that evolved in the gentleman’s club that the Senate has traditionally been.

#### Even if Dems controlled the Senate and won House seats, GOP can still enforce gridlock

State House News Service, Staff Writer, October 26, 2016, “GOP keeps House; Ryan in ‘tough spot’,” Telegram & Gazette (Massachusetts), <http://www.telegram.com/news/20161025/gop-keeps-house-ryan-in-tough-spot>, Accessed 10-30-2016  
Donald J. Trump is lagging in polls and pulling down the party's congressional candidates, analysts are already ceding the Senate to the Democrats and a conservative challenge to Speaker Paul D. Ryan is brewing in the House. ''The math kind of just works for them,'' said Representative Tom Cole, Republican of Oklahoma, though he was not yet willing to concede big gains by Democrats. If the most likely scenario holds -- a Hillary Clinton victory, a narrow Democratic majority in the Senate and a diminished Republican House majority -- Republicans will have to make crucial and onerous decisions they are now beginning to confront. Do they try to find a way to cooperate with Democrats and get something done after years of stasis in Washington, perhaps as a way to move beyond the Trump phenomenon? Or do they dig in against Democrats and the new president as a bet on a Republican comeback in the 2018 midterm elections, adopting a noncooperative strategy to recapture the Senate majority and pad their numbers in the House? Can Mr. Ryan survive as speaker? Does Mr. Ryan even want to survive as speaker of a House where any negotiating room is likely to be severely constricted by pressure from his right? What about Merrick B. Garland or an alternative choice for the Supreme Court? Will Republicans finally make way for the court-shifting nominee of a Democratic president, or will Democrats resort to ending the filibuster to fill a court opening? Even if they sustain the predicted losses, Republicans say they will retain leverage through their control of the House and the proven power of the minority in the Senate, especially under their leader, Mitch McConnell of Kentucky. So those anticipating that the election will somehow lead to a Washington reset should brace for disappointment.

### Democrat Control of House/Senate Good (Clinton Agenda)

#### GOP control of Congress will thwart Clinton legislative agenda

Chris Megerian and Lisa Mascaro, Staff Writers, October 30, 2016, “Clinton pushes to flip Senate; Democratic nominee helps out her party's candidates with an eye toward governing,” Los Angeles Times, p. A6

While Clinton has taken care to mention fellow Democrats on the campaign trail -- she usually starts her rallies by rattling off names of local officials, stealing glances at a list to make sure she doesn't miss anyone -- she recently started fusing her stump speeches with full-throated pitches for her party's Senate candidates. The move represents a new facet of Clinton's push for the White House as she tries to boost candidates like Murphy, who is attempting to unseat Republican Sen. Marco Rubio. She appears to be looking for ways to plow past the obstructionism that has plagued President Obama, starting with a return to Democratic control of the Senate and shoring up a base of support on Capitol Hill by helping Democrats get elected. Republicans have controlled both chambers of Congress since 2015, giving them the power to block Obama's nomination of Merrick Garland to the Supreme Court and stall his choices for other federal judgeships. For years, the GOP has frustrated Obama's efforts at policymaking, including comprehensive immigration reform and an overhaul of the criminal justice system. There are signs that they may keep the same tactics if Clinton is elected. Sen. Ted Cruz of Texas suggested that the Supreme Court could continue operating with one fewer than its full slate of nine justices.

### Democrat Control of House/Senate Good (Supreme Court Deadlock)

#### A Democrat majority ends Supreme Court deadlock, fostering progressivism

David Malet, Director of Security Policy Studies and Visiting Associate Professor of International Affairs, George Washington University, October 19, 2016, “Where the action really is: control of the Senate, and the Supreme Court,” The Conversation, <https://theconversation.com/where-the-action-really-is-control-of-the-senate-and-the-supreme-court-67362>, Accessed 10-30-2016

A new crop of Democrats might be willing to follow the advice of activists and scrap the supermajority requirement. All that is necessary is to include this provision during the vote on the organising rules during the opening session on the first day of the Senate term (which would be by majority vote). In 2013, Democrats already took a step toward this end by exercising the so-called “nuclear option” that eliminated the 3/5 requirement for cloture for many judicial and executive branch appointments. Very quickly, Obama went from having far fewer Federal judges appointed than his predecessor to a greater total. The rule change did not apply to the Supreme Court, but given the deadlock over Republican refusal to schedule hearings or votes on Obama’s nominee for a seat that has been vacant for nearly a year, there will certainly be pressure to consider this change. Some conservative activists who dislike Trump still plan to vote for him because they cannot stomach the prospect of Clinton making lifetime appointments to the Supreme Court, which is currently divided 4-4 between progressives and the conservatives who have controlled it for a generation. If Obama or Clinton fill the currently empty seat the balance will tip to progressives will into the 21st century. That’s why, despite the spectacle of the presidential race, the real drama at this point is in the battle for control of the Senate and who will vote for the Supreme Court and whether they will have the filibuster. A half-dozen Senate races will determine the answers to these questions. They will be the epicentre of the action over the remaining three weeks of the campaign.

### Democrat Control of House/Senate Good (Supreme Court Legitimacy)

#### A GOP controlled Senate would block every Clinton nominee. This guts the Court’s legitimacy

David Weigel, Staff Writer, October 17, 2016, “Progressives ponder the unthinkable — a postelection Supreme Court blockade,” Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2016/10/17/progressives-ponder-the-unthinkable-a-postelection-supreme-court-blockade/, Accessed 10-30-2016

It was buried halfway [through a CNN story](http://www.cnn.com/2016/10/17/politics/mccain-clinton-trump-supreme-court/index.html), but it went off like a land mine with progressive election watchers. Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), who is heavily favored to win reelection in 22 days, campaigned for Sen. Patrick J. Toomey (R-Pa.) with a pledge to oppose any new nominee to the Supreme Court if Donald Trump lost the presidency.

“I promise you that we will be united against any Supreme Court nominee that Hillary Clinton, if she were president, would put up,” McCain told Philadelphia radio host Dom Giordano. “I promise you. This is where we need the majority, and Patrick J. Toomey is probably as articulate and effective on the floor of the Senate as anyone I have encountered.”

McCain's comment appeared to contradict what Republicans have said since refusing to hold hearings on President Obama's nominee, Merrick Garland — that there would be a debate on the Supreme Court after the presidential election. While Democratic candidates for Senate have tried to make hay of the Supreme Court stalemate, [conservatives have cheered](http://www.weeklystandard.com/unheralded-triumph/article/2002478?custom_click=rss&utm_source=twitterfeed&utm_medium=twitter)at how little attention the Garland nomination has received.

Ian Millhiser, a legal writer at the Center for American Progress, was the loudest voice condemning what McCain had said.

“Imagine a world where [late Justice Antonin] Scalia’s seat — and two others — remain vacant for five years because a Republican Senate refuses to confirm anyone named by the president,” wrote Millhiser. “Then imagine that all three of these seats are filled five or nine or thirteen years from today, when Republicans finally manage to gain control of both the White House and the Senate. What reason would Democratic governors have to obey the decisions of such a court?”

A strong commitment to Constitutionalism is modelled globally. This is crucial to prevent global tyranny and oppression  
Nicholas W. Van Aelstyn, Counsel of Record, CJA Center for Justice and Accountability, October 2003, “Brief of the Center for Justice and Accountability, the International League for Human Rights and Individual Advocates for the Independence of the Judiciary in Emerging Democracies,” <https://ccrjustice.org/sites/default/files/attach/2015/05/2004-01-14_SCOTUS_RasulAmicus_CJA.pdf>, Accessed 10-30-2016

This is chiefly, but not solely, a domestic concern. People around the world have long noted that the United States’ experiment with a tripartite government and an independent judiciary has**,** with some notable and regretted missteps**,** succeeded in living up to the ideals expressed in its Constitution. They have noted that the federal judiciary, specifically this Court, has managed to guarantee civil liberties even in times of strife**.** This success has made the U.S. system a model for countries around the world, particularly countries seeking to construct a civil society after decades of tyranny and oppression.However, these attempts to construct civil societies are consistently under assault. And as in this case, often the lead argument for dismantling such systems is national security. Indeed, some would-be democracies already have begun to justify prolonged detentions without judicial review on the basis of the detentions at Guantánamo Bay.

Amici urge this Court to exercise jurisdiction over the claims asserted by the detainees at Guantánamo Bay not only because it is the only result consistent with more than two hundred years of legal precedent in this country, but also becausethe people of countries around the world look to the United States to uphold the ideals so elegantly reflected in its Constitution. When the United States fails to live up to these ideals, the cause of individual rights is diminished not just here but everywhere.

### Democrat Control of House/Senate Good (Court-Abortion)

#### Democratic Court nominees are essential to protect abortion rights

Erwin Chemerinsky, Staff Writer, April 6, 2016, “What If the Supreme Court Were Liberal?,” The Atlantic, http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/04/what-if-the-supreme-court-were-liberal/477018/, Accessed 10-30-2016

Thinking of a Court where there are five or even six justices appointed by Democratic presidents is tantalizing for those on the left, like me, who have spent their entire careers with a Court that has been decidedly right of center. So, where might it most make a difference? Abortion rights. Most obviously, Roe v. Wade and the right to abortion would be secure. State laws imposing restrictions on abortions would be far less likely to be upheld. Since 2010, states have adopted about 290 laws limiting access to abortion. These statutes impose regulations on abortion providers, prohibit abortions earlier and earlier in pregnancy, restrict the use of insurance to pay for abortions, limit medicine to induce abortions, and create many other restrictions. These laws likely would not survive review in a Court dominated by Democratic appointees.

#### Opposition to abortion rights is rooted in and reinforces sexism

Eric W. Dolan, Staff Writer, May 7, 2015, “Study: Anti-abortion views linked to sexist attitudes towards women,” Raw Story, <http://www.rawstory.com/2015/05/study-anti-abortion-views-linked-to-sexist-attitudes-towards-women/>, Accessed 10-30-2016

It is estimated that nearly one in three American women will have an abortion by age 45.  But the debate over a woman’s right to terminate her pregnancy still rages on in the United States, decades after the Supreme Court’s contentious Roe v. Wade ruling. Research in the feminist journal [Affilia](http://aff.sagepub.com/content/30/2/200.abstract) suggests that opposition to abortion is driven in part by sexist attitudes towards women. The study examines the relationship between sexism and abortion through the lens of the Ambivalent Sexism Theory. The psychological theory holds that sexist attitudes about women come in two main forms: a hostile version and a benevolent version. Benevolent sexism describes the belief that women are nurturing, caring and gentle, but cannot function properly without protection from a strong male partner.  Kathleen Connelly of the University of Florida has summarized benevolent sexism as the belief that “women are wonderful, but weak.” Hostile sexism, on the other hand, represents overt antipathy or dislike of women. Both forms of sexism maintain that women should be subordinate to men.

### Democrat Control of House/Senate Good (Immigration Reform)

#### Even if Dems don’t win full control of the House, big gains will get immigration reform

Philip Rucker et al, Staff Writers, October 22, 2016, “Buoyed by rising polls, Clinton shifts to a new target: the House and Senate,” Washington Post, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/buoyed-by-rising-polls-clinton-shifts-to-a-new-target-the-house-and-senate/2016/10/22/9c717070-97c3-11e6-bb29-bf2701dbe0a3_story.html>, Accessed 10-30-2016

Even if Democrats fall short, picking up seats would shrink the size of the GOP majority, potentially creating problems for Ryan because it could strengthen the power of conservative hard-liners inside the conference while also enhancing the prospects for more progressive legislation. “Immigration reform was in the deep freeze, somewhere with Boehner’s frozen peas and ice cubes,” said Sen. Amy Klobuchar (D-Minn.), referring to the last Republican House speaker, John A. Boehner of Ohio. “So even if we don’t take back the House, getting closer in the House makes all the difference.”

#### Democrat control would put infrastructure and immigration reform first. That’s key now because they’ll lose midterm seats

Jeff Stein, Staff Writer, October 31, 2016, “Democrats really might have a shot at taking the House. Here's the math,” Vox, <http://www.vox.com/2016/8/31/12610176/democrats-house-race>, Access 10-31-2016

It’s a colossal understatement to say that the stakes are pretty darn high when it comes to control of the House. If Democrats also go on to win the Senate, winning the House would open the doors for a raft of legislative priorities over climate change, immigration, and a range of other long-held blue sky policy goals for the party. So far, most chatter around a Clinton presidency involves big plans like infrastructure reform and new Supreme Court appointments. Sweeping Congress and the presidency would transform those ambitions into a wholly different kind. But there’s another, and perhaps equally important, reason this fight is so crucial: It may be Democrats’ last shot at the House for a very, very long time. New York magazine’s Ed Kilgore explains: If Democrats do fall short of what they need to regain control of the House even as Hillary Clinton becomes president, prospects for further gains in the near term will probably not be good. The party controlling the White House almost always loses House seats in midterms (1998 and 2002 were the rare exceptions), and 2018 would be a third-term midterm for Democrats, making the odds of an anti–White House trend even stronger. Beyond that, Democrats have a well-known midterm turnout problem associated with their heavy reliance on parts of the electorate — notably young people and minorities — that rarely turn out proportionately in nonpresidential elections. As for 2020, it’s worth noting that Democrats gained only eight House seats when President Obama was reelected in 2012.

### Democrat Control of House/Senate Good (Immigration Reform)

#### Democrat Senate control allows Clinton to pass comprehensive immigration reform

Philip Rucker et al, Staff Writers, October 22, 2016, “Buoyed by rising polls, Clinton shifts to a new target: the House and Senate,” Washington Post, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/buoyed-by-rising-polls-clinton-shifts-to-a-new-target-the-house-and-senate/2016/10/22/9c717070-97c3-11e6-bb29-bf2701dbe0a3_story.html>, Accessed 10-30-2016

Hillary Clinton is pouring $1 million into Indiana and Missouri in the campaign’s final weeks — not because the Democratic presidential nominee thinks she can carry those reliably Republican states, but because she believes that, with an extra push, Democrats can win the Senate and governors’ races there. In Michigan, the Clinton campaign is propelling a late surge by Democratic state legislative candidates to regain their House majority. In parts of Maine, Nebraska, Virginia and other states, Clinton volunteers are touting Democratic congressional candidates in their phone calls and fliers to voters. And as Clinton rallied supporters across Pennsylvania on Saturday with running mate Tim Kaine, she touted Senate hopeful Katie McGinty and attacked her GOP opponent, Sen. Patrick J. Toomey, as beholden to presidential nominee Donald Trump. “Katie is exactly the kind of partner we need in the Senate,” Clinton said at a Pittsburgh rally. “We have got to get things done for the people of Pennsylvania and America. And Katie will help us break through the gridlock, actually make a difference in people’s lives.” Emboldened by polls predicting an electoral-college landslide in the presidential race, Clinton is shifting her strategy to lift up other Democrats coast to coast. She and her party are rushing to capitalize on a turbulent turn in Trump’s candidacy, which has ruptured the Republican Party, to make down-ballot gains that seemed unlikely just a month ago. For Clinton, the move is opportunistic and has governing implications. If elected, a mandate may not be enough for her to muscle a progressive agenda on immigration and other issues through a Republican-controlled Congress. She would almost certainly govern more efficiently with Democratic majorities.

### Democrat Control of House/Senate Bad - Fails

#### Even if Democrats flip Congress, multiple factors mean it won’t help Clinton

Eric Bradner, Staff Writer, October 25, 2016, “Congress may flip -- but dysfunction is here to stay,” CNN, http://www.cnn.com/2016/10/25/politics/elections-congress-majority/, Accessed 10-30-2016

Still, even if Election Day tips heavily in Democrats' favor, it's unlikely to change much on Capitol Hill. Democrats' opportunities for House pickups were limited by 2010 redistricting -- which means Republicans are likely to retain control of at least one chamber. And if the party sheds some House seats, what's left would be a House GOP even smaller and more conservative -- with less room for Speaker Paul Ryan to cut deals with Democrats that cost him conservative votes. On the Senate side, a President Hillary Clinton would not have the 60-vote majority that President Barack Obama entered office with and used to shepherd Obamacare into law. That would leave Senate Republicans with power to stymie bills favored by the majority.

#### Democrat Senate flip means nothing after the first year

Eric Bradner, Staff Writer, October 25, 2016, “Congress may flip -- but dysfunction is here to stay,” CNN, http://www.cnn.com/2016/10/25/politics/elections-congress-majority/, Accessed 10-30-2016

The Republican majority in the Senate -- and maybe even the House -- could be gone after this year's election. But gridlock and dysfunction on Capitol Hill are here to stay. With Donald Trump trailing in the polls, Hillary Clinton is increasingly turning her attention to down-ballot races -- particularly for the Senate, where Democrats are hoping to pick up at least the four seats they'd need to claim the majority if Clinton wins the White House. A Democratic Senate could go a long ways to helping Clinton's White House be successful, especially if they can move along a Supreme Court nomination and high-profile legislation early in her administration. At the same time, the House is likely to be more conservative next year, and the 2018 Senate map is so brutal for Democrats that any majority is likely to be short-lived.

### Democrat Control of House/Senate Bad (gun rights)

#### Senate control means Clinton will decimate gun rights

John Haughey, Staff Writer, October 28, 2016, “GOP Could Lose Senate to Gun-Control Democrats,” Outdoor Life, <http://www.outdoorlife.com/gop-could-lose-senate-to-gun-control-democrats>, Accessed 10-31-2016

Republicans now hold 54 of the Senate's 100 seats and their largest majority in the House in 90 years — 247 to 188. If you listen to pundits, poll-watchers and puffateers, the scenario for 2017 and beyond could be drastically different after the Nov. 8 election. Although most expect the GOP to retain a diminished majority in the House, Republican control of the Senate — achieved in 2014 — is in doubt. This, of course, is a concern for gun-owners. If Democrats gain control of the Senate and Hillary Clinton defeats Donald Trump, she’ll galavant into the White House with the proverbial “mandate” and the actual numbers to effectively do what she’s said she’s going to do — pressure lawmakers into adopting her “common sense” nine-point gun control plan. And she’ll need the numbers. Because, despite the campaign rhetoric, emotional fear-mongering and ideological rigamarole that often blurs any intelligent discussion of virtually any issue anymore, when it comes to actually implementing eight of Clinton’s nine objectives, she’ll need legislative accomplices, especially in the Senate.

#### Only a Republican controlled Senate can fend off Clinton attempts to erode gun rights

Emily Cadei, Staff Writer, October 6, 2016, “NRA Spending Big to Keep Senate in Hands of Pro-Gun Republicans,” Newsweek, <http://www.newsweek.com/nra-senate-spending-506971>, Accessed 10-31-2016

If Republicans maintain control of the Senate this November, they’ll have to be sure to thank the gun lobby. In addition to spending [millions of dollars on TV ads](http://www.politico.com/story/2016/10/donald-trump-nra-guns-229124) and other support for presidential nominee Donald Trump, the National Rifle Association (NRA) is playing a major role in election contests likely to decide which party has a majority in the Senate come 2017, an outcome that is very much up in the air right now. The conventional wisdom in national politics is that voters don’t really start paying attention to the election until after Labor Day. And as Senate races heated up in September, the NRA poured $8.5 million into eight of the most competitive Senate races—more than any other outside group besides the two major political parties and their aligned super PACs. The gun group even outspent the network of advocacy organizations funded by conservative billionaires Charles and David Koch. It helped give Senate Republicans a big edge over Democrats last month in terms of the outside cash flowing into their races. Super PACs and party committees supporting Republican Senate candidates spent roughly $69 million in September; their Democratic counterparts spent about $47 million. It also demonstrates that even as political support for gun control policies has grown, the forces working against gun regulations continue to be formidable. If the polls hold true and Hillary Clinton wins the White House in November, she has promised aggressive measures to curb gun violence. A Republican Senate would be a critical bulwark for the NRA and others that share its views. According to spokeswoman Jennifer Baker, “The Supreme Court is the overarching issue” for the group in 2016, and she highlights the vacancy left by conservative Justice Antonin Scalia’s death earlier this year, which the next president will likely get to fill. “If there is an anti-gun president, then that means what’s standing in the way of [an] anti-gun Supreme Court justice…is a pro-Second Amendment United States Senate,” Baker says.

### Democrat Control of House/Senate Bad (Biotechnology)

#### Massive Democrat gains in Congress will tank the biotech industry and drive up health care costs

[Robert Weisman](https://www.bostonglobe.com/staff/weisman), Staff Writer, October 27, 2016, “Biotech stocks down on worries of a Democratic sweep,” Boston Globe, https://www.bostonglobe.com/business/2016/10/27/biotechs-stocks-down-worries-that-sweep-democrats-would-bring-more-regulation/SbBJRce8yFTXP0wEwiDISM/story.html, Accessed 10-31-2016

Political jitters have fueled a sell-off in biotechnology shares in recent weeks as investors weigh the growing prospects of a Democratic sweep in the coming election that could bring heavier regulation for the industry, including restrictions on prescription drug prices. In a note to investors this week, biotech analyst [Geoffrey C. Porges](http://leerink.com/people/geoffrey-porges/) estimated that escalating market fears over the prospect of Democrats controlling Congress and the White House has shaved about $50 billion off the value of biotech companies since Oct. 7. That’s when a [video was made public](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/trump-recorded-having-extremely-lewd-conversation-about-women-in-2005/2016/10/07/3b9ce776-8cb4-11e6-bf8a-3d26847eeed4_story.html) that showed Republican presidential candidate Donald J. Trump in 2005 using graphic language to boast about groping women. Since then, the value of the benchmark [Nasdaq Biotechnology](https://indexes.nasdaqomx.com/Index/Overview/NBI) Index has dropped 6.6 percent. Porges wrote that the slide could be attributed to doubts about an “‘OK’ election result” — one that has Democrat Hillary Clinton beating Trump, Democrats winning back the Senate, but Republicans retaining a majority in the House of Representatives. While Trump and Clinton have criticized the industry over soaring drug prices, Porges contended a Democratic sweep would strengthen the hand of activist lawmakers such as senators Bernie Sanders of Vermont and Elizabeth Warren of Massachusetts. Both would be likely to push for price regulations, shorter market exclusivity periods for new medicines, and a requirement that drugs developed with federal funding be licensed to multiple parties, he said. “This is an industry dependent on risk capital, and risk capital is dependent on an outsized return on investment,” Porges, director of therapeutics research at Boston health care investment bank Leerink Partners, said in an interview. “If that possibility is taken off the table, companies could be starved of capital and this could become a low-margin, slow-growth industry.” Not everyone holds that view. John Rother, president of the [National Coalition on Health Care](http://www.nchc.org/) — which represents 85 consumer groups, health care providers, and insurers — said there is broad public support for capping drug-price increases, requiring more disclosures about how prices are set, and paying for new therapies based on how well they work. Such measures, he said, would be just as likely to come out of a split Congress. “This is very high on the priority list of voters in both parties, so there’s a basis for bipartisan action,” Rother said. “Failure to act will mean we’ll continue to have out-of-control health care costs, because prescription drugs are one of the main things driving these costs.”

## Capitalism Good

### Link Turn—Plan Anti Capitalist

#### The plan reverses decades of anti-Chinese/ anti-Communist sentiment. Engagement is the opposite of status quo pro-Capitalist isolationism

Li Xing, Political analyst who writes about US and China relations, March 3, 2016, “The Rise of China and the Capitalist World Order,” Google Books online, (accessed July 19, 2016)

Despite the fact that “there was precious little Marxism in Mao Zedong thought" (Gregor, 1995: 262), Mao was able both to combine learning with statesmanship, and Marxism—Leninism with China‘s reality. He seized this opportunity to sinicize the Chinese Communist movement by means of skillful redeﬁnition and application of “class” and class politics.’ Mao’s strategy of“‘using countryside to surround city” turned the Chinese revolution into a successful peasant-based uprising. This is another indication of the “Chinese experiments with holistic transnational political ideas" (Tan\_ 1996: 247). No matter how signiﬁcant Western progressive theories were in inﬂuencing the Chinese revolution, without Mao Zedongs adapting it to China’s reality. Marxism-Leninism would probably have aroused only a few rebels. Although communist historians maintain that it is "the people who create history“ and reject the great-man theory of history. there is no doubt that without Mao’s contribution Chinese history would have run a different course (Chi, 1986: 296). The communist victory in China in 1949 shocked the post-war US-led capitalist world order. This “loss” of China had a tremendous impact on American society (Thomson. 1992). From the President and government officials down to the media and ordinary people, Americans simply could not understand how a promising Chinese Nationalist government backed by modem US military support could be defeated by a Cominunist-led insurrection. The US perception of Mao and the new China as an anti-American force was largely misguided due to a lack of real comprehension of Mao’s real sentiments and perceptions about the United States (He. 1994). Mao’s IIl£l\_]0I' concern in his understanding and analysis of the United States was, in fact, always how to measure its power and inﬂuence on the survival and security of the new Republic. So while there might have been a chance after the Second World War and the Chinese communist victory for an American government to have developed normal relations with the socialist China. mispereeptions got in the Way. The US government immediately responded to the “loss” of China by imposing military containment and isolation on Red China under the assumption that the containment of China could prevent the spread of revolution. For nearly a quarter of a century, the “loss of China" had a grave impact on Americas policies in Asia, which were skewed by the fear of Communism, as were American polities, education. and society. This fear of Communism led the United States to ﬁght two Asian Wars with the goal of containing the Chinese revolution, i.e. The Korea War and The Vietnam War. The United States refused to recognize the victory of the Chinese communist revolution and US-East Asia relations became engulfed in years of blind and lethal zealotry.

### Link Turn—Plan Anti Isolationist

#### Link turn: even if the plan is capitalist, the alternative to engagement is isolationism which is net worse

[J. Michael Millis](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/?term=Millis%20JM%5Bauth%5D), MD and adult and pediatric transplant surgeon, December 2013, “Engagement vs. isolationism: China’s transplant system,” National Center for Biotechnology Information, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3924648/> (accessed July 21, 2016)

Throughout history when confronting significant moral or ethical issues there is frequently a battle between engagement and isolationism. No singular strategy can claim universal success, those on opposite sides are prone to criticize the other, and progress cannot be assured with either strategy, but engagement and isolationism are at opposite ends of the political spectrum when dealing with such problems. At times, different actors can play roles that enable engagement while simultaneously continuing to isolate. Armand Hammer’s role, as trusted messenger between isolationist United States and isolationist Soviet Union in the 1970s, helped lead to engagement through détente and ultimately reconciliation between the United States and the Soviet Union ([1](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3924648/#r1)). Thus was the situation with China and their transplant system in the 1990s through the mid-2000s. China proceeded with their transplant system development in isolation and the world generally did not recognize how it was developing until the early 2000s when the ethical issues became so significant that it was impossible to ignore ([2](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3924648/#r2)). The response from the international transplant community was to isolate China from major publications and fora ([3](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3924648/#r3)). China had allowed the lack of regulation to taint the Chinese Transplant community to an extent that formal intellectual exchange was dramatically curtailed. In the mid-2000s, Jiefu Huang, M.D. publically acknowledged the problems associated with transplantation in China and reached out to international experts to help establish transplant regulations that would help move China towards internationally accepted ethical standards. Informal exchange regarding international ethical standards was initiated and supported by a number of organizations including the China Medical Board, Peking Union Medical College, The University of Chicago, World Health Organization, and The Transplantation Society. Although formal intellectual exchange was limited, Jiefu Huang, M.D., a transplant surgeon and Vice Minister of Health with the support of the Chinese government embarked upon a course that ultimately led to the publication: the national program for deceased organ donation in China ([4](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3924648/#r4)). Hence, while many of the official organizations were still advocating isolation, informal channels had been developed that would allow engagement and help ensure that the changes China made would assist in the development of a system that the international community would see as steps forward.

### Impact—Cap is Good

#### Capitalism increases economic opportunities for all involved and benefits the less fortunate

[Jaana Woiceshyn](http://profitableandmoral.com/), Teaches business ethics and competitive strategy at the Haskayne School of Business, University of Calgary, Canada, March 10, 2015, “Capitalism Benefits Everyone,” Capitalism Magazine, <http://capitalismmagazine.com/2015/03/capitalism-benefits-everyone/> (July 20, 2016)

But there are always students—sometimes only one—who prefer capitalism because of the opportunities it avails to everyone, including those with disabilities. They note that capitalism is a system of competition which breeds innovation: new, better and cheaper technologies, such as robotics, that create opportunities to those with limited mobility to engage in productive work. (Even in mixed economies, such innovations occur most in the least regulated industries, such as computers and consumer electronics.) This would mean opportunities to flourish as opposed to merely subsisting on government social assistance and depending on government for some kind of employment. Not only does capitalism create more opportunities for all; it also creates more benevolence. Those truly destitute with no insurance and unable to be productive (always a very small minority) would have to depend on the benevolence of others. Research shows that such benevolence—for example, private charity—flourishes, absent government force. Historically, private charity has been greatest when government hasn’t taken the welfare role. Even today, there are more individual charitable donations and volunteerism in countries with the lowest taxes and the least government social programs. Just imagine the level of private charity with crowdsourcing campaigns under capitalism, when more wealth is created and none is appropriated by government. Capitalism is not a system advantaging the wealthy. It is a system of competition, innovation, and wealth creation which leads to win-win outcomes and flourishing for all. The following two tabs change content below.

### Impact—Cap Solves Poverty

#### Chinese capitalism has raised more people out of poverty than any other country

[Elizabeth Stuart](https://www.theguardian.com/profile/lizstuart), Research fellow and team leader on the sustainable development goals at the Overseas Development Institute, August 19, 2015, “China has almost wiped out urban poverty. Now it must tackle inequality,” The Guardian, <https://www.theguardian.com/business/economics-blog/2015/aug/19/china-poverty-inequality-development-goals> (accessed July 21, 2016)

Whether it’s the currency devaluation or [the stock market rout](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/aug/19/chinas-flight-of-capital-causes-global-ripples), the economic news coming out of China seems unremittingly negative – and that’s not to mention the [horrific explosions in Tianjin](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/aug/19/tianjin-blast-more-warehouses-accused-of-violating-rules-on-toxic-materials). But here’s some good news. Yet-to-be-released data shows that [China](https://www.theguardian.com/world/china) has all but eradicated urban poverty. For a country with huge numbers of poor people streaming into its cities, many of whom living initially in conditions of abject misery, this is an extraordinary success. It has been achieved, in large part, because of a government subsidy paid to urban dwellers to bring incomes up to a minimum level of 4,476 yuan ($700 or £446). The data comes from the latest survey in the [China Household Income Project](http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/series/243)(Chip) series and will not be formally published until next year. It shows that in 2013 the share of people living in cities below this minimum income line was just 1.6%, adjusted for purchasing power parity. According to Prof Li Shi, director of [Beijing Normal University](http://english.bnu.edu.cn/)’s institute of income distribution who works on Chip, that’s mostly accounted for errors in targeting by the government. And it seems that the data is unusually robust: it is based on a behemoth household survey for which more than 100,000 families recorded their income and consumption every day for a whole year. China has lifted more people out of poverty than anywhere else in the world: its per capita income in increased fivefold between 1990 and 2000, from $200 to $1,000. Between 2000 and 2010, per capita income also rose by the same rate, from $1,000 to $5,000, moving China into the ranks of middle-income countries. Between 1990 and 2005, [China’s progress accounted for more than three-quarters of global poverty reduction](http://www.cn.undp.org/content/dam/china/docs/Publications/UNDP-CH_discussionpaper-MDGPost2015.pdf) and is the reason why the world reached the UN millennium development goal of halving extreme poverty. This incredible success was delivered by a combination of a rapidly expanding labour market, driven by a protracted period of economic growth, and a series of government transfers such as the above urban subsidy, and the introduction of a rural pension.

### Impact—Cap Solves Poverty

#### The presence of capitalism instill wealth and the lack breads poverty

Tim Worstall, Staff writer for Forbes writing about economics, finance, and policy, December 19, 2015, “It's Not Capitalism That Causes Poverty, It's The Lack Of It,” Forbes, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/timworstall/2015/12/19/its-not-capitalism-that-causes-poverty-its-the-lack-of-it/#4bc1229d1b8b> (accessed July 21, 2016)

In this sense the statement is simply absurd. The poor in today’s current world live as the human poor have done since the very invention of agricultures. That $1.90 a day which the World Bank uses as the definition of today’s absolute poverty (and, as always, that is at today’s U.S. retail prices–we are defining poverty as living in what you can buy in Walmart for less than two bucks per day per person, housing, clothing, healthcare, food, heating, everything, included) is the standard of living of the vast majority of humankind for almost all of the last ten millennia. A very few priests and aristocrats rose above it but not many in any generation. This does not mean that we should ignore such poverty, nor not work to alleviate it. But it does mean that we’ve got to switch the question around: What was it that allowed some to leave that poverty behind and what is it allowing even more to do so? The answer being this odd mixture of capitalism and free markets that we have. Starting around and about 1750 in Britain, this is the only economic system ever which has appreciably and sustainably raised the standard of living of the average person. And if we acknowledge this then we can indeed start to say that capitalism causes poverty because the people who don’t have it remain poor, while those oppressed by the capitalist plutocrats (and of course, their lackey dog runners such as myself) get rich, as have all of us in the currently rich countries. All of which is a lead in to this same point being extremely well made by [Ricardo Hausman](http://growthlab.cid.harvard.edu/news/what-should-we-do-about-inequality): Our research has uncovered that in the developing world, there are enormous differences in productivity within countries, across their different regions. For example, in the US, the richest state, which is probably Connecticut, is about twice as rich as the poorest state, which is either Mississippi or West Virginia. The difference is a factor of two. In Mexico, the difference between Chiapas and Nuevo León is a factor of nine. Similar differences exist between the Indian states of Bihar and Goa or between the cities of Patna and Bangalore. These differences in income are mainly differences in productivity. It’s not the result of what share of the pie goes to capital and what size of the pie goes to labor. It is differences in the sizes of the pie. So there are these enormous differences in productivity that make the productive places rich and the unproductive places poor. The poor people are not being exploited. They’re being excluded from the higher productivity activities. It’s not that the capitalists are taking a very large share of what they produce. It’s just that they produce very little in the first place. As Dierdrie McCloskey is wont to note, the only thing worse than being oppressed by a capitalist is not being oppressed by a capitalist (although that might originate with Joan Robinson if memory serves): Many of those that worry about inequality blame capitalism for it. Even Pope Francis has been framing the issue in this way. Now, let’s define capitalism the way Karl Marx did. It is a mode of production where some people own the means of production and others work as wage laborers for them. But if this is the case, capitalism hires 8 out of each 9 workers in the USA, 2 out of 3 in Nuevo Leon, 1 out of 7 in Chiapas and 1 out of 19 in India. Places where more of the labor force works for capitalist firms are richer, because capitalist firms allow for much higher productivity. Poor places are characterized by the absence of capitalist firms and by self-employment, employment: these are small peasants and farmers or owners of small shop. In these settings, there are no wages, there’s no employment relationship. There are no pensions. There is no unemployment insurance. The trappings of a capitalist labor market do not exist. At which point what we must do if we wish to enrich that 10% of humanity which is still absolutely poor becomes obvious: We must go and exploit them as the ruthless, red in tooth and claw, capitalists and free marketeers that we are. Simply because it is the absence of capitalism and markets that allows poverty, their presence that defeats it.

### Impact—Chinese Cap Reduces Famine

#### Chinese capitalism played a role in reducing domestic famine

[Brian Palmer](http://www.slate.com/authors.brian_palmer.html), Staff writer—writes about science, medicine, and the environment, April 2, 2014, “Why Does China Not Have Famines Anymore?,” Slate Magazine, <http://www.slate.com/articles/health_and_science/feed_the_world/2014/04/why_does_china_not_have_famines_anymore_capitalist_and_socialist_reforms.html> (accessed July 21, 2016)

You hear this version of the story quite often in the media. NPR portrayed this secret agreement in Xiaogang as the catalyst that [lifted 500 million Chinese](http://www.npr.org/blogs/money/2012/01/20/145360447/the-secret-document-that-transformed-china) out of poverty. Jikun Huang of the Chinese Academy of Sciences and Stanford economist Scott Rozelle wrote in a report for the World Food Programme that the impact of the reforms “could not have been more dramatic” and the “rise in the vibrancy of the rural economy was one of the [triggers of the rest of the economic reforms](http://www.wfp.org/content/agricultural-development-and-nutrition-policies-behind-china%E2%80%99s-success-j-huang-and-s-rozelle-occasio) in China.” The capitalist fairy tale version of the Chinese miracle has a rather simple lesson for the rest of the world: Create the right incentives, and hard work and human ingenuity will solve all the other problems. “We all secretly competed,” a Xiaogang farmer told NPR. “Everyone wanted to produce more than the next person.” When people talk about this version of the Chinese miracle, the implication is that [capitalism itself is miraculous](http://press.princeton.edu/chapters/s7310.html). There’s a lot of truth to this tale. Agricultural productivity rose at a meager 2.7 percent per year from 1970 to 1978. In the five years following the reforms, the growth rate surged to 7.1 percent. Overall GDP also spiked. The reforms encouraged individual members of farm families to take up non-agricultural employment, diversifying and lifting household incomes in rural areas. The full story is far more complicated than a simple capitalist fairy tale, though. It involves prudent planning, heavy investment in infrastructure, and state subsidies. It doesn’t give you that warm, self-satisfied feeling of Western philosophical triumph. But you ought to hear it anyway. In fact, Chinese authorities recognized the poor productivity of their farming collectives long before 1978 and set in motion a [series of changes](http://books.google.com/books?id=A9Rr-M8MXAEC&pg=PA254) that would take years to pay off. Beginning in the 1950s, the central government worked to bring Chinese farming practices into the 20th century. Just 18 percent of Chinese farmland was under irrigation at the beginning of the technological overhaul. Heavy investment in water infrastructure began more than a decade before de-collectivization. Today, more than one-half of Chinese farmers work irrigated fields, making the country one of the most intensively watered farming economies on the planet. At the same time as the investments in irrigation began, China accelerated research on new varieties of grains, fruits, and vegetables that could, when paired with improved irrigation, produce more food on less land. Many of these varieties didn’t become available until just before the capitalist reforms of the late 1970s. Chinese central planners can also take credit for some of the investments made by Chinese farmers themselves. Around the time of the reform, the Chinese government increased the amount it paid farmers for their crops by around 25 percent. In a single year, Chinese farm income surged massively due almost exclusively to government policy. Many of the farmers put some of their capital windfall toward the purchase of chemical fertilizers, which flooded the Chinese market around the same time, further enhancing productivity. Sheer luck played a major part in the incredible Chinese agricultural surge as well. Beginning in 1982, China saw some of the best years of farming weather in recorded history. Unless you think that was God’s way of endorsing the capitalist reforms, that change artificially inflated early 1980s productivity and magnified the positive effects of both the infrastructure investments and the capitalist reforms. Productivity decelerated a few years later, when the weather took a turn for the worse. Scholars continue to argue over how much of China’s agricultural turnaround was due to the capitalist incentive structure, how much resulted from earlier investments, and how much was a trick of the weather. Some say the end of collective farming accounted for nearly three-quarters of the improvements in productivity, while others say it was responsible for no more than one-third. It’s fine to treat China’s food revolution as a fairy tale. The changes were so dramatic that it’s hard not to. But let’s make sure we get the moral of this story correct. Changing the incentives isn’t a magic trick that can turn any lagging economy into a global juggernaut. Investment in infrastructure, research and development, and putting money into the pockets of workers work wonders as well. And a little sunshine doesn’t hurt, either.

### Impact—Chinese Cap Prevents US/ China War

#### Chinese capitalism raises the financial cost of war with the US allowing peace

Erich Weede, Professor of sociology at the University of Bonn, Germany, May 18, 2010, “The Capitalist Peace and the Rise of China: Establishing Global Harmony by Economic Interdependence,” University of Bonn, Ebsco Host online, (accessed July 20, 2016)

Historically, the rise and fall of great powers has been related to great wars. Both world wars of the twentieth century would not have been possible without the previous industrialization and rise of Germany. World War II, which in Asia was a war between the Japanese on the one hand and the Western powers and China on the other hand, would not have been conceivable without the previous rise of Japan. The early phase of the Vietnam War has to be understood against the background of a declining France. If the rise and fall of great powers indicate great dangers, then one should question whether the world can peacefully accommodate a rising China. Here it is argued that the capitalist peace offers the best way to manage the coming power transition between China and the West.1 China is rising. In the thirty years after Deng Xiaoping began economic reforms the Chinese economy grew nearly by a factor of ten. Recently, the West suffered from negative growth rates whereas China grows by about 8 percent a year. The difference in growth rates between China and the West has been about 10 percent. A power transition of such speed is without historical precedent. Given its size China is a “natural” great power— unlike Britain, France, or Germany. Even the combined population of the United States and the European Union does not approach the population size of China. If China outgrows poverty, then it must become a world power. Although war in the nuclear age threatens to be much worse than any previous world war, fear of nuclear war itself might exert some pacifying impact. Such fear, however, need not be our only protection against future wars. Economic interdependence itself makes war less likely. One finding of quantitative research is that military conflict becomes less likely if a pair of nations—say China and the United States, or China and India, or China and Japan—trade a lot with each other (Hegre 2009; Oneal and Russett 2005; Russett and Oneal 2001). Fortunately, all of them do. One may label this effect “peace by free trade”. Foreign investment has some beneficial impact, too (Souva and Prins 2006). Moreover, economic freedom reduces involvement in military conflict, and financial market openness reduces the risk of war, too (Gartzke 2005, 2007, 2009). Quantitative research has demonstrated that there is something like a capitalist peace.

### Impact—Cap Reduces Risk of War

#### Capitalist economic interdependence lowers the risk of war by raising the cost

John Echeverri-Gent et. al, Associate professor of Government and Foreign Affairs, and April Herlevi, and Kim Ganczak, 2016, “Economic Interdependence and Strategic Interest: China, India, and the United States in the New Global Order,” International Studies Association, <http://web.isanet.org/Web/Conferences/AP%20Hong%20Kong%202016/Archive/5b29eb13-ed65-4176-82b1-7e59f5258d80.pdf> (accessed July 20, 2016)

According to liberal theory, economic interdependence reduces conflict through three mechanisms: opportunity costs, international institutions, and domestic interests. Richard Rosecrance provides the classic explanation for opportunity costs. In The Rise of the Trading State, he argues that as the benefits from trade grow, the costs of wars that disrupt trade increase, deterring states from precipitating conflict.9 Integration with international financial markets has also been found to be associated with less conflict.10 Liberal theorists, who concede the possibility that international economic interdependence may produce conflict as well as peace, underscore the importance of international institutions that enhance and sustain economic openness and mitigate conflict.11 These institutions promote peaceful international adjustments by providing a forum for negotiation and dispute resolution, monitoring and disseminating information about international actors, enabling information exchanges that reduce possibilities for miscalculating resolve, and creating a third party authorities that can enforce regulatory decisions. 12 Scholars have also noted that economic interdependence and international institutions can give rise to powerful interests in both state and society that wish to avoid conflict and protect the gains that they have acquired through interdependence.13

### Impact—Chinese Capitalism Increases Oil Prices

#### Chinese capitalism has driven oil demand which keeps global oil prices high

[Michael Lynch](http://www.forbes.com/sites/michaellynch/) , Contributor to Forbes—analyzes petroleum economics and energy policy, January 6, 2016, “Why China Matters For World Oil Markets,” Forbes, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/michaellynch/2016/01/06/why-china-matters-for-world-oil-markets/#65723de637e8> (accessed July 19, 2016)

The current stock market meltdown in Shanghai has dominated the economic news of late, and in oil markets, is probably overshadowing the dust-up between Saudi Arabia and Iran (at least for now). This is hardly surprising given that, in terms of oil markets, “that’s where the demand is” (to paraphrase Willie Sutton; look it up). Indeed, for most of the past decade, rising oil consumption in China has boosted oil prices—and expectations for long-term oil prices. Numbers tell a clear, but partial, story. Chinese oil demand is now the second largest in the world, trailing only the US, but the growth in demand has dominated the market for some time. Rapid economic growth has been a factor, in part as economic activity drives energy consumption, but also as rising incomes mean increasing automobile ownership. As the figure below shows, Chinese oil demand growth has been rapid and amounted to a large portion of incremental global oil demand.

### Impact—Chinese Cap Solves Poverty

#### Despite problems with Chinese capitalism—Chinese citizens overwhelmingly support capitalism

Katie Simmons, Associate Director of Research at the Pew Research Center, October 10, 2014, “China’s government may be communist, but its people embrace capitalism,” Pew Research, <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/10/10/chinas-government-may-be-communist-but-its-people-embrace-capitalism/> (accessed July 21, 2016)

While China’s government may be officially communist, the Chinese people express widespread support for capitalism. Roughly three-quarters of the Chinese (76%) agree that most people are better off in a free market economy. And since 2002, the Chinese have consistently been one of the strongest proponents of capitalism compared with other publics around the world, even more so than Americans and Western Europeans. The past 30 years have brought enormous changes to the Chinese economy. In the late 1970s, the government started opening the economy to foreign investment and privatization. With these changes came sky-high economic growth – an average of 10% since 1980. And on Wednesday, the [International Monetary Fund (IMF)](http://www.businessinsider.com/china-overtakes-us-as-worlds-largest-economy-2014-10)released figures estimating that China is now the biggest economy in the world, surpassing the United States, though this achievement is up for [debate](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2014-10-08/hold-on-china-u-s-still-world-s-top-economy-by-main-benchmark.html). China’s incredible economic expansion has led the Chinese to be overwhelmingly happy with their economic situation and optimistic about their future, according to a 2014 [survey](http://www.pewglobal.org/2014/09/09/global-public-downbeat-about-economy/) conducted there by the Pew Research Center. But our polling has also shown an undercurrent of [unease](http://www.pewglobal.org/2013/10/23/chinese-unease-growing-at-flip-side-of-progress/) with conditions in China today, as many complain about inflation, inequality and corruption.

### Impact—Chinese Cap Props Global Econ

#### Chinese capitalism helps prop the global economy

Ciaran McEvoy, Staff writer for Investors.com, April 15, 2016, “China Stimulus May Prop Up Global Economy, But For How Long?,” <http://www.investors.com/news/economy/chinas-q1-gdp-gain-should-give-boost-but-for-how-long/> (accessed July 21, 2016)

Meanwhile, U.S. and other global stock markets have rallied strongly from early February lows. Crude prices have moved back above $40 a barrel, along with big gains in iron ore and steel prices. That's bolstered commodities-sensitive industries. "The indirect price effect is the most important channel through which Chinese growth affects the U.S.," according to William Adams, senior international economist at PNC Financial Services. But questions remain about China, Adams said. In Q1, the three major sectors of the economy -- agriculture, industrial and services -- decelerated from Q4 more than the aggregate growth rate. Retail sales grew 10.5% in March, picking up from 10.2% in February, but China includes government purchases in that number, making it somewhat unclear if actual consumer spending is accelerating. Meanwhile, government measures bolstered China's flagging real estate sector, which had been hampered by a glut of development. Investment in fixed assets such as factories and buildings grew 10.7% in Q1, better than expected. Cement production climbed 24% last month compared to a year earlier. Crude steel production gained 2.9% in March compared to the 5.7% decline during January and February. But private firms' investment rose just 5.7% vs. 23.3% for state-owned businesses. China's state-owned enterprises tend to be less efficient than the country's dynamic private sector. Social financing, which includes bank and nonbank lending, soared to a record high in the first quarter, raising concerns that China has been throwing money at the problem. Still, after a bumpy start to the year, China's policymakers have engineered a soft landing, steadied the yuan and slowed capital outflows. "Chinese fiscal stimulus has cushioned the first quarter slowdown and has reduced the downside risks to near-term global growth," Adams said. The world's No. 2 economy is in a well-publicized and long-term transition from an industrial, export-based economy to one led by services and domestic demand. The Chinese consumer's share of GDP rose two points year over year to 56.9%, but that remains far below U.S. numbers.

#### Chinese capitalism is pushing them into the top economic spot globally

[Mike Patton](http://www.forbes.com/sites/mikepatton/), Staff writer for Forbes writing about the economy, investing, and financial planning, April 29, 2016, “China's Economy Will Overtake The U.S. In 2018,” Forbes, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/mikepatton/2016/04/29/global-economic-news-china-will-surpass-the-u-s-in-2018/#79bd9e24474b> (accessed July 22, 2016)

Each country measures economic growth by its gross domestic product or GDP. Negative or positive GDP indicates whether the economy is contracting or expanding. When you combine the total economic output of each country, the result is global GDP. In this article, we will reveal how America’s contribution to global GDP has been falling while China’s has been rising. The Conference Board estimates that by 2018, China’s contribution to global GDP will surpass that of the U.S. In other words, China’s economy will become more significant than America’s. How is this possible? Is the golden era of “Made in America” in our rearview mirror? Is China entering a modern-day economic dynasty? To find the answer, we will examine the period beginning in 1970 and the forecast through 2025.

### A/T “Chinese Cap Same as Western Cap”

#### Chinese capitalism is not the same as western capitalism—influenced by core Chinese national identity and culture

Wei Zhao, Associate Professor of International Management, ESSCA School of Management, June 10, 2015, “What is capitalism with Chinese characteristics? Perspective on State, market, and society,” PDF online, (accessed July 21, 2016)

The real characteristic of Chinese capitalism is the sustaining Chinese life-world, which is not, and never embodies, the spirit of capitalism as Weber defined. Life-world, a term that Habermas adapts from Alfred Schutz, refers to all sorts of assumptions about who we are as a group of people and what we value about ourselves: what we believe, what shocks and offends us, what we aspire to, what we desire, what we are willing to sacrifice to which ends, and so forth. Most of these assumptions are latent in Parsons’s sense of latency. Their legitimacy or power is their “of course” or “taken for granted” quality. Questions about the life-world can only be answered by some version of “because that’s who I am and who we are”. Sharing a common sense in a life-world integrates people in a society. The social action of fulfilling these common value commitments in everyday life reaffirms the fundamental social legitimacy and latently maintains the integration of a society. In terms of social action, the Western capitalism and the current Chinese capitalism may look like each other in many aspects: both involve rational economic actors; both have pecuniary objectives; both search for efficient and practical means; and both are in situations of similar capitalist institutional forms, such as market transaction, free competition, private business, and permission for seeking profits, etc. But they are still fundamentally different in terms of norms and values, and most apparently in terms of cultural rituals. In fact, the Chinese capitalism not only keeps very well its traditional cultural forms of social action, such as the emphasis on “face”, “relationship”, and “human sentiment”, etc., but also sustains or even reinforces its core value system of pragmatism and utilitarianism, i.e., the spirit of Chinese life-world. The reason of such difference in spirit of capitalism is because, different from the indigenous ethical and religious root of capitalism in the West, the Chinese capitalism begun with the State’s political adoption and implementation of a series of institutions around market economy from outside and above. Facing on this new conditional situation, the Chinese, very much in line with their traditions of authority-and-order respect and superficial adoption of exogenous elements, pragmatically amplified and catalyzed the essential spirit of their life-world, i.e., the pragmatism. Though China’s capitalist institutions are Western-style, the resulted spirit is always Chinese by nature.

### A/T “Chinese Cap Destroys the Environment”

#### Chinese capitalism is reflexive, it’s fixing any environmental problems it might cause

Bjorn Carey, Staff writer for Stanford News Service, June 16, 2016, “China’s environmental conservation efforts are making a positive impact, Stanford scientists say,” Stanford News Service, <http://news.stanford.edu/2016/06/16/chinas-environmental-conservation-efforts-making-positive-impact-stanford-scientists-say/> (accessed July 21, 2016)

A series of ambitious environmental policies that invest in natural capital are improving services provided by China's ecosystems, such as flood control and sand storm mitigation, according to research conducted by an international team of scientists. China gets a bad rap on its environmental stewardship, in large part due to the environmental damage and atmospheric pollution that result from the country’s rapid economic and infrastructure growth. But a new decade-long report, involving the work of 3,000 scientists, reveals that China’s environmental policies are making clear positive impacts. “China has gone further than any other country, as strange as that sounds given all the devastation that we read about on the environment front there,” said [Gretchen Daily](https://profiles.stanford.edu/gretchen-daily), the Bing Professor of Environmental Science at Stanford and senior author on the study. “In the face of deepening environmental crisis, China has become very ambitious and innovative in its new conservation science and policies and has implemented them on a breathtaking scale.”

### A/T “Chinese Cap Bad for Workers”

#### Chinese capitalism is slowly improving worker conditions

Linda van der Horst, Master’s degree in Modern Chinese Studies from the University of Oxford. J.D. and is currently a journalism fellow at the Munk School of Global Affairs, November 14, 2015, “Wal-Mart Uprising: The Battle for Labor Rights in China,” The Diplomat, http://thediplomat.com/2015/11/wal-mart-uprising-the-battle-for-labor-rights-in-china/ (accessed July 21, 2016)

Wal-Mart may not care much about the China activists, says Anita Chan, a scholar on China’s labor issues and Wal-Mart’s in particular, but it “may have a wider impact within China.” Through the Staff Association, workers across China’s stores are following the developments at store 1059 in Shenzhen. Successful experiences are quickly shared among workers on social media, especially within organizations such as Zhang Jun’s. Although the labor movement is still in its infancy, says Chan, “in a little over a decade, starting with scant awareness of labor rights and trade unionism as a vehicle for change, workers’ consciousness of the importance of collective representation in the form of democratically elected trade unionism is emerging.” Zhang, the Staff Association founder, is hopeful: “Our cooperation can bring about extraordinary history, which is achieved through an accumulation of small things brought about by ordinary people like us.”

## Capitalism Bad

### Link—Economic Engagement

#### Diplomatic engagement with China is a guise for opening new economic markets

Tim Truman, Press operator for the International Trade Administration, 2016, “Economic Engagement with China Brings Benefits to U.S. Businesses,” Trade.gov, <http://trade.gov/press/publications/newsletters/ita_1208/jcct_1208.asp> (accessed July 21, 2016)

The U.S.–China Strategic Economic Dialogue (SED) is another important mechanism that guides the long-term development of the U.S.–China economic relationship. In 2006, presidents George W. Bush and Hu Jintao established the SED as a framework to address issues of mutual concern. The SED takes a long-term and strategic look at the economic relationship, while the JCCT focuses on specific trade issues. The SED has helped establish the 10-year Energy and Environment Cooperation Framework and has increased transparency in publishing trade-related rules and regulations. The fifth SED took place on December 4–5, 2008, in Beijing, and it focused on balanced growth, energy and environmental protection, challenges to trade, and investment. “Through the JCCT and SED, we continue to work with our Chinese counterparts to ensure we both pursue policies of openness that have helped drive our growth,” Gutierrez said. “I believe that in such an economic environment U.S. firms would welcome the opportunity to do even more business in—and with—China, thus expanding consumer choices and driving growth and job creation. This would be to the mutual advantage of both the United States and China.”

### Link—Bilateral Investment Treaty (BIT)

#### BIT agreement with China is done to prop the capitalist order and US economy

David Dayen, Contributing writer to [Salon.com](http://www.salon.com/), March 18, 2016, “The Job-Killing Trade Deal You’ve Never Heard Of: The China Bilateral Investment Treaty,” Prospect.org,http://prospect.org/article/job-killing-trade-deal-you%E2%80%99ve-never-heard-china-bilateral-investment-treaty (July 20, 2016)

The U.S. has implemented 41 BITs over the years, as well as investment chapters in a dozen free-trade agreements. But the U.S. already attracts more foreign direct investment than any country in the world, with $168 billion flowing in just in 2012. That includes investments from countries that until now have lacked the protections of a BIT, like China. “It’s pitched as a way to promote investment,” said Celeste Drake, trade and globalization policy specialist at the AFL-CIO. “We’re one of the top countries for foreign investment anyway. We don’t need to give away rights for foreign investors.” Few investors have the capital to undertake and manage businesses overseas. Invariably, large multinational corporations, or investment vehicles like hedge funds and private equity firms, engage in foreign direct investment. And a BIT offers them the ability to lock in profits while neutralizing the risks that go along with investing abroad.

### Link—Bilateral Investment Treaty (BIT)

#### US grand strategy towards China is designed to facilitate a transition to capitalism to prop the US economy

[Kenneth Rapoza](http://www.forbes.com/sites/kenrapoza/), Contributing staff writer for Forbes, July 10, 2014, “China Says U.S. Investment Treaty On 'Fast Track',” Forbes, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/kenrapoza/2014/07/10/china-says-u-s-investment-treaty-on-fast-track/#133a0df84930> (accessed July 20, 2016)

Washington is hoping that China remembers 2001, when the U.S. promoted China’s membership in the World Trade Organization. The U.S. clearly wants China to play by market rules, which would require China to be more liberal with its currency. It would also require China to do away with state subsidies to certain industries. For example, subsidies to China solar companies have hurt American competitors. In Massachusetts, Evergreen Solar closed its factory and moved to China in 2011, laying off 800 workers. “On paper and in theory, both countries agree that a level playing field and open markets are the way to go. But in reality, we have seen that even with China’s ascension into the WTO, China did not reduce subsidies, which distorts that playing field,” says Usha V. Haaley, author of the book [Subsidies to Chinese Industry: State Capitalism, Business Strategy and Trade Policy](http://www.chinasubsidies.com/) and a professor at West Virginia University. “State subsidies have transformed Chinese industries like steel, glass, paper, auto parts and solar into some of the leaders in the world. The policy makers in the U.S. have to understand where the money is coming from and that will be very murky.” For its part, China has gingerly opened its markets through the use of pilot free trade zones, most recently in Shanghai. China is unlikely to move quickly from a state-controlled communist government, to a capitalist one. But in the meantime, U.S. industry is behind a bilateral investment treaty in hopes it can take part in that transition.

### Link—South China Sea

#### US/ China SCS dispute is all economic—resource competition forces nations to politically and militarily compete

Max Fisher, Staff writer for the New York Times, July 14, 2016, “The South China Sea: Explaining the Dispute,” NY Times, <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/15/world/asia/south-china-sea-dispute-arbitration-explained.html?_r=0> (accessed July 21, 2016)

5. Why does it matter who controls those trade routes? This gets to a core contradiction in the South China Sea dispute: It is driven by territorial competition, yet all countries involved want open sea routes. Everyone benefits from the free flow of goods between Asia and the rest of the world, and everyone suffers if that is disrupted. This is part of why the United States stresses freedom of movement in international waters. While it is very unlikely that China would ever want to close off trade, the United States would still rather not allow Beijing even the ability to hold the global economy hostage. But, from China’s perspective, the United States itself has that ability, because of American naval dominance; the Chinese also suspect that the global status quo is engineered to serve Western interests first. So it is hardly surprising that China is seeking greater control over waterways it relies on for economic survival. This is a dynamic that has permeated Sino-American relations throughout China’s rise over the past two decades. In theory, both nations understand they are better off cooperating. But in practice, they often treat each other as competitors or potential threats — a cycle that is difficult to break. 6. So this is about China’s rise? In some ways, yes. China sees itself as a growing power that has a right to further its interests in its own backyard, just as Western powers have done for centuries. Beijing considers the South China Sea an area of traditional Chinese influence, and sees its control as a way to assert greater power over the region. Something Americans often miss is that for China, this is in part defensive. The history of Western imperialism looms large. Chinese leaders [often distrust](https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/2012-08-16/how-china-sees-america) the United States’ intentions, and consider their country to be the far weaker party. Extending Chinese control is a way to stave off perceived threats. This insecurity also contributes to Chinese skepticism of international institutions such as the South China Sea tribunal, which Chinese state media [portray](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2016/07/11/china-believes-it-is-the-real-victim-in-the-south-china-sea-dispute/?postshare=7691468243638648&tid=ss_tw) as a plot to weaken China. 7. Why is the United States so involved in this? The United States has a treaty obligation to the Philippines, an ally. As the world’s largest economy, it also has a real interest in maintaining open sea lanes — and, as the world’s biggest naval power, it often assumes the role of policing them. Plus, as the world’s only superpower, the United States often acts as a balancer in regional disputes. But this is also, for Washington, about shaping what sort of major power China becomes. American officials insist that they do not oppose China’s rise. Their concern is whether China will [work within](https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/asia/2008-01-01/rise-china-and-future-west) what scholars call the [liberal order](https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2011-05-01/future-liberal-world-order) — the postwar system of international laws and institutions — or seek to overturn it. The South China Sea, and particularly this week’s ruling, are a test case for whether China becomes the kind of power that works within that system, or against it. While that order has helped [promote](http://www.vox.com/2014/11/24/7272929/charts-thankful) peace and prosperity globally, it also undeniably serves American interests.

### Link—South China Sea

#### US’ interest in the SCS is economic—they won’t let China control trade routes key to propping capitalism

Bonnie S. Glaser, Senior Advisor for Asia, Center for Strategic and International Studies, April 2012, “Armed Clash in the South China Sea,” Council on Foreign, <http://www.cfr.org/asia-and-pacific/armed-clash-south-china-sea/p27883> (accessed July 21, 2016)

The United States has significant political, security, and economic interests at stake if one of the contingencies should occur. Global rules and norms. The United States has important interests in the peaceful resolution of South China Sea disputes according to international law. With the exception of China, all the claimants of the South China Sea have attempted to justify their claims based on their coastlines and the provisions of UNCLOS. China, however, relies on a mix of historic rights and legal claims, while remaining deliberately ambiguous about the meaning of the "nine-dashed line" around the sea that is drawn on Chinese maps. Failure to uphold international law and norms could harm U.S. interests elsewhere in the region and beyond. Ensuring freedom of navigation is another critical interest of the United States and other regional states. Although China claims that it supports freedom of navigation, its insistence that foreign militaries seek advance permission to sail in its two-hundred-mile EEZ casts doubt on its stance. China's development of capabilities to deny American naval access to those waters in a conflict provides evidence of possible Chinese intentions to block freedom of navigation in specific contingencies. Alliance security and regional stability. U.S. allies and friends around the South China Sea look to the United States to maintain free trade, safe and secure sea lines of communication (SLOCs), and overall peace and stability in the region. Claimants and non claimants to land features and maritime waters in the South China Sea view the U.S. military presence as necessary to allow decision-making free of intimidation. If nations in the South China Sea lose confidence in the United States to serve as the principal regional security guarantor, they could embark on costly and potentially destabilizing arms buildups to compensate or, alternatively, become more accommodating to the demands of a powerful China. Neither would be in the U.S. interest. Failure to reassure allies of U.S. commitments in the region could also undermine U.S. security guarantees in the broader Asia-Pacific region, especially with Japan and South Korea. At the same time, however, the United States must avoid getting drawn into the territorial dispute—and possibly into a conflict—by regional nations who seek U.S. backing to legitimize their claims. Economic interests. Each year, $5.3 trillion of trade passes through the South China Sea; U.S. trade accounts for $1.2 trillion of this total. Should a crisis occur, the diversion of cargo ships to other routes would harm regional economies as a result of an increase in insurance rates and longer transits. Conflict of any scale in the South China Sea would hamper the claimants from benefiting from the South China's Sea's proven and potential riches.

### Link—China Containment

#### The plan uses engagement as a means to peacefully contain China—this is a way to protect the US’ economic dominance

[Michael Schuman](http://business.time.com/author/michaeljschuman/), writes about Asia and global economic issues as a correspondent for TIME in Beijing, China, June 07, 2011, “Why do we fear a rising China?,” Time Magazine, <http://business.time.com/2011/06/07/why-do-we-fear-a-rising-china/> (accessed July 20, 2016)

That may be part of the story today with China as well. But the issues are far more complex than that. In the West, Europeans and Americans have dominated the world scene for so many centuries that they’re uncomfortable with the notion of someone else claiming the throne of global hegemony. The concern Americans had with Japan back in the day was that the Japanese were competitors in the global economy, not partners. The fear was that Japan was trying to undermine American dominance, at least in the realm of business. Even beyond that, Japan was winning with an economic system that challenged American ideals of free markets and free enterprise. For many, the rise of Japan seemed to have something sinister behind it – a competing and unfamiliar economic, corporate and cultural system that was producing superior results to those of the West, and appeared to have only its own interests at heart. The challenge from Japan was not just economic, but ideological. The reasons many fear China today are very similar. China, too, uses a competing economic model – “state capitalism” – that challenges the economic ideology of the West. In many ways, China also behaves in a mercantilist fashion, which gives the impression it cares little about anyone else. It keeps its currency controlled so its exports can out-compete those from other countries, and it grabs natural resources for itself wherever and whenever it can. Often state-controlled companies are doing the grabbing, making China seem like a threatening monolithic juggernaut. Worst of all, the political ideology behind China’s economic ascent completely counters Western ideals about democracy and human rights. China is not just competing with the U.S. in world markets, but offering up an entirely different economic and political system, one that at times seems better at creating growth and jobs, even as it restricts much-cherished civil liberties. China is succeeding based on ideas that Americans despise.

### Link—Cyber Security

#### Cooperating with China to prevent cyber-attacks is rooted in a desire to protect the US economy

[Peter Navarro](http://www.theglobalist.com/author/pnavarro/), Peter Navarro is a professor of Economics and Public Policy at The Paul Merage School of Business, University of California-Irvine, May 30, 2016, “China’s State-Sponsored Cyber Attacks Must Stop,” The Globalist, <http://www.theglobalist.com/china-united-states-cyber-crime-politics/> (accessed July 19, 2016)

For all the talk about terrorism on the campaign trail, cyber security issues in one form or another are likely to be prominent in the 2016 presidential election. State-sponsored cyber espionage inflicts significant damage on the American economy. And just which nation is most actively engaged against the United States? According to the [Commission on the Theft of American Intellectual Property](http://www.ipcommission.org/report/ip_commission_report_052213.pdf), America’s largest trading partner – China – accounts for as much as 70% of the losses the United States incurs. What American citizens should find most disturbing about China’s role in what amounts to a global IP theft ring is the outsized role its government plays. A [watershed report](http://intelreport.mandiant.com/) by Mandiant reveals a military force of more than 100,000 cyber spies under the firm control of the People’s Liberation Army and under the clear direction of the Chinese Communist Party. This state-sponsored cyber theft bureaucracy exists despite repeated denials by top government officials that China is even involved in such activities. Stealing blueprints of American businesses While the military may run China’s cyber espionage programs, the People’s Liberation Army nonetheless works hand-in-glove with civilian bureaucrats in charge of advancing China’s industrial policy goals. On any given day, China’s military and civilian hackers seek to steal the obligatory blueprints and proprietary manufacturing processes of American businesses large and small. China’s cyber spies will also vacuum up everything from emails, contact lists, and test results to pricing information and partnership agreements. Sometimes such acts of IP theft can destroy most or all of the value of individual companies. A case in point noted by the IP Commission is American Superconductor: When it “had its wind-energy software code stolen by a major customer in China, it lost not only that customer, but also 90% of its stock value.”

### Link—Intellectual Property

#### Protecting intellectual property from Chinese incursion is an attempt to preserve and grow the US economy

[Michele Nash-Hoff](http://www.industryweek.com/author/michele-nash-hoff), President of ElectroFab Sales, February 9, 2016, “What Could be Done about China's Theft of Intellectual Property?,” Industry Week, <http://www.industryweek.com/intellectual-property/what-could-be-done-about-chinas-theft-intellectual-property> (accessed July 21, 2016)

In researching this topic, I found out that the bipartisan Commission on the Theft of American Intellectual Property of the U.S. International Trade Commission released a [report](http://www.ipcommission.org/report/IP_Commission_Report_052213.pdf) in May 2013. Dennis C. Blair, former director of National Intelligence and commander in chief of the U.S. Pacific Command, and Jon M. Huntsman, Jr., former ambassador to China, governor of Utah, and Deputy U.S. Trade Representative, were the co-chairs of the commission. The day after the release, Forbes published an [article](http://www.forbes.com/sites/emmawoollacott/2013/05/23/us-should-get-tough-on-chinese-ip-theft-committee-warns/#471a011def04) about the report, stating that "China accounts for at least half – and maybe as much as 80% – of U.S. intellectual property theft." The article briefly discussed the problem of China's intellectual property theft and included quotes from the co-chairs, but did not go into any detail about the recommendations of the commission. The article did provide the link to the 100-page report, which I have since read. In view of the continuing problem, it is time to reconsider the key findings of the report, titled, "The Impact of International IP Theft on the American Economy": ”Hundreds of billions of dollars per year. The annual losses are likely to be comparable to the current annual level of U.S. exports to Asia—over $300 billion...” Millions of jobs. If IP were to receive the same protection overseas that it does here, the American economy would add millions of jobs. A drag on U.S. GDP growth. Better protection of IP would encourage significantly more R&D investment and economic growth. Innovation. The incentive to innovate drives productivity growth and the advancements that improve the quality of life. The threat of IP theft diminishes that incentive. The report stated, “A core component of China’s successful growth strategy is acquiring science and technology. It does this in part by legal means—imports, foreign domestic investment, licensing, and joint ventures—but also by means that are illegal. National industrial policy goals in China encourage IP theft, and an extraordinary number of Chinese in business and government entities are engaged in this practice.”

### Impact—Chinese Cap Destroys Environment

#### Chinese style capitalism destroys the environment

Richard Smith, PhD and ecological historian at the Institute for Policy Research & Development, London, 2013, “Capitalism and the destruction of life on Earth: Six theses on saving the humans,” Insitute for Policy Research & Development, <http://www.paecon.net/PAEReview/issue64/Smith64.pdf> (accessed July 21, 2016)

China’s capitalist environmental nightmare As Beijing has been choking on smog this year, Deutsche Bank analysts gloomily conclude that, barring extreme reforms, Chinese coal consumption and increased car ownership will push pollution (http://chinadigitaltimes.net/china/pollution/) levels 70% higher by 2025. They say that even if China’s economy slowed to 5% growth each year, its annual coal consumption would still rise to 6 billion tons (5.4 tonnes) by 2022, from the current 3.8 billion tons. Car ownership is expected to increase over the years to 400 million in 2030 from the current 90 million. With those two figures, it will be very difficult for the government to reduce the national average of PM2.5, or air pollution that is small enough to enter the bloodstream. The current national average is 75 micrograms per cubic meter. In January, PM2.5 levels in Beijing reached 900 micrograms per cubic meter. Already, as resource analyst Michael Klare reviews in his latest book The Race for What’s Left, around the world existing reserves of oil, minerals and other resources “are being depleted at a terrifying pace and will be largely exhausted in the not-too-distant future.” This is driving miners and drillers to the ends of the earth, the bottom of oceans, to the arctic. We’re running out of planet to plunder so fast that serious people like Google’s Larry Page and Eric Schmidt have partnered with film director James Cameron to make life imitate art, to explore the possibility of mining asteroids and near planets. Avatar – the perfect capitalist solution to resource exhaustion (but the Marines will be Chinese). 28

### Impact—Chinese Cap Destroys Environment

#### Chinese style capitalism encourages massive overconsumption destroying the environment

[Devon G. Peña](http://www.alternet.org/authors/devon-g-pena), Staff writer for Alter Net, September 24, 2012, “Why Capitalism, Not Population Is Our Greatest Environmental Threat,” Alter Net,http://www.alternet.org/environment/why-capitalism-not-population-our-greatest-environmental-threat (accessed July 20, 2016)

They are not entirely correct in pointing out that: “Media coverage of the problem is sorely lacking.” Coverage of global climate change, the ozone hole, massive extinctions and threats to biodiversity appear to be a major source of headlines in all media all the time. It has even reached an over-saturation point that turns many of our potential allies off, especially since the ecological doomsayers too often resort to unproven or even embarrassing hyperbolic claims that allow misinformed skeptics to continue challenging the basic scientific truths about climate change, biodiversity extinctions, and the collapse of more resilient human-ecological couplings. In 2008, I received an email from the GPSO inviting other “authoritative” scientific voices to join their call. This campaign is highly problematic and is basically a rehashing of the same arguments that the neo-Malthusians like the Ehrlichs have been making since the 1960s. First, a summary of key aspects of the GPSO campaign. The authors of the letter are correct to argue that our global ecological plight continues to worsen. The letter cites a recent World Wildlife Fund (WWF) Living Planet Report suggesting that in “a moderate business-as-usual scenario…exhaustion of ecological assets and large-scale ecosystem collapse become increasingly likely.” I especially take exception to the next part of their argument: “Particularly underreported is the fundamental link between the size and growth of the human population and environmental degradation. It is no comfort that the rate of global population growth has slowed in recent years...” The GPSO website and project emphasizes the idea that the greatest threat to our planet is overpopulation. I disagree and insist that the greatest threat to our planet is capitalism and more specifically the globalization of capitalism as the singular economic model embraced by all nations including India and China. Why am I reframing the threat as capitalism instead of overpopulation? I have many reasons but present five here to provoke further reflection and discussion. (1) History of Overpopulation Discourse. I wish to start with a brief history of the overpopulation discourse and present an interesting historical example to illustrate the problematic nature of the reductionist claims made by GPSO. The overpopulation thesis was really first put on the discursive map by Thomas Malthus, an English philosopher, mathematician, and heir of a prosperous family from Surrey. He published the first edition of “An Essay on the Principle of Population” in 1798. What became the Malthusian thesis is simple if inelegant: While population growth expands geometrically, our food supply expands arithmetically. Thus, population growth overtakes the growth of our food supply resulting in mass famine and starvation. A corollary of his argument was that the growth of population was also the principal cause of poverty. Paul and Anne Ehrlich in The Population Bomb were proponents of this view. The Ehrlichs’ basic argument was that the principal cause of environmental degradation is overpopulation. It appears that this argument is still embraced by the majority of Western natural scientists as is evident not just from a review of the signature list endorsing the GPSO letter but from any review of the scientific literature on population and the environment. Indeed, at the University of Washington our own celebrated Program on the Environment (PoE) often includes syllabi and lectures that uncritically emphasize the orthodoxy of overpopulation as the key factor underlying ecological degradation and the crises of species extinctions and climate change. The vital issue of consumption the Ehrlichs ignored in the 1968 book is indeed taken up in the GPSO letter, which acknowledges that consumption is also part of the problem. The inclusion of the issue of consumption may have largely been a result of decades of solid criticism by anthropologists and Marxist scholars studying consumption. It is becoming clear that the “population” problem is largely a “consumption” problem. One of the most significant events in this recasting was the realization in the early 1980s that the average American consumed as many natural resources as 1000 average inhabitants of India. It was also realized that the average American produced as much waste (including the all important carbon footprint) as 2500 Indians! Americans were consuming much more and they were also producing more waste. Of course, today the situation is a bit different with the growth of industrial capitalism in India and China and yet, even today, the ratios are still approximately 1:300 (US compared to India) and 1:500 compared to China.

### Impact—Chinese Cap Destroys Democracy

#### Chinese capitalism is strangling hopes of Chinese democracy

Robert B. Reich, Former U.S. secretary of labor, professor of public policy at the University of California, Berkeley, October 12, 2009, “[How Capitalism Is Killing Democracy](http://foreignpolicy.com/2009/10/12/how-capitalism-is-killing-democracy/),” Foreign Policy, <http://foreignpolicy.com/2009/10/12/how-capitalism-is-killing-democracy/> (accessed July 20, 2016)

On the other end of the political spectrum sits China, which is surging toward capitalism without democracy at all. That’s good news for people who invest in China, but the social consequences for the country’s citizens are mounting. Income inequality has widened enormously. China’s new business elites live in McMansions inside gated suburban communities and send their children to study overseas. At the same time, China’s cities are bursting with peasants from the countryside who have sunk into urban poverty and unemployment. And those who are affected most have little political recourse to change the situation, beyond riots that are routinely put down by force. But citizens living in democratic nations aren’t similarly constrained. They have the ability to alter the rules of the game so that the cost to society need not be so great. And yet, we’ve increasingly left those responsibilities to the private sector — to the companies themselves and their squadrons of lobbyists and public-relations experts — pretending as if some inherent morality or corporate good citizenship will compel them to look out for the greater good. But they have no responsibility to address inequality or protect the environment on their own. We forget that they are simply duty bound to protect the bottom line. Why has capitalism succeeded while democracy has steadily weakened? Democracy has become enfeebled largely because companies, in intensifying competition for global consumers and investors, have invested ever greater sums in lobbying, public relations, and even bribes and kickbacks, seeking laws that give them a competitive advantage over their rivals. The result is an arms race for political influence that is drowning out the voices of average citizens. In the United States, for example, the fights that preoccupy Congress, those that consume weeks or months of congressional staff time, are typically contests between competing companies or industries.

### Impact—Cap Emboldens China Regime

#### Capitalism hasn’t moderated Chinese behavior, it enriches and emboldens the tyrannical regime

Frank Langfitt, National Public Radio's London correspondent, November 7, 2014, “Capitalism Is Making China Richer, But Not Democratic,” NPR, <http://www.npr.org/sections/parallels/2014/11/07/362284553/capitalism-is-making-china-richer-but-not-democratic>, (accessed July 21, 2016)

[One popular U.S. columnist](http://www.nytimes.com/2004/06/02/opinion/the-tiananmen-victory.html) argued that as Chinese enjoyed greater and greater consumer choices — such as various types of coffee at Starbucks — a desire for political choice would follow. After meeting with then-premier Wen Jiabao in 2005, then-U.K. Prime Minister Tony Blair told reporters China was heading towards a more open political system. "The whole basis of the discussion I have had in a country that is developing very fast — where 100 million people now use the Internet, and which is going to be the second-largest economy in the world — is that there is an unstoppable momentum toward greater political freedom," [Blair told reporters in Beijing, according to Bloomberg News](http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=newsarchive&sid=adzFsZxMhbLI&refer=uk). But Mann says capitalism had the opposite effect. "It resulted in a rich, authoritarian regime, which is not what we were looking for in the first place, and which is more of a problem to deal with," he says. China has poured some of its riches into naval power and is now tangling with Japan and the Philippines, close American allies, over disputed islands. China claims most of the vast South China Sea as its own, despite the protests of various neighbors. Mann says American policymakers thought China would follow the path of other East Asian dictatorships, such as Taiwan and South Korea, which democratized in the 1980s. Those countries, however, relied on the U.S. for their defense, which Washington used as political leverage.

### Impact—Cap Destroys Environment

#### Capitalism drives all the exacerbating factors that are destroying the environment

[Jennifer Lawrence](http://muse.jhu.edu.libproxy.utdallas.edu/results?searchtype=regular&filtered_content=author&search_term=%22Jennifer%20Lawrence%22), Researcher at Tarrant County College, February 2015, “[Globalization and the Environment by Peter Christoff and Robyn Eckersley (review)](http://muse.jhu.edu.libproxy.utdallas.edu/article/566497),” Tarrant County College, [Global Environmental Politics](http://muse.jhu.edu.libproxy.utdallas.edu/journal/219) [Volume 15, Number 1, February 2015](http://muse.jhu.edu.libproxy.utdallas.edu/issue/31330), (accessed July 21, 2016)

Perhaps the greatest contribution of the book is its fresh take on environmental crisis, a topic that has been a predominant feature of environmental and social theory. Rather than indicting globalization as the sole contributor to environmental degradation, the authors argue that a crisis of accountability runs throughout the body politic, aiding the degeneracy of governance and the environment. Apathy among individuals striving for a better life, irresponsibility of those elected to govern, and corporate insistence of profit over people have all coalesced into a crisis that is expressed through ecological turmoil. This manufactured crisis is most sharply expressed through climate change and biodiversity loss. Climate change is a revelation of a long history of injustice and unequal burdens, a competition for resources, and a struggle for fair and effective governance. In much the same way, biodiversity loss results from ecological imperialism. Both case studies similarly expose modernization/industrialization/globalization—used, apparently, by the authors as code-words for capitalism—as the self-destructive yet resilient perpetrators of environmental destruction. Readers are meant to understand that the lived experience of crisis manifested through climate change and biodiversity loss necessitates a critical shift in global consciousness and requires a disruption of current modes of governance. Globalization and the Environment does not set out to prescribe an alternative politics that resists the forces of globalization. Nonetheless, the authors weave strands of activism throughout the pages, and they clearly believe that private capital will continue to resist counterhegemonic contestations of current discourses of risk and responsibility and will deter attempts to reform government. Any effort to upend the current system of privatizing gains and socializing costs will likely be thwarted. The crisis of accountability that Globalization and the Environment highlights will oblige extended responsibility: Climate change, biodiversity loss and other forms of global environmental change demand a new, postliberal account of accountability that moves beyond a focus on responsibility for particular events in the context of existing rules and toward a critical understanding of the historical conditions and social structures that systemically produce environmental injustices across space and time (p. 191). Globalization and the Environment is exhaustive in its categorizations, definitions, and illustrations of the ways in which different domains of globalization have produced an array of outcomes—from environmental protection to environmental destruction. This well-researched book provides a sophisticated and nuanced analysis of an enormously complex relationship between globalization and the environment, a relationship that is unfortunately all too often oversimplified. Ultimately, the critical aim of the book—“to expose various forms of power” (p. 29)—is realized. However, the normative task of exploring “how and to what extent the process of modernization and globalization need to be transformed in ways that promote environmental protection and environmental justice” (p. 29) remains elusive in the face of multinational “corpocracy.”

### Impact—Capitalism Masks Human Rights Abuses

#### The more successful China becomes at capitalism, the less likely other nations are to question their human rights abuses

Heriberto Araújo and Juan Pablo Cardenal, Researchers and writers about Chinese political and economic affairs, June 1, 2013, “China’s Economic Empire,” NY Times, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/02/opinion/sunday/chinas-economic-empire.html?_r=0> (accessed July 19, 2016)

Closer economic ties have had political side effects; the Harper administration now seems much more cautious in criticizing China’s human rights record. Given that Canada was until very recently one of the fiercest voices on China’s handling of dissidents, this is not only a remarkable 180-degree turn, but also a clear indication of how China’s economic influence can push the political agenda to the sidelines, even in the West. In Australia, Chinese accumulated investment inflows at the end of 2012 surpassed $50 billion. The trend is striking: Chinese direct investment in Australia in 2012 increased 21 percent from 2011 levels to reach $11.4 billion, making it an important player in Australia’s mining industry. Australia’s trade portfolio remains highly diversified, but the Chinese share is growing rapidly. China has also become the biggest investor in Germany (in terms of the number of deals), surpassing the United States. Chinese companies are looking for companies that, like Putzmeister, have a technological edge and have become world leaders in niche markets. Those takeovers also allow them to absorb Western know-how on branding, marketing, distribution and customer relations. Others are more opportunistic. Faced with recession, struggling European firms like Volvo quickly welcomed Chinese partners who were ready to inject capital and take full control. The loans that Beijing is giving worldwide are even more significant, in dollar terms, than direct foreign investment. These loans include $40 billion to Venezuela and more than $8 billion to Turkmenistan in recent years. China’s policy banks (China Development Bank and Export-Import Bank of China) are the key institutions supporting China’s “Go global” strategy, as they provide billions of dollars in loans to foreign countries to acquire Chinese goods; finance Chinese-built infrastructure; and start projects in the extractive and other industries. This is clearest in countries where the West claims to link its aid to human rights and good business practices. Chinese loans have been crucial in countries like Angola that have faced threats of a cutoff in financing from Western creditors, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. Ecuador, Venezuela, Turkmenistan, Sudan and Iran have all faced such difficulties, and China has stepped in without political or ethical strings attached. Chinese statistics reveal little about these loans, but [a study by The Financial Times](http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/488c60f4-2281-11e0-b6a2-00144feab49a.html#axzz2Uv1TQqzb) showed that, between 2009 and 2010, China was the world’s largest lender, doling out $110 billion, more than the World Bank. It is important to remember what is really behind China’s global economic expansion: the state. China may be moving in the right direction on a number of issues, but when Chinese state-owned companies go abroad and seek to play by rules that emanate from an authoritarian regime, there is grave danger that Western countries will, out of economic need, end up playing by Beijing’s rules. As China becomes a global player and a fierce competitor in American and European markets, its political system and state capitalist ideology pose a threat. It is therefore essential that Western governments stick to what has been the core of Western prosperity: the rule of law, political freedom and fair competition.

### Chinese Capitalism Not Sustainable

#### Internal disputes and lack of cheap labor will inevitably crush Chinese democracy

Minqi Li, Associate Professor in the Department of Economics at the University of Utah, November 5, 2012, “A Dying Model: Chinese Capitalism,” Uyghur Human Rights Project, <http://uhrp.org/featured-articles/dying-model-chinese-capitalism> (accessed July 20, 2016)

China’s economic growth has been based on the intense exploitation of a large cheap labor force, unusually high investment rates, and exports to western markets. As the global capitalist economy struggles with stagnation and crisis, China’s exports will achieve at best sluggish growth in the coming years. Investment has risen to about 50 percent of China’s GDP. [The excess investment](http://thediplomat.com/pacific-money/2012/09/14/how-stimulating-is-chinas-stimulus/) has reduced the rates of return on capital and threatens to undermine China’s financial system as much of the investment [has been financed by bank loans](http://thediplomat.com/2012/09/10/are-chinese-banks-hiding-the-mother-of-all-debt-bombs/)and [other forms of debt](http://thediplomat.com/pacific-money/2012/11/02/chinas-economy-addicted-to-credit/). A more sustainable level investment is probably around 30 percent of GDP. However, to lower the investment by about 20 percent of GDP, household consumption needs to rise by a similar magnitude. Most households depend on wages as their main source of income. Thus, for household consumption to rise by 20 percent of GDP, a large portion of the national income (between 15 and 20 percent of China’s GDP) needs to be redistributed from the capitalists to the workers. This is likely to face strong resistance from China’s capitalist class. In this context, a serious debate has emerged in Chinese society. A growing number of Chinese intellectuals and social activists argue that China needs to rethink its free market-oriented economic reform. Public ownership of the means of production needs to be revived and income and [wealth need to be redistributed](http://thediplomat.com/whats-next-china/china%E2%80%99s-highly-unequal-economy/) from the wealthy to the poor in order to enhance social stability. These intellectuals and activists are known as the “New Left.” Many of them are also known as the “Maoists” as they tend to have a sympathetic perspective on China’s Maoist socialist past. In the early 2000s, the Maoist social base was limited to older state sector workers who suffered the most during the privatization in the 1990s. But in recent years, with rising economic and social inequality, the Maoists have gained support among the urban middle class as well as a newer generation of the Chinese working class. Partly encouraged by the growing influence of Maosim, Bo Xilai attempted a moderate social reform agenda while he was the Party Secretary of the city of Chongqing. Bo Xilai cracked down on organized crimes with connections to the local capitalists, increased investments on social housing, and promoted “simultaneous developments” of state owned and private enterprises (rather than outright privatization as has been practiced in many other parts of China). Therefore, the recent purge of [Bo Xilai is politically significant](http://thediplomat.com/the-editor/2012/10/02/why-bo-had-to-go/). It suggests that the “Communist Party” is determined to push forward with further free market-oriented economic reforms without serious social reform. While such a course might benefit Chinese capitalists in the short run, it is set to further intensify China’s various contradictions and potentially prepare the conditions for a general social explosion in the not very distant future. Historical experience from Brazil, South Korea, and Poland suggested that when a country’s non-agricultural labor force increased to more than 70 percent of the total labor force, the working class was likely to emerge as a powerful political and social force, demanding higher wages, social welfare, and political democracy. China’s non-agricultural labor force currently accounts for about 60 percent of the total labor force and its share has been rising at an annual rate of about 1 percent. At this rate, China’s non-agricultural share of labor force could exceed the critical threshold of 70 percent by around 2020. If China’s current capitalist system fails to accommodate Chinese workers’ demands by then, a general economic and political crisis will be highly likely. Chinese capitalist development has taken place [at the cost of massive environmental degradation](http://thediplomat.com/china-power/social-media-china-and-the-enviornment/). According to the latest[Living Planet Report](http://wwf.panda.org/about_our_earth/all_publications/living_planet_report/2012_lpr/), China’s ecological footprint is already more than twice as much as China’s own bio-capacity. China’s has some of the world’s most polluted cities and about 40 percent of China’s land has already been degraded. According to a report prepared by the “2030 Water Resources Group,” China [could face a water deficit](http://www.mckinsey.com/App_Media/Reports/Water/Charting_Our_Water_Future_Exec%20Summary_001.pdf) that amounts to 25 percent of China’s projected water demand by 2030. Thus, in the next one or two decades, economic, social, and ecological crises are likely to converge in China, leading to the downfall of China’s current capitalist model. How the crises will be resolved will have enormous implications not only for China’s future but also for the entire planet.

## Yuan Deval Bad

### Yuan devaluation harms Trade

#### Yuan devaluation spills over internationally through manufacturing exchange—leads to deflation shock

-Ambrose Evans-Pritchard Staff Writer 7-8-16 World faces deflation shock as China devalues yuan at accelerating pace http://www.telegraph.co.uk/business/2016/07/07/world-faces-deflation-shock-as-china-devalues-at-accelerating-pa/

The surplus has flooded Europe, encouraged by export subsidies, tax breaks, and cheap state credit. Even where the volumes admitted have been modest, the marginal effect has upset the market and led to a price slide. Episodes like this help to explain why global deflation is becoming systemic. China’s growth rate has picked up to 4pc to 4.5pc following the stimulus measures of the last year, based on a proxy gauge created by Capital Economics. There is enough juice in the pipeline to keep the economy rolling along for a few more months: before the latest property boomlet fizzles. The closer we move to this tipping point, the more tense it will become, for China and for the world.

#### Yuan devaluation raids jobs from trade partners—hurts US economy

Chriss Street Staff Writer Breitbart 7-13-16 China’s ‘Predatory’ Devaluation Exporting Deflation http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2016/07/13/china-predatory-devaluation-exporting-deflation/

Although China still pumps out positive economic data about the success of its export-driven economy, the annual growth rate of the nation’s internal investments in fixed capital assets, such as new manufacturing plants and housing, has continually fallen from over 33 percent in 2009 to 9.6 percent in May 2016. The easiest way for China to continue expanding their exports would have been to devalue the yuan exchange rate to become more price competitive. But at 13.8 percent of the world’s export volume in 2015, any Chinese currency devaluation would have been seen as a “predatory” job raid by China’s on its top trade partners, the European Union and the United States.

#### Yuan devaluation precipitates fear speculation—incentivizes international price shocks and makes US trade less competitive

Bloomberg News 6-29-16 Goldman Finds ‘Sharp Devaluation’ Fear in China Metals Trade http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2016-06-30/goldman-says-china-metals-investors-fear-sharp-yuan-devaluation

There are “fears in the market over a sharp devaluation in China,” analysts Jeffrey Currie, Yubin Fu and Max Layton wrote in a report. The June 29 note summarized views from Chinese metals traders, producers and investors, and didn’t give the bank’s own assessment of prospects for a devaluation. China’s government shocked global financial markets with a surprise devaluation last August as policy makers confronted slowing economic growth. Earlier this week, the yuan traded at its weakest against the dollar in more than five years in turmoil following Britain’s vote to quit the European Union, and the currency is headed for its worst quarter on record. A weaker yuan makes raw materials more expensive for China to import, while making Chinese products more competitive overseas.

#### Yuan devaluation hurts US economy—empirics prove

Sarah Sands Staff Writer 7-20-16 When Sentiment Drives Valuations, Should You Use the 3-Day Rule? http://marketrealist.com/2016/07/when-sentiment-drives-valuations-should-you-use-pimcos-3-day-rule/

After the yuan’s devaluation in August 2015, the S&P 500 Index (SPXL) fell by 8% in three days. Though the Market recovered slightly, downward pressure continued on the index. After the announcement of the Brexit vote results on June 24, 2016, global markets showed a huge sell-offs for two days, but they immediately recovered.

#### Any increase in China export capability increases are undercut by instability created by exporting low skill goods

Lawrence J. Lau Staff Writer 06-27-16 Why China will avoid a big, destabilising yuan devaluation http://www.scmp.com/comment/insight-opinion/article/1926408/why-china-will-avoid-big-destabilising-yuan-devaluation

Would a devaluation increase Chinese exports? A small devaluation per se is unlikely to do so significantly even though it may increase the profits of Chinese exporters in renminbi terms, especially given that most world economies are either in recession, stagnation or a slow recovery. Moreover, in order for a devaluation to increase Chinese exports meaningfully, it may have to be in the order of 15 per cent or higher. But it is not really in the best interests of China to return to making garments, shoes and stuffed toys all over again, with the low standard of living that implies for its workers. Furthermore, the Chinese economy has also grown too large to be sustainable by increases in exports alone.

#### Yuan devaluation hurts US export capabilities

Alan Wolff Staff Writer 08-19-15 What China's currency devaluation means for the world's trade deals http://fortune.com/2015/08/19/what-chinas-currency-devaluation-means-for-the-worlds-trade-deals/

The effect on trade can be substantial. With the U.S. average tariff on industrial goods well under 2%, this change in China’s currency value easily swamps most U.S. tariffs. And given the fact that the U.S. dollar was already strong, this move is an added disadvantage to U.S. exports headed for China compared to exports from other countries.

### Yuan devaluation increases Global Volatility

#### Yuan devaluation creates international volatility three times greater than the effects of Brexit

Sarah Sands Staff Writer 7-15-16 Market Uncertainty to Remain: Where Do the Markets Go Next? http://marketrealist.com/2016/07/uncertainty-will-remain-market-markets-head-next/

The CBOE Volatility Index, which measures the implied volatility of S&P 500 Index options, rose 49% on June 24, 2016. This was a day after the United Kingdom voted to leave the European Union. On August 24, 2015, after China’s yuan devaluation, the index spiked nearly 150%. This shows how these events increase volatility in the Market. If similar events occur in the future, the Market may face more uncertainties.

#### Yuan devaluation signals global economic slowdown

Harvard Zhang Staff Writer 7-14-16 China likely to repeat Japan’s lost decades with debt, unbalanced economy, Senate hearing finds http://www.marketwatch.com/story/china-likely-to-repeat-japans-lost-decades-with-debt-unbalanced-economy-senate-hearing-finds-2016-07-14

China’s continuous overcapacity and credit-bubble issues coincide with the economic and financial problems haunting developed and emerging markets. “The U.K, Italy, Brazil and Japan are all likely to experience economic slowdown in the period ahead,” Lachman said. “The unwinding of China’s credits and asset-price bubbles will be occurring at a highly inauspicious time for the global economy.”

#### Yuan devaluation leads to capital distribution inefficiency hurting global economy

Christopher Balding Staff Writer 6-20-16 China's "Global" Currency Goes Local http://www.bloomberg.com/view/articles/2016-06-21/china-s-yuan-is-less-international-than-ever

Yet reversing course on internationalization has consequences, too. Unless the government eases its control over the yuan and lifts restrictions on capital mobility -- which MSCI cited in deciding to exclude Chinese stocks from its index -- companies and investors will remain reluctant to use and hold the currency. Meanwhile, capital within the country will continue to be allocated inefficiently, sheltering companies from true international competition. China has set a date for opening its financial sector for good reason. This isn’t the time to change targets.

#### Yuan devaluation destabilizes China economy—capital outflow fears curtail investment

Xie Yu Staff Writer 7-1-16 What next for Chinese yuan after Brexit? ‘Yes’ to devaluation. ‘No’ to capital outflows http://www.scmp.com/business/markets/article/1984033/what-next-chinese-yuan-after-brexit-yes-devaluation-no-capital

The depreciation seen in yuan is less than what has been experienced by other Asian and emerging market currencies after Brexit. Pang said if yuan stays relatively stronger than other currencies, it would erode China’s export competitiveness. A stronger currency may keep the domestic interest rates comparatively high, which would have a negative impact on deleveraging. “If it devalues quickly it will surely cause capital outflows, the current biggest concern of the central government,” she added.

#### Devaluation of the yuan precipitates cash outflows causing economic turmoil in China

Mehreen Kim Staff Writer 01-07-16 Has China lost control of its currency? http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/economics/12086754/Has-China-lost-control-of-its-currency.html

Some claim that the Chinese are beginning to lose control over their exchange rate and their economic policy. Burning through reserves exerts a tightening effect on the economy. This has been offset in the past by cutting interest rates. However, rate cuts only hasten capital outflows and so the vicious cycle continues. China's exchange rate policy, it could be said, has put the country in a bind.

#### Yuan devaluation destabilizes international economy by creating speculation of growth stealing from other nations

Mohamed El-Erian Staff Writer 01-13-16 The perils of China's currency devaluation https://www.theguardian.com/business/2016/jan/13/perils-of-china-currency-devaluation-yuan-renminbi

But in pursuing its domestic objectives, China risks inadvertently amplifying global financial instability. Specifically, markets worry that renminbi devaluation could “steal” growth from other countries, including those that have far more foreign debt and far less robust financial cushions than China, which maintains ample international reserves.

#### Yuan devaluation hurts Chinese stock market stymying growth potential

Bloomberg News 7-5-16 China Stocks Seen Dropping This Quarter on Yuan, Growth Woes http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2016-07-04/china-stocks-seen-declining-this-quarter-on-yuan-growth-concern

China’s benchmark stock gauge has tumbled 15 percent this year, one of the steepest declines among 94 global indexes tracked by Bloomberg, as investors pulled out of equities in the aftermath of 2015’s $5 trillion summer rout. The slowest economic expansion in more than two decades is weighing on corporate earnings, while a weakening yuan is spurring the risk of capital outflows. “The downside risk on the economy is building up and a weak economy is adding pressure to the yuan,” said Li Lifeng, a Shanghai-based strategist at Sinolink Securities Co., who participated in the survey. “In this scenario, stocks are unlikely to perform well.” He predicts the Shanghai Composite will fall to about 2,800 by the end of September

### Trade War

#### Yuan devaluation risks sparking massive trade war

Michael Pettis Staff Writer 5-10-16 Why China Won’t Devalue the Yuan http://www.wsj.com/articles/why-china-wont-devalue-the-yuan-1462899804

In a global economy with growing trade tensions and weak demand, a devaluation that substantially boosts China’s trade surplus may ignite a trade war. If weak currencies only benefit much smaller economies with overvalued currencies and large current account deficits, it is hard to imagine why Beijing would risk devaluation.

#### Yuan devaluation precipitates currency wars across East Asia

Ambrose Evans Pritchard Staff Writer 04-11-16 AEP: Beijing 'must devalue yuan by 15pc' to avert crisis http://www.telegraph.co.uk/business/2016/04/10/china-guru-warns-of-erm-style-currency-crisis-as-deflation-persi/

Fears of uncontrollable capital flight and a yuan devaluation were key reasons for the plunge in global equity markets earlier this year, and are clearly what prompted the US Federal Reserve to delay rate rises. The fate of China's currency has become the most neuralgic issue in global finance. One worry is that a sharp drop in the yuan would set off a second round of 'currency wars' across East Asia, transmitting a deflationary shock through the international system as cheap Asian exports flooded into Western markets.

## Yuan Deval Good

### Yuan devaluation increases Trade

#### Yuan devaluation boosts trade increasing economic interdependence

David Llewellyn-Smith founding publisher and editor for Macrobusiness and former editor-in-chief of The Diplomat magazine 7-12-16 How low will the yuan go and what harm will it do? http://www.macrobusiness.com.au/2016/07/how-low-will-the-yuan-go-and-what-harm-will-it-do/

The next wave of RMB depreciation will see USD-CNY trade up to 7.10 by mid-2017. Since USD-CNY bottomed in early 2014, there have been five waves of depreciation and each has followed a predictable pattern: three to five months of USD-CNY increasing (+3.5% on average), followed by modest gains (+1%) spanning an equivalent time span, before another round of depreciation ensues. The predictability is suboptimal from a policy perspective, but it appears to be the PBoC’s standard playbook. While there could be some consolidation or modest strength after the current depreciation phase ends (3.6% since April), the ensuing wave and medium-term path should see USD-CNY reach 7.10 over the next year.

#### Negative risks of yuan devaluation stymied by Chinese economic policy—only provides export competitiveness and economic stability

Lingling Wei Staff Writer 07-07-16 Brexit Is Helping China Push Down the Yuan http://www.wsj.com/articles/yuan-depreciation-gets-brexit-push-1467898477

China has also been keeping the lid on potential outflows by tightening restrictions on money leaving the country while making it easier for funds to flow in. Chinese banking officials and corporate executives say that authorities have stepped up scrutiny of companies and individuals seeking to move money abroad, halted new applications for an overseas-investment program for individuals, and shrunk the pool of yuan available in Hong Kong for banks to make loans and for investors to wager against the yuan. The government is also allowing Chinese companies greater flexibility in repatriating funds borrowed overseas.

#### Further Yuan devaluation is needed to boost trade competitiveness

Ye Xie Staff Writer 01-07-16 Yuan Seen Needing Bigger Depreciation for China to Reap Benefits http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2016-01-08/yuan-seen-needing-bigger-depreciation-for-china-to-reap-benefits

The yuan, which has fallen 5 percent since China’s central bank devalued the currency in August, probably needs to fall an additional 14 percent if the nation’s economy is to see any real benefits. A decline to 7.7 per dollar, from about 6.6, is needed to boost gross domestic product expansion by 0.7 percentage point, according to estimates by Bloomberg Intelligence Economics. The move, a scenario which none of the analysts in Bloomberg surveys expects, would lead to $670 billion in capital outflows.

#### Minor Yuan devaluation promotes international economic stability by shoring up short term volatility in the market

Tim Clayton Staff Writer 07-22-16 Shenzhen Composite Index Dips ahead of G20 Meeting http://www.economiccalendar.com/2016/07/22/shenzhen-composite-index-dips-ahead-of-g20-meeting/

The Chinese yuan was fixed stronger on Friday with the US currency generally weaker on a trade-weighted basis and a firm currency was an important political aspect ahead of the weekend G20 meeting. Vice Finance Minister Zhu Guangyao stated that there was no basis for a yuan devaluation, as economic fundamentals remained strong, although the currency trends will be watched closely next week after the G20 meeting. There was an increase in shares bought on margin, which could provide near-term support with a decline in volatility also potentially supporting sentiment.

#### Devaluation stabilizes China economy through trade

Phillip Inman Economics correspondent 08-11-15 Why has China devalued its currency and what impact will it have? https://www.theguardian.com/business/2015/aug/11/china-devalues-yuan-against-us-dollar-explainer

Chinese businesses compete with regional rivals to supply the world with everything from raw steel to fridges, and a cheaper yuan will make Chinese exports less expensive, potentially boosting the overseas sales that have been among the main drivers of growth during the nation’s remarkable rise over the past three decades. However, controls on the currency have given Chinese businesses a high degree of predictability when they plan investments in industries heavily dependent on exports.

### Monetary Stability

#### Yuan devaluation creates domestic monetary stability in China

H.S Borji Staff Writer 12-21-15 Chinese Yuan Devaluation Can Impact India http://www.investopedia.com/articles/investing/122115/chinese-yuan-devaluation-can-impact-india.asp

China’s decision to devalue its currency for the first time in more than two decades came in response to a slowing domestic economy. China’s gross domestic product (GDP) expanded 7.3% in 2014, the slowest rate in 24 years. Growth is expected to slow again in 2015 and remain below the 7% mark for the foreseeable future as Beijing attempts to restructure the Chinese economy away from export dependence and toward consumption. The currency devaluation was one of many monetary policy tools the PBOC employed in 2015, including interest rate cuts and tighter financial market regulation.

#### Yuan devaluation stabilizes Chinese economy by lowering debt ratios of Chinese companies

Justina Lee Staff Writer 07-19-16 Yuan’s Best Forecaster Says This Currency Slump Is Close to Over http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2016-07-18/yuan-s-best-forecaster-says-this-currency-slump-is-close-to-over

There are some fundamental reasons for the yuan to stabilize, according to Ji Mo, Hong Kong-based chief economist for Asia ex-Japan at Amundi SA. She estimates that the foreign-currency debt of Chinese companies has dropped to about $500 billion from $1.1 trillion at end-2015, reducing repayment pressures. Speculation that authorities were curbing declines in the exchange rate resurfaced last week when the overnight yuan interbank rate in Hong Kong jumped to a five-month high. The yuan index’s gain last week indicates that the PBOC may have intervened to stem depreciation, said Zhou Hao, an economist at Commerzbank AG in Singapore.

### Yuan devaluation increases Global Stability

#### Yuan devaluation prevents international deflation—helps avoid financial crisis

David Keohane Staff Writer 7-14-16 Brexit upsides, RMB devaluation edition http://ftalphaville.ft.com/2016/07/14/2169688/brexit-upsides-rmb-devaluation-edition/

China is now exporting its deflation, and my goodness it has a lot of deflation to export. In the Ice Age world, countries need to devalue to avoid deflation. So if sterling slumps in the aftermath of a Brexit vote there may be at least one silver lining outside the EU if the UK economy manages to avoid the quagmire of outright deflation.

#### Yuan depreciation post Brexit improves Chinese economic stability while limiting capital outflows

Lingling Wei Staff Writer 07-07-16 Brexit Is Helping China Push Down the Yuan http://www.wsj.com/articles/yuan-depreciation-gets-brexit-push-1467898477

While those earlier bouts of rapid yuan depreciation sent domestic markets tumbling and led to a surge in money fleeing the country, this time, Chinese stock and bond markets have held up well. One closely watched indicator of capital flows—China’s foreign-exchange reserve levels—rose by $13.4 billion to $3.2 trillion in June, official data showed Thursday, although the data captures less than a week following the Brexit vote.

#### Yuan devaluation uniquely suited to provide economic stability

Ivan Martchev Investment Specialist 07-19-16 What happens now that Treasurys hit their target? http://www.marketwatch.com/story/what-happens-now-that-treasurys-hit-their-target-2016-07-14

I view the Chinese yuan as the ultimate monetary-policy "panic button" as it fights the economic problems that a deflating credit bubble produces in a way that conventional monetary policy — like lowering policy rates or reserve requirements — cannot address. Normal monetary policy is less effective at a time when non-performing loans (NPLs) are rising. At a time when NPLs are surging, normal monetary policy is nearly impotent.

#### Yuan devaluation provides stability now—weak American dollar

Evelyn Chang Staff Writer 07-16-16 These could be better bets in a post-Brexit worldhttp://www.cnbc.com/2016/07/13/these-could-be-better-stock-market-bets-in-a-post-brexit-world.html

Lack of dollar strength has helped China keep the pace of its yuan depreciation gradual, while relative stability in Chinese data has alleviated concerns of a sharp economic slowdown. In April, Bank of America Merrill Lynch reversed a five-year negative view with a "structurally bullish" outlook on emerging markets, partly based on its view of stabilization in China.

### Yuan devaluation helps the US Economy

#### Weaker Yuan increases USD purchasing power

Reuters 09-23-15 Wal-Mart presses suppliers to share benefits of cheaper yuan http://www.cnbc.com/2015/09/23/china-yuan-wal-mart-asks-suppliers-to-share-benefits-of-fx-weakness.html

Wal-Mart is seeking price cuts from suppliers that produce goods in China, saying the retailer should share in the savings generated by China's devaluation of the yuan, people with knowledge of the matter said. Wal-Mart managers in recent weeks have contacted more than 10,000 suppliers in various countries, all of which have manufacturing facilities in China, seeking cost cuts of 2 percent to 6 percent on mainly general merchandise including home furnishings, apparel, health and beauty products, appliances, electronics and toys, according to a consultant who advised Wal-Mart on the move and spoke on condition of anonymity to protect his relationship with the retailer.

#### Yuan devaluation provides economic stability in US—greater purchasing power

Joel Naroff Staff Writer 08-23-15 Devaluation of Chinese yuan has implications for U.S. economy http://www.philly.com/philly/business/20150823\_Devaluation\_of\_Chinese\_yuan\_has\_implications\_for\_U\_S\_\_economy.html

What are the implications for the U.S. economy of the devaluation of the yuan? A lower-valued Chinese currency means it takes fewer dollars to buy goods from China, so the price of Chinese products sold in the United States should decline. Consumers, businesses, even governments that purchase Chinese products would benefit, and sales of Chinese imports would rise, which is why the action was taken.

#### Yuan devaluation leads to increased investment in US—boosts economy

Vera Ye Staff Writer 6-30-16 Shares rise as worries on yuan ease http://www.shanghaidaily.com/business/finance/Shares-rise-as-worries-on-yuan-ease/shdaily.shtml

The offshore yuan has declined more than 1 percent since Britain’s decision to leave the European Union — the biggest loss among Asian currencies — after China’s central bank fixed a weaker midpoint for three straight days. The drop in the yuan has triggered worries about capital outflows as investors look for stable places to park their money.

### Yuan devaluation increases Alternative Energy

#### Yuan devaluation benefits solar companies

Ehren Goossens Staff Writer 08-15-15 Yuan’s Drop May Benefit Solar Makers Pricing in Dollars http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-08-13/yuan-s-drop-may-benefit-solar-makers-pricing-in-dollars

While sales in China for foreign brands like BMW AG and Yum! Brands Inc. may suffer, manufacturers, like those that make solar panels, may benefit from a weaker currency. That’s because of the currencies used in sales contracts, Jade Jones, an analyst at GTM Research in San Francisco, said in an interview. “A lot of these deals are signed in dollars,” Jones said. “There have been other problems with depreciation before, specifically in the E.U. and Japan,” she said. Because of that, there was a movement to use U.S. dollars.

# Neg Arctic Coop

### 1NC Norway Vetoes

#### Chinese-Norwegian relations are dead-locked over the 2010 Nobel Peace Prize.

Jingchao Peng, MA in IR from Waseda University, former research fellow at the China and Global Security Program of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, and Njord Wegge, PhD in Arctic IR from the University of Tromso, senior research fellow at the Fridtjof Nansen Institute (FNI), August 2015

“China’s bilateral diplomacy in the Arctic,” Polar Geography, Vol. 38, No. 3, pp. 233–249, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/1088937X.2015.1086445> (Accessed 7/21/16)

As Chinese–Norwegian negotiations on a free trade agreement had almost been concluded by the time of the Nobel award, China would probably have signed the free trade agreement with Norway several years ago, had it not been for the peace price. After the incident, both sides appeared willing to repair the strained political ties but made little headway. Norway’s active support of China to become a permanent observer of the Arctic Council should in this respect be noted. Yet, even though Chinese diplomats have asserted the need to rebuild the ruined political trust between the two nations through ‘joint efforts’, they have made it clear that reconciliation should be based on a Norwegian apology with a guarantee that a similar incident will not take place again in the future. This is not a condition the Norwegian government can accept, thus no viable solution seems to exist mid-2015 to end the political impasse.

#### The US is not the gatekeeper for participation in Arctic governance—it only takes one veto to destroy solvency.

Shiloh Rainwater, senior honors student studying political science and international relations at Pepperdine University, Spring 2013

“Race to the North: China’s Arctic Strategy and its Implications,” Naval War College Review, Vol. 66, No. 2, pp. 62-82, <https://www.usnwc.edu/getattachment/31708e41-a53c-45d3-a5e4-ccb5ad550815/Race-to-the-North--China-s-Arctic-Strategy-and-Its.aspx> (Accessed 7/20/16)

In addition to scientific ventures, China is attempting to augment further its influence through participation in Arctic governance. In 2007, China was admitted as an ad hoc observer to the Arctic Council, the most influential intergovernmental organization in the region. Yet to the distress of CCP leaders, China’s application for full observer status on the council has been denied three times and is unlikely to be granted in the near future. Each of the council’s members has veto power over new accessions, and while some member countries favor China’s bid, there is little consensus about it in the council as a whole. Norway, for example, has threatened to veto China’s application since 2010, when Beijing halted political and human rights discourse with Oslo in response to the awarding to Chinese dissident Liu Xiaobo of the Nobel Peace Prize. Moreover, at the 2011 ministerial meeting a new requirement was established that observers recognize the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the littoral nations over the Arctic, a position that conflicts with China’s interests as a non-Arctic state.

### 2NC CCP Collapse Double-Bind

#### AND they’re in a double-bind—either China’s membership in the AC gets blocked by Norway OR conciliation collapses CCP legitimacy.

Jingchao Peng, MA in IR from Waseda University, former research fellow at the China and Global Security Program of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, and Njord Wegge, PhD in Arctic IR from the University of Tromso, senior research fellow at the Fridtjof Nansen Institute (FNI), August 2015

“China’s bilateral diplomacy in the Arctic,” Polar Geography, Vol. 38, No. 3, pp. 233–249, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/1088937X.2015.1086445> (Accessed 7/21/16)

From Deng Xiaoping and on through Jiang Zemin, Hu Jintao, and also the current leadership of Xi Jinping, economic growth and a ‘normalization’ of China’s external relationship have been core features of the government’s priorities. China’s entrance into the WTO in 2001 is in this respect one of its most important milestones (Zhu 2013: 7). As Chinese diplomacy can be identified as being driven by a desire to support the Chinese Communist Party (CCP), thereby ensuring the party stays in power, bilateral disputes involving Chinese dissidents or issues that are relevant to the upholding of domestic order are taken very seriously by the political leadership. Recent responses to foreign states engaging in, or commenting on, the democratic protests in Hong Kong during the fall of 2014, or the freezing of bilateral ties with Norway after the Nobel Peace prize was awarded to the Chinese dissident Liu Xiaobo in 2010, illustrate this policy. As the CCP continually seeks to reassert its legitimacy in the absence of elections, this dimension should not be underestimated when analyzing China’s diplomatic corps as essentially being an extended body of the party (Shambaugh 2013: 56). Additionally, while the challenge from Chinese dissidents and domestic groups seeking democratic reforms is a key challenge for the Chinese leadership to tackle, some relationships are particularly sensitive. As the CCP came to power by overturning the Japanese and Western imperialist powers, thus restoring its dignity and respect, its relationships with Japan and the West are particularly sensitive, as such relationships are directly linked to the work of upholding the legitimacy of the communist party (Gries 2004; Shambaugh 2013: 56).

#### Maintaining CCP legitimacy is key to prevent WMD use and 1 BILLION deaths.

San Renxing, staff writer at the Epoch Times, 8/29/2005

"The CCP's Last-ditch Gamble: Biological and Nuclear War. Hundreds of millions of deaths proposed," Association for Asian Research, <http://www.asianresearch.org/articles/2692.html> (accessed 7/21/16)

Since the Party’s life is “above all else,” it would not be surprising if the CCP resorts to the use of biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons in its attempt to extend its life. The CCP, which disregards human life, would not hesitate to kill two hundred million Americans, along with seven or eight hundred million Chinese, to achieve its ends. These speeches let the public see the CCP for what it really is. With evil filling its every cell the CCP intends to wage a war against humankind in its desperate attempt to cling to life. That is the main theme of the speeches.

### 1NC Arctic States Say No

#### China won’t be able to sway other Arctic states—their usual tricks are useless.

Jingchao Peng, MA in IR from Waseda University, former research fellow at the China and Global Security Program of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, and Njord Wegge, PhD in Arctic IR from the University of Tromso, senior research fellow at the Fridtjof Nansen Institute (FNI), August 2015

“China’s bilateral diplomacy in the Arctic,” Polar Geography, Vol. 38, No. 3, pp. 233–249, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/1088937X.2015.1086445> (Accessed 7/21/16)

When seeking to answer this question, some key observations should be addressed. First, China has an instinctive fear of big power dominance in the Arctic by Russia, the US, and, to some degree, Canada. At the same time, it has not found a good argument to persuade smaller Arctic states into believing that they actually need China to prevent such dominance in the Arctic. Since its socialist era, China has had a tradition of nurturing ties with remote regions that could help in its efforts to throw off capitalist influence, especially against the US and its western allies. China usually courts such regions by patronizing governments that are hostile to western powers. We can see such recurrent patterns in China’s engagements with states in Africa, Latin America, and Middle East. However, the tactic of invoking sentiments of victimhood and seeking leverage against the ‘big powers’ would not work for Beijing in the Arctic. With the exception of Russia, the Arctic states are all developed liberal democracies who agreed among themselves on a peaceful approach toward Arctic governance, based on the fact that most of the Arctic region is located on their territories, or within the EEZ of the eight Arctic states. This means that there is no natural incentive to collaborate with China for balance-of-power reasons.

#### There’s a whole host of other countries that they’d let in before China.

Shiloh Rainwater, senior honors student studying political science and international relations at Pepperdine University, Spring 2013

“Race to the North: China’s Arctic Strategy and its Implications,” Naval War College Review, Vol. 66, No. 2, pp. 62-82, <https://www.usnwc.edu/getattachment/31708e41-a53c-45d3-a5e4-ccb5ad550815/Race-to-the-North--China-s-Arctic-Strategy-and-Its.aspx> (Accessed 7/20/16)

Yet China faces a further obstacle to participation in Arctic affairs, in the form of competition with other non-Arctic states. Prominent among those countries vying for admission to the Arctic Council as permanent observers are India, Brazil, Japan, South Korea, the European Union, and a number of individual European states. The growing Arctic interests of these states demonstrate that the race to the High North has truly become global, adding to the complexity of Arctic geopolitics. Notably, India, already a competitor with China in South Asia, has established a formidable Arctic research program of its own, including a permanent research station in the Svalbard Archipelago and numerous research expeditions.79 But while the council may expand to admit a few of these states as observers, it is unlikely that many will gain seats, since present members are wary of seeing their own influence diminished.80 Moreover, China, it seems, is not highly favored for accession, as indicated by a January 2011 survey of public opinion in the eight Arctic states that found that “China is the least attractive partner to all current Arctic Council countries [save for Russia].”81 These factors will tend to intensify Chinese relations with other non-Arctic states as Beijing fights to have a say in Arctic affairs.

### 2NC Turns Russia War

#### Chinese admission would trigger Russian backlash—they prefer the squo.

Jingchao Peng, MA in IR from Waseda University, former research fellow at the China and Global Security Program of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, and Njord Wegge, PhD in Arctic IR from the University of Tromso, senior research fellow at the Fridtjof Nansen Institute (FNI), August 2015

“China’s bilateral diplomacy in the Arctic,” Polar Geography, Vol. 38, No. 3, pp. 233–249, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/1088937X.2015.1086445> (Accessed 7/21/16)

It is worth noting that none of these new deals have thus far materialized on the ground. Nor were they able to temper Russia’s highly skeptical attitude towards opening its Arctic resources to non-Arctic states (Global Times 2013). The two postponements of permanent observer decisions were reportedly due to objections by both Russia and Canada. Russia’s ambivalence on this matter set off palpable distrust and uncertainty among Chinese Arctic observers, who publicly spoke about Moscow’s ambition to ‘carve most of the Arctic for its own’ (Kuang 2011), hinting that the Russian regulations over the Northern Sea Route are not in compliance with the UNCLOS (Zhang et al. 2014).

### 1NC Status Competition Turn

#### Chinese exclusion from the Arctic council drives their soft power strategy in the squo.

Shiloh Rainwater, senior honors student studying political science and international relations at Pepperdine University, Spring 2013

“Race to the North: China’s Arctic Strategy and its Implications,” Naval War College Review, Vol. 66, No. 2, pp. 62-82, <https://www.usnwc.edu/getattachment/31708e41-a53c-45d3-a5e4-ccb5ad550815/Race-to-the-North--China-s-Arctic-Strategy-and-Its.aspx> (Accessed 7/20/16)

While eager to access Arctic resources and shipping opportunities, China is also conscious of its disadvantaged status as a non-Arctic state. China’s Arctic strategy therefore privileges cooperation over confrontation so as to position the nation as an Arctic power while preserving the Arctic status quo and avoiding countermeasures from the circumpolar states. This strategy emphasizes soft power through scientific diplomacy, participation in Arctic institutions, and resource diplomacy.

#### Narrowing the status gap triggers bids for primacy that escalate to great power war.

WILLIAM C. WOHLFORTH, professor of government at Dartmouth, January 2009

“UNIPOLARITY, STATUS COMPETITION, AND GREAT POWER WAR,” World Politics, vol. 61, no. 1, pp. 28–57, <http://www.polisci.wisc.edu/Uploads/Documents/IRC/Wohlforth%20(2009).pdf> (Accessed 7/21/16)

The evidence suggests that narrow and asymmetrical capabilities gaps foster status competition even among states relatively confident of their basic territorial security for the reasons identified in social identity theory and theories of status competition. Broad patterns of evidence are consistent with this expectation, suggesting that unipolarity shapes strategies of identity maintenance in ways that dampen status conflict. The implication is that unipolarity helps explain low levels of military competition and conflict among major powers after 1991 and that a return to bipolarity or multipolarity would increase the likelihood of such conflict. This has been a preliminary exercise. The evidence for the hypotheses explored here is hardly conclusive, but it is sufficiently suggestive to warrant further refinement and testing, all the more so given the importance of the question at stake. If status matters in the way the theory discussed here suggests, then the widespread view that the rise of a peer competitor and the shift back to a bipolar or multipolar structure present readily surmountable policy challenges is suspect. Most scholars agree with Jacek Kugler and Douglas Lemke’s argument: “[S]hould a satisfied state undergo a power transition and catch up with dominant power, there is little or no expectation of war.” 81 Given that today’s rising powers have every material reason to like the status quo, many observers are optimistic that the rise of peer competitors can be readily managed by fashioning an order that accommodates their material interests. Yet it is far harder to manage competition for status than for most material things. While diplomatic efforts to manage status competition seem easy under unipolarity, theory and evidence suggest that it could present much greater challenges as the system moves back to bipolarity or multipolarity. When status is seen as a positional good, efforts to craft negotiated bargains about status contests face long odds. And this positionality problem is particularly acute concerning the very issue unipolarity solves: primacy. The route back to bipolarity or multipolarity is thus fraught with danger. With two or more plausible claimants to primacy, positional competition and the potential for major power war could once again form the backdrop of world politics.

### 2NC China Cooperating Now

#### Unambiguous primacy ensures a conciliatory Chinese approach in the status quo.

Ingrid Lundestad, Senior Fellow at the Norwegian Institute for Defence Studies, Norwegian Defence University College, and Oystein Tunsjo, Professor at the Center for Asian Security Studies, Norwegian Institute for Defence Studies, July 2015

“The United States and China in the Arctic,” The Polar Record, vol. 51, No. 4, pp. 392-403, <http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=9821263&fileId=S0032247414000291> (Accessed 7/21/16)

China's stand has been interpreted as a 'wait-and-see approach to Arctic developments, wary that active overtures would cause alarm in other countries due to China's size and status as a rising global power' (Jakobson 2010: 2). Nonetheless, while remaining cautious, China has prepared itself for a more active role in the Arctic. The push for observer status in the AC, and an increasing Chinese presence both on Iceland and Svalbard, evince a clear, official Chinese interest (Alexeeva and Lasserre 2012; Gang Chen 2012; Solli and others 2013). It has been reported that China has a large diplomatic presence in Iceland and that its embassy is the largest in the capital Reykjavik (Tatlow 2012). Strong diplomatic presence has facilitated the signing of a free trade agreement between Iceland and China, the first free trade agreement between China and a European country (Trotman 2013). China's first Arctic research station, Hunghe (Yellow River), was founded at Ny-Ålesund in Norway's Svalbard archipelago in July 2004 and China is now investing in polar hardware, refurbishing and upgrading its polar bases and facilities, and expanding the number of Chinese polar scientists (Brady 2012).

### 2NC Solves Multilateralism

#### That ensures Chinese support for multilateral governance of the global commons.

Ingrid Lundestad, Senior Fellow at the Norwegian Institute for Defence Studies, Norwegian Defence University College, and Oystein Tunsjo, Professor at the Center for Asian Security Studies, Norwegian Institute for Defence Studies, July 2015

“The United States and China in the Arctic,” The Polar Record, vol. 51, No. 4, pp. 392-403, <http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=9821263&fileId=S0032247414000291> (Accessed 7/21/16)

Regarding diplomatic and legal concerns, some Chinese civilian and military observers have questioned the legal framework for the region. Rear-Admiral Yin Zhou's comment in March 2010 that 'the North Pole and surrounding areas are the common wealth of the world's people and do not belong to any one country' is often cited in the literature assessing Chinese perspectives on the Arctic (Dawney 2013). None-Chinese observers also writes that China's position is based on 'the premise that the Arctic remains a global commons, with non-Arctic states having access to the region and its resources,' and emphasise that China might challenge the legal position of the coastal states through positioning itself as a 'near-Arctic state' with 'legitimate rights' in the Arctic (Stephens 2012; see also Blank 2013; O'Rourke 2013: 53; Guschin 2013). With no authoritative Arctic strategy published by the central government, it appears that alarmist voices have been allowed to shape China's public debate over its Arctic policy. At the same time, Hu Zhengyue, Assistant Minister for Foreign Affairs, has clearly stated that China supports both the legal framework of the Arctic and the cooperation promoted by the AC (Chinese MFA 2010; Tang 2013). China's willingness to become an AC observer supports the view that China does not challenge the sovereignty of the littoral states in the Arctic Ocean.

### 2NC Solves Warming

#### AND the status quo locks China in to informal diplomatic measures that commits them to climate change cooperation

Shiloh Rainwater, senior honors student studying political science and international relations at Pepperdine University, Spring 2013

“Race to the North: China’s Arctic Strategy and its Implications,” Naval War College Review, Vol. 66, No. 2, pp. 62-82, <https://www.usnwc.edu/getattachment/31708e41-a53c-45d3-a5e4-ccb5ad550815/Race-to-the-North--China-s-Arctic-Strategy-and-Its.aspx> (Accessed 7/20/16)

The first component of China’s strategy, scientific diplomacy, promotes cooperation with the Arctic Eight on Arctic climate change and ecological studies. To address these issues, China will soon open its first international Arctic cooperation and research institute in Shanghai.64 Further, since 1996 China has participated as a member of the International Arctic Science Committee, which promotes multidisciplinary research on the Arctic and its impact on the world. Chinese scientists also consistently participate in international forums on the Arctic environment, such as the Arctic Science Summit Week and the International Polar Year Programme.65

#### Formalizing cooperation is unnecessary, the status quo solves warming coop.

RAY TSUNG-HAN TAI, Law School, Shandong University, Shandong Province, People’s Republic of China NATHANIEL S. PEARRE, Renewable Energy Storage Laboratory, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada, AND SHIH-MING KAO, Assistant Professor@ the Institute of Marine Affairs, National Sun Yat-sen University, Kaohsiung, Taiwan, 2015

“Analysis and Potential Alternatives for the Disputed South China Sea from Ocean Governance in the Polar Regions,” vol. 43, no.6, pp. 609-627, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/08920753.2015.1086949?journalCode=ucmg20> (Accessed 7/22/16)

Nevertheless, this conclusion does not necessarily mean that the Arctic regime will be replaced by a legally binding regime in the future. The Arctic Council already has had some successes in protecting the Arctic environment that might not have been politically possible under a hard law regime. In addition, the Arctic SAR Agreement by no means replaces the current Arctic regime because it only addresses SAR operations and its adoption may only have been possible because all the Arctic States were already parties to the SAR Convention and the Chicago Convention. Most scholars are of the opinion that a legally binding regime is neither necessary nor suitable for the Arctic. All of these factors suggest that a legally binding regime is not likely in the Arctic in the foreseeable future (Kao, Pearre, and Firestone 2012b, 836–837).

### 2NC Status Competition => GPW

#### Our interpretation of great power politics might be unfashionable, but it’s well supported by the empirical record

WILLIAM C. WOHLFORTH, professor of government at Dartmouth, January 2009

“UNIPOLARITY, STATUS COMPETITION, AND GREAT POWER WAR,” World Politics, vol. 61, no. 1, pp. 28–57, <http://www.polisci.wisc.edu/Uploads/Documents/IRC/Wohlforth%20(2009).pdf> (Accessed 7/21/16)

Despite increasingly compelling findings concerning the importance of status seeking in human behavior, research on its connection to war waned some three decades ago.38 Yet empirical studies of the relationship between both systemic and dyadic capabilities distributions and war have continued to cumulate. If the relationships implied by the status theory run afoul of well-established patterns or general historical findings, then there is little reason to continue investigating them. The clearest empirical implication of the theory is that status competition is unlikely to cause great power military conflict in unipolar systems. If status competition is an important contributory cause of great power war, then, ceteris paribus, unipolar systems should be markedly less war-prone than bipolar or multipolar systems. And this appears to be the case. As Daniel Geller notes in a review of the empirical literature: “The only polar structure that appears to influence conflict probability is unipolarity.”39 In addition, a larger number of studies at the dyadic level support the related expectation that narrow capabilities gaps and ambiguous or unstable capabilities hierarchies increase the probability of war.40

#### AND the theory of status competition is empirically verified in China’s case

WILLIAM C. WOHLFORTH, professor of government at Dartmouth, January 2009

“UNIPOLARITY, STATUS COMPETITION, AND GREAT POWER WAR,” World Politics, vol. 61, no. 1, pp. 28–57, <http://www.polisci.wisc.edu/Uploads/Documents/IRC/Wohlforth%20(2009).pdf> (Accessed 7/21/16)

Research on the elite perceptions and discourse in Russia, China, India, Europe, and Japan reveals that there is a strong interest in a favorable status comparison vis-à-vis out-groups and that the United States looms large as a comparison group, but in no capital is there evidence of the kind of status dissonance that characterized, for example, Moscow in the mid-twentieth century or St. Petersburg in the mid-nineteenth.71 Resentment of the U.S. role is evident, especially in Russia and China, but the operative assessment is that the capabilities gap precludes a competitive identity-maintenance strategy vis-à-vis the United States. Indeed, both countries attempted competitive strategies in the 1990s but reversed course as the evidence accumulated that their efforts had been counterproductive.

### 2NC Spills Over to Other Issues

#### Chinese bids for primacy in the Arctic would prime their broader global strategy.

Jingchao Peng, MA in IR from Waseda University, former research fellow at the China and Global Security Program of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, and Njord Wegge, PhD in Arctic IR from the University of Tromso, senior research fellow at the Fridtjof Nansen Institute (FNI), August 2015

“China’s bilateral diplomacy in the Arctic,” Polar Geography, Vol. 38, No. 3, pp. 233–249, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/1088937X.2015.1086445> (Accessed 7/21/16)

China’s economic interests in the Arctic are indeed a perplexing issue to analyze. On the one hand, Beijing’s official course of action in the Arctic appears to concentrate on scientific research, but at the same time, there is a clear domestic calling from both academia and industry insiders to the Arctic’s economic potential. The reality, however, is that the economic potential in the Arctic is mostly found on the territories of the eight Arctic states. This dichotomy between official interlocutors and general public engagement invites the question as to whether the agendas of science and climate research are just a steppingstone or an end point for Beijing’s Arctic endeavors. China’s future policy could indeed go both ways. It could start to exert influence on Arctic governance on behalf of non-Arctic powers by applying economic pressure – negotiating business and trade deals with Arctic powers to lock them into more economic interdependence. Alternatively, it can continue its current low-profile policy, which generally avoids attention, disputes, and conflicts with Arctic governments and their local populations. Having crossed the basic governance threshold and established a decent research presence, China’s next step in the Arctic will serve as an important example for how China might be expected to approach new regions in the world, essentially embodying China’s rising power through its diplomatic craft.

### 1NC South China Sea Turn

#### Plan reverses precedent for only allowing bordering states into the Arctic council.

RAY TSUNG-HAN TAI, Law School, Shandong University, Shandong Province, People’s Republic of China NATHANIEL S. PEARRE, Renewable Energy Storage Laboratory, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada, AND SHIH-MING KAO, Assistant Professor@ the Institute of Marine Affairs, National Sun Yat-sen University, Kaohsiung, Taiwan, 2015

“Analysis and Potential Alternatives for the Disputed South China Sea from Ocean Governance in the Polar Regions,” vol. 43, no.6, pp. 609-627, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/08920753.2015.1086949?journalCode=ucmg20> (Accessed 7/22/16)

Lastly, it is worth noting that the geographic nature of the Arctic and the Antarctic regions are quite different. The Arctic regime guides the cooperation and management of an open sea (the Arctic Ocean) surrounded by land territories. In contrast, the Antarctic regime addresses the governance of a continent (the Antarctica) and its surrounding waters. Thus, the approach to addressing certain kinds of issues in the two regions could be totally different due to these basic facts. For example, participation in the cooperative mechanism is limited in the Arctic Council to States bordering the Arctic Ocean, and only these States enjoy voting and decision making rights. Other States (i.e., extraregional States) are granted Observer status only. In contrast, in the Antarctic regime there are no bordering States, and only States that have demonstrated their interests by establishing a research station or conducting harvesting activities can be member States of the Antarctic Treaty and enjoy voting and decision-making rights. In other words, extra-regional States can be member States and enjoy rights of decision-making. Similarly, the Ilulissat Declaration implied that only those five States bordering the Arctic Ocean are eligible to cooperate on issues related to the collection of scientific data concerning the continental shelf, the protection of the marine environment and other scientific research in the Arctic region. In contrast, under the framework of the CCAMLR, extra-regional States are also eligible to participate in the work of conservation and management of fisheries resources in the waters surrounding the Antarctica. Thus, cautions should be exercised in drawing lessons from the two regions.

#### That model spills over—makes resolution of SCS disputes impossible.

RAY TSUNG-HAN TAI, Law School, Shandong University, Shandong Province, People’s Republic of China NATHANIEL S. PEARRE, Renewable Energy Storage Laboratory, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada, AND SHIH-MING KAO, Assistant Professor@ the Institute of Marine Affairs, National Sun Yat-sen University, Kaohsiung, Taiwan, 2015

“Analysis and Potential Alternatives for the Disputed South China Sea from Ocean Governance in the Polar Regions,” vol. 43, no.6, pp. 609-627, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/08920753.2015.1086949?journalCode=ucmg20> (Accessed 7/22/16)

As mentioned in the previous section, however, the two regimes took different approach in addressing its participants. Considering the geographic nature of the South China Sea, the Arctic and the Antarctica, the Arctic regime is probably a more suitable and applicable model than the Antarctic regime, because both the Arctic Ocean and the South China Sea belong to “an open sea surrounded by land territories.” Any cooperative mechanism established in the future should reserve voting and decision-making rights for bordering States only. Extra-regional actors should be granted Observer status without decision-making powers. Further, the law of the sea should be the legal framework to deal with the delineation of the outer limits of the continental shelf, the protection of the marine environment, freedom of navigation, marine scientific research, and other uses of the sea similar to the existing practices in the Arctic regime.

#### Failed SCS governance escalates to nuclear war—mismatched threat perceptions increase the risk of miscalc.

Zidny Ilman, research fellow @ Pacivis (Global Civil Society Research Center) of University of Indonesia, July 3, 2016

“Is the South China Sea the Stage for the Next World War?” The National Interest, <http://nationalinterest.org/feature/the-south-china-sea-the-stage-the-next-world-war-16833> (Accessed 7/22/16)

It is a dangerous game to play for sure. Beijing must do its best to make sure the United States will not come by her allies’ side or else it will face a war with the United States—a grim possibility given both sides’ possession of nuclear weapons. In order to succeed, China must be sure that the conflict she is instigating is important enough for U.S. allies that they will call for U.S. assistance, but that the conflict per se is not important enough from the U.S. perspective, making it highly unlikely for her to fulfill her insurance. Put it simply, China must make sure that the conflict per se represents high stakes from U.S. allies’ perspectives while a negligible one from the U.S. perspective. A bunch of uninhabited rocks in the South China Sea (and East China Sea) will do just fine. It is a matter of sovereignty and territorial integrity—which can hardly be compromised—from the perspective of U.S. allies. While from the U.S. perspective, those rocks represent no more than what they are; that is, rocks. Those rocks have little strategic value and, thus, in themselves have little relevance for U.S. national interests.

### 2NC Turns Overfishing

#### China’s overfishing in the SCS turns the advantage.

RAY TSUNG-HAN TAI, Law School, Shandong University, Shandong Province, People’s Republic of China NATHANIEL S. PEARRE, Renewable Energy Storage Laboratory, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada, AND SHIH-MING KAO, Assistant Professor@ the Institute of Marine Affairs, National Sun Yat-sen University, Kaohsiung, Taiwan, 2015

“Analysis and Potential Alternatives for the Disputed South China Sea from Ocean Governance in the Polar Regions,” vol. 43, no.6, pp. 609-627, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/08920753.2015.1086949?journalCode=ucmg20> (Accessed 7/22/16)

These local regulations have once again focused international attention on complex territorial and maritime disputes in the South China Sea, and raised protests from many other States. For example, the U.S. Department of State immediately responded to the unilateral action of PR China, and said “the passing of these restrictions on other countries’ fishing activities in disputed portions of the South China Sea is a provocative and potentially dangerous act” (U.S. Department of State 2014). Japan joined the United States to condemn PR China’s fishing restrictions in the South China Sea (Takenaka 2014). States bordering the South China Sea, such as Vietnam and the Philippines likewise protested PR China’s new fishing laws to “operate in much of the South China Sea, where overlapping territorial claims have increased tensions” (Fox News 2014).

# Neg Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank

## Politics Link

#### Congress will be strongly opposed to funding the bank

Robert Keatley. Writer at National Interest. April 18, 2015. China's AIIB Challenge: How Should America Respond? Accessed April 21, 2016. http://nationalinterest.org/feature/americas-big-strategic-blunder-not-joining-chinas-aiib-12666

To join would require a capital commitment, something a Republican Congress is unlikely to provide even if President Obama asks. After all, the AIIB was born partly because Congress consistently has refused to authorize a larger voice for Beijing in international agencies that the United States dominates, which would give China a role reflecting its new economic strength. For example, for five years it has ignored legislation authorizing a cost-free (to U.S. taxpayers) revision of International Monetary Fund quotas despite administration urging. Even so, the administration should swallow its pride and explore the possibility of getting inside the tent, perhaps with Japan, rather than remain a lonely outsider. On the positive side, Jim Yong Kim, the American who leads the World Bank, already plans talks about future cooperation with the AIIB.

#### AIIB membership will cost political capital and incur riders during passage

Robert Khan. Senior Fellow at Council on Foreign Relations. March 1, 2015. A Bank Too Far? Accessed April 21, 2016. http://www.cfr.org/global-governance/bank-too-far/p36290

While I agree with her on substantive grounds, I have a great deal of concern about the consequences of heading down the path toward membership. First of all, it’s extremely unlikely that Congress would approve U.S. participation in and a financial contribution to a Chinese-led bank. To date, Congress has been unwilling to approve a much less controversial IMF reform package, and the Obama administration's efforts to negotiate a Trans-Pacific Partnership will require whatever political capital the administration can muster on international economic issues. Even if Congress were to consider the bill, there would be a substantial risk of congressional add-ons, such as enforcement of penalties against countries found to manipulate their curriencies for competitive advantage, that would make the bill unacceptable to the Obama administration. It would be a black eye for the administration for to the United States were to join the bank and then not deliver on its commitment. The best course for the United States is to back away from opposition to the AIIB, allow others to join, and let the bank rise or fall on its own merits.

## Dollar Devaluation DA

#### The dollar’s value is high now

Patrick Gillespie. Writer at CNN Money. January 5, 2016. U.S. dollar starts strong in 2016. Accessed April 24, 2016. http://money.cnn.com/2016/01/05/news/economy/dollar-strong-start-to-2016/

Global currencies are falling left and right against the greenback. Renewed fears about China's economy arrived Monday which signals even more bad news for a whole host of countries with economies that depend on the People's Republic. Emerging markets are feeling the dollar's heat. The Turkish lira has lost 2.5% against the dollar since New Year's Day, while the South African rand and the Brazilian real have each shed 1.1%. Colombia's peso is down 1% versus the dollar as well. "The dollar is beginning the new year on a good note," says Marc Chandler, head of currency at Brown Brothers Harriman. All those currencies are now down 20% or more against the dollar from a year ago. The dollar rallied a lot in 2015 amid plunging commodity prices, a weak global economy and the Federal Reserve's first rate hike in nearly a decade. The dollar's gains came after news Monday that China's manufacturing sector shrank further in December. The data sparked a global stock market selloff. It also put pressure on major currencies. The euro has lost 1.1% against the dollar since New Year's Day while the British pound and China yuan have each shed about 0.5% over the same time. For two days, those are solid moves. Weak growth in Europe remains a concern. In the group of 19 countries that use the euro, the economy only grew 0.3% in the third quarter of last year as the region fights high unemployment and concerns of deflation.

#### China will use the AIIB’s dollar devaluation to counter US international interests

Daniel C.K. Chow. Professor at Moritz College of Law. February 25, 2016. Why China Established the Asia Infrastructure Investment Bank. Accessed April 24, 2016. http://ssrn.com/abstract=2737888

The AIIB’s current obligations are to make loans in dollars but the AIIB might in the future make loans in Renminbi (RMB or the “people’s currency”). China has been seeking to promote the RMB as an international currency for some time and these efforts recently were rewarded when on November 30, 2015, the IMF declared the RMB as one of its official currencies.252 Promoting the RMB will add considerable prestige to the currency. Much more than prestige is involved, though. The point missed by this observation is that China will also gain significant political power as well if the RMB becomes an established international currency frequently used in international transactions. Today, most international transactions are conducted in U.S. dollars.254 Transactions in U.S. dollars create great power for the United States over the international financial system. Trade in U.S. dollars, even if initiated overseas, requires the clearance through banks in the United States. 255 The United States can effectively freeze any transaction by blocking the transfer of dollars by U.S. banks. For example, the United States can impose sanctions on a country such as Iran by prohibiting the transfer of U.S. dollars through U.S. banks to Iran.256 Since oil is paid for in U.S. dollars, the United States can effectively restrict the sales of oil by Iran through controlling U.S. banks. In the case of Iran, China was able to circumvent many of the West’s restrictions in buying Iranian oil (using means that are undisclosed) but was careful not to violate U.S. restrictions on banking because China must deal with U.S. banks on a regular basis.257 It is apparent that if China is able establish the RMB as a currency that can be regularly used in international transactions, China can circumvent future U.S. sanctions since China will not need to use U.S. dollars or U.S. banks. China can deal directly with countries subject to U.S. sanctions. In addition, China would now have the same power to control international financial transactions in RMB through its control of Chinese Banks. China can suspend or use the threat of suspending RMB transactions through Chinese Banks to add weight to its dealings in international transactions.

#### AIIB will devalue the dollar

John Browne. Consultant at Euro Pacific Capital. March 31, 2015. Asian Infrastructure Investment bank challenges U.S. supremacy. Accessed April 24, 2016. <http://business.financialpost.com/fp-comment/john-browne-chinese-bank-challenges-u-s-supremacy>

The strength of support for the AIIB could be another step towards the “de-dollarization” that many expect to be the endgame of Chinese economic policy. The loss of the U.S. dollar’s coveted position as the international reserve currency would be a direct threat to America’s ability effectively to set world interest rates and to create seemingly limitless fiat dollars without the need to finance them in free markets. The AIIB represents one more indication that the “old” order of dollar hegemony may be nearing an end. The ADB argues that there is an $8-trillion infrastructure gap in Asia and that investment there will yield true economic growth and wealth creation. However, the Japanese fear that China will try to tie and even annex Asian countries via a network of strategic pipelines, railways and roads. In all likelihood, China may use the newly established AIIB to do just that. Under President Obama, America is appearing weak on many fronts, including defense and monetary affairs. Already a combination of Obama’s apparently inept foreign policy has led Chancellor Merkel of Germany to take a different posture over the Ukraine, exposing a potentially damaging split in the vitally important and longstanding NATO alliance. By leaning on its allies publicly, but ultimately ineffectively, to resist China’s AIIB overtures, Obama has exposed another level of increasing diplomatic and monetary weakness. Clearly, the Obama Administration was angered by the UK’s reversal. Patrick Ventrell, a spokesman for the National Security Council, told CNNMoney that the White House had “concerns” over whether the AIIB will meet “high standards, particularly related to governance, and environmental and social safeguards.” He added, “This is the UK’s sovereign decision. We hope and expect that the UK will use its voice to push for adoption of high standards.” It appears that de-dollarization is progressing slowly but surely, with the formation of the AIIB being just a single but important and highly visible step in that process.

#### Dollar devaluation kills US hegemony

Christopher Layne. Professor at Texas A&M. March 2012. This Time It's Real: The End of Unipolarity and the Pax Americana. Accessed April 24, 2016. http://isq.oxfordjournals.org/content/56/1/203

America’s geopolitical preeminence hinges on the dollar’s reserve currency role. If the dollar loses that status, US hegemony will literally be unaffordable. The dollar’s reserve currency status has, in effect, been a very special kind of “credit card.” It is special because the United States does not have to earn the money to pay its bills. Rather, when the bills come due, the United States borrows funds from abroad and/or prints money to pay them. The United States can get away with this and live beyond its means, spending with little restraint on maintaining its military dominance, preserving costly domestic entitlements, and indulging in conspicuous private consumption, as long as foreigners are willing to lend it money (primarily by purchasing Treasury bonds). Without the use of the “credit card” provided by the dollar’s reserve currency status, the United States would have to pay for its extravagant external and internal ambitions by raising taxes and interest rates, and by consuming less and saving more; or, tightening its belt and dramatically reducing its military and domestic expenditures. In other words, the United States would have to learn to live within its means. As a leading expert on international economic affairs observed just before the Great Recession kicked in, the dollar’s vulnerability “presents potentially significant and underappreciated restraints upon contemporary American political and military predominance”.

#### US hegemonic decline would cause great power wars

Robert Kagan. Senior Fellow at Brookings Institution. January 2012. Not Fade Away. Accessed April 24, 2016. https://newrepublic.com/article/99521/america-world-power-declinism

Is the United States in decline, as so many seem to believe these days? Or are Americans in danger of committing pre-emptive superpower suicide out of a misplaced fear of their own declining power? A great deal depends on the answer to these questions. The present world order—characterized by an unprecedented number of democratic nations; a greater global prosperity, even with the current crisis, than the world has ever known; and a long peace among great powers—reflects American principles and preferences, and was built and preserved by American power in all its political, economic, and military dimensions. If American power declines, this world order will decline with it. It will be replaced by some other kind of order, reflecting the desires and the qualities of other world powers. Or perhaps it will simply collapse, as the European world order collapsed in the first half of the twentieth century.

## Asian Development Bank CP

Counterplan—The United States federal government should make a substantial financial contribution to the Asian Development Bank.

#### US investment in the ADB could help it compete with AIIB and maintain the best safeguards

Scott Morris. Research Fellow at Center for Global Development. January 29, 2015. How China and the United States Can Come to Terms on the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank. Accessed April 24, 2016. <http://www.cgdev.org/publication/ft/how-china-and-united-states-can-come-terms-aiib>

But the real opportunity for a constructive policy shift from the United States comes at the ADB, not the AIIB. After all, if the US wants to maintain regional influence through a multilateral institution, then it ought to focus on the regional development bank where it already has influence. To put it bluntly, the US strategic aim should be to ensure that the AIIB does not eclipse the ADB, something that can be achieved not by criticizing the AIIB, but by making the ADB as attractive and robust in the region as possible. Even better, a pro-ADB strategy is something the Chinese will likely embrace. They have demonstrated through their own engagement with the bank that the regional choice does not need to be ADB or AIIB. It can and should be both. So what would make for a more attractive ADB? Perhaps more than anything else, more capital. Fortunately, the United States will have an opportunity over the next few years to lead a capital-raising effort at no new cost to US taxpayers. The US stands to “save” about $60 million a year as a donor to the ADB’s grant-making activities as a result of the bank’s pending financial reforms. Rather than pocketing that money, why not put it to use as new “paid in” capital in the bank? Combined with other countries’ contributions to a capital increase and the leverage of the ADB’s own borrowing, that $60 million could boost the bank’s infrastructure investment capacity by about $5 billion annually in just five years.

#### The best way for the US to engage with the AIIB is through ADB competition

Scott Morris. Research Fellow at Center for Global Development. January 29, 2015. How China and the United States Can Come to Terms on the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank. Accessed April 24, 2016. <http://www.cgdev.org/publication/ft/how-china-and-united-states-can-come-terms-aiib>

There are a number of areas where the AIIB could usefully depart from the norms of the existing MDBs entirely. For example, would the Bretton Woods architects have so quickly established resident boards of directors, with annual costs in the tens of millions of dollars, in an era of instantaneous global communications? Chinese officials have already made broad-brush commitments to align the AIIB with existing MDB practices and standards. The difficult work of translating those commitments into detailed policies remains ahead. A key demonstration of good faith will be active consultation and engagement with the ADB and World Bank as policies are developed. With a development détente, the United States and China can add a third major outcome to their recent string of bilateral successes. Much like the climate agreement, coming to terms on the AIIB and ADB is not just about what is good for the US and China. It’s ultimately about how these two actors, working through multilateral institutions, can better serve the development aims of the global community.

#### Competition will shape AIIB more effectively than membership

Scott Morris. Research Fellow at Center for Global Development. January 29, 2015. How China and the United States Can Come to Terms on the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank. Accessed April 24, 2016. <http://www.cgdev.org/publication/ft/how-china-and-united-states-can-come-terms-aiib>

The bank’s lending to China actually delivers financial stability to the institution and serves as a useful market test of the ADB’s products and services. After all, China, more than any other country in the region, has options when it comes to development finance. The bank’s efforts to remain attractive to the Chinese, particularly when it comes to technical assistance and knowledge products, are a useful discipline and motivator for the institution that ultimately benefits all ADB borrowers. While the United States has some work to do at the ADB, China in turn could move quickly to make a number of constructive overtures at the AIIB. These actions are less about making concessions to the US than demonstrating a desire to have the AIIB operate as a peer within the existing MDB system by adopting key principles, norms, and values that are firmly established at the World Bank and ADB. First, China’s advertised 50 percent shareholding is far too much for any one country in a multilateral institution. The US is widely characterized as dominating the World Bank, yet its shareholding there is just over 15 percent. China and other emerging market countries have been rightly frustrated by the slow pace of shareholding reform at the IMF and World Bank, but China’s shareholding stance at the AIIB undercuts its principled arguments on governance at the other institutions. Specifically, by signing on to the IMF-World Bank debt sustainability framework, the AIIB would demonstrate its willingness to operate within international principles aimed at preventing unsustainable debt in developing countries. And when debt problems occur, there should be no doubt about the AIIB’s intention to work constructively alongside other multilateral and bilateral creditors toward resolutions.

# Neg Military-to-Military Engagement

## CPs

### CP – Expand “Engage and Hedge”

Text: The United States government will augment its “Engage and Hedge” strategy by strengthening American military leadership in the region

The CP is mutually exclusive and any perm is either severance or intrinsic. Both should be rejected because no Negative could ever win a competitive CP.

#### We should up the ante and call out China and support U.S. exceptionalism and democracy. This sends a clear signal of support for allies

James Jay Carafano, The Heritage Foundation’s vice president for foreign and defense policy studies, E. W. Richardson fellow, and director of the Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for International Studies, February 16, 2015, “The U.S. Needs to Deal with China Differently,” Daily Signal, http://dailysignal.com/2015/02/16/the-u-s-needs-to-deal-with-china-differently/, Accessed 4-23-2016

The United States should recommit to speaking truth to Beijing power, calling out human-rights abuses, religious persecution, corruption, intellectual-property theft and tolerance for authoritarian regimes. America should also stand tall for the American brand, trumpeting American exceptionalism, free enterprise and democracy. Everywhere the Chinese go, the Americans should show up and say, “Wait a minute, here is another side to the story.” Rather than muddy the differences between what Beijing wants and where America stands, the United States should give its friends and allies a clear choice of visions for the future. Asia-Pacific nations will make their own choices and chart their own destinies. The United States needs to cover the bet that, given a choice, more will break our way.

#### The Affirmative is wrong. The U.S. should refine the Engage and Hedge strategy: by creating a robust military presence. This maintains U.S. primacy in the region, reassures allies and fosters greater Chinese incorporation into the regional community built on interdependence

Jihyun Kim, an assistant professor in the Institute of International Studies at Bradley University, Summer 2015, “Territorial Disputes in the South China Sea, Implications for Security in Asia and Beyond,” Strategic Studies Quarterly, <http://www.au.af.mil/au/ssq/digital/pdf/> Summer\_2015/kim.pdf, Accessed 4-21-2016

Thus, the United States needs to continue its engagement in Asia with some muscle in its diplomacy—not necessarily to provoke China but to enhance deterrence to counter China’s expansionism and to convince Beijing there is nothing to be gained by bullying its neighbors. At the same time, nothing good can come from excessively “pushing China, which has its own concerns about America’s role in Asia, into a corner.” Under these conditions, it is essential for the United States to find the right balance between reassuring US allies and partners of Washington’s commitment to the stability in Asia-Pacific and maintaining America’s pragmatic policy of engagement with Beijing so as to protect US interests without exploiting Beijing’s anxieties. This would require the United States to pursue a strategically nuanced approach to sustain its credibility as the major balancer of power in Asia, while simultaneously making efforts to create an environment in which China would be incorporated as an essential part of the regional community. Such an approach would necessitate a delicate balance of alliance management on the one hand and practical and vigorous engagement with Beijing on the other. In this, the United States would have to work hard to enhance its strategic relationship with China, even while striving to maintain its military supremacy and to keep the regional balance of power in its favor. Such a cautious and seemingly inconsistent approach would not necessarily reflect the discrepancy of Washington’s Asia policy. Rather, it would be a sensible manifestation of the realities of America’s complex interdependence with China and other states in the region.

### CP – Expand “Engage and Hedge” – General Extension

#### It’s time to jumpstart Engage and Hedge. We need a greater presence in the Asia-Pacific

Michael Auslin, a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute in Washington, D.C., September 23, 2015, “Time For Realism In U.S.-China Relations,” The National Interest, http://nationalinterest.org/feature/time-realism-us-china-relations-13915, Accessed 4-23-2016

It is time for a new realism in U.S.-China relations. Such realism begins with an official acceptance that we are locked in a competition with China that is of Beijing’s choosing. Our economies may be increasingly interconnected, but no longer can U.S. officials quail at responding to Beijing’s provocations out of fear that trade relations will be harmed. It is time for high-level U.S.-China dialogues to be reset, to use a term once in favor in the Obama Administration, and conducted not as an unearned gift to Beijing, but only when there are concrete goals to be achieved. A state that acts increasingly in violation of global norms of behavior is not one that should be rewarded with pomp and circumstance by U.S. leaders. In addition, it is past time for the U.S. to act as the guarantor of regional stability that it claims to be. That means sending U.S. ships and planes right up to the edges of China’s manmade islands in the South China Sea, something that Obama Administration admitted in Senate testimony last week that it was not doing. By not challenging China’s territorial claims we are in essence confirming them, and sending a message of political weakness to our allies in Asia. A China that knows we will employ our military strength where it is most in question will be far more circumspect in its attempts to undermine the rules of international behavior.

### CP – Expand “Engage and Hedge” Ext. (China is challenging U.S. now)

#### Beijing is actively engaged in anti-U.S. alliance splitting, which undermines U.S. leadership in Asia

Kristien Bergerson, Senior Policy Analyst, Security and Foreign Affairs, U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, March 15, 2016, “China’s Efforts to Counter U.S. Forward Presence in the Asia Pacific,” [http://origin.www.uscc.gov/sites/default/files/Research/ USCC%20Staff%20Report%20on%20China%20Countering%20US%20Military%20Presence%20in%20Asia.pdf](http://origin.www.uscc.gov/sites/default/files/Research/%20USCC%20Staff%20Report%20on%20China%20Countering%20US%20Military%20Presence%20in%20Asia.pdf), Accessed 4-23-2016

In addition to engagement and coercion, Beijing is engaging in attempts to split alliances and exploit seams in relationships between and among the United States and its partners and allies in the Asia Pacific to improve China’s security environment. Some of the most notable examples of China’s alliance splitting efforts are directed at South Korea, which finds itself torn between the promise of economic engagement with China and its security relationship with the United States which Han Suk-hee, a professor at Yonsei University in Seoul, notes “puts South Korea in a strategic dilemma between the United States and China.” Furthermore, Beijing seeks to exploit seams in relationships and has attempted to drive a wedge between Tokyo and Seoul, U.S. allies whose alignment on key security issues is crucial to the success of Washington’s security strategy in Northeast Asia. A George Washington University (GWU) report coauthored by Robert Sutter, a professor at the Elliott School of International Affairs at GWU, assesses this friction between South Korea and Japan has “frustrated U.S. efforts to forge a coherent security policy in Northeast Asia. The two countries continue to clash over the disputed Dodko/Takeshima islands in the Sea of Japan, while rising nationalism in both countries threatens trilateral cooperation with the United States.” Evidence suggests China is also seeking to encourage the sentiment among some Australian strategists that Canberra must “choose” between the United States and China.

#### China takes a triangular approach to the Asia-Pacific, bent on subverting U.S. primacy

Kristien Bergerson, Senior Policy Analyst, Security and Foreign Affairs, U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, March 15, 2016, “China’s Efforts to Counter U.S. Forward Presence in the Asia Pacific,” [http://origin.www.uscc.gov/sites/default/files/Research/ USCC%20Staff%20Report%20on%20China%20Countering%20US%20Military%20Presence%20in%20Asia.pdf](http://origin.www.uscc.gov/sites/default/files/Research/%20USCC%20Staff%20Report%20on%20China%20Countering%20US%20Military%20Presence%20in%20Asia.pdf), Accessed 4-23-2016

China is managing its security interests in the Asia Pacific through a combination of engagement, coercion, and alliance splitting. Beijing is using economic engagement and military-to-military cooperation to try to burnish its “peaceful rise/peaceful development” image to create conditions that enhance its security environment. Beijing has been willing to use coercion to shape its security environment as well. Beijing employs coercion to—among other things—warn U.S. allies and partners against supporting the presence of U.S. forces. It employs alliance splitting to undermine the development of a unified, U.S.-led security architecture in the region and impede U.S. capabilities enabled by its alliance relationships. The aforementioned CSIS report on the “U.S. Force Posture Strategy in the Asia Pacific Region” describes how these efforts could significantly undermine U.S. freedom of action in the region: China is pursuing diplomatic, informational, military and economic instruments for counter-containment in peacetime and counter-intervention in a crisis. Japan and Australia are probably least susceptible to Chinese coercion, but defections by any ally or partner could undermine efforts for dissuasion and possibly undermine operational planning as well. In the absence of crisis or contingency operations, a U.S. request to a partner nation for access, bases, or strategic flexibility with already deployed forces has the potential to cause visible public concern and even rejection, which could undermine U.S. shaping strategies within the region.

### CP - Bilateral Investment Treaty

TEXT: The United States federal government should immediately accede to any necessary compromise to conclude and ratify a Bilateral Investment Treaty with China.

The CP is solves the relations advantage and avoids all our diplomatic engagement offense.

#### A BIT solves relations better through economic engagement. Both sides agree and China is already taking steps for reform

Thomas J. Donohue, president and CEO of the US Chamber of Commerce, September 25, 2015, “US-China understanding benefits the world,” China Daily, http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/bizchina/2015-09/25/content\_21980016.htm, Accessed 4-23-2016

The good news is that the Chinese government has already created opportunities for meaningful improvements to a number of these concerns in the short-­term, without the mandate of a BIT. Such improvements are urgently needed to benefit the Chinese economy, advance innovation and increase consumer welfare. China needs to adopt key reforms with or without a BIT, a fact Chinese leaders acknowledged in their plan for accelerating reform presented at the third plenary session of the Communist Party's 18th Central Committee in 2013. A significantly improved negative list offer would provide a measurable signal of President Xi's intent to increase the role of the market in the economy and to pursue inclusive reforms that allow foreign companies to play a greater role in helping China achieve its goals as a prosperous and innovative economy. Near­-term market opening in advance of a BIT would also go a long way to creating the momentum and public support needed in the US to secure a high standard BIT once negotiations are completed. The development of US­-China relations is a defining strategic issue for both countries. Concluding negotiations on a high ­standard BIT is the best opportunity facing both presidents to renew the vision for the partnership and take concrete steps to improve it. Importantly, it would also ensure that cooperation, rather than differences, dominate in this complex relationship. This is the purpose of the US Chamber's joint efforts with the China Center for International Economic Exchanges to strengthen business­-to-­business engagement through regular dialogue among CEOs on both sides. When CCIEE chairman and former vice ­premier Zeng Peiyan and I convene the seventh meeting of the US-­China CEO Dialogue in Beijing days prior to President Xi's departure for the US, we will call on the two governments to strategically address broader bilateral relations. Leaders, politicians and citizens of both countries must demonstrate clarity, common sense and maturity in conducting and viewing our bilateral relations. We can forge a deeper commercial engagement that benefits the workers and businesses of both countries, and this must happen even as we work through our challenges.

#### The risk of war is still high. Economic productivity is the best area to prevent conflict

Robert Farley, an assistant professor at the Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce, June 9, 2014, “Asia's Greatest Fear: A U.S.-China War,” The National Interest, http://nationalinterest.org/print/feature/asia-flames-us-china-war-10621?page=4, Accessed 4-23-2016

The window for war between the United States will, in all likelihood, last for a long time. Preventing war will require tremendous skill and acumen from diplomats and policymakers. Similarly, the demands of positioning either side for victory will continue to tax diplomatic, military, and technological resources for the foreseeable future. At the moment, however, we shouldn’t forget that China and the United States constitute the heart of one of the most productive economic regions the world has ever seen. That’s something to protect, and to build on.

### CP - Bilateral Investment Treaty Ext.

#### A Bilateral Investment Treaty solves relations better through economic engagement not diplomacy

Thomas J. Donohue, president and CEO of the US Chamber of Commerce, September 25, 2015, “US-China understanding benefits the world,” China Daily, http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/bizchina/2015-09/25/content\_21980016.htm, Accessed 4-23-2016

The United States and China share a highly interdependent yet complex relationship that is critically important to both countries and the world. Our nations benefit from areas of fruitful cooperation, even beyond commerce. But it's no secret that there are disagreements, disputes and tensions. During his state visit to Washington, President Xi Jinping and US President Barack Obama have the chance to work through the differences and renew the vision for a positive and cooperative relationship. The US-­China commercial relationship is among the world's largest. China is a nearly $600 billion market for American companies, and the country has become the United States' third-­largest export market. While the US has long been a significant investor in China, Chinese annual foreign direct investment in the US has grown exponentially and now exceeds FDI by US companies into China. More than 80,000 Americans across the US are employed directly by Chinese firms, and that number is expected to grow fourfold within five years. Despite these opportunities, a growing number of issues are threatening to drive us apart. Our fear is that we could face an economic relationship in the future characterized increasingly more by separate economic development, innovation and financial flows rather than joint opportunity and collaboration. We must not allow that to happen. American and Chinese business communities must deepen our engagement, explore our shared challenges and ensure that our governments work together cooperatively to preserve stability and growth in the global economy. Our two countries should embrace mutually beneficial opportunities. The one with the greatest potential is a bilateral investment treaty. A BIT would build on the burgeoning ties between the US and China and is the logical next step in our relationship. Advances in our commercial relations over the past several years have been nothing short of astounding－supporting strong domestic growth in both economies and contributing to jobs, innovation and productivity gains. But as China's growth slows and uncertainty seizes the global economy, increasing US­-China economic integration is more important than ever.

#### The BIT will serve as the cornerstone for Sino-U.S. economic relations

Marney Cheek, Partner at Covington & Burling, 2012, “Why A U.S.-China Bilateral Investment Treaty Matters,” Investment Policy Central, http://www.investmentpolicycentral.com/content/why-us-china-bilateral-investment-treaty-matters, Accessed 4-23-2016

A U.S.-China bilateral investment treaty (BIT) will serve as the cornerstone for the bilateral economic relationship between these two economic powerhouses for years to come.  It puts in place important rules that protect U.S. investors against discrimination and arbitrary treatment, with the United States promising the same for Chinese investments.  China remains one of the most challenging markets for U.S. investors. This is a deal worth doing, and worth doing right.  BIT negotiations between the United States and China have been underway since 2008.  Last summer the talks gained new momentum.  The parties announced a major breakthrough when China signaled for the first time its willingness to protect U.S. investments at all phases of development and in all sectors and industries, except where specifically excluded.  China’s new openness to broader protection for investments, along with the reform agenda recently released by the new leadership of the Communist Party of China, signals China’s interest in accelerating its own economic growth through greater foreign investment and ensuring protection of Chinese outbound investment to the U.S. market.  While there is a long road ahead before the BIT is concluded, now is the time to identify unique challenges in the Chinese market so they can be addressed in the BIT negotiations.

# Neg US-China Cultural Coop

## Off-Case Arguments

### “Increase” – 1NC

#### A. Interpretation

#### 1. “Increase” means to make greater and requires a pre-existing subject

Jeremiah Buckley, Attorney, Amicus Curiae Brief, Safeco Ins. Co. of America et al v. Charles Burr et al, November 13, 2006, Brief of Amici Curiae Mortgage Insurance Companies of America and Consumer Mortgage Coalition in Support of Petitioners, <http://supreme.lp.findlaw.com/supreme_court/briefs/06-84/06-84.mer.ami.mica.pdf> (Accessed 7-12-2016)

First, the court said that the ordinary meaning of the word “increase” is “to make something greater,” which it believed should not “be limited to cases in which a company raises the rate that an individual has previously been charged.” 435 F.3d at 1091. Yet the definition offered by the Ninth Circuit compels the opposite conclusion. Because “increase” means “to make something greater,” there must necessarily have been an existing premium, to which Edo’s actual premium may be compared, to determine whether an “increase” occurred. Congress could have provided that “ad-verse action” in the insurance context means charging an amount greater than the optimal premium, but instead chose to define adverse action in terms of an “increase.” That definitional choice must be respected, not ignored. See Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. 379, 392-93 n.10 (1979) (“[a] definition which declares what a term ‘means’ . . . excludes any meaning that is not stated”). Next, the Ninth Circuit reasoned that because the Insurance Prong includes the words “existing or applied for,” Congress intended that an “increase in any charge” for insurance must “apply to all insurance transactions – from an initial policy of insurance to a renewal of a long-held policy.” 435 F.3d at 1091. This interpretation reads the words “existing or applied for” in isolation. Other types of adverse action described in the Insurance Prong apply only to situations where a consumer had an existing policy of insurance, such as a “cancellation,” “reduction,” or “change” in insurance. Each of these forms of adverse action presupposes an already-existing policy, and under usual canons of statutory construction the term “increase” also should be construed to apply to increases of an already-existing policy. See Hibbs v. Winn, 542 U.S. 88, 101 (2004) (“a phrase gathers meaning from the words around it”) (citation omitted).

#### 2. Current people-to-people exchanges come in 6 pre-existing areas

U.S. Department of State, Office of the Spokesperson, July 10, 2014, “U.S.-China High-Level Consultation on People-to-People Exchange (CPE), Fact Sheet, <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2014/07/228997.htm> (Accessed 7-12-2016)

Culture: Since the re-establishment of official bilateral relations in 1979, cultural exchanges have played an important role in people-to-people engagement between the United States and China. At today’s meeting, the culture working group decided to continue its outreach efforts to young and diverse audiences through the humanities and performing and visual arts and to continue cooperation between cultural institutions, representatives, and scholars. Exchanges: The U.S. Department of State will continue to promote mutual understanding by hosting exchanges through programs such as the American Film Showcase, American Music Abroad, DanceMotion USA, a residency at the International Writing Program at the University of Iowa, the Museums Connect Program, and the Youth Leadership Program. U.S.-China Cultural Exchange Agreement: The Chinese Ministry of Culture and the U.S. Department of State agreed to renew the Implementing Accord for Cultural Exchange for 2014-2018. Official Exchange of Delegations: The U.S. and China agreed to organize the second of the two official delegation visits between the two countries to allow cultural representatives to learn about each other's cultural administrative system and explore opportunities to strengthen future exchange and cooperation. Continued Cooperation with the Private Sector: People-to-people programs continue to thrive under the cooperation of our private sector partners. The United States welcomed new CPE private sector participants, including Carnegie Hall, the National China Garden Foundation, the National Geographic Society, and the Richmond Ballet. Education: The robust educational relationship between the United States and China is helping both countries build a stronger foundation for our overall bilateral relationship. Cooperation between our educational institutions continues to expand, including in new partnerships with Historically Black Colleges and Universities. U.S.-China Education Agreement: Signifying the commitment of both governments to deepen our educational ties, the U.S. Department of State and the Chinese Ministry of Education renewed their Agreement for Cooperation in Educational Exchanges. Fulbright: The U.S.-China Fulbright program is a cornerstone of our bilateral educational cooperation, demonstrating our commitment to two-way student and scholar exchange. The two sides agreed to take measures to expand the program. Exchanges: In addition to the binational Fulbright program, the Chinese government reiterated its commitment to the three “10,000” programs for students and scholars. The 100,000 Strong Foundation and the China Education Association for International Exchange (CEAIE) announced the establishment of a counterpart organization in Beijing to support the goals of the 100,000 Strong initiative. Other private efforts such as the Schwarzman Scholars program, activities of the Asia Society, and university partnerships were applauded. Education Joint Work Plan: The U.S. Department of Education and the Chinese Ministry of Education agreed to continue promoting state-province K-12 cooperation and the initiation of a higher education meeting. Both activities fall under the U.S.-China Education Development Forum. U.S.-China Friendship Volunteers: The Peace Corps and CEAIE highlighted their efforts to expand placements in underserved areas. Science and Technology: Collaboration in science and technology is an important and dynamic area in the bilateral relationship, dating back to the 1979 U.S.-China Science and Technology Cooperation Agreement. The United States and China are using a variety of tools to enhance public dialogue on science between the two countries, educate the public on the role of science in society, and explore issues of interest to young scientists.Young Scientist Forum: The Science and Technology Pillar will host the 6th and 7th Young Scientist Forums in 2014. The Beijing Young Scientist Forum will bring together U.S. and Chinese graduate students to discuss issues relating to building a career in science, while the Washington Young Scientist Forum will focus on the science of disaster management. Over the past two years, nearly 200 young scientists from the United States and China have participated in the YSF program through the CPE. Sports: “Ping Pong Diplomacy” paved the way for the re-establishment of official relations between the United States and China. From large international competitions like the Olympics, to State Department- and Chinese Government-supported exchange programs ranging from Guangzhou and Seattle, to the creation of the NBA Yao School in Beijing, sports receive high-level attention in both nations. This year, thanks to the contributions of the U.S. Olympic Committee, the Chinese General Administration of Sport, and the Special Olympics, more than a dozen sports leagues and federations from China and the United States came together for competitions and athlete exchanges. New Dialogue: Yesterday, the Sports Pillar held the inaugural U.S.-China Sports Seminar, an academic discussion of the latest advances in sports science and technology. New and Continued Cooperation with Sports Leagues: People-to-people ties continue to thrive due to the close cooperation between the NBA and the Chinese Basketball Association. The United States is also very pleased to welcome for the first time Major League Baseball as a CPE participant. These programs extend beyond the fields of play and go a long way in promoting people-to-people connections between athletes on both countries, of all ages and backgrounds. Women’s Issues: Launched in 2011, the U.S.-China Women’s Leadership Exchange and Dialogue (“Women LEAD”), led by the Secretary’s Office of Global Women’s Issues (S/GWI) at the State Department and the All-China Women’s Federation (ACWF), brings together women leaders of both countries to discuss and tackle issues of mutual concern. New Dialogue: A group of 10 students from the University of Chicago will travel to Beijing at the invitation of the China Women’s University (CWU) in September 2014. Continuing Programs: The Women in Public Service Project housed at the Woodrow Wilson Center in Washington, D.C., and CWU will continue their partnership to engage women at five Chinese universities in women’s leadership training programs. Continuing Programs: Building on previous engagement with ACWF, the Alliance for Clean Cookstoves is working toward an MOU with ACWF on cookstove access for women. Health: The two countries are elevating their people-to-people partnerships even further by adding a health pillar, starting with the 2015 CPE in Washington, D.C. This addition will strengthen existing health collaboration and encourage more people-to-people collaboration in this important area.

### “Increase” – 1NC

#### B. Violation – The plan creates a new program within the 6 areas and/or a new area for exchanges that is not pre-existing

#### C. Reasons to Prefer

#### 1. Limits

The plan justifies creating an infinite number of possible forms and types of engagement. This overwhelms any reasons Negative research burden and justifies cases like “engage China through sign language” or “engage China through art”. Our limits are fair because they are predictable and accessible through the very agency responsible for the plan.

#### 2. Ground

The best links come from existing policies and programs. The plan shifts the debate from expanding or “making greater” existing engagement in favor of creating new forms of engagement. This undermines core Negative disadvantage and counterplan ground and fairness

#### D. Voter – Topicality is an a-priori voting issue that should be judged based on competing interpretations to avoid bias

### “Increase” T - Extension

#### “Increase” requires pre-existence

Anna J. Brown, US Federal Judge – District Court of Oregon, July 17, 2003, Elena Mark and Paul Gustafson, Plaintiffs, v. Valley Insurance Company and Valley Property and Casualty, Defendants, 7-17, Court Listener, <https://www.courtlistener.com/opinion/2463173/mark-v-valley-ins-co/> (Accessed 7-12-2016)

FCRA does not define the term "increase." The plain and ordinary meaning of the verb "to increase" is to make something greater or larger. 4 Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary 589 (10th ed. 1998). The "something" that is increased in the statute is the "charge for any insurance." The plain and common meaning of the noun "charge" is "the price demanded for something." Id. at 192. Thus, the statute plainly means an insurer takes adverse action if the insurer makes greater (i.e., larger) the price demanded for insurance. An insurer cannot "make greater" something that did not exist previously. The statutory definition of adverse action, therefore, clearly anticipates an insurer must have made an initial charge or demand for payment before the insurer can increase that charge. In other words, an insurer cannot increase the charge for insurance unless the insurer previously set and demanded payment of the premium for that insured's insurance coverage at a lower price.

#### The plan must make engagement greater

Merriam-Webster's Learner's Dictionary, 2016, “Increase,” <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/increase> (Accessed 7-12-2016)

to become larger or greater in size, amount, number, etc.

[Cambridge Academic Content Dictionary](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/), 2016, “Increase,” <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/increase> (Accessed 7-12-2016)

the [act](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/act) of [becoming](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/becoming) [larger](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/large) or [greater](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/great) or of making something [larger](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/large) or [greater](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/great): [[ C ]](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/help/codes.html) There was a [slight](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/slight) increase in [unemployment](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/unemployment) last [month](http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/month).

#### “Increase” requires a net increase over an existing baseline

John Marshall Rogers, federal judge on the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and David S. Tatel, United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, June 24, 2005, New York, et al., Petitioners v. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Respondent, NSR Manufacturers Roundtable, et al., Intervenors, http://caselaw.findlaw.com/us-dc-circuit/1290248.html (Accessed 7-12-2016)

Statutory Interpretation. [HN16](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1fe428155fdfc9074f3623f0dae9d78a&docnum=14&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=0ebd338d6a7793de8561db53b915effd&focBudTerms=term%20increase&focBudSel=all#clscc16) While the CAA defines a "modification" as any physical or operational change that "increases" emissions, it is silent on how to calculate such "increases" in emissions. [42 U.S.C. § 7411(a)(4)](http://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=8541fbf7a7f5554ca588059b132acd17&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b367%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%203%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=4&_butStat=0&_butNum=103&_butInline=1&_butinfo=42%20U.S.C.%207411&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=14&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=1f89a0e47b1996a5400e8d865d8da08a). According to government petitioners, the lack of a statutory definition does not render the term "increases" ambiguous, but merely compels the court to give the term its "ordinary meaning." See [Engine Mfrs.Ass'nv.S.Coast AirQualityMgmt.Dist., 541 U.S. 246, 124 S. Ct. 1756, 1761, 158 L. Ed. 2d 529(2004)](http://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=8541fbf7a7f5554ca588059b132acd17&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b367%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%203%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=104&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b541%20U.S.%20246%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=14&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=48f016ea3eabfdb898b67b348b11662c); [Bluewater Network, 370 F.3d at 13](http://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=8541fbf7a7f5554ca588059b132acd17&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b367%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%203%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=105&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b370%20F.3d%201%2cat%2013%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=14&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=78fdfe9d48c7b91d7659b90c0198707e); [Am. Fed'n of Gov't Employees v. Glickman, 342 U.S. App. D.C. 7, 215 F.3d 7, 10 [\*23]  (D.C. Cir. 2000)](http://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=8541fbf7a7f5554ca588059b132acd17&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b367%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%203%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=106&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b342%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%207%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=14&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=fb18ff0b92931ac00621d88dae997e67). Relying on two "real world" analogies, government petitioners contend that the ordinary meaning of "increases" requires the baseline to be calculated from a period immediately preceding the change. They maintain, for example, that in determining whether a high-pressure weather system "increases" the local temperature, the relevant baseline is the temperature immediately preceding the arrival of the weather system, not the temperature five or ten years ago. Similarly, in determining whether a new engine "increases" the value of a car, the relevant baseline is the value of the car immediately preceding the replacement of the engine, not the value of the car five or ten years ago when the engine was in perfect condition.

### Relations bad internal links (Relations adv., Japan, India, Russia, etc.)

#### Increasing people-to-people cultural engagement will strengthen U.S.-China relations

Elaine Chao, a distinguished fellow at the Heritage Foundation, conducting research on employment and the competitiveness of U.S. industries and served as U.S. Secretary of Labor from 2001 to 2009, et al, October 22, 2015, “The Importance of East-West Cultural and Educational Exchanges,” Carnegie-Tsinghua Center for Global Policy, http://carnegietsinghua.org/2015/10/22/importance-of-east-west-cultural-and-educational-exchanges (Accessed 7-13-2016)

People-to-people exchanges between citizens of China and the United States are a promising way to strengthen the bilateral relationship, the Chao family said. These interactions include academics, businesspeople, and former officials, but students and young professionals can also play an important role. Angela Chao urged students to take the initiative to expand cultural engagement between the two countries, saying, “building bridges starts with us, one person at a time.” The Chao family stated that such ties can serve to build trust and goodwill between China, the United States, and other countries.

#### A U.S. push to expand people-to-people engagement would uniquely bolster SINO-US relations

James B. Heimowitz, President of the China Institute in America, September 25, 2015, “Culture Is Key To Improving China-U.S. Relations,” China Institute, <https://www.chinainstitute.org/culture-is-key-to-improving-china-u-s-relations/> (Accessed 7-13-2016)

I’m talking about person-to-person engagement, which comes in two forms: cultural education and business exchange. Chinese President Xi Jinping’s meeting with Silicon Valley leaders (including Boeing, Microsoft, Facebook, Google and IBM), in advance of his meetings with political leaders, clearly demonstrates the significant priority and investment he placed on building business and cross-cultural understanding. His dinner in Seattle, co-hosted by the China Institute, wasn’t just a who’s-who of political dignitaries—instead, it was attended by diplomatic, technological, and cultural institutions from across the U.S. From what I’ve observed at my work at the Institute, it isn’t China that is shying away from cultural engagement with the U.S. The China Institute, for example, was founded in the 1920s with indemnity money from the Boxer Rebellion, and the Chinese government has continued to invest in language and cultural education in the United States. And American culture is flourishing in China. In Xi’s speech in Seattle, the President went out of his way to make references to American culture, from Hemingway to “House of Cards.” Perhaps it’s time for the U.S. to begin making similar investments in cultural understanding among its own citizens. It’s going to be a long road towards improving positive Chinese—U.S. relationships, and we face many challenges. So now, more than ever, we must build mutual respect and understanding between the two nations. That comes from person-to-person interaction and cultural exchange. In that sense, at least, President Xi’s visit was a good start.

### Humanism Kritik Links

#### The 1AC is embedded in a liberal humanism rooted in the Enlightenment. Engagement embodies cultural relations that seek to erase difference

DCMS, Staff Writer, February 04, 2016, The Department for Culture, Media and Sport ([DCMS](https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-culture-media-sport)) is the central UK Government Department, “Cultural exchange not cultural diplomacy: a two way street,” https://dcms.dialogue-app.com/the-cultural-diplomacy-challenge/cultural-exchange-not-cultural-diplomacy-a-two-way-street-1 (Accessed 7-13-2016)

The ‘cultural diplomacy challenge’ as expressed seems to treat cultural exchange in a predominantly 20th century, single-track mode.  It was this USA mindset that led to the overwhelming adoption in 2005 of UNESCO’s Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions on a vote with 148 countries in favour and only two against (the USA and Israel). The British Presidency at the time cast the block vote on behalf of a united EU on this issue. In 2014 the Government, while noting that there was no enthusiasm for the EU to extend its supporting competences in culture, tourism and sport, commented that all the contributors who submitted evidence held the view that the current EU role was “on balance either beneficial to the future development of these sectors and UK national interest, or had the potential to be so” (EU/UK Balance of Competences Review). The ways in which cultural organisations, government, businesses and individuals can work together to reach out to more people, in more countries, calls for skilled practice in cultural relations – a core competence for 21st century. With the worldwide proliferation of relatively low-cost media technologies, the credibility and efficacy of national governments and agencies as the primary communicators are being superseded. We have moved from the old ‘official’ model of ‘few to few’ to that of ‘few to many’ and towards ‘many to many’. It follows that successful promotion of British values and culture to aid appreciation, impact and mutual understanding in a rapidly transforming world requires a high level of intercultural competence. Respect and mutual trust are key factors. The role of national cultural institutions, sometimes contrary to appearances, is not that of static repositories of artefacts or repertoire, but as active participants in the articulation of our own and others’ sense of identity in a changing world. The British Museum’s 1753 founding principles set by Parliament, and deriving from Enlightenment ‘civic humanism’ are just as relevant today, requiring it: “to allow visitors to address through objects, both ancient and more recent, questions of contemporary politics and international relations”. Fixed identities are increasingly confused and threatened. They struggle to take root in a storm but neither can they thrive in isolation. Intercultural dialogue helps marginalise extremism in all its forms, contributing to positive social change and strengthening civil society – both at home and abroad.

#### US-China people-to-people engagement is rooted in the humanistic drive for unity

China Daily, Staff Writer, January 22, 2011, “China-US humanistic exchanges bear global significance,” http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/china/2011huvisistsus/2011-01/22/content\_11900571.htm (Accessed 7-13-2016)

As the only Confucius Institute targeting primary and middle school students in the United States, the Confucius Institute in Chicago (CIC), housed in Walter Payton College Preparatory High School, was a highlight of Hu's four-day visit, which, apart from its diplomatic and economic significance, reflected China's desire to boost humanistic interactions with Americans. At a welcome ceremony on the South Lawn of the White House Wednesday, Hu reiterated the importance of extensively involving the two peoples in efforts to boost the China-U.S. partnership. When meeting with his U.S. counterpart Barack Obama, Hu called on both sides to increase the awareness of the importance of China-U.S. ties, among their peoples, especially their youths; promote mutual understanding and friendship; give full play to their initiative to support the development of bilateral ties; and consolidate the basis of public opinions of the relations.

## Case Debates

### Status Quo Solves – Exchanges Expanding Now

#### The status quo solves. Sino-US engagement through the CPE is expanding on all fronts

John Kerry, Former US Secretary of State, June 7, 2016, “Consultation on People-to-People Exchange Plenary Session,” Remarks at the National Museum, Beijing, China, World Affairs Journal, <http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/content/kerry-us-china-people-people-exchange-needs-greater-reciprocity> (Accessed 7-12-2016)

At the very first CPE, we mentioned and established the goal of enabling 100,000 Americans to study in China over a four-year period. Well, we’ve already achieved that goal. And last September, our two presidents embraced an even more promising ambitious goal to have 1 million Americans studying Mandarin by the year 2020. We’re not there yet, but I have no doubt that we’re going to get there. And the number of U.S. students already learning Mandarin is 10 times what it was only 10 years ago. So if we can maintain that pace, the sky – literally, the sky is the limit on what we will achieve. There are 300,000 young Chinese doing academic work in the United States today. That is a fivefold increase in just 10 years – and while more Americans are in Chinese classrooms than in any other country outside of Western Europe. So the bottom line is very straightforward. More young people on both sides of the Pacific are learning each other’s languages. They are sampling each other’s cultures and gaining a very personal appreciation of the potential for cooperation between the United States and China. And that is enormously important news because it’s human nature to fear the unknown. And for many years, as we know, people built up barriers between us. It is a welcome fact that education and the knowledge that comes with it are the greatest builders that there are of confidence and of trust. I mean, nothing can replace that walk up a mountain where people are talking about everything and becoming friends, not just fellow students. So we need to find as many joint projects as we can to move forward in a variety of fields covering each of the six pillars that we’re already working around. And beyond education, I want to underscore that our doctors are working together to improve health outcomes and to address the threats that are posed by breast cancer, diabetes, and cardiovascular disease. And one of the reasons we were a little late coming here, which I apologize for, is that the vice premier and I were engaged in a deep conversation about how we can grow this. And one of the things that we committed to grow is our engagement in building health capacity and engagement in the health sector. So that will continue. Our innovators and our inventors are collaborating on the latest in science and technology. Our writers, musicians, and filmmakers are exploring new frontiers of cooperation in the arts and culture. Our athletes, as I met downstairs where I met the Duke University women’s team and one of the women’s teams from China that just played to a one-to-one draw – probably a good way for a friendly game to end – but in basketball, baseball, golf, volleyball, swimming, and water polo, we’re competing in ways that bring people together. And of course, no one can forget that it was sports and ping pong diplomacy that originally created a transition for our countries. Our countries are together placing the rights and the equality of women front and center, because respecting our mothers and daughters is an essential building block of progress and prosperity for our families and communities. And no country – no country – can possibly meet its full potential if half of its team or a large percentage of that half are left on the bench.

#### People-to-people exchanges are already expanding and improving now on 3 levels

Liu Yongtao, Assistant Professor of Center for American Studies, Fudan University, June 22, 2016, “[People-to-People Exchanges: A Main Dish, Not A ‘Spice’,”](http://www.chinausfocus.com/culture-history/people-to-people-exchanges-a-main-dish-not-a-spice/) China-US Focus, http://www.chinausfocus.com/culture-history/people-to-people-exchanges-a-main-dish-not-a-spice/ (Accessed 7-12-2016)

The people-to-people exchange in the Sino-U.S. relationship, whose aim is to enhance and strengthen ties between the citizens of the two countries, has been evolving in bascially sound ways. First, it has been conceived by the governments of the two countries as an important and integral part in the bilateral relationship. Seven rounds of the CPE have been held so far. High-level institutions such as Ministry of Culture of China and the U.S. Department of State have been committed to the designing and initiating the people-to-people exchange programs. Second, the scales of the people-to-people exchange have been expanding rapidly. The people-to-people exchange the two countries started in four areas with 13 programs in 2010, when the first round of the CPE was held, and then developed horizontally into six areas with 104 programs, and by 2015 into seven areas with 119 programs. They have been facilitating and promoting pragmatic cooperation, which benefits hundreds of thousands of citizens of the two countries. For instance, increasing numbers of students from both China and the U.S. have been benefiting from such programs as the “Three Ten-Thousand”, and “100, 000 Strong” initiatives. Third, the level of Sino-U.S. cooperation in the people-to-people exchange has been improving. Over past years, it has extended vertically from the national level to local levels. Some 240 sister provinces/states and cities between the two countries have been associated as pairs, and “Sino-U.S. Governors Forum”, “Sino-U.S. Mayors Forum”, “China-U.S. Young Scientists Forum”, and “China-U.S. Women’s Leadership Exchange and Dialogue” have been initiated successively.

### Status Quo Solves – Exchanges Expanding Now

#### People-to-people exchanges are expanding now

Fei Fei, editor, June 7, 2016, “China, U.S. to deepen people-to-people exchanges,” China Radio International, <http://english.cri.cn/12394/2016/06/07/3521s930158.htm>, (Accessed 7-12-2016)

Senior Chinese and U.S. officials vowed to expand people-to-people exchanges during the seventh round of China-U.S. High-Level Consultation on People-to-People Exchange (CPE). Chinese Vice Premier Liu Yandong said both countries should work to improve people-to-people exchanges and involve more people in the program. Secretary of State John Kerry said the United States is willing to work with China to tap cooperation potential and expand exchanges.

#### The CPE is already a centerpiece of relations and expanding

Liu Yongtao, Assistant Professor of Center for American Studies, Fudan University, June 22, 2016, “[People-to-People Exchanges: A Main Dish, Not A ‘Spice’,”](http://www.chinausfocus.com/culture-history/people-to-people-exchanges-a-main-dish-not-a-spice/) China-US Focus, http://www.chinausfocus.com/culture-history/people-to-people-exchanges-a-main-dish-not-a-spice/ (Accessed 7-12-2016)

The 7th China-U.S. High Level Consultation on People-to-People Exchange, in parallel with the 8th Strategic and Economic Dialogue, was concluded in early June in Beijing, and the two countries have signed 12 cooperation agreements and presented 158 results of cooperation covering seven areas including education, science and technology, culture, public health, sports, women and youth. Since the launch of this annual meeting in 2010, the people-to-people exchange has become another highlight in China-U.S. cooperation.

#### China is also pushing people-to-people cultural engagement now

Zhang Lihua, resident scholar at the Carnegie–Tsinghua Center for Global Policy, et al, April 17, 2015, “China’s Cultural Diplomacy: Strategy, Policy, and Implementation,” Carnegie–Tsinghua Center for Global Policy, <http://carnegietsinghua.org/events/?fa=4807> (Accessed 7-13-2016)

Elements of Contemporary Chinese Culture: China has undergone massive changes in the past several decades, and the country’s cultural traditions are no exception, participants noted. They asserted that traditional Confucian and Daoist values—such as the importance of social harmony and order—have blended with China’s unique vision of modernization and economic development. As China has opened up and grown more globally engaged, the country’s traditional values have come into contact with classical liberal ideas about open trade and multilateral institutionalism, which, they explained, has shaped the way China thinks about its role on the world stage. Cultural Diplomacy and Public Diplomacy:  As China’s economic and political clout grows, so too does its need to cultivate soft power through cultural and public diplomacy, participants agreed. They described cultural diplomacy as a way to foster people-to-people ties through initiatives such as cultural festivals, art exhibitions, and language training. They contrasted this with public diplomacy, where governments use strategic communications efforts to enhance understanding of, and win support for, their foreign policy among the general public of other countries.

### Solvency Answers – Exchanges fail to change attitudes

#### Cultural diplomacy fails to change attitudes on Chinese policy, even if we like the culture

Gary Rawnsley, Professor of Public Diplomacy in the Department of International Politics, Aberystwyth University and China Policy Institute’s Senior Fellow, October 23, 2013, “Limits of China’s Cultural Diplomacy,” China Policy Institute, <http://blogs.nottingham.ac.uk/chinapolicyinstitute/2013/10/23/limits-of-chinas-cultural-diplomacy/> (Accessed 7-12-2016)

This brings us to the first weakness with associating cultural projection with soft power: The clear disjuncture between its aspirations and the external perceptions of its behaviour at home and abroad. China’s authoritarian methods of political management undermine the credibility of its cultural soft power. In other words, China experiences problems within the political realm which prevent its soft power – including strategies privileging culture – being as attractive to international audiences as they otherwise might be. Such problems are revealed by opinion polls, which indicate there is no correlation between expenditure on soft power activities and positive changes in attitudes towards China (especially in Europe, North America, Australia, Japan, South Korea and India – centres of strategic importance for China’s global ambitions). In fact, we have tended to see a reversal of fortune despite the huge soft power push engineered in Beijing, and one can only conclude from this that the reversal is due to negative perceptions of China’s policies and behaviour. Thus we must question seriously the justification of China’s expenditure on, and faith in, soft power as a remedy for defects in the international community’s attitudes towards China. In short, there is no obvious correlation between enjoying and liking Chinese culture, and liking contemporary China and its policies, its political system or its behaviour at home or abroad. In this way, there is a serious disconnect between culture and ‘power’ in the soft power equation.

#### Greater appreciation of Chinese culture does not change fundamental opinions about China

Gary Rawnsley, Professor of Public Diplomacy in the Department of International Politics, Aberystwyth University and China Policy Institute’s Senior Fellow, October 23, 2013, “Limits of China’s Cultural Diplomacy,” China Policy Institute, <http://blogs.nottingham.ac.uk/chinapolicyinstitute/2013/10/23/limits-of-chinas-cultural-diplomacy/> (Accessed 7-12-2016)

A third weakness of locating culture and tradition at the forefront of soft power is that there is no guarantee that cultural interest will convert into tangible soft power outcomes. How does cultural power connect with one’s soft power aspirations and foreign policy ambitions? Favourable outcomes depend on converting the resources into measurable effects. Indeed, there is no direct correlation between consuming a cultural product and an increase in sympathy or empathy with the source. Watching a Chinese movie, attending a Chinese food festival or being thrilled by Yao Ming’s prowess on the basketball court does not necessarily translate into a change of attitude, opinion or behaviour towards China.

### Solvency Answers – NGO laws undermine exchanges

#### China is actively constraining participants in the plan’s exchanges, making participants targets of State repression

Edward Wong, Staff Writer, April 29, 2016, “Clampdown in China Restricts 7,000 Foreign Organizations,” New York Times, http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/29/world/asia/china-foreign-ngo-law.html?\_r=0 (Accessed 7-13-2016)

China took a major step on Thursday in President Xi J inping’s drive to impose greater control and limit Western inﬂuences on Chinese society, as it passed a new law restricting the work of foreign organizations and their local partners, mainly through police supervision. More than 7,000 foreign nongovernment groups will be affected, according to state news reports. Foreign groups working across Chinese civil society — on issues including the environment, philanthropy and cultural exchanges, and possibly even in education and business — will now have to find an official Chinese sponsor and must register with the police. This also applies to groups from Taiwan, Hong Kong and Macau. Those organizations that do not receive official approval will be forced to stop operating in the country. Many groups will probably curtail or eliminate programs deemed politically sensitive, such as training lawyers, in order to remain. Groups that may have a hard time getting approval include those promoting workers’ rights, ethnic equality and religious freedoms.

#### New legal reforms in China undermine people-to-people ties. The plan makes participants vulnerable to government crackdowns

Yahoo Finance, Staff Writer, April 28, 2016, “China passes law tightening controls on foreign nonprofits,” http://finance.yahoo.com/news/china-passes-law-tighten-controls-foreign-nonprofits-093242422.html (Accessed 7-12-2016)

U.S. Deputy Secretary of State Antony Blinken told a congressional hearing Thursday that sent a "terrible signal" to NGOs which are acting for the benefit of China and its people. Secretary of State John Kerry said in a statement he was deeply concerned that the law would hurt people-to-people ties between the U.S. and China by creating a "highly uncertain and potentially hostile environment" for such groups. Many overseas organizations have partnered with Chinese academic and social groups, but still operate in a legal gray area that leaves them vulnerable to crackdowns by security forces.

#### China’s NGO laws will constrain exchanges under the plan

BBC News, Staff Writer, April 28, 2016, “China passes new laws on foreign NGOs amid international criticism,”

<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-china-36157052> (Accessed 7-12-2016)

China has passed new laws on foreign non-governmental organisations (NGOs) state media said, amid criticism. The full text was not immediately available, but previous drafts stated that NGOs would have to submit to police supervision and declare sources of funding. Critics say the laws amount to a crackdown, but China has argued that such regulation is long overdue. There are currently more than 7,000 foreign NGOs operating in China. The bill has undergone several drafts after international criticism that it was too onerous. The White House [has said](https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/09/23/readout-national-security-advisor-susan-e-rices-meeting-civil-society) the bill will "further narrow space for civil society" and constrain US-China exchanges.

### Solvency Answers – Human rights differences hurt exchanges

#### Differences on human rights will undermine people-to-people exchanges, seen as Western value campaigns

Thomas Lum, Specialist in Asian Affairs at the Congressional Research Service, September 17, 2015, “Human Rights in China and U.S. Policy: Issues for the 114th Congress,” Congressional Research Service, https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R43964.pdf (Accessed 7-13-2016)

Human rights conditions in the People’s Republic of China (PRC) remain a central issue in U.S.-China ties. Different perceptions of human rights are an underlying source of mutual misunderstanding and mistrust. Frictions on human rights issues affect other issues in the bilateral relationship, including those related to economics and security. China’s weak rule of law and restrictions on information affect U.S. companies doing business in the PRC. People-to-people exchanges, particularly educational and academic ones, are often hampered by periodic Chinese government campaigns against “Western values.”

#### People-to-people engagement fails to improve human rights. Chinese government repression is increasing, despite engagement

[William Ide](http://www.voanews.com/author/4333.html), Staff Writer, March 31, 2016, “China Crackdown on Dissent Raising Questions About International Role,” Voice of America News, <http://www.voanews.com/content/china-crackdown-on-dissidents-raising-quextions-about-international-role/3262797.html> (Accessed 7-12-2016)

In a letter to President Obama, U.S. Representative Christopher Smith and Senator Marco Rubio, co-chairmen of the Congressional Executive Commission on China, even suggested that Xi not be allowed to visit the capital again “without any accounting for the severe erosion of human rights and rule of law which has taken place on his watch and with his authorization.” They also said there is a growing consensus that the pillars of U.S.-China policy are crumbling. “Trade, investment, and people-to-people exchanges have not brought political reforms or ensured human rights or made China a 'responsible stakeholder' in the international system,” they said in the letter. “Rather, Beijing seems emboldened in its repression both at home and abroad.” China has long had little tolerance for dissent. But since Xi Jinping came to power three years ago, the space for civil engagement and criticism has shrunk dramatically. And increasingly, authorities appear to be looking to silence criticisms overseas as well, especially commentaries in Chinese. There has also been a growing number of detentions of lawyers, journalists and activists.

#### People-to-people engagement won’t solve. We should condition every encounter on human rights reform

Christopher Smith, U.S. Representative (NJ) and Marco Rubio, US Senator (FL), co-chairs of the Congressional Executive Commission on China, March 30, 2016, “Chairs Call on President Obama To Prioritize Human Rights Concerns in Meeting with Xi Jinping,” Congressional Executive Commission on China, http://www.cecc.gov/media-center/press-releases/chairs-call-on-president-obama-to-prioritize-human-rights-concerns-in (Accessed 7-13-2016)

There is no shortage of other concerns to include in your discussions with President Xi: The draft overseas non-governmental organization management law; the continued harassment, detention, and other mistreatment of individuals who seek to peacefully practice their religion, express their views, or seek legal redress; the draconian anti-terrorism law being used to crack down on Tibetans, Uyghurs, and broader civil society, at the very time that China’s internal security apparatus is expanding and remains largely unaccountable; the crackdown on labor advocates and further restrictions on labor NGOs and the continued use of coercive population control policies and forced abortions. Additionally, we remain deeply concerned that U.S. citizen and businesswoman, Sandy Phan-Gillis, has been detained without charge for more than a year. She has been denied access to lawyers and at various points held in solitary confinement and interrogated. This abusive treatment raises serious concerns about the safety of Americans doing business in China—this should be made clear to President Xi. There is a growing consensus that the pillars upon which U.S.-China policy were built are crumbling. Trade, investment, and people-to-people exchanges have not brought political reforms or ensured human rights or made China a “responsible stakeholder” in the international system. Rather, Beijing seems emboldened in its repression both at home and abroad. We believe that a full and frank discussion about human rights and civil society is vital during every encounter with President Xi and senior Chinese leadership, particularly during the NSS as well as the G-20, which China will host later this year.

# Neg US/China Cyber Security

### Threat Exaggerated

#### The Chinese cyber threat is over exaggerated—logistics obstacles and incentives not to escalate

Ron R. Lindsay, Assistant Professor at the University of Toronto Munk School, May 2015, “Exaggerating the Chinese Cyber Threat,” Belfer Center, <http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/publication/25321/exaggerating_the_chinese_cyber_threat.html> (accessed July 20, 2016)

Policymakers in the United States often portray China as posing a serious cybersecurity threat. In 2013 U.S. National Security Adviser Tom Donilon stated that Chinese cyber intrusions not only endanger national security but also threaten U.S. firms with the loss of competitive advantage. One U.S. member of Congress has asserted that China has "laced the U.S. infrastructure with logic bombs." Chinese critics, meanwhile, denounce Western allegations of Chinese espionage and decry National Security Agency (NSA) activities revealed by Edward Snowden. The People's Daily newspaper has described the United States as "a thief crying 'stop thief.'" Chinese commentators increasingly call for the exclusion of U.S. internet firms from the Chinese market, citing concerns about collusion with the NSA, and argue that the institutions of internet governance give the United States an unfair advantage. The rhetorical spiral of mistrust in the Sino-American relationship threatens to undermine the mutual benefits of the information revolution. Fears about the paralysis of the United States' digital infrastructure or the hemorrhage of its competitive advantage are exaggerated. Chinese cyber operators face underappreciated organizational challenges, including information overload and bureaucratic compartmentalization, which hinder the weaponization of cyberspace or absorption of stolen intellectual property. More important, both the United States and China have strong incentives to moderate the intensity of their cyber exploitation to preserve profitable interconnections and avoid costly punishment. The policy backlash against U.S. firms and liberal internet governance by China and others is ultimately more worrisome for U.S. competitiveness than espionage; ironically, it is also counterproductive for Chinese growth.

### Threat Exaggerated

#### China can be deterred from mass cyber-attack by retaliation and economic interdependence

Joseph Nye, University Distinguished Service Professor and former Dean of Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government, February 3, 2016, “Can China Be Deterred in Cyber Space?,” The Diplomat, <http://thediplomat.com/2016/02/can-china-be-deterred-in-cyber-space/> (accessed July 20, 2016)

If we look at the cyber realm, the effectiveness of deterrence depends on who (state or non-state) one tries to deter and which of their behaviors. Ironically, deterring major states like China from acts of force may be easier than deterring non-state actors from actions that do not rise to the level of force. The threat of a bolt from the blue attack by a major state may have been exaggerated. Major state actors are more likely to be entangled in interdependence than are many non-state actors, and American declaratory policy has made clear that deterrence is not limited to cyber against cyber but can be cross domain with any weapons of our choice. Along with punishment and denial, entanglement is an important means of making an actor perceive that the costs of an action will exceed the benefits. Entanglement refers to the existence of interdependences which makes a successful attack simultaneously impose serious costs on the attacker as well as the victim. This is not unique to cyber. For example, in 2009, when the People’s Liberation Army urged the Chinese government to dump some of China’s massive holdings of dollar reserves to punish the United States for selling arms to Taiwan, the Central Bank pointed out that this would impose large costs on China as well and the government decided against it. Similarly, in scenarios which envisage a Chinese cyber attack on the American electric grid imposing great costs on the American economy, the economic interdependence would mean costly damage to China as well. Precision targeting of less sweeping targets might not produce much blowback, but the increasing importance of the Internet to economic growth may increase general incentives for self restraint. At the same time, entanglement might not create significant costs for a state like North Korea which has a low degree of interdependence with the international economic system.

### Threat Exaggerated

#### China doesn’t seek military dominance with their cyber campaign, it’s for domestic regime survival

Jack Detsch, Mark Clayton Fellow in Cybersecurity for Passcode, the Monitor's section addressing security and privacy in the Digital Age, May 20, 2015, “Are We Exaggerating China’s Cyber Threat?,” The Diplomat, <http://thediplomat.com/2015/05/are-we-exaggerating-chinas-cyber-threat/> (accessed July 20, 2016)

So how much should we worry about China’s cyber capabilities? Not much, [according](http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/publication/25321/exaggerating_the_chinese_cyber_threat.html) to Professor Jon R. Lindsay’s new policy brief, published by Harvard University’s Belfer Center. Public record on U.S. and Chinese cyber capabilities remains scant, but Lindsay suggests that the U.S. is gaining an “increasing advantage,” evidenced by a new DARPA program launched in 2012, and the use of the Stuxnet worm to [damage](http://www.wired.com/2014/11/countdown-to-zero-day-stuxnet/) computer systems at an Iranian nuclear enrichment facility in 2010. In America’s private cyber industry, the name of the game has shifted from defense to offense. But China’s interest in developing cyber capabilities is political, not military, Lindsay argues, prompting incursions into foreign digitized space to suppress dissent, in the case of GitHub, or to steal secrets from adversaries. Even so, “lax law enforcement, and poor cyber defenses leave the country vulnerable to both cybercriminals and foreign spies,” Lindsay notes, suggesting that China struggles to use the information it comes away with for political gain. China’s successful campaigns target NGOs and private sector companies, and “do nothing to defend China from the considerable intelligence and military advantages of the United States.”

### No Solvency—Cyber Deterrence

#### The plan doesn’t establish cyber deterrence or shore up international norms—it’s insufficient

Andrea Shalal, Staff writer for Reuters, September 30, 2015, “Top U.S. spy says skeptical about U.S.-China cyber agreement,” Reuters, <http://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-cybersecurity-idUSKCN0RT1Q820150930> (accessed July 20, 2016)

Clapper said he was skeptical because Chinese cyber espionage aimed at extracting U.S. intellectual property was so pervasive, and there were questions about the extent to which it was orchestrated by the Chinese government. He said the United States should "trust but verify," a reference to former President Ronald Reagan's approach to nuclear disarmament with the former Soviet Union. China's Foreign Ministry said on Wednesday it hoped both countries would act on the "common understanding" they had reached on cybersecurity. "China and the U.S. are two major internet countries," ministry spokesman Hong Lei told a regular briefing. "As for protecting internet security, both sides have shared interests and relevant challenges." Clapper and other top U.S. military officials said cyber threats were increasing in frequency, scale, sophistication and severity, and the United States needed the same kind of deterrent capability in cyberspace that it maintains for nuclear weapons. Attacks by countries such as Russia, China, Iran and North Korea, as well as non-state actors, would increase and likely grow more sophisticated in coming years, expanding to include manipulation of data, he said. "Such malicious cyber activity will continue and probably accelerate until we establish and demonstrate the capability to deter malicious state-sponsored cyber activity," he said. Establishing a credible deterrent requires agreement on norms of cyber behavior by the international community, he said. However, they said attributing a cyber attack was far more difficult than determining who launched a missile.

### No Solvency—Attacks Inevitable

#### China will never stop their cyber-attacks—they view them as essential to regime power

Dean Cheng, Senior research fellow in The Heritage Foundation’s Asian Studies Center, May 18, 2016, “Here's Why China's Cyber Strategy Should Have America Worried,” The National Interest, <http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/heres-why-chinas-cyber-strategy-should-have-america-worried-16245> (accessed July 20, 2016)

Chinese activities in cyberspace regularly garner a great deal of attention. Chinese hackers have been accused of stealing millions of records from U.S. government databases, such as the Office of Personnel Management, as well as various corporations. But too often, the focus is on the individual attack, rather than understanding the larger context. This leaves us playing whack-a-mole when trying to deal with Chinese cyber espionage efforts. In fact, Chinese leadership sees information as inextricably linked to not only the broader national interest, but also to regime survival. The People’s Republic of China is interested in improving its “comprehensive national power,” the combination of economic, military, political, social, and cultural factors that together reflect national capabilities. In the information age, information is the vital resource that enables all types of power. At the same time, however, the free flow of information constitutes a dire potential threat to Chinese Communist Party rule. China has emplaced the “Great Firewall of China” and deployed an army of censors numbering in the tens, or even hundreds of thousands, to limit the informational threat to the regime. But this is insufficient to allay Beijing’s concerns. Ideally, China must control and influence all information flowing to China, which means shaping and molding the international structures that manage that information flow. China is interested in setting the global norms for cyberspace, but in ways that fundamentally challenge and contradict the free flow of information that the United States has long championed.

### No Solvency—Not Verifiable

#### Cyber security cooperation with China can’t be verified—too difficult to track source of hacks and plausible deniability

Joseph Steinberg, CEO of Secure My Social cyber security firm, September 27, 2015, “10 Issues With the China-US Cybersecurity Agreement,” INC, <http://www.inc.com/joseph-steinberg/why-the-china-us-cybersecurity-agreement-will-fail.html> (accessed July 19, 2016)

4. Even if it were more comprehensive, the agreement is essentially unenforceable. There are no "inspections" or any other clear methods of implementing a "trust, but verify" strategy. One cannot simply prevent a country from launching cyberattacks by inspecting facilities as would be done to verify that a nation is not building nuclear weapons or the like. Hackers can be anywhere; it is a lot easier for them to hide--even in plain sight--than to hide thousands of centrifuges and a nuclear reactor. Chinese hackers don't even need to be in China in order to carry out their attacks. Furthermore, much as Iran sponsors terror through proxies--Hezbollah and the like--China could easily hack through third parties; it is often impossible to determine who is paying a hacker to carry out attacks, or if an attack is emanating from its true source or has been routed through another party. 5. Contrary to the perception that many people develop from fictional stories, experts often cannot identify with certainty the source of a professionally-executed cyberattack; to this day, experts disagree as to who carried out various high profile breaches. Furthermore, even when the culprit of an attack is identified, that party often has a great deal of plausible deniability. As Stewart Draper, Director of Insider Threats for Securonix, noted: "China has always denied involvement in data theft by its government, or encouraging Chinese companies to perform espionage." Practically speaking, should the need arise, how is the United States going to substantiate any perceived violations by China?

#### There’s no way to verify or enforce cyber agreements with China

[Sarah Cook](https://freedomhouse.org/expert/sarah-cook), Senior Research Analyst for East Asia, November 9, 2015, “Obama-Xi Agreement Will Not Resolve China Cybersecurity Threat,” Freedom House, <https://freedomhouse.org/blog/obama-xi-agreement-will-not-resolve-china-cybersecurity-threat> (accessed July 20, 2016)

But while the commitment signals bilateral goodwill, there are a number of reasons to doubt its effectiveness in curbing commercial espionage and the broader problem of intrusive, destructive cyberattacks against a range of U.S. targets by entities tied to the Chinese government: Absence of clear standards or verification mechanisms: Security experts analyzing the agreement noted its vague wording and [lack of definitions](http://www.inc.com/joseph-steinberg/why-the-china-us-cybersecurity-agreement-will-fail.html) for what constitutes acceptable or unacceptable activity, meaning further negotiation would be required to render the agreement effective. Similarly, no objective metrics were identified for determining whether one side or the other has followed through on its commitments. These challenges, along with the near impossibility of tracing who is responsible for most cyberattacks, will make enforcement difficult.

### No Solvency—China Can’t Help

#### China doesn’t have the ability to aid the US in preventing cyber attacks

Joseph Steinberg, CEO of Secure My Social cyber security firm, September 27, 2015, “10 Issues With the China-US Cybersecurity Agreement,” INC, <http://www.inc.com/joseph-steinberg/why-the-china-us-cybersecurity-agreement-will-fail.html> (accessed July 19, 2016)

7. Even if China desired to deliver on its promises, it is not clear that the country has the resources to do so. Chinese hackers are believed to commonly hack businesses within China, making one wonder whether the nation's government truly has the capability to curtail hacking. Furthermore, as Ken Westin, Senior Security Analyst at Tripwire noted, the Chinese government has "taken a stance of complete innocence when it comes to cyber war and espionage to the point of claiming naivety." This deal is "sort of like having two parties agree to not hit each other in the face, but one of the parties says he cannot agree because he doesn't have the ability to punch."

### No Solvency—China Lies

#### China will lie—they’ll continue cyber-attacks despite agreements

[Bill Gertz](http://freebeacon.com/author/bill-gertz/), Senior editor of the Washington Free Beacon, October 19, 2015, “China Continues Cyber Espionage Despite Summit Accord,” The Washington Free Beacon, <http://freebeacon.com/national-security/china-continues-cyber-espionage-despite-summit-accord/> (accessed July 20, 2016)

China’s government continued economic cyber espionage attacks against businesses despite a pledge to halt the practice last month, a cyber security firm revealed on Monday. The security company CrowdStrike stated in a blog post that seven companies were hit by hackers that “we have affiliated with the Chinese government.” The hacker group includes Deep Panda, a code name used by security researchers for Chinese military-affiliated hackers who have been linked to numerous covert information network intrusions. The company said the recent intrusions were detected by software used to monitor and thwart sophisticated hacking attacks. The Chinese cyber strikes contradict the informal agreement announced Sept. 25 during a summit in Washington between President Obama and President Xi Jinping.

### No Solvency—China Won’t Comply

#### China can’t afford to stop cyber-crime, it’s how they advance their R&D sector

Jennifer McArdle, Research Associate at the Potomac Institute for Policy Studies and a Fellow in the Center for Revolutionary Scientific Thought, November 1, 2015, “Why the U.S.-China Cyber Spying Ban Will Inevitably Fail,” National Interest, <http://nationalinterest.org/feature/why-the-us-china-cyber-spying-ban-will-inevitably-fail-14219>

2. The Chinese R&D strategy supports acquiring foreign technology via espionage. The impetus for Chinese industrial espionage is also captured in Beijing’s research and development (R&D) strategy. China’s “National Medium and Long-Term Plan for Science and Technology Development (2006-2020),” [known in the West as the MLP](https://www.uschamber.com/sites/default/files/legacy/reports/100728chinareport_0.pdf) [13], describes itself as being the “grand blueprint for science and technology development” required to realize the “great renaissance of the Chinese nation.” While the MLP does promote a policy of indigenous innovation, it also advocates “enhancing original innovation through co-innovation and re-innovation based on the assimilation of technologies.” Accordingly, many international technology companies consider the MLP an official green light for industrial espionage. Furthermore, the [U.S. Counterintelligence Executive](http://www.ncsc.gov/publications/reports/fecie_all/Foreign_Economic_Collection_2011.pdf) [14] has detailed how aspects of China’s science and technology modernization strategy, known as the “863 Program,” explicitly provides funding and guidance on how to clandestinely acquire U.S. technology and other sensitive information for the purpose of the PLA, in addition to funding indigenous R&D efforts. Of the nine foreign espionage cases that have been prosecuted in the States between 1996 and 2011, three were linked to the 863 Program. 3. Cyber is fragmented across the PRC; an agreement may not have consensus. As [John Lindsey](https://global.oup.com/academic/product/china-and-cybersecurity-9780190201265?cc=us&lang=en&) [15] so aptly notes, “there is no single Chinese view on cybersecurity and cyberwarfare, just as there is no one Western view.” While China does have a one-party system, Chinese policy on cybersecurity is in reality highly fragmented, both functionally and regionally. The Party, State Council, PLA and provincial governments thus all have differing roles and responsibilities. When combined, the multiplicity of actors, lack of transparency and absence of effective policy coordination in the Chinese system create a “Wild East” approach to cybersecurity policy. It is therefore possible that even though ranking members of the Communist party may be in favor of an anti–corporate espionage agreement, other government entities are not.

### No Solvency—No Cooperation

#### Plan can’t spark US/China cooperation on cyber security, recent attacks overwhelm

[Keith Moore](http://sparkcognition.com/author/kmoore/), Staff writer for Spark Cognition news, June 3, 2016, “The gloves are off in the US-China Cyberwar,” Spark Cognition, <http://sparkcognition.com/2016/06/sparkblog-gloves-off-us-china-cyberwar/> (accessed July 20, 2016)

Although heads of state from both sides have expressed interest in cooperating to better govern the Internet through the UN as recently as June of last year, recent developments have severely hampered any chances of cooperation. What does that mean for businesses with e-assets and privileged information? Unfortunately, nothing very good. The one, certain conclusion we can draw is that there will be no break in cybercrime activities internationally for the foreseeable future. The distrust on both sides will likely lead to an unsafe cyber world for corporations and institutes with increasingly digital, and increasingly more expensive R&D and other proprietary assets. The irony, of course, is that international laws (including NATO’s Tallinn Manual) fail to address spying on private companies. For now, companies will have to invest in better technology, better security policies and constant vigilance to guard against this looming – and ever expanding – threat.

### Inherency—Squo Solves—Agreement Now

#### No need for the plan, recent US/China cyber security agreement solves the impact

Adam Segal, Maurice R. Greenberg Senior Fellow for China Studies and Director of the Program on Digital and Cyberspace Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, and Tang Lan, Deputy Director at the Institute of Information and Social Development, China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations, April 27, 2016, “Can the United States and China De-Conflict in Cyberspace?,” War on the Rocks, <http://warontherocks.com/2016/04/can-the-united-states-and-china-de-conflict-in-cyberspace/> (accessed July 20, 2016)

In spite of significant differences in views, Beijing and Washington appear committed to not letting cyber issues derail the U.S.-China relationship or interfere with cooperation on other high-profile issues. Among the wide range of issues raised at their recent meeting on the sidelines of the Nuclear Security Summit, Presidents Barack Obama and Xi Jinping reiterated their commitment to last September’s breakthrough cybersecurity agreement. The agreement included important cybersecurity measures, including a pledge to refrain from stealing intellectual property or trade secrets to give domestic companies a competitive advantage. Both sides also agreed to identify and endorse norms of behavior in cyberspace and to establish two high-level working groups and a hotline for crisis response. The success and ultimate implications of which have yet to be determined and the two sides work cautiously to build greater collaboration in cyberspace.

### Inherency—Squo Solves—Attacks Declining

#### Chinese cyber-attacks against the US are decreasing now

Matthew Deluca and Robert Windrem, Staff writers for NBC News, July 3, 2016, “Are Chinese Hackers Slowing Down Their Cyber Attacks on the U.S.?,”NBC News, <http://www.nbcnews.com/tech/tech-news/are-chinese-hackers-slowing-down-their-cyber-attacks-u-s-n601961> (accessed July 20, 2016)

Hackers based in China seem to have slowed some of their attacks on U.S. targets, private cybersecurity researchers and U.S. government officials have recently suggested, hinting at a shift in strategy for the nation as more public and political attention has turned to online threats. But it's not clear how long that will last, and companies and individuals shouldn't be quick to let their defenses down, they say. "Since mid-2014, we have seen a notable decline in China-based groups' overall intrusion activity against entities in the U.S. and 25 other countries," cybersecurity firm FireEye said in a report published on June 20. While prominent actions by the U.S. government, including the indictment of accused hacker members of the Chinese military in 2014, seem to have played a role in tamping down the cyber threat, the FireEye report suggests that China had already begun to tone down some of its activities amid a shift in strategy started by Chinese President Xi Jinping.

#### Bilateral agreements aren’t key—cyber-attacks were declining a year before the US/ China made the agreement

David E. Sanger, chief Washington correspondent of The New York Times, June 20, 2016, “Chinese Curb Cyberattacks on U.S. Interests, Report Finds,” NY Times, <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/21/us/politics/china-us-cyber-spying.html> (accessed July 20, 2016)

Nine months after [President Obama](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/o/barack_obama/index.html?inline=nyt-per) and President [Xi Jinping](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/x/xi_jinping/index.html?inline=nyt-per) of China agreed to a broad crackdown on cyberespionage aimed at curbing the theft of intellectual property, the first detailed study of Chinese hacking has found a sharp drop-off in almost daily raids on Silicon Valley firms, military contractors and other commercial targets. But [the study](https://www.fireeye.com/content/dam/fireeye-www/current-threats/pdfs/rpt-china-espionage.pdf), conducted by the iSight intelligence unit of FireEye, a company that manages large network breaches, also concluded that the drop-off began a year before Mr. Obama and Mr. Xi announced their accord in the White House Rose Garden. In a conclusion that is largely echoed by American intelligence officials, the study said the change is part of Mr. Xi’s broad effort to bring the Chinese military, which is considered one of the main sponsors of the attacks, further under his control.

#### No need for the plan—cyber-attacks from China are declining now

Taipei Times, Taiwan based news organization, June 22, 2016, “Chinese economic cyberespionage on US declines: study,” Taipei Times, <http://www.taipeitimes.com/News/front/archives/2016/06/22/2003649182> (accessed July 20, 2016)

As a result, the same political forces that may be alleviating the theft of data from US companies are also responsible for Xi’s stunningly swift crackdown on the Chinese media, bloggers and others who could challenge the Chinese Communist Party. “It’s a mixed bag,” said Kevin Mandia, founder of Mandiant, now part of FireEye, which first detailed the activities of a PLA cyberarm, called Unit 61398, that had been responsible for some of the most highly publicized thefts of US technology. “We still see semiconductor companies and aerospace firms attacked.” The daily barrage of attacks has diminished, which Mandia attributed to “public pressure” from, among others, the US Department of Justice’s decision to indict five members of the PLA unit about a year after its activities were exposed. Today, Unit 61398 appears to be largely out of business, its hackers dispersed to other military, private and intelligence units, although many China and legal experts remain skeptical that the Chinese are deterred by US indictments, since the PLA officers are unlikely to see the inside of an US courtroom. However, US Assistant Attorney General for National Security John Carlin said the report validated his strategy. “The lesson is that when you figure out who has done this kind of theft, don’t fear making it public,” he said. “This is a slow process, but we are beginning to make people realize that even in cyberspace, laws and norms are applicable.” Obama and Xi drew up their agreement narrowly. It covers intellectual property theft, but not ordinary espionage against government targets. As recently as last week, senior US officials were in Beijing trying to flesh out the agreement between the two presidents. Participants say that among the points of discussion was how to set up a hotline through which the two nations can alert each other to malicious software they have detected in global networks.

### A/T US/China Relations Adv

#### US and China have irreconcilable differences—cyber accords won’t change it

[Michael Auslin](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/authors/michael_auslin/), Resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, September 22, 2015, “Sino-U.S. Cyber Pact Reveals Failure of U.S.-China Policy,” Real Clear Politics, <http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2015/09/22/sino-us_cyber_pact_reveals_failure_of_us-china_policy.html> (accessed July 20, 2016)

If Barack Obama signs a landmark cyberspace agreement with visiting Chinese President Xi Jinping this week in Washington, D.C., it will be hailed as evidence that Beijing and Washington can forge an adult, working relationship on a critical security issue. In reality, the very need to negotiate such a pact reveals the failure of America’s decades-long China policy and the inability of the U.S. government to understand China’s evolving threat to U.S. interests. Step back from any discussion of the specifics of such an agreement. Consider instead the state of relations that must hold between two nations for their top leadership to even contemplate a pact that, in the [words](http://www.nytimes.com/2015/09/20/world/asia/us-and-china-seek-arms-deal-for-cyberspace.html?_r=1) of the New York Times, would embrace “a commitment by each country that it will not be the first to use cyber weapons to cripple other’s critical infrastructure during peacetime …” Not wartime, mind you, but peacetime. Why should such an issue even need to be addressed between two nations that had any type of working relationship based on trust? Note, too, the implications of the above formulation. First, there apparently exists a need to ensure that one country does not try to cripple the vital infrastructure of one of its largest trade partners. Why would two nations without possibly irreconcilable differences, or at the least a trust deficit of epic proportions, even be contemplating such a move, and therefore have to try and prevent it?

#### China will comply just enough to maintain relations with the US, they’ll never actually give up cyber attacks

Darren Pauli, Staff writer for The Register, October 14, 2015, “US-China cyber espionage treaty ‘will do nothing’: FireEye boss”<http://www.theregister.co.uk/2015/10/14/uschina_treaty_will_do_nothing_fireeye_boss/> (accessed July 20, 2016)

The China-US treaty will do next to nothing to slow or stymie espionage attacks, says FireEye boss Kevin Mandia. Presidents Obama and Xi Jinping recently pledged to stop economic espionage efforts, in a bid to repair the bilateral relationship between the countries. The agreement, positioned as a means to curb wholesale pillaging of US corporate assets and the activities of the NSA, has attracted wide criticism from the information security community since so much network-centric espionage is confirmed to originate from China. Beijing's backing of well-resourced Chinese hacking groups has not been confirmed but is the subject of much speculation. Some groups employ dozens of hackers working regular nine to five shifts and are using expensive zero day exploits to compromise high-value corporate and defence targets. Mandia, a former Pentagon man and founder of forensics giant Mandiant, says the treaty will do little to curb the hacking. "This agreement with China … healthcare is fair game, universities are fair game, and you keep going down the list, and bottom line is it doesn't end," Mandia told the Cyber Defence Summit (formerly Mircon) in Washington DC today. "Nothing really changes. The intrusions will still stay the same.

#### Other big obstacles overwhelm cyber’s ability to shore up US/China relations—the plan alone is insufficient

Shiran Shen, Ph.D. student in political science at Stanford University and an Asia-Pacific Scholar at Stanford's Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies, and Robert D. O'Brien, Ph.D. candidate in international relations at the University of Oxford and a research analyst at context China, May 24, 2013, “The U.S., China, and Cybersecurity: The Ethical Underpinnings of a Controversial Geopolitical Issue,” The Carnegie Council, <http://www.carnegiecouncil.org/publications/articles_papers_reports/0156> (accessed July 20, 2016)

What is the greatest ethical challenge facing U.S.-Asia relations? In this unique contest, Carnegie Council challenged American and East Asian students to partner together and submit a joint essay or video to answer this question—whether about U.S.-Asia relations in general, or U.S. relations with a particular East Asian country. This contest is part of [Ethics for a Connected World](http://www.carnegiecouncil.org/programs/100/index.html), a three-year global education project to mark the Council's [2014 Centennial](http://www.carnegiecouncil.org/programs/100/index.html). For more about the contest, [click here](http://www.carnegiecouncil.org/about/announcements/0078). Find all the entries on our [Global Ethics Network](http://www.globalethicsnetwork.org/profiles/blog/list?tag=%23ConnectedWorld). The rise of Asia is one of the most significant developments in the 21st century geopolitical landscape. Pundits who dubbed the 20th century the "American Century" are now predicting that the 21st century will be the "Pacific Century." Asia's ascendance is driven in large part by the return of China, whose economic and political might has been growing at unprecedented speeds, to a position of international prominence. China's re-emergence as a significant global player has heightened the importance of the bilateral relationship between the United States and China, the two largest economies in the world. These two countries, which feature markedly different political systems and cultures, have an unprecedented opportunity to cooperate in reshaping global norms in the name of the greater good. To do so, however, they will have to overcome numerous bilateral disputes, many of which are grounded in divergent views on ethics. Human rights and climate change are two of the most prominent areas where divergent Chinese and American views, determined in large part by differing stances on various ethical questions, are inhibiting cooperation. In this essay, however, we would like to examine another issue that looms large in both U.S.-China ties and international relations writ large—cybersecurity. Though commonly conceptualized as a strategic geopolitical issue, we contend that its underpinnings are comprised of a series of ethical considerations. Moreover, we believe that addressing some of these fundamental ethical considerations will provide a better framework for easing bilateral tensions and promoting cooperation than surface-level tit-for-tat negotiations and public naming and shaming.

### A/T Cyber War Adv—Impact Defense

#### Cyber-attacks won’t escalate into a shooting war—aff claims are exaggerated

Brandon Valeriano, PhD Political Science—reader at the Cardiff University School of Law and Politics, and Ryan C. Maness, Visiting fellow of security and resilience studies in the Department of Political Science at Northeastern University, April 27, 2015, “Cyber War versus Cyber Realities: Cyber Conflict in the International System,” , Google Books, (accessed July 20, 2016)

We developed our theory of cyber engagement fully in Chapter 3. The argument considers that cyber restraint is expected to dominate cyber interactions and should be predictive of future cyber operations. States will restrain themselves from crossing the “red lines" of cyber conﬂict because of the high operational and normative cost associated with these operations. They will not shut down military networks, knock out power grids, or black out Wall Street; the fear of blowback and retaliation not only in cyberspace, but by conventional means as well, is too great. States will also avoid these actions because of fears of collateral damage and infecting the rest of the Internet. Actions taken in cyberspace tend to invade all aspects of cyberspace. Even when states take actions to keep operations in the realm of cyber, the operations tend to spread and proliferate in ways not predicted. Escalated offensive capabilities will not be used because they could lead directly to war, civilian harm, and economic retaliation, which would then esca- late conﬂict among states. These tactics would spread the conﬂict from the cyber realm to conventional conﬂict. Therefore, restraint is what we expect to ﬁnd when we examine Cyber conﬂict among states. States will do what they believe they can get away with and then will go no further. Restraint is the outcome we expect to see among states, while the process we expect to see at work is what we term cyber straitjacketing. The low level and limited amount of cyber conﬂict we do observe will mostly be between regional rivals, an unexpected result given the global reach of cyber technologies. Cyber regionalism is the assertion that most rival interactions in cyberspace will have a regional context, usually tied to territorial issues and other traditional issues between regional actors. However, because cyber conﬂict is restrained, these cyber incidents and disputes will usually take the form of propaganda, vandalism, or inconvenient denial of service methods and will not esca- late to militarized conﬂict solely because of cyber issues.

#### New US/China hotline prevents cyber-attack escalation

Eric Geller, Staff writer for the Daily Dot, December 11, 2015, “U.S. and China establish cyber working group with Cold War-esque 'hotline',” The Daily Dot, <http://www.dailydot.com/layer8/us-china-cybercrime-working-group-cyber-norms/> (accessed July 20, 2016)

President Barack Obama announced Friday that the United States and China have agreed to establish a new working group for combating cybercrime, potentially paving the way for more extensive cooperation between two countries locked in a fierce and costly digital rivalry. The working group, composed of senior law-enforcement and intelligence officials from both nations, will evaluate how the two major powers respond to each other's requests for assistance fighting "malicious cyber activity," the White House said in a statement. The group will hold its first meeting before the end of the year, with subsequent meetings occurring twice per year. The new cyber dialog will include "a hotline for the escalation of issues that may arise in the course of responding to such requests," a system reminiscent of the direct link between the leaders of the U.S. and the Soviet Union during the Cold War. The U.S. and China also agreed not to "conduct or knowingly support cyber-enabled theft of intellectual property, including trade secrets or other confidential business information, for commercial advantage," Obama said at a joint press conference with Chinese President Xi Jinping. The agreement was immediately met with cautious optimism from some members of Congress.

### A/T Cyber War Adv—No Inherency

#### The US and China are already engaged in a cyber war

[Paul Szoldra](http://www.techinsider.io/author/paul-szoldra), Correspondent for Tech Insider mainly focused on cybersecurity and hackers, May 24, 2016, “Here's how the US military is beating hackers at their own game,” Tech Insider, <http://www.techinsider.io/us-military-cyberwar-2016-5> (accessed July 20, 2016)

There's an unseen world war that has been fought for years with no clear battle lines, few rules of engagement, and no end in sight. But it's not a shooting war; not a war where combatants have been killed or wounded — at least not yet. It's a war that pits nations against each other for dominance in cyberspace, and the United States, like other nations employing professional hackers as "cyber soldiers," sees it as a battlefield just like any other. “It’s like an operational domain: Sea, land, air, space, and cyber," Charlie Stadtlander, chief spokesperson for US Army Cyber Command, told Tech Insider. "It’s a place where our presence exists. Cyber is a normal part of military operations and needs to be considered as such.” As US military leaders warn of the growing progress of Russia, China, and [North Korea](http://www.techinsider.io/north-korea-worlds-best-hackers-2016-5) in cyberspace, the Pentagon has ramped up its own efforts in what it calls the "cyber domain" after the release of a new [cyber strategy in April 2015](http://www.defense.gov/News/Special-Reports/0415_Cyber-Strategy). "This ephemeral space that's all around us, literally, is a space where operations can be performed against us," Frank Pound, a program manager who leads DARPA's ["Plan X"](http://www.darpa.mil/program/plan-x) cyber warfare platform, told Tech Insider. "And how do we defend against that? How do we detect that?"