

CDL Core Files Index

Bilateral Investment Treaty

AFFIRMATIVE

Vocabulary

Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP): Major trade deal which expands investment, economic cooperation, and reduces taxes. It's signed, but it has not been ratified by the US so all the good things about it are not happening. It includes 12 countries in the Pacific Rim area, but does *not* include China.

Bilateral Investment Treaty (BIT): A BIT is an agreement between two countries that sets up "rules of the road" for foreign investment in each other's countries. BITs give US investors better access to foreign markets—and on fairer terms. The United States currently has BITs with 42 countries. A high-quality US-China BIT would give American companies better access to China's market, and equal rights as Chinese firms.

South China Seas (SCS): Part of the Pacific Ocean just southeast of China. It is near Taiwan, the Philippines, Cambodia, and Vietnam. A great deal of goods are moved through the area and there's supposedly a lot of oil in the sea bed. There are serious disputes about who actually owns it and thus many countries are fighting over it.

Senkaku Islands: Islands in the East China sea that have no one living on them. The US gave them to Japan, but China disagrees. These islands, like the South China Sea, are areas where fighting might erupt.

Xi Jinping (She jin-PING): General Secretary of the Communist Party of China, the President of the People's Republic of China, and the Chairman of China's Central Military Commission. He's like Obama, but even more powerful since China does not have the same political structure as the US. Essentially, he's the president of China.

Gross Domestic Product (GDP): value of all goods and services made in a particular country, usually counted yearly. This is a good indicator of how well an economy is doing—the higher the GDP the better.

Foreign Direct Investment: When a foreign company owns a business in another country. It also includes general investment from one country to another. For example, US companies invest and own companies in China.

State Owned Enterprise (SOE): a business that is partially or entirely owned by the “state” or the government. The US is worried about these in China because they are worried that the Chinese government will give better treatment to their companies than US ones.

People’s Liberation Army (PLA): The Chinese armed forces. Basically the accumulation of all the Chinese military. It is the largest military in the world.

Communist Party of China (CCP): Main political party of China. They have large control over the entire country and believe in a strong government with control over the people and economy. Xi Jinping is the leader of the party.

AT=Answers To

Bilateral Investment Treaty 1AC

First, our PLAN: The United States federal government should ratify the bilateral investment treaty with the People's Republic of China.

Contention One: Harms (The Global Economy)

1. China's economic slowdown causes social unrest and collapse of the country
2. The global economy is headed for a recession
3. Economic decline causes nuclear war

Contention Two: Harms (US-China War)

1. China is building up its military in the South China Sea—This guarantees miscalculation and war
2. South China Sea conflict causes nuclear war

Contention Three: Solvency

1. A US-China BIT will not pass now. However, the plan passes BIT and opens up investment and reduces trade barriers
2. China can either be a partner or an adversary—economic cooperation is the only way to solve global economic decline and war

2AC AT Global Economy #1—China

Investment High

1. Extend our Diplomat evidence.
2. Foreign Direct Investment is quite low—this evidence is from your author
3. US-China economic cooperation limited—US is hesitant to work with China

2AC AT Global Economy #2—Economic

Decline War

1. Extend our Mead evidence.
- 2 Economic decline causes war—three warrants

2AC AT Global Economy #3—BIT Hurts

Economy

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 A mutually benefitting BIT is possible and would include higher investment, transparency, a legal framework, and an equal playing field.
- 3 China is a HUGE growing market for goods—BIT gives US access
- 4 Investment between the US and China is low now, but a BIT would substantially improve both economies

2AC AT Global Economy #4—Economies

Improving

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 China and Europe's economies are faltering
- 3 Chinese economic slowdown causes riots

2AC AT US-China War #1—No US/China

War

1. Extend our TIME evidence.
- 2 Computer simulations show all out Asian war is inevitable without diplomacy
The Telegraph, April 2016 [Riccardo Cociani is a second year undergraduate student in war Studies at King's College London and Chair of the KCL Crisis Team "Is war with China inevitable?" April 18,
<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/04/18/is-war-with-china-inevitable/>]

2AC AT US-China War #2—China

Expansion Solves War

1. Extend our TIME and Tikhonova evidence.
- 2 Tension between the U.S. and China is increasing—conflict is inevitable in the South China Sea

**2AC AT US-China War #3—Brink Passed
Already**

- 1. Extend our _____ evidence.

**2AC AT US-China War #4—China’s not a
threat**

- 1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 China is aggressively building up their military—
MANY warrants
- 3 Chinese expansion and declining diplomatic relations
make war inevitable

2AC AT Solvency #1—Diplomacy Fails

- 1. Extend our Mendis and Wang evidence.
- 2 Strong economic relations with Asia are key to global
prosperity and security
- 3 US-Chinese trade solves conflict—multiple historical
examples

**2AC AT Solvency #2—Diplomacy High
Now**

- 1. Extend our Diplomat evidence.

2AC AT Solvency #3—China will say “No”

- 1. Extend our _____ evidence.

**2AC AT: China Will Punish the US
Economically**

- 1. China won’t use trade retaliation—they’re incredibly
tied to the US economy

Bilateral Investment Treaty NEGATIVE

1NC The Global Economy Frontline

1. Investment between the countries is high now
2. No Impact--Economic decline does not cause war—In 2008, the economy went down substantially and no one went to war. In fact, the US fought two wars in the Middle East when the economy was good.
3. Solvency Turn: BIT outsources American jobs and hurts the economy
4. No Impact: China is economically fine—your cards exaggerate

**2NC/1NR Global Economy #1--
Investment High Now Extensions**

1. Extend our Morrison evidence.
2. China is breaking records for investments in the U.S.
3. Investment between countries high now

**2NC/1NR Global Economy #2—Economic
Decline Does Not Cause War**

1. Extend our analytic evidence.
2. No impact to another recession.
3. Economic Decline does not cause war—history proves it

**2NC/1NR Global Economy #3—BIT Hurts
the Economy**

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
2. The Chinese only buy American companies to get technology and military secrets

**2NC/1NR Global Economy #4—Economy
Stable Extensions**

1. Extend our Reuters evidence.
2. The US economy is growing nicely

1NC US-China War Frontline

1. No US-China War—people know the consequences and miscommunication happens all of the time

2. Impact Turn: China expansion solves war between Southeast Asian countries
3. Brink Passed—All of their evidence says that there will be a war extremely soon. The BIT will take time to pass and relations to develop. This means that their impacts will happen before they can fix them.
4. China is reducing military spending—they're not a threat

2NC/1NR US-China War #1--No War

Extensions

1. Extend our Think Progress evidence.
2. Economic ties and war cost deter conflict

2NC/1NR US-China War #2—China

Expansion Solves War Extension

1. Extend our Li and Yanzhuo evidence.

2NC/1NR US-China War #3—No Brink

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
2. Accidents and threats happen all the time and have not caused a war

2NC/1NR US-China War #4—China Not a

Threat

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
2. China will decline and naturally cooperate with the US—Five reasons

1NC Solvency Frontline

1. Diplomacy fails to fix military relations
2. No Solvency: The US and China cooperate all of the time. There's nothing that makes this plan any different. The status quo is enough to solve the harms. Also, the aff would have to cooperate over military matters, not economic ones.
3. China will say 'no' to the plan—they're resistant to foreign companies

2NC/1NR Solvency #1—Diplomacy Fails

1. Extend our Li and Yanzhuo evidence.
- 2 Military cooperation and economic engagement are distinct—straight from Xi’s mouth

2NC/1NR Solvency #2—BIT Not Enough

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 The US and China already economically and diplomatically cooperate

2NC/1NR Solvency #3—China Will Say No

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 Technology disagreements prove China’s resistance to BIT

Human Rights AFFIRMATIVE

Vocabulary

Multi-National Corporations (MNCs): A corporation that has factories or offices in a foreign country. For example, a US company that has a factory in China is an MNC.

These include Ford, Apple, Nike, and Gap to name a few.

Sullivan Principles/Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR):

These are guidelines for MNCs in foreign countries. These rules must be followed if the company or the government makes them law. These rules/principles protect basic workplace rights including discrimination, unionization, pay, environmental, and safety. These can differ from country-to-country and company-to-company but these are Global Sullivan Principles found at

<http://hrlibrary.umn.edu/links/sullivanprinciples.html>

Tibet: Region in China originally inhabited by Tibetans.

Tibetans are a distinct culture from the rest of China and want their independence. China politically, religiously, and physically persecutes the people of Tibet.

Uyghur (Wee-Grr): Ethnic group originally of Turkish descent. Like the Tibetans, they live in China, but are discriminated against because of ethnic difference.

Apartheid: Afrikaans word meaning “separateness”.

Apartheid normally refers to the awful racial discrimination in South Africa from the 1940’s to 1990’s.

The AFF argues that the Sullivan Principles influenced South Africa to move away from their legal racism.

Xi Jinping (She jin-PING): General Secretary of the Communist Party of China, the President of the People's Republic of China, and the Chairman of China's Central Military Commission. He's like Obama, but even more powerful since China does not have the same political structure as the US. Essentially, he's the president of China.

People's Liberation Army (PLA): The Chinese armed forces. Basically the accumulation of all the Chinese military. It is the largest military in the world.

AT=Answers To

China Human Rights 1AC

Contention One: Harms (Human Rights)

1. Progress is a myth in China—2015 was their worst year for human rights violations. People who speak out against the government are put in jail for years or executed. Women are forced to have abortions while human trafficking is on the rise.
2. China abuses rights with authoritarian-style governance. The government kicks ethnic minorities out of their homes and children with disabilities are discriminated against
3. Human rights must be protected in all instances—It's a moral obligation and a more probable impact

Contention Two: Harms (Democracy)

1. Chinese crack downs against democracy cause massive violence and result in country collapse
2. Other countries model China's politics—the result is war, inequality, and totalitarianism

Contention Three: Solvency

1. The Sullivan Principles protect fair wages, race, safety, unionization, ethical guidelines, and monitoring
2. The Plan solves in two ways. One, the workplace respect is modeled and spills over into broader society. Second, China will protect human rights because they want to keep US companies in their country

Advantage _____ : Harms (US Credibility)

3. Human rights credibility is the foundation for all other diplomatic efforts. Its credibility is key to all US international policies
4. Effective U.S. diplomacy is necessary to prevent the escalation of wars, nuclear proliferation, climate change, and a host of other impacts
5. Climate change will cause extinction.

Advantage _____ : Harms (China Stability)

1. Promoting labor rights in China is critical for their economy because it will grow the middle class

2. A strong Chinese economy is critical to ensure that the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) will stay in power
3. If the CCP loses power it will cause a nuclear war

Advantage : Harms (US Trade Competitiveness)

1. A disregard for labor rights will give China an unfair advantage in world trade. This will threaten U.S. trade competitiveness
2. Now is the key time to curb Chinese gains over U.S. trade- Currency manipulation already threatens our global advantage over China
3. U.S trade competitiveness is key to prevent global wars

2AC Human Rights AT #1—China

Improving Human Rights

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 Labor rights are violated creating a chilling effect in the workplace
- 3 Women’s rights are limited

2AC Human Rights AT #2--No Moral

Obligation

1. Extend our Gibney evidence.
- 2 US human rights protections are modeled globally—it’s ethical and practical to protect them

2AC Human Rights AT #3—High

Magnitude Impacts Outweigh

1. Extend our Gibney evidence.
- 2 Low risk, high magnitude impacts are extremely flawed—it’s propaganda and causes war
- 3 Failure to prevent human rights abuses risks nuclear war

2AC Democracy AT #1—US Violates

Democracy

1. Extend our Williams and Human Rights Watch evidence.
- 2 Chinese democracy is in decline as those who disagree are silenced. A strong arm ruler will be elected and strike militarily—they have their own Trump problems
- 4 U.S. domestic policy has no effect on the ability for us to project human rights norms credibly

2AC Democracy AT #2—Chinese Democracy Improving

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 Expression of ideas and internet information is silenced
- 3 Political dissidents and racial minorities are imprisoned or murdered by the thousands
- 4 New law shows Chinese commitment to repressing human rights and democracy

2AC Democracy AT #3—Countries Model US Democracy

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 China's politics are modeled globally—They can be a symbol of peaceful democracy
- 3 Democracy and human rights must be seen as successful in China or other countries will become authoritarian
- 4 Even if that's true, the US needs to support democracy globally to be a good model

2AC Solvency AT #1—Human Rights Appeals Fail

1. Extend our Two pieces of Lee evidence.
- 2 China is showing some signs of openness to human right changes
- 3 Sullivan Principles protect essential human rights—they historically worked during South Africa's apartheid
4. Human rights measures can work in China

2AC Solvency AT #2—Human Rights are Imperialism

1. Extend our Lagon and Diamond evidence.
- 2 Even if they're a little imperialist, human rights protections stabilize the country and prevent larger violence
- 3 We are morally obligated to protect the Tibetan and Uyghur people. This racism is the root of all wars

2AC Solvency AT #3—Sullivan Principles Hurt Economy

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 There will be monitoring of the MNC's to guarantee they follow the law—protects economic rights too
- 3 Sullivan Principles historically solved in South Africa—business relationships spillover into society

2AC – Harms (US Credibility) Extensions

1. Engagement over human rights issues with China will boost the U.S.'s reputation on human rights issues
2. In order to have credibility, the U.S. must “lead by example”. This means seizing every opportunity to condemn human rights abuses
3. The U.S. needs to be vocal and steadfast on human rights issues with China in order to have global credibility

2AC Answers to: China Relations DA

1. The negative misunderstands the nature of our relations with China. Yes, human rights issues are contentious, but failure to acknowledge these differences will strain relations further
2. Engagement over human rights issues will not strain relations with Beijing

2AC Answers to: EU Counterplan

1. Only the perm solves – The US and EU being on the same page about human rights gives added credibility

**that neither the Counterplan alone lacks because of
current trade disputes between China and Europe**

Human Rights NEGATIVE

1NC Human Rights Frontline

1. China is making incredible progress on human rights
2. No moral obligation—human rights violations happen daily. Their own evidence says that thousands die from preventable diseases. We aren't responsible for everything wrong in the world. We should try to stop the largest, most pressing impact instead.
3. Existence before human rights. We need to be alive to protect human rights

2NC/1NR Human Rights #1—China

Improving

1. Extend our Contorno evidence.
2. China will protect human rights in the future—Western judgement is hypocritical

2NC/1NR Human Rights #2—No

Obligation

1. Extend our Analytic evidence.
2. The Democratic Republic of Congo is a much worse human rights problem—there's no brink

2NC/1NR Human Rights #3--

Extinction/War First Extensions

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
2. We massively outweigh on magnitude—Extinction includes the 500 trillion people who are yet to be born

1NC Democracy Frontline

1. Democracy is violated in the US too so there's no brink
2. Chinese democracy is coming now—this evidence is from their impact author
3. Countries model US democracy, not China's

2NC/1NR Democracy #1—No Brink

1. Extend our Guardian evidence.
2. The US prison system violates democracy and human rights

2NC/1NR Democracy #2—Democracy Improving

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 China has multiple ways it will transition to a more democratic country

2NC/1NR Democracy #3—Countries Model the US

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 African and third world countries model us democracy

1NC Solvency Frontline

1. Human rights appeals fail
2. Solvency Turn: Imperialism
 - A. Human Rights confrontation is Western cultural imperialism and guarantees backlash
 - B. Imperialism causes global wars, terrorism, and cultural violence
3. Solvency Turn: Sullivan Principles hurt Companies—they'll just return to the US

2NC/1NR Solvency #1—Human Rights Appeals Fail

1. Extend our Christenson evidence.
- 2 China resists human rights criticism and turns it on the US
- 3 No Solvency: China uses US hypocrisy to not make meaningful reforms

2NC/1NR Solvency #2—Imperialism

1. Extend our Callahan evidence.
- 2 Human rights appeals are just Western Imperialism used to justify wars

2NC/1NR Solvency #3—Sullivan Principles Bad for the Economy

1. Extend our _____ evidence.

1NC- U.S. Credibility Frontline

1. No solvency: private companies will side step regulations
2. No impact: Global warming will not cause extinction.
3. No solvency: China does not see the U.S. as credible on human rights
4. Solvency Turn- U.S. efforts to enforce labor rights have actually increased abuses
5. No impact: Global warming is reducing by itself

1NC- Harms (CCP Stability) Frontline

1. Solvency Turn- the affirmative is actually bad for the Chinese economy. Increased regulations on labor rights will decrease foreign investment
2. No impact: The CCP is becoming stronger
- 3 No impact: The Communist Party will transition peacefully out of power

1NC- Harms (U.S. Trade Competitiveness) Frontline

1. No solvency: China manipulates their currency
2. No impact: US trade credibility has been low for years

North Korea AFFIRMATIVE

Vocabulary

Six Party Talks: Diplomatic talks with the purpose of ending North Korea's nuclear program. These started in 2003 and have only had moderate success. The six parties are China, the United States, North South Korea, Japan, and Russia.

Sanctions: A penalty for not following a rule. In the case of the Aff, these are economic or trade sanctions. This means that countries ask North Korea to change its policy with nuclear weapons or human rights and if they refuse then countries will not trade. Think of this as the "lunch table" diplomacy. If someone is being a jerk, then everyone will not trade lunch with them. If they change their ways, then they can come back to the negotiating table and see what they can get for that PB & J.

Military Concessions: To remove military presence or make military promises to other countries. For the Aff, North Korea wants less US military in the area because they are worried the US will destroy them. The Affirmative agrees with North Korean demands and reduces weapons, troops, threats toward North Korea.

Pyongyang (Pee-yong-yang): Capital of North Korea. It can be used to describe what the government wants. For example, “Pyongyang wants the US to do ___” really means that the North Korean government wants the US to do ____.

Kim Jung-Un: Current leader of North Korea—son of Kim Jung-Il. He is described by many as a dictator or authoritarian leader who oppresses his people. He has ultimate authority and is North Korea’s “Supreme Leader”.

Kim Jung-Il: Former leader of North Korea and father of Kim Jung-Un. Established a corrupt dictatorship where the government has ultimate authority.

Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK): The full, exact name for North Korea. If you see this name or the abbreviation, they’re talking about North Korea.

Terminal High Altitude Air Defense (THAAD): A missile system that was put in and over South Korea in July to protect them from North Korea. The US, South Korea, and Japan like this idea because it will better protect these countries from North Korean weapons. China and North Korea don’t like it because they feel like this is an excuse for the US to put their military in the area.

South China Seas (SCS): Part of the Pacific Ocean just southeast of China. It is near Taiwan, the Philippines, Cambodia, and Vietnam. A great deal of goods are moved through the area and there’s supposedly a lot of oil in the sea bed. There are serious disputes about who actually owns it and thus many countries are fighting over it.

Senkaku Islands: Islands in the East China sea that have no one living on them. The US gave them to Japan, but China disagrees. These islands, like the South China Sea, are areas where fighting might erupt.

Xi Jinping (She jin-PING): General Secretary of the Communist Party of China, the President of the People's Republic of China, and the Chairman of China's Central Military Commission. He's like Obama, but even more powerful since China does not have the same political structure as the US. Essentially, he's the president of China.

AT=Answers To

North Korea 1AC

First, the PLAN: the United States federal government should make military concessions to People's Republic of China in exchange for collaborative sanctions against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Contention One: Inherency

1. Current diplomacy is failing—emboldening North Korea and hurting the US-Chinese relationship

Contention Two: Harms (North Korean War)

1. A US-North Korean war is coming—US military posture escalates the conflict to nuclear war
2. Promising military concessions for stronger sanctions can bring North Korea to the negotiating table—solving lash out

Contention Three: Harms (Regime Change)

1. North Korea is literally the worst place on Earth—hundreds of thousands are murdered, enslaved, and abused
2. Human rights must be protected in all instances—it's a moral and legal obligation

Contention Four: Solvency

1. Solvency: strong sanctions and Six Party Talks cause North Korean shift away from human rights abuses and nuclear ambitions
2. Engaging China tips the balance in talks—they tame North Korea

2AC Harms (North Korean War) AT #1—

No Nuclear Ability/Backlash

1. Extend our International Business Times and Feng evidence.
- 2 North Korea goes nuclear
- 3 Stronger nuclear weapons are being developed
- 4 And North Korea will sell weapons to Syria and Libya

2AC Harms (North Korean War) AT #2—

No North Korea War

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 North Korea has the world's largest stockpile of chemical weapons and will use them
- 3 Missiles would rain down on South Korea in the first hour of war
- 4 Many different ballistic missiles are being developed too

2AC Harms (North Korean War) AT #3—

North Korea Won't Give up the Bomb

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 Talks convince North Korea to end the nuclear program
- 3 All countries have reachable objectives including ending the nuclear weapons program

2AC Harms (Regime Change) AT #1—

Regime Change Coming Now

1. Extend our Human Rights Watch evidence.

2AC Harms (Regime Change) AT #2--No

Moral Obligation

1. Extend our Gibney evidence.
- 2 US human rights protections are modeled globally—
it's ethical and practical to protect them

2AC Harms (Regime Change) AT #3—High Magnitude Impacts Outweigh

1. Extend our Gibney evidence.
- 2 Low risk, high magnitude impacts are extremely flawed—it's propaganda and causes war
- 3 Failure to prevent human rights abuses risks nuclear war

2AC Harms (Regime Change) - North Korea Oppression Extensions

1. North Korea has prison camps where people are worked to death and thousands of children go hungry
2. North Korea is a totalitarian state that abuses its citizens

2AC Solvency AT #1—China Can't Solve

1. Extend our Chanlett-Avery, Rinehart, and Nikitin evidence.
- 2 China is the lone standout protecting the regime—they're economically propping up North Korea
- 3 China is the lynchpin for North Korea economically and diplomatically—now is a key time for the US to shift the relationship.
- 4 China sees North Korea as their sphere of influence

2AC Solvency AT #2—Sanctions Fail

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 Reducing military aggression will bring North Korea to the negotiating table
- 3 Sanctions solve
- 4 Exchanging security assurances for strong economic sanctions resolves North Korean aggression

2AC Solvency AT #3—Six Party Talks Fail

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 Talks solve human rights abuses

- 3 Sanctions are historically effective if done correctly
- 4 Exchanging security assurances for strong economic sanctions bring resolves North Korean aggression

2AC Solvency Extensions

1. Reducing military aggression will bring North Korea to the negotiating table
2. Security guarantees bring China to our side

North Korea NEGATIVE

1

1NC Harms (North Korean War) Frontline

1. Solvency Turn: North Korea has no nuclear capability and aggression causes backlash
2. No North Korea War—Three reasons
3. North Korea won't give up the Bomb

2NC/1NR Harms (North Korean War)**#1—No Nukes and Backlash**

1. Extend our InfoWars evidence.
- 2 Countries actually know little about the nuclear program and even if it has weapons, it's only a few

2NC/1NR Harms (North Korean War)**#2—No War**

1. Extend our Vox World evidence.
- 2 Multiple reasons a North Korean war will never happen

1NC Harms (Regime Change) Frontline

1. Regime shift will happen without the plan
2. No moral obligation—human rights violations happen daily. Their own evidence says that thousands die from preventable diseases. We aren't responsible for everything wrong in the world.
3. Existence before human rights. We need to be alive to protect human rights

2NC/1NR Harms (Regime Change) #1—**Change Inevitable**

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 The North Korean regime will collapse on its own

2NC/1NR Harms (Regime Change) #2—**No Obligation**

1. Extend our Analytic evidence.
- 2 The Democratic Republic of Congo is a much worse human rights problem—there's no brink

1

2NC/1NR Harms (Regime Change) #3-- Extinction/War First Extensions

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 We massively outweigh on magnitude—Extinction includes the 500 trillion people who are yet to be born

1NC Solvency Frontline

1. China fails to contain North Korea, enough is being done already, and the US should negotiate with other states
2. Sanctions are high now —The US and other countries already sanction North Korea heavily and have been doing so for decades. There's no reason China will make the difference.
3. Diplomatic talks fail

2NC/1NR Solvency #1—China Fails

1. Extend our Lord evidence.
- 2 North Korea and Chinese relations are very low—Kim is calling to use nuclear weapons against Beijing

2NC/1NR Solvency #2—Sanctions High

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 Recent international sanctions are incredibly strong

2NC/1NR Solvency #3—Talks Fail

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 Six Party Talks fail and give North Korea time to develop weapons

Currency Manipulation AFFIRMATIVE

Vocabulary

Currency Manipulation: This is when the government, in this case China, buys or sells their currency to influence the value. For example, China can reduce the value of the Yuan Renminbi to draw more companies to their country, make goods cheaper, etc. Essentially, China is controlling the value of their money and that is not a free-market

approach where companies trade, but government manipulation.

Inflation: when money comes to be worth less than it did before. This naturally happens slowly in the global economy. It can be a serious problem when it happens quickly because individuals' money loses buying power. For example, a dollar would buy much more fifty years ago than it does today.

World Trade Organization (WTO): An organization with many countries represented whose goal is to promote free and fair trade rules. They want to increase cooperation and trade between nations. However, they may do so through being a middle person between countries who have unfair trade rules.

Trade Deficit: When imports are larger than exports. Basically, the US has a large trade deficit with China because we buy much more from them than they do from us which means there is a deficit in our trade with them.

Xi Jinping (She jin-PING): General Secretary of the Communist Party of China, the President of the People's Republic of China, and the Chairman of China's Central Military Commission. He's like Obama, but even more powerful since China does not have the same political structure as the US. Essentially, he's the president of China.

Gross Domestic Product (GDP): value of all goods and services made in a particular country, usually counted yearly. This is a good indicator of how well an economy is doing—the higher the GDP the better.

AT=Answers To

Currency Manipulation 1AC

First, the PLAN: The United States Federal Government should file a complaint with the World Trade Organization regarding currency manipulation by the People's Republic of China

Contention One: Inherency

1. The U.S. has lost hundreds of billions of dollars in global trade and millions of jobs because of China's currency practices, but neither the US nor the WTO have taken action. If this manipulation continues, it will severely impact our economic competitiveness

Contention Two: Harms - Economy

1. Currently, China is severely devaluing their currency. That hurts the US economy through trade imbalance and millions of lost jobs
2. Manufacturing jobs are critical for a strong and prosperous U.S. economy
3. A strong U.S. economy with good jobs is key to global economic stability
4. Foreign debt causes global economic decline and nuclear World War III

Contention Three: Solvency

1. The U.S. has lost close to 5 million manufacturing jobs due to Chinese currency manipulation. If we prevent China from continuing this practice through a WTO complaint it will restore our global competitiveness and prevent an economic decline

2AC Inherency AT #1—US Acting Now

1. Extend our _____ evidence.

2AC Inherency AT #2—China Not Manipulating

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 China is manipulating their currency to get ahead of the US

2AC Harms (US Economy) AT #1— Manipulation Doesn't Hurt US Economy

1. Extend our _____ evidence.

2AC Harms (US Economy) AT #2— Economy is Resilient

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 Economic decline causes war—three warrants

2AC Harms (US Economy) AT #3— Domestic Matters More

1. Extend our _____ evidence.

2AC Harms (US Economy) AT #4—Deficit Good

1. Extend our _____ evidence.

2AC Solvency AT #1—Other Countries Manipulate

1. Extend our _____ evidence.

2AC Solvency AT #2—China Won't Follow WTO

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 The WTO was set up to prevent unfair trade practices such as China's currency manipulation. They will rule in favor of the aff.
- 3 WTO is the best mechanism for fighting currency manipulation

2AC Solvency AT #3—Plan Takes Years

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 Our Plan only takes a few months

Currency Manipulation **NEGATIVE**

1NC Inherency Frontline

1. The affirmative is the status quo. We are already taking steps to resolve China's manipulation of their currency.
2. China is not manipulating their currency. Countries routinely inflate and deflate the value of their currency.

2NC/1NR Inherency #1—US Taking Steps to Solve Currency Manipulation

1. Extend our _____ evidence.

2NC/1NR Inherency #2—China not Manipulating

1. Extend our _____ evidence.

1NC Harms (US Economy) Frontline

1. China's currency manipulation has not negatively affected U.S. trade or unemployment.
2. No Impact: The U.S. and global economy are resilient.
3. Domestic consumer practices have a bigger impact on the health of our economy.
4. Solvency Turn- a trade deficit with China will actually improve long-term economic growth.

2NC/1NR Harms (US Economy) #1—Manipulation Doesn't Hurt the US

1. Extend our _____ evidence.

2NC/1NR Harms (US Economy) #2—The Economy is Resilient

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 And, a decline in U.S. hegemony does not cause great power war
- 3 Economic Decline does not cause war—history proves it

2NC/1NR Harms (US Economy) #3—Domestic Economy More Important

1. Extend our _____ evidence.

1

2NC/1NR Harms (US Economy) #4— Deficit Good

1. Extend our _____ evidence.

1NC Solvency Frontline

1. South Korea, Japan, and Germany also manipulate their currencies at the expense of the U.S. economy.
2. China won't admit any fault to the WTO so nothing will change
- 3 The plan takes until after 2018—the impacts happen first

2NC/1NR Solvency #1—Other Countries Manipulate

1. Extend our _____ evidence.

2NC/1NR Solvency #2—China Won't Change

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 The WTO will not take up China's currency manipulation. This means the plan will not solve

2NC/1NR Solvency #3—Plan Takes Years

1. Extend our _____ evidence.

China Nationalism Disadvantage

Vocabulary

Chinese Communist Party (CCP): Main political party of China. They have large control over the entire country and believe in a strong government with control over the people and economy. Xi Jinping is the leader of the party.

South China Seas (SCS): Part of the Pacific Ocean just southeast of China. It is near Taiwan, the Philippines, Cambodia, and Vietnam. A great deal of goods are moved through the area and there's supposedly a lot of oil in the sea bed. There are serious disputes about who actually owns it and thus many countries are fighting over it.

Xi Jinping (She jin-PING): General Secretary of the Communist Party of China, the President of the People's

Republic of China, and the Chairman of China's Central Military Commission. He's like Obama, but even more powerful since China does not have the same political structure as the US. Essentially, he's the president of China.

Nationalism: Love of one's country. This can include small things like saluting a flag or singing the national anthem. However, it can sometimes mean loving one's country and not respecting other people. This happened during Nazi Germany, for example. In China, Xi needs to have nationalists on his side to keep the country stable.

People's Liberation Army (PLA): The Chinese armed forces. Basically the accumulation of all the Chinese military. It is the largest military in the world.

Taiwan, Republic of China (ROC), Taipei: Island off the coast of China. In the 1940's, a Chinese political party fled mainland China and started a government there. Since then, China has claimed Taiwan as their own country while Taiwan (generally) wants independence.

AT=Answers To

1NC China Nationalism Disadvantage Shell

- A. Uniqueness: China acts independently of the US and only cooperates sparingly—they're "frenemies". Xi maintains his strong, nationalist image now
- B. Link and Internal Link: Compromise makes Xi look weak—he will respond with aggressive military action in the South China Seas and Taiwan
- C. Impact: South China Sea conflict leads to nuclear war

2NC/1NR AT #1—China already in SCS

- 1. Extend our Council on Foreign Relations evidence.
- 2 There's restraint now, but more expansion could prompt a major war
- 3 China's interest is mostly economic—rising tension would start a major war though

2NC/1NR AT #2—Cooperation is Popular

- 1. Extend our Council on Foreign Relations evidence.
- 2 The plan makes Xi look weak on foreign policy and emboldens nationalists
- 3 If Xi looks weak toward the US, he will use nationalist wars to protect his image

2NC/1NR AT #3—Case Outweighs

2NC/1NR AT #4—Xi Looks Weak

- 1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 Xi has great authority and respect with Chinese Nationalists
- 3 Xi's centralized authority has stabilized the country, but he takes the heat for any problems
- 4 Strong Chinese Nationalism now
- 5 Xi's Nationalism is strong

2NC/1NR AT #5—Nationalists Don't Matter

- 1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 Nationalists and Xi are sensitive to foreign policy

- 3 Xi gets blamed for all mistakes—especially in a declining Chinese economy

2NC/1NR AT #6—Cooperation Solves

Conflict

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 Cooperation with the US causes nationalist backlash and drains Xi's political capital

2NC/1NR Human Rights Link

1. Human rights discourse has significant potential to alter domestic politics in China. Threats from the U.S. will make the leadership look weak
2. The affirmative's insistence on pressuring China to adopt human rights policies backfires- leads to increased hostility and collapses the CCP
3. By helping religious minorities in China, the affirmative is directly undermining CCP authority.

2NC/1NR Currency Manipulation Link

1. The affirmative is bad for internal stability within China- Without a strong economy, the CCP cannot justify communist rule

2NC/1NR AT: China Already Trades with the US

1. Recently, China has been blocking US diplomatic outreach—Xi's nationalism is at an all-time high

2AC Affirmative Answers to China Nationalism Disadvantage

1. Non-Unique: China is expanding into the South China Sea already
2. Link Turn: Economic reforms are popular among nationalists
3. Impact Calculus:
4. Non-Unique: Xi looks weak now
5. No Internal Link: Xi doesn't care about nationalists

6. **Link Turn: Economic cooperation builds US-China relationship and prevents conflict**

China Politics Disadvantage

Vocabulary

Chinese Communist Party (CCP): Main political party of China. They have large control over the entire country and believe in a strong government with control over the people and economy. Xi Jinping is the leader of the party.

Xi Jinping (She jin-PING): General Secretary of the Communist Party of China, the President of the People's Republic of China, and the Chairman of China's Central Military Commission. He's like Obama, but even more powerful since China does not have the same political structure as the US. Essentially, he's the president of China.

Political Capital: Power to influence members of a political party. It is also the ability to progress a particular issue/agenda. The DA argues that there is a limited amount that politicians can spend.

Economic and Political Reforms: These are changes to the political and economic system to make them better. In the case of China, these reforms are to make the country more "open". Economic reforms might include reducing government involvement in businesses, reducing taxes, and increasing free trade. Political reforms might include more free speech, freedom of religion, freedom of press, gender and sexual identity freedoms, and military freedoms.

Corruption: dishonesty in a political figure. This is where someone in power takes bribes, hires friends, or simply does not try at their job. There are high-levels of corruption in China that Xi is trying to eliminate.

AT=Answers To

1NC China Politics Disadvantage Shell

- A. Uniqueness: Xi pushing for economic and political reforms. These require significant political capital
- B. Link: The plan spends Xi's political capital—It's controversial to work with the US
- C. Internal Link: These political and economic reforms prevent country collapse
- D. Impact: Country collapse sparks nuclear lash out

2NC/1NR Diplomatic Engagement Link

Extensions

- 1. The plan makes Xi look weak on foreign policy and drains his political capital
- 2. Cooperation with the US causes nationalist backlash and drains Xi's political capital

2NC/1NR BIT Link

- 1. Economic engagement makes Xi look suspicious—compromise may seem good, but it's costly to convince his peers

2NC/1NR Currency Manipulation, North

Korea and Human Rights Link

- 1. Xi will burn his political capital by cooperating with the US—history makes even diplomacy seem like a trick

2NC/1NR Impact Extensions

- 1. China collapse causes lash out and multiple wars
- 2. CCP collapse results in nuclear weapons use
- 3. Regime collapse destabilizes the region and causes a laundry list of impacts

2NC/1NR AT #1—Xi Not Pushing Reforms

- 1. Extend our Naughton evidence.
- 2. Xi is pushing political reforms to end corruption in the government
- 3. Now is the brink—Xi has extensive political capital and can either become a great reformer or a dictator
- 4. Political reform efforts are successful, but they require all of Xi's political capital

2NC/1NR AT #2—Case Outweighs**2NC/1NR AT #3—US-China Meet****Regularly**

1. Extend our Lieberthal and Jisi evidence.
- 2 Recently, China has been blocking US diplomatic outreach

2NC/1NR AT #4—Reforms Cause**Collapse**

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 Reforms prevent country collapse
- 3 Xi must be strong and follow through on his reforms otherwise China will collapse and go to war

2NC/1NR AT #5—No Political Capital Loss

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 Xi's political capital is key to reforms – Perception of international strength is critical to holding off nationalist challenges to his domestic agenda
- 3 Xi must use all of his political capital to fix corruption

2NC/1NR AT—“Xi has no Political**Capital”**

1. Xi has the political capital to get things done

2AC Affirmative Answers to China**Politics Disadvantage**

1. Non-unique: Xi not pushing for reforms
2. Impact Calculus:
3. The US and China cooperate on other issues happen all of the time! This should have triggered the DA
4. Impact Turn:
 - A. Reforms are political violence, hurt the economy, and destabilizes the country
 - B. Instability causes their impacts: All of these bad policy decisions hurt the country and make it more likely

to collapse. If there are riots and no jobs, the country will falter and their impacts will happen.

5. **No Internal-Link: Xi does not have to use political capital—the communist party controls all politics**

Taiwan Relations Disadvantage

Vocabulary

Taiwan, Republic of China (ROC), Taipei: Island off the coast of China. In the 1940's, a Chinese political party fled mainland China and started a government there. Since then, China has claimed Taiwan as their own country while Taiwan (generally) wants independence.

People's Liberation Army (PLA): The Chinese armed forces. Basically the accumulation of all the Chinese military. It is the largest military in the world.

Ma Ying-jeou (Ma Ying Joe): President of Taiwan from 2008-2016. Generally, a pretty moderate leader of the country. He had many policies that brought Taiwan closer to the PRC and received heavy criticism. He was the head of the Kuomintang (KMT) party.

Kuomintang (KMT) (Co-Min-Tahng): Taiwanese political party which influences Taiwan toward the PRC. They eventually want Taiwan reunified with China. They just lost huge in the recent election to the DPP.

Tsai Ing-wen (Ty eng-When): Current president of Taiwan and their first female president. She has just become president May 20th so it's hard to say exactly what she will do. However, she is a member of the Democratic People's Party (DPP) so many believe she will strongly push back against the PRC.

Democratic People's Party (DPP): Taiwanese political party which wants Taiwan to remain independent from China. They just received a huge lead in the legislature and won the presidency so they will decide policy until the next election.

Appease: To give in usually militarily. This is connected to political leaders who gave Hitler what he wanted in the late 1930's because they believed that would make Hitler happy and he would stop being horrible. Instead, just like

giving in to a bully, they only made him stronger and gain more power.

Zero-Sum: Direct trade-off. There is a limited amount of something and so when one person/group/country takes, everyone else has less. When relationships are zero-sum that means that when one gains, the other loses.

Terminal High Altitude Air Defense (THAAD): A missile system that may be put in South Korea to protect them from North Korea. The US, South Korea, and Japan like this idea because it will better protect these countries from North Korean weapons. China and North Korea don't like it because they feel like this is an excuse for the US to put their military in the area.

AT=Answers To

1NC Taiwan Relations Disadvantage

- A. Uniqueness: US military position is aggressive and containing
- B. Link and Internal-Link: US-China cooperation makes Taiwan more vulnerable and leads to war
- C. China-Taiwan conflict becomes nuclear WWII

2NC/1NR AT #1—China Taiwan War Now

- 1. Extend our Krepinevich evidence.
- 2. China-Taiwan relations high now
- 3. US military presence contains China and North Korea
- 4. Military containment is working

2NC/1NR AT #2—Case Outweighs

Impact Calculus:

2NC/1NR AT #3—Diplomacy Solves War

- 1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2. [INSERT 1-3 LINKS SPECIFIC TO THE AFF DEPENDING ON IF IT'S DIPLOMATIC OR ECONOMIC ENGAGEMENT]

2NC/1NR AT #4—No Link/No Trade Off

- 1. Extend our Brookings evidence.
- 2. [INSERT 1-3 LINKS SPECIFIC TO THE AFF DEPENDING ON IF IT'S DIPLOMATIC OR ECONOMIC ENGAGEMENT OR CROSS APPLY FROM THE OTHER LINK DEBATE]

2NC/1NR AT #5—No Brink

- 1. Extend our Brookings evidence.
- 2. Taiwan must keep the US close diplomatically otherwise China will attack

2NC/1NR AT #6—No Impact

- 1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2. China-Taiwan war goes nuclear
- 3. Historically, diplomacy and economic ties are not enough to prevent war

2NC/1NR Diplomacy Links

- 1. China uses diplomatic relations to isolate Taiwan
- 2. Diplomatic Engagement emboldens China's military

3. **Diplomacy provides no benefits on Taiwan and only appeases China**
4. **Diplomatic and military concessions only make China stronger**

2NC/1NR Economic Links

1. **Economic engagement is zero-sum: China's economy becomes stronger and Taiwan's becomes weaker—this causes military expansion by China**

2AC Affirmative Answers to Taiwan Relations Disadvantage

1. **Non-Unique: China-Taiwan War coming now—military presence encourages conflict**
2. **Impact Calculus:**
3. **Link Turn: Increased military focus causes war between China and Taiwan—new diplomatic conversations solve miscalculation**
4. **No Link: Cooperating with China does not throw off US-Taiwan relations**
5. **No Brink—The US and China cooperate on many issues every year. This would have already triggered their DA and caused all of their impacts.**
6. **No Impact: A China-Taiwan war would remain regional—the cost of escalation is too high**

Topicality

Vocabulary

Quid pro quo—Means “this for that” in Latin. Basically, there must be an exchange of favors. Think when you negotiate with your family and you exchange a week of chores for money. You may be able to convince your parents to let you go to a concert in exchange for finishing your homework.

Limits: The amount of arguments that can be run. This is usually about how many affirmatives are topical under a certain interpretation. If there are many, many affs—think 50—that would make it super hard to be negative. On the other hand, if there were only 2 affs, then that

would make it too hard for the aff. When people talk about limits, this is the discussion.

Ground: Which arguments that can be run depending on the interpretation. Basically, which Disadvantages, Counterplans, Kritiks, and Case arguments can you read. If you couldn't read ANYTHING in the core files against an aff, that would make it challenging to be negative.

1NC Bilateral Investment Treaty

Topicality

A. Economic Engagement is unconditional—The US should do it without waiting on China

B. Violation: The plan involves negotiations and agreements before the treaty is authorized by the Senate and President

Duke Law, 2005 [10/5, “U.S. Treaties & Agreements - The Process”, https://law.duke.edu/ilrt/treaties_3.htm]

C. Topicality is a voting issue for fairness and education:

1. Fairness—all of our pre-round preparation is based on the plan text. However, they can’t prove their solvency based on that alone. They need to prove China will agree, how they will agree, and how that affects relations. They get an unfair advantage.

2. Ground: Our Disadvantages are based on how the US does the plan. If it can change or alter based on China policy that makes it hard to make a link. They also get unpredictable advantages based on how China engages the plan.

2NC/1NR Bilateral Investment Treaty

Topicality - AT #1—We Meet

1. You don't meet—extend our Celik evidence that economic engagement must be unconditional. The goal must be to change the relationship between the two countries with a one-sided gesture without a certain benefit.
2. Treaties are Conditional—Extend our Duke evidence. It explains that treaties are negotiated between the two countries before they are sent to the president and signed by the senate. Their Aff would take months of cooperation between the US and China hamming out a quid pro quo deal.

2NC/1NR Bilateral Investment Treaty

Topicality AT #2—Counter Interpretation

1. Extend our Celik evidence. Our interpretation is preferable for debate because of limits, ground, fairness, and education.
2. There's a topical version of the Aff—they should just have the us lower trade barriers and increase investment in China. This would increase economic ties and solve war. Also, China would probably lower its trade barriers after the US did it. This would allow us to learn about their Harms - we just argue they should have used a different Plan that's Topical.
3. Limits—they allow impossible to predicts Affs because the US-China negotiation process could change the Aff hundreds of ways. The negative list includes hundreds of industries that could be protected. This is totally unpredictable and reason to vote Neg.
4. They've abused us in the debate round because they

2NC/1NR Bilateral Investment Treaty

Topicality AT--#3A—Context

1. We are in the topic—our evidence is about economic engagement between countries. It doesn't matter if it's specific to China. It's predictable enough.
2. Case list answers context: our interpretation includes the North Korea Aff, the T version of this Aff, the human rights Aff, and any one-sided action. That means there are plenty of Affs to be read and we're being fair in the topic.
3. They explode the number of cases that can be read—that destroys education and makes it impossible to gain depth

2NC/1NR Bilateral Investment Treaty

Topicality AT #3B—Ground

1. We give fair ground—the US action is enough to give the neg ground on all us action. In fact, their conditional interpretation would mean that us action would be uncertain and we would lose core Das like elections, Taiwan, and diplomatic capital.
2. Not predictable ground—yes, China must interact for their interpretation. However, who knows what the plan will look like after months of negotiation. This means the Aff could always link turn the DA because our links will be way too generic.

2NC/1NR Bilateral Investment Treaty

Topicality AT #3C—Real World Education

1. We give real world education—there's still a debate about how government policy works with China. We just argue that the US must commit first.
2. Debate Education—we need a fair round now. It's great in the abstract to learn about negotiation, but it's more important to have a fair and educational debate round now. If too many teams lose, they'll give up on researching and learn nothing.

2NC/1NR Bilateral Investment Treaty

Topicality AT #4—Reasonability

- 1. Reasonability is subjective—it’s impossible to tell how fair is fair enough. Some people may think it’s fair for me to play my grandma in basketball, but I sure don’t.**
- 2. Judge intervention: The term “reasonable” is vague, and open to interpretation. Instead of having the judge decide which definition they find reasonable, the debaters should debate the merits of each definition.**
- 3. Education: Competing interpretations is better for cost benefit analysis and decision making skills. The process of weighing the pros and cons of each definition develops these skills.**
- 4. Look to the best interpretation—whichever interpretation is best for education and fairness should win. The Aff should have to defend their counter interpretation and win that it’s educational and fair.**
- 5. Err neg on T—there’s an aff bias because the topic is enormous with diplomatic and economic engagement. Also, it’s a challenging international topic. We need to protect the limits and ground of the Neg.**

= Quid Pro Quo)

1NC Currency Manipulation Topicality - Engagement is Quid Pro Quo (Conditional Engagement)

A. Interpretation- Economic Engagement requires a quid pro quo exchange of benefits with China with conditions

B. Violation- the plan only files a complaint with the WTO. To be Topical, engagement must directly give positive incentives in order to expect something in return from China. The plan offers only threats of sanctions, which are not engagement.

C. Topicality is voting issue for fairness and education:

1. Limits - If the affirmative were not required to condition the plan, any small action would be topical. In order for us to gain the most topic education, we need to make only a small number of affirmatives topical. A small number of affirmatives means the negative can do more in depth research on those cases.

2. Ground- making the affirmative offer an incentive guarantees the negative arguments against these incentive mechanisms of the affirmative, ensuring we have a stable set of arguments against all cases and strong links to Disadvantages

2NC/1NR Currency Manipulation “Quid Pro Quo” Topicality - AT #1—We Meet

1. You don't meet—extend our Shinn evidence that economic engagement must be quid pro quo. The goal must be to change the relationship between the two countries by conditioning our policies so both countries benefit. This has to be symmetrical and intended to integrate China into the world economy – they're the opposite. They take an asymmetrical hostile action meant to isolate China from the world economy.
2. Sanctions must be positive with the intention of getting something in return – Extend our Borer evidence. Filing a claim with the WTO is a NEGATIVE sanction and has no explicit policy return from China – there's no quid pro quo because the Aff never gives China anything it wants.
3. They're the opposite of engagement – they reduce our economic ties with China rather than offering positive engagement

2NC/1NR Currency Manipulation “Quid Pro Quo” Topicality AT #2—Counter Interpretation

1. Extend our Shinn evidence. Our interpretation is preferable for debate because of limits, ground, fairness, and education.
2. There's a topical version of the Aff—they should just have the US increase investment or foreign aid in China in exchange for China cooperating in its currency valuation. This would allow us to learn about their US economy Harms - we just argue they should have used a different Plan that's Topical.
3. Limits—they allow impossible-to-predict Affs because the US could come up with countless policies that might affect China in some way. This is totally unpredictable and reason to vote Neg.

4. They've abused us in the debate round because they

2NC/1NR Currency Manipulation "Quid Pro Quo" Topicality AT--#3A—Context

1. We are in the topic—our evidence is about the only way we really do economic engagement between countries. It's predictable.
2. Case list answers context: our interpretation includes the North Korea Aff, the BIT aff, and the Topical version of this Aff. That means there are plenty of Affs to be read and we're being fair in the topic.
3. They explode the number of cases that can be read—that destroys education and makes it impossible to gain depth

2NC/1NR Currency Manipulation "Quid Pro Quo" Topicality AT #3B—Ground

1. We give fair ground—quid pro quo creates predictable Negative strategies against incentive mechanisms the Aff could use. In fact, their interpretation that engagement is unconditional hurts our links to Politics, China Nationalism, China Politics, and Taiwan Relations Disadvantages.
2. Not predictable ground—there's always predictable ground against negotiating a quid pro quo. The Aff's interpretation denies us the ability to have these debates about the mechanisms of engagement – the process is key to the outcome in foreign policy. The entire history of our foreign policy with China since Nixon and Kissinger demonstrates that making deals is more important than doing our own policies no matter what China thinks, pretending that we aren't interdependent and deeply tied to China.

2NC/1NR Currency Manipulation “Quid Pro Quo” Topicality AT #3C—Real World Education

1. We give real world education—there’s still a debate about how government policy works with China. We just argue that the US must offer China a quid pro quo. This is MORE real world and the way foreign policy actually works.
2. Debate Education—we need a fair round now. It’s great in the abstract to learn about all the different policies that might affect China, but it’s more important to have a fair and educational debate round now about policies that are already part of our negotiations with China. If too many teams lose, they’ll give up on researching and learn nothing.

2NC/1NR Currency Manipulation “Quid Pro Quo” Topicality AT #4—Reasonability

1. Reasonability is subjective—it’s impossible to tell how fair is fair enough. Some people may think it’s fair for me to play my grandma in basketball, but I sure don’t.
2. Judge intervention: The term “reasonable” is vague, and open to interpretation. Instead of having the judge decide which definition they find reasonable, the debaters should debate the merits of each definition.
3. Education: Competing interpretations is better for cost benefit analysis and decision making skills. The process of weighing the pros and cons of each definition develops these skills.
4. Look to the best interpretation—whichever interpretation is best for education and fairness should win. The Aff should have to defend their counter interpretation and win that it’s educational and fair.
5. Err neg on T—there’s an aff bias because the topic is enormous with diplomatic and economic engagement.

Also, it's a challenging international topic. We need to protect the limits and ground of the Neg.

= Gov't to Gov't)

1NC Human Rights Topicality – Engagement = Government to Government

- A. Interpretation: Economic engagement must be government to government
- B. Violation: The Sullivan Principles, as per the Lee evidence, only apply rules to US companies in China. The plan does not do any economic engagement government to government.
- C. Topicality is voting issue for fairness and education:
 - 1. Limits: There are thousands of organizations outside the U.S. government including companies, other governments, individuals, and NGO's. They explode the topic leading to a much larger case list. The negative would not be able to research effectively and would lose.
 - 2. Ground: The AFF gets to claim advantages based off company to company engagement and boosting the economy. Also, our links won't apply to company to company action, only the federal government. Without these core Disadvantages, we won't be able to compete. We also lose the ability to use strategies like the EU Counterplan because they act on American companies, not China.

2NC/1NR Human Rights Topicality AT

#1—We Meet

1. Extend our Daga evidence. “Its” refers to the U.S. and so economic engagement with countries must be between governments.
2. They don’t meet—their Lee evidence is very clear that they change policy for MNCs. There is no direct government to government interaction, only the US changing a policy that affects companies in China.

2NC/1NR Human Rights Topicality AT

#2—Counter Interpretation

1. Extend our interpretation that economic and diplomatic engagement must be between governments. Daga lists multiple cases that would be topical including lowering trade barriers, remittances, and foreign direct investment. Their Haas evidence defines cultural or civil society engagement, not economic or diplomatic engagement.
2. Topical Version of the Aff: They could withhold US direct investments or US foreign aid until China changes its human rights policy or have direct diplomacy about Human Rights. This would allow us to learn about their Human Rights Harms - we just argue they should have used a different Plan that’s Topical.
3. Grammar: They violate the sentence structure of the resolution. The antecedent of “its” is the federal government. Without understanding the grammar of the resolution, it’s impossible to predict any Aff and we also become worse at reading/grammar.
4. They’ve abused us in the debate round because they

2NC/1NR Human Rights Topicality AT

#3A Overlimiting

1. We have Fair Limits--Cross apply our topical version of the Aff—we don't even limit out the 1ac. The BIT and North Korea Affs are both topical because they're government to government actions. There are enough Affs that we allow.
2. They absolutely explode the limits debate because anybody can be the target of the plan. That means a private company, an individual, a not-for-profit or any other country. This means that there are literally thousands of affs.
3. Clear limits are key to education and fairness – they explode the topic and that destroys education and makes it impossible to gain depth

2NC/1NR Human Rights Topicality AT

#3B—Ground

1. Cross apply the limits debate—they're right that there's more ground, but it will be unpredictable and our links will be weaker. While there may be many actors, it's much harder to research a strong link to an NGO or private company. This explodes our research burden.
2. There's enough ground—this topic already has two of the world's largest super powers and you get to debate about all the things they do toward each other. You don't need to add all the things America does domestically to that mix as well.
3. We lose key Negative ground like the EU Counterplan – we can't have a debate about their harms because they take the non-Topical action of having a policy toward American companies, not China itself.

2NC/1NR Human Rights Topicality AT

#3C—Education

1. Again, limits outweigh—We will learn more about different topics, but those topics will be unpredictable and the debate will be shallow. It's very hard to debate against different, unpredictable Affs. It's more

important that we have clash and a testing of ideas than learn new, random facts.

2. Fairness outweighs education—it's more important that we have a balance debate. There should be a balance of Aff and Neg arguments that allows us to really disagree. If one side continually loses, then people will give up on researching or be so upset they will learn nothing.

2NC/1NR Human Rights Topicality AT

#4—Reasonability

- 1. Reasonability is subjective—it's impossible to tell how fair is fair enough. Some people may think it's fair for me to play my grandma in basketball, but I sure don't.**
- 2. Judge intervention: The term "reasonable" is vague, and open to interpretation. Instead of having the judge decide which definition they find reasonable, the debaters should debate the merits of each definition.**
- 3. Education: Competing interpretations is better for cost benefit analysis and decision making skills. The process of weighing the pros and cons of each definition develops these skills.**
- 4. Look to the best interpretation—whichever interpretation is best for education and fairness should win. The Aff should have to defend their counter interpretation and win that it's educational and fair.**
- 5. Err neg on T—there's an aff bias because the topic is enormous with diplomatic and economic engagement. Also, it's a challenging international topic. We need to protect the limits and ground of the Neg.**

(Engagement \neq Military)

1NC North Korea Topicality – Engagement \neq Military

- A. Interpretation: Diplomatic engagement is recognition, talks, or targeted sanctions. Military engagement is distinctly different
- B. Violation: The Plan's main positive incentive is the removal of US troops, weapons, and security guarantees for North Korea.
- C. Topicality is voting issue for fairness and education:
 - 1. Limits: The definition of diplomatic engagement must remain centered in direct diplomatic talks, recognition or sanctions. Anything outside would explode the topic leading to a much larger case list. The negative would not be able to research effectively and would lose.
 - 2. Ground: Including military engagement means the AFF will get distinct military advantages—their first advantage is a perfect example. They will beat our Disadvantages with this unfair ground. Also, military engagement should be our ground since it's outside of diplomatic engagement.

2NC/1NR North Korea Topicality – Engagement ≠ Military AT #1—We Meet

- 1. They Don't Meet—our interpretation is that engagement must be diplomatic through recognition, sanctions, or economic cooperation—that's our Haas evidence.
- 2. Military Engagement is different—Haas makes it clear that removing the military or joint exercises is military engagement. These are very different and their first advantage shows they're military engagement.

2NC/1NR North Korea Topicality – Engagement ≠ Military AT #2—Counter Interpretation

- 1. Extend our Haas evidence—he distinguishes between economic and diplomatic engagement, which is about meetings and economic cooperation, versus military to military relations.
- 2. Topical Version of the Aff—they could just cooperate with China to increase sanctions on North Korea. There is no need for the military withdrawal. This means that they can still read their Aff – all they should done is read a Topical plan without the non-Topical military withdrawal.
- 3. Brightline—Our evidence is not only comparative between the two, but makes it super clear if you're topical or not. Either the Aff does military engagement or it doesn't. This is good for T debates because it removes judge uncertainty and choice making.
- 4. They've abused us in the debate round because they

2NC/1NR North Korea Topicality – Engagement ≠ Military AT #3A—Core of the Topic

1. No it's not—the topic calls for economic and diplomatic cooperation. In fact, diplomacy is almost the opposite of military engagement. This means they move the conversation far away from the economic and diplomatic debates we're supposed to have.
2. We allow some military conversations—there can still be South China Sea and North Korea Affs, the plan just can't be directly about the military. For example, the BIT Aff is OK because it uses the economy to solve military problems.
3. Extra-Topical—Even if most of your aff is topical, you still include part that is military. You leverage that untopical part of your Aff to abuse us which means the Aff should lose. It doesn't matter that the other part of the Aff is topical.

2NC/1NR North Korea Topicality – Engagement ≠ Military AT #3B—Ground

1. You destroy our Disadvantages—you have an unfair advantage related to the military. This is a huge advantage and it will outweigh our Disadvantages and our case arguments won't apply as well because the advantage is unpredictable.
2. That's our Counter Plan or Case ground—we should be able to make military arguments and compare that to diplomacy. That's a central conversation we should have and you have taken our ground. We can't make the strongest arguments now and we lose out on education and fairness.

2NC/1NR North Korea Topicality – Engagement ≠ Military AT #3C— Reasonable Limits

1. **You destroy limits—now that economic and diplomatic engagement do not limit the topic there are no boundaries. There can be hundreds of military Affs, immigration Affs, agriculture Affs, or Environment Affs. You allow hundreds of different types of engagement Affs destroying predictable education and fairness.**
2. **Fair Case List: BIT and Human Rights are both topical along with the topical version of the Aff. The topic is already large because of the economic and diplomatic options and a huge international topic. We need to keep the number of cases low.**
3. **Clear limits are key to education and fairness – they explode the topic and that destroys education and makes it impossible to gain depth**

2NC/1NR North Korea Topicality – **Engagement ≠ Military AT #4—** **Reasonability**

1. **Reasonability is subjective—it’s impossible to tell how fair is fair enough. Some people may think it’s fair for me to play my grandma in basketball, but I sure don’t.**
2. **Judge intervention: The term “reasonable” is vague, and open to interpretation. Instead of having the judge decide which definition they find reasonable, the debaters should debate the merits of each definition.**
3. **Education: Competing interpretations is better for cost benefit analysis and decision making skills. The process of weighing the pros and cons of each definition develops these skills.**
4. **Look to the best interpretation—whichever interpretation is best for education and fairness should win. The Aff should have to defend their counter interpretation and win that it’s educational and fair.**
5. **Err neg on T—there’s an aff bias because the topic is enormous with diplomatic and economic engagement. Also, it’s a challenging international topic. We need to protect the limits and ground of the Neg.**

2AC Affirmative Topicality Answers

2AC Bilateral Investment Treaty

Topicality Answers

1. **We Meet:** The US signs the treaty regardless of what China does. It's unconditional on the US side.
2. **Counter-Interpretation: Economic Engagement** requires an exchange of benefits or quid pro quo (this for that), it's conditional on China's agreement
3. **Counter-Standards:**
 - A. **Context:** Our evidence is written directly about US-Chinese engagement. Since this is directly rooted in the topic, this is the most predictable interpretation. Anything about engagement overall should not be evaluated.
 - B. **Ground:** Many of our Disadvantages are based on cooperating with China. The AFF plan does not ensure that China will react. We will lose our core Disadvantages like China Nationalism and Politics, making it impossible to be negative.
 - C. **Real World Education:** Very few things in life are free while much of it is negotiation and compromise. Our counter interpretation includes education about how to broker deals between countries and individuals.
4. **Reasonability:** We are having a fair debate. They have enough things to say against our AFF. Unless the judge is certain we have abused the neg, let's focus on the substance of the debate.

1AR Bilateral Investment Treaty

Topicality Extensions

1. Engagement includes trade agreements. Their definition overlimits.
2. Economic engagement is defined by trade liberalization

2AC Human Rights Topicality Answers

1. **We Meet:** The government makes the policy of economic engagement with China, then the companies use that policy—that's our Lee evidence.

AFF 2AC Answers

2. Counter-Interpretation: Engagement includes non-government actors

3. Counter-Standards

A. Overlimiting: Government to government engagement is too limiting - these would only include direct investment of money or foreign aid. Almost every case includes companies that invest in China, with the help of the government. Having only a few Topical cases will make the debate round stale and neg biased. No case meets their interpretation.

B. Ground: We increase Neg ground by having different actors. There are more Disadvantage links to changing how we regulate multinational corporations like Politics and the Neg has great ground like the Pressure Counterplan or Conditions Counterplan.

C. Education: Our interpretation increases education about economic engagement outside the government. Corporations are among the key violators of human rights in China. It's best we learn about realistic ways to curb human rights abuses than just the process of diplomacy.

4. Reasonability: We are having a fair debate. They have enough things to say against our AFF. Unless the judge is certain we have abused the neg, let's focus on the substance of the debate.

2AC North Korea Topicality – **“Engagement ≠ Military” Answers**

1. **We Meet—We cooperate with China to increase sanctions on North Korea—that’s our Feng evidence. We fit under your interpretation.**
2. **Counter Interpretation: Diplomatic Engagement includes civil-military action**
3. **Counter Standards:**
 - A. **Core of the Topic: Military conversations are the core of the topic. It’s the main focus of the South China Seas, North Korea, and Taiwan. These are the most educational conversations we can have.**
 - B. **Ground: We give even more ground to the neg with this aff. They can argue that reducing the military triggers bigger Disadvantages. Limited diplomatic talks would not be enough for a link.**
 - C. **Reasonable Limits: There are only a few forms of military engagement that would fit under the topic. They would have to be directed toward China, come from the US, and be substantial. This means we’re predictable.**
4. **Reasonability: We are having a fair debate. They have enough things to say against our AFF. Unless the judge is certain we have abused the neg, let’s focus on the substance of the debate.**

1AR Extensions

1AR North Korea Topicality – **“Engagement ≠ Military” Extensions**

1. They are wrong – military to military contact is diplomatic engagement
2. Engagement with China includes the military

2AC Currency Manipulation - Topicality – **“Engagement = Quid Pro Quo” Answers**

1. **We Meet:** Plan is a quid pro quo. We file a WTO complaint with the result being that China stops manipulating its currency. We get fairer trade and China gets greater access to trade and cooperation with us. Their Kane definition also lists other kinds of engagement other than quid pro quo.
2. **Counter-Interpretation:** Economic engagement is unconditional and focused on long term goals to change the behavior of another state
3. **Counter-Standards**
 - A. Overlimiting:** Quid pro quo is too limiting – there are very few areas where we can have actual research on China and the US exchanging policies through conditions. Having only a few topical cases will make the debate round stale and neg biased. No case meets their interpretation.
 - B. Ground:** We increase Neg ground by having more stable links to more engagement policies. There are more predictable Disadvantage links to definite, unconditional economic policies with ground like Politics, China Relations and China Politics Disadvantages – the Neg also gets more ground with the Conditions Counterplan.
 - C. Education:** Our interpretation increases education about a broader range of engagement policies. Their interpretation focuses 2/3rds of our attention on China’s policies and the conditions themselves rather than the best foreign policy toward China. This is irrelevant to the core of the topic and distracts us with the process of making deals in foreign policy rather than

***actual* foreign policy. It makes research infinitely harder because we have to research not only a US policy, but also China's policies and whether they're tied to an existing deal.**

4. Reasonability: We are having a fair debate. They have enough things to say against our AFF. Unless the judge is certain we have abused the neg, let's focus on the substance of the debate.

European Union Counterplan

Vocabulary

European Union (EU): Economic and political grouping of 28 states in Europe. They work together to solve problems that go across borders such as climate change, refugee crises, and economic relationships. An analogy is that these countries are like the US states—they both go under the larger authority of the organization, but are together in that union.

One Belt One Road (OBOR): Enormous trade route following the path of the original Silk Road—a path for goods and people to pass across all of Asia. Xi Jinping suggested a similar trade system today spanning all of Asia to Europe. This would include infrastructure like train and road development, but also cultural exchanges between different countries. OBOR would run through multiple ocean and sea routes along with the land ones.

Multi-National Corporations (MNCs): A corporation that has factories or offices in a foreign country. For example, a US company that has a factory in China is an MNC.

These include Ford, Apple, Nike, and Gap to name a few.

Sullivan Principles/Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR): These are guidelines for MNCs in foreign countries. These rules must be followed if the company or the government makes them law. These rules/principles protect basic workplace rights including discrimination, unionization, pay, environmental, and safety. These differ from country-to-country and company-to-company.

South China Seas (SCS): Part of the Pacific Ocean just southeast of China. It is near Taiwan, the Philippines, Cambodia, and Vietnam. A great deal of goods are moved through the area and there's supposedly a lot of oil in the sea bed. There are serious disputes about who actually owns it and thus many countries are fighting over it.

Senkaku Islands: Islands in the East China sea that have no one living on them. The US gave them to Japan, but China disagrees. These islands, like the South China Sea, are areas where fighting might erupt.

Xi Jinping (She jin-PING): General Secretary of the Communist Party of China, the President of the People's Republic of China, and the Chairman of China's Central Military Commission. He's like Obama, but even more powerful since China does not have the same political structure as the US. Essentially, he's the president of China.

Gross Domestic Product (GDP): value of all goods and services made in a particular country, usually counted yearly. This is a good indicator of how well an economy is doing—the higher the GDP the better.

Foreign Direct Investment: When a foreign company owns a business in another country. It also includes general investment from one country to another. For example, US companies invest and own companies in China.

State Owned Enterprise (SOE): a business that is partially or entirely owned by the “state” or the government. The US is worried about these in China because they are worried that the Chinese government will give better treatment to their companies than US ones.

People's Liberation Army (PLA): The Chinese armed forces. Basically the accumulation of all the Chinese military. It is the largest military in the world.

AT=Answers To

1NC Bilateral Investment Treaty

European Union Counterplan

COUNTERPLAN TEXT: The European Union should ratify the bilateral investment treaty with the People's Republic of China.

A. Solvency: The Counter Plan is identical to the AFF and would solve

2NC/1NR Bilateral Investment Treaty EU CP Solvency Extensions

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 The Counter Plan is modeled after the US—there's no difference
- 3 The EU already has ties and a way to deal with trade disputes, but they have low bilateral trade now
- 4 A BIT would be identical to that of the plan—the demands for transparency, cooperation, and funding are very similar
- 5 China-EU BIT brings the countries closer and results in massive economic benefits

1NC North Korea European Union CP

COUNTERPLAN TEXT: The European Union should substantially increase diplomatic engagement with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea over their nuclear weapons program.

A. Solvency: Increased talks with EU solve

2NC/1NR North Korea EU CP Solvency Extensions

1. EU humanitarian aid is the leverage—the relationship is also very strong

2NC/1NR North Korea EU CP Answer to “Perm: US-EU Cooperation”

1. EU security action restarts negotiations—US sanctions derail the process
2. US participation destroys talks—too many cooks in the kitchen

1NC Human Rights European Union CP COUNTERPLAN TEXT: The

European Union should pass legislation mandating multinational corporations located in the People’s Republic of China to follow the Sullivan Principles outlined in the Lee evidence.

- A. Solvency: EU has historically used Corporate Social Responsibility which is the same thing as the Sullivan Principles—they can easily solve in China

2NC/1NR Human Rights EU CP Solvency Extensions

1. There are more EU MNC’s than the US—there’s more money to be lost if China does not reform
2. China trades more with the EU—one billion euros daily!

2NC/1NR Human Rights EU CP AT: the EU already regulates

1. Currently, the EU does not institute strong limits to their MNC’s across the globe

1NC Currency Manipulation European Union CP

Counterplan text: The European Union should substantially increase its economic engagement with China over issues of currency manipulation

A. Solvency: The EU has the diplomatic capital and economic tools to challenge China's devaluation of its currency- Now is the key time for the EU to stand up to China and reverse this trend

2NC/1NR Currency Manipulation EU CP Solvency Extensions

1. The EU can compel China to reverse its economic policies. Like the U.S., the EU is negatively impacted by Chinese currency manipulation

2NC/1NR Currency Manipulation EU CP Solvency Extensions

1. Empirically, China has responded to EU threats on their trading and investment practices. The counterplan solves

2NC/1NR EU CP AT #1—CP Takes a Long Time

1. Identical to the Aff—Our EU CP goes through the same process as the Aff so there's no reason it would take longer for the EU to do it. If there are delays, that would delay the aff the same amount. The barriers to the AFF prove our point.

2. The EU could do the aff faster than the US because

3. No impact—there’s no problem with the CP taking a few more months. None of their impacts are going to happen in that period of time. It worth it to have our net benefits to do the CP later if you buy their argument.

2NC/1NR EU CP AT #2 and #3—Perm

1. Our Disadvantages still link—Even if the EU, China and the US could do the plan, *should* they? Just because I can drive a car blindfolded doesn’t mean I should. If you vote for the perm, then all of our Disadvantages based on the US will happen. It’s better to do the CP alone.
2. Turn: US and EU cooperation isolates China and tanks relations between all three countries
3. Delay—Agreeing to a treaty between three countries would take forever—the TPP is a perfect example. It would take years to do any part of the plan which means the impacts would happen before the perm could solve them.
4. No net benefit—The US would get all of the credit and the EU and China would not boost relations. The US is always placing itself at the center of the conversation and will crowd out the EU.

2NC/1NR EU CP AT #4—No Solvency

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 [Insert 1-3 pieces of specific solvency evidence depending on the Aff]

2NC/1NR EU CP AT #5—Hegemony Add

On

1. Our OBOR DA outweighs their hegemony impact because

2. Hegemony is high now
3. Turn: Diplomacy destroys hegemony and causes war

1NC European Union CP OBOR Internal Net Benefit Shell

- A. Uniqueness and Internal Link: One Belt One Road is not connected between China and the EU—improved relations tie them together
- B. Link: Economic and diplomatic engagement improves relations—spills over into more cooperation
- C. Impact: OBOR solves many impacts including the global drug trade, terrorism, economic decline, and Asian war

2NC/1NR EU CP Internal Net Benefit AT #1—No OBOR Funding

- 1. Extend our RSIS evidence.
- 2. Improved relations guarantee the passage of the “One Belt, One Road” policy

2NC/1NR EU CP Internal Net Benefit AT #2—Case outweighs the DA

2NC/1NR EU CP Internal Net Benefit AT #3—EU/China Relations High

- 1. Extend our RSIS evidence.
- 2. Low relations prevent passage of One Belt One Road connecting China and Europe
- 1. EU-Chinese relations are low because EU engagement is unconditional and limited
- 3. China exploits country differences in the EU—comprehensive cooperation is low

2NC/1NR EU CP Internal Net Benefit AT #4—One Issue Isn't Enough

- 1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2. Tough economic and Diplomatic cooperation improve China-EU relations
- 3. Cooperation on single issues spills over

2NC/1NR EU CP Internal Net Benefit AT #5—OBOR Bad Impact Turn

1. Extend our Ntousas evidence.
2. OBOR has counter measures to prevent problems
3. OBOR dramatically improves the global economy while making countries more interconnected

2NC/1NR EU CP Internal Net Benefit - OBOR Solves Terrorism/Drug Trade Extensions

1. Improved relations lead to passage of OBOR—that's key to ending Afghanistan's drug trade, improving relations, and stabilizing Central Asia

2NC/1NR EU CP Internal Net Benefit - OBOR Solves EU Economy

1. OBOR solves the EU and Chinese economies

2AC European Union Counterplan Answers

1. No Solvency: Disagreements cause delay in EU-China cooperation
2. Permutation: The US, EU, and China should cooperate on the plan. The EU will get the same amount of credit for improving China relations and the OBOR policy will still be built.
3. Cooperation between all three countries solve a ton of different impacts—the perm is best
4. No Solvency: The US has unique relationship with China. Our AFF outlines how the US is necessary to cooperate either because of its military, economy, or human rights stance. Our _____ evidence or _____ advantage explains why the US can only do the plan.
5. Hegemony:
 - A. US-China cooperation strengthen declining US hegemony

B. US hegemony solves global warfare between the US and China—strong diplomacy solves

2AC EU CP OBOR Net Benefit Answers

1. **No Internal Link: OBOR will be divided and underfunded**
2. **Impact Calculus:**
3. **Non-Unique: EU-China relations are at an all-time high**
4. **No Link: One Issue—Diplomacy on a single issue will not be enough to convince China and the EU to spend billions of dollars. One single cooperation on diplomacy will not completely change China’s mind—they’re either going to do OBOR or not.**
5. **Impact Turn: OBOR causes economic decline, water wars, and terrorism**

Pressure Counterplan

Vocabulary

Pressure: Placing force on a country. The CP argues that instead of using diplomacy and cooperation, the US should just tell China to do the plan. Every Aff would involve some compromise, but the CP says that the US should be strong/hardline and force China to do the Aff.

Hegemony/Primacy: The US’s military and diplomatic power. The Neg argues that compromise and cooperation make the US look weak—especially when other countries ignore us. This power is essential to keeping the world safe through threats, protecting our allies, and the general fear of US force.

Beijing: Capital of China. When a piece of evidence says “Beijing”, it means the government and political officials representing China.

Chinese Communist Party (CCP): Main political party of China. They have large control over the entire country and believe in a strong government with control over the people and economy. Xi Jinping is the leader of the party.

1NC Human Rights Pressure CP

Counterplan Text: The United States Federal Government should pressure China on human rights issues

A. Solvency: The U.S. needs to adopt a hardline stance on human rights issues with China- historically, China has responded to threats, not soft diplomatic approaches

2NC/1NR Solvency Human Rights

Extensions

1. The Counterplan solves better than the aff. Attempts to merely engage China on human rights issues failed, but historically, sustained pressure has worked.

2NC/1NR AT: "Human Rights Pressure Destabilizes China"

1. They say human rights pressure destabilizes China, but the best way to ensure a smooth transition to democracy in China is through pressuring China to integrate into the global economy

1NC Currency Manipulation Pressure CP

Counterplan Text: The United States Federal Government should pressure China to end the manipulation of their currency

A. Solvency: The counterplan solves better than the affirmative- China will only listen to concrete threats

2NC/1NR Currency Manipulation

Solvency Extensions

1. Economic engagement with China in the WTO is ineffective. The US must confront China

1NC North Korea Pressure CP

Counterplan text: The United States Federal Government should pressure the People's Republic of China to impose collaborative sanctions against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

A. Solvency: The counterplan solves better than the affirmative. Only direct pressure on the PRC will lead to sanctions that solve the threat posed by North Korea.

2NC/1NR Pressure CP- North Korea

Affirmative- Solvency Overview

1. Extend our 1NC Wall Street Journal 2015 evidence. It indicates that China has been unwilling to openly condemn North Korea in international forums. Only the counterplan, which is unequivocal on its stance regarding whether China should impose sanctions on North Korea, has a chance of compelling China.
2. Here's more evidence. The counterplan solves best. China will only respond to pressure, not the quid pro quo of the affirmative

1NC BIT Pressure CP

Counterplan Text: The United States Federal Government should pressure the People's Republic of China to ratify the Bilateral Investment Treaty with the United States.

A. Solvency: The U.S. must exert pressure on China in order for them to ratify the treaty. Historically, China has been foreign direct investment difficult within China, and they have made little progress on opening up their country

2NC/1NR Pressure CP- BIT - Solvency

Overview

1. Extend our 1NC Diplomat 2016 evidence. It indicates that China does not see it in their best interests to open up their country to Foreign Direct Investment. The affirmative can fiat US, but they cannot fiat that the PRC signs the treaty. Our evidence indicates there is not willpower to do so, and that only pressuring China, not engaging them, will lead to them signing the treaty.
2. Here's more evidence, China will not budge on foreign direct investment unless the USFG pressures them to do so. The counterplan solves best.

2NC/1NR Pressure CP AT # --CP Doesn't Solve

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 [Insert 1-3 pieces of specific solvency evidence depending on the Aff]

2NC/1NR Pressure CP Human Rights – AT: Perm Do Both

1. The permutation still links to the net benefit. Extend our 1NC Singh evidence. When the U.S. engages China through bilateral negotiations, it seldom works, and the U.S. is left looking weak and unable to curtail China's rise. This will lead to U.S. losing our global dominance.
2. Here's more evidence. China will not implement human rights reforms despite bilateral efforts. In fact, they will point out the hypocrisy of U.S. claims on human rights, further undermining our global credibility

2NC/1NR- Pressure CP- Currency

Manipulation- AT: Permutation do Both

1. They say the plan and the counterplan are effectively the same. However, the plan and the counterplan are conceptually different. Engagement involves a quid pro quo, while the counterplan pressures China to reverse a current monetary policy without expecting anything in return. Hold the affirmative to this definition. Allowing engagement without expecting something in return limits negative ground since it prohibits us from reading CPs that do the opposite of engagement. Further, a quid pro quo interpretation limits the number of affirmatives

that can be read on the topic, ensuring more in depth and educational discussions. Either the counterplan is competitive, or the affirmative is not topical. They cannot be both.

1NC Hegemony Net Benefit Shell

A. Uniqueness and Link: Continued cooperation with China signals global weakness and destroys US hegemony

Singh, 2012 [Robert, Professor of Political Science at the University of London, Barack Obama's Post-American Foreign Policy.]

B. Internal Link and Impact: U.S. hegemony is key to prevent major wars

2NC/1NR- Pressure CP- Hegemony Net Benefit AT: "Non-Unique"

1. They say the DA is not unique. However, it is. China's rise has been curtailed in the status quo, and the U.S. is the global hegemon.

2NC/1NR Pressure CP- Hegemony Net Benefit AT: "No Link"

1. They say that engagement with China does not hinder U.S. hegemony, but it does. U.S. hegemony exists in the status quo, but China is attempting to challenge it. By engaging with China, the U.S. recognizes a sort of mutual and equal international status. This undermines U.S. hegemony

2AC Affirmative Answers to Pressure Counterplan

2AC- Pressure CP- Human Rights

Affirmative

1. Permutation: do both- The U.S. must sustain dialogue with China in order to be credible- This means the CP cannot solve. Additionally, dialogue with China gives us global credibility, which resolves the hegemony link on the net benefit.
2. China will not compromise on human rights with a hardline stance. Engagement such as the affirmative's is critical to solve our advantages
3. Pressure doesn't solve and will lead to domestic instability in China.

2AC- Pressure CP- Currency Manipulation

Affirmative

1. Permutation: do both - filing a complaint in the WTO about Chinese currency manipulation is tantamount to pressuring China to change their currency practices. The CP and the plan are the same
2. The plan is net better for hegemony than the CP alone- Our 1ac evidence indicates that economic engagement not only compels China to change its policies on currency manipulation, but that it sends a global signal that the U.S. is a credible, but steadfast trading partner. This also resolves the link to the hegemony net benefit because the US takes on China through the WTO.
3. Pressure alone won't resolve currency manipulation- the plan's approach, which uses engagement, is the most promising strategy to get China to change its practices

2AC- Pressure CP- North Korea

Affirmative

1. Permutation: do both – having the US pressure China diplomatically while offering military withdrawal as a concession means the perm solves our Harms better than the Counterplan does and also solves their Hegemony Net Benefit – the perception that we're still tough on them means no less of hegemony.

2. Solvency deficit – Extend our 1AC Chanlett-Avery and Council on Foreign Relations evidence. The CP is the failed status quo – we’re trying to pressure China now and they’re not cooperating on North Korea. We need to engage them with a concession like the plan to make China support sanctions on North Korea.
3. The CP is counter-productive. Pressure leads to China opposing us – we cannot apply pressure instead of making military concessions

2AC- Pressure CP- BIT Affirmative

1. Permutation: do both. Pressuring China diplomatically while ratifying the BIT here works - there’s no reason we can’t do both to solve.
2. Solvency deficit – nothing in the plan text passes BIT here. We need to take definite action in order to get China to comply.
3. We’ve already begun negotiating BIT with China – only continued negotiation and our support gets China on board. Pressure is a 180 degree change that risks this process and alienates Chinese reform moderates that support BIT.

2AC Affirmative Answers to Pressure CP- Hegemony Net-Benefit

1. The Net Benefit Disadvantage is not unique. The global order is already shifting towards multipolarity.
2. There is no link. Engagement with China will not make us look weak. The perception of international credibility is not zero sum.

China Securitization Kritik

Vocabulary

Link: Something the aff has said in a card, cross-ex, or analytic that is flawed. Just like a DA link, it connects the negative argument to something the aff has done. In the case of the K, this is using security language.

Impact: The same as a DA—something very bad that happens because of the Aff’s actions. With the K, it’s a little different though because it makes a “root cause” argument that the ideas that the Aff has makes their own impacts happen.

Alternative: Think similar to a Counterplan text, but more about what happens in the debate round instead of a government actor doing it. The alternative is what we should do in the debate round to try to fix the problem laid out by the K. These are usually rethinking or rejecting bad ideas.

Securitization: Language intended to protect one country from another and usually a criticism of the country’s use of the military. The K argues that security language is bad because it is usually wrong. Think about a time you had an argument with someone and you said, “It’s all their fault!” That’s probably not fair, right? You probably did something. Similarly, when the US says that China is “coming for us”, “building weapons”, or “trying to attack the US” that’s making things too simple. Basically, saying bad things about a country or their military causes knee-jerk responses or war.

Representations: Language or how things are said. This is different from a policy because representations are the words we use, the text of the cards, and how we frame arguments. The K argues that the way we talk about things impacts how we act or see the world.

Epistemology: Epiteme=thought, ology=study of→the study of how we think. How do you know what you know? Who told you to think that? Did you come up with that on your own? Generally speaking, this is a reflection on how we think and how we have come by knowledge. We do this all the time! For example, when you think about what study habits are most effective; you’re thinking about how you learn best. When you consider the honesty of a news source, you’re thinking about how you get your knowledge.

Ontology: The study of “being” or existence. Simply put, the main question is “Who are you?” That’s a really tough question that most adults don’t even know, so don’t

stress if you're not sure. When ontology is used in these cards, they are related to security. Basically, if your identity becomes tied up in fear, anger, and insecurity toward another race/country, then you are more likely to react with violence.

Cede the Political: "Cede" means to leave or give up and "the political" refers to voting and the government.

Therefore, to cede the political means to give up on working through the government and trying to change it, but instead to try to work outside this political system.

Permutation (Perm): A Perm is arguing that the CP or Alternative can actually work with the plan together. A perm must include all of the plan and all or part of the CP/Alternative.

Severance: An argument against a perm. Severance is when the AFF does not include part of the plan in the permutation—they sever or remove part of the 1ac.

People's Liberation Army (PLA): The Chinese armed forces. Basically the accumulation of all the Chinese military.

Chinese Communist Party (CCP): Main political party of China. They have large control over the entire country and believe in a strong government with control over the people and economy. Xi Jinping is the leader of the party.

1NC China Securitization Kritik Shell

- A. Link--The AFFs framing of China as a threat is unrealistic and is grounded in circular logic. Everything China does *seems* like a threat because they appear threatening and different already. In reality, these are just racist stereotypes.
- B. Impact: These threats become self-fulfilling. The US threatens China and they threaten the US. Trust is broken and both countries learn to fear each other. Both militaries expand and war becomes inevitable.
- C. Alternative: The judge should vote for the negative team to question the flawed stereotypes about China. Only by seeing the country as a genuine partner and not a conflict-region with scary people can we produce real change.

Specific Links

Economic Link

1. The AFF's realist understanding of the economic power shift to the East is a reductionist approach that escalates tensions, making conflict inevitable.

Bilateral Investment Treaty/South China Sea Link

1. US intervention in South China Sea affairs intensifies tensions and makes conflict more likely.

Nuclear Weapon/North Korea Link

1. Claiming that other countries should not have nuclear weapons is unfair—it assumes they won't use them correctly even though the US has thousands

Democracy Link

1. Democracy is only a justification for cultural imperialism ending in war

Human Rights Link

2NC/1NR War Impact Extensions

1. Security politics makes escalation of war inevitable
2. Personal fear of different people causes insecurity and violence on a global scale
3. Their mode of security politics makes both escalation and global structural violence inevitable

2NC/1NR Alternative Extensions

1. Our Alternative solves by analyzing the racist stereotypes of the AFF. After that, we can engage the political realm with a positive stance
- 2 The alternative breaks free of small-minded, false choices. We instead view the world with many different options preventing war
- 3 Self-reflection and critique of security politics can solve

2NC/1NR AT—“China is a Threat”

1. Their supposedly objective portrayal of China translates threat into reality, legitimizing US power politics.

2NC/1NR Your Authors are Biased Extensions

1. Their impact is constructed—the fact that threat perception has changed over time and that countries with similar political and economic profiles are *not* considered threats proves.
2. Be skeptical of their authors—arguing that China is a “real threat” is what legitimizes their claims in the first place.

2NC/1NR China Securitization Kritik Overview

1. The aff is using security representations and exaggerating the threat of China—that’s Pan. If we make everything and everyone seem threatening, then the US will just attack everywhere. We will see threats where they don’t even exist, leading to endless war—that’s Turner. Our alternative is to reject the Aff and examine our security representations for a better political system—that’s also Turner.
2. If that wasn’t enough, security representations destroy value to life because people become afraid of everything

2NC/1NR AT #1—Framework

1. Counter-Interpretation: The aff must defend their language or representations before they can have any of their case. Representations come first!
2. Representations shape policy-making by altering the way we perceive threats. The way we talk about things impacts how we try to fix them
3. Their limits education argument is a lie—they’re just trying to exclude our conversation to control how people learn about security
4. Fairness and Education—Kritiks are a common discussion that happens frequently. There’s no abuse here and the Aff should be prepared. This is especially true because this Kritik is specific to the China topic.

2NC/1NR AT #2—Perm: Do Both

1. The permutation is severance—they used their offensive security language in the 1ac—look at our link evidence. They can’t take that back in the 2ac. Severance is a voting issue and reason to reject the perm because shifting their position in the 2ac makes it impossible to be neg.
2. Masking: the perm is an attempt to cover up the mistake they had in the 1ac—they’re just trying to absorb our Kritik
3. Still links—the Aff advantages, cross-ex, and impacts are all security rhetoric. Just because they’re trying to cooperate now, doesn’t mean that they still don’t support security representations. Reject the perm.

2NC/1NR AT #3—Engagement Link Turn

1. Extend our Pan evidence.
2. They link through language--In Cross-ex or a card they said:

3. [INSERT A SPECIFIC LINK TO THE AFF FROM THIS FILE]

2NC/1NR AT #4—Cede the Political

1. Only the round matters—we’re not policy makers and most of us won’t be able to vote in this November election. What matters is what is said in this debate round. If we win that security language is bad, vote neg to stop it.
2. Our impacts outweigh. Endless war is a bigger impact than their cede the political argument because:

3. Working in the system causes constant policy failures—there’s a chance the alternative could solve
4. Alternative Solves—Extend our Turner evidence. It says that by changing our mindset we can adapt our politics. If we include China and change our understanding of them, we can make positive politics.

2NC/1NR AT #5—Impact Calculus

2NC/1NR AT #6—No Impact/Security Inevitable

1. Only this round—again, only evaluate this debate round. If we fix 1% of security, then that’s better than doing nothing. Their logic is like saying we should litter because we can’t stop all global warming. Do the right thing in this round.
2. Everything they say is a lie—security authors make up facts to justify war
3. Alternative Solves: Our Turner evidence says that once we can fix our representations, then we can fix our politics. We can change how we work between governments, but we must fix our language first. Basically, we agree with the aff, we just have to do the alternative first.

2AC Affirmative Answers to China Securitization Kritik

1. Framework

Our interpretation is that the impacts of the Aff should be evaluated.

A. Ground—If we can't weigh the Aff impacts, they will have destroyed the entire 1ac. They will be one speech ahead and we will always lose. Weigh our impacts for fairness.

B. Policy Education—We should be talking about the policy of the plan. This is the best way to discuss the topic and learn about what we can do to help in the future. If we only talk about representations, then we can't fix the bad US-China policy.

2. Focus on representations leads to inaction and bad education

3. Permutation: Do both – Reform solves

4. Link Turn: Engagement. Cooperation between the US and China will reduce tension and security rhetoric

5. Turn: Abandoning politics cedes it to the elites – causes war, slavery, and authoritarianism

6. Impact Calculus:

7. No impact and no solvency: Government officials, news outlets, and think tanks in China and the US frequently use security rhetoric—the plan solves military fears

Positive Peace Kritik (Human Rights)

1NC Positive Peace Kritik - Human Rights Affirmative

A. Link: The affirmative would like us to believe that torture and unfair imprisonment are practices that exist under repressive regimes such as the Chinese Communist Party. In reality, the U.S. is just as guilty. Many of these abuses are happening in our own backyards in Chicago, yet the affirmative wants to focus on “global hotspots”.

We Charge Genocide, 2014 [Organization focused on challenging human rights abuses in the US, “Summary of We Charge Genocide Trip to United Nations Committee Against Torture”, Dec. 15, <http://wechargegenocide.org/tag/united-nations/>]

B. Impact: The affirmative claims to resolve global nuclear wars and create the conditions for peace. Yet, militarism also pervades the lives of many Chicagoans, and will continue even if the judge votes affirmative. This narrow understanding of peace, as just the absence of wars, glosses over systemic violence, and makes it more difficult to address local issues such as police brutality.

C. Alternative: Critically analyze the meaning of the term “peace”. What conditions need to be in place for us to truly call ourselves “at peace”? And who, ultimately is allowed to live in peace, and what sorts of populations continue to live under a militarized police presence? Absent this critical intervention, systematic violence such as police brutality will continue in the status quo, and it will be ignored.

1NC Positive Peace Kritik - Economy Link

1. The negative’s characterization of economic growth as a remedy to all of our problems follows a similar logic to their claim that the absence of armed conflict guarantees peace. In this instance, their understanding of “growth” is limited to certain populations, those who already have wealth and capital. However, global economic growth does not impact those who live in poverty in the inner city. Failure to conceptualize growth outside of macro-economic terms, ignores the plight of America’s poor and risks perpetuating their conditions

2NC/1NR Positive Peace K- Human Rights Affirmative- Overview

1. Extend our 1NC We Charge Genocide in 2014 evidence. The U.S. routinely engages in human rights violations against its own citizens. The killing of unarmed African Americans at the hands of police, and the high rate of incarceration for small crimes are just a few of the abuses outlined in our evidence. Instead of calling our attention to these domestic abuses, the affirmative focuses on the human rights violations of the People's Republic of China. We must critically analyze our own actions before criticizing others. In fact, activists are already challenging the notion that the U.S. is a bastion of freedom and justice by testifying about police brutality in multilateral forums.
2. Extend our 1NC Cuomo evidence. The affirmative has a narrow and self-serving definition of militarism and peace that allows for the continuation of everyday militarism. That is, when peace is defined as just the absence of armed conflict between states, we are lulled into the false belief that everyone is at peace. Our 1NC Richmond evidence indicates that this understanding of peace glosses over instances of structural violence such as poverty and police brutality, ensuring their perpetuation.

2NC/1NR- Positive Peace K- Human Rights Affirmative- AT: Permutation do Both

1. They say we can focus on systemic violence and nuclear war. However, there is a tradeoff. Extend our 1NC Richmond and Cuomo evidence. Their definition of peace is problematic. At numerous points in the 1AC, the affirmative asserts that if we adopt the plan we no longer have to worry about conflict. However, this framing of war glosses over systemic violence, ensuring that it will continue. They cannot backtrack on the claims they made in the 1AC regarding nuclear war, that

is severance, which is a reason to reject the argument. The negative cannot generate links to off-case positions if the affirmative can change their plan in the 2AC.

2. They say systemic violence exists in China. However, they only care about human rights as a means to perpetuate U.S. credibility and prevent global nuclear war. This is still problematic. Yes, people may also be suffering in China. However, the affirmative instrumentalizes their plight to further their own version of U.S. dominated-global peace. Framing the situation in this way not only ignores micro-level violence, it also fails to interrogate the true conditions for structural violence in China, turning the case.

3. They say nuclear war increases structural violence. Even if this is true, the conceptualization of war under the affirmative makes us unable to address structural violence at all. Everyday forms of violence go unnoticed when we think of war as a global event. The permutation is not net-beneficial.

2NC/1NR Positive Peace K- Human Rights Link Extension

1. There is a direct tradeoff between protecting the labor and human rights of those in the U.S. and the affirmative. By pointing fingers at China, U.S. policymakers can distract us from the pressing humanitarian issues in the U.S.

2NC- Positive Peace K- Human Rights Affirmative- AT: Alternative Can't Solve

1. The alternative does solve for structural violence. Recognition of a globalized world does not preclude the recognition of everyday violence. By shifting the definition of militarism and peace, the negative is able to account for the ethical responsibility we have towards those living under repressive regimes.

2AC Affirmative Answers to Positive Peace Kritik (Human Rights Affirmative)

1. Permutation: do both

A. The plan and the alternative are not mutually exclusive. One can acknowledge systemic violence that occurs domestically and also focus on foreign policy initiatives that could stave off a nuclear crisis.

B. Our 1AC evidence indicates that numerous human rights abuses occur in China. Poor working conditions, the imprisonment of activists, and the oppression of ethnic and religious minorities are just a few of the many forms of systemic violence in the People's Republic of China. The negative cannot claim that these matter any more or less than the violence that they outline exists in the status quo in the U.S. This means you should prefer the permutation.

C. The permutation is net beneficial. The threat of nuclear conflict would exacerbate structural violence.

2. Their alternative cannot solve for structural violence. The plan's shift towards a global ethical responsibility prevents genocide and other large-scale atrocities.

Diplomatic Capital Disadvantage (January 2017 Update)

Vocabulary

Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS, ISIL)—Sunni Muslim extremist group that believes in the spread of Islam across the world. They are a militant and spread their power through violence, kidnapping, and torture.

Diplomatic Capital: Power to influence other countries through negotiations, incentives, or bargaining chips. The DA argues that Obama only has so much, so he has to spend it wisely.

Syria: A country in the Middle East where has broken out between Assad, ISIS, and opposition groups. There are many different religious and political groups fighting for survival and power in the country. The death tolls are high and it is a serious crisis.

Bashar Al-Assad: (Bah-shar all-awss awd): President of Syria fighting for control of the country. He is described as authoritarian kind of like a dictator. He has used violence against those that oppose him.

Diplomatic Talks: These are conversations between countries to try to find peace in Syria. These include the US, Russia, Syria, Iran, and Turkey. However, each country has different opinions on how and what should be done.

South China Seas (SCS): Part of the Pacific Ocean just southeast of China. It is near Taiwan, the Philippines, Cambodia, and Vietnam. A great deal of goods are moved through the area and there's supposedly a lot of oil in the sea bed. There are serious disputes about who actually owns it and thus many countries are fighting over it.

Senkaku Islands: Islands in the East China sea that have no one living on them. The US gave them to Japan, but China disagrees. These islands, like the South China Sea, are areas where fighting might erupt.

Xi Jinping (She jin-PING): General Secretary of the Communist Party of China, the President of the People's Republic of China, and the Chairman of China's Central Military Commission. He's like Obama, but even more powerful since China does not have the same political structure as the US. Essentially, he's the president of China.

People's Liberation Army (PLA): The Chinese armed forces. Basically the accumulation of all the Chinese military. It is the largest military in the world.

AT=Answers To

1NC Diplomatic Capital Disadvantage Shell

- A. UNIQUENESS: President-elect Trump is focusing diplomatic relations on Russia instead of China.
- B. LINK: Russia views US-China engagement like the plan as a zero sum tradeoff with productive US-Russian diplomacy
- C. INTERNAL LINK: Russia is key to negotiating a ceasefire in Syria and to defeat ISIS
- D. Impact: ISIS will use nuclear weapons

Chinese Diplomacy Link

- 1. Historically, Chinese cooperation drains diplomatic because military tensions are so high

North Korea Specific Link

Diplomacy with China over North Korea destroys diplomatic capital

2NC/1NR AT #1—Can't Speculate on Trump's Agenda

- 1. Extend our Beauchamp & Aleem- Dec 18th evidence.
- 2. Trump's recent appointments show his agenda is geared toward diplomacy with Russia
- 3. Trump is pushing for less diplomatic engagement with China and more with Russia. Involvement with China directly trades-off with Russia.

2NC/1NR AT #2—Trump won't be Distracted

- 1 Extend our Hill '16 evidence.
- 2 Link: Trump's current strategy of getting close to Russia gets derailed if he turns toward China

2NC/1NR AT #3—Diplomacy Fails

- 1. Extend our evidence from THE HILL.
- 2 Trump and Putin will work together to solve the Syrian conflict.
- 3 Thousands are dying in Syria and diplomacy is the only answer—it has historically worked in Europe
- 4 Iran is a major player and they support the talks

2NC/1NR AT #4—Fix Tough Issues First

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 Diplomatic Capital is limited—adding other issues makes doing both impossible

2NC/1NR AT #5 ISIS Threat Exaggerated

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
- 2 ISIS can get access to nuclear material and make havoc
- 3 Even if ISIS can't get nuclear weapons the Syrian conflict kills 440 people a day—this humanitarian crisis 100% probable and must be stopped

2NC/1NR AT #6—Case Outweighs**2NC/1NR AT #7— Diplomats Fill In**

1. Extend our evidence from The Hill
- 2 US diplomacy can't have more than one primary priority

2AC Affirmative Answers to Diplomatic Capital Disadvantage (January 2017 Update)

2AC Diplomatic Capital Disadvantage Answers

- 1 NO INTERNAL LINK: WE CAN'T PREDICT ANYTHING ABOUT TRUMP'S FOREIGN POLICY BECAUSE HIS CABINET IS DIVIDED AND TRUMP HAS NO KNOWLEDGE TO DIRECT DIPLOMACY
2. NO LINK – China will not distract Trump from focusing on the Middle East with Russia and he will defer to Russian diplomacy in Syria.
3. DIPLOMACY FAILS - THE US CAN'T RELY ON RUSSIA AS A PARTNER IN FIGHTING ISIS IN SYRIA
- 4 Link Turn: Vegetables First! If China is so challenging, Obama needs to get that off his plate first. This will be seen as a huge victory and he can now directly focus on the Middle East.

5. No impact: the ISIS threat is exaggerated—MANY reasons

6. Impact Calculus:

7. No Link: There are thousands of diplomats and the US can hire more

1AR Extensions to 2AC #1: Can't Predict Trump Foreign Policy

1. EXTEND OUR SLATE EVIDENCE – TRUMP'S CABINET IS DIVIDED AND TRUMP'S ADMINISTRATION HAS NO FOREIGN POLICY TO SPEAK OF. PREDICTIONS ARE USELESS.

2. NO INTERNAL LINK: TRUMP HAS NO DIPLOMATIC CAPITAL AND HIS "DEAL-MAKER" APPROACH TO FOREIGN POLICY REQUIRES BUILDING MANY NEW RELATIONSHIPS HIS INEXPERIENCED TEAM DOESN'T HAVE

1AR Extensions to 2AC #3: Diplomacy Fails

1. Extend our 2AC Foreign Policy evidence. Russia has done nothing to fight ISIS and doesn't want to – it only wants to prop up Syria's government to maintain influence.

2. NO INTERNAL LINK: IT'S IMPOSSIBLE TO PREDICT SECRETARY OF STATE NOMINEE TILLERSON'S ABILITY TO NEGOTIATE WITH RUSSIA ON SYRIA FOR TWO REASONS – FIRST, HE MIGHT NOT EVEN BE APPROVED BY CONGRESS. SECOND, HE HAS NO EXPERIENCE AND DOESN'T SHARE TRUMP'S VISION

Taiwan Relations Disadvantage (January 2017 Update)

Taiwan Relations Disadvantage (January 2017 Update) – NEG UNIQUENESS

Uniqueness: Trump plans to contain China and display our strength

Taiwan Relations Disadvantage – AFF Answers (January 2017 Update)

LINK TURN: Trump can't contain china – only engagement leads to security in Asia

NON-UNIQUE: China and Taiwan are already in conflict due to US policy

China Relations Disadvantage (January 2017 Update)

Vocabulary

Relations: Think relationship. This DA is based on the US and China being cooperative. If relations are high, that means that the US and China will work together on pressing problems. If they are low, then the countries are less likely to fix issues.

Nuclear Proliferation: Proliferation means to spread so nuclear proliferation is the spread of nuclear weapons. This means that more countries get access to full weapons and nuclear materials thus increasing the risk of nuclear use.

People's Liberation Army (PLA): The Chinese armed forces. Basically the accumulation of all the Chinese military. It is the largest military in the world.

South China Seas (SCS): Part of the Pacific Ocean just southeast of China. It is near Taiwan, the Philippines, Cambodia, and Vietnam. A great deal of goods are moved through the area and there's supposedly a lot of oil in the sea bed. There are serious disputes about who actually owns it and thus many countries are fighting over it.

Senkaku Islands: Islands in the East China sea that have no one living on them. The US gave them to Japan, but China disagrees. These islands, like the South China Sea, are areas where fighting might erupt.

Xi Jinping (She jin-PING): General Secretary of the Communist Party of China, the President of the People's Republic of China, and the Chairman of China's Central Military Commission. He's like Obama, but even more powerful since China does not have the same political structure as the US. Essentially, he's the president of China.

Chinese Communist Party (CCP): Main political party of China. They have large control over the entire country

and believe in a strong government with control over the people and economy. Xi Jinping is the leader of the party.

AT=Answers To

1NC- China Relations Disadvantage Shell

- A. UNIQUENESS: China is giving Trump a grace period now, but it's short-lived: we are at a key point in relations
- B. <Insert plan-specific link>
- C. Internal-Link: Maintaining good relations with China is critical to resolve almost every status quo impact including nuclear proliferation

1NC- China Relations Disadvantage

Human Rights Link

The affirmative's insistence on pressuring China to adopt human rights policies backfires- leads to increased hostility and collapses the CCP

1NC- China Relations Disadvantage -

North Korea Link

China and North Korea are still major trading partners and allies. The shared border between them, means China will always have ties with North Korea. If the U.S. pressures China to change this relationship, it will appear coercive

1NC China Relations Disadvantage -

Currency Manipulation Link

China wants to be perceived as a fair trader – the plan puts them on blast and makes them fear sanctions

2NC/1NR- China Relations Disadvantage

- North Korea Link Extensions

China is economically dependent on North Korea. This means the plan would be viewed as comprising China's economic growth, straining relations

2NC/1NR China Relations Disadvantage

AT: #1 Non-Unique: Relations Bad Now

1. Extend our NEW YORK TIMES evidence.
4. [Choose what YOU feel are the BEST 1 or 2 pieces of UNIQUENESS evidence in the next three pages to read in the 2NC or 1NR to extend this argument effectively]

Trump made other positive moves that keep relations vulnerable but stable until China sees what his policy will be – all eyes are on the AFF PLAN

Trump’s Taiwan phone call was bad, but China’s going to give him chance to make a next move. The AFF PLAN is the WRONG move
Don’t believe “Insider” hype. Relations were already so bad under Obama that conflict was inevitable. Trump can only do better with a fresh approach

Chinese President Xi and Trump are already establishing goals together

Their authors are exaggerating – Trump’s call with Taiwan fits our past pattern of relations

2NC/1NR China Relations Disadvantage

AT: #2 “Plan Helps China Relations”

1. Extend our _____ evidence.

2NC/1NR China Relations Disadvantage

AT: #3 LINK TURN – “Plan is a Win-Win”

1. Extend our _____ evidence.
2. The AFF’s claim of a “win-win” is the exact kind of deal-making that China hates about Trump and would damage relations worse than ever before

2NC/1NR China Relations Disadvantage

AT: #4 NO LINK: “Trump is a loose cannon”

1. Extend our NEW YORK TIMES ___ evidence.
- 3 [Choose one or two of the following pieces of evidence from the next 3 pages that YOU think are BEST to extend the argument, if you have time.]

China is cautiously optimistic about Trump being practical
History proves China will take a “wait and see” approach toward Trump’s unpredictable WORDS, but will react strongly to POLICIES like the AFF PLAN that they dislike

They LINK. We agree with the NEG that China has uncertainty about Trump. The AFF PLAN causes escalation when China views it as the start of a back-and-forth rivalry

2NC/1NR China Relations Disadvantage

AT: #5 “No Nuclear Proliferation”

1. Extend our _____ evidence.

2AC Affirmative Answers to China Relations Disadvantage (January 2017 Update)

1. **NON-UNIQUE-** Relations are bad already. Trump has already undone 35 years of diplomacy with China in one phone call with Taiwan
2. **LINK TURN:** <insert analysis as to why plan actually improves relations with China and refer to 1AC evidence>
3. Our LINK TURN is **UNIQUE** because after Trump's initial provoking of China, they're looking for win-win policies like our plan to increase relations
4. **NO LINK:** Their Disadvantage is inevitable – whether or not we make China angry with the plan, Trump is a loose cannon and they'll be angry anyway regardless
5. **NO IMPACT:** Nuclear proliferation is slowing in the status quo

1AR Extension to 2AC #1: NON-UNIQUE: Relations Bad Now

Extend the 2AC SYDNEY MORNING HERALD evidence. It says that Trump's phone call to Taiwan was the worst thing that's happened to relations with China in 35 years and could cause conflict by itself. Group their responses.
TRUMP IS VIEWED BY CHINA AS DESTABILIZING RELATIONS
Trump phone call with Taiwan is historically bad for China relations

China Nationalism Disadvantage (January 2017 Update)

China Nationalism Disadvantage **(January 2017 Update) – AFF** **Answer Updates**

NO LINK and NON-UNIQUE: No risk of nationalist backlash to the PLAN – Xi has undisputed control and Trump is perceived positively by the Chinese, even after his Taiwan actions

China Nationalism Disadvantage (Jan **2017 Update) – NEG BRINK**

China's hardline nationalists are already pushing Xi about Trump – they're watching now but will come down hard against any further sign of weakness