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# Introduction:

Welcome to the China-Taiwan Affirmative & Negative Evidence Set. In here, you’ll find all the research you’ll need to construct a winning 1AC and 1NC in the novice division.

We’ve organized this evidence into a few different categories:

* **1AC** – This is the argument you’ll read in the first affirmative constructive. Notice it has one advantage (Relations) that has two different scenarios. Each scenario is a reason to vote for the advantage. Depending on how much information you can read in 8 min you can read either or both scenarios in the 1AC.
* **2AC Extensions** – These are arguments that bolster your case and answer the arguments that the negative may make in their speeches. Use each argument as necessary to answer negative arguments. Remember you can also answer negative arguments by explaining how your original 1AC arguments apply.
* **1NC:** This section of the file includes the cards that should be read on the negative in the first negative constructive. These cards should be read in addition to other case arguments that you may already be more familiar with.
* **Negative Extensions:** This section of the file includes arguments to bolster the claims you’ve made in the 1NC. If you have time it also includes arguments the negative may make in the 1NC.
* **Affirmative Answers:** This section includes the cards the affirmative team will need in order to answer the hegemony DA and elections DA. \*NOTE: You may also have cards that answer this DA in the global influence or elections DA files so be sure to check both places. ALSO NOTE: Many leagues do not allow teams to read DAs until later in the season. Be sure you double check your league’s evidence rules before using these arguments.\*

**How to use this file:**

The file is organized by side and the components of a disadvantage. You will need to pick and choose which arguments you will make in a given round after the 1NC. You will not have time to make all of these arguments in any round.

1. Read the summaries of each argument available in the packet
2. Check out the glossary to make sure you understand all of the words and terms.
3. Read and highlight the evidence, making sure you understand the argument being made and pulling out the key parts of each piece of evidence.
4. Pick the arguments you will use in the negative block and as the affirmative.

# Debating the China-Taiwan Aff and Neg

Taiwan is an interesting double bind in regards to its relationship with the United States and mainland China. In 1979, the United States passed the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA), giving the government a legal obligation to provide “arms of a defensive nature” to Taiwan. Seven years later, in 1986, the US passed a treaty agreeing to significantly reduce their arms sales to Taiwan, and to continue to reduce the level of arms sales over time. More than 30 years later, we are in the exact same situation, however, where there is a legal obligation for the US to both provide arms to Taiwan and NOT to provide arms to Taiwan. This means both sides of the debate have very strong claims.

On the one hand, because it is an important cultural issue for the Chinese government to assimilate Taiwan into the mainland, a reduction in US arms sales to Taiwan improves the relationship between the US and China.

On the other hand, however, the US’s assistance is one of the last things allowing Taiwan to maintain independence and resist modern-day imperialism from China. Students will either argue that it is more important to stand in solidarity with Taiwan and continue to provide them with arms, or to let them fend for themselves in order to strengthen our relationship with China, which could lead to increased cooperation in science, technology, the environment, etc. Not to mention continued world peace, as China’s military spending is beginning to beat even the US.

# Speech Times

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Speech** | **Time (Minutes)** |
| **1st Affirmative Constructive (1AC)** | **8** |
| **2nd Negative Speaker Questions 1st Affirmative Speaker** | **3** |
| **1st Negative Constructive (1NC)** | **8** |
| **1st Affirmative Speaker Questions 1st Negative Speaker** | **3** |
| **2nd Affirmative Constructive (2AC)** | **8**  |
| **1st Negative Speaker Questions 2nd Affirmative Speaker** | **3**  |
| **2nd Negative Constructive (2NC)** | **8**  |
| **2nd Affirmative Speaker Questions 2nd Negative Speaker** | **3**  |
| **1st Negative Rebuttal (1NR)** | **5**  |
| **1st Affirmative Rebuttal (1AR)** | **5** |
| **2nd Negative Rebuttal (Closing Statement) (2NR)** | **5**  |
| **2nd Affirmative Rebuttal (Closing Statement) (2AR)** | **5**  |

# Being Affirmative

The goal of the affirmative is simple: Suggest a plan of action, show how it will work, and why it is a good idea. If the affirmative’s plan is a good idea at the end of the round, then you will win. The more you focus on the plan and why it is a bad idea, the more often you’ll win debates.

**Speaking Roles on the Affirmative:**

* **1st Affirmative Speaker:** Your job is to introduce the affirmative case in the 1AC, and to keep the affirmative case (plan, solvency and at least one advantage) alive during the 1AR.
* **2nd Affirmative Speaker:** Your job is answer negative attacks in the 2AC, adding any evidence the affirmative might need, then to make a closing statement explaining why the affirmative team should win in the 2AR. This should focus on why the plan is a good idea and how the advantages are more important than the disadvantages.

**Goals of each speech:**

1. **1AC:** Build your case: Inherency, The Plan, Solvency, and the Advantages.
2. **2AC/1AR:** Respond to the negative’s arguments and add new evidence if needed. You need to be winning at least Solvency and an Advantage after the 1AR to win the debate.
3. **2AR:** The second affirmative speaker should give a closing argument all about why the plan is a good idea. Answer the second negative rebuttal (2NR) and tell the judge why the affirmative team should win.

# Being Negative

The goal of the negative is simple: Prove that the plan presented by the affirmative team is a bad idea. The more you focus on the plan and why it is a bad idea, the more often you’ll win debates.

**Speaking Roles on the Negative:**

* **1st Negative Speaker:** Your job is to introduce a range of negative arguments in the 1NC, and to definitively win at least one of those arguments in the 1NR.
* **2nd Negative Speaker:** Your job is to expand upon one or two arguments made in the 1NC, then to choose the best argument made by the negative team and show why the negative should win the debate in the 2NR. You are in charge of choosing negative strategy, since you’ll have to explain it in the 2NR

**Phases of a Debate:**

1. **1NC:** Outline a few different reasons why the affirmative is a bad idea, without going into too much detail on any one of them.
2. **2NC/1NR:** Think of these as a single speech, given by different people. Each debater should choose one or two (different) arguments from the 1NC and go into greater detail, explaining and adding evidence when needed.
3. **2NR:** The second negative speaker should give a closing argument all about the strongest negative position (after hearing the affirmative speak in the 1AR). Tell the judge why the negative team should win.

## Affirmative Overview: How to debate the Aff

In this affirmative case, you will be arguing that the world will be better if the United States agrees to significantly decrease the amount of arms we are currently selling to Taiwan. We say that the world will improve by bettering our relationship with China. A strong relationship with China is very important as they become more and more of a global superpower.

The first argument we are making is that reducing arms sales to Taiwan signals to China that we are not a threat to their authority in the region. This suspicion from China puts us in a tense space, where the risk of armed conflicts increase. From there, once the first strike occurs, there will only be retaliation after retaliation, until both countries utilize their deadliest weapons. The number of deaths and amount of money spent on a war between two world superpowers cannot be properly calculated, and should be avoided at all costs.

The second argument relates to the United States and China’s cooperation on green technology. The green technology sector is one of the few areas where the US and China find common ground, and try to work together, even despite tensions. However, US sales of arms to Taiwan is a very hot-button, culturally significant issue for China, and continued lack of respect to the US’s promises to China could ruin our ability to work together to develop new environmentally friendly technologies. This lack of innovation will affect the entire world, as we are currently on the brink of environmental collapse. It may already be too late to save the planet, but the US and China are our best hope of finding something that can maybe reverse the catastrophic effects of climate change.

On the negative you will want to challenge some of the presumptions of the affirmative. Here are some questions to keep in mind as you compile your negative strategy:

* **Solvency:** How will the plan work? Will it result in the consequences that the affirmative team predicts or will it have different consequences?
* **Case Impacts:** These arguments say that the impacts the affirmative claims are not correct.
* **Case Turns:** These are potentially other bad effects of the affirmative.
* **Solidarity:** Are there moral or ethical reasons that US should continue to sell arms to Taiwan?

Go through the arguments and determine which cards you’d like to read in each speech on the affirmative and the negative. You will not have time to make every argument in this file so you need to pick the ones you think are most strategic.

# Key terms Glossary

**PRC** – People’s Republic of China. The Government in mainland China

**Kuomintang** – “Nationalist party of China”. China-friendly political party in Taiwan.

**PLA** – People’s Liberation Army, the armed forces of China.

**Communique** – An official announcement or statement, especially one made to the media.

**Rhetoric** – The art of effective or persuasive speaking or writing, especially the use of figures of speech and other techniques.

**Retaliation** – The action of returning a military attack; counterattack.

**Bilateral –** Having or relating to two sides; affecting both sides.

**Cybersecurity** – The state of being protected against the criminal or unauthorized use of electronic data, or the measures taken to achieve this

**Emission** – The production and discharge of something, especially gas or radiation.

**Reunification** – The concept of Taiwan becoming a part of the country of China, either through peace or force.

**Cross-strait** – Having to do with China and Taiwan (they are separated by the Taiwan Strait)

**Imperialism** – A country extending their power and influence through either diplomacy or force

**Bipartisan** – Supported by both (political) parties in the United States.

**Agenda** – Plan of action

**Assimilation** – The process of one group coming to resemble or adopt the culture/practices of another place. Can happen by choice or by force.

**Exacerbate –** To make worse

**Crimp –** Bad or limiting effect

**Subsidy** – Funding for something, usually by the government, in order to make it more desirable/easier to access something.

# 1AC

## Inherency

#### The Trump Administration has recently increased its arms sales to Taiwan, causing tension between the US and China.

Wadhams et al 19[Nick Wadhams, Jennifer Jacobs, Jenny Leonard, Anthony Capaccio, Writers, Bloomberg, “China Protests Possible Trump Move to Sell F-16’s to Taiwan”, <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2019-03-21/trump-aides-said-to-back-selling-f-16-fighter-planes-to-taiwan>]]

The Trump administration has given tacit approval to Taiwan’s request to buy more than 60 F-16 fighter jets, according to people familiar with the matter, prompting a fresh protest from China amid its trade dispute with the U.S. President Donald Trump’s advisers encouraged Taiwan to submit a formal request for the jets, built by [Lockheed Martin Corp.](https://www.bloomberg.com/quote/LMT%3AUS), which it did this month, according to the people, who asked not be identified discussing internal discussions. Any such request would need to be converted into a formal proposal by the Defense and State Departments, and then Congress would have 30 days to decide whether to block the sale. “China’s position to firmly oppose arms sales to Taiwan is consistent and clear,” Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman Geng Shuang told a regular news briefing Friday in Beijing. “We have made stern representations to the U.S. We have urged the U.S. to fully recognize the sensitivity of this issue and the harm it will cause.”The U.S., wary of antagonizing China, hasn’t sold advanced fighter jets since then-President George H.W. Bush announced the sale of 150 F-16s to Taiwan in 1992.

Recent increases in arms sales are a direct violation of the 1982 agreement between the US and China in order to preserve relations.

Chen, Kastner, & Reed 2017[Ping-Kuei Chen, Scott L Kastner, William L Reed, “A Farewell to Arms? US Security Relations with Taiwan and the Prospects for Stability in the Taiwan Strait”, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/j.ctt1w76wpm.15?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents>]

Washington agreed in a 1982 communique “to reduce gradually its sale of arms to Taiwan” and promised that future arms sales to Taiwan “would not exceed, either in qualitative or quantitative terms,” those of recent years, but the record of US arms sales since suggests that the communique has had little constraining effect on US behavior. US arms sales to Taiwan, in turn, often provoke angry Chinese response, which typically includes tough rhetoric and symbolic retaliation, such as temporarily suspending US-China military-to-military dialogues. US arms sales to Taiwan have continued to generate frictions in US-China relations even though relations between Taipei and Beijing improved dramatically after the 2008 election of Ma Ying-jeou as president in Taiwan. In early 2010, for instance, PRC officials were “strong indignant” after an arms sale announcement, calling the sale a “gross intervention in China’s internal affairs” that would have a “serious negative impact” on bilateral relations.

Plan: The United States Federal Government should cease arms sales to Taiwan (May change this to “should reduce arms sales to provide basic defensive capabilities”)

## 1AC Advantage 1: US-China Relations

## 1AC Scenario 1: Military Relations

#### China’s military strength is growing, quickly becoming an equal to the US. Lee 19 [John Lee, Writer, The Diplomat, “Why a US Sale of Fighter Jets to Taiwan Matters”, <https://thediplomat.com/2019/04/why-a-us-sale-of-fighter-jets-to-taiwan-matters/>]

In the lead-up to the 1996 Taiwanese presidential elections, mainland China conducted a series of missile tests to express its displeasure against the pro-independence leanings of then-leader Lee Teng-hui and impress on the Taiwanese electorate that returning Lee to office might lead to war. The United States’ response to the so-called [Third Taiwan Strait Crisis](https://nationalinterest.org/feature/the-third-taiwan-strait-crisis-the-forgotten-showdown-19742), which was to order two aircraft carrier groups to the area, did the trick. The largest display of American military might since the Vietnam War forced a humiliating Chinese backdown and persuaded Beijing it needed to modernize its military to counter the U.S. Navy. The Chinese move also backfired as Lee’s popularity in Taiwan gained a shot in the arm for standing up to the mainland. Back in 1996, China’s [military budget](https://www.sipri.org/sites/default/files/SIPRI-Milex-data-1949-2017.xlsx) was only about twice that of Taiwan’s and approximately 16 times smaller than that of the United States. Today, the People’s Liberation Army’s (PLA) budget is almost 22 times larger than Taiwan’s and over one-third that of the United States. China’s advanced short-range ballistic missile could destroy every runway attached to Taiwan’s six air force bases and destroy almost all Taiwanese fighter planes in the early moments of a war. The PLA has established superiority over Taiwan in the air, and on and under the water. The only thing the PLA cannot achieve is landing troops on Taiwan without suffering unacceptable losses.

Recent sales of arms to Taiwan could be putting the United States at the tipping point of conflict with China. Lu 19 [Zhenhua Lu, Writer, South China Morning Post, “US-China tensions could ignite over Taiwan, American officials warn]

Beijing has repeatedly warned Washington to stop any official contacts and cut off all military ties with Taiwan, which Beijing regards as a breakaway province to be taken back by force if necessary. Washington has no formal ties with Taipei, but remains its major arms supplier and is bound by law to help defend the island. Last week, Taiwan President Tsai Ing-wen addressed a Heritage Foundation event in Washington, via a live video link, on US-Taiwan and cross-strait relations. She is scheduled to deliver a second, similar speech to the US Centre for Strategic and International Studies on April 9, a day ahead of the 40th anniversary of the Taiwan Relations Act, the US law which has defined its relations with the island since it switched sovereign recognition from Taipei to Beijing in 1979. The message from Washington has been alarming enough to prompt a former top White House official on Asian affairs to heap scorn on the current Taiwan policymakers in the Trump administration.

China has the military strength and technology to win a US-China war, with the ability to attack before the US can even retaliate. Kazianis 18 [John Kazianis, Writer, National Interest, “Just how bad a war with China would be (and how Beijing would win)”]

What if Beijing simply degraded and destroyed the ability of U.S. forces to have those advanced eyes and ears and brought back an old foe of U.S. forces— the much hated “fog of war?” If that was the goal, a Chinese military campaign might just begin in cyberspace. Beijing might launch massive cyber strikes against U.S. command and control centers around the world— trying to blind America and disrupt the ability of U.S. warfighters from seeing the coming battlefield in real time. Such strikes, at least if I was in charge in Beijing, would come from third party countries (or at least look like it thanks to proxy servers). America would know its systems were under attack, but it might not be clear from who— at least not right away. China would have the advantage, at least for now. The next blow would come before America could ascertain who was striking at the heart of its best military capabilities— and this one would have China’s fingerprints all over them. Beijing would begin to attack American satellites in orbit, attempting to destroy Washington’s massive intelligence gathering machine and communications systems. At this point, war has definitely started and there is no mistake who is behind it. First China blinds its enemy, than it drops the hammer. A large body of recent Western literature assumes China would leverage the large amounts of cruise and ballistic weapons it has developed and deployed over the last several decades in any conflict with America and its allies.

Even a small scale conflict could spiral out of control into a nuclear war. Talmadge 18[Catilin Talmadge, Associate Professor of Security Studies (adapted from a speech), Foreign Affairs, “Why a US-Chinese war could spiral out of control”, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/2018-10-15/beijings-nuclear-option>]

As China’s power has grown in recent years, so, too, has the risk of war with the United States. Under President Xi Jinping, China has increased its political and economic [pressure](https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/taiwan/2017-04-13/how-beijing-could-squeeze-taiwan) on Taiwan and built [military installations](https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/asia/2017-05-18/adrift-south-china-sea) on coral reefs in the South China Sea, fueling Washington’s fears that Chinese expansionism will threaten U.S. allies and influence in the region. U.S. destroyers have transited the Taiwan Strait, to loud protests from Beijing. American policymakers have wondered aloud whether they should send an aircraft carrier through the strait as well. Chinese fighter jets have intercepted U.S. aircraft in the skies above the South China Sea. Meanwhile, U.S. President Donald Trump has brought long-simmering economic disputes to a rolling boil. A war between the two countries remains unlikely, but the prospect of a military confrontation—resulting, for example, from a Chinese campaign against Taiwan—no longer seems as implausible as it once did. And the odds of such a confrontation going nuclear are higher than most policymakers and analysts think.  Members of China’s strategic com­munity tend to dismiss such concerns. Likewise, U.S. studies of a potential war with China often exclude nuclear weapons from the analysis entirely, treating them as basically irrelevant to the course of a conflict.

## 1AC Scenario 2: Green Co-op

#### The US and China are working together to invest in green technology. Recent economic and political tensions cause this program to lose funding. Liao 19 [Rita Liao, Tech writer with a focus on China, TechCrunch, “this $550M fund is bringing green tech from the west to china, despite trade tensions”, <https://techcrunch.com/2019/02/28/us-china-green-fund/>]

Escalating trade frictions between the U.S. and China have a range of businesses and investors in both countries sweating, but some believe there remains a bright spot where the antagonists can find common ground — fighting environmental issues.One of them is the [U.S.-China Green Fund,](http://www.uschinagreenfund.com/) which does exactly as the name suggests — financing projects in the U.S. (and the west in general) and China that yield both financial and environmental returns. The fund recently closed its maiden fund of 3.7 billion yuan ($550 million) and has already started to raise a second and larger yuan fund, it told TechCrunch. “The U.S.-China Green Fund believes that cleantech and environmental products are a positive, apolitical sector of focus for U.S.-China cooperation,” said Annie Zhou, the fund’s director of U.S. external affairs. “Currently, trade tensions have elevated some concerns from companies in both countries but have not affected our investments.” With the fresh capital, the firm will continue to back companies that could address China’s environmental challenges, areas that it believes are far and remote from the kind of cybersecurity concerns that underpin the current wave of bilateral tensions. “We are looking for win-win opportunities — improving the environment in China, which will benefit the rest of the world and also help Western companies tap into large markets in China,” added Zhou. In China alone, the fund has poured 2.8 billion yuan ($420 million) into a portfolio of 13 companies with the likes of a [marketplace for green home appliances](http://www.hosjoy.com/) serving more than 300,000 households and an [energy performance service provider](http://www.elc.cn/) that’s completed 100-plus projects at public facilities like hospitals, hotels and supermarkets. Trade tensions aside, another potential roadblock exists stateside for the fund: President Donald Trump’s [withdrawal from the Paris Agreement](https://techcrunch.com/2017/06/01/venture-investors-blast-us-decision-to-withdraw-from-paris-climate-accord/) and his denial of climate change’s devastating effects on the earth.

In this unstable time, any increase in arms sales to Taiwan could mean we reach the point of no more cooperation with China. Panda 19 [Ankit Panda, Editor, The Diplomat, Are the US and Taiwan about to face off over American Fighter Sales to Taiwan?"]

The issue hasn’t gone unnoticed in China, where Taiwan is seen as an inherent part of the country. Relations across the Taiwan Strait have been particularly strained since Tsai’s inauguration in 2016. The Taiwanese president hails from the independence-leaning Democratic Progressive Party (DPP), though she herself has not explicitly supported independence — long a red-line for Beijing — Tsai, however, has refused to endorse the so-called “1992 consensus,” which her predecessor had supported and which forms what Beijing sees as the baseline for cordial cross-strait relations. “China’s position to firmly oppose arms sales to Taiwan is consistent and clear,” Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesperson Geng Shuang said during a press briefing on Friday. “We have made stern representations to the U.S. We have urged the U.S. to fully recognize the sensitivity of this issue and the harm it will cause.” The prospect of a fighter sale to Taiwan this time comes at a time of particularly heightened U.S.-China tensions. The Trump administration has been known to seek leverage with Beijing across issues and it is possible that this may turn into the latest case of Taiwan being used a possible bargaining chip as Trump seeks to clinch a favorable trade deal with Chinese President Xi Jinping.

We are at an environmental tipping point now. A loss of US-China Environmental cooperation means a laundry list of disasters. Sengupta 18 [Somini Sengopta, int’l climate reporter, “US-China Friction Threatens to undercut the Fight against climate Change” <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/12/07/climate/us-china-climate-change.html>]

The tensions between Washington and Beijing range from trade to cybersecurity to military rivalry in the Pacific. And while some of those issues have simmered for years, cooperation in the fight against climate change had once been a bright spot, so much so that it propelled the creation of the landmark global agreement in Paris in 2015 to curb greenhouse gas emissions. But then the Trump administration announced its intention to pull out of the Paris pact altogether, rejecting the scientific consensus that greenhouse gas emissions are warming the planet. That represented perhaps the most consequential diplomatic reversal of the Trump era. “The biggest threats to the planet are the lack of U.S. climate leadership at home and the unwillingness of the U.S. to engage with China,” said Joanna Lewis, a China specialist at Georgetown University. “The rest of the world looks to the U.S. and China for leadership, and it has become clear that, as the alliance has waned, global momentum to address climate change has slowed.” Taken together, the emissions produced by the United States and China account for more than 40 percent of the global total. In both countries, emissions went up this year, according to an analysis issued this week by the Global Carbon Project in which one scientist likened the acceleration of global emissions to “a speeding freight train.”

## 1aC Solvency

#### A reduction in arms sales to Taiwan removes tension and competition between the US and China. Chen et al 17 [Ping-Kuei Chen, Scott L. Kastner and William L. Reed, “A Farewell to Arms? US Security Relations with Taiwan and the Prospects for Stability in the Taiwan Strait”]

Given the tensions—and the anger in Beijing—that are generated by US arms sales to Taiwan, some in the United States propose that Washington end (or at least scale back) weapons sales to the island. Doing so, proponents suggest, would remove a major irritant in the US-China relationship and would increase trust and cooperation in bilateral relations. More fundamentally, proponents of a reduced US commitment to Taiwan suggest that such a policy approach would help lower the risk of armed conflict in East Asia. This argument is developed most fully by Charles Glaser, who suggests that ending the US commitment to defend Taiwan would bring with it two significant benefits for the US-China relationship. First, it could improve US-China relations because such a shift in US policy would remove a key source of mistrust in Beijing concerning US motivations. Second, ending US support for Taiwan—by removing the key potential source of military conflict between China and the United States—would reduce military competition between Washington and Beijing. Glaser thus proposes a “grand bargain,” in which the United States would end its commitment to Taiwan in return for Chinese willingness to “resolve its maritime disputes on ‘fair’ terms” and to accept a long-term US security presence in East Asia.

A loss of US military support will actually motivate Taiwan to seek a peaceful plan of action with China. Chen et al 17 [Ping-Kuei Chen, Scott L. Kastner and William L. Reed, “A Farewell to Arms? US Security Relations with Taiwan and the Prospects for Stability in the Taiwan Strait”]

For instance, we believe it is likely that an end to arms sales would indeed lead Taiwanese officials to feel less confident about their bargaining power vis-à-vis the PRC. But it is not obvious why this should in itself make them less likely to negotiate with Beijing: it is also plausible that, in such a scenario, Taiwan’s leaders would feel they had no other choice but to negotiate with an increasingly powerful PRC. Similarly, while a shift in the cross-Strait balance of power would indeed imply that Beijing could more easily utilize a military option, it isn’t obvious that this would in turn make the relationship less stable: it is conceivable, for instance, that Taiwan would respond with more accommodating policies that would remove Beijing’s incentives to consider military force. In short, how a shifting cross-Strait military balance of power would affect stability in the Taiwan Strait is not straightforward; in the following section, we consider the topic more systematically.

## 2AC Solvency EXT – AT Trump

#### Arms sales *unlocks* mutual, strategic coop between the US and China – no alt causes or Trumpers.

Jiemian 17 (Yang Jiemian is Professor and President Emeritus of the Shanghai Institutes for International Studies, “Managing China-U.S. Relations in the Trump Era Approaches and Policies,” China Quarterly of International Strategic Studies, Vol. 3, No. 3, 357–375, <https://www.worldscientific.com/doi/pdf/10.1142/S237774001750021X>)

In appearance, President Trump is hard to read, full of uncertainties and extraordinary acts. This is both true and false. Indeed, he thinks not like a seasoned politician, speaks in an unconventional fashion, and acts in his own way. As a presidential candidate during the campaign, Mr. Trump vehemently attacked China for currency manipulation, job-stealing and business deception. Even after entering the White House, he often speaks negatively about China. President Trump can be rather fickle in his attitudes, approaches and policies toward China. He praises China’s role in the Korean nuclear issue on one day, yet complains about China’s role on the next, all via Twitter. Shortly after his meetings with President Xi in which consideration of China’s concerns appeared to have been acknowledged, he turned around and gave the green light to massive arms sales to Taiwan and approved a plan to give the U.S. navy more freedom to carry out patrols in the South China Sea. When it comes to the Taiwan issue, his words and deeds are even more dramatic and eventful. Since his election in November 2016, Mr. Trump’s stance toward China and Taiwan has shifted dramatically. As mentioned earlier, shortly after his electoral victory, Mr. Trump seemed to signal he was ready to confront China over Taiwan when he broke with the long-established protocol and took a phone call from Ms. Tsai Ing-wen. But he later backed off from more calls. In April, President Trump told Reuters that he would consult with Chinese President Xi Jinping before speaking to Ms. Tsai to avoid causing “difficulty” for Beijing.28 Realistically, President Trump should not be judged only by his situational words or deeds, but the more profound reasons behind them. Substantively, all these are still understandable. President Trump’s uncertainty and anti-establishment words and deeds are shaped by the very changes of the world today. At a time of great changes, development and adjustment, President Trump represents a part of American political forces to find a new role in the international community while defending and expanding U.S. interests. He and his people are trying to move away from the trodden path and break new ground. Therefore, President Trump does not believe in so-called political correctness, nor would he overemphasize human rights issues. He even attaches much less importance to geostrategy than his predecessors. All these peculiarities reflect President Trump’s new thinking and behaviors that the world should pay due attention to. China does not seek to replace the United States as the world leader, but will keep working with it for favorable conditions to achieve its own national revival. China’s general principle of dealing with the United States under President Trump’s leadership is to seek progress while maintaining stability. China strives for overlapping interests and coordination with the United States just as pragmatically as President Trump. Therefore, we have good reasons to be cautiously optimistic so long as the two countries keep to the path agreed upon by both leaders at their meeting in Hamburg, which is very likely to be further consolidated at their next meeting in Beijing.

# 2AC Case Answers

## Military Relations

#### The most recent evidence shows that Taiwan is quickly becoming the most dangerous and tense part of the US-China relationship. Carpenter 19 [Ted Galen Carpenter, senior fellow in defense and foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute and a contributing editor at the National Interest, June 8th, 2019,“Forget the U.S.-China Trade War: Is a Conflict Over Taiwan the Real Threat?” <https://nationalinterest.org/feature/forget-us-china-trade-war-conflict-over-taiwan-real-threat-61627>]

Tensions between Taiwan and the People’s Republic of China (PRC) are surging to an alarming extent. The latest indicator is the recent exchange of heated rhetoric between Gen. Wei Fenghe, China’s Minister of National Defense, and Taiwan’s Mainland Affairs Council, the Taiwanese government’s chief policymaking body dealing with cross-strait relations. As Taiwan’s self-proclaimed protector, Washington should be extremely worried about these developments.

Speaking on June 1 at the Shangri-La Dialogue, an annual multilateral conference on Pacific security issues, Wei warned against efforts either in Taiwan or foreign countries to thwart China’s goal of reunification. Moreover, “any underestimation of the PLA’s resolve and will is extremely dangerous.” Wei added ominously, “If anyone dares to split Taiwan from China, the Chinese military will have no choice but to fight at all costs, at all costs, (sic.) for national unity. If the PLA cannot even safeguard the unity of our motherland, what do we need it for?”

The Mainland Affairs Council responded with equally harsh and uncompromising language. In a statement issued the following day, the council reasserted that Taiwan has never been a part of the PRC and would never accept Beijing’s control or threats. It accused China not only of “challenging international norms and order,” but added the gratuitous slap that Beijing’s claim to seek peaceful development was “a lie of the ages.” Lest anyone not fully grasp the extent of Taipei’s hostility toward the PRC, the statement went on: “We need to remind the public that the Chinese Communist Party is practicing anti-democracy, anti-peace between the two sides of the strait and further resorting to war. This is the main cause of the tension in the Taiwan Strait and the region, and it is the source of danger and provocation against peace and stability.

A US-China war is increasingly likely, and China’s military forces are slowly becoming more powerful than the United States’ Farley 19[Robert Farley, Professor & Contributor to The National Interest, “We Dreamed Up a U.S.-China War in 2030 (And It's Terrifying)”, <https://nationalinterest.org/blog/buzz/we-dreamed-us-china-war-2030-and-its-terrifying-55792>]

We can imagine a significant threat to a U.S. ally, whether it be Japan, the Republic of Korea (ROK), India, Taiwan, or perhaps the Philippines. The seeds of conflict between China and all of these countries have already been planted, even if they never bloom. If a militarized conflict developed between the PRC and any of these countries, the United States would almost invariably be drawn in. A war involving India and the PRC would undoubtedly carry the greatest stakes, threatening to bring not only the United States into the fray, but also Pakistan and Russia. But war between China and Japan could also have catastrophic consequences. We should also remain open to the prospect of significant strategic changes, such as rivalry between the ROK and Japan that leads to a militarized dispute that then leads to a confrontation involving China and the United States. While the field of battle will depend on the cause of conflict, we can expect that the crucial theaters of war will be the East and South China Seas. This will place an emphasis on the air and naval capabilities of each country, granting that the U.S. Army and U.S. Marine Corps have worked hard on developing ways to contribute to the ensuing “multi-domain battle.” There is every reason to believe that the military balance will shift in China’s favor over the next twelve years. This does not mean that China will have an advantage, but, compared to the status quo, time favors the PRC. The People’s Liberation Army Navy (PLAN) is growing faster than the United States Navy (USN), even if the latter can find its way to 355 ships. In addition, the People’s Liberation Army Air Force (PLAAF) is modernizing faster than the United States Air Force (USAF), even as F-35s and B-21s come online.

# 2AC Case Answers

## Military Relations - Conflict Likely

A military conflict with China could also spur them to worsen the current trade war, resulting in huge economic losses for the United States. Sherman 19[Erik Sherman, Writer, Fortune, “Rare Earths, Bonds, and Permit Hell: 3 Weapons China Can Use to Escalate the Trade War” <https://fortune.com/2019/05/29/rare-earths-bonds-and-permit-hell-three-weapons-china-can-use-to-escalate-the-trade-war/>]

The ongoing trade war between the U.S. and China has been intense. Even disputes with other countries have often been used as ways to indirectly attack China. Overall, China has found subtle ways to beat Donald Trump at his own trade war, even as it has suffered economic damage in turn. But China has yet to fully deploy their fiscal sledgehammers. Here are three things the country could do—and in some cases has already begun to do—if it chooses to inflict maximum pain on the United States. China is one of the largest holders of U.S. debt, according to Treasury Department figures. The amount it holds is $1120.5 trillion, which represents 27.5% of all held by foreign countries or 5.1% of the total $22 trillion U.S. debt. And selling some of that could have bad effects for the U.S. economy, says Amit Batabyal, a professor of economics at Rochester Institute of Technology. The action could affect the value of U.S. bonds and the dollar, possibly increasing the difficulty of the U.S. to raise money as easily as it now does. And then there are basic materials used in pharmaceutical production. “China makes around 40% of the basic chemicals (API’s [or] active pharmaceutical ingredients) needed in pharma,” wrote Michael Gravier, an associate professor of marketing at Bryant University, in an email to Fortune. That isn’t the same level of supply domination, but it could disrupt things. Any of these measures could prove painful to China, either through the loss of U.S.-backed industry, investment value, or important export markets. However, what might have been considered unthinkable becomes all the more plausible as the trade war drags on.

Rising of conflict growing due to Taiwan push for independence and Chinese nationalism

Gomez 16 (Eric, policy analyst for defense and foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute, Masters of Arts in International Affairs from the Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University, “A Costly Commitment: Options for the Future of the U.S.-Taiwan Defense Relationship,” 9-28, <https://www.cato.org/publications/policy-analysis/costly-commitment-options-future-us-taiwan-defense-relationship>)

Maintaining stability in the Taiwan Strait will become more complicated as a result of two trends in cross-strait relations and one higher-level trend. First, a distinct identity is taking hold in Taiwan; the people living there see themselves as Taiwanese instead of Chinese. Surveys conducted in 2014 showed that “fewer than 4 percent of respondents [in Taiwan] self-identified as solely Chinese, with a clear majority (60 percent) self-identifying solely as Taiwanese.”75 A unique Taiwanese identity is dangerous to Beijing because it makes China’s ultimate goal of reunification more difficult, especially if the identity issue leads to greater political support for independence. Thankfully, the Taiwanese people have been very pragmatic and have not yet made a significant push for de jure independence.76 Second, if China’s economy continues to slow down Beijing could become more aggressive toward Taiwan. A parade of doom and gloom headlines reveal the weaknesses of China’s economic miracle. The Chinese stock market experienced downturns in August 2015 and January 2016 that affected global financial markets.77 China Labor Bulletin, a Hong Kong-based workers’ rights group, recorded more than 2,700 strikes and worker protests throughout China in 2015—more than double the 1,300 recorded the year before.78 In February 2016, Reuters reported that 1.8 million workers in China’s state-owned coal and steel companies will be laid off in the coming years.79 This is not to say that China’s economy is in imminent danger of a catastrophic collapse. However, the political instability resulting from economic troubles could create an incentive for Beijing to act aggressively to burnish the Chinese Communist Party’s image at home.80 Exacerbating this risk is the rise of nationalist forces within Chinese society that could push the government into a more aggressive cross-strait policy. Such forces played an important role in the government’s heavy-handed response to 2014’s Occupy Central protests in Hong Kong.81 Economic problems coupled with aggressive ideology could prompt China to back away from any rapprochement with Taiwan. This could make the task of deterring a Chinese attack harder for the United States.

# 2AC Case Answers

## Environment

#### China’s green tech sector is booming now, they are already the new global leader in climate change, and is set to only get bigger. Cooperation with the United States could create a new future of combating environmental issues. The Economist 18 [The Economist, “China is rapidly developing its clean-energy technology”, <https://www.economist.com/special-report/2018/03/15/china-is-rapidly-developing-its-clean-energy-technology>]

WHEN IT COMES to energy, no country generates such bittersweet superlatives as China. It is the world’s largest consumer of coal and the second-largest of oil, after America. It has the largest power-generation capacity, by a wide margin. It also produces more carbon dioxide than any other country. China is hoping to deal with this over-dependence on fossil fuels partly by rebalancing the economy away from energy-intensive industries. But it also leads the world in clean energy. In recent years, through a combination of subsidies, policy targets and manufacturing incentives, it has spent more on cleaning up its energy system than America and the EU combined. Last year alone it shelled out $132bn, according to Bloomberg New Energy Finance (BNEF), a consultancy.

The effects of climate change are irreversible, and even the best green technology does not solve the issue. COL 14[Consortium of Ocean Leadership, Effects of Climate Change ‘Irreversible,’ U.N. Panel Warns in Report, <https://oceanleadership.org/effects-climate-change-irreversible-u-n-panel-warns-report/>]

The Earth is locked on an “irreversible” course of climatic disruption from the buildup of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, and the impacts will only worsen unless nations agree to dramatic cuts in pollution, an international panel of climate scientists warned Sunday. “Continued emissions of greenhouse gases will cause further warming and long-lasting changes in all components of the climate system, increasing the likelihood of severe, pervasive and irreversible impacts,” concluded the report by the United Nations’ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), which draws on contributions from thousands of scientists from around the world. The report said some impacts of climate change will “continue for centuries,” even if all emissions from fossil-fuel burning were to stop. The question facing governments is whether they can act to slow warming to a pace at which humans and natural ecosystems can adapt, or risk “abrupt and irreversible changes” as the atmosphere and oceans absorb ever-greater amounts of thermal energy within a blanket of heat-trapping gases, according to scientists who contributed to the report. In cautious and often technically complex language, the new report cites soaring emissions of carbon dioxide, methane and other greenhouse gases in the past 60 years as the cause of nearly all the warming seen so far. While carbon dioxide is a naturally abundant gas essential for plant photosynthesis, it has been accumulating in the atmosphere at an unprecedented rate as a byproduct of the burning of fossil fuels by automobiles, power plants and factories. Concentrations of the heat-trapping gas is 40 percent higher than in pre-industrial times, a level “unprecedented in at least the last 800,000 years,” the report states.

# 2AC Case Answers

## Solidarity 2AC Answers

#### Taiwan is trending towards reunification China now, and any transition would be peaceful and would benefit Taiwan as well. Huang 19 [Kristin Huang, Senior Reporter, South China Morning Post, “Taiwan can’t resist historic trend towards unification, says head of Chinese cross-strait group”, South China Morning Post, <https://www.scmp.com/news/china/diplomacy/article/3001575/taiwan-cant-resist-historic-trend-towards-unification-says>]

Any effort by Taiwan to resist the “historic trend” towards unification is doomed to failure since Beijing is in a much stronger position to realise its goals, the head of a semi-official Chinese body to handle relations with the island said on Wednesday. Zhang Zhijun, the president of the Association for Relations Across the Taiwan Strait, told reporters at the annual legislative session in Beijing that reunification was inevitable as China becomes stronger. “The Taiwan issue happened because of the degeneration of the Chinese nation,” Zhang, the former director of the Taiwan Affairs Office of the State Council, said. “The problem will be resolved as our country rejuvenates.” “We now have greater influence across the Taiwan Strait and we are more capable than ever of leading cross-strait relations in the right direction … and achieving the peaceful reunification of China,” he added. Tsai has refused to acknowledge the “one-China” principle – which holds that the mainland and Taiwan are part of one sovereign nation without defining what that means in practice – as the basis for reunification negotiations.

In a speech in January, Chinese President Xi Jinping said that unification with Taiwan was a key part of China’s “national rejuvenation” and the political divide must be resolved.

After many years, both Beijing and Taiwan are opening up to the idea of peaceful reunification, and talks could begin soon. Reuters 19[Reuters, “China says Taiwan talks must benefit 'reunification'”, <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-china-taiwan/china-says-taiwan-talks-must-benefit-reunification-idUSKCN1QG0CJ>]

China can talk to Taiwan as long as it helps promote peaceful development and “reunification”, Beijing said on Wednesday, after the island’s main opposition party said it could sign a peace treaty if it wins a presidential election next year. China claims self-ruled and proudly democratic Taiwan as its own and has vowed to bring the island, which it regards as sacred territory, under Chinese control, by force if necessary. While China has not broached the idea of a peace deal in years, the chairman of the Beijing-friendly Kuomintang, Wu Den-yih, said earlier this month the party could sign a peace deal with China if it won the hotly contested election.Taiwan President Tsai Ing-wen, from the pro-independence Democratic Progressive Party (DPP), said the island will not accept any deal that destroys its sovereignty and democracy. China’s policy-making Taiwan Affairs Office, in the government’s first official response to the Kuomintang’s peace agreement proposal, said anything that benefits the interests of people on both sides of the Taiwan Strait should be promoted. “As long as it benefits protecting the peace of the Taiwan Strait and increasing the peaceful development of relations, and pushes the peaceful reunification process of the motherland, it can be jointly investigated by both sides,” spokesman An Fengshan told a regular news briefing.

# 2AC Case Answers

## Elections 2AC Answers

#### Trump doesn’t care at all about whether or not he’s popular in Congress, arms sales are something he cares about, and is willing to use his power to push through his own plans. Zengerle 19 [Patricia Zengerle, “Defying Congress, Trump sets $8 billion-plus in weapons sales to Saudi Arabia, UAE”, Reuters, <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-saudi-arms/defying-congress-trump-sets-8-billion-plus-in-weapons-sales-to-saudi-arabia-uae-idUSKCN1SU25R>]

U.S. President Donald Trump, declaring a national emergency because of tensions with Iran, swept aside objections from Congress on Friday to complete the sale of over $8 billion worth of weapons to Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates and Jordan. The Trump administration informed congressional committees that it will go ahead with 22 military sales to the Saudis, United Arab Emirates and Jordan, infuriating lawmakers by circumventing a long-standing precedent for congressional review of major weapons sales. Members of Congress had been blocking sales of offensive military equipment to Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates for months, angry about the huge civilian toll from their air campaign in Yemen, as well as human rights abuses such as the murder of Saudi journalist Jamal Khashoggi at a Saudi consulate in Turkey. Lawmakers and congressional aides warned earlier this week that Trump, frustrated with Congress holding up weapons deals including the sale of bombs to Saudi Arabia, was considering using a loophole in arms control law to go ahead by declaring a national emergency.

There is no risk of Trump becoming more popular and overcoming the democratic vote; His recent arms sales and using legal loopholes has other politicians angry.

Zengerle 19 [Patricia Zengerle, “Defying Congress, Trump sets $8 billion-plus in weapons sales to Saudi Arabia, UAE”, Reuters, <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-saudi-arms/defying-congress-trump-sets-8-billion-plus-in-weapons-sales-to-saudi-arabia-uae-idUSKCN1SU25R>]

“President Trump is only using this loophole because he knows Congress would disapprove ... There is no new ‘emergency’ reason to sell bombs to the Saudis to drop in Yemen, and doing so only perpetuates the humanitarian crisis there,” said Senator Chris Murphy. Murphy, a Democrat, made public on Twitter on Wednesday that Trump was considering the loophole in the Arms Control Export Act to clear the sales. Several of Trump’s fellow Republicans, as well as Democrats, said they would object to such a plan, fearing that blowing through the “holds” process would eliminate Congress’ ability to check not just Trump but future presidents from selling weapons where they liked. Representative Mike McCaul, the top Republican on the House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee, said the administration’s action was “unfortunate” and likely to damage future White House interactions with Congress. “I would have strongly preferred for the administration to utilize the long-established and codified arms sale review process,” McCaul said in a statement. U.S. Secretary of State Mike Pompeo said in a statement that U.S. partners in the Middle East needed the contracts to be completed to help deter Iran, and that the decision to circumvent Congress was meant to be a “one-time event.” It is not the first time Congress and Trump have clashed over policy in the region, or the division of powers between the White House and Capitol Hill. The House and Senate voted to end U.S. military support for the campaign in Yemen earlier this year, but Trump vetoed the resolution.

# Negative Evidence

## Inherency

#### They say that we need to fix the tensions between the US and China over Taiwan, but China and Taiwan are currently working on that problem themselves. The presidents of both countries are trying to peacefully join Taiwan back with mainland China.

Chen et al 17 [ Ping-Kuei Chen, Scott L. Kastner and William L. Reed, “A Farewell to Arms? US

Security Relations with Taiwan and the Prospects for Stability in the Taiwan Strait”]

China can talk to Taiwan as long as it helps promote peaceful development and "reunification", Beijing said yesterday, after the island's main opposition party said it could sign a peace treaty if it wins a presidential election next year. China claims self-ruled and proudly democratic Taiwan as its own and has vowed to bring the island, which it regards as sacred territory, under Chinese control, by force if necessary. While China has not broached the idea of a peace deal in years, Mr Wu Den-yih, chairman of the Beijing-friendly Kuomintang, said earlier this month that the party could sign a peace deal with China if it won the hotly contested election. Taiwan President Tsai Ing-wen, who is from the pro-independence Democratic Progressive Party (DPP), said the island will not accept any deal that destroys its sovereignty and democracy. China's policymaking Taiwan Affairs Office, in the government's first official response to the Kuomintang's peace deal proposal, said anything that benefits the interests of people on both sides of the Taiwan Strait should be promoted. Its spokesman An Fengshan said: "As long as it benefits protecting the peace of the Taiwan Strait and increasing the peaceful development of relations, and pushes the peaceful reunification process of the motherland, it can be jointly investigated by both sides."

The rise of Chinese power in the status quo makes Taiwan more willing to negotiate peaceful terms of reunification, regardless of current tensions between the two countries.

Cole 19 [J Michael Cole, Author, The Sentinel, “The KMT’s Dangerous Flirting with a China Peace Agreement”, <https://sentinel.tw/the-kmts-dangerous-flirting-with-a-china-peace-agreement/>]

With elections approaching again in 2020, members of the KMT are once again mooting the idea of seeking a peace agreement with China. This time around, however, the context is much different. Back in 2011, President Ma’s talk about a peace accord occurred in times of high hopes, at the height of a “golden decade” which many described as the best cross-Strait environment in six decades. Today, suggestions of a peace agreement with China are being made at a time of high tensions in the Taiwan Strait.  While not unification per se, a peace agreement would be a stepping stone toward that goal; and although some proponents of a peace accord have argued that this could buy time for Taiwan, or at a minimum help it secure the best terms possible before the inevitable occurs, successful negotiations would be contingent on both sides agreeing to different interpretations of the text and to a certain amount of flexibility in implementation. That, as Xi made clear in his Jan. 2 address to Taiwanese compatriots, is no longer viable. In his view, as the central authority Beijing is in a position to dictate, and dictate it will. So this, too, has changed since 2011, when Ma often was able to get away with his claim that he had things under control by insisting that the two sides agreed to disagree on certain matters, that they could have different interpretations on a few fundamentals. This no longer is possible, and any KMT leader who argues to the contrary is deceiving him/herself along with the Taiwanese public.

# Us-China Relations Neg Evidence

## Military Conflict Scenario

#### They say reducing arms sales to Taiwan will lower tensions between the US and China, but tensions are high now, even increased cooperation now is unlikely to ease our bad relationship.

AFP 19 [France24, “Tense future for US-China ties, with or without trade deal”, <https://www.france24.com/en/20190512-tense-future-us-china-ties-with-or-without-trade-deal>]

With or without a trade deal, US-China relations are destined to deteriorate as they enter an era of increasingly nationalistic rivalry in the diplomatic and economic arena, according to analysts. The United States faces a growing challenge to its lone superpower status from a Communist-ruled China whose global influence, military might and high-tech capabilities are rapidly rising. The toughening stances on both sides in their trade war showed that the two powers are ready to play hardball to protect their national interests. President Donald Trump followed through Friday on a threat to target all remaining Chinese exports with tariffs, then warned Saturday any trade deal would be "far worse for (China) if it has to be negotiated in my second term".Beijing said it would make no concessions on core principles, even as the two sides eye more talks. There are many other sources of tension ripe for flare-ups: US military aid to self-ruled Taiwan, Chinese territorial claims in the disputed South China Sea, US criticism of Beijing's Belt and Road global infrastructure programme, and US security warnings against Chinese telecom champion Huawei. "US-China relations are continuing their steady deterioration, which I think is an inevitable consequence of national interests that are starting to overlap and bump into each other and cause friction," said Jonathan Sullivan, a China specialist at the University of Nottingham. "Despite the Trump wild card factor, I would suggest that the current trade war is a symbol of things to come."

They say even a small conflict could escalate, but any danger or threats from China are just that: threats. China will never escalate conflicts.

Bodeen 19 [James Bodeen, “China blames US for trade dispute, but doesn’t escalate”, <https://www.apnews.com/f2f3c0e49d94465a942cb5d8c6b712ae>]

The report from the Cabinet spokesman’s office said China won’t back down on “major issues of principle,” but offered no sense of whether or how the world’s second largest economy might retaliate against U.S. tariffs on goods manufactured in China. The report said China has kept its word throughout 11 rounds of talks and will honor its commitments if a trade agreement is reached. It accused the U.S. of backtracking three times over the course of the talks by introducing new tariffs and other conditions beyond what was agreed on. “But the more the U.S. government is offered, the more it wants,” it said, accusing America’s negotiators of “resorting to intimidation and coercion.” “A country’s sovereignty and dignity must be respected, and any agreement reached by the two sides must be based on equality and mutual benefit,” the report said. The report, delivered at a Sunday morning news conference, appears to be a bid to shore up China’s arguments and justify its position in the face of what looks to be a protracted dispute. Over recent days, China has been mobilizing its representatives abroad to sell its position with foreign audiences, while the domestic propaganda apparatus has been working overtime to convince the public of the righteousness of the government’s stance. Linda Lim, a professor at Ross School of Business at the University of Michigan, said the report does not represent an escalation on China’s part, but rather reiterates the government’s position in a clear and measured way that leaves the door open for negotiations

China has too many reasons to not go to war with the US: the economy, domestic fear of war, damage to China’s image, etc

Asen 19[Eric Asen, Writer, National Interest, China Is Not Interested in War with America, <https://nationalinterest.org/blog/skeptics/china-not-interested-war-america-54042>]

Despite troubling developments, the United States and China are not on a deliberate path to conflict, as each country has strong domestic incentives to avoid engaging in war with the other. The strained relationship between China and the United States appears to worsen with each passing day. Tensions have risen due to China stepping up its theft of intellectual property, the Trump administration initiating a trade war with China, and the labeling of China as a threat to U.S. interests and ideals. In light of such escalation, some scholars claim that China simply cannot rise peacefully and should be met with an increase in U.S. military capabilities. Despite these troubling developments, the United States and China are not on a deliberate path to conflict, as each country has strong domestic incentives to avoid engaging in war with the other. China will try to avoid any war with the United States, as its cornerstone policy of maintaining domestic stability would otherwise be placed in jeopardy. Chinese leaders are “obsessed” with social stability, since social unrest threatens the survival of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP). The Tiananmen Square protests were a major wake-up call for the CCP, as the Party nearly collapsed due to mass social protest. Since then, many CCP leaders, including Xi Jinping, have believed that “social stability overrides all other considerations.” In order to ensure stability, China has implemented a social credit system that punishes or rewards certain behavior, transformed the nation into a surveillance state, and even created mass detention camps to “deradicalize” alleged extremists. In “both foreign and domestic policy” the CCP is forced to preemptively consider how new policy would affect social stability with the knowledge that “foreign aggression sparks domestic upheavals.”

The tensions between the two countries is actually good; as long as tensions don’t boil over, competition benefits both the US and China.

Erickson 19 [Andrew Erickson, Writer, The National Interest, “Competitive Coexistence: An American Concept for Managing U.S.-China Relations”, <https://nationalinterest.org/feature/competitive-coexistence-american-concept-managing-us-china-relations-42852?page=0%2C1>]

These examples of Beijing’s recalibration following pushback indicate opportunities for American “counter-pressure” to deter negative Chinese actions. The United States should also prepare cost imposition options to punish bad behavior. When Beijing does respond, it does not automatically do so aggressively or escalate. Despite complaining, it continues to tolerate U.S. Freedom of Navigation Operations (FONOPs), military surveys in its claimed Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), and Taiwan Strait transits. American officials must be willing to walk away from engagements that China values more than does the United States. There are multiple engagements which the PLA prioritizes highly, for instance, that yield little for the United States. Washington can, and should, accept—and in some cases insert—friction by denying these engagements. This is particularly the case when engagements the United States values highly, such as Military Maritime Consultative Agreement talks and Joint Staff Dialogue Mechanism meetings, are held hostage by the PLA. U.S.-China relations are not a zero-sum game. Competitive coexistence both rejects ready agreement on disputed issues (unrealistic) and an inevitable drift to war (similarly unlikely given overwhelming costs and considerable shared interests). In its latest report on China’s military power, the Pentagon emphasizes that “strategic competition does not mean conflict is inevitable, nor does it preclude cooperation on areas of mutual interest.” Even while differing in important areas, the United States and China maintain tremendous economic, cultural, and societal interaction. As strategic stakeholders, they share mutual interests in humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, anti-piracy, counter-terrorism, and nuclear nonproliferation. This extensive interaction and overlapping interests distinguish U.S.-China competition from U.S.-Soviet Cold War rivalry in important respects.

# Environmental Scenario

#### They say China and the US are able to cooperate on Green Tech, but alternative sources of tension ensure that environmental cooperation will fail, regardless of the plan.

Pike 18 [Lili Pike, December 13, 2018, Competition fears threaten Chinese investment in US clean tech, <https://www.chinadialogue.net/article/show/single/en/10972-Competition-fears-threaten-Chinese-investment-in-US-clean-tech>]

A new investment fund is looking to strengthen this relationship. The California-China Cleantech Partnership Fund was launched at the Global Climate Action Summit in San Francisco in the autumn. It aims to help investors and companies operate across borders to rapidly scale up their clean energy technologies. But a new US law scrutinising Chinese investments poses a threat to the fledgling initiative. Clean technology trade has been snagged by similar policies in the past. Now this law is testing, once again, whether clean energy cooperation can overcome economic nationalism Chinese investment in the US has fallen dramatically since 2017, but not in clean tech. However, the sector is not immune to geopolitical tensions.  The new US law will target foreign investment in “critical technologies”, a category that spans industries, including some related to clean energy such as battery manufacturing. Research from the Rhodium Group found that almost 40% of China’s US investments last year could be subject to review depending on how the rules are applied. Meanwhile in China, the trade war has spurred rising nationalism in the technology sector. President Xi has called for “self-reliance”, echoing the country’s goal to build its own advanced technologies, as articulated in the Made in China 2025 plan. Clean technologies, including power technologies and new energy vehicles, feature in this strategy. As the US closes its borders, China-US clean tech cooperation and the new partnership fund may be at odds with the protectionist era. If the new US investment rules make it prohibitively difficult to access the Californian market, the fund may have to invest in other countries rather than the US. “If we do not have collaboration between China and the US, everyone is going to lose out,” warned Mialaret.

We have a president that does not believe in climate change, or the scientists that argue for it. There is 0 chance that the United States will be able to effectively cooperate to invest and create green technology. The US currently is working to reverse advances in climate change solutions, and should not be given a leadership position on the issue.

Wolff 18 [Eric Wolff, Reporter, Politico, “Trump’s failing war on green power”, <https://www.politico.com/story/2018/01/24/trumps-failing-war-green-power-307281>]

President Donald Trump and Republicans have tried again and again during the past year to turn back the clock on energy — pushing policies that would help fossil fuels stave off advances by solar and wind. But they have repeatedly come up short. Energy Secretary Rick Perry’s proposal to force electricity customers to subsidize ailing coal plants ran aground early this year. The Senate rebuffed efforts to water down tax credits for solar and wind power. And Trump’s move this week to impose a tariff on imported solar panels should put only a crimp in the growth of sun-powered energy, analysts have said, despite the outcry it’s generated from most of the U.S. solar industry. Trump spent his campaign promoting an "America First" energy policy that translated to more oil, gas and especially coal — even as he slammed solar as expensive and hammered wind turbines as ugly. But after growing rapidly during the Obama years, wind and solar energy may have come too far for even a pro-fossil-fuel administration to stuff back into the barrel — especially after creating tens of thousands of jobs in red and blue states alike. The administration's most ambitious effort so far to tilt the scale in the direction of traditional fuels came from the Energy Department last fall, when Perry invoked a rarely used authority to press federal energy regulators to create a subsidy for a group of coal-fired and nuclear power plants in markets stretching from the Midwest to the East Coast. The move would have propped up plants that are struggling to survive in the face of rising natural gas and wind power.

Lack of environmental cooperation is good; the United States and China are on very different pages about climate change. Letting each country make their own choices is overall more beneficial. In particular, China has been making climate change a national priority, and should continue to do their own work towards greener technology.

Moore and Melton 19 [Scott Moore, Political Scientist and Director of the Penn Global China Program at UPenn Michelle Melton, 3L at Harvard Law School associate fellow in the Energy and National Security Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies,

 “China’s pivot on climate change and national security”, <https://www.lawfareblog.com/chinas-pivot-climate-change-and-national-security> ]

The official positions of the U.S. and China have reversed in recent years. Despite decades of acceptance among U.S. military and civilian national security leadership that climate change poses a threat to U.S. interests, the Trump administration has continually questioned the fact of climate change itself and pushed to revoke assessments that climate change is a critical threat to U.S. national security and military readiness. In contrast, Beijing in 2017 broke with decades of reluctance to label climate change as a security issue by signing onto a joint statement with the European Union terming rising global temperatures “a root cause of instability.” China’s shift from skeptic to true believer on climate change and security is not, for the most part, because leadership has suddenly become convinced that climate change is real. As the Chinese government acknowledged in its most recent comprehensive assessment of climate change, China is already affected by worsened floods, more extreme droughts, diminished fishery productivity and other ecological changes. The government has long understood that a warming climate will threaten the country’s agricultural production, make economically important cities vulnerable to catastrophic flooding and eventually dry out many of the country’s rivers. In particular, scientists predict that China’s northern region—the country’s breadbasket—will suffer crippling droughts, making it increasingly difficult to maintain the ruling Communist Party’s goal of basic self-sufficiency in key crops. China is already one of the most water-scarce countries in the world, and in the decades to come, this scarcity is projected to get much, much worse as the flow of rivers fed primarily by meltwater decreases sharply toward the end of the century. The embrace of climate and security instead reflects a calculation that embracing the issue can enhance China’s legitimacy at home and its influence abroad. While breathless claims that China is the world’s “green superpower” should be taken with a big grain of salt, Beijing’s resolve on climate and energy policy is nonetheless real, driven by concerns about the impacts of environmental change on both domestic and international stability.

# Negative Solvency

#### They say that reducing arms sales to Taiwan would reduce US-China tension, but there is no proof it will work, and it may even make the situation worse.

Chen et al 17 [ Ping-Kuei Chen, Scott L. Kastner and William L. Reed, “A Farewell to Arms? US Security Relations with Taiwan and the Prospects for Stability in the Taiwan Strait”]

Proposals to scale back US security ties to Taiwan are controversial, however, and several scholars have written thoughtful critiques of the idea. These critiques have generally made a few key points. First, it is not self-evident that ending security ties with Taiwan would in fact transform the US-China relationship: the interests of the two countries arguably clash on many other issues (North Korea, maritime disputes in East Asia, economic issues), and it is unclear why Beijing would yield on these other issues if only the United States were to adopt a policy on arms sales that—from Beijing’s vantage—the United States had already committed to follow in the 1982 joint communiqué. Second, the United States’ reputation in the region could be at stake. Some worry that walking away from a commitment to Taiwan would send a troubling signal to other US allies in East Asia. Beijing might likewise view US concessions on Taiwan as a sign of weakness and conclude that Washington was unlikely to challenge the PRC on other issues in the region. Third, ending arms sales—because it would add to Taiwan’s sense of insecurity—could actually make Taipei more hesitant about entering into sensitive political talks with the PRC; thus it isn’t clear that a reduced US commitment to Taiwan would facilitate a peaceful resolution to the dispute. Finally, and relatedly, ending arms sales would likely undercut Taiwan’s deterrent capabilities, which in turn could encourage a more coercive PRC approach to the island.

US-Chinese green technology cooperation would fail, China currently spreads “dirty energy” globally. Even if they do produce a lot of green technology, studies show that China themselves, a top source of pollution, will not transition away from coal for a long time.

Niler 18 [Eric Niler, Writer, Wired, “CHINA IS BOTH THE BEST AND WORST HOPE FOR CLEAN ENERGY”, <https://www.wired.com/story/china-is-best-worst-hope-at-cop24-climate-summit/>]

Meanwhile China, with its massive economy and growing green energy sector, has become the world’s climate leader. That might seem like a good thing if it weren’t for a couple of problems. China is the world’s biggest carbon polluter, and its emissions won’t start easing for many years. Chinese leaders are also exporting dirty energy around the world through their “belt and road” development program, which is spurring economic growth throughout Africa and Southeast Asia. A construction boom in coal-fired power plants has accompanied that growth in places like Vietnam, Pakistan and Kenya, for example. So having China as the big power at a climate summit doesn’t bode well for any new get-tough-on-carbon deals between now and the end of the meeting on Dec. 14, experts say. “The negotiations abhor a vacuum,” says Andrew Light, senior fellow at the World Resources Institute and a former climate negotiator in the Obama administration. “The US is not showing leadership, so China steps in.” But China’s reliance on dirty coal has come back to haunt its own citizens, according to Nahm. “The air pollution crisis is a reason to get away from coal,” he said. “That’s the first environmental crisis that’s pushed the government to act, and then the impact of climate change. There’s desertification, water shortages, giant dust storms and some of these problems are getting more severe.”

# 1NC Taiwan War – No Solvency/Prolif Turn

#### Arms sales preserve cross-strait peace – the plan ensures Taiwan insecurity provoking conflict, prolif and collapse of diplomacy

Tucker & Glaser 11 (Nancy Bernkopf Tucker, Professor of History at Georgetown University, PhD from Columbia, & \*Bonnie Glaser, Senior Chair Fellow with the Freeman Chair in China Studies at CSIS, MA from John Hopkins, “Should the United States Abandon Taiwan?,” The Washington Quarterly, Sept 14, <https://doi.org/10.1080/0163660X.2011.609128>)

The Obama administration should stop equivocating and move forward with arms sales. There will never be a good time to sell weapons to Taiwan. Diplomacy with China as well as congressional routines and requirements invariably intervene what former deputy assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific affairs Randall Schriver has called ‘‘the tyranny of the calendar.’’ Upgrading existing aircraft would be welcome, but Taiwan’s aging and shrinking air force also needs new planes. Were the United States to wait and the F-16 C/D production line to close, Taiwan would have no other source. Washington might well be faced with the complicated dilemma of whether to sell even more advanced F-35s. Washington ought to reassert its longstanding position to Beijing that sales do not promote Taiwan’s separation from the mainland but, in the current phase of cross-Strait relations, create an environment for improved China—Taiwan relations. Indeed, in the past two years, the United States has sold almost $13 billion in weapons to Taiwan, and cross-Strait relations are in the best shape in decades. In the absence of U.S. backing, Taipei would likely be too insecure and Taiwan’s leaders too vulnerable politically to negotiate with China. Arms sales, therefore, facilitate cross-Strait compromise and should not be anathema to Beijing. The United States should also accelerate dialogue with Taipei to promote increased U.S.—Taiwan trade, reduce Taiwan’s growing isolation from regional and global trading blocks, and prevent yet more dependence on China. Refusing to talk about a broad range of economic issues through the only available dispute settlement mechanism, the Trade and Investment Framework Agreement (TIFA), because of minor, if politically thorny, problems like U.S. beef exports to Taiwan is a mistake. And progress should be made on commonplace but important requests from Taipei to join the U.S. visa waiver program and conclude a bilateral extradition agreement. Higher-level contact between U.S. and Taiwan officials ought to occur routinely. Even if presidential meetings are not possible, dialogue between leaders should be facilitated by video conferences and regular correspondence. Cabinet-level visits to Taiwan, five of which occurred during the Clinton administration alone, could quickly be resumed. The prolonged and ill-considered hiatus in those visits during the George W. Bush and early Obama years is self-defeating. Such trips are important symbolically, but they also improve communication and raise awareness of common interests. Taiwan’s representatives also should be granted better access to U.S. officials in Washington and not be barred from buildings such as the Department of State. There is no formal agreement that requires such restrictions; they are entirely self-imposed. Washington cannot sustain the U.S.—Taiwan relationship unilaterally. Taipei has to assign priority to strengthening ties with Washington, even as it improves relations with Beijing. This will require tackling difficult domestic political obstacles in Taiwan and should be a bipartisan endeavor. It will be increasingly important to conduct relations in an environment of trust and candor. There are risks to a strategy which strengthens rather than abandons U.S. ties to Taiwan. If Washington continues to support Taiwan, it must simultaneously find ways to convince Beijing that the United States does not seek to prevent an accommodation between Taiwan and China. The United States does not secretly promote independence or block progress in cross-Strait relations. Rather, U.S. policy aims at sustaining peaceful conditions in which Taiwan and China can reach a long-term modus vivendi by themselves. Although the Six Assurances and the Taiwan Relations Act attempted to keep the focus of U.S.—Taiwan relations on the United States and Taiwan, China has always been a critical variable and its importance is growing. But those who worry that Taiwan policy will set back U.S.—China relations ought instead to persuade China that, in the absence of U.S. support, Taipei would likely lose confidence and put negotiations with the mainland on hold. An abandoned and isolated Taiwan might, in desperation, declare independence or even revive efforts to produce nuclear weapons, not pursue unification as Beijing assumes. So, in fact, U.S. support is not harmful, but helpful to China’s interests. The course of cross-Strait relations does not lead inexorably in any one direction. Taiwan’s options remain open. The United States wants Taiwan stable, peaceful, and democratic for the people of Taiwan, as a model to others in East Asia, and as assurance of U.S. credibility and dependability. The United States should not abandon its principled dedication to freedom of choice, but should strengthen it.

# Solidarity Case ARgument 1NC

#### They say we need to decrease our arms sales to Taiwan, but Taiwan has had a long history of fighting against oppressive rulership. The desire to be an independent country has been growing. We have a moral obligation to assist Taiwan.

BBC 19[British Broadcast Channel, “What’s behind the Taiwan divide?” <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-34729538>]

Starting at the beginning of the 17th Century, significant numbers of migrants started arriving from China, often fleeing turmoil or hardship. Most were Hoklo Chinese from Fujian (Fukien) province or were Hakka Chinese, largely from Guangdong. The descendants of these two migrations now make up by far the largest population group. In 1895, following Japan's victory in the First Sino-Japanese War, the Qing government had no choice but to cede Taiwan to Japan. But after World War Two, the Republic of China - one of the victors - began ruling Taiwan with the consent of its allies the US and UK, after Japan surrendered and relinquished control of the territory it had taken from China. However in the next few years, the leader at the time Chiang Kai-shek's troops were beaten back by the Communist armies under Mao Zedong. Chiang and the remnants of his Kuomintang (KMT) government fled to Taiwan in 1949. This group, referred to as Mainland Chinese and then making up 1.5m people, dominated Taiwan's politics for many years, even though they only account for 14% of the population. Having inherited an effective dictatorship, facing resistance from local people resentful of the 228 Massacre and authoritarian rule, and under pressure from a growing democracy movement, Chiang's son, Chiang Ching-kuo, began allowing a process of democratisation, which eventually led to the 2000 election of the island's first non-KMT president, Chen Shui-bian. Officially, the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) still favours eventual independence for Taiwan, while the KMT favours eventual re-unification. Opinion polls show only a small minority of Taiwanese support pursuing one or the other at the moment, with most preferring to stick with the current middle ground. Yet more and more people say they feel Taiwanese rather than Chinese. Support for the DPP increased at the January 2016 election. This was partly because of dissatisfaction with the KMT's handling of economic matters, from the wealth gap to high housing prices, and partly because of worries that Mr Ma's administration was making Taiwan too dependent on Beijing.

The United States are literally Taiwan’s only significant ally. Without our support, they will have effectively no protection from China forcing Taiwan to re-join the mainland. This is modern day imperialism.

BBC 19[British Broadcast Channel, “What’s behind the Taiwan divide?” <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-34729538>]

The US is by far Taiwan's most important friend, and are its only ally. The relationship, forged during World War Two and the Cold War, underwent its sternest test in 1979, when President Jimmy Carter ended US diplomatic recognition of Taiwan in order to concentrate on burgeoning ties with China. The US Congress, responding to the move, passed the Taiwan Relations Act, which promises to supply Taiwan with defensive weapons, and stressed that any attack by China would be considered of "grave concern" to the US. Since then, US policy has been described as one of "strategic ambiguity", seeking to balance China's emergence as a regional power with US admiration for Taiwan's economic success and democratisation. The pivotal role of the US was most clearly shown in 1996, when China conducted provocative missile tests to try and influence Taiwan's first direct presidential election. In response, US President Bill Clinton ordered the biggest display of US military power in Asia since the Vietnam War, sending ships to the Taiwan Strait, and a clear message to Beijing.

Continuing to support and protect Taiwan is the more ethical decision, as well as the law. Our choice to reduce arms sales will be the deciding factor in whether or not Taiwan remains independent from China. To vote affirmative is to choose the side of the conqueror. Not only is this immoral, but it will damage the image of the United States as a stabilizing force in the region.

Bowman & Smits 19[Bradley Bowman, Mikhael Smits, DefenseNews, “Trade deal with China or not, the US must bolster Taiwan’s defense”, <https://www.defensenews.com/opinion/commentary/2019/06/26/trade-deal-with-china-or-not-the-us-must-bolster-taiwans-defense/>]

In the past, Taiwan’s superior technology and geography gave Taiwan a military edge when it came to a potential conflict in the strait. However, as the Pentagon noted, due to China’s military buildup, those advantages are now largely gone. In fact, as the Defense Intelligence Agency’s 2019 report on Chinese military power assessed, “Beijing’s longstanding interest to eventually compel Taiwan’s reunification with the mainland and deter any attempt by Taiwan to declare independence has served as the primary driver for China’s military modernization.” Simultaneously, based on an overzealous and counterproductive desire in previous administrations to avoid offending Beijing, Washington has often been reluctant to provide Taiwan the arms it needed. Fearful to not provoke the Chinese, the Obama administration rejected Taiwanese requests for 66 new F-16 fighter jets — instead only offering modifications for its aging aircraft. Admittedly, America’s arms sales to Taiwan are relatively modest compared to China’s military buildup. However, the failure to provide Taiwan the required weapons exacerbated the shift toward Beijing in the military balance. As a result, across most combat domains, Beijing has established both a quantitative and qualitative advantage over Taiwan.

Consequently, there is a risk that Beijing planners and decision-makers might determine they could launch a successful offensive against Taiwan. That perception in Beijing makes aggression in the strait and a war with the United States more likely. The bipartisan National Defense Strategy Commission listed aggression against Taiwan as a top concern, arguing that allowing China to absorb Taiwan by military force would constitute a “crushing blow to America’s credibility and regional position.” In addition to genuine hard-power concerns, there is also a matter of principle. When an authoritarian power threatens and bullies a democratic people, America is not neutral. Furthermore, providing Taiwan the means to defend itself is not just consistent with sound policy and good principle — it is the law.