# 1NC

## 1

### OFF

#### Interpretation: Debaters must disclose all broken constructive positions with underlining and highlighting on open source on the 2021-2022 NDCA LD wiki and under their own name within 30 minutes before the round.

#### Violation – they don’t not for every round

Graphical user interface, application

Description automatically generated

#### A. Debate resource inequities—you’ll say people will steal cards, but that’s good—only way to level the playing field for students like novices in under-privileged programs – key to inclusion and its an independent voter and outweighs because you can’t debate if you aren’t included

#### B. Evidence ethics – open source is the only way to verify before round that cards aren’t mis cut – otherwise you could have highlighted or bracketed unethically. That’s an independent voter – maintaining ethical evidence practices is key to being good academics and to verify you didn’t cheat

#### C. Depth of clash – open source allows debaters to come up with more nuanced researched objections to their opponents evidence before the round faster since it’s easier to read through the doc and see what parts of the evidence are actually highlighted. Leads to highest quality evidence comparison – outweighs – thinking on your feet is non-unique but the best quality responses will come from full access to a case.

#### [1] DTD on 1nc theory and disclosure – a) disclosure cannot be drop the argument because it would just drop you because you’re the norm b) deterrence

#### [2] Reject all responses to disclosure – they selectively comply with our norm because they disclose some docs that meet our criteria which proves we can’t verify what norms they actually agree with.

#### [3] No RVI on ac theory – chilling infinite abuse, substance ed, illogical

#### [4] CI – 1] reasonability is arbitrary – impossible to know what is reasonable until you establish a brightline 2] bites judge intervention cuz they have to gut check what they think is good 3] reasonability collapses cuz u use offense defense to evaluate offense under the BL 4] norms – you can sidestep norms by selectively choosing a different brightline you meet every round.

#### [5] Disclosure outweighs – it’s key to assessing the honesty of the form of your argumentation and how you presented arguments which means it precludes 1nc claims also lexically prior forced down strat

#### [6] Fairness is a voter because debate is a game governed by rules and you can’t tell who actually won if the layer was skewed.

## 2

### OFF

#### Interpretation: If the affirmative delineates specific functions of its advocacy as normal means i.e. enforcement, actor, definitions of strike, specific workers, etc, then it must have a unified solvency advocate that agrees with all those specifications.

#### Violation: They don’t – elaborate

#### Negate-

#### 1] Limits- Not having a unified solvency advocate that agrees with all your “normal means” specifications allow you to choose any permutation of actor, enforcement mechanism, punishment, targeted group of people, and government in conjunction with each other that makes negative advocacy construction impossible because its literally impossible to predict which is supercharged by no normal means on this topic. Unified solvency advocates grant sufficient aff flexibility while still ensuring a reasonable case list since specification all comes from one source.

#### 2] Ground- They can choose the best definition for right to strike that suites them, the best enforcement mechanism, all with any exceptions they want which makes it really easy for them to delink core negative positions like circumvention, PICs out of weapons, etc.

## 3

### OFF

#### Interpretation: the affirmative must defend that only just governments ought to recognize the right to strike

#### Just governments respect liberties

Dorn 12 James A. Dorn, Cato Journal, "The Scope of Government in a Free Society", Fall 2012, https://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/serials/files/cato-journal/2012/12/v32n3-10.pdf

If laws are just, liberty and property are secure. The most certain test of justice is negative—that is, justice occurs when injustice (the violation of natural rights to life, liberty, and property) is prevented. The emphasis here is on what Hayek (1967) called “just rules of conduct,” not on the fairness of outcomes. No one has stated the negative concept of justice better than the 19th century French classical liberal Frederic Bastiat ([1850] 1964: 65): When law and force confine a man within the bounds of justice, they do not impose anything on him but a mere negation. They impose on him only the obligation to refrain from injuring others. They do not infringe on his personality, or his liberty or his property. They merely safeguard the personality, the liberty, and the property of others. They stand on the defensive; they defend the equal rights of all. They fulfill a mission whose harmlessness is evident, whose utility is palpable, and whose legitimacy is uncontested. In short, the purpose of a just government is not to do good with other people’s money, but to prevent injustice by protecting property and securing liberty.

#### US HR violations don’t secure liberties

Amnesty International, 4-14-2021, "Everything you need to know about human rights in United States of America," No Publication, https://www.amnesty.org/en/countries/americas/united-states-of-america/report-united-states-of-america/

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 2020 The Trump administration’s broadly dismal human rights record, both at home and abroad, deteriorated further during 2020. The USA experienced massive demonstrations across the country with the backdrop of the COVID-19 pandemic, contested 2020 general elections and a widespread racist backlash against the Black Lives Matter movement. In response to thousands of public demonstrations against institutional racism and police violence, law enforcement authorities routinely used excessive force against protesters and human rights defenders and failed to constrain violent counter-protests against primarily peaceful assemblies. The administration also sought to undermine international human rights protections for women; lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) people; and victims of war crimes, among others. It also exploited the COVID-19 pandemic to target migrants and asylum-seekers for further abuses. Joe Biden was declared the winner of the November presidential election. Background Despite confirmation by the Electoral College that Joe Biden had won the November presidential election, President Trump continued to challenge the result, making repeated unsubstantiated claims of electoral irregularities. These continued allegations sparked a number of pro-Trump protests and raised concerns about the peaceful transfer of power in January. Discrimination The COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated long-standing inequalities in the USA. Inadequate and uneven government responses to the pandemic had a disproportionate and discriminatory impact on many people based on their race, socioeconomic situations and other characteristics. Systemic disparities dictated who served as frontline workers and who had employment and economic security and access to housing and health care.1 Incarcerated people were particularly at risk due to insanitary conditions in prisons and detention where they were unable to adequately physically distance and had inadequate access to hygienic supplies as facilities became hotspots for infection. Additionally, racially discriminatory political speech and violence risked increasing the number of hate crimes. Right to health Workers in health care, law enforcement, transportation and other “essential” sectors faced enormous challenges as the US government failed to adequately protect them during the pandemic. Shortages in personal protective equipment (PPE) meant that health and other essential workers often had to perform their jobs without adequate protection and in unsafe environments. In April, the National Nurses Union held a physically distanced protest in front of the White House against the lack of PPE for health workers. From March to December 2020, more than 2,900 health care workers died amidst the COVID-19 pandemic. The US Centres for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) acknowledged that available figures were likely underestimates. Some health and other essential workers in the public and private sectors also faced reprisals, including harassment, disciplinary procedures and unfair dismissal, if they spoke out about the inadequate protective measures. Excessive use of force At least 1,000 people were reportedly killed by police using firearms. The limited public data available suggests that Black people are disproportionately impacted by police use of lethal force. The US government’s programme to track how many such deaths occur annually was not fully implemented. No state laws governing the use of lethal force by police – where such laws exist – comply with international law and standards regarding the use of lethal force by law enforcement officials.2 Freedom of assembly Law enforcement across the USA committed widespread and egregious human rights violations against people protesting about the unlawful killings of Black people and calling for police reform. Amnesty International documented 125 separate incidents of unlawful police violence against protesters in 40 states and Washington, D.C., between 26 May and 5 June alone.3 Thousands more protests took place in the remainder of the year. Violations were committed by law enforcement personnel at the municipal, county, state and federal levels, including by National Guard troops who were deployed by the federal government in some cities. The violence included beatings with batons or other devices, the misuse of tear gas and pepper spray, and the inappropriate and indiscriminate firing of “less lethal” projectiles. In numerous incidents, human rights defenders – including protest organizers, media representatives, legal observers and street medics – were specifically targeted with chemical irritants and kinetic impact projectiles, arrested and detained, seemingly on account of their work documenting and remedying law enforcement agencies’ human rights abuses. Right to life and security of the person The government’s ongoing failure to protect individuals from persistent gun violence continued to violate their human rights, including the right to life, security of the person and freedom from discrimination, among others. Unfettered access to firearms, a lack of comprehensive gun safety laws (including effective regulation of firearm acquisition, possession and use) and a failure to invest in adequate gun violence prevention and intervention programmes continued to perpetuate this violence. In 2018, the most recent year for which data was available, some 39,740 individuals died from gunshot injuries while tens of thousands more are estimated to have sustained gunshot injuries and survived. In the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic, with increased gun sales and shootings, the USA failed in its obligation to prevent deaths from gun violence, which could have been done through a range of urgent measures, including de-listing gun stores as essential businesses. As of 2020, expansive “Stand Your Ground” and “Castle Doctrine” laws, both of which provide for private individuals to use lethal force in self-defence against others when in their homes or feeling threatened, existed in 34 US states. These laws appeared to escalate gun violence and the risk of avoidable deaths or serious injuries, resulting in violations of the right to life. As protesters against the killing of Black people took to the streets in cities across the USA, there were instances where armed civilians in states where the open carrying of firearms is permitted engaged protesters, causing at least four deaths.

#### Prefer –

#### 1] Precision — anything else justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### 2] Limits – there are 200 governments in the world – letting them pick an unjust ones explodes limits via infinite permutations of governments

#### 3] Phil ed – 1AR will claim no government is just but that just means that we defend ideal theory. That’s good –

#### A] forces philosophical contestation which can uniquely happen in LD debate whereas you can util debate on any topic

#### B] outweighs – framework debate allows to identify injustice which is a prereq to any other theory voter because they’re all philosophically grounded

#### Fairness – debate is a competitive activity that requires fairness for objective evaluation. Outweighs because it’s the only intrinsic part of debate – all other rules can be debated over but rely on some conception of fairness to be justified.

## Case

### UV

New 2nr responses

#### Neg abuse outweighs Aff abuse – 1] Infinite prep time before round to frontline 2] 2AR judge psychology and 1st and last speech 3] Infinite perms and uplayering in the 1AR.

#### Reasonability on 1AR shells – 1AR theory is very aff-biased because the 2AR gets to line-by-line every 2NR standard with new answers that never get responded to– reasonability checks 2AR sandbagging by preventing really abusive 1NCs while still giving the 2N a chance.

#### DTA on 1AR shells - They can blow up a blippy 20 second shell to 3 min of the 2AR while I have to split my time and can’t preempt 2AR spin which necessitates judge intervention and means 1AR theory is irresolvable so you shouldn’t stake the round on it.

#### RVIs on 1AR theory – 1AR being able to spend 20 seconds on a shell and still win forces the 2N to allocate at least 2:30 on the shell which means RVIs check back time skew – ows on quantifiability

### Framing

Impact justified

### Adv

#### NO STRIKE CLAUSES IN PRISON UNION CONTRACTS MEAN STRIKES WON’T HAPPEN EVEN IF GOVERNMENTS PERMIT THEM – PRISON RULES MEAN PRESUMPTION

Hamilton 5-4 HAMILTON NOLAN (labor reporter for In These Times. He has spent the past decade writing about labor and politics for Gawker, Splinter, The Guardian, and elsewhere) 5/4/21, Get Rid of No-Strike Clauses and Stop Begging, https://inthesetimes.com/article/no-strike-clause-labor-peace-union-contracts

Two of the candidates running for president of a 100,000-member public employee union in California, SEIU Local 1000, have a notable plank in their platforms: they want to get no-strike clauses out of their union contracts. They have an uphill battle, in large part because, on this particular issue, the labor movement will tend to act as a rock pulling them down, rather than helping them up. In post WWII America, union contracts work more or less like this: The company guarantees workers certain wages and benefits, and the workers agree to give up their right to strike for the term of the contract. This fundamental agreement — material gains in exchange for labor peace — defines modern labor relations. And where has this arrangement gotten the labor movement? Near death. For decades, union membership has declined, wages have stagnated, and capital has gained more and more power over working people. This devastating collapse in the power of organized labor has coincided with the post ​“Treaty of Detroit” period in which a very dangerous idea was cemented and enshrined as conventional wisdom. That is the idea that employers agree to union contracts in order to purchase labor peace—that the incentive for a company to bargain and sign a contract with its workers is to receive, in turn, a guarantee that those workers will be quiescent.

#### Climate strikes aren’t sufficient to reduce reliance on fuels.

Hayes 19 [Jason; Contributor to The Hill, director of environmental policy at the Mackinac Center for Public Policy, a research and education institute in Midland, Mich; “A global climate strike isn't enough,” The Hill; 9/19/19; <https://thehill.com/opinion/energy-environment/461809-a-global-climate-strike-isnt-enough>] Justin

A collective of influential green groups and corporations is supporting a campaign for a global climate strike from Sept. 20-27. The strike pushes young people to walk out of schools and workplaces to protest the energy sources that keep us alive and thriving. That many people are concerned about the global climate is obvious, but how will encouraging them to abandon their jobs or schools for a day or two, or seven, reduce greenhouse gas emissions?

The campaign website — globalclimatestrike.net — tells people they must “demand an end to the age of fossil fuels.” But, in the United States, we rely on these fuels for over 80 percent of the energy we use to provide basic necessities such as food, clean water, heating and air conditioning, medicine, transportation and so much more.

To make things worse, the energy sources offered up as replacements for fossil fuels — typically wind and solar — couldn’t even exist without fossil fuels. Natural gas, oil and coal are needed to mine, refine, process and ship the metals, rare earth minerals, silicone, plastics and various chemicals that go into renewables. Without steel, there are no towers to hold up wind turbines. Without rare earths, there are no solar panels. Adding to this conundrum is the fact that wind and solar cannot provide reliable power. They are intermittent, meaning they must be propped up by more reliable energy sources, such as natural gas.

A group of environmental policy experts has put together MyClimatePledge.com as our response, because we’d like to challenge climate strikers and to help them appreciate that striking won’t be enough.

#### Climate strikers don’t have enough leverage.

Dolsak and Prakash 19 [Nives and Aseem; We write on environmental issues, climate politics and NGOs; “Climate Strikes: What They Accomplish And How They Could Have More Impact,” 9/14/19; Forbes; <https://www.forbes.com/sites/prakashdolsak/2019/09/14/climate-strikes-what-they-accomplish-and-how-they-could-have-more-impact/?sh=2244a9bd5eed>] Justin

But strikers must have the leverage to accomplish their goals

Strikers represent the demand for climate action. But who will supply these policies and what leverage do strikers have over these policymakers? This is where climate strikes could run into a problem.

Strikers have leverage when their absence from work disrupts activities that are valuable to policymakers. If railway workers go on strike, trains cannot run and the public is upset. When airline pilots go on strike, people cannot fly, and airlines lose revenue. By some accounts, the 48-hour strike of British Airways pilots (regarding a pay dispute) in September 2019 will cost the company about £100 million.

What leverage do the climate strikers have? Assuming most of the strikers are students, what costs might their strikes impose on the actors that need to change their climate policies (namely, governments and fossil fuel firms)?

Student strikes probably do not disrupt the government or fossil fuel firms. The main bearer of these costs are the conscientious teachers who need to figure out how they are going to make up for the lost teaching time.

### 1NC – “Spark”

1ac’s must specify how they stop climate change through which technology – cx was clear they will shift – pin them to my definition they use renewables – if not then they have no solvency

#### Materials like neodymium are essential to the manufacturing of renewables and exclusively come from China. These mines also create a toxic environment which link turns the affirmative

**Chen 19** Angela Chen, 2-15-2019, "Where will the materials for our clean energy future come from?," Verge, [https://www.theverge.com/2019/2/15/18226210/energy-renewables-materials-mining-environment-neodymium-copper-lithium-cobalt //](https://www.theverge.com/2019/2/15/18226210/energy-renewables-materials-mining-environment-neodymium-copper-lithium-cobalt%20//) LEX JB

“There really isn’t anything to compete with **neodymium for magnets**,” says [**Frances Wall**](http://emps.exeter.ac.uk/csm/staff/fw223)**, a professor of applied mineralogy at the University of Exeter’s Camborne School of Mines. “They’re just by far the best for the application.”** Neodymium is **a so-called rare earth element,** a **silvery** metal with **a very** important role in renewable energy. When combined with iron and boron, **it makes** strong **magnets** that are important both **for generators in wind turbines and motors in electric vehicles.** Despite the name, rare earth elements like neodymium aren’t particularly rare, Wall explains. The elements are relatively abundant. Some are found in the same concentration in Earth’s crust as the far more pedestrian-sounding element copper. **The challenge is that** neodymium is **very much** controlled by a single country. About 85 percent of **the world’s neodymium** comes out of a few mines in China. One mine **called Baotou** in northern China [has created a toxic lake](http://www.bbc.com/future/story/20150402-the-worst-place-on-earth) and other environmental horrors. There are a few small mines elsewhere — like the [Rainbow Rare Earths](http://rainbowrareearths.com/) mine in Burundi and the [Mkango](http://www.mining.com/canadas-mkango-start-mining-rare-earths-malawi-2020/) mine in Malawi — but oftentimes, even mines outside of China tend to send their deposits to China to process. That’s the case with the [Mountain Pass rare Earth mine](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mountain_Pass_rare_earth_mine) in California. One huge bottleneck for neodymium mining and processing is funding. “There were loads of rare earth exploration projects and what happens is they gradually just slow down if they don’t get investments into the next stage,” explains Wall. As demand increases, Wall predicts that other suppliers will come into the market, and there will be room for more mines to open up.

#### Importing from China kills US primacy and gives complete Chinese control of the energy grid.

**Yellen 20** David Yellen, 11-3-2020, "How China Came to Dominate Clean Energy Technologies, and How the US Can Catch Up," No Publication, [https://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/how-the-us-can-better-compete-with-china-in-the-clean-energy-technology-cold-war //](https://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/how-the-us-can-better-compete-with-china-in-the-clean-energy-technology-cold-war%20//) LEX JB

The United States’ competition with China, which last year escalated to a trade war **that cost**[**tens of billions of dollars**](https://www.cnn.com/2020/01/14/politics/cost-of-china-tariff-trade-war/index.html), has been a primary focus of the current administration’s effort to "put America first." But from the steep economic costs of that trade war to America’s withdrawal from the Paris climate agreement and the World Health Organization, America is losing its position as the world’s leading superpower and economy**. Nowhere is U.S.-China competition more fierce than in advanced technological sectors —**what has been termed the “[technology cold war](https://www.bloomberg.com/graphics/2019-us-china-who-is-winning-the-tech-war/)” — and China has already dominated clean energy industries. But China’s ascension to technological dominance is not inevitable. In order for the U.S. to retain its lead **in tech and compete more effectively in clean energy,** it needs to act quickly — and the first step is to recognize how China has attained its leading position.The conventional story of China’s economic rise isn’t complicated. China has cheap access to labor and capital by virtue of its large population and supportive government. Its [state capitalist](https://rauli.cbs.dk/index.php/cjas/article/view/4813) system allows the government to support favored industries by giving land grants to build factories, low- or zero-interest loans for working capital, and subsidies for finished products. **This is the most ubiquitous explanation for why the solar panels you see on a rooftop or in a small solar array alongside a stretch of highway are almost certainly from Chinese firms.** China controls almost [60 percent of the solar market](https://www.pbs.org/wnet/peril-and-promise/2019/08/climate-second-democratic-debate/) worldwide, purportedly because China’s government and cheap labor [enable the country to produce and sell panels for far less](https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/why-china-is-dominating-the-solar-industry/) than anyone else can produce them.

#### Transition supercharges energy taxing war which re-entrenches us in the trade war

**Stromsta 19** [KARL-ERIK STROMSTA](https://www.greentechmedia.com/authors/karl-erik-stromsta), 8-2-2019, "Global Energy Transition at Risk From US-China Trade War," No Publication, [https://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/global-energy-transition-at-risk-from-us-china-trade-war //](https://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/global-energy-transition-at-risk-from-us-china-trade-war%20//) LEX JB

For the energy transition, the risk from the trade war comes on several fronts. First is the **negative** impact on global econ**omic** growth, which in turn makes it more difficult for political leaders to push aggressive decarbonization agendas**. Despite a booming stock market,** the U.S. Federal Reserve this week lowered interest **rates for the first time since the Great Recession.** China’s econ**omic** growth has slowed **to a multi-decade low,** and both countries increasingly appear to be digging in for a protracted trade war. “The major priority in China is continued economic growth and stability,” Brown said. “**If the trade war continues, and it drags on economic growth, it could impact their decision making.” Meanwhile, the rise of protectionism**, exemplified by the Trump administration’s “America First” approach to foreign policy, **is making lower-carbon options more difficult or expensive for some countries. On the renewables front,** the U.S. has imposed tariffs on most types of imported solar modules, and [newly proposed tariffs](https://www.greentechmedia.com/articles/read/us-wind-boom-faces-new-threat-from-proposed-tower-tariffs) on wind turbine towers could undermine project economics just as the wind market enters what is expected to be a historic boom period. **By the end of 2019, WoodMac expects the overall U.S. tariff rate to be near 4 percent, a level not seen since the mid-1980s. Meanwhile,** China is showing less interest in buying U.S. liquefied natural gas exports to meet demand in its power-hungry eastern provinces on a lower-carbon basis.“China is one of the world’s largest hydrocarbon producers,” Brown said. “It has some of the world’s largest supplies of coal. They have that supply option — to switch back to coal — should they want to. Things that could spur that include less bilateral trade with other markets or weaker economic growth.” While it’s unlikely China would reverse direction on coal, “what’s maybe more realistic is China slows down its coal-to-gas switching,” Brown said.The impact of **protectionism on decarbonization** reverberates far beyond the energy industry. Take steel production, which is intensely competitive, inherently difficult to decarbonize, and has “national champions” in many countries. Steel accounts for 9 percent of global emissions.“Who will be willing to create ‘green steel’ first when the returns are not visible?” the ETO asks.

#### Scenario 1 is Trade War – that goes nuclear – escalates and causes miscalc – studies prove – extinction

**Kazianis 18** [Harry, director of defense studies at the Center for the National Interest, Fellow for National Security Affairs at the Potomac Foundation and a non-resident Senior Fellow at the University of Nottingham. "The US-China trade war has begun - a shooting war could be next." 7/6. http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2018/07/06/us-china-trade-war-has-begun-shooting-war-could-be-next.html]

A trade war broke out Friday between the U.S. and China, when the U.S. imposed tariffs on $34 billion in Chinese products and China slapped tariffs on and equal amount of U.S. products. President Trump has said that would prompt the U.S. to impose up to $**500 billion** in Chinese products. But things could get worse. The deterioration in U.S.-China relations could **escalate** and turn into a **shooting war** between two nuclear armed superpowers. In the worst-case scenario, this could result in massive casualties on both sides that could even lead to **nuclear war**. Some will call such a statement pure hype – and **I wish it was**. But the facts lead us to a dark place when it comes to our relationship with China, which is becoming less of a partnership and more like a fight between mortal enemies looking to gain any advantage they can over the other. We are all rightly concerned over North Korea’s nuclear weapons, Iran’s penchant for backing terror, and a rogue Russia that can’t seem to stop causing trouble all over the world. But these problems are **nothing** when **compared to** the **China** challenge. No other nation is as able to challenge American power on the world stage in the coming years. Just look over the current state of affairs in the U.S.-China relationship. We see trade and military stand-offs, territorial disputes, and allies and partners of both nations squaring off or **cybersecurity challenges**. We see two nations on a **collision course** that seems more like the Cold War than the 21st century. But before we stare war with China in the eye, let’s consider the budding trade battle between Washington and Beijing. The Trump administration new duties on $34 billion in on Chinese goods amount to a 25 percent tariff. The duties impact items such as X-ray machine parts, water boilers, airplane tires and industrial parts. China slapped its tariffs on $34 billion worth of U.S. products such as soybeans, electric cars, pork and other products. But the Trump administration is not ready to back down, and, in fact, seems itching for a scrap. A senior Trump administration official told me Friday: “We are ready for a trade war. If they want it we are ready to fight it. They need to remember America would win that so-called war, hands-down. Our market is bigger, our consumers richer – we are the global innovator. All we ask is for an even playing field from the Chinese. If they won’t agree to that, then they will have to deal with the consequences.” When I asked what those consequences were, the official was quite clear: “China will pay a price. We will impose costs on them. They need to be ready for that. We are.” And one thing is quite clear: Washington does hold an advantage in a trade fight – the numbers don’t lie. America imports much more from China than China imports from the U.S. And while U.S. consumers and businesses would be hurt in a full-blown trade war, China stands to lose out on a big portion of the $462 billion in goods and services America imports from that nation. Considering the fact that the Chinese economy is already slowing down, Chinese President Xi Jinping would be wise to back off. But something bigger is afoot here – a seismic shift in international affairs that has been dormant, until now. As I have explained in these very digital pages, the U.S.-China relationship was bound to become adversarial as soon the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991. The Soviet threat was the one thing that brought both China and the U.S. together in the 1970s. Beijing saw the confrontation with America coming, and was already beginning to modernize its armed forces and recalibrate its military posture to take on the looming challenge from across the Pacific. While China certainly did prepare for what it felt was an inevitable encounter with America, time and circumstances seems to put any sort of showdown. Beijing’s ascension to the World Trade Organization in 2001 meant economic ties would grow between both nations quickly – and geopolitical tensions are not good for business. The Sept. 11, 2001 terrorist attacks also meant Washington was forced to shift its attention from Asia and back into the Middle East for over a decade. A true showdown with China was averted – at least for a while. Unfortunately, it seems the chances of a real clash with China – and even a military confrontation – **are now spiking**. With America less involved in the daily squabbles of the Middle East and no longer keen on letting Beijing take us to the cleaners on trade, **any number of issues** could see these two superpowers **exchange blows.** For example, China over the last few years has been pushing absurd claims that seek to turn the waters around its coasts into its own sovereign territory. From the **E**ast **C**hina **S**ea all the way to **S**outh **C**hina **S**ea, Beijing is determined to ensure that it is the master of the seas – and push Washington out of the region for good. To support such claims, Beijing has made some key investments in its military to win a war with America. The centerpiece of this is a **missile arsenal** that is second to none, and is of such a size that U.S. missile defenses would be overwhelmed many times over. Firing from shore, China would hope to destroy most of America’s military bases around the region as well as sink any warships as far out as Guam. The worst part of all – thanks to treaty commitments with Russia – is that Washington is unable to counter Beijing’s missile weaponry on land. And from there it gets even worse. Backed by a massive militia that is nearly impossible to match, a growing navy armed with aircraft carriers and an air force that is producing fighter planes that strangely look like our very own stealth aircraft – because China stole the technology – Beijing’s claims in Asia are only growing more outrageous. At one point a few years ago, it seemed China was even making veiled claims to Okinawa, a clear part of Japanese territory that is home to a massive U.S. military presence. Such claims have even fostered parody articles saying that China has claimed most of the Pacific and Hawaii, almost fooling an entire conference at Yale University a few years ago. History tells us that nations with divergent interests and competing geopolitical goals with enough proximity tend to clash. In fact, as Harvard Professor Graham Allison reminds us, **in 12 out of 16 cases studies** where a rising power competed with an established power – **think China vs. America** – **war was the result.** Therefore, when talk of a trade war with China heats up, **I think of a very different type of war**. And **you should too.**

#### Scenario 2 is Econ – trade war escalates and draws in the EU which causes global economic collapse

**Varblane 19** Urmas Varblane, 11-22-2019, "Escalation of the China-US Trade War Could Lead to an Economic Crisis," ICDS, [https://icds.ee/en/escalation-of-the-china-us-trade-war-could-lead-to-an-economic-crisis //](https://icds.ee/en/escalation-of-the-china-us-trade-war-could-lead-to-an-economic-crisis%20//) LEX JB

Instead of transatlantic cooperation, president Trump has favoured a unilateral approach to China, which coincides with his “America First” policy principles. What is more, the US and the EU are also facing a limited trade conflict. Bruno Le Maire, the French Minister of the Economy and Finance, hit the nail on the head by saying that the winner in the EU-US trade war was China. However, it is difficult for Europe to choose sides **in the trade war between Beijing and Washington.** Supporting China seems inconceivable because **the** US and Europe **share similar concerns and** are security allies. **At the same time,** endorsing the US **approach** would **run** counter **to** EU principles founded on a rules-based and multilateral trading system. In addition, China is one of the most promising foreign markets that it would be better not to aggravate. To take a neutral position, there is the hope that, with the mutual Sino-US sanctions, European products will become more competitive in both the Chinese and the US markets. On the other hand, the EU must consider the possibility of diverting some of the goods moving between the two hostile sides to the European market, the over-saturation of which could cause problems for local producers. In summary, the economic effect of the trade war **between two of the world’s largest countries** is complicated and has a global impact. In simple terms, imposing trade restrictions inevitably brings about an economic recession**. Even if customs duties fill the coffers of one country, collecting them requires additional resources**. Non-tariff barriers to trade—from quotas to unreasonable product standards—may stop trade completely. At the same time, trade sanctions imposed by one country are likely to provoke a similar reaction from the other. Thus, one of the possible short-term consequences of the escalation of the trade war is an economic crisis, as (intermediate) products and services can no longer cross national borders, and the complex clockwork of the international economy stops. Various economic growth forecasting agencies, such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and the OECD, have already reduced economic growth indicators for the coming years.

#### Collapse causes nuclear war

Tønnesson 15 [Tønnesson is a research professor at the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) in Norway and the leader of the East Asia Peace program at Uppsala University in Sweden.] “Deterrence, interdependence and Sino–US peace.” International Area Studies Review, volume 18, number 3, pgs. 297-311. 2015.

If leaders on either side of the Atlantic begin to seriously fear or anticipate their own nation’s decline then they may blame this on external dependence, appeal to anti-foreign sentiments, contemplate the use of force to gain respect or credibility, adopt protectionist policies, and ultimately refuse to be deterred by either nuclear arms or prospects of socioeconomic calamities. Such a dangerous shift could happen abruptly, i.e. under the instigation of actions by a third party – or against a third party. Yet as long as there is both nuclear deterrence and interdependence, the tensions in East Asia are unlikely to escalate to war. As Chan (2013) says, all states in the region are aware that they cannot count on support from either China or the US if they make provocative moves. **T**he greatest risk is not that a territorial dispute leads to war under present circumstances but that changes in the world economy alter those circumstances in ways that render inter-state peace more precarious. If China and the US fail to rebalance their financial and trading relations (Roach, 2014) then a trade war could result, interrupting transnational production networks, provoking social distress, and exacerbating nationalist emotions. This could have unforeseen consequences in the field of security, with nuclear deterrence remaining the only factor to protect the world from Armageddon, and unreliably so. Deterrence could lose its credibility: one of the two great powers might gamble that the other yield in a cyber-war or conventional limited war, or third party countries might engage in conflict with each other, with a view to obliging Washington or Beijing to intervene.

#### Nuclear war causes extinction

Starr 15 Steven Starr 15. “Nuclear War: An Unrecognized Mass Extinction Event Waiting To Happen.” Ratical. March 2015. <https://ratical.org/radiation/NuclearExtinction/StevenStarr022815.html> TG

A war fought with 21st century strategic nuclear weapons would be more than just a great catastrophe in human history. If we allow it to happen, such a war would be a mass extinction event that [ends human history](https://ratical.org/radiation/NuclearExtinction/StarrNuclearWinterOct09.pdf). There is a profound difference between extinction and “an unprecedented disaster,” or even “the end of civilization,” because even after such an immense catastrophe, human life would go on. But extinction, by definition, is an event of utter finality, and a nuclear war that could cause human extinction should really be considered as the ultimate criminal act. It certainly would be the crime to end all crimes. The world’s leading climatologists now tell us that nuclear war threatens our continued existence as a species. Their studies predict that a large nuclear war, especially one fought with strategic nuclear weapons, would create a post-war environment in which for many years it would be too cold and dark to even grow food. Their findings make it clear that not only humans, but most large animals and many other forms of complex life would likely vanish forever in a nuclear darkness of our own making. The environmental consequences of nuclear war would attack the ecological support systems of life at every level. Radioactive fallout produced not only by nuclear bombs, but also by the destruction of nuclear power plants and their spent fuel pools, would poison the biosphere. Millions of tons of smoke would act to [destroy Earth’s protective ozone layer](https://www2.ucar.edu/atmosnews/just-published/3995/nuclear-war-and-ultraviolet-radiation) and block most sunlight from reaching Earth’s surface, creating Ice Age weather conditions that would last for decades. Yet the political and military leaders who control nuclear weapons strictly avoid any direct public discussion of the consequences of nuclear war. They do so by arguing that nuclear weapons are not intended to be used, but only to deter. Remarkably, the leaders of the Nuclear Weapon States have chosen to ignore the authoritative, long-standing scientific research done by the climatologists, research that predicts virtually any nuclear war, fought with even a fraction of the operational and deployed nuclear arsenals, will leave the Earth essentially uninhabitable.