## 1

**Interpretation: The affirmative must defend an unconditional right of workers to strikes**

**Violation: They pick a subset that isn’t a worker but an employee.**

#### MBN 2021

(Market Business News,Market Business News is an online newspaper that specializes in publishing financial, economic, stock market, and business news articles on a daily basis, 2021, "What is a worker? Definition and examples," <https://marketbusinessnews.com/financial-glossary/worker/>LexPR )

We often use the two terms interchangeably. However, there are situations in which we can only use one term. For example, it would sound strange if we referred to a member of the board of directors as a worker. **If we had to choose between ‘worker’ and ’employee,’ most people would choose ‘employee’ when referring to a company director.**  **Legally, in most countries, an employee has entered into or works under the terms of a contract.** **Specifically, a contract of employment.** The contract does not necessarily have to be a written one. It may be an oral contract or even one what is implied by the nature of the relationship. According to the UK law firm FDA Law, to have **employee status**: **“1. An individual must be obliged to do the work personally (rather than being able to send a substitute).** 2. The employer needs to be obliged to provide the work and the employee is obliged to accept the work.” “3. The employer needs to have some control over the way the employee carries out the work.” **A worker has a ‘half-way house’ status between self-employed and employee. Legally, a worker is entitled to fewer statutory rights than an employee.**

#### Teachers are classified as employees,

(Paul Fulbrook, 8-1-2020, "Are Teachers Federal Employees?," TeacherOfSci, <https://teacherofsci.com/are-teachers-federal-employees/> )

Are Teachers Federal Employees? **Teachers that work in state-funded institutions are classified as state employees, not federal employees** because public schools fall within the jurisdiction of their individual states and receive the bulk of their funding through the state. Though the government does provide federal funding and grants to the educational sector, this is awarded to the whole of the sector or state rather than individual schools.

**Standards:**

**Limits – you explode limtis since you could functionally defend any agent gets the right to strike i.e. teachers, students, government officials, athletes, celebrities, etc.**

**Topic ed - you kill topic ed by forcing us to debate about fringe parts of the topic with minimal ground.**

**T first – scope, timeframe**

## 2

Interpretation: All AC spikes or preemptive theoretical framing issues/RoB must be read at the top of the affirmative’s case

Violation: They were at the bottom

Standards:

1. Strat skew: I can’t formulate my NC strategy until after the spikes are read because you could have several framing issues like 1AR theory paradigm, AFC, Theory incoherent, no neg fiat, or PICs bad. That moots 6 minutes of time I could be using to formulate an NC that best meets the spikes and engages with the aff. Stratskew key to recipricol fairness since you get to form your 1AR strat during my NC. Key to education since it leads to more specific clash with the aff.

Scrolling to the bottom of the doc doesn’t solve

1. Some ppl don’t flow off the doc
2. It forces me to miss the top part of the case while reading the underview

Fairness is a voter because the judge needs to evaluate the better debater

Education is a voter because it’s the only portable impact

Drop the debater to deter future abuse since it’s the most severe form of punishment

No RVIs 1) its illogical you don’t win by proving that you’re fair 2) encourages theory baiting where good theory debaters bait the RVI to win

Use competing interps it creates a race to the top where we set the best norms

**Nc theory first – aff abuse frames neg abuse, norming initiated before 1AR thoery**

## 3

**Interpretation: Arguments concerning the fairness of negative arguments may be read in the 1AR but not in the 1AC. To clarify, you can’t preemptive AC theory shells.**

**Violation: they read a shell**

**Standards:**

**[1] Strat Skew: A) No-Risk Issues: If I drop the spike in my NC because I genuinely don’t believe I link, the 1AR can make the most nonsensical violations that become no-risk voting issues for the aff, meaning at worst I lose if I mishandle one and at best I have to waste more time than it took you to spout out BS violations, which also trades off with substance education since that's time we don’t spend on substance, that outweighs since its about things that are actually relvant and not only specific to a highschool activity. B) Neg strat. I shouldn’t be afraid to run a given neg strat because of what you might make up in the 1AR. Spike theory arbitrarily limits out theory, counterplans, and NCs that are key to neg strategy. Unnecessary exclusion of positions is the biggest harm to fairness because it’s a 100% ground loss. Also means you set unpredictable limits on the topic.**

**Implication is to drop them and reject the shell – I need to be able to engage for the rest of the round fairly so act like they didn’t read their spikes and drop them to deter future abuse and set good norms.**

## 4

#### Global tech innovation high now.

Mercury News et al 6/4 [Mercury News and East Bay Times Editorial Boards, June 4, 2021, “Editorial: How America can Win the Global Tech War” <https://www.mercurynews.com/2021/06/04/editorial-why-silicon-valley-needs-endless-frontier-bill/> //gord0]

The nation that wins the global tech race will dominate the 21st century. This has been true since the 1800s. Given the rapid pace of innovation and tech’s impact on our economy and defense capabilities in the last decade, there is ample evidence to suggest that the need for investment in tech research and development has never been greater. China has been closing the tech gap in recent years by making bold investments in tech with the intent of overtaking the United States. This is a tech war we cannot afford to lose. It’s imperative that Congress pass the Endless Frontier Act and authorize the biggest R&D tech investment in the United States since the Apollo years. Rep. Ro Khanna, D-Santa Clara, made a massive increase in science and technology investment a major part of his platform while campaigning for a seat in Congress in 2016. Now the co-author of the 600-page legislation is on the cusp of pushing through a bipartisan effort that has been years in the making. Khanna and his co-authors, Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer, D-N.Y., Sen. Todd Young, R-Ind., and Rep. Mike Gallagher, R-Wisc., are shepherding the bill through the Senate, which is expected to approve it sometime later this month. That would set up a reconciliation debate between the House and Senate that would determine the bill’s final language. The ultimate size of the investment is still very much up in the air. Khanna would like Congress to authorize $100 billion over a five-year period for critical advancements in artificial intelligence, biotechnology, cybersecurity, semiconductors and other cutting-edge technologies. The Senate is talking of knocking that number down to $50 billion or $75 billion. They should be reminded of China Premier Li Keqiang’s March announcement that China would increase its research and development spending by an additional 7% per year between 2021 and 2025. The United States still outspends China in R&D, spending $612 billion on research and development in 2019, compared to China’s $514 billion. But the gap is narrowing. At the turn of the century, China was only spending $33 billion a year on R&D, while the United States was spending nearly 10 times that amount. The bill would authorize 10 technology hubs throughout the nation designed to help build the infrastructure, manufacturing facilities and workforce needed to help meet the nation’s tech goals. Building tech centers throughout the United States should also create more support for the industry across the country. Tech’s image has taken a beating in recent years — the emergence of the term “Big Tech” is hardly a positive development — and the industry will need all the support it can muster in Congress. The United States continues to have a crucial tech edge over its competitors, most notably China. The only way we can hope to win the 21st century is to make significant investments in research and development that will spark the next wave of innovation.

#### Violent strike efforts are increasing – they slow innovation, specifically in the tech sector.

Hanasoge 16 [Chaithra; Senior Research Analyst, Market Researcher, Consumer Insights, Strategy Consulting; “The Union Strikes: The Good, the Bad and the Ugly,” Supply Wisdom; April/June 2016 (Doesn’t specifically say but this is the most recent event is cites); <https://www.supplywisdom.com/resources/the-union-strikes-the-good-the-bad-and-the-ugly/>] Justin

The result: Verizon conceded to several of the workers’ demands including hiring union workers, protection against outsourcing of call-center jobs, and employee benefits such as salary hikes and higher pension contributions, among others and thus bringing an end to the strike in June.

The repercussion: The strike witnessed several instances of social disorder, violence and clashes, ultimately calling for third party intervention (Secretary of Labor – Thomas Perez) to initiate negotiations between the parties. Also, as a result of the strike, Verizon reported lower than expected revenues in the second quarter of 2016.

Trade unions/ labor unions aren’t just this millennia’s product and has been in vogue since times immemorial. Unions, to ensure fairness to the working class, have gone on strike for better working conditions and employee benefits since the industrial revolution and are as strong today as they were last century. With the advent of technology and advancement in artificial intelligence, machines are grabbing the jobs which were once the bastion of the humans. So, questions that arise here are, what relevance do unions have in today’s work scenario? And, are the strikes organized by them avoidable?

As long as the concept of labor exists and employees feel that they are not receiving their fair share of dues, unions will exist and thrive. Union protests in most cases cause work stoppages, and in certain cases, disruption of law and order. Like in March 2016, public servants at Federal Government departments across Australia went on a series of strikes over failed pay negotiations, disrupting operations of many government departments for a few days.  Besides such direct effects, there are many indirect effects as well such as strained employee relations, slower work processes, lesser productivity and unnecessary legal hassles.

Also, union strikes can never be taken too lightly as they have prompted major overturn of decisions, on a few occasions. Besides the Verizon incident that was a crucial example of this, nationwide strikes were witnessed in India in March and April this year when the national government introduced reforms related to the withdrawal regulations and interest rate of employee provident fund, terming it as ‘anti-working class’. This compelled the government to withhold the reform for further review. In France, strike against labor law reforms in May turned violent, resulting in riots and significant damage to property. The incident prompted the government to consider modifications to the proposed reforms.

However, aside from employee concerns, such incidents are also determined by a number of other factors such as the country’s political scenario, economy, size of the overall workforce and the unions, history of unionization, labor laws, and culture. For example, it is a popular saying that the French are always on strike as per tradition (although recent statistics indicate a decline in frequency). In a communist government like China, strikes have steadily risen in number. In 2015, China Labor Bulletin (CLB), a Hong Kong-based workers’ rights group recorded 2,700 incidents of strikes and protests, compared to 1,300 incidents in 2014. Most of them have stemmed out of failure by the government to respect the basic rights of employees and address labor concerns.

Interestingly, unions have not been able to gain a strong foothold in the IT-BPO industry. While many countries do have a separate union to represent workers from the sector, incidents of strikes like Verizon have been relatively low.  However, workplace regulations, in addition to other factors mentioned could be a trigger for such incidents, even if on a smaller scale. For example, a recent survey that interviewed several BPO employees in India revealed that while forming a union in the BPO sector was difficult, irksome workplace regulations such as constant surveillance, irregular timings and incentives have prompted employees to express their resentment in smaller ways such as corruption of internal servers and so on.  Such risks are further enhanced in a city like Kolkata, which carries a strong trade union culture.

#### Victories like the aff mobilizes unions in the IT sector.

Vynck et al 21 [Gerrit De; Carleton University, BA in Journalism and Global Politics, tech reporter for The Washington Post. He writes about Google and the algorithms that increasingly shape society. He previously covered tech for seven years at Bloomberg News; Nitashu Tiku; Columbia University, BA in English, New York University, MA in Journalism, Washington Post's tech culture reporter based in San Francisco; Macalester College, BA in English, Columbia University, MS in Journalism, reporter for The Washington Post who is focused on technology coverage in the Pacific Northwest; “Six things to know about the latest efforts to bring unions to Big Tech,” The Washington Post; <https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2021/01/26/tech-unions-explainer/>] Justin

In response to tech company crackdowns and lobbying, gig workers have shifted their strategy to emphasize building worker-led movements and increasing their ranks, rather than focusing on employment status as the primary goal, says Veena Dubal, a law professor at the University of California Hastings College of the Law in San Francisco. The hope is that with President Biden in the White House and an even split in the Senate, legislators will mobilize at the federal level, through the NLRA or bills such as the PRO Act, to recognize gig worker collectives as real unions.

#### Technological innovation solves every existential threat – which outweighs.

Matthews 18 Dylan. Co-founder of Vox, citing Nick Beckstead @ Rutgers University. 10-26-2018. "How to help people millions of years from now." Vox. https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/2018/10/26/18023366/far-future-effective-altruism-existential-risk-doing-good

If you care about improving human lives, you should overwhelmingly care about those quadrillions of lives rather than the comparatively small number of people alive today. The 7.6 billion people now living, after all, amount to less than 0.003 percent of the population that will live in the future. It’s reasonable to suggest that those quadrillions of future people have, accordingly, hundreds of thousands of times more moral weight than those of us living here today do. That’s the basic argument behind Nick Beckstead’s 2013 Rutgers philosophy dissertation, “On the overwhelming importance of shaping the far future.” It’s a glorious mindfuck of a thesis, not least because Beckstead shows very convincingly that this is a conclusion any plausible moral view would reach. It’s not just something that weird utilitarians have to deal with. And Beckstead, to his considerable credit, walks the walk on this. He works at the Open Philanthropy Project on grants relating to the far future and runs a charitable fund for donors who want to prioritize the far future. And arguments from him and others have turned “long-termism” into a very vibrant, important strand of the effective altruism community. But what does prioritizing the far future even mean? The most literal thing it could mean is preventing human extinction, to ensure that the species persists as long as possible. For the long-term-focused effective altruists I know, that typically means identifying concrete threats to humanity’s continued existence — like unfriendly artificial intelligence, or a pandemic, or global warming/out of control geoengineering — and engaging in activities to prevent that specific eventuality. But in a set of slides he made in 2013, Beckstead makes a compelling case that while that’s certainly part of what caring about the far future entails, approaches that address specific threats to humanity (which he calls “targeted” approaches to the far future) have to complement “broad” approaches, where instead of trying to predict what’s going to kill us all, you just generally try to keep civilization running as best it can, so that it is, as a whole, well-equipped to deal with potential extinction events in the future, not just in 2030 or 2040 but in 3500 or 95000 or even 37 million. In other words, caring about the far future doesn’t mean just paying attention to low-probability risks of total annihilation; it also means acting on pressing needs now. For example: We’re going to be better prepared to prevent extinction from AI or a supervirus or global warming if society as a whole makes a lot of scientific progress. And a significant bottleneck there is that the vast majority of humanity doesn’t get high-enough-quality education to engage in scientific research, if they want to, which reduces the odds that we have enough trained scientists to come up with the breakthroughs we need as a civilization to survive and thrive. So maybe one of the best things we can do for the far future is to improve school systems — here and now — to harness the group economist Raj Chetty calls “lost Einsteins” (potential innovators who are thwarted by poverty and inequality in rich countries) and, more importantly, the hundreds of millions of kids in developing countries dealing with even worse education systems than those in depressed communities in the rich world. What if living ethically for the far future means living ethically now? Beckstead mentions some other broad, or very broad, ideas (these are all his descriptions): Help make computers faster so that people everywhere can work more efficiently Change intellectual property law so that technological innovation can happen more quickly Advocate for open borders so that people from poorly governed countries can move to better-governed countries and be more productive Meta-research: improve incentives and norms in academic work to better advance human knowledge Improve education Advocate for political party X to make future people have values more like political party X ”If you look at these areas (economic growth and technological progress, access to information, individual capability, social coordination, motives) a lot of everyday good works contribute,” Beckstead writes. “An implication of this is that a lot of everyday good works are good from a broad perspective, even though hardly anyone thinks explicitly in terms of far future standards.” Look at those examples again: It’s just a list of what normal altruistically motivated people, not effective altruism folks, generally do. Charities in the US love talking about the lost opportunities for innovation that poverty creates. Lots of smart people who want to make a difference become scientists, or try to work as teachers or on improving education policy, and lord knows there are plenty of people who become political party operatives out of a conviction that the moral consequences of the party’s platform are good. All of which is to say: Maybe effective altruists aren’t that special, or at least maybe we don’t have access to that many specific and weird conclusions about how best to help the world. If the far future is what matters, and generally trying to make the world work better is among the best ways to help the far future, then effective altruism just becomes plain ol’ do-goodery.

## 5

#### Biden’s policies are continuing the US-Chinese trade war; however, agreements and deals are being made to end it.

Bradsher 21 Bradsher, Keith. “A Temporary U.S.-China Trade Truce Starts to Look Durable.” *The New York Times*, The New York Times, 27 May 2021, www.nytimes.com/2021/05/27/business/us-china-trade-deal.html. SJEP

SHANGHAI — Just days before the coronavirus shut down the [Chinese](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/05/29/health/us-china-mask-production.html) city of Wuhan and changed the world, the Trump administration and China [signed](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/01/15/business/economy/china-trade-deal.html) what both sides said would be only a temporary truce in their 18-month trade war. Since then, the pandemic has scrambled global priorities, international commerce has stalled and surged again and President Biden has taken office. But the truce endures — and now appears to be setting new, lasting ground rules for global trade. The agreement didn’t stop many of the same practices that sparked the trade war, the biggest in history. It does nothing to prevent China from throwing huge subsidies at a range of industries — from electric cars to jetliners to computer chips — that could shape the future, but for which the country often relies heavily on American technology. In return, the truce left in place most of the tariffs that the Trump administration imposed on $360 billion a year in Chinese-made goods, many of them subsidized. Such unilateral moves run counter to the spirit of the rules of global trade, which were set up to stop nations from starting economic conflicts on their own and to keep them from spiraling out of control. But the new model seems to be catching on. The European Union announced on May 5 that it was drafting legislation that would allow it to [broadly penalize imports and investments](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/QANDA_21_1984) from subsidized industries overseas. E.U. officials, who had initially [looked askance at the U.S.-China truce](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/01/23/business/economy/china-us-trade-deal-allies.html), said their policy was not aimed specifically at China. But trade experts were quick to note that no other exporter has the scale of manufacturing and breadth of subsidies that China has. “You see a real appetite in the U.S. but also in the E.U. for unilateral measures,” said Timothy Meyer, a former State Department lawyer who is now a professor at Vanderbilt Law School. The truce, known as the Phase 1 agreement, could still be supplanted by a new deal. The agreement requires that the two sides conduct a high-level review of it this summer. On Wednesday in Washington, Katherine Tai, the United States trade representative, held an introductory call with a senior Chinese official, Vice Premier Liu He — a signal that Mr. Liu, the same top negotiator who squared off against the Trump administration, will be kept in place by China. But prospects for a far-reaching new deal this year are slim. The Biden administration is drafting a comprehensive strategy toward China, a complex interagency procedure that could last into early next year. It has also shown little appetite for easing up on China’s trade practices, and it has publicly discussed smoothing ties with European and other allies that were ruffled by other disputes during the Trump administration. “We welcome the competition,” Ms. Tai [told lawmakers](https://www.finance.senate.gov/hearings/the-presidents-2021-trade-policy-agenda) earlier this month. “But the competition must be fair, and if China cannot or will not adapt to international rules and norms, we must be bold and creative in taking steps to level the playing field and enhance our own capabilities and partnerships.”

#### The plan will cause an increase in jobs outsourced to China. South Africa proves.

Maré 17 Maré, Arnoux. “How Staff Outsourcing Can Help Avoid Wage Strikes.” *Innovative Staffing Solutions*, 12 Sept. 2017, innovativestaff.net/staff-outsourcing-can-help-avoid-wage-strikes/. SJEP

Strike action is so destructive to a business’ operations, it comes as no surprise that organisations are willing to go to extremes to avoid such devastation. It was recently announced that government and labour and business agreed to a package of labour market reform which will see R20/hour as the minimum wage. This arguably provides more benefits to the labour movement than it does to business. However, this is the price business is willing to pay to reduce labour market tension. The South African government, business, community sector and the labour federations represented at Nedlac signed the agreement earlier this year in Cape Town. The agreement came in the wake of years of destructive labour unrest, particularly in the mining industry, which wreaked untold damage on the economy and on job creation. Faced with the option of paying a wage that many businesses really cannot afford, or alternatively risking their entire business destroyed by prolonged strike activity, Nedlac opted for the former. Nonetheless, individual companies may feel they cannot afford that leap in their wage bill. However, strikes at a local level could be avoided in other ways. Strike action typically doesn’t happen from any principled stance by either labour or business, but because the situation is not anticipated or managed and simply drifts out of control. A viable solution to eliminating the strike factor is by outsourcing your staff. We employ more than 6,000 staff whom we contract out to various clients, and in our experience, if you take care of your staff they will take care of you. It also makes the commitment that should there ever be a strike, alternative staff are put on site at the client to ensure its operations are not affected. South Africa’s economy has become an extremely competitive one, and losing business through a strike is a serious blow. While some companies are strong enough to survive the damage, they may still lose market share. Weaker businesses could go under as a result of industrial action. It is not just its client companies that benefit, but also the workers who often in the past found themselves embroiled in strike action against their will due to union pressure. This takes as great a financial toll on the lives of staff as it does on the company, as employees are not paid for the days they are on strike. In fact, a prolonged strike may also mean striking workers never truly recover financially. The labour agreement also introduces secret strike balloting, advisory arbitration and agreed standards of conduct during industrial action (including by the police and private security companies) and this is a step in the right direction which should reduce the propensity for violence and the length of strikes. This is going to become the higher priority, if the Nedlac deal achieves its aim of reducing strike activity. The price tag for securing labour’s co-operation was steep: it is estimated that R20/hour (R3,500/month for a 40-hour week) national minimum wage will raise wages across nearly half of South Africa’s businesses. Many small businesses are panicking that it will put them out of business. Staff outsourcing is an option they should consider as it can save a business up to 60% in operational costs instead of letting things drift until they inevitably are forced to close their doors.

#### The trade war has already weakened China’s economy.

Wallace 19 Wallace, Charles. “Trade War Hurting China's Economy.” *Forbes*, Forbes Magazine, 9 Aug. 2019, www.forbes.com/sites/charleswallace1/2019/08/09/trade-war-hurting-chinas-economy/?sh=1528d6694035. SJEP

New signs emerged Friday that President Trump’s tariffs on Chinese exports are beginning to seriously impact the overall Chinese economy. [The Chinese government reported that exports to the U.S. in July fell by 6.5%.](https://www.scmp.com/economy/china-economy/article/3022013/chinas-us-trade-slumps-again-exports-rise-due-higher-demand)It was the second month after Trump increased tariffs on $250 billion worth of Chinese goods to 25%. Imports from the U.S.. Also fell by 19.1%. Perhaps more alarming, the[country’s producer price index turned negative, falling 0.3% from flat levels in the previous month. It was the first time the PPI has been negative in three years.](https://www.scmp.com/economy/china-economy/article/3022075/us-trade-war-drives-chinas-producer-prices-deflation-pork) Analysts say that the trade war with the U.S. Is forcing Chinese factories to sell their wares to wholesalers at a discount. Another key indicator, the manufacturing purchasing managers’ index (PMI) – which measures factory owner sentiment, registered 49.7 in July. Although this was slightly above June’s levels, a reading below 50 is a sign that the industrial sector is still contracting. The country’s National Bureau of Statistics reported Friday that the means of production – capital goods like machinery – fell by 0.7 % in the month. Trump has expressed hope that the declines in the Chinese economy will force the Beijing government to agree to terms of a new trade agreement when the two sides next meet in September. But the Chinese have accused the U.S. of instigating unrest in Hong Kong and allowed their currency, the renminbi, to fall in value against the U.S. dollar, signs that relations are worsening rather than improving.

#### A greater outsourcing of jobs to China will levy additional tariffs crippling China’s economy.

Gereffi 21 Gereffi, Gary, and Joonkoo Lee and [Hyun-Chin Lim](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#auth-Hyun_Chin-Lim) . “Trade Policies, Firm Strategies, and Adaptive Reconfigurations of Global Value Chains.” Journal of International Business Policy, Palgrave Macmillan UK, 16 Mar. 2021, link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z. SJEP

Since his inauguration in January 2017, U.S. President Donald Trump and his administration have imposed various trade restrictions against a host of countries, including its allies.1 The protectionist moves culminated in a U.S. trade conflict with China, which started in early 2018 and featured U.S. tariff hikes on imports from China and an American trade ban against Huawei, the Chinese electronics and telecom giant, over national security concerns and China’s retaliatory counter-tariffs. Despite a first-phase deal in January 2020, many contentious issues are largely unresolved (Swanson & Rapperport, [2020](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#ref-CR83)), and the stand-off between the two countries has intensified amid the COVID-19 pandemic (Rudd, [2020](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#ref-CR74)). The trade war is notable not only because it involves the world’s two largest economies tightly connected through GVCs, but also because GVCs continued to expand in recent decades amidst lowered trade barriers and a rules-based regime under the World Trade Organization (WTO), which provided predictability in trade and investment (Azmeh, [2019](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#ref-CR2); Fajgelbaum, Goldberg, Kennedy & Khandelwal, [2020](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#ref-CR26)). Now, the tide is apparently turning in the opposite direction, raising the specter of the shrinkage, if not demise, of GVCs (Chor, [2019](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#ref-CR17)). However, given the prevalence of GVCs nowadays, the impacts of trade restrictions can be different from those in the pre-GVC world, and some measures can have unintended consequences (Bellora & Fontagné, [2019](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#ref-CR7); Blanchard, [2019](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#ref-CR9)). In the GVC world, diverse trade patterns other than a simple bilateral exchange of final goods exist, and trade is intertwined with foreign direct investment (FDI) and outsourcing (UNCTAD, [2013](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#ref-CR86); Head & Mayer, [2019](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#ref-CR50)). As a result, the effect of trade restrictions can be amplified beyond the two disputing partners or the targeted final products. For instance, when U.S. or third-country firms outsource to or invest in China in order to export to the U.S., they are immediately exposed to the U.S. restrictions against China. Thus, higher U.S. import tariffs penalize many non-Chinese firms (including American ones) that use China as a sourcing location where imported inputs are assembled for export to the U.S, as in the case of Apple’s iPhone.2 At the same time, higher tariffs on imported intermediate goods from China can hurt U.S. domestic firms using these inputs. Tesla, an American electric vehicle company, uses imported parts from China, and higher U.S. tariffs will drive up its U.S. production costs (Matousek, [2018](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#ref-CR63)). Furthermore, because “not all imports are equal” (Gereffi, [2018b](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#ref-CR39): 436), the impact and magnitude of trade restrictions are highly specific and vary not only by sector (Erken, Giesbergen & Nauta, [2019](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#ref-CR25)) as well as over time, but also by the type of GVC linkages a country or firm is involved in (Gereffi, Humphrey & Sturgeon, [2005](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#ref-CR43); Van Assche & Gangnes, [2019](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#ref-CR89)). Thus, it is increasingly difficult to pinpoint the winners and losers of trade policies because they are not always straightforward in a GVC world. The gains and losses depend not only on a country’s or firm’s engagement with its target market, but also the way it is involved in GVCs through third countries and the time period involved.

#### An economically weak China leads to diversionary war– it escalates.

Hassid, PhD, 19

(Jonathan, PoliSci@Berkeley, AssistProfPoliSci@IowaState, A Poor China Might Be More Dangerous Than a Rich China, in Foreign Policy Issues for America, ed. Richard Mansbach DPhil and James McCormick PhD, Routledge)

China has a number of political differences and potential conflicts with the United States, some of which are summarized in Chapter 4. From China’s vast maritime territorial claims, the anomalous status of Taiwan to America’s alliances with Japan and South Korea, its treatment of Tibetans and Islamic minorities like the Uighurs, and its reluctance to implement UN-sponsored sanctions to force North Korea to abandon nuclear weapons, there are many potential flash points in the Sino-U.S. relationship. Many analysts noted that at the 19th Party Congress Xi Jinping promoted a more aggressive and muscular foreign policy, promising that China would become a world superpower by 2050. This fact alone could presage eventual conflict with the current reigning superpower, the United States. Indeed, many in China and across Asia feel that President Trump’s pullout from the U.S.-led Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) have already signaled US retreat from the region, opening the way for a more assertive Chinese foreign policy. Some analysts go further, arguing that China is even now trying to build its own world order and muscle out U.S. trade influence by signing new bilateral trade agreements with historical U.S. allies like Canada. These signs may point to potential conflict in the future. However there is also reason to be hopeful; relations between the two giants were normalized in the 1970s, and thus far China and the United States have avoided serious conflict. In part this has been a result of U.S. policies in the region and because China has been able to increase its global status peacefully. But perhaps the most important reason conflict has been avoided is because Beijing has looked inwardly, concentrating on generating economic growth within its borders rather than making trouble beyond them. President Donald Trump has repeatedly argued that the United States must be more assertive in foreign affairs and in realizing its national interest regardless of the impact on others. His rhetoric has been highly combative. From vowing to declare China a “currency manipulator” on his first day in office – a claim he has since abandoned – to arguing that China has been cheating America in trade deals and denouncing the U.S. trade deficit with China, Trump has appeared to prefer confronting Beijing rather in engaging and cooperating with China. But this appearance of confrontation may belie a different reality. Many have noted that Trump and his family have personal business ties with China, including large investments and numerous pending trademark applications. Actions like Trump’s 2018 public support for state-owned Chinese tech company ZTE – coming just two days after the Chinese government announced a US $500m investment in a Trump-branded property in Indonesiaiii – further suggest to some that Beijing might be directly manipulating the US president to benefit Chinese foreign policy. Combined with the perception, common in Chinese official circles, that the United States under Trump is actually retreating from its commitments in Asia, the result might be additional areas of potential conflict with China and misperception and misunderstanding between the two. What might happen if there were an unintended Sino-American military confrontation in the South China Sea or the Sea of Japan, just as the Chinese economy slumps and triggers spreading labor unrest and disturbances at home? What might happen if Xi Jinping’s goal of having “no poverty in China by 2020” proves impossible, and China’s middle class becomes alienated from the regime and political dissent spreads owing to acute economic and/or environmental distress? Under such circumstances, China’s history suggests that Xi and other leaders might decide a “minor” foreign conflict would be a way to divert the attention of Chinese citizens from their domestic concerns. In China’s past, as we have seen, such “domestically-influenced” conflicts have been contained, but the very success of these previously limited conflicts might make Chinese leaders overconfident about their ability to avoid military escalation. Mistakes are easy to make, especially if the potential foe has a leader who tweets militant threats. If Beijing sought to distract an unhappy population by stirring up Chinese nationalism toward the United States, Taiwan, or Japan regarding maritime territorial claims, for example, and believes the Trump administration will not intervene, the two might careen toward a war that neither wants. An incident caused by a trigger-happy U.S. pilot or Chinese naval officer might escalate into a war that neither Washington nor Beijing sought. In the end, then, it may arguably better for the Trump administration that China continues to flourish economically. A prosperous China means that the United States has a valuable trading partner and – in certain issues – even a strategic partner. An impoverished China, however, might be bad news for everyone.

#### Even a limited nuclear war would cause extinction – best science.

Cribb 17 (Julian, BA Classics@WesternAusstralia, FoundingEditor@ScienceAlert, Surviving the 21st Century, Springer)

The most publicised horrors of nuclear war, over the past half-century, were blast damage, fi reball burns and radiation sickness, as they were in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, leading to a perception that those well away from target areas might be spared. Scientists however demur, arguing that the biggest killer of all is likely to be a ‘ nuclear winter ’ , triggered by the immense quantities of dust and smoke from burning cities and forests lofted into the upper atmosphere, and the simultaneous stripping of the Earth’s protective ozone layer: “In the aftermath… vast areas of the earth could be subjected to prolonged darkness, abnormally low temperatures, violent windstorms, toxic smog and persistent radioactive fallout.” This would be compounded by the collapse of farming and food production, transport, energy grids, healthcare, sanitation and central government. Even in regions remote from the actual blasts people would starve, die from freezing temperatures as much as 30 °C below normal, from radiation sickness and a pandemic of skin cancers, pollution and loss of immunity to ordinary diseases. The nuclear winter is in effect the antithesis of global warming, a shock cooling of the entire planet, but one lasting several years only. However, “A number of biologists contend the extinction of many species … - including the human species— is a real possibility,” they say (Turco et al. 2012 ). In the 1980s a group of courageous scientists 1 alerted the leaders of both the US and Russia to the dangers of a nuclear winter. In an atomic war, they warned, there will be no winners. Th en-Soviet president Mikhail Gorbachev took their counsel to heart: “Models made by Russian and American scientists showed that a nuclear war would result in a nuclear winter that would be extremely destructive to all life on Earth; the knowledge of that was a great stimulus to us, to people of honor and morality, to act in that situation,” he subsequently related (Hertsgard 2000 ). US President Ronald Reagan concurred: “A nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought,” he said in his State of the Union Address in 1984 (Reagan 1984 ). Marking this watershed moment in history Al Gore recounted in his Nobel Prize oration in 2007 “More than two decades ago, scientists calculated that nuclear war could throw so much debris and smoke into the air that it would block life- giving sunlight from our atmosphere, causing a ‘nuclear winter.’ Th eir eloquent warnings here in Oslo helped galvanize the world’s resolve to halt the nuclear arms race.” How large a nuclear release is required to precipitate a nuclear winter is still subject to technical debate, but with the greatly improved models developed for climate science, recent estimates suggest as few as 50 Hiroshima-sized bombs (15 kilotonnes each) would do it—or the use of only one weapon in every 200 from the global nuclear arsenal