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### 1NC – AT: COVID

**1] Presumption –**

**A] Plan says nothing about a waiver but their advantage is about a waiver – They haven’t read any ev a reduction entails a waiver**

**B] Aff ev is about vaccines, but the plan says medicines, which doesn’t cover vaccines**

Elbe 10 [Stefan Elbe, director of the Centre for Global Health Policy and a professor of international relations at the University of Sussex. "Security and Global Health," ISBN 0745643744, accessed 8-10-2021, https://www.wiley.com/en-ee/Security+and+Global+Health-p-9780745643731]

Yet here too we must be careful not to overlook other types of medical intervention simultaneously pursued by the 'social' arm of modern medicine at the population level. Vaccines in particular continue to be particularly important medical interventions that repeatedly surface in a variety of different health security delib- erations. Strictly speaking, vaccines are not medicines because they consist of small concentrations of disease-causing microbes (or their derivatives) used to enhance a person's immuno-response to a future infection. As a public health measure, vaccines have therefore also been largely sidelined in the existing medicalization literature. Yet, generally speaking, vaccines too can be considered as medical inter- ventions. That is certainly how the World Health Organization views them, pointing out that 'vaccines are among the most important medical interventions for reducing illness and deaths' available today (WHO 2009a). Whereas pills and other therapies mark the tools of clinical medicine, vaccines play a crucial part in the arsenal of 'social' medicine and public health. Developing and rolling out of new vaccines against a range of current (and future) diseases therefore represents further evidence of how the rise of health security is also encouraging security to be practised through the introduction of new medical interventions in society.

**Vaccines are different from medicines in the context of intellectual property**

Garrison 04 [Christopher Garrison, Consultant Legal Advisor to WHO. "Intellectual Property Rights and Vaccines in Developing countries," 04-13-2004, accessed 9-2-2021, https://www.who.int/intellectualproperty/events/en/Background\_paper.pdf?ua=1]

In the last few years, there has been a substantial debate about how intellectual property impacts medicines and in particular how the TRIPS Agreement impacts access to medicines in the developing world. Vaccines are different from medicines in a number of important respects however (at least from the small molecule ‘pill’ medicines if not the newer ‘biotech’ medicines). The issues raised in the access to medicines debate may therefore apply to a greater or lesser extent for vaccines, depending on these differences. This section examines a few of the different forms of intellectual property rights that are relevant in the context of vaccines and outlines the impact of some of the differences between vaccines and medicines.

#### 2] Waiver doesn’t solve – COVID vaccines require technical knowledge, financial investment, and training – At best, aff has a 10% chance of solvency in 11 years

Hotez et al. 5/10 [ PETER J. HOTEZ is Dean of the National School of Tropical Medicine and Co-Director of Texas Children’s Hospital Center for Vaccine Development at Baylor College of Medicine. He served as U.S. Science Envoy for vaccine diplomacy during the Obama administration. MARIA ELENA BOTTAZZI is Associate Dean of the National School of Tropical Medicine and Co-Director of Texas Children’s Hospital Center for Vaccine Development at Baylor College of Medicine. PRASHANT YADAV is a Senior Fellow at the Center for Global Development, Affiliate Professor at INSEAD, and Lecturer at Harvard Medical School. May 10, 2021, “Producing a Vaccine Requires More Than a Patent,” Foreign Affairs, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2021-05-10/producing-vaccine-requires-more-patent//lhs-ap>]

Intellectual property sharing may be helpful in the long term. But producing complicated biologics, especially innovative ones such as mRNA or adenovirus-vectored vaccines, is not solely a matter of patent access. Small-molecule antiviral drugs are comparatively straightforward: the multistep chemical processes through which they are synthesized are often fully detailed in published patents or scientific papers. Chemists and formulation experts can often synthesize and scale up production just from knowing the drug structure. But vaccines are different. Producing and manufacturing lipid-encased mRNA molecules, recombinant adenoviruses, or even the proteins or whole inactivated viruses used in older-generation vaccines requires a far higher level of sophistication than is needed for producing small-molecule drugs. Moreover, vaccine production must meet stringent requirements for quality control, quality assurance, and regulatory oversight.

The effective transfer of such complex technology requires a receiving ecosystem that can take years, sometimes decades, to build. Countries seeking to ramp up vaccine production will need to train staff scientists and technicians. They will also need scientific administrators versed not only in basic research and development but also in detailed record keeping, including specific documentation practices such as batch production records. Moreover, they will need strong quality control systems and regulatory guardrails. Building such an infrastructure requires intensive training and often considerable financial investment and risk. It also takes time—by some estimates, vaccine development requires at least 11 years, and even then the probability that such efforts will result in bringing a vaccine to market is less than ten percent. Consider that the COVID-19 vaccines were themselves the outcome of decades of research and development. Few nations are prepared to take such risks.

Only a handful of low- or middle-income countries currently have the capacity to produce new vaccines. The most notable and largest is India, which currently makes the adenovirus-vectored vaccines developed by Janssen and by Oxford and AstraZeneca, as well as an older-technology recombinant protein vaccine and a whole inactivated virus vaccine. Manufacturers in Brazil, Cuba, and some Southeast Asian countries have experience producing childhood vaccines and may be able to develop the capacity to make COVID-19 vaccines as well. Other possibilities may develop elsewhere, including in the Middle East and Africa. But in the near term, such manufacturers will require financing, access to very large amounts of raw materials and supplies (possibly including relaxation of export controls), and some technical expertise in manufacturing and quality control if they are to produce the existing vaccines against COVID-19.

Vaccinating India alone will require almost two billion doses, and more than 12 billion doses will be required to vaccinate the world. The emergence of new variants and the need for booster doses may increase demand even further. Whether mRNA vaccine technology can be scaled to produce billions of doses in 2021, or even by early 2022, remains entirely unknown, but the goal is worth pursuing. To this end, some kind of patent relaxation may be necessary, but far from sufficient. Would-be producers will need technical know-how, regulatory controls, and components that are currently in very short supply, such as nucleotides and lipids.

#### 3] Shifting production is counterproductive and wastes scarce resources

Lowe 5/6 [Derek Lowe, an Arkansan by birth, got his BA from Hendrix College and his PhD in organic chemistry from Duke before spending time in Germany on a Humboldt Fellowship on his post-doc. He’s worked for several major pharmaceutical companies since 1989 on drug discovery projects against schizophrenia, Alzheimer’s, diabetes, osteoporosis and other diseases. 6 May, 2021, “Waiving IP,” In the Pipeline, https://blogs.sciencemag.org/pipeline/archives/2021/05/06/waiving-ip//lhs-ap]

I’ve gone over these other problems before, but here’s a brief summary of those – not in any order, because it’s difficult to rank them and those ranks change. An obvious first problem is hardware: you need specific sorts of cell culture tanks for the adenovirus vaccines, and the right kind of filtration apparatus for both the mRNA and adenovirus ones. You also need specialized mixing equipment for the formation of the mRNA lipid nanoparticles. A good proportion of the world’s supply of such hardware is already producing the vaccines, to the best of my knowledge. Second, you need some key consumable equipment to go along with the hardware. Cell culture bags have been a limiting step for the Novavax subunit vaccine, as have the actual filtration membranes needed for it and others. These are not in short supply because of patents, and waiving vaccine patents will not make them appear. Third, you need some key reagents. Among others, there’s an “end-capping” enzyme that has been a supply constraint, and there are the lipids needed for the mRNA nanoparticles, for those two vaccines. Those lipids are indeed proprietary, but their synthesis is also subject to physical constraints that have nothing to do with patent rights, such as the availability of the ultimate starting materials. Supplies have been increasing via the tried and true method of offering people money to make more, but switching over equipment and getting the synthesis to work within acceptable QC is not as fast a process as you might imagine. Fourth, for all these processes, there is a shortage of actual people to make the tech transfer work. For most reasonably complicated processes, it helps a great deal to have experienced people come out and troubleshoot, because the number of tiny things that can go wrong is not easy to quantify. Moderna, for one, has said that a limiting factor in their tech-transfer efforts is that they simply do not have enough trained people to go around. And keep in mind that these all have to do with producing a stream of liquid vaccine solution – but you need what the industry calls “fill-and-finish” capacity to deal with it after that. Filling and capping sterile vials for injection is a specialized business and the great majority of large-scale capacity is already being used for the existing vaccines. Time and money will fix that, and has been, but waiving vaccine patents won’t.

Short Term Versus Long Term Supply

The mention of scale deserves some comment. We need to vaccinate billions of people around the world – no argument there. But that means that if you’re working under the constraints above, your time and effort are best spent on the largest capacity manufacturing efforts available. I believe that the majority of these are already enlisted in the vaccine production efforts, though, both in the production and fill-and-finish areas. I have seen people talking about how now every country will be able to produce its own vaccines, but that’s not a feasible or useful idea. Most countries do not have industrial cell culture capacity or sterile fill-and-finish lines, and trying to start them from scratch is not a good use of the time, money, and effort. It would be like deciding that Switzerland needs to be self-sufficient in sushi.

Look at a part of pharma world that (while it has its technical aspects, for sure) is much less demanding than vaccines, the production of small-molecule generic drugs. The chemical matter involved is off-patent, and nonpatented routes are available for them. But the great majority of these drugs are still made in a handful of countries, and if you trace the starting material supply chains back, the list of countries and suppliers narrow still more. As with most industries, you find yourself going back to the people with the expertise and equipment to produce things on large scale.

As mentioned several times during the above, these supply problems are all fixable. Indeed, many of them are already greatly improved compared to the situation a few months ago. But from what I can see, none of this fixing would have been aided by waiving the patent rights to the vaccines themselves at some earlier date. The supply of vaccines has been increasing, and would continue to increase without the patent waiver idea. The constraints are physical ones, supply chains and engineering ones, not legal.

We actually have some proof of this already. As others have noted, Moderna announced last October that they would not enforce any of their own patents on the production of the vaccine. But this has not led, as far as I can tell, to any non-Moderna production of it, or even the announcement that anyone is thinking about it. A more cynical person than I am – they exist – might conclude that Moderna knew this full well when they made their announcement, but in either case, this situation largely obtains because of the constraints above.

#### 4] Waiver worsens covid variants by disincentivizing innovation

Bishwal 5/5 [Eva Bishwal is a Senior Associate in the litigation and enforcement team at Fidus Law Chambers. She is a graduate of the Symbiosis Law School, Noida. Her areas of practice include trademark litigation, anti-counterfeiting actions, domain disputes, copyright litigation, designs litigation and trade secrets litigation. She regularly appears before the Delhi High Court and Delhi district courts, and coordinates matters in several courts across the country. May 5, 2021, “Indian Vaccine Economics: IP Rights are Not the Real Villain in India’s COVID-19 Emergency,” IP Watchdog, www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/05/05/indian-vaccine-economics-ip-rights-not-real-villain-indias-covid-19-emergency/id=133134//lhs-ap]

The idea behind patent waiver is to take away control over manufacture and pricing from private entities and equip the governments to produce as per demand. However, critics of patent waiver argue that the waiver hinders expansion and production by private entities, as they miss out on their incentive to invest in R&D and production. This is particularly relevant in the case of the COVID-19 vaccines, where the healthcare systems are entirely dependent on the ingenuity of private entities. Given that there are reports that the vaccine may require periodic “tweaking” due to the mutations, it is crucial that the private entities are equipped and motivated to continually invest in R&D.

#### Either vaccines are effective, so no extinction cuz the vaccinated survive OR they’re ineffective and extinction is irrelevant regardless of vaccine production

#### 5] Infectious diseases don’t cause extinction

Owen Cotton-Barratt 17, et al, PhD in Pure Mathematics, Oxford, Lecturer in Mathematics at Oxford, Research Associate at the Future of Humanity Institute, 2/3/2017, Existential Risk: Diplomacy and Governance, https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Existential-Risks-2017-01-23.pdf

For most of human history, natural pandemics have posed the greatest risk of mass global fatalities.37 However, there are some reasons to believe that natural pandemics are very unlikely to cause human extinction. Analysis of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) red list database has shown that of the 833 recorded plant and animal species extinctions known to have occurred since 1500, less than 4% (31 species) were ascribed to infectious disease.38 None of the mammals and amphibians on this list were globally dispersed, and other factors aside from infectious disease also contributed to their extinction. It therefore seems that our own species, which is very numerous, globally dispersed, and capable of a rational response to problems, is very unlikely to be killed off by a natural pandemic.

One underlying explanation for this is that highly lethal pathogens can kill their hosts before they have a chance to spread, so there is a selective pressure for pathogens not to be highly lethal. Therefore, pathogens are likely to co-evolve with their hosts rather than kill all possible hosts.39

#### 6] [No](https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2016/06/infectious-diseases-extinction/487514/) extinction---resilient and current infrastructure solves.

Adalja 16. (Amesh Adalja is an infectious-disease physician at the University of Pittsburgh. Why Hasn't Disease Wiped out the Human Race? June 17, 2016. https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2016/06/infectious-diseases-extinction/487514/)

In other words, no, I wasn’t worried—and not because I have a rosy outlook on infectious diseases. I’m well-aware of the damage these diseases are causing around the world: HIV, malaria, tuberculosis; the influenza pandemic that took the world by surprise in 2009; the anti-vaccine movement bumping cases of measles to an all-time post-vaccine-era high; antibiotic-resistant bacteria threatening to collapse the entire structure of modern medicine—all these, like Ebola, are continuously placing an enormous number of lives at risk. But when people ask me if I’m worried about infectious diseases, they’re often not asking about the threat to human lives; they’re asking about the threat to human life. With each outbreak of a headline-grabbing emerging infectious disease comes a fear of extinction itself. The fear envisions a large proportion of humans succumbing to infection, leaving no survivors or so few that the species can’t be sustained. I’m not afraid of this apocalyptic scenario, but I do understand the impulse. **Worry about the end is a quintessentially human trait. Thankfully, so is our** resilience. For most of mankind’s history, infectious diseases were the existential threat to humanity—and for good reason. They were quite successful at killing people: The 6th century’s Plague of Justinian knocked out an estimated 17 percent of the world’s population; the 14th century Black Death decimated a third of Europe; the 1918 influenza pandemic killed 5 percent of the world; malaria is estimated to have killed half of all humans who have ever lived. **Any yet, of course, humanity continued to flourish**. Our species’ recent explosion in lifespan is almost exclusively the result of the control of infectious diseases through sanitation, vaccination, and antimicrobial therapies. Only in the modern era, in which many infectious diseases have been tamed in the industrial world, do people have the luxury of death from cancer, heart disease, or stroke in the 8th decade of life. Childhoods are free from watching siblings and friends die from outbreaks of typhoid, scarlet fever, smallpox, measles, and the like. So what would it take for a disease to wipe out humanity now? In Michael Crichton’s The Andromeda Strain, the canonical book in the disease-outbreak genre, an alien microbe threatens the human race with extinction, and humanity’s best minds are marshaled to combat the enemy organism. Fortunately, outside of fiction, there’s no reason to expect alien pathogens to wage war on the human race any time soon, and my analysis suggests that any real-life domestic microbe reaching an extinction level of threat probably is just as unlikely. Any apocalyptic pathogen would need to possess a very special combination of two attributes. First, it would have to be so unfamiliar that no existing therapy or vaccine could be applied to it. Second, it would need to have a high and surreptitious transmissibility before symptoms occur. The first is essential because any microbe from a known class of pathogens would, by definition, have family members that could serve as models for containment and countermeasures. The second would allow the hypothetical disease to spread without being detected by even the most astute clinicians. The three infectious diseases most likely to be considered extinction-level threats in the world today—influenza, HIV, and Ebola—don’t meet these two requirements. Influenza, for instance, despite its well-established ability to kill on a large scale, its contagiousness, and its unrivaled ability to shift and drift away from our vaccines, is still what I would call a “known unknown.” While there are many mysteries about how new flu strains emerge, from at least the time of Hippocrates, humans have been attuned to its risk. And in the modern era, **a full-fledged industry of influenza preparedness exists, with effective vaccine strategies and antiviral therapies.** HIV, which has killed 39 million people over several decades, is similarly limited due to several factors. Most importantly, HIV’s dependency on blood and body fluid for transmission (similar to Ebola) requires intimate human-to-human contact, which limits contagion. Highly potent antiviral therapy allows most people to live normally with the disease, and a substantial group of the population has genetic mutations that render them impervious to infection in the first place. Lastly, simple prevention strategies such as needle exchange for injection drug users and barrier contraceptives—when available—can curtail transmission risk. Ebola, for many of the same reasons as HIV as well as several others, also falls short of the mark. This is especially due to the fact that it spreads almost exclusively through people with easily recognizable symptoms, plus the taming of its once unfathomable 90 percent mortality rate by simple supportive care. Beyond those three, **every other known disease falls short of what seems required to wipe out humans**—which is, of course, why we’re still here. And it’s not that diseases are ineffective. On the contrary, diseases’ failure to knock us out is a testament to just how resilient humans are. Part of our evolutionary heritage is our immune system, one of the most complex on the planet, even without the benefit of vaccines or the helping hand of antimicrobial drugs**. This system**, when viewed at a species level, **can adapt to** almost **any enemy imaginable**. Coupled to genetic variations amongst humans—which open up the possibility for a range of advantages, from imperviousness to infection to a tendency for mild symptoms—this adaptability ensures that almost any infectious disease onslaught will leave a large proportion of the population alive to rebuild, in contrast to the fictional Hollywood versions.

### 1NC – AT: WTO

#### 1 – Capitalist peace is wrong -- interdependence multiplies the risk of war.

Lucas Hahn 16. Bryant University. April, 2016. Global Economic Expansion and the Prevalence of Militarized Interstate Disputes. <https://digitalcommons.bryant.edu/honors_economics/24/> brett \*MIDs = Militarized Interstate Disputes

3. Neo-Marxist Views on Asymmetrical Trade One of the most supported arguments against the notion that economic expansion promotes peace is that trade, brought about by economic expansion, actually increases MIDs. Many authors have in fact argued that increased economic interdependence and increased trade may have, in some ways, “cheapened war”, and thus made it easier to wage war more frequently (Harrison and Nikolaus 2012). Neo-Marxists and Dependency Theorists argue that the notion that trade promotes peace often depends on the balance of trade between two nations with a trading relationship. If the two nations have a symmetrical trading relationship, then both nations benefit from trade equally and may thus, engage in less conflict just as proposed by many liberal theorists. However, more often than not, the trading relationship between two nations may be asymmetrical. In this case, one nation benefits more than the other. Furthermore, one nation is often more dependent on trade with its partner than the partner is with it. These circumstances can breed violent conflicts (Barbieri and Schneider 1999). Barbieri’s (1996, 40) regression analyses have supported these claims. She found that when dyads (pairs of nation-states) are highly interdependent, they are nearly 25 times more likely to engage in armed conflict than when the dyads are not interdependent. Ultimately, she came to the conclusion that there seems to be a “hurdle effect”. Up to a point trade does seem to promote peace. However, after that point, the balance of trade often becomes disproportionate between two nations and as a result trade promotes conflict.

#### 2 – Interdependence especially through the EU and WTO fuels populism

Milner 21 [Helen V. Milner is the B.C. Forbes Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University and the director of the Niehaus Center for Globalization and Governance. She is the president of the International Studies Association (2020–2021). “Is Global Capitalism Compatible with Democracy? Inequality, Insecurity, and Interdependence,” International Studies Quarterly (2021) 00, 1–14, https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqab056//lhs-ap]

Deep integration of national economies through trade, capital markets, and immigration poses direct challenges for democracy. Above, I noted the indirect ways that globalization might undermine support for democracy, first by increasing inequality and second by fostering faster technological change. But globalization may also have more direct effects. I discuss three such effects here: increasing economic policy constraints on the government; pushing convergence on economic policy choices; and creating more need for international cooperation and governance. Each of these means that governments have less control over the economy, less room for partisan competition, and less autonomy.

Globalization seems to produce three inter-related processes that might undermine support for democracy. As trade, capital, and labor flows grow in importance, governments become increasingly constrained; governments can always opt out of this but the costs of doing so rise as globalization proceeds. First, globalization can undercut the government’s ability to direct the economy. The government’s policy instruments become more limited and less effective. With an open economy, macroeconomic policy and exchange rate policy become more interdependent and less effective, especially for smaller economies (Frieden and Rogowski 1996; Broz and Frieden 2001). As countries joined the WTO and signed preferential trade agreements, trade policy and investment policy have become more constrained as well. Fiscal policy in an open economy also loses some of its effect as it flows across borders. While some scholars have noted that larger and more developed countries have more room to maneuver (Mosley 2003), others have noted the shrinking field of policy choice and autonomy open to countries (Rodrik 1997, 2011). Policy autonomy and efficacy matter for democracies because the public often judges governments and parties on the basis of economic outcomes (Kosmidis 2018; Duch and Stevenson 2010, 2008). When governments lose the ability to direct the economy, democratic accountability is weakened and so is its legitimacy (Hellwig 2001; Hellwig and Samuels 2007; Hellwig 2015).

A second process that might undercut democracy is the policy convergence and consensus that has grown with globalization. As governments around the world increasingly liberalized trade and opened their capital markets, policy converged and consensus grew across parties about the value of openness and to some extent deregulation as well as austerity. Differences among left and right centrist parties on their platforms diminished, and publics began to view all mainstream parties as very similar (Sen and Barry 2020; Ward et al. 2015). Globalization may force parties to converge on their economic policies, restricting parties’ ability to differentiate themselves and thus to effectively compete against other parties on economic issues.19 The consensus over economic policies and globalization has left many European Social Democratic parties losing vote share and public support (Mair 2000).

This convergence has created an opening for extreme right and populist parties to generate support.20 As (Mughan, Bean, and McAllister 2003, 619) points out,“By virtue of their commitment to economic internationalization, the established parties of government are blamed by populists for turning a blind eye and a deaf ear to workers’ legitimate concerns for their job security in an increasingly global, competitive, and volatile labor market. Blaming it on established parties’ commitment to economic globalization, in other words, right-wing populist parties have commonly sought electoral advantage by turning job insecurity into a political issue.” If vigorous party competition along programmatic lines is central to democracy, then globalization may be undermining it. And lack of partisan competition among centrist parties may enable more extreme parties to gain support.

The third element is that globalization has also raised pressure on governments to coordinate their polices to eliminate externalities (Milner 1997). A more open economy implies a greater need to cooperate and coordinate with other countries. The past 30 years have seen many international regimes and institutions created to deal with global problems, all of which have constrained governments even more. The IMF, World Bank, OECD, EU, WTO, regional development banks, and many preferential trade agreements are the major examples of these multilateral economic institutions; each of which produces norms, rules, and procedures that members are expected to follow. They constrain government policy choices domestically; they appear to impose decisions from unelected international elites on the public; and they push all parties who might be in government to adopt similar policies. Many of these have generated popular dissatisfaction and resentment, being seen as undemocratic and as undermining democracy and its legitimacy at home. The EU is a prime example of this complaint about “democratic deficits”; EU decision-making is often seen as too elite- and interest group-driven, and too distant from public preferences (Follesdal and Hix 2006; Mair 2007). Brexit as a vote against international cooperation and extensive coordination is a reflection of this public perception of the EU.

The nationalist backlash that has animated populist parties recently builds off of this anxiety over and distaste toward global governance. The cosmopolitan elites that supposedly direct international institutions are seen as having made bad decisions (e.g., the financial crisis) and as holding preferences far removed from those of the average national voter. Populist leaders thus call for a return to national priorities and a rejection of global cooperation, as the quote from Marine Le Pen at the start of this article illustrates. As Mughan, Bean, and McAllister (2003, 619) points out, “the economic basis of their [populist parties’] appeal [lies] in their rejection of the postwar social democratic consensus. Taking as a starting date the end of the Second World War we can, with a nod to national variations, pick out four elements that have characterised the domestic politics of Western Europe in the ensuing four decades: social democracy, corporatism, the welfare state and Keynesianism. It is on the fertile ground of the foundering of these four pillars that the new (populist) parties have taken root.” Globalization by making international cooperation ever more necessary thus contributes to legitimacy problems for mainstream political parties and may generate public dissatisfaction with their governments and democracy.

#### Populism goes nuclear

**McCoy 17** (Alfred McCoy – Alfred McCoy is the Harrington professor of history at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. <KEN> "The Bloodstained Rise of Global Populism," War is Boring. April 4, 2017. DOA: 4/1/19. https://warisboring.com/the-bloodstained-rise-of-global-populism/)

Scholar Michael Lee suggests that a populist leader succeeds by rhetorically defining his or her national community by both its supposedly “shared characteristics” and its inevitable common “enemy,” whether Mexican “rapists” or Muslim refugees, much as the Nazis created a powerful sense of national selfhood by excluding certain groups by “blood.” In addition, he argues, such movements share the desire for an “apocalyptic confrontation” through a final “mythic battle” as “the vehicle to revolutionary change.” Although scholars such as Lee emphasize the ways in which populist demagogues rely on violent rhetoric for their success, they tend to focus less on another crucial aspect of such populists globally — actual violence. These movements might still be in their relatively benign phase in the United States and Europe, but in less developed democracies around the world populist leaders haven’t hesitated to inscribe their newfound power on the battered bodies of their victims. For more than a decade, for instance, Russian president Vladimir Putin, a reasonable candidate for sparking this wave of populism, has demonstrated his famously bare-chested version of power politics by ensuring that opponents and critics meet grim ends under “mysterious” circumstances. These include the lethal spritz of polonium 210 that killed Russian secret police defector Alexander Litvinenko in London in 2006, the shooting of journalist and Putin critic Anna Politkovskaya outside her Moscow apartment that same year, a dose of rare Himalayan plant poison for banker and Putin nemesis Alexander Perepilichny in London in 2012, a fusillade that felled opposition leader Boris Nemtsov in downtown Moscow in 2015 and four fatal bullets this March for refugee whistleblower Denis Voronenkov on a Kiev sidewalk, which Ukraine has denounced as “an act of state terrorism.” As an Islamist populist, Turkish president Recep Erdogan has projected his power through a bloody repression of, and a new war with, the country’s Kurdish minority. He portrays the Kurds as a cancer within the country’s body politic whose identity must be extinguished, much as his forebears rid themselves of the Armenians. In addition, since mid-2016, he’s overseen a wholesale purge of 50,000 officials, journalists, teachers and military officers in the aftermath of a failed coup, and in a brutal round of torture and rape filled Turkish prisons to the brim. In 2014, retired general Prabowo Subianto nearly won Indonesia’s presidency with a populist campaign of “strength and order.” In fact, Prabowo’s military career had long been steeped in such violence. In 1998, when the authoritarian regime of his father-in-law Suharto was at the brink of collapse, Prabowo, then commander of the Kopassus Rangers, staged the kidnapping-disappearance of a dozen student activists, the savage rape of 168 Chinese women — acts meant to incite racial violence — and the burning of 43 shopping malls and 5,109 buildings in Jakarta, the country’s capital, that left more than 1,000 dead. During his first months in power, newly-elected Philippine president Duterte waged his highly publicized war on the drug trade in city slums by loosing the police and vigilantes nationwide in a campaign already marked, in its first six months, by at least 7,000 extrajudicial killings. The bodies of his victims were regularly dumped on Manila’s streets as warnings to others and as down payments on Duterte’s promises of a new, orderly country. And he wasn’t the first populist in Asia to take such a path either. In 2003, Thai prime minister Thaksin Shinawatra launched his “red shirt” movement as a war on his country’s rampant methamphetamine abuse. In just three months under Thaksin’s rule, the police carried out 2,275 extrajudicial killings of suspected drug dealers and users, often leaving the bodies where they fell as a twisted tribute to his power. Such examples of populist political carnage and the likelihood of more to come — including what Trump’s presidency might have in store — raise certain questions. Just what dynamics lie behind the urge toward violence that seems to propel such movements? Why does the virulent campaign rhetoric of populist political movements so often morph into actual violence once a populist wins power? And why is that violence invariably aimed at enemies believed to threaten the imagined integrity of the national community? In their compulsion to “protect” the nation from what are seen as pernicious alien influences, such populist movements are defined by their need for enemies. That need, in turn, infuses them with an almost uncontrollable compulsion for conflict that transcends actual threats or rational political programs. To give this troubling trend its political due, it’s necessary to understand how, at a particular moment in history, global forces have produced a generation of populist leaders with such potential compulsions. And at the moment, there may be no better example to look to than The Philippines. During its last half-century of bloodstained elections, two populists, Ferdinand Marcos and Duterte, won exceptional power by combining the high politics of diplomacy with the low politics of performative violence, scattering corpses scarred by their signature brutality as if they were so many political pamphlets. A quick look at this history offers us an unsettling glimpse of America’s possible political future. Rodrigo Duterte presents a chart illustrating a drug trade network of high-level drug syndicates in The Philippines during a 2016 press conference. Photo via Wikipedia Populism in The Philippines Although now remembered mainly as a “kleptocrat” who plundered his country and enriched himself with shameless abandon — epitomized by the discovery that his wife possessed 3,000 pairs of shoes — Ferdinand Marcos was, in fact, a brilliant populist, thoroughly skilled in the symbolic uses of violence. As his legal term as president came to an end in 1972, Marcos — who, like many populists, saw himself as chosen by destiny to save his people from perdition — used the military to declare martial law. He then jailed 50,000 opponents, including the senators who had blocked his favored legislation and the gossip columnists who had mocked his wife’s pretensions. The first months of his dictatorship actually lacked any official violence. Then, just before dawn on Jan. 15, 1973, Constabulary officers read a presidential execution order and strapped Lim Seng, an overseas Chinese heroin manufacturer, to a post at a Manila military camp. As a battery of press photographers stood by, an eight-man firing squad raised their rifles. Replayed endlessly on television and in movie theaters, the dramatic footage of bullets ripping open the victim’s chest was clearly meant to be a vivid display of the new dictator’s power, as well as an appeal to his country’s ingrained anti-Chinese racism. Lim Seng would be the only victim legally executed in the 14 years of the Marcos dictatorship. Extra-judicial killings were another matter, however. Marcos made clever use of the massive U.S. military bases near Manila to win continuing support for his authoritarian and increasingly bloody rule from three successive American administrations, even effectively neutralizing Pres. Jimmy Carter’s human rights policy. After a decade of dictatorship, however, the economy began to collapse from a too-heavy dose of “crony capitalism” and the political opposition started to challenge Marcos’s self-image as destiny’s chosen one. To either sate or subdue an increasingly restive population, he soon resorted to escalating raw violence. His security squads conducted what were referred to as “salvagings,” more than 2,500 of them — or 77 percent of the 3,257 extrajudicial killings during his 14-year dictatorship. Bodies scarred by torture were regularly abandoned in public plazas or at busy intersections so passers-by could read the transcript of terror in their stigmata. In the capital, Manila, with only 4,000 police for six million residents, the Marcos regime also deputized hundreds of “secret marshals” responsible for more than 30 shoot-on-sight fatalities during May 1985, the program’s first month, alone. Yet the impact of Marcos’s version of populist violence proved mutable — effective at the start of martial law when people yearned for order and counterproductive at its close when Filipinos again longed for freedom. That shift in sentiment soon led to his downfall in the first of the dramatic “people power” revolutions that would challenge autocratic regimes from Beijing to Berlin. Flickr photo Duterte’s violence Rodrigo Duterte, the son of a provincial governor, initially pursued a career as the mayor of Davao City, a site of endemic violence that left a lasting imprint on his political persona. In 1984, after the communist New People’s Army made Davao its testing ground for urban guerilla warfare, the city’s murders soared, doubling to 800, including the assassination of 150 policemen. To check the communists, who took over part of the city, the military mobilized criminals and ex-communists as death squad vigilantes in a lethal counterterror campaign. When I visited Davao in 1987 to investigate death squad killings, that remote southern city already had an unforgettable air of desolation and hopelessness. It was in this context of rising national and local extrajudicial slaughter that the 33-year old Duterte launched his political career as the elected mayor of Davao City. That was in 1988, the first of seven terms that would keep him in office, on and off, for another 21 years until he won the country’s presidency in 2016. His first campaign was hotly contested and he barely beat his rivals, taking only 26 percent of the vote. Around 1996, he reportedly mobilized his own vigilante group, the Davao Death Squad. It would be responsible for many of the city’s 814 extrajudicial killings over the next decade, as victims were dumped on city streets with faces wrapped bizarrely in packing tape. Duterte himself may have killed one or more of the squad’s victims. Apart from liquidating criminals, the Davao Death Squad also conveniently eliminated the mayor’s political rivals. Campaigning for president in 2016, Duterte would proudly point to the killings in Davao City and promise a drug war that would murder 100,000 Filipinos if necessary. In doing so, he was also drawing on historical resonances from the Marcos era that lent some political depth to his violent rhetoric. By specifically praising Marcos, promising to finally bury his body in the National Heroes Cemetery in Manila, and supporting Ferdinand Marcos, Jr. for vice president, Duterte identified himself with a political lineage of populist strongmen epitomized by the old dictator at a time when desperate Filipinos were looking for new hope of a decent life. On taking office, Duterte promptly started his promised anti-drug campaign and dead bodies became commonplace sights on city streets nationwide, sometimes accompanied by a crude cardboard sign reading “I am a pusher,” or simply with their faces wrapped in the by-now trademark packing tape used by the Davao Death Squad. Although Human Rights Watch would declare his drug war a “calamity,” a resounding 85 percent of Filipinos surveyed were “satisfied,” apparently seeing each body sprawled on a city street as another testament to the president’s promise of order. At the same time, like Marcos, Duterte deployed a new style of diplomacy as part of his populist reach for unrestrained power. Amid rising tensions in the South China Sea between Beijing and Washington, he improved his country’s bargaining position by distancing himself from The Philippines’ classic alliance with the United States. At the 2016 ASEAN conference, reacting to Barack Obama’s criticism of his drug war, he said bluntly of the American president, “Your mother’s a whore.” A month later during a state visit to Beijing, Duterte publicly proclaimed “separation from the United States.’’ By setting aside his country’s recent slam-dunk win over China at the Court of Arbitration in the Hague in a legal dispute over rival claims in the South China Sea, Duterte came home with $24 billion in Chinese trade deals and a sense that he was helping establish a new world order. In January 2017, after his police tortured and killed a South Korean businessman on the pretext of a drug bust, he was forced to call a sudden halt to the nationwide killing spree. Like his role model Marcos, however, Duterte’s populism seems to contain an insatiable appetite for violence and so it was not long before bodies were once again being dumped on the streets of Manila, pushing the death toll past 8,000. Davao City. Photo via Wikipedia Success and the strongman The histories of these Filipino strongmen, past and present, reveal two overlooked aspects of the ill-defined phenomenon of global populism: the role of what might be termed performative violence in projecting domestic strength and a complementary need for diplomatic success to show international influence. How skillfully these critical poles of power are balanced may offer one gauge for speculating about the fate of populist strongmen in disparate parts of the globe. In Russia’s case, Putin’s projection of strength through the murder of selected domestic opponents has been matched by unchecked aggression in Georgia and Ukraine — a successful balancing act that has made his country, with its rickety economy the size of Italy’s, seem like a great power again and is likely to extend his autocratic rule into the foreseeable future. In Turkey, Erdogan’s harsh repression of ethnic and political enemies has essentially sunk his bid for entry into the European Union, plunged him into an unwinnable war with Kurdish rebels, and complicated his alliance with the United States against Islamic fundamentalism — all potential barriers to his successful bid for unchecked power. In Indonesia, Prabowo Subianto failed in his critical first step — building a domestic base large enough to sweep him into the presidency, in part because his call for order resonated so discordantly with a public still capable of remembering his earlier bid for power through eerie violence that roiled Jakarta with hundreds of rapes, fires and deaths. Without the popular support generated by his local spectacle of violence, Duterte’s de facto abrogation of his country’s claims to the South China Sea’s rich fishing grounds and oil reserves in his bid for Chinese support risks a popular backlash, a military coup, or both. For the time being, however, Duterte’s deft juxtaposition of international maneuvering and local bloodletting has made him a successful Philippine strongman with, as yet, few apparent checks on his power. While the essential weakness of the Philippine military limits Duterte’s outlets for his populist violence to the police killings of poor street drug dealers, Trump faces no such restraints. Should Congress and the courts check the virulence of his domestic attacks on Muslims, Mexicans or other imagined enemies and should his presidency run into further setbacks like the recent repeal-Obamacare humiliation, he could readily resort to violent military adventures not only in Iraq, Syria, Yemen, Afghanistan and Libya, but even in Iran, not to speak of North Korea, in a bid to recover his populist aura of overweening power. In this way, unlike any other potential populist politician on the planet, he holds the fate of countless millions in his much-discussed hands. If populism’s need for what scholar Michael Lee calls an “apocalyptic confrontation” and a “mythic battle” proves accurate, it might, in the end, lead the Trump administration’s “systemic revolutionaries” far beyond even their most extreme rhetoric into an endlessly escalating cycle of violence against foreign enemies, using whatever weapons are available, whether drones, special operations forces, fighter bombers, naval armadas or even nuclear weapons.

#### Decline increases cooperation

Clary ’15 (Christopher; 4/25/15; Ph.D. in political science from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, M.A. in National Security Affairs, Postdoctoral fellow, Watson Institute for International Studies, Brown University; MIT Political Science Department Research Paper, “Economic Stress and International Cooperation: Evidence from International Rivalries,” https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2597712)

Do economic downturns generate pressure for diversionary conflict? Or might downturns **encourage austerity and economizing behavior** in foreign policy? This paper provides **new evidence** that economic stress is associated with **conciliatory policies** between strategic rivals. For states that view each other as military threats, the biggest step possible toward bilateral cooperation is to terminate the rivalry by taking political steps to manage the competition. Drawing on **data from 109 distinct rival dyads since 1950**, 67 of which terminated, the evidence suggests rivalries were approximately **twice as likely to terminate** during economic downturns than they were during periods of economic normalcy. This is true controlling for all of the main alternative explanations for peaceful relations between foes (democratic status, nuclear weapons possession, capability imbalance, common enemies, and international systemic changes), as well as many other possible confounding variables. This research questions existing theories claiming that economic downturns are associated with diversionary war, and instead argues that in certain circumstances peace may **result from economic troubles**. I define a rivalry as the perception by national elites of two states that the other state possesses conflicting interests and presents a military threat of sufficient severity that future military conflict is likely. Rivalry termination is the transition from a state of rivalry to one where conflicts of interest are not viewed as being so severe as to provoke interstate conflict and/or where a mutual recognition of the imbalance in military capabilities makes conflict-causing bargaining failures unlikely. In other words, rivalries terminate when the elites assess that the risks of military conflict between rivals has been reduced dramatically. This definition draws on a growing **quantitative literature** most closely associated with the research programs of William Thompson, J. Joseph Hewitt, and James P. Klein, Gary Goertz, and Paul F. Diehl.1 My definition conforms to that of William Thompson. In work with Karen Rasler, they define rivalries as situations in which “[b]oth actors view each other as a significant politicalmilitary threat and, therefore, an enemy.”2 In other work, Thompson writing with Michael Colaresi, explains further: The presumption is that decisionmakers explicitly identify who they think are their foreign enemies. They orient their military preparations and foreign policies toward meeting their threats. They assure their constituents that they will not let their adversaries take advantage. Usually, these activities are done in public. Hence, we should be able to follow the explicit cues in decisionmaker utterances and writings, as well as in the descriptive political histories written about the foreign policies of specific countries.3 Drawing from available records and histories, Thompson and David Dreyer have generated a universe of strategic rivalries from **1494 to 2010** that serves as the basis for this project’s empirical analysis.4 This project measures rivalry termination as occurring on the last year that Thompson and Dreyer record the existence of a rivalry. Economic crises lead to conciliatory behavior through five primary channels. (1) Economic crises lead to **austerity pressures**, which in turn incent leaders to search for ways to **cut defense expenditures**. (2) Economic crises also encourage strategic reassessment, so that leaders can argue to their peers and their publics that defense spending can be arrested without endangering the state. This can lead to **threat deflation**, where elites attempt to **downplay** **the seriousness** of the threat posed by a former rival. (3) If a state faces multiple threats, economic crises provoke elites to **consider threat prioritization**, a process that is postponed during periods of economic normalcy. (4) Economic crises increase the political and economic benefit from **international economic cooperation**. Leaders **seek foreign aid**, **enhanced trade**, and **increased investment** from abroad during periods of economic trouble. This search is made easier if tensions are reduced with historic rivals. (5) Finally, during crises, elites are more prone to select leaders who are perceived as **capable of resolving economic difficulties**, permitting the emergence of leaders who hold heterodox foreign policy views. Collectively, these mechanisms make it **much more likely** that a leader will prefer conciliatory policies compared to during periods of economic normalcy. This section reviews this **causal logic** in greater detail, while also providing **historical examples** that these mechanisms recur in practice. Economic Crisis Leads to **Austerity** Economic crises generate pressure for austerity. Government revenues are a function of national economic production, so that when production diminishes through recession, revenues available for expenditure also diminish. Planning almost **invariably assumes growth** rather than contraction, so the deviation in available revenues compared to the planned expenditure can be sizable. When growth slowdowns are prolonged, the cumulative departure from planning targets can grow even further, even if no single quarter meets the technical definition of recession. Pressures for austerity are **felt** most **acutely** in governments that face difficulty borrowing to finance deficit expenditures. This is **especially the case** when this borrowing relies on international sources of credit. Even for states that can borrow, however, intellectual attachment to balanced budgets as a means to restore confidence—a belief in what is sometimes called “expansionary austerity”—generates **incentives to curtail expenditure**. These incentives to cut occur precisely when populations are experiencing economic hardship, making reductions especially painful that target poverty alleviation, welfare programs, or economic subsidies. As a result, mass and elite constituents strongly resist such cuts. Welfare programs and other forms of public spending may be especially susceptible to a policy “ratchet effect,” where people are **very reluctant** to forego benefits once they have become accustomed to their availability.6 As Paul Pierson has argued, “The politics [of welfare state] retrenchment is typically treacherous, because it imposes **tangible losses** on concentrated groups of voters in return for diffuse and uncertain gains.”7

### 1NC – AT: Primacy

#### They don’t access Taiwan scenario or hard power – Waiver doesn’t affect either of those

#### Proves deterrence inevitable – all offshore bases and alliances remain intact

#### Chinese leadership solves existential threats.

Yamei 18 Shen Yamei 18, Deputy Director and Associate Research Fellow of Department for American Studies, China Institute of International Studies, 1-9-2018, "Probing into the “Chinese Solution” for the Transformation of Global Governance," CAIFC, <http://www.caifc.org.cn/en/content.aspx?id=4491>

As the world is in a period of great development, transformation and adjustment, the international power comparison is undergoing profound changes, global governance is reshuffling and traditional governance concepts and models are confronted with challenges. The international community is expecting China to play a bigger role in global governance, which has given birth to the Chinese solution. A. To Lead the Transformation of the Global Governance System. The “shortcomings” of the existing global governance system are prominent, which can hardly ensure global development. First, the traditional dominant forces are seriously imbalanced*.* The US and Europe that used to dominate the global governance system have been beset with structural problems, with their economic development stalling, social contradictions intensifying, populism and secessionism rising, and states trapped in internal strife and differentiation. These countries have not fully reformed and adjusted themselves well, but rather pointed their fingers at globalization and resorted to retreat for self-insurance or were busy with their own affairs without any wish or ability to participate in global governance, which has encouraged the growth of “anti-globalization” trend into an interference factor to global governance. Second, the global governance mechanism is relatively lagging behind. Over the years of development, the strength of emerging economies has increased dramatically, which has substantially upset the international power structure, as the developing countries as a whole have made 80 percent of the contributions to global economic growth. These countries have expressed their appeal for new governance and begun policy coordination among themselves, which has initiated the transition of global governance form “Western governance” to “East-West joint governance”, but the traditional governance mechanisms such as the World Bank, IMF and G7 failed to reflect the demand of the new pattern, in addition to their lack of representation and inclusiveness. Third, the global governance rules are developing in a fragmented way, with governance deficits existing in some key areas. With the diversification and in-depth integration of international interests, the domain of global governance has continued to expand, with actors multiplying by folds and action intentions becoming complicated. As relevant efforts are usually temporary and limited to specific partners or issues, global governance driven by requests of “diversified governance” lacks systematic and comprehensive solutions. Since the beginning of this year, there have been risks of running into an acephalous statein such key areas as global economic governance and climate change*.* Such emerging issues as nuclear security and international terrorism have suffered injustice because of power politics*.* The governance areas in deficit, such as cyber security, polar region and oceans, have “reversely forced” certain countries and organizations to respond hastily*.* All of these have made the global governance system trapped in a dilemma and call urgently for a clear direction of advancement. B. To Innovate and Perfect the International Order. Currently, whether the developing countries or the Western countries of Europe and the US are greatly discontent with the existing international order as well as their appeals and motivation for changing the order are unprecedentedly strong. The US is the major creator and beneficiary of the existing hegemonic order, but it is now doubtful that it has gained much less than lost from the existing order, faced with the difficulties of global economic transformation and obsessed with economic despair and political dejection. Although the developing countries as represented by China acknowledge the positive role played by the post-war international order in safeguarding peace, boosting prosperity and promoting globalization, they criticize the existing order for lack of inclusiveness in politics and equality in economy, as well as double standard in security, believing it has failed to reflect the multi-polarization trend of the world and is an exclusive “circle club”. Therefore, there is much room for improvement. For China, to lead the transformation of the global governance system and international order not only supports the efforts of the developing countries to uphold multilateralism rather than unilateralism, advocate the rule of law rather than the law of the jungle and practice democracy rather than power politics in international relations, but also is an important subject concerning whether China could gain the discourse power and development space corresponding to its own strength and interests in the process of innovating and perfecting the framework of international order. C. To Promote Integration of the Eastern and Western Civilizations. Dialog among civilizations, which is the popular foundation for any country’s diplomatic proposals, runs like a trickle moistening things silently. Nevertheless, in the existing international system guided by the “Western-Centrism”, the Western civilization has always had the self-righteous superiority, conflicting with the interests and mentality of other countries and having failed to find the path to co-existing peacefully and harmoniously with other *civilizations.* So to speak, many problems of today, including the growing gap in economic development between the developed and developing countries against the background of globalization, the Middle East trapped in chaos and disorder, the failure of Russia and Turkey to “integrate into the West”, etc., can be directly attributed to lack of exchanges, communication and integration among civilizations. Since the 18th National Congress of CPC, Xi Jinping has raised the concept of “Chinese Dream” that reflects both Chinese values and China’s pursuit, re-introducing to the world the idea of “all living creatures grow together without harming one another and ways run parallel without interfering with one another”, which is the highest ideal in Chinese traditional culture, and striving to shape China into a force that counter-balance the Western civilization. He has also made solemn commitment that “we respect the diversity of civilizations …… cannot be puffed up with pride and depreciate other civilizations and nations”; “facing the people deeply trapped in misery and wars, we should have not only compassion and sympathy, but also responsibility and action …… do whatever we can to extend assistance to those people caught in predicament”, etc. China will rebalance the international pattern from a more inclusive civilization perspective and with more far-sighted strategic mindset, or at least correct the bisected or predominated world order so as to promote the parallel development of the Eastern and Western civilizations through mutual learning, integration and encouragement. D. To Pass on China’s Confidence. Only a short while ago, some Western countries had called for “China’s responsibility” and made it an inhibition to “regulate” China’s development orientation. Today, China has become a source of stability in an international situation full of uncertainties. Over the past 5 years, China has made outstanding contributions to the recovery of world economy under relatively great pressure of its own economic downturn. Encouraged by the “four confidences”, the whole of the Chinese society has burst out innovation vitality and produced innovation achievements, making people have more sense of gain and more optimistic about the national development prospect. It is the heroism of the ordinary Chinese to overcome difficulties and realize the ideal destiny that best explains China’s confidence. When this confidence is passed on in the field of diplomacy, it is expressed as: first, China’s posture is seen as more forging ahead and courageous to undertake responsibilities ---- proactively shaping the international agendas rather than passively accepting them; having clear-cut attitudes on international disputes rather than being equivocal; and extending international cooperation to comprehensive and dimensional development rather than based on the theory of “economy only”. In sum, China will actively seek understanding and support from other countries rather than imposing its will on others with clear-cut Chinese characteristics, Chinese style and Chinese manner. Second, China’s discourse is featured as a combination of inflexibility and yielding as well as magnanimous ---- combining the internationally recognized diplomatic principles with the excellent Chinese cultural traditions through digesting the Chinese and foreign humanistic classics assisted with philosophical speculations to make “China Brand, Chinese Voice and China’s Image get more and more recognized”. Third, the Chinese solution is more practical and intimate to people as well as emphasizes inclusive cooperation, as China is full of confidence to break the monopoly of the Western model on global development, “offering mankind a Chinese solution to explore a better social system”, and “providing a brand new option for the nations and peoples who are hoping both to speed up development and maintain independence”. II.Path Searching of the “Chinese Solution” for Global Governance Over the past years’ efforts, China has the ability to transform itself from “grasping the opportunity” for development to “creating opportunity” and “sharing opportunity” for common development, hoping to pass on the longing of the Chinese people for a better life to the people of other countries and promoting the development of the global governance system toward a more just and rational end. It has become the major power’s conscious commitment of China to lead the transformation of the global governance system in a profound way. A. To Construct the Theoretical System for Global Governance. The theoretical system of global governance has been the focus of the party central committee’s diplomatic theory innovation since the 18th National Congress of CPC as well as an important component of the theory of socialism with Chinese characteristics for a new era, which is not only the sublimation of China’s interaction with the world from “absorbing and learning” to “cooperation and mutual learning”, but also the cause why so many developing countries have turned from “learning from the West” to “exploring for treasures in the East”. In the past 5 years, the party central committee, based on precise interpretation of the world pattern today and serious reflection on the future development of mankind, has made a sincere call to the world for promoting the development of global governance system toward a more just and rational end, and proposed a series of new concepts and new strategies including engaging in major power diplomacy with Chinese characteristics, creating the human community with common destiny, promoting the construction of new international relationship rooted in the principle of cooperation and win-win, enriching the strategic thinking of peaceful development, sticking to the correct benefit view, formulating the partnership network the world over, advancing the global economic governance in a way of mutual consultation, joint construction and co-sharing, advocating the joint, comprehensive, cooperative and sustainable security concept, and launching the grand “Belt and Road” initiative. The Chinese solution composed of these contents, not only fundamentally different from the old roads of industrial revolution and colonial expansion in history, but also different from the market-driven neo-liberalism model currently advocated by Western countries and international organizations, stands at the height of the world and even mankind, seeking for global common development and having widened the road for the developing countries to modernization, which is widely welcomed by the international community. B. To Supplement and Perfect the Global Governance System. Currently, the international political practice in global governance is mostly problem-driven without creating a set of relatively independent, centralized and integral power structures, resulting in the existing global governance systemcharacterized as both extensive and unbalanced**.** China has been engaged in reform and innovation, while maintaining and constructing the existing systems, producing some thinking and method with Chinese characteristics. First, China sees the UN as a mirror that reflects the status quo of global governance, which should act as the leader of global governance, and actively safeguards the global governance system with the UN at the core. Second, China is actively promoting the transforming process of such recently emerged international mechanisms as G20, BRICS and SCO, perfecting them through practice, and boosting Asia-Pacific regional cooperation and the development of economic globalization. China is also promoting the construction of regional security mechanism through the Six-Party Talks on Korean Peninsula nuclear issue, Boao Forum for Asia, CICA and multilateral security dialog mechanisms led by ASEAN so as to lay the foundation for the future regional security framework. Third, China has initiated the establishment of AIIB and the New Development Bank of BRICS, creating a precedent for developing countries to set up multilateral financial institutions. The core of the new relationship between China and them lies in “boosting rather than controlling” and “public rather than private”, which is much different from the management and operation model of the World Bank, manifesting the increasing global governance ability of China and the developing countries as well as exerting pressure on the international economic and financial institution to speed up reforms. Thus, in leading the transformation of the global governance system, China has not overthrown the existing systems and started all over again, but been engaged in innovating and perfecting; China has proactively undertaken international responsibilities, but has to do everything in its power and act according to its ability. C. To Reform the Global Governance Rules. Many of the problems facing global governance today are deeply rooted in such a cause that the dominant power of the existing governance system has taken it as the tool to realize its own national interests first and a platform to pursue its political goals. Since the beginning of this year, the US has for several times requested the World Bank, IMF and G20 to make efforts to mitigate the so-called global imbalance, abandoned its commitment to support trade openness, cut down investment projects to the middle-income countries, and deleted commitment to support the efforts to deal with climate change financially, which has made the international systems accessories of the US domestic economic agendas, dealing a heavy blow to the global governance system. On the contrary, the interests and agendas of China, as a major power of the world, are open to the whole world, and China in the future “will provide the world with broader market, more sufficient capital, more abundant goods and more precious opportunities for cooperation”, while having the ability to make the world listen to its voice more attentively. With regard to the subject of global governance, China has advocated that what global governance system is better cannot be decided upon by any single country, as the destiny of the world should be in the hands of the people of all countries. In principle, all the parties should stick to the principle of mutual consultation, joint construction and co-sharing, resolve disputes through dialog and differences through consultation. Regarding the critical areas, opening to the outer world does not mean building one’s own backyard, but building the spring garden for co-sharing; the “Belt and Road” initiative is not China’s solo, but a chorus participated in by all countries concerned. China has also proposed international public security views on nuclear security, maritime cooperation and cyber space order, calling for efforts to make the global village into a “grand stage for seeking common development” rather than a “wrestling arena”; we cannot “set up a stage here, while pulling away a prop there”, but “complement each other to put on a grand show”. From the orientation of reforms, efforts should be made to better safeguard and expand the legitimate interests of the developing countries and increase the influence of the emerging economies on global governance. Over the past 5 years, China has attached importance to full court diplomacy, gradually coming to the center stage of international politics and proactively establishing principles for global governance. By hosting such important events as IAELM, CICA Summit, G20 Summit, the Belt and Road International Cooperation Forum and BRICS Summit, China has used theseplatforms to elaborate the Asia-Pacific Dream for the first time to the world, expressing China’s views on Asian security and global economic governance, discussing with the countries concerned with the Belt and Road about the synergy of their future development strategies and setting off the “BRICS plus” capacity expansion mechanism, in which China not only contributes its solution and shows its style, but also participates in the shaping of international principles through practice. On promoting the resolution of hot international issues, China abides by the norms governing international relations based on the purposes and principles of the UN Charter, and insists on justice, playing a constructive role as a responsible major power in actively promoting the political accommodation in Afghanistan, mediating the Djibouti-Eritrea dispute, promoting peace talks in the Middle East, devoting itself to the peaceful resolution of the South China Sea dispute through negotiations. In addition, China’s responsibility and quick response to international crises have gained widespread praises, as seen in such cases as assisting Africa in its fight against the Ebola epidemic, sending emergency fresh water to the capital of Maldives and buying rice from Cambodia to help relieve its financial squeeze, which has shown the simple feelings of the Chinese people to share the same breath and fate with the people of other countries. D. To Support the Increase of the Developing Countries’ Voice. The developing countries, especially the emerging powers, are not only the important participants of the globalization process, but also the important direction to which the international power system is transferring. With the accelerating shift of global economic center to emerging markets and developing economies, the will and ability of the developing countries to participate in global governance have been correspondingly strengthened. As the biggest developing country and fast growing major power, China has the same appeal and proposal for governance as other developing countries and already began policy coordination with them, as China should comply with historical tide and continue to support the increase of the developing countries’ voice in the global governance system. To this end, China has pursued the policy of “dialog but not confrontation, partnership but not alliance”, attaching importance to the construction of new type of major power relationship and global partnership network, while making a series proposals in the practice of global governance that could represent the legitimate interests of the developing countries and be conducive to safeguarding global justice, including supporting an open, inclusive, universal, balanced and win-win economic globalization; promoting the reforms on share and voting mechanism of IMF to increase the voting rights and representation of the emerging market economies; financing the infrastructure construction and industrial upgrading of other developing countries through various bilateral or regional funds; and helping other developing countries to respond to such challenges as famine, refugees, climate change and public hygiene by debt forgiveness and assistance.

#### The only comprehensive study proves retrenchment is comparatively more peaceful

MacDonald & Parent 11—Professor of Political Science at Williams College & Professor of Political Science at University of Miami [Paul K. MacDonald & Joseph M. Parent, “Graceful Decline? The Surprising Success of Great Power Retrenchment,” International Security, Vol. 35, No. 4 (Spring 2011), pp. 7–44]

In this article, we question the logic and evidence of the retrenchment pessimists. To date there has been neither a comprehensive study of great power retrenchment nor a study that lays out the case for retrenchment as a practical or probable policy. This article fills these gaps by systematically examining the relationship between acute relative decline and the responses of great powers. We examine eighteen cases of acute relative decline since 1870 and advance three main arguments. First, we challenge the retrenchment pessimists’ claim that domestic or international constraints inhibit the ability of declining great powers to retrench. In fact, when states fall in the hierarchy of great powers, peaceful retrenchment is the most common response, even over short time spans. Based on the empirical record, we find that great powers retrenched in no less than eleven and no more than fifteen of the eighteen cases, a range of 61–83 percent. When international conditions demand it, states renounce risky ties, increase reliance on allies or adversaries, draw down their military obligations, and impose adjustments on domestic populations. Second, we find that the magnitude of relative decline helps explain the extent of great power retrenchment. Following the dictates of neorealist theory, great powers retrench for the same reason they expand: the rigors of great power politics compel them to do so.12 Retrenchment is by no means easy, but necessity is the mother of invention, and declining great powers face powerful incentives to contract their interests in a prompt and proportionate manner. Knowing only a state’s rate of relative economic decline explains its corresponding degree of retrenchment in as much as 61 percent of the cases we examined. Third, we argue that the rate of decline helps explain what forms great power retrenchment will take. How fast great powers fall contributes to whether these retrenching states will internally reform, seek new allies or rely more heavily on old ones, and make diplomatic overtures to enemies. Further, our analysis suggests that great powers facing acute decline are less likely to initiate or escalate militarized interstate disputes. Faced with diminishing resources, great powers moderate their foreign policy ambitions and offer concessions in areas of lesser strategic value. Contrary to the pessimistic conclusions of critics, retrenchment neither requires aggression nor invites predation. Great powers are able to rebalance their commitments through compromise, rather than conflict. In these ways, states respond to penury the same way they do to plenty: they seek to adopt policies that maximize security given available means. Far from being a hazardous policy, retrenchment can be successful. States that retrench often regain their position in the hierarchy of great powers. Of the fifteen great powers that adopted retrenchment in response to acute relative decline, 40 percent managed to recover their ordinal rank. In contrast, none of the declining powers that failed to retrench recovered their relative position. Pg. 9-10

#### Spheres of influence are inevitable – BUT consolidation and non-military influence solve deterrence
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In the heady aftermath of the Cold War, American policymakers pronounced one of the fundamental concepts of geopolitics obsolete. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice described a new world “in which great power is defined not by spheres of influence . . . or the strong imposing their will on the weak.” Secretary of State Hillary Clinton declared that “the United States does not recognize spheres of influence.” Secretary of State John Kerry proclaimed that “the era of the Monroe Doctrine is over,” ending almost two centuries of the United States staking claim to its own sphere of influence in the Western Hemisphere.

Such pronouncements were right in that something about geopolitics had changed. But they were wrong about what exactly it was. U.S. policymakers had ceased to recognize spheres of influence—the ability of other powers to demand deference from other states in their own regions or exert predominant control there—not because the concept had become obsolete. Rather, the entire world had become a de facto American sphere. Spheres of influence had given way to a sphere of influence. The strong still imposed their will on the weak; the rest of the world was compelled to play largely by American rules, or else face a steep price, from crippling sanctions to outright regime change. Spheres of influence hadn’t gone away; they had been collapsed into one, by the overwhelming fact of U.S. hegemony.

Now, however, that hegemony is fading, and Washington has awakened to what it calls “a new era of great-power competition,” with China and Russia increasingly using their power to assert interests and values that often conflict with those of the United States. But American policymakers and analysts are still struggling to come to grips with what this new era means for the U.S. role in the world. Going forward, that role will not only be different; it will also be significantly diminished. While leaders will continue announcing grand ambitions, diminished means will mean diminished results.

Unipolarity is over, and with it the illusion that other nations would simply take their assigned place in a U.S.-led international order. For the United States, that will require accepting the reality that there are spheres of influence in the world today—and that not all of them are American spheres.

THE WORLD AS IT WAS

Before making pronouncements about the new rules of geopolitics, post–Cold War U.S. secretaries of state should have looked back to the final months of World War II, when U.S. policymakers were similarly resistant to accepting a world in which spheres of influence remained a central feature of geopolitics. Competing views on the issue lay at the core of a debate between two top Soviet experts in the U.S. government.

On February 4, 1945, President Franklin Roosevelt met with Soviet leader Joseph Stalin and British Prime Minister Winston Churchill at Yalta. At Roosevelt’s side was his translator and principal adviser on the Soviet Union, Charles Bohlen. Just that morning, Bohlen had opened an urgent private missive from his close colleague George Kennan in Moscow. Kennan correctly forecast that the Soviet Union would attempt to maintain control of as much of Europe as it could. The question was what the United States should do about that. Kennan asked, “Why could we not make a decent and definitive compromise with it—divide Europe frankly into spheres of influence—keep ourselves out of the Russian sphere and keep the Russians out of ours?”

The United States must realize that there are spheres of influence in the world today—and that not all of them are American.

Bohlen was appalled. “Utterly impossible,” he erupted in response. “Foreign policy of that kind cannot be made in a democracy.” Reflecting on this moment later, Bohlen explained: “The American people, who had fought a long, hard war, deserved at least an attempt to work out a better world.” Between 1945 and 1947, Bohlen worked alongside other leading figures in the Roosevelt and then the Truman administration to realize their “one world” vision, in which the allies who had fought together to defeat the Nazis would remain allied in creating a new global order. But he ultimately resigned himself to the world as it was—in short, Kennan had been right. “Instead of unity among the great powers on the major issues of world reconstruction—both political and economic—after the war, there is complete disunity between the Soviet Union and the satellites on one side and the rest of the world on the other,” Bohlen acknowledged in the summer of 1947 in a memo to Secretary of State George Marshall. “There are, in short, two worlds instead of one.”

When he finally came to share Kennan’s diagnosis, Bohlen did not shrink from the implications. His memo to Marshall concluded:

Faced with this disagreeable fact, however much we may deplore it, the United States in the interest of its own well-being and security and those of the free non-Soviet world must . . . draw [the non-Soviet world] closer together politically, economically, financially, and, in the last analysis, militarily in order to be in a position to deal effectively with the consolidated Soviet area.

This conviction became a pillar of the United States’ strategy for the coming decades, and it rested on the acceptance of spheres of influence. There would be areas that would be subjected to Soviet domination, with often terrible consequences, but the best course for the United States was to bolster those powers on the periphery of this Soviet sphere while reinforcing the strength and unity of its own sphere.

For the four decades that followed, the United States and the Soviet Union engaged in the great-power competition that we know as the Cold War. In the Soviet sphere, the captive nations of Eastern Europe remained under the boot of an “evil empire.” American presidents faced repeated crises in which they had to choose between sending troops into Soviet-dominated nations to support freedom fighters seeking to exercise rights that the American creed declares universal and standing by as those freedom fighters were slaughtered or suppressed. Without exception, U.S. presidents chose to watch instead of intervene: consider Dwight Eisenhower when Hungarians rose up in 1956 and Lyndon Johnson during the Prague Spring of 1968 (or, after the Cold War, George W. Bush when Russian troops attacked Georgia in 2008 and Barack Obama when Russian special forces seized Crimea). Why? Each had internalized an unacceptable yet undeniable truth: that, as U.S. President Ronald Reagan once explained in a joint statement with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, “a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought.”

This bit of Cold War history should serve as a reminder: a nation that is simultaneously idealistic and realistic will always struggle to reconcile rationales and rationalizations of purpose, on the one hand, with realities of power, on the other. The result, in the foreign policy analyst Fareed Zakaria’s apt summary, has been “the rhetoric of transformation but the reality of accommodation.” Even at the height of U.S. power, accommodation meant accepting the ugly fact of a Soviet sphere of influence.

TECTONIC SHIFTS

After nearly half a century of competition, when the Cold War ended and the Soviet Union disappeared, in 1991, the United States was left economically, militarily, and geopolitically dominant. In the first two decades of the post–Cold War era, U.S. defense spending exceeded the defense budgets of the next ten nations combined (five of them U.S. treaty allies). Operationally, that meant that, as Secretary of Defense James Mattis’s 2018 National Defense Strategy put it, the United States “enjoyed uncontested or dominant superiority in every operating domain. We could generally deploy our forces when we wanted, assemble them where we wanted, and operate how we wanted.” The United States and its allies could welcome new members into NATO, applying to them its Article 5 security guarantee, without thinking about the risks, since the alliance faced no real threat. In that world, strategy in essence consisted of overwhelming challenges with resources.

But that was then. The tectonic shift in the balance of power that occurred in the first two decades of the twenty-first century was as dramatic as any shift the United States has witnessed over an equivalent period in its 244 years. To paraphrase Vaclav Havel, then the president of Czechoslovakia, it has happened so fast, we have not yet had time to be astonished. The U.S. share of global GDP—nearly one-half in 1950—has gone from one-quarter in 1991 to one-seventh today. (Although GDP is not everything, it does form the substructure of power in relations among nations.) And as the United States’ relative power has declined, the menu of feasible options for policymakers has shrunk. Consider, for example, the U.S. response to China’s Belt and Road Initiative. With currency reserves of almost $3 trillion, China can invest $1.3 trillion in infrastructure linking most of Eurasia to a China-centered order. When Secretary of State Mike Pompeo announced that the United States would increase its own investments in the Indo-Pacific in response, he was able to come up with just $113 million in new investments.

China has, of course, been the chief beneficiary of this transformation. In the past generation, its GDP has soared: from 20 percent of the U.S. level in 1991 to 120 percent today (measured by purchasing power parity, the metric that both the CIA and the International Monetary Fund use to compare national economies). Although China faces many internal challenges, there are more reasons to expect this basic economic trend to continue than to bet that it will stop soon. With four times as many citizens as the United States, and if Chinese workers become as productive as Portuguese workers are today (that is, around half as productive as Americans), China will see its GDP rise to double that of the United States.

In Asia, the economic balance of power has tilted especially dramatically in China’s favor. As the world’s largest exporter and second-largest importer, China is the top trading partner of every other major East Asian country, including U.S. allies. (And as an aggressive practitioner of economic statecraft, Beijing does not hesitate to use the leverage this provides, squeezing countries such as the Philippines and South Korea when they resist Chinese demands.) Globally, China is also rapidly becoming a peer competitor of the United States in advanced technologies. Today, of the 20 largest information technology companies, nine are Chinese. Four years ago, when Google, the global leader in artificial intelligence (AI), the most significant advanced technology, assessed its competition, Chinese companies ranked alongside European companies. Now, that state of affairs is barely visible in the rearview mirror: Chinese companies lead in many areas of applied AI, including surveillance, facial and voice recognition, and financial technology.

China’s military spending and capabilities have surged, as well. A quarter century ago, its defense budget was one-25th that of the United States; now, it is one-third and on a path to parity. And whereas the U.S. defense budget is spread across global commitments, many of them in Europe and the Middle East, China’s budget is focused on East Asia. Accordingly, in specific military scenarios involving a conflict over Taiwan or in the South China Sea, China may have already taken the lead. Short of actual war, the best tests of relative military capabilities are war games. In 2019, Robert Work, a former U.S. deputy secretary of defense, and David Ochmanek, one of the Defense Department’s key defense planners, offered a public summary of the results from a series of classified recent war games. Their bottom line, in Ochmanek’s words: “When we fight Russia and China, ‘blue’ [the United States] gets its ass handed to it.” As The New York Times summarized, “In 18 of the last 18 Pentagon war games involving China in the Taiwan Strait, the U.S. lost.”

Russia is a different matter. Whatever President Vladimir Putin might want, Russia will never again be his father’s Soviet Union. When the Soviet Union dissolved, the resulting Russian state was left with less than half the GDP and half the population and saw its borders rolled back to the days before Catherine the Great. Yet Russia remains a nuclear superpower with an arsenal that is functionally equivalent to that of the United States; it has a defense industry that produces weapons the world is eager to buy (as India and Turkey have demonstrated in the past year); and it boasts military forces that can fight and win—as they have demonstrated repeatedly in Chechnya, Georgia, Ukraine, and Syria. On a continent where most of the other nations imagine that war has become obsolete, and maintain military forces more for ceremonial than combat operations, military prowess may now be Russia’s major comparative advantage.

BACK TO BASICS

The claim that spheres of influence had been consigned to the dustbin of history assumed that other nations would simply take their assigned places in a U.S.-led order. In retrospect, that assumption seems worse than naive. Yet because many U.S. analysts and policymakers still cling to images of China and Russia formed during this bygone era, their views about what the United States should and should not do continues to reflect a world that has vanished.

Over the course of centuries of geopolitical competition, policymakers and theorists developed a set of core concepts to help clarify the complexities of relations among states, including spheres of influence, balances of power, and alliances. These concepts must be adapted to take account of specific conditions in the twenty-first century. Yet they remain the sturdiest building blocks available for understanding and constructing international order.

Where the equilibrium of forces between one state and another shifts to the point where the first becomes predominant, the resulting new balance of power casts a shadow that becomes, in effect, a “sphere of influence.” That specific term entered the vocabulary of diplomacy in the early nineteenth century, but the concept is as old as international relations itself. (As Thucydides noted, after the defeat of the Persians in the fifth century BC, Sparta demanded that Athens not rebuild the walls around its city-state to leave itself vulnerable.) Traditionally, great powers have demanded a degree of deference from lesser powers on their borders and in adjacent seas, and they have expected other great powers to respect that fact. Recent actions by China and Russia in their respective neighborhoods are just the most recent examples of that tradition.

Spheres of influence also extend beyond geography. When the United States led the world in the creation of the Internet, and the hardware and software that empowered it, the United States enjoyed what Michael Hayden, a former director of the National Security Agency, later called a “golden age of electronic surveillance.” Since most countries were unaware of the surveillance capabilities revealed by the former NSA contractor Edward Snowden, the United States had an unparalleled ability to exploit technology to listen to, track, and even influence them. But post-Snowden, many states are resisting the current U.S. campaign to prevent them from buying their 5G wireless infrastructure from the Chinese telecommunications giant Huawei. As the leader of a country currently considering the choice recently put it, Washington is trying to persuade other countries not to buy Chinese hardware because it will make it easier for China to spy and instead to buy American hardware, which would make it easier for the United States to spy.

A REALISTIC RECKONING

From the perspective of American interests and values, the consequences of increases in China’s and Russia’s power relative to that of the United States are not good. As great powers, China and Russia can use their power to suppress protesters’ freedom in Hong Kong or block Ukrainian membership in NATO. The South China Sea is likely to become more like the Caribbean than the Mediterranean—that is, China’s neighbors in Southeast Asia will be as beholden to China as Latin Americans have been to their hemispheric hegemon. Ukraine will have to get over the loss of Crimea as countries in Russia’s “near abroad” learn to be both more fearful of and more deferential to the Kremlin.

For many other nations and individuals around the world who have found shelter under the American security umbrella and found inspiration in a vision of an American-led international order that safeguards core liberties, the consequences will be tragic. Recent events in Syria offer a preview of what’s to come. As the Arab Spring erupted in late 2010 and 2011, Obama famously declared that Syrian leader Bashar al-Assad “must go.” But Putin had other ideas, and he was willing to act on them. He demonstrated that a nation Obama had dismissed as a “regional power” could use its military forces to defy the United States and help the Syrian leader consolidate his control.

This has been a horror for Syrians, and the millions of displaced people have had a major impact on neighboring countries and Europe. But did Obama, or, later, President Donald Trump, conclude that this outcome was so costly that it would be better to send large numbers of U.S. troops to fight and perhaps die in Syria? Can Americans sleep soundly in a world in which Putin and Assad now smile when they ask visitors who is gone and who is still standing? U.S. inaction speaks for itself.

Sadly, Americans will come to accept such outcomes as good enough—at least for the foreseeable future. Like Assad’s atrocities, Russia’s absorption of Crimea and China’s militarization of the South China Sea are now facts on the ground that no one will contest militarily.

Washington can shape other countries’ strategies through nonmilitary means.

Acknowledging that other powers have spheres of influence does not, of course, mean that the United States can do nothing. It is a reflection of the recent overmilitarization of U.S. foreign policy that restraint in the use of military force is often equated with acquiescence. Washington has other ways in which it can shape other countries’ calculations of costs and benefits: through the condemnation of unacceptable actions; the denial of legal status; the imposition of economic sanctions on countries, companies, and individuals; and support for local resisters. But such tools can rarely decisively alter a decision another power has made when interests it sees as vital are at stake. And it is worth remembering how often a refusal to recognize and accept realities on the ground in the shadow of other powers has led to major U.S. policy failures. From General Douglas MacArthur’s rush to the Chinese border during the Korean War (which triggered Chinese intervention and a bloody, inconclusive war) to George W. Bush’s insistence that NATO offer membership to Georgia and Ukraine (which led to Georgian overconfidence, ending in the country’s partial dismemberment by Russia), a stubborn disregard of brute facts has been counterproductive.

THE MUSEUM OF RETIRED INTERESTS

When it comes to doing what it can, Washington should focus above all on its alliances and partnerships. If China is destined to be “the biggest player in the history of the world,” as the longtime Singaporean leader Lee Kuan Yew once claimed, the United States must work to assemble allied powers who together will constitute a correlation of forces to which China will have to adjust.

This logic is most evident in the economic arena. Before the Trump administration ended U.S. participation in the Trans-Pacific Partnership, that trade agreement promised to bring together countries accounting for 40 percent of global GDP under a common set of rules on everything from tariffs to state-owned enterprises to labor and environmental standards—providing a counterweight to Chinese economic might that could have made Beijing a rule-taker rather than a rule-maker. Thanks to the efforts of Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe, the TPP is now a reality—but without the United States. If American policymakers could find a way to allow strategic interests to trump politics, the United States could rejoin the TPP. If that new TPP were combined with the parallel trade agreement between the United States and the European Union that was being negotiated at the end of the Obama administration, nearly 70 percent of the world’s GDP could be on one side of the balance, versus China’s approximately 20 percent on the other.

Washington will need partners that bring more in assets than they introduce in risks.

In the military arena, the same logic applies, but with more complexity. Washington will need partners—but partners that bring more in assets than they introduce in risks. Unfortunately, few of the United States’ current allies meet this standard. The U.S. alliance system should be subjected to a zero-based analysis: every current ally and partner, from Pakistan, the Philippines, and Thailand to Latvia, Saudi Arabia, and Turkey, should be considered in terms of what it is doing to enhance U.S. security and well-being, and with what risks and costs. Alliances are not forever. Historically, when conditions have changed, particularly when a focal enemy has disappeared or balances of power have shifted dramatically, so, too, have other relationships among nations. Most Americans today have forgotten an era in which NATO had a counterpart in Asia, SEATO (the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization), and even an analogue in the Middle East, CENTO (the Central Treaty Organization); both of those are now artifacts in the museum of retired national interests. As Kennan noted, “There is more respect to be won . . . by a resolute and courageous liquidation of unsound positions than by the most stubborn pursuit of extravagant or unpromising objectives.”

To understand the risks entailed in the inheritance of current U.S. alliances, consider two scenarios U.S. defense planners worry about today. If, watching China’s suppression of protests in Hong Kong, Taiwan should make a dramatic move toward independence that leads China to react violently, would the United States go to war with China to preserve Taiwan’s status? Should it? On the European front, if in response to an uprising of ethnic Russian workers in Riga’s shipyards, the Latvian government cracked down on ethnic Russians and sparked Russia’s annexation of a swath of Latvia—Crimea 2.0—would NATO launch an immediate military response, in accordance with its Article 5 guarantee? Should it? If the answer to any of those questions is not a straightforward yes—and it is not—then the time has come for an alliance-focused version of the stress tests for banks used after the 2008 financial crisis.

Such an approach is all the more important given the realities of nuclear weapons in this new world. Both China and Russia have reliable second-strike nuclear capabilities—that is, the ability to withstand an initial nuclear attack and conduct a retaliatory strike that could destroy the United States. Accordingly, not only is nuclear war not a viable option; even a conventional war that could escalate to nuclear war risks catastrophe. Competition must thus be tempered by caution, constraints, and careful calculations in risk taking. For a nation that has accumulated a long list of entanglements with nations that may have, or may imagine they have, a blank check from Washington, this creates a big problem. The line between reassuring an ally and emboldening its leadership to act recklessly is a fine one.

If the balance of military power in a conventional war over Taiwan or the Baltics has shifted decisively in China’s and Russia’s favor, current U.S. commitments are not sustainable. The gap between those commitments and the United States’ actual military capabilities is a classic case of overstretch. What a zero-based assessment would mean for the current alliance system, and for U.S. relations with each of more than 50 treaty allies and partners, should emerge as a result of an analysis of the evidence. But it would likely lead the United States to shed some allies, double down on others whose assets are as important for U.S. security as U.S. assets are for them, and radically revise the terms of each commitment to make obligations and restraints as prominent as reassurances and guarantees.

This process would also enhance the credibility of the commitments that the United States chose to renew. While the veterans of the Cold War rightly claim that NATO has been the greatest alliance in the history of the world, neither Trump nor Obama before him was convinced. Tellingly, American military commanders doubted that the North Atlantic Council would authorize a military response to the Russian annexation of Crimea or that the U.S. government would be able to make a decision about how to respond before the event was over. Rethinking the United States’ commitments to its allies would enhance American security and make these same pacts stronger.

PRESENT AT THE (RE-)CREATION

Strategy is the purposeful alignment of means and ends. Among the many ways in which a strategy fails, the two most common are mismatch—when the means an actor can organize and sustain are insufficient to achieve the stated ends—and vision blindness, when an actor is mesmerized by an ideal but unachievable end. The United States’ twenty-first-century wars in the Middle East offer vivid examples of both.

Going forward, U.S. policymakers will have to abandon unattainable aspirations for the worlds they dreamed of and accept the fact that spheres of influence will remain a central feature of geopolitics. That acceptance will inevitably be a protracted, confusing, and wrenching process. Yet it could also bring a wave of strategic creativity—an opportunity for nothing less than a fundamental rethinking of the conceptual arsenal of U.S. national security.

The basic view of the United States’ role in the world held by most of today’s foreign-policy makers was imprinted in the quarter century that followed the U.S. victory in the Cold War. That world is now gone. The consequences are as profound as those that Americans confronted in the late 1940s. Accordingly, it is worth remembering how long it took individuals now revered as “wise men” to understand the world they faced. Nearly five years passed between Kennan’s “Long Telegram,” an early warning of Cold War competition, and the policy paper NSC-68, which finally laid out a comprehensive strategy. The confusion that reigns in the U.S. foreign policy community today should thus not be a cause for alarm. If it took the great strategists of the Cold War nearly five years to forge a basic approach, it would be beyond hubris to expect this generation to do better.

#### Regionalism is peaceful and causes cooperation esp over warming.

Tang, PhD, ‘19

(Shiping, WayneStUniversity, MSIR@UCBerkeley, ProfInternationalStudies@FudanUniversity, “The Future of International Order(s),” The Washington Quarterly, 41(4), January) BW

Overlapping regional orders will become a key component of any future international order.15 Moreover, although the European Union is often the model conjured when thinking of regionalism, we need to approach regionalism without always taking the EU as the yardstick.16 According to a recent study by J. Thomas Volgy et al,17 regions with a single great power (e.g., North America) tend to be the most peaceful, with the exception of South Asia. In contrast, regions without a great power are more violence-prone such as the Middle East. Thus, when a region lacks a regional great power or a regional great power is either unable or unwilling (or both) to construct a peaceful regional order, that region tends to be less peaceful. In contrast, the outcomes for regions with two or more (mostly two) great powers depend on whether the regional powers can work together. Regional great powers working together tend to produce peace (e.g., the European Union in Europe), while their lack of cooperation (e.g. East Asia) tends to be more prone to war. Western Europe has been largely peaceful since World War II because Germany and France have cooperated with each other. By the same token, Central Asia may be moving toward a zone of peace, now that Russia and China have been increasingly working together. By comparison, East Asia’s future is looking increasingly fraught, given the rivalry between the U.S./Japan alliance and China, in addition to many regional states’ reluctance to embrace some kind of leadership role for Japan previously and now China. Indeed, with the collapse of the East Asia Summit that aims to forge a more integrated East Asia with only states from East Asia, East Asia seems to be a region lacking a genuinely regional project, at least for now. What does this mean for global governance? I venture to argue that regional resilience may now be more important than ever. As long as these regional blocs (and even spheres of influence) are rule-based and peacefully shaped, the current international order may be more stable and resilient than an order with only one center. Indeed, one can credibly argue that the post-WWII international system has been so stable precisely because many regions have institutionalized regional peace by constructing more rule-based regional orders.18 The key is not necessarily that there is one rule-maker, but that each region has rules. Here, it may be useful to recall that Pax Americana extended beyond the Western hemisphere only after the Cold War, and this may well be the first and the last time that any order approaches a global one. Throughout history, many regional orders have existed, though no truly global one has. Although many regional great powers may attempt to construct regional orders that can manage most regional issues within the region, few, if any, of these orders run counter to Pax Americana. The notion that Pax Americana is coming to an end and then will be replaced by a new global order underpinned by another global hegemon cannot be easily substantiated. We therefore should welcome regionalism projects in various regions. When regions can mostly take care of themselves, the world becomes a much safer and better governed place. Indeed, if regional states can manage their regional affairs well, then regions can withstand stronger headwind from the lonely and now whimsical superpower under Donald Trump. After all, almost every one of the existing security communities have originated regionally first. If regions are becoming increasingly critical, then we can also expect interregional coordination between regions to become more critical for the future international order. There are three possible types of these interregional dynamics. First, extra-regional great powers (EGPs) can choose to work for or against regionalism projects in other regions.19 It is certainly possible that extra-regional great powers (such as the United States in the European order) and regional great powers (such as France and Germany in Europe, or China and Japan in East Asia) and other regional small-to-medium states work together, if they can realize that doing so is better than plotting against each other. On this front, the United States has been the traditional go-to extra-regional great power. Today, however, both the EU and China might possibly join its ranks. Arguably, the Asia-Europe Summit, the Africa-China summit, and China’s “One Belt and One Road” (OBOR), or Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), are initiatives undertaken by the EU and China that may have a constructive role in another region. Of course, it must be admitted that China’s OBOR has not always been welcomed, to put it politely. As a result, it is unclear whether and how much OBOR can create interregional linkages. Likewise, it is unclear whether the China-Africa Summit can create much interregional and intraregional connection within Africa, although several African countries are quite interested in drawing useful lessons from China’s economic development simply because these countries would love to achieve a sustained high rate of economic growth. The same can be said regarding the Asia-EU Meeting (ASEM) and the Africa Union-EU Summit: these two interregional initiatives have added little to intraregional integration and the making of regional orders because countries within one of the regions do not like greater integration, at least for now. Second, regional organizations (e.g., the EU, the Africa Union, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations [ASEAN], and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization) can work together with each other and other key players to create new interregional frameworks or initiatives that can bring different regions together, or at least make different regions more connected with each other, besides making states within a region work together more. Here, the key question may be whether regions with more mature regionalism projects can lead the way. For instance, can the EU and East Asia work together, or even the EU, East Asia, and the Africa Union together? Third, different regional great powers can choose to work together with each other. Again, the United States has been the traditional go-to partner for many issues. Now with Trump, will key regional states rethink whether their U.S.-centrism is still warranted, at least until Trump is gone? For instance, can China and Japan work more closely with Argentina and Brazil in Latin America, or with India in South Asia? Likewise, can France and Germany work more closely with China and Japan? Altogether, because regions are becoming more regionalized, closer interregional coordination and cooperation based on open regionalism can become a key pillar of the emerging multiplex international order.20 Reforming Global Governance: More Bottom-up than Top-down? According to the definition of order noted above, rules or institutions (as key components of global governance) constitute the third dimension of international order, with the first being an order’s scope of coverage and the second being the relative distribution of power. Hence, reforming global governance is to reform one dimension of the international order for a better world by revising (or modifying) old rules and making new ones while retaining many key old rules. The post-WWII and then post-Cold War international order was mostly a top-down order because it was mostly imposed by the United States and its allies. Maintaining this status quo looks increasingly unlikely. In terms of making rules and reforming global governance, we are now moving from a mostly top-down style to a more bottom-up one. There are two critical forces behind this. First, major transformations of international order in the past had been mostly a process of victors imposing order after major wars (e.g., 1648, 1919, 1945, and 1991). With major wars being no longer feasible among great powers, it may be increasingly unlikely to have clear winners and losers. Hence, it may be increasingly unlikely to have clearly victorious sides that can hold the power and moral influence to impose order (upon losers and the rest). Second, with the diffusion of power from the West, the ability to impose order may no longer be realized. States, at least since 1648, were the only central agents in holding a concentration of power. In contrast, in today’s “flat” world, agents other than states have gained increasingly significant power in shaping rules, even though states remain key players. As a result, both developments point to new and multiple agents contesting rules. In addition, more regionalization will also mean that global governance will be increasingly constrained by regionalism projects. More regional, issue-specific, domain-specific (or ad hoc) rule-making is becoming the norm. Climate change is one prominent example of a specific issue getting attention because it is being moved forward by regional and subnational players. Federations of scientists and grassroots movements have played a critical role

in pushing forward important agendas for environmental protection and reducing greenhouse gas. Despite serious under-participation from the Global South, subnational players, especially global cites, have taken a more active role in shaping the future rules of environmental protection while state-to-state coordination on climate change has mostly stalled.21 This is just one example. There will be many regional orders within different domains and dimensions, meaning more bottom-up rather than top-down rule-making. Similarly, key progress has been advanced by nongovernmental actors in areas like quality management, transparency accounting and corporate responsibilities.22 Even though many of these major changes such as the ISO certificate system and corporate responsibilities for environmental protection were mostly from the corporate world, they have played an important role in shaping global governance more broadly. Without quality management and corporate responsibilities, it is unlikely that issues such as food security and environmental protection would have the kind of attention they do. Global governance is no longer the exclusive domain of states. Non-corporate nongovernmental actors have also been making moves. One such example is the area of art repatriation. Although often a victim state does formally request its stolen or looted art treasures to be returned and often another state has to approve the repatriation, the real action in art repatriation has been driven by museums, artists, and associations of them. Finally, we should never forget technological breakthroughs. The capitalist system will continue to spur the relentless drive for technological progress and profit, and thus will continue to bring profound changes in rules underpinning global governance, especially in areas such as communication, logistics, e-commerce, and travel. All these developments point to a more bottom-up style of shaping the international order, with multiple cross-cutting agents and initiatives. For instance, global cities may work with grassroots movements to pressure their respective national governments in other areas as they have about environmental protection when state-led initiatives (e.g., the Paris Accord) have stalled. The question though remains: can we effectively cope with challenges by having multiple agents competing for rules in overlapping domains? Nevertheless, it appears to be the world (and the order) that we are increasingly living in. Beyond the West: The Future of Modernity Though cracks within the West were evident before Brexit and Trump—ranging from how to tackle global warming, the rise of non-Western countries, and regime change in Iraq, Libya, and Syria—I am not predicting the decline of the West. Global governance without the West is both unimaginable and undesirable. However, both the West and the non-West must look beyond the West for partners in a host of issues. Some issues require cooperation within the non-West; others require cooperation between the West and the non-West. Thus, the West needs to reduce its egocentrism and look beyond its borders for the sake of a better international order. More critically, identifying the West as the eternal exception in the modernity project hinders rather than helps progress toward a more inclusive modernity project. What does the rise of ethno-nationalism within the West (e.g., the United States, the UK, Austria, or even France) mean for the future of international order(s)? Politically, it will mean more “America first,” “Britain first,” and “Germany First” etc. As such, it will deepen the cracks in the West. Economically, it will mean more or less the same as what we have seen in recent years, with more protectionism and less open trade. Both trends present challenges for the operation of the present order. For the future of the West itself, two critical points should be considered. First, despite the rise of non-Western countries, the United States and the West remain the most critical players of the existing international order in the foreseeable future. Thus, one of the most critical unknowns to the future of international order may be what kind of damages Trump can wreck upon it. Trump will inevitably pass, but Trumpism, for lack of a better term, will likely remain an undercurrent within U.S. domestic politics for some time to come. What does this mean for the international order? At the very least, two aspects should be considered. First, will Trump and Trumpism have some lasting impact (or do lasting harm) on the U.S. role and power in the world, including on the legitimacy of American leadership? Or could the resilience of U.S. staying power make Trump and Trumpism only a fleeting moment without lasting impact? Also, even if the United States reverted to its pre-Trump approach toward the international order, will the world have changed so much that the United States will need to find new roles for exercising its leadership in a new world order? The second critical point about the West, for the near future, is whether the idea of a more-or-less coherent West persist with some modifications? Should such an idea still hold special sway inside and outside the West? Within the West, the idea of a unified West certainly provides a sense of security, solidarity, and perhaps superiority. But that idea may also have inhibited the West from coming to terms with the non-West. If this is true, will the West become less Western-centric? Or will the non-West remain so fragmented that the concept of the West will still remain a linchpin of any future international order? Since World War II, the United States and the EU (often together) have been leaders of the international order by default. Both sides of the Atlantic prefer each other as the go-to partner for almost all key issues. Yet, if the West-centric order really desires to integrate the rest of the world into the existing order, then a partnership between the EU and other key states and regional organizations would be useful. This is especially true with Trump in the White House and the European Union experiencing its own problems of governance and populism backlashes. For one thing, Trump seems to believe that the United States should replace partners, which are expensive and no longer necessary, with followers. The key question then becomes whether the EU can work together with other states and regional organizations. For instance, can the African Union and the EU cooperate to reduce poverty? Can the EU and Asia work together to promote trade? Similarly, can the EU and China forge a stable partnership to combat climate change and advance African growth? All these possibilities cannot become realities unless the EU and other regional organizations and states no longer see the United States as their only plausible partner. It may be high time for countries to rethink whether their U.S.-centrism is still warranted, at least until Trump is gone. For instance, whether the EU and China can forge a stable partnership really depends on whether they can see each other and approach their potential cooperation from an angle without the United States being at the center of their imagination.23 Likewise, can the EU and BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) provide better ideas on rules of global governance and fill the void of political power now that Trump has only an “America First” policy? This may be the critical question for leaders of these countries. We need not only “West and West” and “Non-West and Non-West” but also “West and Non-West” partnerships. This rejection of U.S.-centrism, whether temporary or not, may be a critical variable in shaping the rules of global governance in future international order(s) in the next couple years.

#### Warming causes extinction

Dr. Yew-Kwang Ng 19, Winsemius Professor of Economics at Nanyang Technological University, Fellow of the Academy of Social Sciences in Australia and Member of Advisory Board at the Global Priorities Institute at Oxford University, PhD in Economics from Sydney University, “Keynote: Global Extinction and Animal Welfare: Two Priorities for Effective Altruism”, Global Policy, Volume 10, Number 2, May 2019, pp. 258–266

Catastrophic climate change Though by no means certain, CCC causing global extinction is possible due to interrelated factors of non-linearity, cascading effects, positive feedbacks, multiplicative factors, critical thresholds and tipping points (e.g. Barnosky and Hadly, 2016; Belaia et al., 2017; Buldyrev et al., 2010; Grainger, 2017; Hansen and Sato, 2012; IPCC 2014; Kareiva and Carranza, 2018; Osmond and Klausmeier, 2017; Rothman, 2017; Schuur et al., 2015; Sims and Finnoff, 2016; Van Aalst, 2006).7 A possibly imminent tipping point could be in the form of ‘an abrupt ice sheet collapse [that] could cause a rapid sea level rise’ (Baum et al., 2011, p. 399). There are many avenues for positive feedback in global warming, including: • the replacement of an ice sea by a liquid ocean surface from melting reduces the reflection and increases the absorption of sunlight, leading to faster warming; • the drying of forests from warming increases forest fires and the release of more carbon; and • higher ocean temperatures may lead to the release of methane trapped under the ocean floor, producing runaway global warming. Though there are also avenues for negative feedback, the scientific consensus is for an overall net positive feedback (Roe and Baker, 2007). Thus, the Global Challenges Foundation (2017, p. 25) concludes, ‘The world is currently completely unprepared to envisage, and even less deal with, the consequences of CCC’. The threat of sea-level rising from global warming is well known, but there are also other likely and more imminent threats to the survivability of mankind and other living things. For example, Sherwood and Huber (2010) emphasize the adaptability limit to climate change due to heat stress from high environmental wet-bulb temperature. They show that ‘even modest global warming could ... expose large fractions of the [world] population to unprecedented heat stress’ p. 9552 and that with substantial global warming, ‘the area of land rendered uninhabitable by heat stress would dwarf that affected by rising sea level’ p. 9555, making extinction much more likely and the relatively moderate damages estimated by most integrated assessment models unreliably low. While imminent extinction is very unlikely and may not come for a long time even under business as usual, the main point is that we cannot rule it out. Annan and Hargreaves (2011, pp. 434–435) may be right that there is ‘an upper 95 per cent probability limit for S [temperature increase] ... to lie close to 4°C, and certainly well below 6°C’. However, probabilities of 5 per cent, 0.5 per cent, 0.05 per cent or even 0.005 per cent of excessive warming and the resulting extinction probabilities cannot be ruled out and are unacceptable. Even if there is only a 1 per cent probability that there is a time bomb in the airplane, you probably want to change your flight. Extinction of the whole world is more important to avoid by literally a trillion times.

#### Pursuit of primacy not inevitable

Joe **Barnes 15**, Bonner Means Baker Fellow, Rice University’s Baker Institute For Public Policy; and Andrew Bowen, Ph.D., Senior Fellow and Director of Middle East Studies, Center for the National Interest, 2015, “Rethinking U.S. Strategy in the Middle East,” https://bakerinstitute.org/media/files/files/0b23aade/CME-Pub-StrategyMiddleEast-061915.pdf

We may argue about the wisdom of invading Iraq in the first place. We can enter into what is now an extensive debate upon the success or failure of the 2007 “surge” or the advisability of withdrawing U.S. troops from Iraq in 2010. But the **bottom line** remains: the experience of the Iraq invasion is a cautionary tale about the limits of U.S. power— however immense—to remake fractured polities. Afghanistan, where the U.S. has been fighting for 13 years without a conclusive victory over the Taliban, is another case in point. One might contend that the U.S. response to such failures should be to increase the human and financial resources it commits to “victory,” however defined: more troops, more budgetary outlays, permanent stationing of significant numbers of U.S. troops in places like Iraq and Afghanistan. Putting aside the question of whether such a response would merely mire the U.S. even more deeply in never-ending conflict, there is **little evidence** that **the American public would support such a policy**. U.S. power is not just limited by its ability to shape developments on the ground; it is also limited by the necessity of creating and, more importantly, **sustaining domestic support** for costly foreign military ventures. Finally, there are **real financial limits to U.S. freedom of action**. After all, the U.S. already spends immense sums on defense; a major new military intervention would further increase the cost. The public might accept substantially higher taxes, sharply reduced expenditures, or the acquisition of even greater debt in a true national emergency. But there is **little taste to do so**, for the sake of yet another large-scale intervention in Iraq.