## T

#### First off is Topicality –

#### Our interpretation is that the affirmative may only garner offense from the desirability of topical action.

#### “Resolved” before colon denotes a formal resolution.

**AWS ’13** [Army Writing Style; August 24th; Online resource dedicated to all major writing requirements in the Army; Army Writing Style, "Punctuation — The Colon and Semicolon," <https://armywritingstyle.com/punctuation-the-colon-and-semicolon/>; GR]

The colon introduces the following:

a.  A list, but only after "as follows," "the following," or a noun for which the list is an appositive: Each scout will carry the following: (colon) meals for three days, a survival knife, and his sleeping bag. The company had four new officers: (colon) Bill Smith, Frank Tucker, Peter Fillmore, and Oliver Lewis.

b.  A long quotation (one or more paragraphs): In The Killer Angels Michael Shaara wrote: (colon) You may find it a different story from the one you learned in school. There have been many versions of that battle [Gettysburg] and that war [the Civil War]. (The quote continues for two more paragraphs.)

c.  A formal quotation or question: The President declared: (colon) "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." The question is: (colon) what can we do about it?

d.  A second independent clause which explains the first: Potter's motive is clear: (colon) he wants the assignment.

e.  After the introduction of a business letter: Dear Sirs: (colon) Dear Madam: (colon) f.  The details following an announcement For sale: (colon) large lakeside cabin with dock

g.  A formal resolution, after the word "resolved:". Resolved: (colon) That this council petition the mayor.

#### Violation: A Just Government is confined to legal boundaries

Merriam Webster [Merriam Webster, No Date. “Just” [https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/just Accessed 10/24](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/just%20Accessed%2010/24) //gord0]

Definitions of Just 1a **:** having a basis in or conforming to fact or reason **:** [reasonable](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reasonable) had just reason to believe he was in danger b **:** conforming to a standard of correctness **:** [proper](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/proper) just proportions c archaic **:** faithful to an original 2a (1) **:** acting or being in conformity with what is morally upright or good **:** [righteous](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/righteous) a just war (2) **:** being what is merited **:** [deserved](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/deserved) a just punishment b **:** legally correct **:** [lawful](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/lawful) just title to an estate

#### A government is a political system

brittanica nd (https://www.britannica.com/topic/government)

government, the political system by which a country or community is administered and regulated.

#### Vote neg for limits and clash---Post facto topic change warps inevitable competitive incentives to encourage affs that avoid rigorous contestation and pick and choose literature rendering research useless. The resolution ensures a predictable role for the negative and affs that defend a controversial claim, which precludes monopolization of the moral high ground and concessionary ground.

#### Filter offense through iteration---Individual debates don’t shape subjectivities---Lots of alt causes like social background that one round can’t overcome. Only the long-term process of clash enables movements broadly by rewarding epistemic humility, rigorous research, self-reflexivity, and cost-benefit analysis.

#### Fairness first – Debate is a game, competitive equity is necessary to access any of its benefits, and it’s the only impact the ballot can solve.

#### Switch side solves – critiques of the resolution work just as well as critiques of topical affirmatives

#### TVA –

#### Double Bind: Either competition is their solvency mechanism and they don’t solve because we couldn’t meet our burden of rejoinder or its not and you can vote neg to say the aff is a good idea

#### No cross apps from case because it hasn’t been subject to rigorous scrutiny and procedurals always determine substance

#### No RVI’s or impact turns – T is a strategic choice necessitated by the burden of rejoinder otherwise kills neg flex and engagement.

## DA- Hospital Profits

#### Hospital profit margins are razor thin, COVID only makes the problem worse

AHA 20 American Hospital Association, July 2020, "The Effect of COVID-19 on Hospital Financial Health," <https://www.aha.org/guidesreports/2020-07-20-effect-covid-19-hospital-financial-health>, llr

Hospitals Require a Positive Margin to Serve Their Communities. For any organization, a positive operating margin is essential for long-term survival. Few organizations can maintain themselves for an extended period when total expenses are greater than total revenues. For hospitals, positive financial margins allow them to invest in new facilities, treatments, and technologies to better care for patients, and to build reserves to meet unexpected expenses or revenue shortfalls. Before COVID-19; Compared with other industries, healthcare margins typically have been very thin. Even before COVID-19, a number of U.S. hospitals struggled with negative margins—in other words, they were losing money on operations. In fact the median hospital margin was a very modest 3.5%. This situation has been a serious threat to the future viability of many of America’s hospitals. The Effect of COVID-19 on Hospital Margins. When the COVID-19 pandemic emerged, hospitals had to stop all but the most urgent non-COVID care. The result was a dramatic slowdown in volume of patients and in revenue, while expenses remained high. To date, no one knows when and to what degree these patients will return. The result has been an unprecedented impact and an uncertain future about the ability of hospitals to serve their communities and remain financially viable.

#### Healthcare worker strikes destroy hospital profits, increase spending, and can put hospitals out of business

Masterson 17, Les Masterson, 8-15-2017, "Nursing strikes can cause harm well beyond labor relations," Healthcare Dive, <https://www.healthcaredive.com/news/nursing-strikes-can-cause-harm-well-beyond-labor-relations/447627>, llr

officials at Tufts Medical Center in Boston refused to allow nurses just off of a one-day strike return to their jobs, the footage spread across TV news programs and social media. Boston Mayor Martin Walsh, a former labor leader, spoke in favor of the striking nurses and the hospital found itself in an uncomfortable spotlight. About 1,200 nurses went on a one-day strike after their union, the Massachusetts Nurses Association, and Tufts couldn't come to a new contract agreement after more than a year of negotiations. Tufts, in turn, locked out the nurses when they attempted to return to work the next day. Officials said the lockout was required because they needed to give at least five-day contracts to 320 temporary nurses brought in to fill the gap. The nurses are back on the job now without a new contract, but the strike and subsequent lockout got the public’s attention. Hospital strikes aren't that common — usually, the sides agree to a new contract. Strikes or threatened strikes in recent years have typically involved conflicts over pay, benefits and staff workloads. When strikes do happen, however, they can hurt a hospital’s reputation, finances and patient care. Strike’s effect on patient safety. A study on nurses’ strikes in New York found that labor actions have a temporary negative effect on a hospital’s patient safety. Study authors Jonathan Gruber and Samuel A. Kleiner found that nurses’ strikes increased in-patient mortality by 18.3% and 30-day readmission by 5.7% for patients admitted during the strike. Patients admitted during a strike got a lower quality of care, they wrote. “We show that this deterioration in outcomes occurs only for those patients admitted during a strike, and not for those admitted to the same hospitals before or after a strike. And we find that these changes in outcomes are not associated with any meaningful change in the composition of, or the treatment intensity for, patients admitted during a strike,” they said. They said a possible reason for the lower quality is fewer major procedures performed during a strike, which could lead partially to diminished outcomes. The study authors found that patients that need the most nursing care are the ones who make out worst during strikes. “We find that patients with particularly nursing-intensive conditions are more susceptible to these strike effects, and that hospitals hiring replacement workers perform no better during these strikes than those that do not hire substitute employees,” they wrote. Allina Health’s Abbott Northwestern Hospital in Minneapolis faced a patient safety issue during a strike last year that resulted in the CMS placing the hospital in “immediate jeopardy” status after a medication error. A replacement nurse administered adrenaline to an asthmatic patient through an IV rather than into the patient’s muscle. The patient, who was in the emergency room (ER), wound up in intensive care for three days because of the error. Allina said the error was not the nurse’s fault, but was the result of a communication problem. The CMS accepted the hospital plan of correction, which included having a nurse observer when needed and retraining ER staff to repeat back verbal orders. A strike’s financial impact. Hospitals also take a financial hit during strikes. Even the threat of a one- or two-day nurse strike can cost a hospital millions. Bringing in hundreds or thousands of temporary nurses from across the country is costly for hospitals. They need to advertise the positions, pay for travel and often give bonuses to lure temporary nurses. The most expensive recent nurse strike was when about 4,800 nurses went on strike at Allina Health in Minnesota two times last year. The two strikes of seven days and 41 days cost the health system $104 million. The hospital also saw a $67.74 million operating loss during the quarter of those strikes. To find temporary replacements, Allina needed to include enticing offers, such as free travel and a $400 bonus to temporary nurses. Even the threat of a strike can cost millions. Brigham and Women’s Hospital in Boston spent more than $8 million and lost $16 million in revenue preparing for a strike in 2016. The 3,300-nurse union threatened to walk out for a day and much like Tufts Medical Center, Brigham & Women’s said the hospital would lock out nurses for four additional days if nurses took action. At that time, Dr. Ron Walls, executive vice president and chief operating officer at Brigham and Women’s Hospital, said the hospital spent more than $5 million on contracting with the U.S. Nursing Corp. to bring on 700 temporary nurses licensed in Massachusetts. The hospital also planned to cut capacity to 60% during the possible strike and moved hundreds of patients to other hospitals. They also canceled procedures and appointments in preparation of a strike. The Massachusetts Nurses Association and Brigham & Women’s were able to reach a three-year agreement before a strike, but the damage was already done to the hospital’s finances. Richard L. Gundling, senior vice president of healthcare financial practices at Healthcare Financial Management Association, told Healthcare Dive that healthcare organizations need to plan for business continuity in case of an event, such as a labor strike, natural disaster or cyberattack. “Business continuity is directly related to the CFO’s responsibility for maintaining business functions. The plan should include having business continuity insurance in place to replace the loss associated with diminished revenue and increased expenses during the event,” Gundling said. These plans should provide adequate staffing, training, materials, supplies, equipment and communications in case of a strike. Hospitals should also keep payers, financial agencies and other important stakeholders informed of potential issues. “It’s also key to keep financial stakeholders well informed; this includes insurance companies, bond rating agencies, banks, other investors, suppliers and Medicare/Medicaid contractors,” he said. “Business continuity is directly related to the CFO’s responsibility for maintaining business functions. The plan should include having business continuity insurance in place to replace the loss associated with diminished revenue and increased expenses during the event." Impact to a hospital’s reputation. Hospital strikes, particularly nurses’ strikes, can also wreak havoc on a hospital’s reputation. Nurses are a beloved profession. They work hard, often long hours and don’t make a fortune doing it. The median registered nurses’ salary is about $70,000, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Nurses’ contract disputes involving staffing levels are a sticky situation for hospitals. Nurses will almost always win the PR battle against hospital executives. If a hospital can’t avoid a strike, Fraser Seitel, president of Emerald Partners, a communications management consulting company, told Healthcare Dive said two keys for the organization are telling the truth and not being passive about untrue statements from the other side. They don’t want to be adversarial and escalate the situation, but go with a more measured approach. Seitel said there are two ways that hospital leadership can avoid a strike. “The best way to prevent a strike is by the management of the hospital having a robust communications program with the staff of the hospital as well as keeping competitive in terms of salaries and benefits,” said Seitel, who has helped hospitals during times of labor strife. Seitel said labor issues often crop up when management isn’t communicative. Communication, transparency and competitive compensation are the best preventative medicine for a strike, he said.

#### Hospital profits are key to the economy

Samuelson 17, Kate Samuelson, Policy Advisor to the United States Senate and Research Assistant University of Pennsylvania for pediatric and adolescent public health research at the Penn Center for Public Health Initiatives, 5-4-2017, "The Role of Hospitals in Community and Economic Development," Fels Institute of Government University of Pennsylvania, <https://www.fels.upenn.edu/recap/posts/1071>, llr

Across differing regions, medical institutions (often referred to as “anchor institutions”) play a major role in the social and economic vitality of cities. In total, hospitals provide employment for more than 5.7 million Americans, with tens of thousands of new healthcare jobs added each month. Additionally, hospitals spend over $852 billion on goods and services annually and generate greater than $2.8 trillion of economic activity. The Bureau of Labor Statistics predicts that, between 2014 and 2024, the healthcare industry will grow faster and add more jobs than any other sector. Hospitals are particularly important in high-poverty areas. In each of the largest twenty U.S. cities, a health system is among the top ten private employers; in high-poverty communities, a health system is almost always among the top five. About one in fifteen of the largest hospitals in the U.S. are located in “inner cities,” and these hospitals alone spend more than $130 billion each year. Because not-for-profit hospitals are tax-exempt, surrounding neighborhoods might view them as disconnected from small business and community development. However, the missions and bottom lines of hospitals tie them to their respective communities. More than other industries, the hospital industry has the ability and incentive to leverage resources for community revitalization. Increasingly, hospital executives are pursuing upstream interventions to minimize downstream costs. There is a major push to make healthcare for low-income individuals less reactive and more proactive; hospitals are striving to reach these patients more frequently at less expensive points in the healthcare system. Community health centers lack the capacity to fully serve the large population without quality health insurance. Private hospitals effectively serve as the “insurers of last resort,” caring for uninsured patients who can’t afford to pay their medical bills. Many are aiming to generate long-term savings through population health and community development strategies. When not-for-profit hospitals address socioeconomic issues in the communities they serve, they help residents to afford health insurance, reduce costs due to preventable and chronic conditions, and support their own workforce needs. Building community wealth improves the ability of local residents (who are likely patients) to pay for care. Further, attending to the social determinants of health can prevent or significantly reduce the management cost of chronic conditions such as diabetes, which disproportionately affects low-income individuals. Community building, the highly necessary counterpart to healthcare access work, has been steadily gaining traction within the field of public health. According to the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, sixty percent of premature deaths are related to environmental conditions, social circumstances, and behavioral patterns; just ten percent are the result of inadequate healthcare access. Moreover, ninety-eight percent of hospital CEOs agree that, at least at some level, hospitals should investigate and implement population health management strategies. Hospitals are increasingly acting on the growing evidence base suggesting that interventions to improve a community’s social and economic health can significantly impact community members’ physical and mental health. Since around the mid-1990s, hospitals across the U.S. have experimented with innovative approaches to community and economic development. In Rochester, Minnesota, Mayo Clinic invested $7 million to establish First Homes, a community land trust. The trust has created 875 units of high-quality affordable housing and encouraged over $360 million of private investment in downtown Rochester. In Boston, Massachusetts, Partners Healthcare (parent to Massachusetts General Hospital and Brigham & Women’s Hospital) has integrated community health improvement with workforce development, providing job training and a pathway to entry- and mid-level employment (approximately 90% placement rate) for over 400 community members. Since 1990, San Francisco-based Dignity Health (formerly Catholic Healthcare) has provided $133 million in below-market interest rate loans and $47 million in grants to nonprofits improving health and quality of life in its service area. These are just a few examples of the many meaningful ways in which hospitals are supporting their communities, making local capacity building a priority, and creating the foundation for long-term poverty alleviation. The reconceptualization of healthcare to include social determinants of health is critical to public health and economic development alike. Nonprofit hospitals, private health foundations, government institutions, and other entities must collaborate to address the multi-faceted, social drivers of health disparities.

#### Healthcare decline crashes the US economy

Howrigon 17, Ron Howrigon, president and CEO, Fulcrum Strategies and the author of Flatlining: How Healthcare Could Kill the U.S. Economy, 1-19-2017, "How health care could crash the U.S. economy," KevinMD, <https://www.kevinmd.com/blog/2017/01/health-care-crash-u-s-economy.html>, llr

In recent history, the U.S. economy has experienced the near catastrophic failure of two major market segments. The first was the auto industry and the second was the housing industry. While each of these reached their breaking point for different reasons, they both required a significant government bailout to keep them from completely melting down. What is also true about both of those market failures is that, looking back, it’s easy to see the warning signs. What happens if health care is the next industry to suffer a major failure and collapse? It’s safe to say that a health care meltdown would make both the automotive and housing industries’ experiences seem minor in comparison. While that may be hard to believe, it becomes clear if you look at the numbers. The auto industry contributes around 3.5 percent of this country’s GDP and employs 1.7 million people. This industry was deemed “too big to fail” which is the rationale the U.S. government used to finance its bail out. From 2009 through 2014, the federal government invested around $80 billion in the U.S. auto industry to keep it from collapsing. Health care is five times larger than the auto industry in terms of its percentage of GDP, and is ten times larger than the auto industry in terms of the number of people it employs. The construction industry (which includes all construction, not just housing) contributes about 6 percent of our country’s GDP and employs 6.1 million people. Again, the health care market dwarfs this industry. It’s three times larger in terms of GDP production and, with 18 million people employed in the health care sector, it’s three times larger than construction in this area, too. These comparisons give you an idea of just how significant a portion health care comprises of the U.S. economy. It also begins to help us understand the impact it would have on the economy if health care melted down like the auto and housing industries did. So, let’s continue the comparison and use our experience with the auto and housing industries to suggest to what order of magnitude the impact a failure in the health care market would cause our economy. The bailout in the auto industry cost the federal government $80 billion over five years. Imagine a similar failure in health care that prompted the federal government to propose a similar bailout program. Let’s imagine the government felt the need to inject cash into hospital systems and doctors’ offices to keep them afloat like they did with General Motors. Since health care is five times the size of the auto industry, a similar bailout could easily cost in excess of $400 billion. That’s about the same amount of money the federal government spends on welfare programs. To pay for a bailout of the health care industry, we’d have to eliminate all welfare programs in this country. Can you imagine the impact it would have on the economy if there were suddenly none of the assistance programs so many have come to rely upon? When the housing market crashed, it caused the loss of about 3 million jobs from its peak employment level of 7.4 million in 1996. Again, if we transfer that experience to the health care market, we come up with a truly frightening scenario. If health care lost 40 percent of its jobs like housing did, it would mean 7.2 million jobs lost. That’s more than four times the number of people who are employed by the entire auto industry — an industry that was considered too big to be allowed to fail. The loss of 7.2 million jobs would increase the unemployment rate by 5 percent. That means we could easily top the all-time high unemployment rate for our country. OK, now it’s time to take a deep breath. I’m not convinced that health care is fated to unavoidable failure and economic catastrophe. That’s a worst-case scenario. The problem is that at even a fraction the severity of the auto or housing industry crises we’ve already faced, a health care collapse would still be devastating. Health care can’t be allowed to continue its current inflationary trending. I believe we are on the verge of some major changes in health care, and that how they’re implemented will determine their impact on the overall economic picture in this country and around the world. Continued failure to recognize the truth about health care will only cause the resulting market corrections to be worse than they need to be. I don’t want to diminish the pain and anguish that many people caught up in the housing crash experienced. I think an argument can be made, though, that if the health care market crashes and millions of people end up with no health care, the resulting fallout could be much worse than even the housing crisis.

#### Economic decline causes nuclear war

Mann 14, Eric Mann, Master of Arts in Global Security Studies Johns Hopkin, “AUSTERITY, ECONOMIC DECLINE, AND FINANCIAL WEAPONS OF WAR: A NEW PARADIGM FOR GLOBAL SECURITY,” May 2014, <https://jscholarship.library.jhu.edu/bitstream/handle/1774.2/37262/MANN-THESIS-2014.pdf>

The conclusions reached in this thesis demonstrate how economic considerations within states can figure prominently into the calculus for future conflicts. The findings also suggest that security issues with economic or financial underpinnings will transcend classical determinants of war and conflict, and change the manner by which rival states engage in hostile acts toward one another. The research shows that security concerns emanating from economic uncertainty and the inherent vulnerabilities within global financial markets will present new challenges for national security, and provide developing states new asymmetric options for balancing against stronger states. The security areas, identified in the proceeding chapters, are likely to mature into global security threats in the immediate future. As the case study on South Korea suggest, the overlapping security issues associated with economic decline and reduced military spending by the United States will affect allied confidence in America’s security guarantees. The study shows that this outcome could cause regional instability or realignments of strategic partnerships in the Asia-pacific region with ramifications for U.S. national security. Rival states and non-state groups may also become emboldened to challenge America’s status in the unipolar international system. The potential risks associated with stolen or loose WMD, resulting from poor security, can also pose a threat to U.S. national security. The case study on Pakistan, Syria and North Korea show how financial constraints affect weapons security making weapons vulnerable to theft, and how financial factors can influence WMD proliferation by contributing to the motivating factors behind a trusted insider’s decision to sell weapons technology. The inherent vulnerabilities within the global financial markets will provide terrorists’ organizations and other non-state groups, who object to the current international system or distribution of power, with opportunities to disrupt global finance and perhaps weaken America’s status. A more ominous threat originates from states intent on increasing diversification of foreign currency holdings, establishing alternatives to the dollar for international trade, or engaging financial warfare against the United States.

## Heg

#### International military presence is inevitable, but wavering alliance commitments cause great power war, prolif, nuclear miscalc, and human rights violations.

Wright 20 [THOMAS WRIGHT is Director of the Center on the United States and Europe and a Senior Fellow in the Project on International Order and Strategy at the Brookings Institution. He is the author of All Measures Short of War: The Contest for the Twenty-first Century and the Future of American Power. March/April 2020, “The Folly of Retrenchment,” Foreign Affairs, Volume 99, Number 2, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2020-02-10/folly-retrenchment//lhs-ap>]

This is a false promise, for a number of reasons. First, retrenchment would worsen regional security competition in Europe and Asia. The realists recognize that the U.S. military presence in Europe and Asia does dampen security competition, but they claim that it does so at too high a price—and one that, at any rate, should be paid by U.S. allies in the regions themselves. Although pulling back would invite regional security competition, realist retrenchers admit, the United States could be safer in a more dangerous world because regional rivals would check one another. This is a perilous gambit, however, because regional conflicts often end up implicating U.S. interests. They might thus end up drawing the United States back in after it has left—resulting in a much more dangerous venture than heading off the conflict in the first place by staying. Realist retrenchment reveals a hubris that the United States can control consequences and prevent crises from erupting into war.

A U.S. pullback from Europe or Asia is more likely to embolden regional powers.

The progressives’ view of regional security is similarly flawed. These retrenchers reject the idea that regional security competition will intensify if the United States leaves. In fact, they argue, U.S. alliances often promote competition, as in the Middle East, where U.S. support for Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates has emboldened those countries in their cold war with Iran. But this logic does not apply to Europe or Asia, where U.S. allies have behaved responsibly. A U.S. pullback from those places is more likely to embolden the regional powers. Since 2008, Russia has invaded two of its neighbors that are not members of NATO, and if the Baltic states were no longer protected by a U.S. security guarantee, it is conceivable that Russia would test the boundaries with gray-zone warfare. In East Asia, a U.S. withdrawal would force Japan to increase its defense capabilities and change its constitution to enable it to compete with China on its own, straining relations with South Korea.

The second problem with retrenchment involves nuclear proliferation. If the United States pulled out of NATO or ended its alliance with Japan, as many realist advocates of retrenchment recommend, some of its allies, no longer protected by the U.S. nuclear umbrella, would be tempted to acquire nuclear weapons of their own. Unlike the progressives for retrenchment, the realists are comfortable with that result, since they see deterrence as a stabilizing force. Most Americans are not so sanguine, and rightly so. There are good reasons to worry about nuclear proliferation: nuclear materials could end up in the hands of terrorists, states with less experience might be more prone to nuclear accidents, and nuclear powers in close proximity have shorter response times and thus conflicts among them have a greater chance of spiraling into escalation.

Third, retrenchment would heighten nationalism and xenophobia. In Europe, a U.S. withdrawal would send the message that every country must fend for itself. It would therefore empower the far-right groups already making this claim—such as the Alternative for Germany, the League in Italy, and the National Front in France—while undermining the centrist democratic leaders there who told their populations that they could rely on the United States and NATO. As a result, Washington would lose leverage over the domestic politics of individual allies, particularly younger and more fragile democracies such as Poland. And since these nationalist populist groups are almost always protectionist, retrenchment would damage U.S. economic interests, as well. Even more alarming, many of the right-wing nationalists that retrenchment would empower have called for greater accommodation of China and Russia.

A fourth problem concerns regional stability after global retrenchment. The most likely end state is a spheres-of-influence system, whereby China and Russia dominate their neighbors, but such an order is inherently unstable. The lines of demarcation for such spheres tend to be unclear, and there is no guarantee that China and Russia will not seek to move them outward over time. Moreover, the United States cannot simply grant other major powers a sphere of influence—the countries that would fall into those realms have agency, too. If the United States ceded Taiwan to China, for example, the Taiwanese people could say no. The current U.S. policy toward the country is working and may be sustainable. Withdrawing support from Taiwan against its will would plunge cross-strait relations into chaos. The entire idea of letting regional powers have their own spheres of influence has an imperial air that is at odds with modern principles of sovereignty and international law.

A fifth problem with retrenchment is that it lacks domestic support. The American people may favor greater burden sharing, but there is no evidence that they are onboard with a withdrawal from Europe and Asia. As a survey conducted in 2019 by the Chicago Council on Global Affairs found, seven out of ten Americans believe that maintaining military superiority makes the United States safer, and almost three-quarters think that alliances contribute to U.S. security. A 2019 Eurasia Group Foundation poll found that over 60 percent of Americans want to maintain or increase defense spending. As it became apparent that China and Russia would benefit from this shift toward retrenchment, and as the United States’ democratic allies objected to its withdrawal, the domestic political backlash would grow. One result could be a prolonged foreign policy debate that would cause the United States to oscillate between retrenchment and reengagement, creating uncertainty about its commitments and thus raising the risk of miscalculation by Washington, its allies, or its rivals.

Realist and progressive retrenchers like to argue that the architects of the United States’ postwar foreign policy naively sought to remake the world in its image. But the real revisionists are those who argue for retrenchment, a geopolitical experiment of unprecedented scale in modern history. If this camp were to have its way, Europe and Asia—two stable, peaceful, and prosperous regions that form the two main pillars of the U.S.-led order—would be plunged into an era of uncertainty.

THE CHINA CHALLENGE

Such are the inherent flaws of retrenchment, downsides that would apply at any time in the post–Cold War era. But the strategy is particularly poorly suited for the current moment, when the United States finds itself in a systemic competition with China, in which each side threatens the other not just because of what they do but also because of what they are.

To China and other autocracies, the United States’ democratic system is inherently threatening. The free press promises to reveal vital secrets about the Chinese regime simply because it can, with American journalists’ 2012 reports about elite corruption in China and Hong Kong and their 2019 revelations about the repression of China’s Uighurs serving as Exhibits A and B. Social media, businesses, universities, nongovernmental organizations, and Congress have all played a role in undermining the regime in Beijing and sowing the seeds of democracy.

To combat these threats, Beijing is increasingly relying on repression, often facilitated by innovations such as facial recognition technology and artificial intelligence. But its ambitions are not limited to its own territory: Beijing has exported its tactics and technology abroad in an attempt to undermine liberalism. It has cracked down on foreign nongovernmental organizations with a presence in China, pressured foreign corporations to endorse its behavior, and grown more vocal within the UN Human Rights Council in an effort to weaken international norms. China has also attempted to illicitly influence Western democracies through operations such as illegally funneling money into Australian politics to support politicians favorable to China. These actions are seen as threatening by the United States.

The competition of systems between the United States and China increasingly involves all parts of society—business, the media, sports, technology, education, politics, diplomacy, intelligence, the military. This competition does not generally involve the use of force, but the geopolitical balance of power is a vital component. It is the United States’ strength and the deterrence it produces that prevents this competition from spilling over into the military domain. The U.S. alliance system also provides a basis for helping other states preserve and strengthen their democratic systems in the shadow of Chinese influence. But advocates of retrenchment aim to weaken both the U.S. military and U.S. alliances. It is vitally important that the United States manage this competition of systems responsibly to protect U.S. interests and to prevent the rivalry from spiraling out of control.

#### Russia is evil – they exhibit hyper-revisionist behavior and destabilize the liberal order in order to conquer the Baltics

Kirillova 18 [Kseniya Kirillova is a Russian journalist that focuses on analyzing Russian society, political processes in modern Russia and the Russian-Ukrainian conflict. She writes for Radio Liberty and other outlets and is an expert of the Center for Army, conversion, and disarmament studies and the Free Russia foundation. 8/29. "WHY RUSSIAN “SOFT POWER” IS MUCH MORE DANGEROUS THAN WESTERN “SOFT POWER”." https://demwritepress.com/2018/08/29/why-russian-soft-power-is-much-more-dangerous-than-western-soft-power/]

The Russian threat is incalculably more destructive and terrible than the activities of the United States. Apart from espionage which all great states conduct, I shall attempt to concentrate on the differences in so-called “soft power.” These differences manifest themselves as follows:

Different goals. The “soft power” used by the USA in Eastern Europe and Russia throughout the period following the fall of the USSR did not have as its goal the destruction of these countries. Quite the opposite: the democratic institutions the United States tried to introduce into the post-Soviet space, had they been fully enacted, would have led to notable improvements in the development of the country and the standard of living. This includes anti-corruption initiatives and attempts to create a transparent and independent judiciary, as well as procedures to insure the fairness of elections, etc.

Throughout my last years in Russia I maintained close ties to supporters of human rights in my native Urals, and I can confirm that the grant projects implemented by local human rights defenders and supported by foreign funds were in accordance with their officially announced goals. Moreover, if the USA really wanted to “destroy Russia” as averred by Kremlin propaganda, it would have been fully possible to do so in the 90’s. However, rather than this, America provided colossal assistance to Russia, both material and institutional.

In contrast, Moscow does not conceal its view of the USA as its main, deadly and irreconcilable enemy, the essence of evil, the creator of international terrorism, and the primary threat to the very existence of Russia. Therefore, the Russian authorities set as their task to weaken the USA and Europe to the greatest possible extent, to undermine Western democracy, to destroy existing institutions with one overriding goal – to render these countries one way or another dependent on the Kremlin and incapable of resisting Russian aggression in Eastern Europe.

Russia has no interest in introducing any constructive institutions or positive changes in the West; she wants to convert the mass media into a source of propaganda and fake news and convert business into a criminally corrupt mechanism to spread its influence and self-serving lobbying. Even the supposedly positive goals announced by Moscow turn out to be lies inasmuch as not a single positive program exists in today’s Russia. This is why the Kremlin supports any, often mutually exclusive, ideologies and trends that could lead to the collapse of the “enemy” country.

For example, by wholly supporting Trump and his battle against key American institutions, Moscow also supports the man who claims to be Trump’s irreconcilable enemy who calls for the secession of California from the USA – Louis Marinelli. Clearly, the goal of Russian influence is the absolute destruction of the West.

Difference in methods. Given the goals of US activities, the way they use “soft power” is completely transparent and consistent with stated goals. America attempts to translate American values via mass media, the activities of NGO’s (including grants for foreign organizations), the possibility of foreign internships, educational programs, etc. Russian political scientists use almost the same channels of influence over Western societies with the difference that Russia does not create values for those it takes under its wing, but rather fear – and false fear, at that. Fear, hatred, and lies such as “Ukrainian fascism” or “American aggression” – these are the basic products of Russian propaganda.

The basic methodology of Kremlin propagandists is not to introduce positive examples and concrete models for development as is the practice of Western countries, but rather to take advantage of any compromising material, disagreement, human fallibility, hatred, prejudice or fear, etc. They use stereotypes, name calling, the demonization of certain groups of people, the destruction of identities, the creation of false templates and clichés that make it difficult for people to regard one another objectively. As a result, even the most insignificant contradictions are taken as insurmountable, and completely natural difficulties are presented as catastrophes. The distortion of reality and drawing various political and social forces into a war of everybody against everybody else – this has always been the favorite method for destabilization used by Russian special services.

One should not discard from consideration the criminally corrupt contacts developed by Russian business, hacker attacks and false information intended to destroy the very concept of truth itself. And possibly the most important difference from the USA is the use by Russia of criminals and terrorists for military purposes, especially in Europe. Even without taking into account the unproven suspicion of many experts concerning possible contacts with ISIS by Russian intelligence, it is sufficient to cite the example of the annexation of the Crimea, the war in Donbass, and preparations for the unsuccessful coup in Montenegro to confirm that international terrorism in Europe has become the norm for today’s Russia.

A tendency toward conspiracy: It is important to remember that Russia is a totalitarian state headed by former special service operatives, above all the KGB. It is the FSB that controls the majority of social organizations, mass media, all big business, expatriate organizations abroad, many cultural programs, funds, etc. So, the suspicion that this or that Russian structure serves as a conduit for Kremlin policy and has no independence is completely justifiable no less so than suspicions of conspiracy, recruitment, and the like that always have been used by Russian special services in relations with their “partners.”

This is why the Russians very often judge western countries according to their own example. Former KGB officers simply are incapable of imagining the existence of independent mass media, a strong civil society with a plethora of social organizations free from government interference, uncensored creative arts, an independent judiciary, etc. Therefore, the spread of Russian propaganda and western adherents of conspiracy theories about a “world government” or a “deep state” in the USA are laughable lies or conscious projections by Moscow of its own operating style in quite a different society and state that exists according to its own laws.

From the above it is obvious that the Russian threat demands a serious response from western society because, using all the advantages of the free world, Moscow resorts to methods that are unacceptable for western governments. And such a threat merits an adequate response.

#### China doesn’t seek territorial integrity --- they are seeking conquest

Goswami 19 (Dr. Namrata Goswami, Independent Senior Analyst and Author, 2016-2017 Minerva Grantee. Statement before the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission Hearing on “China in Space: A Strategic Competition?” April 25, 2019 https://www.uscc.gov/sites/default/files/Namrata%20Goswami%20USCC%2025%20April.pdf)

While others offer insights that PRC space efforts are mostly aimed at anti-access, or information dominance strategies, in my perspective, what should be of concern to the U.S are the elements that are focused on material and economic strength and securing of space resources. Chinese space activities should be seen through the lens of territorial and resource competitive offensives such as the Belt and Road Initiative and 5G internet. China’s space ambitions indicate that under the leadership of Xi, it is not only establishing capacity to take advantage of the multi-trillion dollar space industry that awaits but also enhancing and streamlining its military capacities for power projection in outer-space. Leading to these are proclaimed ambitions of colonizing the moon, and establish norms and regulations for outer-space led by China. The Commission has good reasons to be skeptical of PRC efforts at norm construction. China supported a joint draft proposal with Russia for the “Treaty on Prevention of the Placement of Weapons in Outer Space and of the Threat or Use of Force Against Outer Space Objects” in 2008 and again in 2014.148 While the move for such a treaty appears noble, an in-depth assessment indicates that it does not include a ban on direct ascent ASAT technologies or terrestrially based space weapons. The Commission should consider that there are indications China views space territorially and therefore it is relevant to examine how China behaves with respect to territory and resources on Earth. China’s history of signing bilateral agreements with countries it has land disputes with committing to de-escalation and peaceful resolution of disputes, while simultaneously engaging in behavior that is contrary to its signed commitments, do not give us much assurance it will behave any differently in the space domain.149 This aspect was visible in the 2017 China-Bhutan border dispute. The dispute started when the Royal Bhutan Army (RBA) observed Chinese road-building activities in the Doklam area. The RBA tried to dissuade the People’s Liberation Army (PLA) engineers from constructing the road but failed. This led to Indian military intervention on behalf of Bhutan, and de-escalation of the conflict after a 73 days standoff between two nuclear armed nations. Critically, China and Bhutan had signed agreements to resolve this dispute peacefully and have held 24 rounds of negotiations on the same, since 1984. The Bhutanese government’s take is that China’s roadbuilding activities is against the 1988 and 1998 bilateral China-Bhutan agreements by which all boundary disputes will be resolved by negotiations. Bhutan states that “we have written agreements of 1988 and 1998 stating that the two sides agree to maintain peace and tranquility in their border areas pending a final settlement on the boundary question, and to maintain status quo on the boundary as before March 1959. The agreements also state that the two sides will refrain from taking unilateral action, or use of force, to change the status quo of the boundary”.150 On the other hand, the Chinese perspective is that its road-building activities do not infringe upon Bhutanese territory as Doklam has always been a part of China. Foreign Ministry Spokesperson, Lu Kang, asserted “Doklam has been a part of China since ancient times. That is an indisputable fact supported by historical and jurisprudential evidence, and the ground situation. China's activities in Doklam are acts of sovereignty on its own territory. It is completely justified and lawful”.151 An analysis of China’s past behavior regarding negotiations on disputed territory reveals a clear systematic pattern of engagement which is relevant to its future space ambitions. In its active border and territorial disputes, be it with India over Arunachal Pradesh, or the South China Sea (SCS), or Bhutan, China has favored the signing of ‘Guiding principles’ or ‘Agreements to maintain peace and tranquility” with the state it is in dispute with. Such a framework, by establishing clear guidelines constrains the negotiating power of the fellow signatory state blindsiding it to China’s future plans of sudden aggressive broadcasting of territorial claims. For instance, China and India signed a 2005 agreement on “Political Parameters and Guiding Principles for the Settlement of the India-China Boundary Question”.152 As per the agreement’s Article IX, Pending an ultimate settlement of the boundary question, the two sides should strictly respect and observe the line of actual control and work together to maintain peace and tranquility in the border areas. Yet, despite this agreement which establishes both China and India’s commitment to maintain status quo and peace at the border, in 2006, the Chinese ambassador to India, Sun Yuxi stated categorically that "In our position, the whole of the state of Arunachal Pradesh is Chinese territory. And Tawang is only one of the places in it. We are claiming all of that. That is our position”.153 This was followed by frequent PLA incursions into the Indian side of the LAC on several occasions, as well as an attempt to set up permanent camps and settlements.154 These intrusions have been augmented by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs publishing maps in Chinese passports depicting Arunachal Pradesh and other disputed areas like the SCS as Chinese sovereign territory.155