

# Overviews Pro

## Totally not abusive leverage overview( cards from owen)

Voting for Pro is the best way to solve any issues our opponents are talking about. When the EU joins as a unified bloc, they can leverage against china and force them to make reforms. For this reason, Leverage undermines every con argument both on their case and against ours – Judge hold them to the standard that they have to prove its not reasonable that the EU would be able to challenge the harms presented by China.

2 lenses in this round

- 1) Internationally - Leverage works internationally and theres barely any threshold – Malaysia convinced China to massively slash the cost of investment: the EU, a far stronger superpower, would force China to relent even more.

If a country with barely any economic power such as Malaysia was able to check China's abuse theres no reason why the EU's vastly superior economy wouldn't be able to check China's international abuse

2. Domestically: Indonesia isnt recognized globally for its democratic values and yet the bare minimums of accountability prevent abuse and force China to uphold the highest operational integrity within their countries

**Democracy protects from Belt and Road fallout even in poorer countries – the EU is a shining beacon of democracy: if Indonesia isn't harmed theres no way the EU will be touched**

Furthermore, China will be forced to negotiate because Lee '19 finds that **leverage is guaranteed since the Belt and Road won't go any further without increased transparency and policy reform.**

# Overview Eurocentric impacts

We can circumvent all of the neg's arguments because of the unique nature of BRI contracts. [Chowdhury in 2019](#) contextualizes this by explaining that the most probable way the EU would sign with China's BRI is with an MOU: a nonbinding agreement different from traditional treaties. What that means is the EU can pull out at anytime as nothing within negotiations binds the EU to BRI. If the EU experiences the negative effects they tell you, they can pull out of the contract, withdrawing their funding, meaning joining the BRI guarantees the EU can force China to comply, guaranteeing infrastructure will either be enough to lift millions of out poverty or at worst be something easily avoided.

## Individual Countries Will Join Bilaterally Overview

Right now, individual European countries are already joining the BRI.

[Xinhua 19](#) furthers in 2019, that the attractiveness of Chinese investment will inevitably lead Individual European countries to join the BRI.

This is corroborated by [Fred Kempe in 2019](#) who says that Europe has lacked any unified policy approach of its own, giving China maximum leverage in negotiating with EU member countries, almost exclusively on a bilateral basis.

Signing bilaterally allows China to abuse individual EU countries, as [Godement 17](#) finds that China strategically manipulates its relations with the European Union, focusing on its own direct interests while ignoring EU norms.

Thus, your vote becomes not a question of whether the EU should join or not, but whether they should join individually, allowing China to bully them, or as a unified bloc that can hold China accountable.

## Climate Change Overview

**In the status quo, The effects of climate change are inevitable. [Harvey '19](#) of The Guardian finds that temperatures will still rise up to 5 °C even if the Paris Accords are met. This is confirmed by [Rapier in 2012](#) who reports that even if all coal power in the world stopped, it wouldn't solve global warming. At the point that the Negative world does nothing to solve this, their argument is nonunique.**

# Econ Growth Solves CC

[Bailey 15](#) finds that faster growth means higher incomes, which correlate with lower population growth. Greater wealth also means higher agricultural productivity, freeing up land for forests to grow as well as speedier progress toward developing and deploying cheaper non-fossil fuel energy technologies

What this means is that the best thing we can do is lessen the severity of climate change harms.

Affirming does this, as [Andrew King](#), a climate research at the University of Melbourne in Australia finds in 2018 that the poorest countries in the world bear the brunt of the harms due to climate change.

The reason for this is twofold.

First is geographic. [Harrington](#) of the New Zealand Climate Change Research Institute finds in 2016 that Most of the world's poorest people live at low latitudes near the equator, and as a result, people in poverty experience the earliest emergence of extreme temperatures.

Second is adaptability. People living in poverty are not going to be as resilient to changing global temperatures. If I struggle to find adequate food and shelter, I'm not going to have the resources to adapt to a shifting climate Because of this, a [UN report](#) in 2019 finds that while the rich will be able to pay their way out, poor people will be left to face the worst effects of climate change.

What this means, is that you should be voting for our side, because the pro side is going to be the one that gives these poor countries and poor people a chance to lift themselves out of poverty, and allow them to deal with climate change when it finally arrives.

## A2 Authoritarianism

Claim: If the EU joins the BRI, then that will allow China to spread authoritarian ideology.

NU: : Most countries that are along the BRI routes are already authoritarian so China can't even spread their ideologies. [Dalibor Rohak of Foreign policy](#) finds that

Hungary and Poland (both of which are part of the EU) are pulling into a mistakenly authoritarian regime already because of Russia, not China. But if you don't believe that.....

TURN: The Curtin evidence we tell you in-case explains that China is dependent on the European Union for funding, meaning that the EU can use its leverage to force China to cooperate with its guidelines.

[Tim Ruhlig of MERICS in 2018](#) writes that if united and with the full support of all member states, the EU has the potential to exercise more leverage than individual member states with China in regard to democracy, human rights, and the rule of law. What this means is an actual reason to affirm and join the EU to the BRI as a united force; in order to negotiate and use leverage to stop the spread of authoritarianism.

Third, we would tell you that economic growth solves the threat of authoritarianism, because it is primarily poor countries who are the most vulnerable to authoritarianism. This is corroborated by [Rodrik 16](#) who finds that democratic governments are particularly hard to institute in developing countries because of structural conditions.

This is corroborated by [Jose Tavares of the University of Lisband](#) writes that an increase in aid inflows of 1% of GDP leads to a decrease in corruption of 2%

## A2 Arctic Sea Routes CC

NU: Multiple other countries are already traveling through the Arctic, specifically with the use of icebreaker ships as well. These include, [United States, Canada, Russia, Finland, Denmark, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden.](#)

Turn: Third and most importantly, [Costas Paris of the Wall Street Journal in June of 2019](#) discovers that China has already found access to the Arctic shipping routes through Russia. China is breaking into Arctic transport through a joint venture between the country's biggest ocean carrier, Cosco Shipping Holdings Co., and its Russian counterpart PAO Sovcomflot to move natural gas from Siberia to Western and Asian markets. Now, the question isn't whether the EU should allow access for China, it's whether China should go to the Arctic partnering with the EU, which has high environmental standards, or with Russia, [with low environmental standards.](#)

## A2 Arctic Drilling CC - 3 responses

NU: Russia is already drilling in the Arctic

NU: Climate Change inevitable

DELINK: **Arctic Drilling is not cost effective.** According to [Karl Mathiesen](#) in [2015](#), it costs over \$100 to produce a single barrel of oil in the arctic while the price of oil is \$50, which is problematic. OPEC predicts that best case scenario, companies will not being to consider Arctic drilling until 2040. Additionally, [Peak Oil News tells us in June of 2019](#) that oil prices have fallen by 20%, signifying that the profitability of oil is declining.

DELINK: Companies will never want to invest in the Arctic because there is not enough oil in the first place. [Critchlow in 2015](#) tells us that Royal Dutch Shell has been forced to abandon its search for oil in the Arctic waters off Alaska after its exploitation well tests found little resources in the areas where rigs were placed. Additionally [Grandia in 2012](#) tells us that there is only 3.3 years worth of oil sitting off the shores of the Arctic.

DELINK: The demand for oil is falling. According to [Jacobson in 2017](#), by [the time](#) the BRI project will be completed, 139 countries globally are likely to be 100% reliant on renewable energy. By the time the infrastructure is created to make arctic drilling viable, we will already have switched to renewables.

## A2 Austerity Measures

NU: If austerity measures were ever going to be implemented, they would have already been put in place.

[Plecher 19](#) finds that 14 out of 23 countries in the EU exceed the maximum allowed debt-to-GDP ratio allotted by the EU's debt regulations, [which is 60 percent](#). After 60 percent, countries are supposedly forced to enact austerity measures.

DELINK: Affirming actually provides solvency, as [Bivens 17](#) finds that for every \$1 put into infrastructure investment, \$1.57 comes out. This fixes the debt to GDP ratio issue, as affirming increases the GDP more than the debt, lowering the ratio.

DL: Remember the Curtin evidence we give you in case, China needs 3 trillion dollars in cash investment from the EU, which means that it's China that needs money from the EU, not the other way around.

Short-circuit:

## A2 Brexit

1. This simply isn't true, Daniel Clark from Statista last month wrote that:

Clark, Daniel. "EU Contributions by Country." *Statista*, 26 June 2019,

[www.statista.com/statistics/316691/european-union-eu-budget-share-of-contributions/](https://www.statista.com/statistics/316691/european-union-eu-budget-share-of-contributions/).

**In 2018 Germany's share of total contributions to the budget of the European Union was 20.78 percent, the highest of any EU member state. Only three other member states contributed more than ten percent to the EU budget, France (15.58 percent)** the United Kingdom (11.88 percent) **and Italy (11.74 percent).** The small island-nation of Malta contributed the least to the EU budget, at 0.08 percent.

While the UK leaving the EU will damage them in the short term, we can see that other countries still outperform the UK in terms of contributions to Brussels, so the impact is much smaller than the opponent is making it out to be

2. This argument shows a key misunderstanding in the concept of countries and debt in general, it assumes that the EU will be taking out trillions of dollars immediately, this simply isn't the case, debt can be paid back gradually

## A2 Coal Bad

**Turn:** Switching to coal would be the lesser of two evils, as it would replace current biomass energy sources which are far worse for the environment. (China has an excess of coal as my opponents stated, which turns to our side) The [PFPI](#) quantifies that biomass emit 150% more carbon dioxide than coal. This is critical, as the [World Health Organization](#) finds that more than 2.4 billion people globally rely on biomass fuels.

**PreReq:** Countries need to be economically developed to focus on green energy investment. Otherwise poor countries are going to be dependent on cheaper coal power instead.

OUTWEIGH: [Hurley in 2018](#) finds that there were only eight countries out of 65 where BRI appeared to create the potential for debt sustainability problems. However, the infrastructure built by the Belt and Road outweighs any potential impacts of debt. Remember the World Bank evidence that tells you 40 million people will be lifted out of poverty

-China bailed out 28 different countries through debt forgiveness

Realize that we, the affirmative side, are the only side with solvency for dozens of emerging economies and poor countries in desperate need of infrastructure and economic growth

## A2 Dumping

### A2 Dumping in EU

1. [Xinzheng finds in 2016](#) that the EU already has anti-dumping measures, designed to prevent these issues, meaning that this will not become a problem.
2. Looking specifically at China, just three months ago [Reuters](#) reports that China gave up on its run to be labeled a market economy by the World trade organization, which means that “Beijing must accept continued EU and US “anti-dumping” levies on cheap Chinese goods”
3. Cheap Chinese goods raise the standard of living, raises standard of living.

## A2 China Heg Bad

DELINK: Wang Jiangy from the [National University of Singapore 2019](#): China recruits nations using a soft law treaty that creates a **voluntary cooperation** rather than a **legally binding obligation**. China won't be able to increase their soft power because no country has obligations.

DELINK: Economic growth isn't enough to give a country superpower status. [Goldring 18](#) finds that China's financial system lacks credibility, and **the financial sector rarely provides investors with real, profitable returns, and has been accused of limiting competition.**

NU: China's economic output is going to surpass the US' eventually either way. Steinbock of the World Economic Forum finds in 2017 that Despite being a command economy and temporary declines, “By 2050, Chinese economy would be almost 50 percent bigger than its US counterpart” due to its massive population, consumption, and production. This means that no matter which side you vote for in this round, China will surpass the US.

TURN: Finally, this means you can turn the argument to our side, because we tell you that if the EU joins, China's hegemony can at least be controlled and tempered due to leverage, rather than just expand without the EU on its own.

## A2 Debt Traps

TURN: If countries do not receive BRI loans, they must turn to other worse lenders like the IMF and World Bank for financial assistance. Problematically, [Simone Rensch](#) of Public Finance International finds that over the course of its eight year IMF loan, mandated austerity measures lost Greece 25% of its GDP, brought its unemployment rate to almost 20% and the national debt to about 180%. Rensch furthers that the nation of Ghana has gone to the IMF 15 different times over the last 50 years, hurting the livelihood of its poorest citizens. The BRI is the better choice.

DELINK:: In most cases, China also provides debt relief and forgiveness. [Hurley](#) of the Center For Global Development '18 explains that China has provided debt relief in at least 28 heavily indebted poor countries of them, including 100 percent forgiveness for several nations such as Burundi, Afghanistan, and Guinea. According to Asia Special Report, In the case of heavily indebted poor countries (HIPC), China has provided relief to 28 of the world's 31 HIPC countries and offered full debt forgiveness to several (Afghanistan, Guinea and Burundi). In 2011, China reportedly agreed to write-off Tajikistan's debt in exchange for 1158sqkm of disputed territory (CGD).

OUTWEIGH: [Hurley in 2018](#) finds that there were only eight countries out of 65 where BRI appeared to create the potential for debt sustainability problems. However, the infrastructure built by the Belt and Road outweighs any potential impacts of debt. Remember the World Bank evidence that tells you 40 million people will be lifted out of poverty

Realize that we, the affirmative side, are the only side with solvency for dozens of emerging economies and poor countries in desperate need of infrastructure and economic growth



## A2 Debt Traps- Military Expansion

DELINK: This is a myth: The one and only case of China seizing an asset was the Hambantota port in Sri Lanka, which specifically **included a proviso that specified that China could not use the port for military purposes.**

## A2 Stock Environment- 3 responses

NU: In the status quo, all of the negative environmental effects are already taking place in BRI countries outside of the EU. This is not a reason to negate because whether the EU joins or does not join would not eliminate the current negative effects.

DELINK: Currently, China is taking huge steps towards a paradigm shift to green energy. [Asit Biswas of the Conversation finds in 2017](#) that by 2020, China plans to spend more than 360 billion dollars developing renewable energy, while decommissioning existing coal-fired plants.

In addition, [Reuters 17](#) finds that China has become the world's largest green bond market, accounting for nearly 40 percent of global green bond issuance last year

In [November of 2019, the World Economic Forum](#) and many other Belt and Road authority figures launched the Green Investment Principles for the Belt and Road. This plan makes it so that lenders, investors, and corporations that invest and operate in the BRI region are forced to ensure their projects are aligned with the requirements of environmental sustainability and the Paris Agreement.

Turn: Instead, TURN this argument against them.

The Curtin evidence we tell you in case explains that China is dependent on the European Union for funding, meaning that the EU can use its leverage to force China to cooperate with environmental guidelines.

This is important, because [EUROPA](#) asserts that the EU has some of the highest environmental standards in the world. The EU and national governments have set clear objectives to guide European environment policy until 2020 and beyond, thus playing a key role in promoting sustainable development at a global level.

[Tim Ruhlrig of MERICS in 2018](#) asserts that if united and with the full support of all member states, the EU has the potential to exercise more leverage than individual member states with China in regard to democracy, human rights, and the rule of law. Joining the Belt and Road Initiative as a single block would actually help the environment by allowing the EU to negotiate for better environmental standards.

## A2 EU/US Relations-Tariffs

DELINK: The US will never carry out threats to go into large scale trade war with the EU for two reasons.

First, Lee of CNBC in 2019 finds that the current trade war between the U.S. and China is hurting U.S. economic growth, and that the net impact of the trade fight is likely negative for America.

But Secondly, Trump will never put tariffs on the EU because of the need to preserve his image. In order for Trump to win the re-election, the economy needs to be strong. Trump will prioritize his image over the need to engage in an economic conflict. Rather, [Karl Smith of Bloomberg in 2019](#) reports that the expanding economy has been President Trump's strongest argument for re-election

DELINK: Drop their internal link to recession, because even if you believe that Trump will place tariffs, it's unlikely to cause a recession or major economic impact. [Franck from CNBC in 2019](#) writes that even the growing conflict between two of the world's largest economies (US and China) is not enough to spark a major downturn, The market understands that recessions (at least in the U.S.) have always been associated with demand shocks not supply shocks. The tariff tit-for-tat between the U.S. and China continues to escalate. Yet, markets have essentially shrugged off the consequences.

De-link/mitigate: EU has a massive trade surplus with the US. [European Parliament 18](#): EU exports 139 billion euros more to the US than it imports from the US. This implies that even if the US limits imported goods from the EU, it's not going to affect much.

DELINK: [Danielle Haynes of UPI](#) finds that when the US imposes tariffs on the EU, the EU responds with counter tariffs that specifically target Trump's voting base. Trump would never risk this

DELINK: Even if tariffs lead to a trade deficit within the EU, it's not going to hurt it much. Look to the US, who has massive trade deficits, yet its economy is doing well right now.

Solve back: After the EU joins the BRI, trade diversification from the US would allow the EU to have other trade backbones. Within the week that Italy joined the BRI, [Lau 19](#) finds that because of the MoU and the BRI, Italy opened up 4 trading ports to China for increased exports and trade diversification. [AP News 19](#) quantified that value of Italy's exports instantly increased to nearly 3 billion euros within a day of the deal.

## A2 EU Collapse/Populism

**FIAT:** Affirming would realistically imply that all EU countries had mutually agreed to join the BRI, implicating that there's no anti-BRI resentment in the first place

**DL:**^ Even if that's not true, the benefits of staying in the EU outweigh the benefits of leaving the BRI. This is for a few reasons.

1. Many EU countries are in economic shambles right now, and the BRI is their best shot at success for redeveloping their economies
2. Even if the EU was economically perfect right now, insofar as a global recession will hit within next year, the entire EU will become dependent on the BRI economically

**NU:** It's already Non-Unique right now; insofar as individual countries of the EU are already splintering off into the BRI and there's lots of opposition towards the BRI right now, then that means that their link about resentment is still going to be there either way

**ALTC:**

**The leading factor behind EU instability is the stagnant economy – BRI is the single-most effective solution to a trailing economy Pope 18 finds that**

Stephen Pope 18, 8-22-18, "Brexit Is Just One Of Many European Problems," Forbes,  
<https://www.forbes.com/sites/stephenpope/2018/09/22/brexit-is-just-one-of-many-european-problems/#11b459d51536>

**The Stagnant state of the economy**, the scale of sovereign indebtedness and banking non-performing loans (NPL's), **will**, eventually **serve to undermine the EU**. The structure at the moment is such that **too many European banks are facing severe deterioration in the quality of the asset books**. So much so that the once mighty Deutsche Bank has been rated just BBB+ by Standard & Poor's. It really is struggling just to maintain an investment grade. **The situation in Italy is dire** as there are more than €185 Billion (\$216 Billion) of NPL's outstanding at the end of 2017, the most for any country in the EU. The nationalist-populist government in **Italy appears determined to ignore the EU** rules on budget spending and that is worrying as the link between Italian sovereign bonds and Italian banks remains tight. This year an index of Italian bank stocks has lost 61.8% of the ground it recovered since 2009. It is no surprise that Fitch has changed the outlook for Italy's BBB credit rating to negative from stable. In Spain, there is no effective

government and it is highly likely to see how far it can test the EU C budget rules. The Prime Minister, Pedro Sanchez saw parliament reject his draft 2019 budget. It was embarrassing as just 88 MP's out of 350 voted for the plan. His Socialist minority could not gather support from the anti-austerity left-wing party, Podemos, which holds just 67 seats yet wields a large influence. It wants fewer budget cuts and softer deficit targets. Trying to square the circle will place Spain in a difficult position as it must submit a budget to Brussels by October 15. So, of course Brexit is serious, however, **never overlook the degree of discomfort and mistrust that lurks below the surface of European waters.**

## A2 FDI → Inequality → Poverty

They are right about the part where an increase in FDI will occur, but they misrepresent the actual impact this has.

(part bout fdi good here as #1)

2. An increase in income inequality doesn't necessarily mean a worse standard of living. If A poor person and a rich person both earn the same amount of money, income inequality stays the same, but the poor person is still relatively better off.

## A2 FDI bad

Short-circuit?: Increased infrastructure offsets negative impacts of FDI

TURN: FDI is good in this instance. [Chen, World Bank 18](#) states that an increase in FDI resulting from reducing the costs of transportation causes a positive effect on GDP, trade, and employment [especially in lower-income countries]. He goes on to say that the proposed BRI transportation network coupled with the increase in FDI would increase BRI countries' GDP growth by 0.09

## A2 Infrastructure Bad

We would contend that this is strictly untrue for the EU because when Chinese companies build in the European Union, they must adhere to building codes.

Turn this argument to our side, because when the EU joins as a bloc, it gains negotiating power to hold China accountable.

DELINK: [Chinafile 16](#) states that anecdotes about infrastructure failures do not reflect the reality about the building quality and reliability of Chinese construction work and that no statistically significant difference has been found between the quality of work of Chinese firms and OECD country firms.

## A/2 Invasive Species

1. AL. Has it happened yet? The BRI is already in 60+ countries, make them prove this apocalyptic scenario has already manifested in BRI members countries.

2. DL. [Dasgupta 19](#) finds that the squo is solving, as China is already making reforms to stop invasive species because of backlash. Because they PERCEIVE invasive species as bad, they don't want the BRI to flop and thus are making changes. Before they tell you that these reforms are cosmetic, realize that its in their interests to let the BRI backfire.

## A2 Human Rights

TURN: The Curtin evidence we tell you in case explains that China is dependent on the European Union for funding, meaning that the EU can use its leverage to force China to cooperate with environmental guidelines.

This is corroborated by [Tim Ruhlig of MERICS in 2018](#) writes that if united and with the full support of all member states, the EU has the potential to exercise more leverage than individual member states with China in regard to democracy, human rights, and the rule of law. [maybe add reasoning for leverage] What this means is an actual reason to affirm and join the EU to the BRI as a united force, in order to efficiently leverage legislation and end Human Rights Violations from China.

## A2 Human Rights- Weighing

1. This is the fallacy of relative privation. By insinuating that just because one level of suffering is worse than another and that it should be the most important impact and scope should be ignored, you are ignoring the plights of millions who are living in suffering as well. We

would say this is really bad because it leads to desensitization of society to suffering borne by a far greater number of people.

2. But even if you want to believe their version of weighing, we would say that ultimately poverty is a far more severe impact for 2 reasons
  - a. First, because poverty is structural and entrenched in society, leading to intergenerational cycles of poverty which specifically are going to be worse in developing countries. This weighs to us on magnitude
  - b. But secondly, structural poverty itself is a precursor to human rights abuses. Human rights abuses don't happen to the well-off, it happens when the poorest in society are left particularly vulnerable. It's these kind of people who are tricked into taking job offers that are actually slave-like labor. By solving poverty, you solve for these human rights abuses.

## A2 Transition War

We would contend that war between the US and China is impossible for two reasons:

DL: [Matt Egan of CNN Business finds in 2019](#) that the two countries' massive economies are deeply intertwined in ways that soon will make even the intensifying trade war unsustainable. China and the US are each other's biggest trading partners. Nearly \$700 billion in goods were sent between China and the United States in 2018 alone. And with \$1.1 trillion of Treasuries, China is America's largest foreign creditor.

DL: the threat of nuclear war is far too great. In a world where both countries know that mutually assured destruction is inevitable in the event of another war, conflict will never arise.

## A2 Any War Scenario: Solve Back

Trade is the biggest disincentive for war—maintaining globalization solves all their impacts [Griswold 11](#) finds that trade disincentivizes war for 3 reasons

First, free trade and globalization have reinforced the trend towards democracy, which is shown to have lower rates of conflict.

Second, trade raises the cost of war. As national economies become more intertwined, those nations end up having more to lose should war break out. War in a globalized world not only means the loss of human lives and tax dollars, but also ruptured trade and investment ties that impose lasting damage on the economy.

And Third, is that trade reduces the spoils of war. Because trade allows nations to acquire wealth through production and exchange rather than conquest of resources, wealth becomes measured in terms of intellectual property, financial assets, and human capital, assets that cannot be seized by armies.

But under all of that, we would say that economic decline in the status quo increases the risk of war. Royal 10 statistically finds that economic crises and the ensuing uncertainty with power balances increases the risk of miscalculation and increases the likelihood of external conflict.

## A2 Eu Alternative

**DELINK: Asian countries are unwilling to switch to an EU alternative. [Elmer 18](#) states, that while BRI has helped spur the EU to create its own plan. The EU plan may encounter difficulties, “The EU’s rules may work well within its own borders, but they should prepare for the possibility that Asian countries may not accept them.**

## A2 Surveillance/5g Bad

### De-link

Basic Argument: While China may use surveillance techniques domestically, they would never implement these practices in foreign nations. The backlash that China would receive from spying on European citizens would result in a substantial decrease in technological and overall trade. As

China owes a large portion of its trade to the European Union, a scenario where they compromise their entire economy to further surveil an allied country is entirely unrealistic.

#### China Would Never Compromise Trade by Spying Through 5g

Jason **Perlow**, Senior Technology Editor at ZDNet, 2018, “Paranoia will destroy us: Why Huawei and other Chinese tech is not spying on Americans,” ZDNet,

<https://www.zdnet.com/article/paranoia-will-destroy-you-why-chinese-tech-isnt-spying-on-us/>

It should be noted no substantial proof of espionage by China or Huawei/ZTE has ever been established from these accusations and the House intelligence committee report released at the time did not offer much in terms of substance either.

OUTWEIGH: we would contend that the guaranteed global benefits of 5g technology would outweigh the slim risk of impact.

- Scope: 5g benefits globally spread, surveillance limited to EU
- Magnitude: Mortality down 45% vs violation of privacy
- Probability: Innovations are guaranteed from 5G; surveillance is not

## A2 NATO

DELINK: Trump's threats about leaving NATO are empty. [Ellis 19](#): Trump isn't cutting funding to NATO, he's just demanding more from allies. Affirming won't change this.

DELINK: If leaving NATO harms the US and the EU so much, then the US won't leave. *Assumes Trump is rational which could get clapped bc same argument as tariffs basically*

MITIGATE: Even if NATO collapses, the EU still has allies.

## A2 Aquaculture

NUQ: Climate Change inevitable

Only pro has risk of solvency - Economic growth = innovation = save the fish

## Indict 2004 Lopez Inequality → Poverty

TURN: The study they're citing **actually concludes** that the scenario that they test that leads to short-term poverty increase leads to an eventual overall decrease in poverty and increase in economic growth.

“On the interaction between growth and inequality, the paper argues that in the short run, the positive impact on growth of the identified win-lose policies would not be enough to offset the negative impact they have on inequality and therefore, in the absence of pro-poor policies that accompany those reforms or additional feedback effects from growth (such as



improvements in education or infrastructure), poverty could actually increase. In the long run, however, we find that the growth impact of these policies would offset the negative impact on distribution, and therefore poverty would fall as a result of the implementation of pro-growth policies”

## Indict 12 years climate change

Clearly, con didn't actually read the UN report. The report states, in no unclear language, that their model that predicts 12 years to prevent climate change requires a 45% decrease in emissions by 2030, and net zero emissions by 2050. They provide no proof as to why negating leads to a 45% emissions reduction by 2030, thereby proving that whether or not you affirm has no impact on climate change.

## Indict 153m

Con is using this evidence saying that action against climate change could save 153m people. However, realize that this evidence is saying that *this is specifically with a 180GtC reduction in emissions*. Understand that this isn't going to happen regardless of whether or not the European Union joins, and that con has no quantification of how much carbon the BRI specifically is going to lead to, so you can't know how much of this impact they gain access to if any.

If con runs Ciurтин: BRI and China funding green tech, by negating you decrease this

If con runs BRI countries 50% emissions by 2050: Realize that this has nothing to do with the BRI; the BRI is just investing in developing countries, so it follows logically that developing countries are going to increase in their share of global emissions.

## A2 Inequality → Less mobility → Poverty

[Raj Shetty 2014 finds that “the top 1% share \[of the wealth\] is uncorrelated with relative mobility”](#)

# A2 Trade Deficit

## Pelagidis of the Brookings Institute '19

<https://www.brookings.edu/blog/up-front/2019/04/15/chinas-backdoor-to-europe/>

The China-EU trade balance is the first reason cited by European BRI doubters. They fear a deteriorating trade deficit <sup>that</sup> could emerge if China keeps its market substantially protected. **In 2018, the EU's trade deficit with China was 185 billion euros.** The 28 countries of the EU exported 210 billion euros' worth of goods and services to the Chinese market while imports from China totaled 395 billion euros (Figure 2).

Link - BRI increases exports and reduces trade deficit, Italy proves.

China's opening up is not limited to Italy, but to Europe as a whole. In the last visit by the Chinese president to Europe, he moved from Italy to Monaco and Paris and met President Emmanuel Macron, who is trying to open up to Beijing. German Chancellor Angela Merkel has opposed the Sino-Italian rapprochement with signing the agreement to join the Belt and Road Initiative, so that **Italy will be the first G7 country to join the initiative.** Beijing is interested in investing in Italian ports, including the port of Trieste on the Adriatic, to boost its exports to Europe. Italy seeks to balance trade with China. According to official data, trade between the two countries grew by 9.2% compared to 2016, reaching 42 billion euros. **Italy managed to cut its trade deficit with China by 1.37 billion euros, increasing exports to Beijing by 22.2%,** while imports rose to 28.4 billion euros, an increase of 4% compared to 2016

# A2 South China Sea Aggression

Turn: The BRI could actually **reduce** aggression in the South China Sea, as Maceas 19 states that

**The Maritime Silk Road will** advance Chinese interests in the South China Sea in different ways. First, it can further develop points of pressure and reward similar to those used with Cambodia and the Philippines in 2012. Second, cooperative projects may be relied upon to **reduce tensions**. Third, and equally important, **strengthened institutional links are expected to foster the view that maritime affairs and disputes should be handled and resolved by directly concerned parties, avoiding the involvement of outside actors** such as the United States.<sup>22</sup> Mações, Bruno. Belt and Road (p. 70). Hurst. Kindle Edition.ww.face

Secondly, Ljungwall '17 explains that the EU can join the initiative and integrate themselves into BRI supply chains, enabling the EU to maintain economic power over China and deterring them from action in the South China Sea.

*Logical TURN (I wrote this but Billy hasn't proofed yet):*

*Joining the BRI is going to reroute trade over land; there's no logical reason that the EU joining to the West of China would increase shipping in the East. It better follows that the EU joining would lead to a rerouting of shipping, leading to deescalation in the SCS.*

## Griswold '11

Daniel Griswold is director of the Center for Trade Policy Studies at the Cato Institute and author of *Mad about Trade: Why Main Street America Should Embrace Globalization*. "Free Trade and the Global Middle Class," *Hayek Society Journal* Vol. 9

<http://www.cato.org/pubs/articles/Hayek-Society-Journal-Griswold.pdf> Accessed 6/30/12

Our more globalized world has also yielded a "peace dividend." It may not be obvious when our daily news cycles are dominated by horrific images from the Gaza Strip, Afghanistan and Libya, but our more globalized world has somehow become a more

peaceful world. **The number of civil and international wars has dropped sharply**

**in the past 15 years**, along with battle deaths. The reasons behind the retreat of war are complex, but again **the**

**spread of trade and globalization have played a key role.** Trade has been seen as a friend of peace for

centuries. In the 19th century, British statesman Richard Cobden pursued free trade as a way not only to bring more affordable bread to English workers but also to promote peace with Britain's neighbors. He negotiated the Cobden-Chevalier free trade agreement with France in 1860 that helped to cement an enduring alliance between two countries that had been bitter enemies for centuries. In the 20th century, President Franklin Roosevelt's secretary of state, Cordell Hull, championed lower trade barriers as a way to promote peaceful commerce and reduce international tensions. Hull had witnessed first-hand the economic nationalism and retribution after World War I. Hull believed that "unhampered trade dovetail[s] with peace; high tariffs, trade barriers and unfair economic competition, with war." Hull

was awarded the 1945 Nobel Prize for Peace, in part because of his work to promote global trade. **Free trade and**

**globalization have promoted peace in three main ways. First, trade and globalization**

**have reinforced the trend towards democracy, and democracies tend not to pick**

**fight with each other. A second and even more potent way that trade has promoted**

**peace is by raising the cost of war. As national economies become more intertwined,**

**those nations have more to lose should war break out. War in a globalized world not**

**only means the loss of human lives and tax dollars, but also ruptured trade and**

**investment ties that impose lasting damage on the economy.** Trade and economic integration has

helped to keep the peace in Europe for more than 60 years. More recently, deepening economic ties between Mainland China and Taiwan are drawing those two governments closer together and helping to keep the peace. Leaders on both sides of the Taiwan Strait seem to

understand that reckless nationalism would jeopardize the dramatic economic progress that region has enjoyed. **A third reason**

**why free trade promotes peace is because it has reduced the spoils of war. Trade**

**allows nations to acquire wealth through production and exchange rather than**

**conquest of territory and resources. As economies develop, wealth is increasingly**

**measured in terms of intellectual property, financial assets, and human capital. Such**

**assets cannot be easily seized by armies.** In contrast, hard assets such as minerals and farmland are becoming

relatively less important in high-tech, service economies. If people need resources outside their national borders, say oil or timber or farm products, they can acquire them peacefully by freely trading what they can produce best at home. The world today is harvesting the peaceful fruit of expanding trade. The first half of the 20th century was marred by two devastating wars among the great powers of Europe. In the ashes of World War II, the United States helped found the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in 1947, the precursor to

the WTO that helped to spur trade between the United States and its major trading partners. As a condition to Marshall Plan aid, the U.S. government also insisted that the continental European powers, France, Germany, and Italy, eliminate trade barriers between themselves in what was to become the European Common Market. One purpose of the common market was to spur economic development, of course, but just as importantly, it was meant to tie the Europeans together economically. With six decades of hindsight, the plan must be considered a spectacular success. The notion of another major war between France, Germany and another Western European powers is unimaginable. Compared to past eras, our time is one of relative world peace. According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, the number of armed conflicts around the world has dropped sharply in the past two decades. Virtually all the conflicts today are civil and guerilla wars. The spectacle of two governments sending armies off to fight in the battlefield has become rare. In the decade from 1998 through 2007, only three actual wars were fought between states: Eritrea-Ethopia in 1998-2000, India-Pakistan in 1998-2003, and the United States-Iraq in 2003. From 2004 through 2007, no two nations were at war with one another. Civil wars have ended or at least ebbed in Aceh (in Indonesia), Angola, Burundi, Congo, Liberia, Nepal, Timor-Leste and Sierra Leone. Coming to the same conclusion is the Human Security Centre at the University of British Columbia in Canada. In a 2005 report, it documented a sharp decline in the number of armed conflicts, genocides and refugee numbers in the past 20 years. The average number of deaths per conflict has fallen from 38,000 in 1950 to 600 in 2002. Most armed conflicts in the world now take place in Sub-Saharan Africa, and the only form of political violence that has worsened in recent years is international terrorism. Many causes lie behind the good news – the end of the Cold War, the spread of democracy, and peacekeeping efforts by major powers among them – but expanding trade and globalization appear to be playing a major role in promoting world peace. In a chapter from the 2005 Economic Freedom of the World Report, Dr. Erik

**Gartzke of Columbia University compared the propensity of countries to engage in wars to their level of economic freedom. He came to the conclusion that economic freedom, including the freedom to trade, significantly decreases the probability that a country will experience a military dispute with another country.** Through econometric analysis,

he found that, "Making economies freer translates into making countries more peaceful. At the extremes, the least free states are about 14 times as conflict prone as the most free. A 2006 study for the institute for the Study of Labor in Bonn, Germany, found the same pacific effect of trade and globalization. Authors Solomon Polachek and Carlos Seiglie found that "trading nations cooperate more and fight less." In fact, a doubling of trade reduces the probability that a country will be involved in a conflict by 20 percent. Trade was the most important channel for peace, they found, but investment flows also had a positive effect. A democratic form of government also proved to be a force for peace, but primarily because democracies trade more. All this helps explain why the world's two most conflict-prone regions – the Arab Middle East and Sub-Saharan Africa – are also the world's two least globally and economically integrated regions. Terrorism does not spring from poverty, but from ideological fervor and political and economic frustration. If we want to blunt the appeal of radical ideology to the next generation of Muslim children coming of age, we can help create more economic opportunity in those societies by encouraging more trade and investment ties with the West. The U.S. initiative to enact free trade agreements with certain Muslim countries, such as Morocco, Jordan, Bahrain and Oman, represent small steps in the right direction. An even more effective policy would be to unilaterally open Western markets to products made and grown in Muslim countries. A young man or woman with a real job at an export-oriented factory making overcoats in Jordan or shorts in Egypt is less vulnerable to the appeal of an Al-Qaida recruiter. Of course, free trade and globalization do not guarantee peace or inoculation against terrorism, anymore than they guarantee democracy and civil liberty. Hot-blooded nationalism and ideological fervor can overwhelm cold economic calculations. Any relationship involving human beings will be messy and non-linear. There will always be exceptions and outliers in such complex relationships involving economies and governments. But deeper trade and investment ties among nations have made it more likely that democracy and civil liberties will take root, and less likely those gains will be destroyed by civil conflict and war.

## Royal 10

Economic decline increases the risk of war—strong statistical support.

Royal 10 — Jedidiah Royal, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense, M.Phil. Candidate at the University of New South Wales, 2010 ("Economic Integration, Economic Signalling and the Problem of Economic Crises," Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, Edited by Ben Goldsmith and Jurgen Brauer, Published by Emerald Group Publishing, ISBN 0857240048, p. 213-215)

Less intuitive is how **periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict.**

Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been

considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, **finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin. 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation** (Feaver, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner. 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland's (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that 'future expectation of trade' is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult [end page 213] to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.<sup>4</sup> Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write, The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002. p. 89) Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. "Diversionary theory" suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a 'rally around the flag' effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995). and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels.<sup>5</sup> This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention. This observation is not contradictory to other perspectives that link economic interdependence with a decrease in the likelihood of external conflict, such as those mentioned in the first paragraph of this chapter. [end page 214] Those studies tend to focus on dyadic interdependence

instead of global interdependence and do not specifically consider the occurrence of and conditions created by economic crises. As such, the view presented here should be considered ancillary to those views.