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## 1NC Shell- Arms Race DA

#### Relations with China on brink- tensions over South China Sea

Bradley Klapper**,** Associated Press, 7-12-**2012**, “U.S., China Square Off over South China Sea,” <http://www.wset.com/story/19006237/us-china-square-off-over-south-china-sea>

PHNOM PENH, Cambodia (AP) - The Obama administration pressed Beijing on Thursday to accept a code of conduct for resolving territorial disputes in the resource-rich South China Sea, a difficult U.S. mediation effort that has faced resistance from the communist government - although it has endeared the U.S. to once-hostile countries in Southeast Asia.¶ U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton met with Chinese Foreign Minister Yang Jiechi on the sidelines of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations' annual conference.¶ Sitting across from each other at a long table in a grand hall with chandeliers, Clinton stressed the different ways Washington and Beijing are cooperating. Yang spoke of building an even closer U.S.-Chinese relationship. Neither side spoke about the South China Sea while reporters were allowed in the room.¶ Several Asian governments have expressed worry about China's expansive maritime claims. Tensions have threatened to boil over in recent months, with a standoff between Chinese and Philippine ships and sharp disagreements between China and Vietnam.¶ China claims virtually the entire area and has created an entirely new city to administer it, sparking deep concern from rival claimants. The sea hosts about a third of the world's cargo traffic, has rich fishing grounds and is believed to store vast oil and gas reserves.¶ "The United States has no territorial claims there and we do not take sides in disputes about territorial or maritime boundaries," Clinton told foreign ministers gathered in Cambodia's capital. "But we do have an interest in freedom of navigation, the maintenance of peace and stability, respect for international law and unimpeded lawful commerce in the South China Sea."¶ Later Thursday, Clinton told delegates the U.S. was "intensely focused" on how countries were handling the different claims, singling out "confrontational behavior" in the disputed Scarborough Shoal off the northwestern Philippines, including the denial of access to other vessels. The actions she cited were China's, though she didn't mention the offending country by name.¶ According to Filipino officials, at different points earlier this year the Chinese attached fishing nets to ropes held by buoys to block entry to the sprawling lagoon at Scarborough Shoal, or tied several dinghies together with ropes. One official said the barriers were washed away by waves in recent storms. The officials spoke on condition of anonymity because the sensitivity of the issue.¶ "None of us can fail to be concerned by the increase in tensions, the uptick in confrontational rhetoric and disagreements over resource exploitation," Clinton said. "We have seen worrisome instances of economic coercion and the problematic use of military and government vessels in connection with disputes among fishermen. There have been a variety of national measures taken that create friction and further complicate efforts to resolve disputes."¶ ASEAN's 10 members announced earlier this week that they have drafted a set of rules governing maritime rights and navigation, and procedures for when governments disagree. But China is not a member of the group and hasn't agreed to anything.¶ The ASEAN countries are presenting their proposal to China at this week's conference in Cambodia's capital, though Beijing will probably want to water down any language that ties its hands.¶ Clinton said the tensions "underscore the need for agreement among all parties on rules of the road and the establishment of clear procedures for addressing disagreements," still an elusive objective a decade after Southeast Asian countries adopted it as their goal.¶ "We now look to ASEAN and China to make meaningful progress toward finalizing this code," Clinton added. She also suggested countries consider joint oil and gas exploitation in unresolved territories or other "creative ways" to avoid conflict.¶ A senior administration official said Yang, in his discussion with Clinton, cautiously signaled China's willingness to negotiate with other Asian nations on the code. The talks could start as early as September, said the official, who briefed reporters on the meeting on condition of anonymity.¶ Meanwhile, disagreements among ASEAN's members on Thursday were still holding up a concluding document for this year's meeting. How to address the Philippines' and Vietnam's disputes with China remained issues of contention, U.S. officials said.¶ For the United States, the difficult diplomacy ahead could be a major test of the Obama administration's efforts to "pivot" American power toward the world's most populous continent. Just speaking out on the subject already has helped the U.S. deepen ties with Vietnam, and relations are warming with other governments in the region.¶ But countless meetings between American and Chinese officials have not led to progress on a lasting solution.¶ Various longstanding disputes among China, the Philippines, Vietnam, Taiwan, Malaysia and Brunei involve the area's busy sea lanes, and many observers fear the complicated web of disputes could spark a violent conflict.¶ The standoff between China and the Philippines in the Scarborough Shoal began in April when the Philippines accused Chinese fishermen of poaching in its exclusive economic zone, including the shoal. During the tensions, both sides sent government ships to the area though both have since withdrawn vessels.¶ Vietnam has protested a recent announcement by the China National Offshore Oil Corp. opening nine oil and gas lots for international bidders in areas overlapping with existing Vietnamese exploration blocks. Vietnam says the lots lie entirely within its 200-nautical mile exclusive economic zone and continental shelf.

#### U.S. military action threatens China- plan will be tipping point

Joseph Santolan, 1-27-2012 Globalresearch.ca: Centre for Research on Globalization “Threatening China: U.S. Plans to Expand Military Presence in Phillipines,” <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=28925>

|  |
| --- |
| An article in the *Washington Post* on January 26 revealed that a delegation from the Philippines was engaged in bilateral talks in Washington to negotiate the expansion of the American military presence in the country. The provocative move is a key step in US imperialism’s strategy to contain China.¶ The bilateral talks were announced during the visit of US Senators John McCain and Joseph Lieberman to the Philippines last week, although the subject to be discussed was simply termed ‘maritime security.’ Higher-level talks are scheduled to take place in March between Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta and their Philippine counterparts. These negotiations are scheduled to culminate in talks between President Barack Obama and Philippine President Benigno Aquino in the White House in May.¶ The *Washington Post* stated: “Among the options under consideration are operating Navy ships from the Philippines, deploying troops on a rotational basis and staging more frequent joint exercises. Under each scenario, US forces would effectively be guests at existing foreign bases.” The Philippine officials, who spoke under conditions of anonymity, told the *Post* the Philippines was willing “to host American ships and surveillance aircraft.”¶ This arrangement would not involve a permanent US military base but rather the long-term deployment of US forces at a major local facility. Pentagon officials referred to this policy as ‘maintaining a light footprint.’ In essence, the ‘light footprint’ policy is a means of passing much of the economic cost of deployment onto the host country, and of circumventing the constitutional issues and political controversy involved in establishing a major permanent base.¶ The deployment of US vessels and forces in the Philippines would be a further ratcheting up of the Obama administration’s confrontation with China in the Asia Pacific generally, and particularly in the South China Sea.¶ Concerned at the rising economic power of China, US imperialism has asserted its ‘national interest’ in the vital waterways of the South China Sea. Over the past two years it has backed up this claim with diplomatic maneuvering, political machinations within each country in the region, and increased military deployments.¶ Washington has stationed Littoral Combat Ships in Singapore, guarding the crucial Strait of Malacca; conducted numerous joint war games with regional powers, each scenario increasingly provocative; and, most importantly, has signed basing arrangements for stationing 2,500 US Marines in northern Australia, as well as access to Australian naval and air bases. The deal being concluded with the Philippines follows this pattern.¶ The South China Sea and key waterways such as the Strait of Malacca are central to Washington’s ambitions to control China’s shipping lanes for energy and raw materials from Africa and the Middle East. The influential think tank *Center for a New American Security* released a position paper on the South China Sea on January 9 that explained: “To the extent that the world economy has a geographical center, it is in the South China Sea. The South China Sea is where a militarily rising China is increasingly challenging American naval preeminence—a trend that, if left on its present trajectory, could upset the balance of power that has existed since the end of World War II.”¶ Among the cornerstones of American military preeminence in the 20th century were its bases in the Philippines—the Subic Naval Base and Clark Air Force Base. During their operation, they were the largest overseas US bases anywhere in the world. Established in the aftermath of the US colonial occupation of the Philippines, the bases were a mainstay in asserting the interests of US imperialism during the Cold War.¶ An eruption of Mount Pinatubo in 1991 devastated Clark Air Force Base. The US government declared the base a ‘total loss.’ In late 1991, in response to intense popular pressure and against the strongly expressed wishes of President Corazon Aquino, the Philippine Senate voted not to extend the US lease on Subic. Washington’s refusal to disclose the presence of nuclear warheads at the naval base, in flagrant violation of Philippine law, was a key issue in the debate.¶ The loss of both Subic and Clark was a sharp blow to US interests. In 1999, the Philippine government signed a Visiting Forces Agreement (VFA) with Washington that laid the groundwork for renewed US troop deployment in the Philippines under the auspices of training exercises. The VFA allowed the US military to retain jurisdiction over US military personnel accused of committing crimes in the Philippines, effectively granting them immunity from prosecution.¶ Under the auspices of the VFA, Washington began a series of ‘temporary military exercises’ against the Muslim insurgency in the Southern Philippines termed Balikatan – ‘shoulder to shoulder.’ January 2012 marks the 10th year of the uninterrupted Balikatan deployment of 1,200 US soldiers in the Philippines. Balikatan underscores what Washington means when it negotiates the ‘temporary’ stationing of military forces.¶ During the 2001-10 decade, President Gloria Macapagal Arroyo maintained the country’s military alliance with the US, but sought closer economic and political relations with China. President Benigno Aquino has, since assuming office, sharply reversed this trend. Washington has backed his consolidation of political power, and supported, both militarily and diplomatically, his increasingly confrontational stance toward China in the South China Sea.¶ The stationing of US ships and forces in the Philippines will likely occur again at Subic Bay. In April 2011, the *Philippine Daily Inquirer* reported on negotiations between visiting US diplomats and the Aquino administration on the US military’s possible use of Subic.¶ China has not taken the Obama’s stance lying down. At every turn, China has expressed its displeasure. The South China Sea is vital to China’s geostrategic interests. In 2011, People’s Liberation Army Navy commander Wu Shengli, when asked at a forum in Singapore about China’s outrage over the US role in the South China Sea, responded: “How would you feel if I cut off your arms and legs? That’s how China feels about the South China Sea.”¶ The United States also has its eye on Cam Ranh Bay in Vietnam. The *Washington Post* report stated: “The strategic talks with the Philippines are in addition to feelers that the Obama administration has put out to other Southeast Asian countries, including Vietnam and Thailand.”¶ Obama’s policy of asserting US military might in the South China Sea through the deployment of forces in Australia, Singapore, the Philippines and possibly Vietnam and Thailand is an open attempt to encircle China. It is a reckless policy that has the potential to lead to war on a global scale. |
|  |

#### US China relations are key to solve every global impact

**Cohen 2009 -** former U.S. secretary of defense [Maurice R. Greenberg is chairman and CEO of C.V. Starr & Co., Inc. “Smart Power in U.S.-China Relations,” pg online @ http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/090309\_mcgiffert\_uschinasmartpower\_web.pdf //ef)¶

The evolution of Sino-U.S. relations over the next months, years, and decades has the potential to have a greater impact on global security and prosperity than any other bilateral or multilateral arrangement. In this sense, many analysts consider the US.-China diplomatic relationship to be the most influential in the world. Without question, strong and stable U.S. alliances provide the foundation for the protection and promotion of U.S. and global interests. Yet within that broad framework, the trajectory of U.S.-China relations will determine the success, or failure, of efforts to address the toughest global challenges: global financial stability, energy security and climate change, nonproliferation, and terrorism, among other pressing issues. Shepherding that trajectory in the most constructive direction possible must therefore be a priority for Washington and Beijing. Virtually no major global challenge can be met without U.S.-China cooperation. The uncertainty of that future trajectory and the "strategic mistrust" between leaders in Washington and Beijing necessarily concerns many experts and policymakers in both countries. Although some U.S. analysts see China as a strategic competitor—deliberately vying with the United States for energy resources, military superiority, and international political influence alike— analysis by the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) has generally found that China uses its soft power to pursue its own, largely economic, international agenda primarily to achieve its domestic objectives of economic growth and social stability.1 Although Beijing certainly has an eye on Washington, not all of its actions are undertaken as a counterpoint to the United States. In addition, CSIS research suggests that growing Chinese soft power in developing countries may have influenced recent U.S. decisions to engage more actively and reinvest in soft-power tools that have atrophied during the past decade. To the extent that there exists a competition between the United States and China, therefore, it may be mobilizing both countries to strengthen their ability to solve global problems. To be sure, U.S. and Chinese policy decisions toward the respective other power will be determined in large part by the choices that leaders make about their own nations interests at home and overseas, which in turn are shaped by their respective domestic contexts. Both parties must recognize—and accept—that the other will pursue a foreign policy approach that is in its own national interest. Yet, in a globalized world, challenges are increasingly transnational, and so too must be their solutions. As demonstrated by the rapid spread of SARS from China in 2003, pandemic flu can be spread rapidly through air and via international travel. Dust particulates from Asia settle in Lake Tahoe. An economic downturn in one country can and does trigger an economic slowdown in another. These challenges can no longer be addressed by either containment or isolation. What constitutes the national interest today necessarily encompasses a broader and more complex set of considerations than it did in the past As a general principle, the United States seeks to promote its national interest while it simultaneously pursues what the CSIS Commission on Smart Power called in its November 2007 report the "global good."3 This approach is not always practical or achievable, of course. But neither is it pure benevolence. Instead, a strategic pursuit of the global good accrues concrete benefits for the United States (and others) in the form of building confidence, legitimacy, and political influence in key countries and regions around the world in ways that enable the United States to better confront global and transnational challenges. In short, the global good comprises those things that all people and governments want but have traditionally not been able to attain in the absence of U.S. leadership. Despite historical, cultural, and political differences between the United States and China, Beijing's newfound ability, owing to its recent economic successes, to contribute to the global good is a matter for common ground between the two countries. Today there is increasing recognition that no major global challenge can be addressed effectively, much less resolved, without the active engagement of—and cooperation between—the United States and China. The United States and China—the worlds first- and third-largest economies—are inextricably linked, a fact made ever more evident in the midst of the current global financial crisis. Weak demand in both the United States and China, previously the twin engines of global growth, has contributed to the global economic downturn and threatens to ignite simmering trade tensions between the two countries. Nowhere is the interconnectedness of the United States and China more clear than in international finance. China has $2 trillion worth of largely U.S. dollar-denominated foreign exchange reserves and is the world's largest holder—by far—of U.S. government debt. Former treasury secretary Henry M. Paulson and others have suggested that the structural imbalances created by this dynamic fueled the current economic crisis. Yet. China will almost certainly be called on to purchase the lion's share of new U.S. debt instruments issued in connection with the U.S. stimulus and recovery package. Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton's February 23.2009, reassurance to Beijing that U.S. markets remain safe and her call for continued Chinese investment in the U.S. bond market as a means to help both countries, and the world, emerge from global recession underscored the shared interest—and central role—that both countries have in turning around the global economy quickly. Although China's considerable holdings of U.S. debt have been seen as a troubling problem, they are now being perceived as a necessary part of a global solution. Similarly, as the worlds two largest emitters of greenhouse gases, China and the United States share not only the collateral damage of energy-inefficient economic growth, but a primary responsibility to shape any ultimate global solutions to climate change. To date, cooperation has been elusive, owing as much to Washington's reluctance as to Beijing's intransigence. Painting China as the environmental bogeyman as an excuse for foot-dragging in policymaking is no longer an option; for its part, China, as the world's top polluter, must cease playing the developing-economy card. Yet energy security and climate change remain an area of genuine opportunity for joint achievement. Indeed, U.S.-China cooperation in this field is a sine qua non of any response to the energy and climate challenges. The sheer size of the Chinese economy means that collaboration with the United States could set the de facto global standards for etficiency and emissions in key economic sectors such as industry and transportation. Climate change also provides an area for cooperation in previously uncharted policy waters, as in emerging Arctic navigational and energy exploration opportunities. Washington and Beijing also share a deep and urgent interest in international peace and stability. The resumption of U.S.-China military contacts is a positive development. As two nuclear powers with worldwide economic and strategic interests, both countries want to minimize instability and enhance maritime security, as seen by parallel antipiracy missions in the waters otT Somalia. Joint efforts in support of United Nations peacekeeping, nonproliferation, and counterterrorism offer critical areas for bilateral and multilateral cooperation. Certainly, regional and global security institutions such as the Six-Party Talks concerning North Korea or the UN Security Council require the active engagement of both Washington and Beijing. Even more broadly, crisis management in geographic regions of mutual strategic interest like the Korean peninsula, Iran, or Burma require much more Sino-U.S. communication if the two countries are to avoid miscalculation and maximize opportunities to minimize human sutfering. Increasing the number of mid-level military-to-military exchanges would help in this regard. The United States and China could do more to cooperate on law enforcement to combat drug trafficking and organized crime in Western China. Afghanistan is competing with Burma as the main provider of narcotics to China; Washington could use its influence with the International Security Assistance Force in Kabul to develop a joint antinarcotics program. This could potentially build networks and joint capabilities that might be useful for U.S.-China cooperation on the issue of Pakistan. In addition, Washington should also encourage NATO-China cooperation along the Afghan border. Collaborating under the auspices of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) might provide an additional framework for Beijing and Washington to address Central Asian security issues in a cooperative manner. 1he SCO, which includes Pakistan as an observer and will convene a multinational conference on Afghanistan in March 2009, has long made curbing narcoterrorism in Afghanistan a priority. In addition, the VS. Drug Enforcement Agency and the Chinese Anti-Narcotics Bureau should expand cooperation on interdiction and prosecution of heroin and meth traffickers. To be sure, there are a number of areas of serious divergence between Washington and Beijing. This should surprise no one. The United States has disagreements with even its allies. Two large powers with vastly dilferent histories, cultures, and political systems are bound to have challenges. History has shown, however, that the most effective way of addressing issues is for the U.S. and Chinese governments to engage in quiet diplomacy rather than public recrimination. In the U.S.-China context, there is often little to be gained—and much to be lost in terms of trust and respect—by a polarizing debate. Any differences, moreover, must not necessarily impede Sino-U.S. cooperation when both sides share strong mutual interests. I;. Scott Fitzgerald wrote that "the test of a first-rate intelligence is the ability to hold two opposed ideas in the mind at the same time, and still retain the ability to function."3 Effective policy toward China by the United States, and vice versa, will require this kind of dual-minded intelligence. Moreover, working together on areas of mutual and global interest will help promote strategic trust between China and the United States, facilitating possible cooperation in other areas. Even limited cooperation on specific areas will help construct additional mechanisms for bilateral communication on issues of irreconcilable disagreement. In fact, many of the toughest challenges in U.S.-China relations in recent years have been the result of unforeseen events, such as the accidental bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade in May 1999 and the EP-3 reconnaissance plane collision in April 2001. Building trust and finding workable solutions to tough problems is the premise behind the Obama administrations foreign policy of smart power, as articulated by Secretary of State Clinton. Smart power is based on, as Secretary Clinton outlined in her confirmation hearing, the fundamental belief that 'We must use... the full range of tools at our disposal—diplomatic, economic, military, political and cultural—picking the right tool, or combination of tools, for each situation."' As the CS1S Commission on Smart Power noted in November 2007, "Smart Power is neither hard nor soft—it is the skillful combination of bothIt is an approach that underscores the necessity of a strong military, but also invests heavily in alliances, partnerships and institutions at all levels... .°5 As such, smart power necessarily mandates a major investment in a U.S.-China partnership on key issues. 'The concept enjoys broad support among the Chinese and American people and, by promoting the global good, it reaps concrete results around the world. There should be no expectation that Washington and Beijing will or should agree on all, or even most, questions. But the American and Chinese people should expect their leaders to come together on those vital issues that require their cooperation. U.S.-China partnership, though not inevitable, is indispensable.

#### Nuclear war ensues

Mead 9 – Walter Russell, the Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow in U.S. Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, 2-4, “Only Makes You Stronger,” The New Republic, <http://www.tnr.com/politics/story.html?id=571cbbb9-2887-4d81-8542-92e83915f5f8&p=2>¶

If current market turmoil seriously damaged the performance and prospects of India and China, the current crisis could join the Great Depression in the list of economic events that changed history, even if the recessions in the West are relatively short and mild. The United States should stand ready to assist Chinese and Indian financial authorities on an emergency basis--and work very hard to help both countries escape or at least weather any economic downturn. It may test the political will of the Obama administration, but the United States must avoid a protectionist response to the economic slowdown. U.S. moves to limit market access for Chinese and Indian producers could poison relations for years. For billions of people in nuclear-armed countries to emerge from this crisis believing either that the United States was indifferent to their well-being or that it had profited from their distress could damage U.S. foreign policy far more severely than any mistake made by George W. Bush. It's not just the great powers whose trajectories have been affected by the crash. Lesser powers like Saudi Arabia and Iran also face new constraints. The crisis has strengthened the U.S. position in the Middle East as falling oil prices reduce Iranian influence and increase the dependence of the oil sheikdoms on U.S. protection. Success in Iraq--however late, however undeserved, however limited--had already improved the Obama administration's prospects for addressing regional crises. Now, the collapse in oil prices has put the Iranian regime on the defensive. The annual inflation rate rose above 29 percent last September, up from about 17 percent in 2007, according to Iran's Bank Markazi. Economists forecast that Iran's real GDP growth will drop markedly in the coming months as stagnating oil revenues and the continued global economic downturn force the government to rein in its expansionary fiscal policy. All this has weakened Ahmadinejad at home and Iran abroad. Iranian officials must balance the relative merits of support for allies like Hamas, Hezbollah, and Syria against domestic needs, while international sanctions and other diplomatic sticks have been made more painful and Western carrots (like trade opportunities) have become more attractive. Meanwhile, Saudi Arabia and other oil states have become more dependent on the United States for protection against Iran, and they have fewer resources to fund religious extremism as they use diminished oil revenues to support basic domestic spending and development goals. None of this makes the Middle East an easy target for U.S. diplomacy, but thanks in part to the economic crisis, the incoming administration has the chance to try some new ideas and to enter negotiations with Iran (and Syria) from a position of enhanced strength. Every crisis is different, but there seem to be reasons why, over time, financial crises on balance reinforce rather than undermine the world position of the leading capitalist countries. Since capitalism first emerged in early modern Europe, the ability to exploit the advantages of rapid economic development has been a key factor in international competition. Countries that can encourage--or at least allow and sustain--the change, dislocation, upheaval, and pain that capitalism often involves, while providing their tumultuous market societies with appropriate regulatory and legal frameworks, grow swiftly. They produce cutting-edge technologies that translate into military and economic power. They are able to invest in education, making their workforces ever more productive. They typically develop liberal political institutions and cultural norms that value, or at least tolerate, dissent and that allow people of different political and religious viewpoints to collaborate on a vast social project of modernization--and to maintain political stability in the face of accelerating social and economic change. The vast productive capacity of leading capitalist powers gives them the ability to project influence around the world and, to some degree, to remake the world to suit their own interests and preferences. This is what the United Kingdom and the United States have done in past centuries, and what other capitalist powers like France, Germany, and Japan have done to a lesser extent. In these countries, the social forces that support the idea of a competitive market economy within an appropriately liberal legal and political framework are relatively strong. But, in many other countries where capitalism rubs people the wrong way, this is not the case. On either side of the Atlantic, for example, the Latin world is often drawn to anti-capitalist movements and rulers on both the right and the left. Russia, too, has never really taken to capitalism and liberal society--whether during the time of the czars, the commissars, or the post-cold war leaders who so signally failed to build a stable, open system of liberal democratic capitalism even as many former Warsaw Pact nations were making rapid transitions. Partly as a result of these internal cultural pressures, and partly because, in much of the world, capitalism has appeared as an unwelcome interloper, imposed by foreign forces and shaped to fit foreign rather than domestic interests and preferences, many countries are only half-heartedly capitalist. When crisis strikes, they are quick to decide that capitalism is a failure and look for alternatives. So far, such half-hearted experiments not only have failed to work; they have left the societies that have tried them in a progressively worse position, farther behind the front-runners as time goes by. Argentina has lost ground to Chile; Russian development has fallen farther behind that of the Baltic states and Central Europe. Frequently, the crisis has weakened the power of the merchants, industrialists, financiers, and professionals who want to develop a liberal capitalist society integrated into the world. Crisis can also strengthen the hand of religious extremists, populist radicals, or authoritarian traditionalists who are determined to resist liberal capitalist society for a variety of reasons. Meanwhile, the companies and banks based in these societies are often less established and more vulnerable to the consequences of a financial crisis than more established firms in wealthier societies. As a result, developing countries and countries where capitalism has relatively recent and shallow roots tend to suffer greater economic and political damage when crisis strikes--as, inevitably, it does. And, consequently, financial crises often reinforce rather than challenge the global distribution of power and wealth. This may be happening yet again. None of which means that we can just sit back and enjoy the recession. History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads--but it has other, less reassuring messages as well. If financial crises have been a normal part of life during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, so has war. The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war: The list of wars is almost as long as the list of financial crises. Bad economic times can breed wars. Europe was a pretty peaceful place in 1928, but the Depression poisoned German public opinion and helped bring Adolf Hitler to power. If the current crisis turns into a depression, what rough beasts might start slouching toward Moscow, Karachi, Beijing, or New Delhi to be born? The United States may not, yet, decline, but, if we can't get the world economy back on track, we may still have to fight.

## 2NC UQ Cards

#### Relations on brink- Olympics uniforms causing tension

Khaleej Times, 7-16-2012, “U.S. Uniforms, China’s Pride,” <http://www.khaleejtimes.com/kt-article-display-1.asp?xfile=/data/editorial/2012/July/editorial_July32.xml&section=editorial>

THE OUTCRY of American lawmakers about the decision of the US Olympic Committee to source the uniforms of the country’s Olympic athletes from China has given a new spin to US-China relations. While China is yet to respond to the outcry, and rightly so, the debate that’s brewing in US on whether it was right to give Chinese firms the order to manufacture the uniforms presents another side of the globalisation narrative that America has always flaunted.¶ For the US lawmakers, the fact that Chinese textile units are providing the uniforms is a severe grouse for the simple reason that many textile units in the country are going through a prolonged period of crisis with some having gone belly up and facing bankruptcy. Americans are are losing their jobs, and here is China, stepping in to manufacture uniforms when these surviing units could very well have made them, the lawmakers contend.¶ The US Olympic Committee says the decision was all about sponsorship support, adding that the US Olympic team is privately funded. Now that the issue has come out in the open, the debate has become one of national pride versus China’s long hand in virtually every affairs of the world.¶ The Olympic Committee’s decision might have made prudent financial sense, given that the Chinese manufactured uniforms no doubt is cheaper than if they were manufactured in the US. But from a wider perspective, it shames the lawmakers that their athletes have to wear uniforms that were made in a country which is one of the biggest contenders at the Games itself.¶ It is only logical to think what America’s reaction would be to the very fact that most athletes in other countries use sports gear that is made by American companies or patented to them. In an increasingly globalised world such give-and-take is only natural.¶ After all, in its quest to be the global power, America has put a finger in every global pie — from politics to economy. China’s rise might be worrying for the US, especially on the economic front, but there’s no choice but to live with the fact that the world has changed.¶ The axis of economic might is shifting. China, through its cost-effective manufacturing model, lead in no mean measure by the availability of cheap labour, is taking centrestage. Even when the country’s economy is cooling, as per current data, the growth rate is still far higher than US or Europe.¶ The uniform controversy is a stark reminder to America that when it comes to a truly globalised world order, there is little room for sentiments. The consideration here is money, and that is the lesson America has been teaching the world for a long time now.¶ Perhaps it would be worthwhile to ponder over whether sentimental values come to the fore only when one’s financial luck is down. When the going is good, few really bother about matters of the heart. America has just learnt it.

#### **China-U.S. Relations Struggling- Human Rights Violations, South China Sea Dispute prove**

Associated Press, 7-12-2012, “U.S. Tries to Balance Values, Economies in Asia,”

<http://www.usnews.com/news/us/articles/2012/07/12/us-china-square-off-over-south-china-sea>

PHNOM PENH, Cambodia (AP) — The Obama administration now has a taste of the difficult diplomacy necessary to sharpen the focus of American power on Asia, seeking investment opportunities alongside reforms from rights-abusing governments and working with China while defending U.S. interests.¶ From democratic Mongolia to once-hostile Vietnam and long-isolated Laos, Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton this week faced governments eager to embrace the United States as a strategic counterweight to China's expanding military and economic dominance of the region, while still lukewarm about American demands for greater democracy and rule of law.¶ And after meeting face-to-face with China's foreign minister Thursday as she began to wrap up a weeklong tour of Asia, Clinton lauded Washington's cooperation with Beijing even as she took up the case of several Southeast Asian nations threatened by the communist government's expansive claims over the resource-rich South China Sea.¶ In the discussions across the world's most populous continent, U.S. officials outlined their belief in greater democracy and freedom for Asian nations. The vision is part of a larger Obama administration effort to change the direction of U.S. diplomacy and commercial policy and redirect it to the place most likely to become the center of the global economy over the next century.¶ It is also a reaction to the region's slide toward undemocratic China as its economy has boomed and America's has struggled.¶ "As we've traveled across Asia, I've talked about the breadth of American engagement in this region, especially our work to strengthen economic ties and support democracy and human rights," Clinton told reporters Thursday. "This is all part of advancing our vision of an open, just and sustainable regional order for the Asia-Pacific."¶ Clinton will meet Friday with Myanmar's reformist President Thein Sein and introduce him to American business leaders looking for investment opportunities. The U.S. eased sanctions on the once reclusive military dictatorship this week, opening up new opportunities for the administration as it seeks to double American exports.¶ Still, Clinton said she would urgeThein Sein to do more. "Political prisoners remain in detention," she said. "Ongoing ethnic and sectarian violence continues to undermine progress toward national reconciliation, stability and lasting peace. And fundamental reforms are required to strengthen the rule of law and increase transparency."¶ The tour started in Japan, where Clinton assured a long-time ally the U.S. was committed to its security. From there, she visited four countries in China's backyard, part of a larger economic area among the world's most dynamic. Up to now, however, China has taken the most advantage.¶ In each place, Clinton was careful to make the case for American values alongside American business aspirations. It's unclear, however, if both messages were received.¶ In Ulan Bator, she credited Mongolia with liberalizing economically as well as politically, holding it up as a foil to the Chinese model of growth without freedom. And she offered deeper U.S. partnerships with communist governments in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, which have looked to Washington for fear of being swallowed up by China's expanding power.¶ But while two-way trade between Vietnam and the U.S. has soared by 40 percent in the last two years, there has been little improvement in the Vietnamese government's respect for dissidents. Laos may seek similar business relations with the U.S., but has yet to show any willingness to rectify its poor labor rights record.¶ What Washington doesn't want with these countries is what it has with Beijing, a partnership of unprecedented economic integration that stops when the discussion turns to human rights, democracy or sharing a vision for the world. It's a relationship that neither side appears able to change, both equally reliant on the other's goods and consumers, while mistrustful of the other's intentions.¶ "We are committed to working with China within a framework that fosters cooperation where interests align, and manages differences where they don't," Clinton said.¶ In probably her most difficult work of the week, Clinton pressed Beijing on Thursday to accept a code of conduct for resolving territorial disputes in the South China Sea, a U.S. mediation effort that has faced resistance from China..¶ PHNOM PENH, Cambodia (AP) — The Obama administration now has a taste of the difficult diplomacy necessary to sharpen the focus of American power on Asia, seeking investment opportunities alongside reforms from rights-abusing governments and working with China while defending U.S. interests.¶ From democratic Mongolia to once-hostile Vietnam and long-isolated Laos, Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton this week faced governments eager to embrace the United States as a strategic counterweight to China's expanding military and economic dominance of the region, while still lukewarm about American demands for greater democracy and rule of law.¶ The vision is part of a larger Obama administration effort to change the direction of U.S. diplomacy and commercial policy and redirect it to the place most likely to become the center of the global economy over the next century.¶ It is also a reaction to the region's slide toward undemocratic China as its economy has boomed and America's has struggled.¶ "As we've traveled across Asia, I've talked about the breadth of American engagement in this region, especially our work to strengthen economic ties and support democracy and human rights," Clinton told reporters Thursday. "This is all part of advancing our vision of an open, just and sustainable regional order for the Asia-PacificMeeting on the sidelines of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations' annual gathering, Clinton stressed the different ways Washington and Beijing are cooperating, while Chinese Foreign Minister Yang Jiechi spoke of building even closer U.S.-Chinese ties.¶ Neither side mentioned the South China Sea while reporters were in the room. Afterward, according to U.S. officials, they got into the sensitive talk of the South China Sea, an issue that has caused grave concerns among China's neighbors and the wider world as tensions have threatened to boil over amid standoffs between Chinese and Philippine ships and competing Chinese and Vietnamese claims.¶ While China's claim over the entire area has driven countries closer to Washington, countless hours of talks between U.S. and Chinese officials haven't led to progress on a lasting solution. The waters host about a third of the world's cargo traffic, rich fishing grounds and vast oil and gas reserves — economic opportunities the U.S. would be locked out of if China were to seize total control.¶ Clinton, however, again framed it as a question of principles.¶ "The United States has no territorial claims there and we do not take sides in disputes about territorial or maritime boundaries," she told foreign ministers gathered in Cambodia's capital. "But we do have an interest in freedom of navigation, the maintenance of peace and stability, respect for international law and unimpeded lawful commerce in the South China Sea."¶ She singled out "confrontational behavior" in the disputed Scarborough Shoal off northwestern Philippines, including the denial of access to other vessels. The actions she cited were China's, though she didn't mention the offending country by name.¶ "We have seen worrisome instances of economic coercion and the problematic use of military and government vessels in connection with disputes among fishermen," she said. "There have been a variety of national measures taken that create friction and further complicate efforts to resolve disputes."¶ Despite publicly exhorting both China and Southeast Asian nations to diplomatically settle their disputes, a State Department release made no mention of the issue and instead spoke of Sino-American cooperation on everything from disaster relief to tiger protection. The issues were clearly secondary, but reflected an effort to compartmentalize any confrontation with Beijing and paint a larger picture of collaboration.¶

#### U.S. China relations improving- still shaky

Xinhuanet, 7-13-2012, “U.S.-China Ties Continue to Make Progress,” <http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/video/2012-07/13/c_131713847.htm>

BEIJING, July 13 (Xinhuanet) -- Chinese Foreign Minister, Yang Jiechi, has met with US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton during the ASEAN Foreign Ministers’ Meetings. Both leaders agreed to continue making efforts to improve bilateral relations.¶ Foreign Minister Yang Jiechi met with US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton on the sidelines of the ASEAN conference.¶ Yang said bilateral ties are making progress this year. And he said China hopes to continue pushing the relationship forward.¶ Yang Jiechi, Chinese Foreign Minister, said, "China is ready to work with the United States to continue to implement the agreement between the two presidents, to maintain and enhance our dialogue, to coordinate and cooperate in the Asia Pacific and globally, to continue to expand our common ground, respect each other properly, and to be humble in order to process sensitive issues."¶ Clinton said that the US is committed to developing a positive and cooperative relationship with China.¶ Hillary Clinton, US Secretary of State, said, "I want to stress the importance of US-China cooperation in regional institutions such as the East Asia Summit and in particular the ASEAN Regional Forum. I’m delighted that we’re going to be issuing a joint media note that will give specifics about the cooperative projects in the Asia Pacific that we are engaging in and it is an important signal that the United States and China, not only can, but will work together in Asia."¶ Both sides agreed that the China-US ties are of great importance. A good relationship is not only in the interests of the two countries, but also the whole region.

#### Relations struggling now- human rights violations, Taiwan

Josh Chin, 4-30-2012, China News, “Escape Tangles U.S.-China Ties,” <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303916904577373961921550778.html>

BEIJING—China has clamped down on activists and online media following the dramatic escape of a blind human-rights advocate from home imprisonment, an embarrassment for Beijing that could complicate U.S.-China relations if he is found in U.S. protective custody.¶ U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner are meeting with their Chinese counterparts in Beijing on Thursday to discuss everything from economics to environmental policy. ¶ The escape last week of Chen Guangcheng, coupled with indications on Friday that the Obama administration was considering the sale of U.S. fighter jets to Taiwan, could complicate discussions of such contentious issues as Syria and the nuclear programs of North Korea and Iran.¶ The Obama administration dispatched Assistant Secretary of State for Asia affairs Kurt Campbell to Beijing over the weekend. The State Department declined to comment on Mr. Campbell's trip. Congressional officials working on Asia believe the diplomat is seeking to resolve the Chen issue before the arrival of Mrs. Clinton and Mr. Geithner.¶ Activist Chen Guangcheng is being sheltered at the U.S. Embassy in Beijing. The WSJ's Deborah Kan speaks to reporter Josh Chin about what--if any--options the U.S. has.¶ At least three activists were detained after the escape of Mr. Chen, who spoke out against forced abortions under China's one-child policy. Popular Twitter-like microblogging service Sina Weibo blocked use of the words "blind man" and "UA898," reference to a United Airlines flight from Beijing to Washington that Mr. Chen was rumored aboard. News of his escape hasn't appeared in major state-run ¶ Legal activist Chen Guangcheng, left, poses with Hu Jia in a photo Mr. Hu says was taken not long after Mr. Chen's April 22 escape.¶ The Chinese government appeared to be digging for details about who helped Mr. Chen escape and whether the U.S. has played any role.¶ Activist Hu Jia, a friend of Mr. Chen, was detained on Saturday. In an interview after his release late Sunday, he said authorities asked him when Mr. Chen met with U.S. Ambassador Gary Locke and whether he was present. Mr. Hu said the two questions "really surprised me" because they indicated that state security believed Mr. Chen was in U.S. custody. ¶ Activists who spoke with Mr. Chen said they believed he sought U.S. protection, though his whereabouts was unclear on Sunday. The White House and the State Department declined to comment on the status of Mr. Chen or any possible U.S. role in protecting him. The Chinese government didn't comment.¶ Friends of Mr. Chen said his escape from his home in the village of Dongshigu in Shandong province on April 22 was carefully planned. They said he stayed in his bedroom for weeks to fool his guards into thinking his health was poor. Then he scaled a wall at night and fled to Beijing, where he moved among safe houses. His wife and daughter were believed to remain under home confinement, his friends said.¶ Mr. Hu said one of the activists who helped in the escape told him Friday that Mr. Chen was in the "safest place" in Beijing—code, he explained, for the U.S. embassy. "If you ask any Chinese person where the safest place in Beijing is, they'll all think the same thing," he said.¶ Sheltering Mr. Chen would present the U.S. with a dilemma. Keeping Mr. Chen at a U.S. facility could strain relations with China. Turning over Mr. Chen to Chinese authorities might subject him to harsh punishment, which could be politically damaging to the Obama administration. Mr. Chen had said he didn't want to leave China, said activists who helped him.¶ "This is a no-win situation for the U.S., exacerbated by the likely tendency of some Chinese to believe that we engineered the whole thing to embarrass China's leaders and the entire Chinese nation," said Richard Bush, director for Northeast Asian policy studies at the Brookings Institution.¶ Mr. Obama's top counterterrorism official, John Brennan, was asked Sunday on Fox News whether Mr. Obama was committed to protecting Mr. Chen. "I'm confident that the president and others within the U.S. government are going to be able to find the right way forward," he said.¶ Chinese officials said this week's Strategic and Economic Dialogue would continue. "I don't know why a question like that would be raised," said China's Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs Cui Tiankai on Saturday. Mrs. Clinton and Mr. Geithner are scheduled to meet with Vice Premier Wang Qishan and State Councilor Dai Bingguo.¶ The Chen incident comes at a sensitive time for both countries. Beijing's hopes of a smooth leadership change later this year have been dashed by the March ouster of Bo Xilai from senior posts in the Communist Party. President Barack Obama, facing a re-election campaign, is under pressure from Republicans to take a tougher stance in dealings with China. The presumptive Republican presidential nominee Mitt Romney on Sunday urged the White House to offer protection to Mr. Chen and his family.¶ China broke off military-to-military talks with the U.S. in 2010 after the U.S. decided to sell up to $6.4 billion in arms to Taiwan, which has de facto independence, but which Beijing considers part of China. Last year, the U.S. decided to upgrade Taiwan's existing F-16 jets rather than selling it new ones.¶ In a letter Friday to Sen. John Cornyn (R., Texas), who has pressed the administration on Taiwan weapons sales, a White House official said the U.S. would give "serious consideration" to selling new F-16 fighter jets to Taiwan. National Security Council spokesman Tommy Vietor said the letter "is consistent with our current policy on Taiwan, which has not changed."¶ U.S. officials acknowledged this weekend that the Taiwan arms issue could emerge as an irritant to U.S.-China relations. The Pentagon and State Department had spent a year trying to repair military ties with Beijing. "The timing isn't great for this," said a U.S. official.¶ Mr. Chen, who over the years helped mount legal challenges against forced abortions in China, spent about four years in prison on charges of disturbing public order. After his release in September 2010, he and his wife were confined to their house without formal arrest or charges, watched over by a rotating cast of plainclothes guards, friends said. Their young daughter recently has been allowed to attend school, escorted to and from the house by guards.¶ Mr. Hu, the activist, said Mr. Chen suffered a leg injury during his escape while climbing over a wall around his home. He struggled for 20 hours to reach a rendezvous point, where volunteers picked him up and drove him to Beijing, moving him from safe house to safe house, Mr. Hu said. ¶ Two of the activists involved in helping Mr. Chen escape—He Peirong and Guo Yushan—are missing and believed held by authorities, other activists said.¶ On Sunday night, Liu Weiguo, a Shandong lawyer, said he was searching for Mr. Chen's nephew, Chen Kegui, who appeared to be fleeing from police after local officials released a statement Friday saying he had attacked them.

#### **China-U.S. relations down- competition over trade with Liberia**

Solomon Watkins, 4-21-2012, African Standard News, “China, U.S. Relations with Liberia: Which is best? As China Reports $5 billion in trade in 2011,” <http://www.africanstandardnews.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=256:solomon-watkins-monrovia-liberia&catid=3:newsflash>

Monrovia: The United States of America and China two world super powers continue to struggle for influence on most developing countries with West Africa serving as one of the regions in which these two powers are competing.¶ In West Africa, resource rich Liberia is one of the countries in which the two nations are struggling for influence, fighting neck to neck. Although Liberia has a long standing relationship with the United States of America dating far back in the 1800s but China has made significant progress in its relationship with Liberia during the post war years of the country. The United States is considered Liberia’s God Father but recent developments are proving the contrary as Liberia is cleverly maintaining relations with the two countries. Chinese’s presence is heavily felt on the grounds in Liberia as China is involved in Liberia’s reconstruction in all aspects ranging from investment to infrastructural development amongst others. Days after Liberia’s President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf publicly stated that the United States is Liberia’s biggest partner, the Ambassador of the People’s Republic of China (PRC), Zhao Jianhua has outlined progress made thus far with the post conflict recovery process of the third world nation, by pointing out how his government has helped raise trade and expedite projects. Liberia’s is China 4th Largest trading partner-says envoy The PRC’s envoy stated “As you all know; China has been a good trading partner of Liberia. According to our statistics, in 2011, our trade volume surpassed 5 billion US dollars. Liberia has become the No. 4th trading partner among all African countries with China.”

#### **Sino-U.S. Relations Vulnerable**

Benjamin Shobert, 12-9-2011,China Daily, “Sino-U.S. Relations at Vulnerable Juncture,” <http://www.atimes.com/atimes/China_Business/ML09Cb02.html>

The November release of the US-China Economic and Security Review Commission's (USCC) annual report on the state of US-Sino relations certainly covered its fair share of the traditional suspects. Spread throughout the report are numerous calls for action on the matter of the yuan valuation, the need for the US to more aggressively access the WTO as a means of addressing its grievances with China, and on the foreign affairs front, China's reticence to deal with North Korea and Iran in ways that America believes China should. But this year's report is different in that the commission's 2011 report to congress takes place in the shadow of major power transitions in both China and the United States (which country's transition will be more orderly and productive is, of course, a matter of some dispute). In the US, the 2012 presidential election will occur in November, while in China, the 18th National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) will occur sometime in the autumn, during which time a new central committee, politburo and general secretary will be chosen. Political forces have obviously always shaped US-Sino relations, but in 2012 the stakes are much higher for both countries. America's feeling of economic vulnerability is beginning to express itself with building intensity over what it feels is an unbalanced and unfair trade relationship with China. This frustration is slowly but surely acting to reinforce the opinions of those in Washington who believe that China should be seen less as a potential partner and more as a strategic competitor on both economic and military fronts. Consequently, those who have in the past dismissed the findings of this commission as pure political posturing can not afford to any longer diminish the weight of congressional committee findings like those of the USCC's. Whatever lens through which outsiders may choose to interpret the USCC's 2011 report, it unmistakably captures and reflects a vibrant and increasingly influential line of thought about China from within the US Congress. At the forefront of the 2011 USCC report are ongoing concerns over the role of China's state-owned enterprises (SOEs). As the report notes, the process of reforming China's domestic economy and the role of SOEs within it has, if anything, gone backwards over the last year. The USCC points out that this reversal has been designed to, "creat[e] SOEs that dominate important portions of the economy, especially in the industrial sectors, reserved for the state's control". The USCC believes that this change in the direction can be largely understood as a perhaps unforeseen consequence of the massive 2008-2009 stimulus put through by Beijing. This stimulus largely benefited China's SOEs at the expense of both China's privately owned companies as well as to the detriment of American and European companies who stood to potentially benefit if the stimulus money could be directed towards products and services they were capable of providing. Quoting a 2010 World Trade Organization report on China's SOEs, the USSC report shares that "SOEs have been 'benefitting disproportionately from the [g]overnment's recent measures to boost the economy ... at the same time domestic private enterprises are finding it more difficult to access credits from banks." The net of this is, to quote many a Chinese entrepreneur, "the state advances, the private [sector] retreats." How open Beijing is willing to be towards outside competition in sectors its SOEs currently dominate is not only a question related to economic reform; it also has implications for how American and European companies view the domestic Chinese market. Here the long-standing and much publicized Indigenous Innovation policies put forward by Beijing during its 2008-09 stimulus program continue to be a cause for concern. Even though analysts have pointed out that much of what is written in the Indigenous Innovation policy was essentially putting down in writing what has been the unspoken reality on the ground in China for years, by codifying the practices, Beijing put a bulls-eye on an issue that most inside and outside the country knew would ultimately need to be dealt with. Beijing has made gradual moves to neutralize some of the more draconian aspects of the Indigenous Innovation policy by relaxing the expectations that government procurement catalogs only feature domestic Chinese companies (or multinationals who had agreed to the technology transfer policy); however, as the USCC report notes, "the long effort by the central government ... is a message that will likely outlive any product catalogues." What troubles the USCC is not only the policy itself, but also what it suggests about China's attitude towards the need for a healthy trade relationship with its partners. As the report notes, the policy "demonstrated the government's view that Chinese companies and governments are better off substituting domestic goods for imports". USCC chairman William Reinsch said in opening remarks when the 2011 report was issued, "These policies are intended to discriminate against foreign goods and services and to substitute domestic goods, apparently as a device to force the transfer of technology to Chinese firms." He then went on to state, "These policies, along with China's failure to provide adequate IP [intellectual property] protection, strike at the heart of America's greatest economic strength - its ability to innovate". Throughout the 2011 report, numerous instances are made towards China's strategy for moving up the manufacturing supply chain into higher value products coupled to "large swathes of the Chinese economy [being] closed off to foreign investors", a key structural challenge for the two countries. By connecting technology transfer requirements to China's SOE sector, the USCC is drawing a clear line connecting the direction of China's economic reforms and its unwillingness to play by the rules with what the American economy must rely on to pull itself out of the current recession. Whether this is a fair criticism or a voice of suspicion related to American insecurities, there is no more powerful political narrative in Washington right now than the growing sense that China's entrance to the WTO has helped China bend the rules to its benefit and the general detriment of its trading partners. Making note of the 10th anniversary of China's entry to the WTO in December, Reinsch noted that China's most recent strategies have been "contrary to the spirit, and in many cases the letter, of China's WTO commitments". The 2011 USCC report goes further, writing that "China has grown more assertive and creative in using WTO procedures to alleviate, eliminate, and avoid certain restrictions in the Accession Protocol." China's autocratic tendencies are of concern not only in how it manages its domestic economy, but also in what the USCC report calls China's "internal dilemmas". Of note through the course of 2011 was not only a regression of hoped-for economic reforms, but also anticipated political changes. Frightened by the instability brought upon governments in the Middle East during the Arab Spring, Beijing acted to clamp down on any potential source of instability. The report notes that in 2011, China acted to clamp down on Internet freedoms while spiriting away several high-profile political activists. Internet cafes are now being required to install software that obtains the user's information, making it easier for the government to track down dissenting voices that use the Internet to express their frustrations or opinions. They point, as the report notes, to a government increasingly concerned over already wide and growing inequalities of income and access to services that hold the potential to destabilize the country. What Beijing may not realize, or, to give its leaders some credit, what they may not agree with, is the timing of China's retrenchment and how it coincides with the country's militarization. How these three phenomena have aligned over the last twelve months is cause for concern because it brings together economic, political and national security concerns. While 2011 did see China's first aircraft carrier launch and the first flight of its J-20 stealth fighter, the USCC notes that the more subtle change from a policy of access denial to what the Commission calls a policy of "area control". The change in language captures what the USCC believes is what the PLA is now positioning itself for, "to easily conduct operations against regional states". This doctrinal adjustment represents a country that no longer believes its best strategy against American power will be purely to deny access to critical parts of its littorals. Now the People's Liberation Army (PLA) instead is preparing itself to be capable of forward projecting its power regionally. None of this is to say China is preparing to act in this way, merely that the country's military planners are now developing strategies and weapons platforms capable of doing so should they feel it necessary to do so. Looking at the PLA's growing capabilities, the USSC report writes that "While US bases in East Asia are vulnerable to PLA air and missile attacks, Japanese, Philippine, and Vietnamese bases are just as vulnerable, if not more so." At the end of the 2011 report, Commissioners Reinsch and Robin Cleveland make a final plea for those reading the USCC's findings to look beyond those issues the US may have with China and see those that lie within America's ability to change. As they both write, "This means that the right answers lie in policies we should pursue to make ourselves more competitive than policies to hold the Chinese back." While admirable sentiments, the bulk of the 2011 report suggests that unless China and the United States can find a way to better balance their respective domestic economic and political needs against the weight of globalization and the changes it has brought with it, we may well be on the road towards additional conflict instead of cooperation in 2012 and beyond.

## 2NC Link Cards

#### Past exchanges prove- China will retaliate

Washington Times, 1-30-2010, “China Suspends Military Exchanges with U.S.,” http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/jan/30/china-suspends-military-exchanges-us/

BEIJING (AP) — China suspended military exchanges with the United States, threatened unprecedented sanctions against American defense companies and warned Saturday that cooperation would suffer after Washington announced $6.4 billion in planned arms sales to Taiwan.¶ The response to Friday’s U.S. announcement, while not entirely unexpected, was swift and indicated that China plans to put up a greater challenge than usual as it deals with the most sensitive topic in U.S.-China relations.¶ “This is the strongest reaction we’ve seen so far in recent years,” said Stephanie T. Kleine-Ahlbrandt, northeast Asia project director for the International Crisis Group. “China is really looking to see what kind of reaction it’s going to receive from Obama on this.”¶ China’s Defense Ministry said the arms sales to self-governing Taiwan, which the mainland claims as its own, cause “severe harm” to overall U.S.-China cooperation, the state-run Xinhua News Agency reported. Vice ministerial-level talks on arms control and strategic security were postponed.¶ The warning comes as the U.S. seeks Beijing’s help on issues including the global financial crisis and nuclear standoffs in North Korea and Iran. Tensions were already high after recent U.S. comments on Internet freedom and a dispute between Google and China, as well as President Barack Obama’s plan to meet with Tibetan spiritual leader the Dalai Lama this year.¶ China’s Vice Foreign Minister He Yafei told U.S. Ambassador Jon Huntsman that the sales of Black Hawk helicopters, Patriot Advanced Capability-3 missiles and other weapons to Taiwan would “cause consequences that both sides are unwilling to see,” a ministry statement said.¶ The Foreign Ministry also threatened sanctions against U.S. companies involved in the arms sales, which hasn’t happened in past sales to Taiwan.¶ “Our action regarding Taiwan reinforces our commitment to stability in the region,” U.S. State Department spokesman P.J. Crowley said Saturday. “We know China has a different view. Given our broad relationship with China, we will manage this issue as we have in the past.”¶ The United States is Taiwan’s most important ally and largest arms supplier, and it’s bound by law to ensure the island is able to respond to Chinese threats.¶ China responds angrily to any proposed arms sales, however, and it also cut off military ties with the U.S. in 2008 after the former Bush administration announced a multibillion-dollar arms sale to Taiwan.¶ A similar cutoff of military ties was expected this time, but it comes as Washington and Beijing wanted to improve normally frosty relations between their armed forces. The U.S. has tried to use military visits to build trust with Beijing and learn more about the aims of its massive military buildup.¶ “In the past, these kinds of suspensions have lasted for three to six months, with some parts of the military-to-military relationship suspended beyond that,” said Phillip Saunders, a distinguished research fellow at the National Defense University in Washington. “I expect something similar this time.”¶ It’s not known whether the arms sale will affect President Hu Jintao’s expected visit to the U.S. this year or a summit on nuclear safety . Experts on China warned Beijing could take further steps to punish the United States to show its newfound power and confidence in world affairs.¶ Jin Canrong, a professor of international studies at China’s Renmin University, said the sale would give Beijing a “fair and proper reason” to accelerate weapons testing. China test-fired rockets in recent weeks for an anti-missile defense system in what security experts said was a display of anger at the pending arms sale.¶ “The U.S. will pay a price for this. Starting now, China will make some substantial retaliation, such as reducing cooperation on the North Korea and Iran nuclear issues and anti-terrorism work,” Jin added.¶ The latest suspension of military ties should affect planned visits to China by U.S. Secretary of Defense Robert Gates and Admiral Michael Mullen, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff. A visit to the U.S. by the Chinese military’s chief of the general staff, Gen. Chen Bingde, could also be called off.¶ The U.S. Congress has 30 days to comment on the newest arms sales before the plan goes forward. Lawmakers traditionally have supported such sales.¶ Though Taiwan’s ties with China have warmed considerably since Taiwanese President Ma Ying-jeou took office 20 months ago, Beijing has threatened to invade if the island ever formalizes its de facto independence. China has more than 1,000 ballistic missiles aimed at Taiwan.¶ China often argues that arms sales to Taiwan hurt their relations, but Saunders said that despite the latest announcement and the one in 2008, “cross-Strait relations have never been better.”¶ The arms package announced Friday dodged a thorny issue: The more advanced F-16 fighter jets that Taiwan covets are not included.¶ The Pentagon’s decision not to include the fighters and a design plan for diesel submarines — two items Taiwan wants most — “shows that the Obama administration is deeply concerned about China’s response,” said Wang Kao-cheng, a defense expert at Taipei’s Tamkang University.¶ Taiwan’s Ma told reporters Saturday that the deal should not anger the mainland because the weapons are defensive, not offensive.

#### US-China War is Hardly Avoidable

Lieven 6/12/12 "Avoiding a US-China War" NYT <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/13/opinion/avoiding-a-us-china-war.html?_r=1>

In East Asia, things are very different. For most of its history, China has dominated the region. When it becomes the largest economy on earth, it will certainly seek to do so. While China cannot build up naval forces to challenge the United States in distant oceans, it would be very surprising if in future it will not be able to generate missile and air forces sufficient to deny the U.S. Navy access to the seas around China. Moreover, China is engaged in territorial disputes with other states in the region over island groups — disputes in which Chinese popular nationalist sentiments have become heavily engaged.

#### US-China War Would Result in Catastrophic Damage from both sides, also spiraling into Economic Damage

Lieven 6/12/12 "Avoiding a US-China War" NYT <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/13/opinion/avoiding-a-us-china-war.html?_r=1>

Neither the United States nor China would “win” the resulting war outright, but they would certainly inflict catastrophic damage on each other and on the world economy. If the conflict escalated into a nuclear exchange, modern civilization would be wrecked. Even a prolonged period of military and strategic rivalry with an economically mighty China will gravely weaken America’s global position. Indeed, U.S. overstretch is already apparent — for example in Washington’s neglect of the crumbling states of Central America.