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# China DA

**Summary:**

The China Disadvantage argues that currently, in the status quo, NATO is reviewing its strategic priorities and realizing that China could pose a bigger threat than they previously realized. China is advancing its economy and modernizing its military at an extremely fast rate. We’ve seen growth like this before with Russia, however, we ignored it and allowed Russia to poke holes in the alliances. The DA argues that learning from our mistakes sounds great and is exactly what NATO needs, but the Affirmative will ruin that plan. By enacting the Affirmative, necessary attention and resources is taken away from the new NATO strategy to focus on China. Once that happens, China will continue to grow and get stronger which ultimately poses a huge threat to NATO. Chinese expansion will essentially scare other countries into making moves for power and advancements, causing great power wars.

**Strategy Guide:**

This disadvantage is an example of a common debate argument called a “trade-off” disadvantage. When arguing a “trade-off”, you are saying that by doing one thing, we sacrifice something else that was possibly more important. In this case by doing the aff, we sacrifice or ‘trade’ the new strategy of focusing resources on China.

When using this file, it’s important to remember that after the 1nc, you cannot just read straight down, card after card. You must listen and flow the 2ac, so that you know what arguments are important for you to emphasize and what cards to use in response. So once you listen to the 2ac, think about what they’ve said and search through the cards in the ‘Extensions’ and ‘Answers’ sections and decide which cards answer the arguments best as well as extend your arguments efficiently.

**Argument Breakdown:**

Uniqueness: NATO is currently focusing on China because their power is rising very fast

Link: The Affirmative plan takes necessary NATO focus away from China in order to enact the plan

Internal Link: This trade off gives China more space to grow and plot plans to divide NATO

Impact: Chinese expansion creates major wars

# Argument Glossary

**Supplant** (verb)- replacement of something with a substitute that is comparatively preferable

**Expansionism** (noun)- typically a country or countries pursuit of acquiring more influence through physical expansion of their borders and territory (i.e. China and Taiwan, Russia and Crimea, etc.)

**Protectorate** (noun)- a power dynamic in which one country has overwhelming rule over another

**Infrastructure** (noun)- organizational structures needed for society to function (ie hospitals, roads, schools, buildings, etc.)

**Pivot** (noun/verb)- a general focus (to focus on something)

**Underpin** (verb)- to support

**Liberal democracy** (noun)- a form of government characterized by democracy and capitalist markets (i.e. USA, France, Germany)

**Mandate** (noun/verb)- typically a law: an authoritative command

**Adversary** (noun)- an enemy or opponent

**Proxy wars** (noun)- a conflict between two states instigated by a larger state

**Trade wars** (noun)- a type of economic conflict that involves increasing tariffs on trade to place economic pressure on another state

**Sovereignty** (noun)- the state of independence of a nation

**Vaccine Diplomacy** (noun)- negotiating vaccines as a means of building relations with a country

**Status Quo** (noun)- current state of the world

**Revisionist** (adjective)- revolutionary advocacy that supports reforming or rebuilding previous structures

**Hegemony** (noun)- overwhelming global dominance

## China DA 1NC

#### Uniqueness – NATO’s learning from its mistakes with Russia, shifting resources to focus on China in the newest strategy

Mahashie 21’ (Abraham, Defense Writer Washington Examiner, 06/15) <https://news.yahoo.com/nato-pivots-toward-china-seeks-181700482.html?fr=yhssrp_catchall>

**NATO’s new strategic concept** will incorporate the threat from China in a way that **seeks to learn from failures to counter Russia’s influence**, security analysts told the Washington Examiner, noting China is watching Russia’s techniques to drive wedges and weaken the alliance. NATO Secretary-General Jens Stoltenberg told reporters Tuesday that a 2010 alliance strategy document that spoke of Russia in terms of a “strategic partnership” needs to be scrapped as Russia continues hybrid warfare on the eastern flank. Likewise, **the new framework must address** how the 30 countries should view **an emerging threat posed by China.** “**We need to** engage with China, but we also need to **take into account the challenges** Russia or **China poses to our alliance**,” Stoltenberg told reporters on a Zoom call after the NATO ministerial wrapped up Monday. **The warning is especially vital, considering how the alliance failed to fend off Russian aggression** that created protracted conflicts in Georgia, Moldova, Ukraine, and Armenia, some of whom aspired to greater proximity with Europe and membership in the defense alliance. Russia’s resulting military and intelligence creep positioned assets within 200 miles of NATO shores. Security experts say **China is watching to see how, or if, allies will take a firmer stance**. **Meanwhile**, **China uses its economic power to better position itself militarily** in Europe.

#### Chinas technological advancements are unmatched and a growing suspicion to NATO

NATO 21’(06/14 National Atlantic Treaty Organization <https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_185000.htm>)

**China** does not compare to the direct threat that Russia poses but **has** nevertheless **appeared on NATO’s strategic radar as an economic great power with a high-tech edge that Russia is unlikely to ever match.** Chinese 5G network provider Huawei remains a pertinent topic for NATO, as several European countries, including Germany, Austria, Spain, the Netherlands and Hungary, are still undecided about relying on its potentially compromised technology or de facto allowing their national operators to use Chinese providers. Moreover, **Chinese investments in** continental **Europe** without conditionalities attached and targeting critical infrastructure (railway stations, ports and airports) **raise suspicions about Beijing’s underlying political and military motives. Moreover, China is pressing ahead with military applications of** artificial intelligence (**AI**), and its space ambitions are growing.

#### Link - The pacing gap prevents tech innovation like the aff and the maintenance of international relations at the same time, NATO diplomacy could be thrown off balance by weighing tech regulation against international disputes

Haar 18’ (Flemming, The Strategy Bridge, 9/16 https://thestrategybridge.org/the-bridge/2018/8/16/resistance-to-innovation-in-nato)

In the 1940s, the German psychologist Kurt Lewin was the first to introduce a systemic understanding of the resistance phenomenon. The cause, according to Lewin, is not found in the mind of the individual employee, but in the dynamics of opposing forces, including the behavior of leadership. According to the political economist Josef Schumpeter, “Innovation is the creation of new combinations that represent a departure from established practices.” In other words, a technological tension between the need to innovate and the desire to maintain order and stability will always exist. Wendell Wallach nicely defines the problem as “the pacing gap” between the introduction of a new technology and the establishment of laws, regulations, and oversight mechanisms for shaping its safe development. Wallach believes that modern technological innovation is occurring at an unprecedented pace, making it harder than ever to govern using traditional legal and regulatory mechanisms. If the allies are not careful, domestic contentions and international disputes over trade and technology regulation could consume their political energy, breaking the promise of transatlantic renewal before it has even begun. To stave off this dim prospect, NATO is embarking on a strategy of transatlantic renewal, the centerpiece of which will be a new Strategic Concept—its first in a decade. NATO’s current Strategic Concept dates back to 2010 and reflects NATO’s thinking on how to cope with the divisive nature of the War on Terror, and it is inadequate for a changed world of great power rivalry.

#### Internal Link - Continuing to have a wide and shallow focus will prove fatal as the rising power of China coerce to break NATO

Haar 18’ (Flemming, The Strategy Bridge, 9/16 https://thestrategybridge.org/the-bridge/2018/8/16/resistance-to-innovation-in-nato)

A focused (narrow and deep) approach to a renewed Strategic Concept would serve NATO better than a broadened agenda because it highlights what NATO does best—collective defense—and in a complex security environment, it forces decision-makers to think through the defense implications of political choices like enlargement. NATO can and should address any theme and any geography that impacts its collective defense interests and capacity; it should avoid chasing alliance legitimacy and relevance by labeling a range of national security issues as “core tasks. “Continuing to go wide will bring NATO into conflict with the range of domestic reforms as well as the political-economic rationale of a strengthened EU. Russia and China are the two strategic actors that have a capacity to break NATO by strategies of coercion. NATO allies, by fighting long wars in Afghanistan and Iraq and intervening in Libya and Syria, have offered these competitors ample opportunity to adapt to Western military strengths and political   
weaknesses.29 Were NATO to label these countries threats and challenges, which it has, and then wander off in many policy directions, which it may, it would embolden these competitors further and erode NATO’s own resolve and reputation. This challenge lies at the heart of a new Strategic Concept for NATO.

#### **Impact- China expansionism creates World War III, Cold War 2.0, and proxy wars**

Veriek 20’ (Sim, 06/15, <https://asiatimes.com/2020/06/three-pathways-to-war-between-the-us-and-china/>)

According to the theory of international relations, the world is constantly in a state of anarchy and countries always seek a balance of power to maintain their own security. **With China’s rise, the US and its allies fear losing the equilibrium that supports American domination of the global order. Considering China a “revisionist state,” they have raised concerns about Beijing’s unchecked attempt to change the status quo, to pursue military expansionism and follow a path toward hegemony.** From geo-strategic flashpoints in the South China Sea to Taiwan, to trade wars and technological wars, the likelihood of confrontations seems inevitable. That raises a simple question. **Will war between the US and China result from the current tension?** If so, what form of war will that be? If history is any indication, three speculations can be made for war between the US and China: **World War III, Cold War 2.0, and regional proxy wars.** **World War III would be the most extreme.** When China is considered a security threat and that seeks hegemony through military expansionism, should one consider it as equivalent to Germany and Japan during the two World Wars? Has China invaded and occupied any countries? Has China pursued imperialist colonialism? Has it committed a mass atrocity, or is it a terrorist state? Similarly, if war is to happen between the two superpowers, then what might trigger the United States’ involvement? Events like the attack on Pearl Harbor? **The second form of war is Cold War 2.0, which is being hotly debated as the closest to the current realities.** But this time it is not about ideologies, space war or nuclear brinkmanship. **It is more about a trade war, currency war, technological war, cyber war or even hybrid war that combines elements of some or all of these.** Competition for the domination of multilateral frameworks is one of the possible fronts of Cold War 2.0, which has gradually divided nations along this polarity if it truly exists – **for instance, the competition between the Belt and Road Initiative and the Indo-Pacific Strategy.** But if Cold War 2.0 does exist, it would be a limited version of Cold War 1.0 with fewer fronts and features owing to China’s reluctance to take global leadership on every front as the former Soviet Union tried to do vis-à-vis the US. Using the word “competition” on multilateral frameworks is not totally right either, because while China is increasing its contribution to the multilateral system, the share is still low compared with the US. It would not constitute a competition either if the US is withdrawing from every multilateral system that it helped build after World War II. **Modern China in fact has benefited from the system created by the domination of the US, and it has yet to create any global governance system, either politically or economically.** China has not tried or at least has not been seen as attempting to impose or spread its own system. Thus far, no country has proclaimed that it is adopting China’s governance system. **The next possible type of war is a regional proxy war in the Asia-Pacific, which is the main platform of competition between the US and China.** Like in Cold War 1.0, the US-China rivalry could result in “hot wars” between peripheral states. Regional flashpoints such as the South China Sea and Taiwan could ignite such hot wars. For the Mekong region, the likelihood of Vietnam War 2.0 cannot be ruled out while China and Vietnam keep confronting each other in the South China Sea. Cambodia used to be a sideshow of Vietnam War 1.0.

## China DA 2NC/1NR Extensions

### 2NC/1NR Uniqueness Extensions

#### China is advancing its military technology quickly, NATO is focusing on AI weapons to keep up

Xi 21’ (Jai, 10/22, VOA News Reporter <https://www.voanews.com/a/nato-s-new-focus-reflects-china-s-rise-/6282496.html>)

China is “heavily modernizing its military capabilities, including advanced nuclear systems and long-range missile systems," and "we see China coming much closer to us, not least in cyberspace,” he said. And in response, the allies agreed “to do more together."Without giving details, Stoltenberg said NATO would cooperate on a strategy involving areas such as artificial intelligence and technologically advanced weapon systems, “relevant to the challenges posed by the rise of China.”He said that applies not only to Europe, NATO’s traditional focus, but also to challenges in the Asia Pacific, where “the rise of China just makes it even more important that Europe and North America stand together in NATO.”

#### China holds important ports and other infrastructure investments across Europe.

Mashie 21’ (Abraham, Defense Writer Washington Examiner, 06/15) <https://news.yahoo.com/nato-pivots-toward-china-seeks-181700482.html?fr=yhssrp_catchall>

“China invests,” former Romanian National Security Council member George Scutaru said at a recent interview with the Washington Examiner in Bucharest. Scutaru described China’s use of vaccine diplomacy, building a factory in Serbia that will by the fall distribute its coronavirus vaccine regionally. Also, a Chinese company owns the largest port in Greece, a NATO member. The security analyst said Russia’s interests are oriented toward defense and geopolitics, whereas China’s moves are economic but have a military component. “China’s growing influence and international policies present challenges to alliance security,” Stoltenberg said at the post-summit press conference. “Leaders agreed that we need to address such challenges together as an alliance and that we need to engage with China to defend our security interests.”

#### China expanding its power rapidly and aggressively, putting NATO on high alert

Xi 21’ (Jai, 10/22, VOA News Reporter <https://www.voanews.com/a/nato-s-new-focus-reflects-china-s-rise-/6282496.html>)

As China expands its influence globally in a more aggressive manner, NATO’s concern about China’s rise has grown. In a joint communiqué in June, NATO leaders accused China of rapidly expanding its nuclear arsenal and being opaque in implementing its military modernization. “China’s stated ambitions and assertive behavior present systemic challenges to the rules-based international order and to areas relevant to alliance security,” the communiqué said. Dan Hamilton, a senior fellow at Johns Hopkins University's SAIS Foreign Policy Institute and director of the postdoctoral program on “The United States, Europe, and World Order,” told VOA Mandarin that the 27 countries in the European Union are feeling China’s presence in the region. China is the EU’s No. 1 trading partner and the source of billions of dollars per year in direct investment, particularly in energy, according to a recent VOA Mandarin report. Beijing’s relations vary from one EU nation to the next, with east-central European nations such as Hungary and Serbia eager to engage while Western European countries are more skeptical.

#### NATO pivot focus on China is vital to security for the future

Xi 21’ ( Jie, Reporter for VOA News 10/22)<https://www.voanews.com/a/nato-s-new-focus-reflects-china-s-rise-/6282496.html>

In a recent interview with the Financial Times, Stoltenberg said that **countering the security threat from the rise of China will be an important part of NATO’s future rationale**. “NATO is an alliance of North America and Europe. But this region faces global challenges: terrorism, cyber, but also the rise of China. So when it comes to strengthening our collective defense, that’s also about how to address the rise of China,” Stoltenberg told the Financial Times. “What we can predict is that the rise of China will impact our security. It already has.” He pointed out that **China has had an impact on European security through its cyber capabilities, new technologies and long-range missiles.** Bruce Jones, director and a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, a Washington think tank, said Stoltenberg’s remarks revealed an important shift of the military alliance. “It's an important shift of NATO inside NATO,” he told VOA Mandarin in a phone interview. “There's been a debate about whether NATO should concentrate on Russia, Europe, or whether it should be part of a wider American reorientation towards China.” He added that the statement from the secretary-general is “a signal about the direction that he is going to go and that he has some support for changing the orientation.” Stoltenberg said **NATO will adopt a new strategic concept** next summer**, which wil**l outline the group’s strategies for the next 10 years. The current 2010 version does not mention China. In an interview with Politico earlier this month, Stoltenberg also stressed that NATO needs to **strengthen its engagement with China.** “We don't regard China as an adversary or an enemy,” he said. “We need to engage with China on important issues such as climate change — there's no way to reduce emissions enough in the world without also including China.”

#### NATO Expanding its Technology With China in its Sights

Wright 21’ (Ann, 03/29,https://truthout.org/articles/in-alarmist-turn-nato-is-increasingly-positioning-itself-in-opposition-to-china/)

During the March 23-24 meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) council, Anthony Blinken, the U.S. secretary of state, **encouraged NATO members to join the U.S. in viewing China as an economic and security threat to the U.S. as well as to NATO countries, thereby expanding NATO’s areas of focus to include the Pacific.** This is a dangerous move that must be challenged. To gain insight into what transpired at the March NATO meeting, we can look to a roadmap for NATO’s future, which was released last fall. The report, entitled [“*NATO 2030: United for a New Era*](https://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/2020/12/pdf/201201-Reflection-Group-Final-Report-Uni.pdf),” is intended to be a guide for the military alliance in meeting the challenges it will face in the next decade. This new proposed roadmap for NATO reflects an alarming expansion: **It is as much about China and the Asia/Pacific region as it is about NATO’s traditional area of operations and concern, Europe and Russia.** Although the group identified the No. 1 threat to NATO as Russia, China was named as threat number 2. Secretary of State Blinken, in his address on **March 24 to NATO members, strongly rebuked China and urged NATO allies to join with the U.S. in this adversarial position.** Blinken said the U.S. wouldn’t force its European allies into an “*us-or-them choice*,” but he then implied the opposite, **emphasizing that Washington views China as an economic and security threat, particularly in technology, to NATO allies in Europe.** “*When one of us is coerced, we should respond as allies and work together to reduce our vulnerability by ensuring our economies are more integrated with each other*,” Blinken said. Stoltenberg nevertheless continued to spell out specific reasons NATO agrees with the U.S.: **“The rise of China has direct consequences to our security…. So, one of the challenges we face as we now have this forward looking process with NATO 2030 is how to strengthen and how to work more closely together as allies, responding to the rise of China.”** NATO’s concerns about Chinese military expansion include the construction of **nine naval bases** on atolls in the South China Sea and **an increasing number of ships: China now has the largest navy in the world, with 350 ships and submarines, including over 130 ships. In comparison, the U.S. Navy has 293 ships as of early 2020, but U.S. naval ships have substantially more firepower than Chinese Navy ships.** At the March meeting, NATO members spoke frequently about China’s increasingly global military footprint, including the development of an overseas base in Djibouti, which now [“*hosts*” military bases](https://medium.com/@LongTwentiethCentury/why-are-there-so-many-military-bases-in-djibouti-f8c579e961d5) of the United States, France, Italy, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Japan and China. China also has several smaller bases around the world, including **in the province of Neuquén, Patagonia, Argentina, on land loaned to the Chinese government during Cristina Fernández de Kirchner’s presidency**. [China claims the land is for space exploration](https://www.rionegro.com.ar/nacion-respaldo-la-continuidad-de-la-base-china-en-neuquen-1260148/) and intelligence services**.** The Chinese government also has a **naval** [**electronic intelligence facility on the Great Coco Island**](https://www.globalsecurity.org/intell/world/china/coco.htm) **of Myanmar in the Bay of Bengal and a small** [**military post in south-eastern Tajikistan**](https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/asia_pacific/in-central-asias-forbidding-highlands-a-quiet-newcomer-chinese-troops/2019/02/18/78d4a8d0-1e62-11e9-a759-2b8541bbbe20_story.html)**.** China has a total of **13 military bases worldwide**, including the nine on atolls in the South China Sea. Meanwhile**, NATO is also raising alarm about China’s economic Belt and Road Initiative, which includes a “***belt***” of overland road and rail corridors and a maritime “***road***” of shipping lanes and ports.**

### 2NC/1NR Link Extensions

#### NATO wants to set AI standards. If only its members agreed on the basics.

[**HEIKKILÄ**](https://www.politico.eu/author/melissa-heikkila/) **21’** (Melissa, 03/29, https://www.politico.eu/article/nato-ai-artificial-intelligence-standards-priorities/)

**Big differences over how to treat autonomous weapons could undermine NATO’s drive.** On paper, NATO is the ideal organization to go about setting standards for military applications of artificial intelligence. But the widely divergent priorities and budgets of its 30 members could get in the way. The Western military alliance has identified artificial intelligence as a key technology needed to maintain an edge over adversaries, and it wants to lead the way in establishing common ground rules for its use. **"I'm ... not sure that they're having the same debates on principles of responsible use or they're definitely not applying our democratic values to these technologies,” he said.** Meanwhile, the EU — which has pledged to roll out the world's first binding rules on AI in coming weeks — is seeking closer collaboration with Washington to oversee emerging technologies, **including artificial intelligence.** **The alliance's own AI strategy, to be released before the summer, will identify ways to operate AI systems responsibly, identify military applications for the technology, and provide a “platform for allies to test their AI to see whether it's up to NATO standards,”** van Weel said. ***“If an adversary would use autonomous AI powered systems in a way that is not compatible with our values and morals, it would still have defense implications because we would need to defend and deter against those systems,”*** Van Weel said. The problem is that NATO's members are at very different stages when it comes to thinking about AI in the military context. *The U.S., the world's biggest military spender, has prioritized the use of AI in the defense realm. But in Europe, most countries — France and the Netherlands excepting — barely mention the technology’s defense and military implications in their national AI strategies.* The U.S., which tends to be light on regulation and keen on defense, sees things differently. There are also divergences over what technologies the alliance ought to develop, including lethal autonomous weapons systems — **often dubbed “killer robots” — programmed to identify and destroy targets without human control.**  *These weapons systems have also faced fierce public opposition from civil society and human rights groups, including from United Nations Secretary-General António Guterres, who in 2018 called for a ban.* *"I think there’s a certain danger that if NATO doesn’t take this on as a real challenge, that it may be marginalized by other such efforts,”* Franke said. She pointed to the U.S.-led AI Partnership for Defense, which consists of 13 countries from Europe and Asia to collaborate on AI use in the military context — a forum which could supplant NATO as the standard-setting body. **That could have consequences for human rights, too.**

### 2NC/1NR Impact Extensions

#### Danger of Emerging Technologies Dividing NATO

Walsh 13’ (Eddie, 9/16, https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/natosource/danger-of-emerging-technologies-dividing-nato/)

Converging technologies also pose fundamental human security challenges. **As Francis Fukuyama once argued in** [**Our Posthuman Future: Consequences of the Biotechnology Revolution**](https://www.amazon.com/Our-Posthuman-Future-Consequences-Biotechnology/dp/0312421710)**, converging technologies could inequitably transform the world we live in and, in the process, undermine the very foundations that underpin liberal democracies**. Whether or not such a future unfolds, it is clear that their application raises **serious ethical and moral issues** that are proving divisive for allies and enemies alike (eg: the debates over armed drones and cyber espionage). If NATO member states want to sustain **“the traditional transatlantic compact [European political support in return for US military guarantees]”, they must change the way NATO approaches cooperative security around emerging technologies. And, they need to do it now.** First and foremost, NATO needs to substantially increase its investment in its Emerging Security Challenges Division (ESCD). This division should be provided the resources necessary to properly investigate the net security implications of converging technologies. It also must be granted the agency to pursue independent assessments of the security impacts posed by emerging technologies. This requires a mandate to conduct its research at arm’s length from NATO member states to ensure that its reports are not subject to their political meddling. If this cannot be achieved within the institution, then NATO should consider transforming ESCD into an independent institution (eg: the role that UNIDIR plays in the United Nations). **NATO also needs to ensure that all member states possess equal agency to call upon the ESCD to prepare reports on particular emerging technology issues of concern. This would be similar to the agency provided to US Congress members to call upon** [**Congressional Research Services**](https://www.loc.gov/crsinfo/)**.** Separately, the [NATO Parliamentary Assembly](http://www.nato-pa.int/) needs to be **held accountable for failing in its duty to address the serious threat posed by emerging technologies.** To date, there have been [far too few committee reports](http://www.nato-pa.int/Default.asp?SHORTCUT=677) designed to create awareness and common understanding of the key security challenges posed by individual emerging technologies. And, there have been no substantive reports that have tackled the overarching implications of the NBRIC revolution. Moving forward, all of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly Committees should place emerging technologies on their annual agenda. By doing so, they could remedy some of the challenges raised by the inability of individual member states to develop the legislation and regulations to manage the downside risks of converging technologies. The NATO Parliamentary Assembly might even consider convening a major conference open to all national politicians from the NATO Community on the security implications of converging technologies. Finally, NATO must do a better job of partnering with **non-NATO states and Track II actors to address the security implications of emerging technologies.**

#### War spirals into Proxy wars

Veriek 20’ (Sim, 06/15, <https://asiatimes.com/2020/06/three-pathways-to-war-between-the-us-and-china/>)

The bombing was said to be one of the major triggers of the consolidation of the Khmer Rouge’s power and the genocide that followed. While other parts of Southeast Asia remained peaceful, half of the Mekong region experienced prolonged bloodshed during the Cold War until the late 1990s when the civil war finally came to an end in Cambodia in 1998. It is true that China and the US do not want to confront each other in any direct war. As for China and Vietnam, even if they constantly confront each other in the South China Sea, they do not want direct war either owing to the strong ties between the two Communist parties and enormous trade relations. However, **one cannot ignore the fact that these two countries did experience multiple wars between each other after World War II, including a brief and bloody battle in 1974 over the** [**Paracel Islands**](https://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/the-flash-war-74-china-vietnams-south-china-sea-showdown-15540)**.** **Even if the US and China themselves do not want direct war, proxy wars could re-emerge, and small states would pay the price, as was the case during the Vietnam War.** These are the three speculations of possible types of wars between China and the US. Onlookers like Cambodia and other peripheral states can divide themselves in the new polarity at their own risk. **Like in the previous Cold War, silence and neutrality would not be an option. Few policy options would be left for small states. Like it or not, these few options often present risks to their sovereignty and independence.** Countries can stay safe and secure only if they can learn from history, which can be horrifying, cruel and bloody, at least in the case of Cambodia, because Cold Wars are only cold for the superpowers.

#### Countering ‘Threat’ From China

Wright 21 (Ann, 3/31, Truthout Reporter <https://truthout.org/articles/in-alarmist-turn-nato-is-increasingly-positioning-itself-in-opposition-to-china/>)

**China participated in the** [**2014 RIMPAC with four ships**](https://news.usni.org/2018/05/24/33834) **and in 2016 but was disinvited in 2018 due to its military activities in the South China Sea. According to the Congressional Research Service, the Light Amphibious Warship,** [**a proposed new class of Navy vessel**](https://news.usni.org/2020/09/01/report-to-congress-on-navy-light-amphibious-warship-2)**, will be between 200 and 400 feet long and cost $100 million. The Navy wants to have 28 to 30 of these amphibious ships, which will have the capability to pull up onto beaches.** How many ships would be based in Hawaii, Guam and Okinawa remains unclear, as is where they would practice beach landings in the islands, which will be watched closely by local environmental activists. **The U.S. Marines are also adding weaponized drones to their war-fighting equipment. Beginning in 2023,** [**18 Predator drones will come into the Pacific region**](https://popularresistance.org/next-indo-pacific-us-military-commander-warns-of-chinas-threat-to-taiwan/)**, 6 in Hawaii and the others going to Guam and Okinawa.** Meanwhile, the U.S. military is building new bases in the Pacific. In 2020, the president of Palau, a small Pacific island nation of a population of only 17,000, [offered his country as a new base of operations](https://breakingdefense.com/2020/10/as-us-military-moves-into-palau-china-watches-intently/) for the U.S. military in the Pacific. The U.S. has already constructed a runway and **has** [**increased the number of U.S. Navy ships**](https://breakingdefense.com/2020/10/as-us-military-moves-into-palau-china-watches-intently/) **using Palau’s ports**. **The Chinese military has responded with its own naval drills in the South China Sea and air armadas of 18 aircraft flying to the edge of Taiwan’s air defense zone during the Trump administration’s increased diplomatic engagement and military sales to Taiwan, an island the People’s Republic of China (PRC) considers as a renegade province of the PRC.** The level of air and sea confrontation in the Western Pacific between the U.S. and NATO forces and China has increased dangerously over the past two years, and it’s only a matter of time until an accident or purposeful event presents a potential war incident that can lead to horrific consequences. As NATO advisers name China as the No. 2 threat to the organization after Russia, the U.S. top diplomat echoes their rallying call as the U.S. military ramps up its forces in the Pacific region. These worrisome developments suggest the **U.S. will continue to play a leading role in pushing NATO to train its sights on China, which will heighten the dangerous confrontation in the Western Pacific.**

## China DA 2NC/1NR Answers

### 2NC/1NR Answers -- Cyber Security

#### No Alt Cause – NATO is strong and united right now, China is the only thing that can cause a rift but standing together against them in the squo will draw NATO closer, the aff tears them apart

King 19’ (Ian, 11/27, <https://nationalinterest.org/feature/why-nato-stronger-ever-100482>)

**Some suggest communist China is a greater challenge to U.S. supremacy. China’s rise is a story of rags to riches. Today, the country draws its strength from its new status as a manufacturing superpower, making it the only rival to the economic supremacy of the United States.** There is no doubting the connection between economic strength and the power to influence world events. After all, it was a head start in the industrial revolution which enabled the British empire to thrive, and a similar leap in U.S. manufacturing which helped the United States to win out in the twentieth century. But the challenge from both China and Russia is not primarily economic. It is to the system of rules and international norms, carefully developed over several decades, under U.S. leadership, which underpins peace and prosperity in the world. Through their illegal annexation of Crimea, their shameless assassinations on the streets of Berlin and Salisbury, and their mischievous efforts to sow discord through disinformation, Moscow is challenging that system. And China undermines it too—by creating artificial islands to make artificial claims of sovereignty, by stealing intellectual property, and through coercive economic measures.

The twenty-nine countries of the Western military alliance are now responsible for 53 percent of global GDP. Half of that total is American, but the other half comes from countries like the UK, France, Germany, Spain and Italy. **These non-U.S. NATO countries have a combined GDP greater than China’s and, if the United States is included, more than twice as much.** NATO is already upholding the rules-based international system in Europe. It has troops poised to respond to a Russian incursion in the Baltics. It is fighting back against Moscow’s disinformation campaigns, and it is deterring further Russian malfeasance against its neighbors. But NATO is more than that. **The Alliance is proof that once rival nations can come together to defend principles and to defend each other. From the most populous contributor, the United States, to the smallest, Iceland, all NATO member states invoked the principle of collective defense after 9/11.** NATO—the most powerful military alliance ever assembled—embodies the rules-based international system laid out by the US following allied success in World War II. It is an alliance of values as much as it is an alliance of armed forces.

Signed into being on April 4, 1949, NATO is older than Russia’s status as a nuclear power and has been established longer than the communist leadership of China. **NATO does not seek world leadership—it is a defensive alliance.** But it can lend moral authority to the United States around the world and help protect U.S. interests against the challenges posed by the other institutions that came into being in 1949, such as nuclear-armed Russia and Communist China. **Best of all, NATO can underpin the rules and norms of the international system far better than any one nation ever could. The United States should not fear bequeathing its leadership role to a seventy-year-old institution, which now dominates half the world economy, because that institution is the NATO alliance it still leads.**

#### --- Yes impact, US would overreact and exasperate a war along with China, ropes everyone else in and causes nuclear escalation Disrupting the balance between maintaining relations and new technology leads to nuke war

[Gopalaswamy](https://thebulletin.org/biography/bharath-gopalaswamy/) 2018 (Kroenig, 11, 12 https://thebulletin.org/2018/11/will-disruptive-technology-cause-nuclear-war/)

**The key to this model of deterrence is the maintenance of secure second-strike capabilities—the ability to absorb an enemy nuclear attack and respond with a devastating counterattack. Recently analysts have begun to worry, however, that new strategic military technologies may make it possible for a state to conduct a successful first strike on an enemy.** For example, Chinese colleagues have complained to me in Track II dialogues that the United States may decide to launch a sophisticated cyberattack against Chinese nuclear command and control, essentially turning off China’s nuclear forces. **Then, Washington will follow up with a massive strike with conventional cruise and hypersonic missiles to destroy China’s nuclear weapons. Finally, if any Chinese forces happen to survive, the United States can simply mop up China’s ragged retaliatory strike with advanced missile defenses.** Would any US president truly decide to launch a massive, bolt-out-of-the-blue nuclear attack because he or she thought s/he could get away with it? And why does it make sense for the country in the inferior position, in this case China, to intentionally start a nuclear war that it will almost certainly lose? **More importantly, this conceptualization of how new technology affects stability is too narrow, focused exclusively on how new military technologies might be used against nuclear forces directly.**

**New technologies threaten to create potentially destabilizing shifts in the balance of power. For decades, stability in Europe and Asia has been supported by US military power. In recent years, however, the balance of power in Asia has begun to shift, as China has increased its military capabilities.** The results of Russia’s military modernization have been on full display in its ongoing intervention in Ukraine. And Russian President Vladimir Putin is building new unmanned vehicles while ominously declaring, ***“Whoever leads in AI will rule the world.”*** **If China or Russia are able to incorporate new technologies into their militaries before the United States, then this could lead to the kind of rapid shift in the balance of power that often causes war.**. And if Putin thinks new tech has strengthened his hand, **he may be more tempted to launch a Ukraine-style invasion of a NATO member.** **Either scenario could bring these nuclear powers into direct conflict with the United States, and once nuclear armed states are at war, there is an inherent risk of nuclear conflict through** [**limited nuclear war**](https://www.jstor.org/stable/1962402?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents) **strategies,** [**nuclear brinkmanship**](https://www.jstor.org/stable/1958063?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents)**, or simple** [**accident**](https://press.princeton.edu/titles/5301.html) **or** [**inadvertent escalation**](http://www.cornellpress.cornell.edu/book/?GCOI=80140100559570&fa=author&person_id=428)**.** This framing of the problem leads to a different set of policy implications. The concern is not simply technologies that threaten to undermine nuclear second-strike capabilities directly, but, rather, **any technologies that can result in a meaningful shift in the broader balance of power.** **When it comes to new technology, this means that the United States should seek to maintain an innovation edge. Washington should also work with other states, including its nuclear-armed rivals, to develop a new set of arms control and nonproliferation agreements and export controls to deny these newer and potentially destabilizing technologies to potentially hostile states. These are no easy tasks, but the consequences of Washington losing the race for technological superiority to its autocratic challengers just might mean nuclear Armageddon.**

### 2NC/1NR Answers -- Artificial Intelligence

#### -- Extend Harr 2018’ – Any further attempts to balance tech advancements with relations and international disputes will give China an opening to further creep in the shadows

#### -- And China will take that opening to attack, proven by the slow increase we already see in cyber attacks, theyre testing the waters

Conklin 22’ (Audrey, 03/26 https://www.foxbusiness.com/technology/chinese-cyberattacks-nato-increase-ukraine)

**Cyberattacks against NATO countries originating from Chinese IP addresses have increased 116% since Russia invaded Ukraine** on Feb. 24, new research shows. **Cyberattacks from Chinese IPs have also risen 72% worldwide**, according to trends analyzed before and after Russia's invasion of Ukraine by cybersecurity firm Check Point Research.

"As the Russia-Ukraine conflict intensifies, we grew curious around cyber attacks originating from China. We’re seeing significant increases in cyber attacks that originate from Chinese IP addresses," Omer Dembinsky, data group manager at Check Point Software, the software arm of Check Point, said in an emailed statement.