

2016-17 NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL POLICY DEBATE TOPIC

CHINA

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase its economic and/or diplomatic engagement with the People's Republic of China.

Among the possible areas could be: Reforming segments of U.S./China trade; working with China to increase respect for human rights; working with China to better understand and manage its territorial ambitions in the South China Sea and other parts of Asia; how to work with China to best mitigate ongoing concerns over Taiwan; how to work with China to ensure sustainable energy and resource policies; how best to protect indigenous groups within China; how best to handle ongoing concerns over Tibet; how best to work together on the threat posed by world terrorism and many others. Given the amount of literature on the topic, and the number of policy experts opining about China – teams can be assured of finding case ideas in a wide range of areas, with novel and unique Affirmatives being proposed by policy experts almost monthly. The topic's literature base ensures a dynamic range of case options. Negatives will have ample ground to explore the solvency of diplomatic or economic engagement; the effects of changes in China policy on surrounding Asian nations; the implications for U.S. allies in the region should any change to U.S. policy toward China occur and the effect of change on the U.S. in light of its other national interests and obligations. Case specific disadvantages, again, given the literature base, will move beyond the generic, allowing for case advantages to be weighed by countervailing arguments – including arguments pertaining to the crack-down on rights within China; land use arguments, and specific species protection disadvantages; implications for China/Taiwan relations; labor specific disadvantages; and disadvantages dealing with economic issues specific to plan action (inflation, currency collapse, etc., all directly related to case specific action in China. Counterplan and Kritik ground will be fertile with both case specific and generic arguments in play. There will be plenty of case specific debate, given the literature base on the topic and the number of international experts that write on China there will be no shortage of clashing ideas on how best to engage China, giving teams many possibilities to find proposals for action directly counter to the Affirmative's. These clashing ideas would affect debate over specific solvency options and case specific advantages. With China rising in stature on the national stage, the resolution is education, timely, and necessary to debate.