



21ST CENTURY DEBATE

A DEEPER LEARNING APPROACH TO DEBATE EDUCATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GREAT POWERS COMPETITION (PRO)	5
[PRO] SECURITY (Global Security, & U.S. National Security)	5
PRO: Critical Resistance to Authoritarianism (ex. a powerful bulwark against authoritarianism)	5
John R. Allen, President, Brookings Institution, former NATO Commander, Foreign Affairs, Oct. 13, 2020	5
PRO: China Seeks to Deny Access to the Western Pacific	5
Prof. Bruce Jones, Stanford University (Yale Law School, Fellow), Brookings Institution, August 3, 2022	5
PRO: US Military Undergoing Crucial Transformation to Deter Competitors	5
Prof. Bruce Jones, Stanford University (Yale Law School, Fellow), Brookings Institution, August 3, 2022	5
PRO: Creating "Combat-Credible" Deterrence (& Protecting Trade Routes)	5
Prof. Bruce Jones, Stanford University (Yale Law School, Fellow), Brookings Institution, August 3, 2022	5
PRO: Leverage for Negotiation (ex. for favorable cooperation terms)	6
Hal Brands, Distinguished Professor of Global Affairs, the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, Foreign Affairs, October 13, 2022.....	6
PRO: Must Meet China's Assertiveness with More Vessels.....	6
Prof. Bruce Jones, Stanford University (Yale Law School, Fellow), Brookings Institution, August 3, 2022	6
PRO: Reducing Competitiveness Creates Dangerous Vulnerabilities	6
Prof. Bruce Jones, Stanford University (Yale Law School, Fellow), Brookings Institution, August 3, 2022	6
PRO: Cuts That Reduce Competitiveness Threaten Global Trade	6
Prof. Bruce Jones, Stanford University (Yale Law School, Fellow), Brookings Institution, August 3, 2022	6
PRO: GPC Requires an Urgent Call to Action - "This [is a] Critical Decade"	6
Prof. Bruce Jones, Stanford University (Yale Law School, Fellow), Brookings Institution, August 3, 2022	6
PRO: Shifting Trade Protection to Allies Increases Capacity for Deterrence	7
Prof. Bruce Jones, Stanford University (Yale Law School, Fellow), Brookings Institution, August 3, 2022	7
PRO: GPC Necessary to Respond to Violence from Climate Change	7
American Security Project, National Defense Strategy, 2018	7
PRO: GPC Necessary to Stabilize Order and Strengthen Influence	7
American Security Project, National Defense Strategy, 2018	7
PRO: GPC [Strength] Necessary to Protect Allies from Coercion	7
American Security Project, National Defense Strategy, 2018	7
PRO: Natural Security Competition Policies Favor U.S. Over China	8
New America (Report), Last Updated: October 23rd, 2019.....	8
[PRO] ECONOMICS (& Global Trade)	9
PRO: Ocean Access Vital to Economy	9
Prof. Bruce Jones, Stanford University (Yale Law School, Fellow), Brookings Institution, August 3, 2022	9
PRO: US Navy Provides Crucial Function (ex. Secures Economic Growth).....	9
Prof. Bruce Jones, Stanford University (Yale Law School, Fellow), Brookings Institution, August 3, 2022	9
PRO: Combat-Credible Deterrence Protects Global Trade	9
Prof. Bruce Jones, Stanford University (Yale Law School, Fellow), Brookings Institution, August 3, 2022	9
PRO: China Displacing US in Latin American Trade	9
Center for Strategic and International Studies, September 2022.	9
PRO: Chinese Government Economic Approach Ineffective (ex. Corruption and Inefficiency)	9
The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021	9
[PRO] GLOBAL GOVERNANCE (& Development)	10
PRO: Promotes America's Development Goal for Africa.....	10
Harvard Kennedy School, June 2020.	10
PRO: China Threatens US Ability to Shape Global Governance (ex. Latin American Countries)	10
Center for Strategic and International Studies, September 2022.	10



21ST CENTURY DEBATE

A DEEPER LEARNING APPROACH TO DEBATE EDUCATION

[PRO] GLOBAL GOVERNANCE (& Development): *Continued*... 10
 PRO: Chinese Competition uses Excessive Debate Dependencies (or Debt traps!)..... 10
 Chatham House, July 7, 2022..... 10

[PRO] ENVIRONMENT (& Climate Change)..... 11
 PRO: Chinese Government Disingenuous About Cooperation (ex. Environment) 11
 The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021 11
 PRO: Chinese Government Creates an "Illusion of Cooperation" 11
 The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021 11
 PRO: Top-Down Approach Harms Environmental Innovation (ex. Intervention & Misallocation) 11
 The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021 11
 PRO: Chinese Government Environmental Approach Ineffective (ex. Corruption and Inefficiency) 11
 The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021 11
 PRO: GPC Effective in Protecting Environment (ex. Coast Guard Protection of Fisheries) 11
 The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021 11
 PRO: Human-Induced Climate Change is Humanity's Single Greatest Threat..... 11
 Chatham House, July 7, 2022..... 11



21ST CENTURY DEBATE

A DEEPER LEARNING APPROACH TO DEBATE EDUCATION

GREAT POWERS COMPETITION (CON)	12
[CON] SECURITY (Global Security, & U.S. National Security)	12
CON: Severely Damaging Peace & Stability	12
The Yale Review of International Studies, November 2021	12
CON: Lack of Shipbuilding Capacity Limits GPC	12
Prof. Bruce Jones, Stanford University (Yale Law School, Fellow), Brookings Institution, August 3, 2022	12
CON: Lack of Ally Contributions Undermine GPC Effectiveness (ex. Impact of War & Lack of Capacity)	12
Prof. Bruce Jones, Stanford University (Yale Law School, Fellow), Brookings Institution, August 3, 2022	12
CON: Promotes Dangerous Global Power Politics	12
Prof. Tarak Barkawi, International Relations, London School of Economics, Foreign Affairs, October 13, 2022	12
CON: Current GPC Weakens Security (ex. Limited resources = diluted and insufficient)	12
The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021	12
CON: [Biden's] Great Power Competition Undermines Innovation.....	13
The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021	13
[CON] ECONOMICS (& Global Trade)	14
CON: GPC Harms Economic Growth (ex. Unfavorable Trade-off for non-productive military investment)	14
German Council on Foreign Relations, May 2022.....	14
[CON] ENVIRONMENT (& Climate Change)	15
CON: Wrong Approach to Climate Challenges (GPC Impractical, Unrealistic, & Ineffective)	15
The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021	15
CON: Erasing Freedom/Sovereignty for Climate (GPC Unnecessary and Unrealistic)	15
The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021	15
CON: Real Environmental Leadership Comes from Realistic/Sound Decision-making.....	15
The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021	15
CON: Engagement, Partnership, & Power Vital to Motivate China (Cooperation for Env Change)	15
The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021	15
CON: Not All Environmental Concerns Are Matters of National Security	15
The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021	15
CON: Free Market and Global Partnership is Essential (Improves infrastructure)	15
The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021	15
CON: Great Power Competition "ill-suited" to Address Environmental Concerns.....	16
The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021	16
CON: Free Markets Innovate, Improve Efficiency, and Invest in Technology	16
The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021	16
CON: Government First Priorities Fail in Comparison to Free Market Approaches	16
The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021	16
CON: Human-Induced Climate Change is Humanity's Single Greatest Threat.....	16
Chatham House, July 7, 2022.....	16
CON: GPC Fails to Prepare Pacific Nations for Climate Change.....	16
Chatham House, July 7, 2022.....	16
CON: US/China Rivalry Threatens Climate Security (ex. Pacific)	16
Chatham House, July 7, 2022.....	16
[CON] HEALTH / SAFETY (& Human Rights)	17
CON: Biden [GPC] Policy Endangers Disaster Response (GPC Diverts Resources)	17
The Stimson Center, July 22, 2022.....	17
CON: Growing Demand for Disaster Response (Trade-off: GPC Takes the Resources)	17
The Atlantic Council, July 22, 2022.....	17
CON: Disaster Response Cannot Keep Up w/o Significant Resources	17
The Atlantic Council, July 22, 2022.....	17



21ST CENTURY DEBATE

A DEEPER LEARNING APPROACH TO DEBATE EDUCATION

[CON] HEALTH / SAFETY (& Human Rights): *Continued*..... 17

CON: Policy Reduces Ability to Engage in Future Conflict (ex. GPC Drawing away attention & resources)..... 17
The Atlantic Council, July 22, 2022..... 17

CON: National Guard Effectiveness is Undermined (ex. less time for training) 17
The Atlantic Council, July 22, 2022..... 17

CON: Ability to Respond to Disasters Threatened by GPC Restructure 18
The Atlantic Council, July 22, 2022..... 18

CON: Threats to Readiness a Critical Factor (ex. GPC diverts resources Increasing threat from wildfires!) 18
The Atlantic Council, July 22, 2022..... 18

CON: Current GPC Planning Ignores Disaster Response..... 18
The Atlantic Council, July 22, 2022..... 18

[CON] GLOBAL GOVERNANCE (& Development)..... 19

CON: GPC Shifts Pacific Nations Toward China 19
Chatham House, July 7, 2022..... 19

REFERENCES 20



21ST CENTURY DEBATE

A DEEPER LEARNING APPROACH TO DEBATE EDUCATION

GREAT POWERS COMPETITION (PRO)

[PRO] SECURITY (Global Security, & U.S. National Security)

PRO: Critical Resistance to Authoritarianism (ex. a powerful bulwark against authoritarianism)

John R. Allen, President, Brookings Institution, former NATO Commander, Foreign Affairs, Oct. 13, 2020

<https://www.foreignaffairs.com/ask-the-experts/2020-10-13/should-us-foreign-policy-focus-great-power-competition>

Should U.S. Foreign Policy Focus on Great-Power Competition? [Strongly Agree]

Great-power competition has long been a key organizing principle not just of U.S. foreign policy but of the international order writ large. To deny this is to deny history, and at its best, the United States has operated within this system as a beacon of moral authority and leadership and as a powerful bulwark against those who would trample on the shared and cherished values that have brought out the very best in humanity. Time and time again, coalitions have been empowered due to U.S. involvement—we've not always gotten it right, but none can deny the critical role we've played as an honest broker and friend of peace, order, and prosperity. Given the disturbing rise of authoritarianism and instability, this same type of American leadership is sorely needed in the world today. Indeed, its current absence is deeply alarming. For only through the organizing and uplifting of a unified global community of democracies will we resist and rise above these powerful forces.

PRO: China Seeks to Deny Access to the Western Pacific

Prof. Bruce Jones, Stanford University (Yale Law School, Fellow), Brookings Institution, August 3, 2022

<https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2022/08/03/navigating-great-power-competition-a-serious-planning-start/>

Enter the Chinese People's Liberation Army Navy (PLAN). Evolving from a semi-partner to the U.S. in securing trade against Indian Ocean and Malacca Straits piracy, as well as a regional claimant; then, a complicating regional player; to now, a regional powerhouse with increasingly assertive policy, and a global claimant of growing capability. The PLAN is the leading edge of Chinese militarization and feeds the development of the leading-edge technologies — like space-based communications — required for a blue water navy. For good reason: The baseline geopolitical fact of our time is that the world's two most powerful countries are separated by thousands of miles of ocean — ocean waters that both sides want to dominate and secure, for commercial and strategic purposes. The core function of Chinese military modernization, as sagely assessed in a new U.S. Navy planning publication, is "... to reshape the security environment to its advantage by denying the United States military access to the western Pacific and beyond." The cost, if they succeed, will be a serious decline in American commercial and diplomatic power, and an equal loss of freedom of maneuver in strategic terms.

PRO: US Military Undergoing Crucial Transformation to Deter Competitors

Prof. Bruce Jones, Stanford University (Yale Law School, Fellow), Brookings Institution, August 3, 2022

<https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2022/08/03/navigating-great-power-competition-a-serious-planning-start/>

The 2022 Navigation Plan (NavPlan) lays out nothing short of an ambitious blueprint for preserving American maritime dominance. Other U.S. armed services — notably the Marines — have already laid out some of their own required transformations for deterrence and warfighting against powerful competitors. The Air Force and the Army lag in laying out a credible vision for their role in the current threat environment. This document, coming from the Navy, is crucial, as many of the key tasks ahead are uniquely naval functions.

PRO: Creating "Combat-Credible" Deterrence (& Protecting Trade Routes)

Prof. Bruce Jones, Stanford University (Yale Law School, Fellow), Brookings Institution, August 3, 2022

<https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2022/08/03/navigating-great-power-competition-a-serious-planning-start/>

The NavPlan lays down the two essential missions: fielding the capacity and readiness for warfighting in unnamed but obvious seas to deter China (as well as Russia); and global maritime dominance — both to keep the sea-lanes open for trade, and to give the U.S. military flexibility unavailable to its competitors. This will require what the chief of naval operations (CNO) describes as a "combat-credible U.S. Navy — forward deployed and integrated with all elements of national power...". This would allow the Navy to be consistently positioned in theater should conflict occur. Among an ongoing debate on the value of forward presence, the CNO argues persuasively in favor of combat-credible forward deployment — not simply presence for presences' sake.



21ST CENTURY DEBATE

A DEEPER LEARNING APPROACH TO DEBATE EDUCATION

[PRO] SECURITY (Global Security, & U.S. National Security): *Continued...*

PRO: Leverage for Negotiation (ex. for favorable cooperation terms)

Hal Brands, Distinguished Professor of Global Affairs, the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, Foreign Affairs, October 13, 2022.

<https://www.foreignaffairs.com/ask-the-experts/2020-10-13/should-us-foreign-policy-focus-great-power-competition>

Should U.S. Foreign Policy Focus on Great-Power Competition? [Strongly Agree]

It is entirely true that transnational issues—pandemics, climate change—will compete for the attention of policymakers. But getting great-power competition right will be a prerequisite to building the leverage that is required to negotiate cooperation on these issues on favorable terms.

PRO: Must Meet China's Assertiveness with More Vessels

Prof. Bruce Jones, Stanford University (Yale Law School, Fellow), Brookings Institution, August 3, 2022

<https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2022/08/03/navigating-great-power-competition-a-serious-planning-start/>

That's going to take a larger fleet. The United States faces the mounting challenge of PLAN assertiveness in the western Pacific, potential second-stage Russian aggression in the regions bordering the Baltic Sea or Arctic Ocean, and the continuing challenge of securing globalization. To tackle all of that, simply put, requires a larger navy than the U.S. currently maintains. The CNO's document lays down the design imperatives for such a fleet, setting out six needed elements: expanding the distance from which long-range precision fire can be launched, enhanced deception, hardened defenses, increased distribution, reliable delivery, and improved decisional advantage (involving naval information warfare). And, mindful of cost imperatives, argues that this can best be achieved in the context of a hybrid fleet, combining staffed, optionally staffed, and unstaffed ships — 500 of them, by the CNO's design; 350 staffed and 150 unstaffed. The document goes on to lay out a specific force design to accomplish the goals. One can quibble with precise numbers of this or that class of ship or boat but the overall picture of a force more reliant on submarines, smaller ships, and hybrid platforms is convincing.

PRO: Reducing Competitiveness Creates Dangerous Vulnerabilities

Prof. Bruce Jones, Stanford University (Yale Law School, Fellow), Brookings Institution, August 3, 2022

<https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2022/08/03/navigating-great-power-competition-a-serious-planning-start/>

Of course, the U.S. could reduce costs by choosing to have its navy focus narrowly on only the one mission, putting all its eggs in the basket of deterrence in the western Pacific. This, though, would leave U.S. and allied interests in Europe dangerously unguarded, and leave a major lacuna in the protection of global trade. The U.S. has recently experienced the steep costs of even minor interruptions to sea-based flows of good and energy; we are not prepared for larger, wider, longer interruptions. If America wants to deter China, and keep the global economy flowing, it needs a bigger navy. It's as simple as that.

PRO: Cuts That Reduce Competitiveness Threaten Global Trade

Prof. Bruce Jones, Stanford University (Yale Law School, Fellow), Brookings Institution, August 3, 2022

<https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2022/08/03/navigating-great-power-competition-a-serious-planning-start/>

Of course, the U.S. could reduce costs by choosing to have its navy focus narrowly on only the one mission, putting all its eggs in the basket of deterrence in the western Pacific. This, though, would leave U.S. and allied interests in Europe dangerously unguarded, and leave a major lacuna in the protection of global trade. The U.S. has recently experienced the steep costs of even minor interruptions to sea-based flows of good and energy; we are not prepared for larger, wider, longer interruptions. If America wants to deter China, and keep the global economy flowing, it needs a bigger navy. It's as simple as that.

PRO: GPC Requires an Urgent Call to Action - "This [is a] Critical Decade"

Prof. Bruce Jones, Stanford University (Yale Law School, Fellow), Brookings Institution, August 3, 2022

<https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2022/08/03/navigating-great-power-competition-a-serious-planning-start/>

Another question, though, is: how fast? In an otherwise compelling document, there's one jarring note, on the by when issue. This comes in the headline that marks the transition from strategy to planning. Before that headline, the document repeatedly — and convincingly — refers to "this critical decade" in the race to reshape capacity. But the section on force design and architecture is headlined by an effort to imagine the fleet in 2045. Twenty-plus years — more than double the time it took to wage the Spanish Civil War and World War II combined. The U.S. doesn't have that kind of time.



21ST CENTURY DEBATE

A DEEPER LEARNING APPROACH TO DEBATE EDUCATION

[PRO] SECURITY (Global Security, & U.S. National Security): *Continued...*

PRO: Shifting Trade Protection to Allies Increases Capacity for Deterrence

Prof. Bruce Jones, Stanford University (Yale Law School, Fellow), Brookings Institution, August 3, 2022

<https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2022/08/03/navigating-great-power-competition-a-serious-planning-start/>

Of course, part of the issue of size and timelines is dependent on what capacity U.S. allies and partners can wield. The 2022 NavPlan correctly states that their capacity will be essential to succeeding in the stated missions. But it's rather silent on how to incentivize the right set of investments by those countries. Our closest allies in Europe are grappling with a land war and the major economic/energy costs associated with that crisis, and our Asian allies lag far behind in terms of net capacity. Perhaps it is a question better posed to the authors of the National Defense Strategy — but there, at least in public version, the reference is simply to planning around allied capability, not incentivizing change. That won't get us where we need to be. Part of the answer might lie in pushing more of the global trade protection mission onto allies; after all, their stake in securing globalization is even larger than ours. That could free up U.S. capacity for deterrence.

PRO: GPC Necessary to Respond to Violence from Climate Change

American Security Project, National Defense Strategy, 2018

<https://www.americansecurityproject.org/climate-change-in-the-age-of-great-power-competition/>

The National Defense Strategy (NDS) is the primary planning document that guides decision making within the United States military. The 2018 NDS outlines the priorities of the U.S. within the framework of “great power competition,” particularly focusing on China and Russia in addition to threats from North Korea, Iran, and terrorists. The document notes the challenges of an “increasingly complex security environment.” Climate change is a major factor in this “security environment,” even if left unsaid explicitly by the document. The 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review, the last time the Department of Defense released a major strategy document, highlighted the threats of a changing environment, noting that, “The impacts of climate change may increase the frequency, scale, and complexity of future missions, including defense support to civil authorities, while at the same time undermining the capacity of our domestic installations to support training activities.” Further, “The pressures caused by climate change will influence resource competition while placing additional burdens on economies, societies, and governance institutions around the world. These effects are threat multipliers that will aggravate stressors abroad such as poverty, environmental degradation, political instability, and social tensions – conditions that can enable terrorist activity and other forms of violence.”

PRO: GPC Necessary to Stabilize Order and Strengthen Influence

American Security Project, National Defense Strategy, 2018

<https://www.americansecurityproject.org/climate-change-in-the-age-of-great-power-competition/>

Today, the effects of climate change have only become more extreme and the threats have, indeed, multiplied. The 2018 NDS outlines how the operating environment is changing, highlighting “challenges to free and open international order and the re-emergence of long-term strategic competition between nations.” Within this framework, we find that climate change will impact the national security of our nation in three main ways. First, climate change will undermine the existing international order. Second, at the same time, weak states will be more vulnerable to great power influence. And third, threats to the homeland will become closer to home and less concrete, allowing them to permeate our borders. As noted in the NDS, “the homeland is no longer a sanctuary.”

PRO: GPC [Strength] Necessary to Protect Allies from Coercion

American Security Project, National Defense Strategy, 2018

<https://www.americansecurityproject.org/climate-change-in-the-age-of-great-power-competition/>

As both countries [Russia & China] develop their influence around the world, weaker nations may turn to them for aid and collaboration instead of the United States. The NDS notes that revisionist powers and rogue regimes are using a wide range of tactics to coerce U.S. allies and foes alike. Today, China and Russia are developing relationships in both South America and Africa. The effects of climate change will likely increase instability and insecurity within already vulnerable regions, potentially pushing them towards new partners. China, especially, is using climate-related aid as a new element of leverage.



21ST CENTURY DEBATE

A DEEPER LEARNING APPROACH TO DEBATE EDUCATION

[PRO] SECURITY (Global Security, & U.S. National Security): *Continued...*

PRO: Natural Security Competition Policies Favor U.S. Over China

New America (Report), Last Updated: October 23rd, 2019

<https://www.newamerica.org/resource-security/reports/great-power-resource-competition-changing-climate/>

Natural security, or having enough energy, food, minerals, and water, is essential to supporting stable and prosperous societies. A growing global population, however, needs more resources to meet rising standards of living, even as the industrial age's bill is coming due in the form of sweeping environmental degradation. Climate change is reshaping global natural security, affecting water availability, weather patterns, agricultural productivity, the energy trade, and the demand for critical minerals. Put simply: natural security is under threat around the world. China and the United States, the two biggest global economies, are also the biggest polluters and consumers of the world's resources. Their natural security affects everyone else's, both in terms of meeting demand and dealing with the consequences of high consumption. Moreover, the United States has declared a new era of "great power competition" and singled out China. Natural security will be a key part of the rivalry, especially as these two countries already rely on some of the same suppliers for key resources—including each other, for now. New America's Natural Security Index compares the natural security of China and the United States and identifies their top resource allies and trade partners. By comparing the countries' resources, production, imports, and exports, the index finds that the United States has a comparative natural security advantage over China, though China has a more diversified resource trade and investment portfolio, according to our analysis. Altogether, this project suggests that natural resources will help shape the competition between the United States and China for geopolitical influence and investments—and that competition will, in turn, shape global natural security.



21ST CENTURY DEBATE

A DEEPER LEARNING APPROACH TO DEBATE EDUCATION

[PRO] ECONOMICS (& Global Trade)

PRO: Ocean Access Vital to Economy

Prof. Bruce Jones, Stanford University (Yale Law School, Fellow), Brookings Institution, August 3, 2022

<https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2022/08/03/navigating-great-power-competition-a-serious-planning-start/>

The U.S. economy relies heavily on the global flow of goods - consumer, commercial, energy - across the ocean. That fact has been brought vividly to life by supply chain interruptions - in the Suez Canal and the Port of Long Beach- and their inflationary effects. True there are vital industries like finance and software that rely on the flow of data, not goods. However, over 90% of all data in the world flows through undersea cables that line the ocean floor. There's no part of our prosperity that would not be adversely affected if ocean-based trade were impeded or slowed.

PRO: US Navy Provides Crucial Function (ex. Secures Economic Growth)

Prof. Bruce Jones, Stanford University (Yale Law School, Fellow), Brookings Institution, August 3, 2022

<https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2022/08/03/navigating-great-power-competition-a-serious-planning-start/>

...There's no part of our prosperity that would not be adversely affected if ocean-based trade were impeded or slowed. Securing that flow of trade has long been a primary mission of the U.S. Navy. Since the end of the Cold War the U.S. has enacted this mission largely alone, the only nation with a genuinely global navy. This crucial function adds weight to American influence in the workings of globalization, which redounds to U.S. profit — literally as well as diplomatically.

PRO: Combat-Credible Deterrence Protects Global Trade

Prof. Bruce Jones, Stanford University (Yale Law School, Fellow), Brookings Institution, August 3, 2022

<https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2022/08/03/navigating-great-power-competition-a-serious-planning-start/>

The NavPlan lays down the two essential missions: fielding the capacity and readiness for warfighting in unnamed but obvious seas to deter China (as well as Russia); and global maritime dominance — both to keep the sea-lanes open for trade, and to give the U.S. military flexibility unavailable to its competitors. This will require what the chief of naval operations (CNO) describes as a “combat-credible U.S. Navy — forward deployed and integrated with all elements of national power...”. This would allow the Navy to be consistently positioned in theater should conflict occur. Among an ongoing debate on the value of forward presence, the CNO argues persuasively in favor of combat-credible forward deployment — not simply presence for presences' sake.

PRO: China Displacing US in Latin American Trade

Center for Strategic and International Studies, September 2022.

<https://www.csis.org/analysis/importance-democracy-promotion-great-power-competition-latin-america-and-caribbean>

As China continues to increase its economic ties with countries around the world, it threatens to overtake the United States' economic partnerships with many nations. China has become the top trading partner for many countries in South America and the second-largest trading partner for nearly all of LAC. China may eventually overtake the United States as the world's largest economy in terms of GDP by the mid-2030s. China's Belt and Road Initiative continues to invest in massive infrastructure projects, including in 21 countries in LAC. Economically, the United States accounted for nearly 50 percent of the global economic market after World War II. The emergence of China as an economic giant that could soon surpass the United States as the world's largest economy presents an entirely new dilemma in the twenty-first century. Without LAC countries onboard, the United States has little chance of retaining its ability to shape global economic governance, standards setting, and rulemaking by working with a large number of countries through multilateral bodies and international treaties.

PRO: Chinese Government Economic Approach Ineffective (ex. Corruption and Inefficiency)

The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021

<https://www.heritage.org/energy-economics/commentary/great-power-competition-putting-planet-earth-risk>

Technological change and innovation on a grand scale is not deterministic. Free nations disadvantage themselves when they compromise on the advantages provided by a free society. Empowering politicians to pick winners and losers in economic competition is as likely to lead to widespread corruption, inefficiencies and corporatism as it is to produce optimal economic and environmental outcomes.



21ST CENTURY DEBATE

A DEEPER LEARNING APPROACH TO DEBATE EDUCATION

[PRO] GLOBAL GOVERNANCE (& Development)

PRO: Promotes America's Development Goal for Africa

Harvard Kennedy School, June 2020.

<https://www.belfercenter.org/publication/cooperation-competition-or-both-options-us-land-forces-vis-vis-chinese-interests-africa>

The Chinese presence on the African continent, exemplified by large-scale transportation infrastructure projects, overt and covert arms sales, peacekeeping operations, and the establishment of the first of potentially several overseas bases, is an irritant, but not yet a threat, to America's enduring interest in establishing a secure, stable, and prosperous Africa. This is not a return to the Cold War where Washington and Moscow saw Africa as a zero-sum game as China has as much to gain as Washington from a stable and prosperous African continent. Nonetheless, a strategy to manage these developments, in an era of global power competition, will ensure America's standing, meet broader foreign policy objectives, and permit continuous freedom of movement on the continent and its littoral regions. This paper addresses courses of action that for the near to midterm will maintain a favorable balance of power.

PRO: China Threatens US Ability to Shape Global Governance (ex. Latin American Countries)

Center for Strategic and International Studies, September 2022.

<https://www.csis.org/analysis/importance-democracy-promotion-great-power-competition-latin-america-and-caribbean>

As China continues to increase its economic ties with countries around the world, it threatens to overtake the United States' economic partnerships with many nations. China has become the top trading partner for many countries in South America and the second-largest trading partner for nearly all of LAC. China may eventually overtake the United States as the world's largest economy in terms of GDP by the mid-2030s. China's Belt and Road Initiative continues to invest in massive infrastructure projects, including in 21 countries in LAC. Economically, the United States accounted for nearly 50 percent of the global economic market after World War II. The emergence of China as an economic giant that could soon surpass the United States as the world's largest economy presents an entirely new dilemma in the twenty-first century. Without LAC countries onboard, the United States has little chance of retaining its ability to shape global economic governance, standards setting, and rulemaking by working with a large number of countries through multilateral bodies and international treaties.

PRO: Chinese Competition uses Excessive Debate Dependencies (or Debt traps!)

Chatham House, July 7, 2022

<https://www.chathamhouse.org/2022/07/great-power-competition-and-climate-security-pacific>

Furthermore, going forward, it will be important to avoid the negative impacts of China's development spending that has surfaced in other countries such as excessive debt dependencies, infrastructure with ecological impacts or costly 'white elephant' projects with little or no benefits for local communities.



21ST CENTURY DEBATE

A DEEPER LEARNING APPROACH TO DEBATE EDUCATION

[PRO] ENVIRONMENT (& Climate Change)

PRO: Chinese Government Disingenuous About Cooperation (ex. Environment)

The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021

<https://www.heritage.org/energy-economics/commentary/great-power-competition-putting-planet-earth-risk>

At a recent meeting of the UN General Assembly, Chinese President Xi Jinping proclaimed that his country was leading the world in responding to climate concerns and protecting the planet. No claim could be more disingenuous. China is the world's dirtiest country. It spews more greenhouse gases than any other nation and is a leading air polluter. Most of the 1.3 billion tons of plastics that are dumped into the ocean each year come from China. Many of the freshwater scarcity challenges in Asia are linked back to Chinese mismanagement, the Mekong River Delta being a prime example. Chinese fleets are decimating the fishing reserves of other nations. Meanwhile, China makes a concerted effort to manage international institutions and shape international agreements (such as the Paris Climate Accord) to nakedly advance Beijing's interests.

PRO: Chinese Government Creates an "Illusion of Cooperation"

The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021

<https://www.heritage.org/energy-economics/commentary/great-power-competition-putting-planet-earth-risk>

Certainly, entertaining its pro-environment propaganda while setting standards that serve only to facilitate the CCP narrative will never succeed. Meanwhile, the leverage the CCP gains through the illusion of cooperation will only hamstring the United States and its allies from doing what is necessary in other areas.

PRO: Top-Down Approach Harms Environmental Innovation (ex. Intervention & Misallocation)

The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021

<https://www.heritage.org/energy-economics/commentary/great-power-competition-putting-planet-earth-risk>

Task #2: Embrace a Market-Driven Green Industrial Revolution. Left and Right agree that technology can be a powerful tool for building a better world. Why wouldn't we all want a new generation of technology that delivers high productivity, greater efficiency, and better environmental outcomes? The centrally-directed government will not deliver on that agenda. In fact, government intervention often stymies innovation and misallocates public and private dollars, meaning economically and environmentally promising technologies may get left behind.

PRO: Chinese Government Environmental Approach Ineffective (ex. Corruption and Inefficiency)

The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021

<https://www.heritage.org/energy-economics/commentary/great-power-competition-putting-planet-earth-risk>

Technological change and innovation on a grand scale is not deterministic. Free nations disadvantage themselves when they compromise on the advantages provided by a free society. Empowering politicians to pick winners and losers in economic competition is as likely to lead to widespread corruption, inefficiencies and corporatism as it is to produce optimal economic and environmental outcomes.

PRO: GPC Effective in Protecting Environment (ex. Coast Guard Protection of Fisheries)

The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021

<https://www.heritage.org/energy-economics/commentary/great-power-competition-putting-planet-earth-risk>

Moreover, the U.S. national security apparatus is broadly ill-suited to effectively address many environmental concerns. That said, there are environmental challenges where national security instruments play an important and legitimate role. One good example is U.S. Coast Guard's crucial leadership role in protecting world fisheries.

PRO: Human-Induced Climate Change is Humanity's Single Greatest Threat

Chatham House, July 7, 2022

<https://www.chathamhouse.org/2022/07/great-power-competition-and-climate-security-pacific>

'Climate change remains the single greatest threat to the livelihoods, security and wellbeing of the peoples of the Pacific,' according to the 2018 Boe Declaration on Regional Security, outlined by the Pacific Islands Forum. The need for climate security was re-emphasized recently by Fijian Defense Minister, Inia Seruiratu, who stated, 'The single greatest threat to our very existence is [...] human-induced climate change. It threatens our very hopes and dreams of prosperity'.



21ST CENTURY DEBATE

A DEEPER LEARNING APPROACH TO DEBATE EDUCATION

GREAT POWERS COMPETITION (CON)

[CON] SECURITY (Global Security, & U.S. National Security)

CON: Severely Damaging Peace & Stability

The Yale Review of International Studies, November 2021

<http://yris.yira.org/comments/5489>

The newly established trilateral defense pact between Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States, known as AUKUS, has added fuel to the rivalry in the Indo-Pacific. The agreement to provide Australia with eight nuclear-powered submarines was taken against the backdrop of China's increasingly aggressive posture in the South China Sea. Zhao Lijian, a spokesperson for the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, immediately denounced the US-UK-Australia clique, stating that AUKUS severely damages "regional peace and stability," further exhibiting "outdated Cold War zero-sum mentality." [i] In addition to the debate over AUKUS's merit to maintain a "free and open Indo-Pacific" [ii], the concerns from regional countries are largely overlooked.

CON: Lack of Shipbuilding Capacity Limits GPC

Prof. Bruce Jones, Stanford University (Yale Law School, Fellow), Brookings Institution, August 3, 2022

<https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2022/08/03/navigating-great-power-competition-a-serious-planning-start/>

Congressional leaders as well, especially those who are in position to authorize increased and more predictable funding for an expanded shipbuilding program. The CNO's document points to the importance of the shipbuilding, maintenance, and logistics components of fielding a larger navy, though perhaps not quite with the emphasis it deserves. At present, even huge congressional largesse couldn't produce the navy the United States needs — there simply isn't adequate shipbuilding capacity in the country.

CON: Lack of Ally Contributions Undermine GPC Effectiveness (ex. Impact of War & Lack of Capacity)

Prof. Bruce Jones, Stanford University (Yale Law School, Fellow), Brookings Institution, August 3, 2022

<https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2022/08/03/navigating-great-power-competition-a-serious-planning-start/>

Of course, part of the issue of size and timelines is dependent on what capacity U.S. allies and partners can wield. The 2022 NavPlan correctly states that their capacity will be essential to succeeding in the stated missions. But it's rather silent on how to incentivize the right set of investments by those countries. Our closest allies in Europe are grappling with a land war and the major economic/energy costs associated with that crisis, and our Asian allies lag far behind in terms of net capacity. Perhaps it is a question better posed to the authors of the National Defense Strategy — but there, at least in public version, the reference is simply to planning around allied capability, not incentivizing change. That won't get us where we need to be. Part of the answer might lie in pushing more of the global trade protection mission onto allies; after all, their stake in securing globalization is even larger than ours. That could free up U.S. capacity for deterrence.

CON: Promotes Dangerous Global Power Politics

Prof. Tarak Barkawi, International Relations, London School of Economics, Foreign Affairs, October 13, 2022.

<https://www.foreignaffairs.com/ask-the-experts/2020-10-13/should-us-foreign-policy-focus-great-power-competition>

Should U.S. Foreign Policy Focus on Great-Power Competition? [Strongly Disagree]

Since 9/11, the United States has helped undermine the world order it set up after 1945 to serve its own interests. The outcome can only be a much more dangerous world where power politics are the order of the day. But this competition will come not only from great powers—after all, jihadis and insurgents have played major roles in bringing down the West. That said, the point of engaging in power politics is to ensure the flourishing of values you care about; you don't engage in them for their own sake.

CON: Current GPC Weakens Security (ex. Limited resources = diluted and insufficient)

The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021

<https://www.heritage.org/energy-economics/commentary/great-power-competition-putting-planet-earth-risk>

Defense resources are already strained to accomplish traditional national security missions. Lumping everything we think is important into the basket of "national security" dilutes the term, making it harder to prioritize limited resources. Our armed forces are insufficiently ready to handle more than one major conflict. That's a real issue in an age of great-power competition where we face multiple capable and competent adversaries. Our military should not be compelled to undertake a dangerous reorientation away from its real job.



21ST CENTURY DEBATE

A DEEPER LEARNING APPROACH TO DEBATE EDUCATION

[CON] SECURITY (Global Security, & U.S. National Security): *Continued...*

CON: [Biden's] Great Power Competition Undermines Innovation

The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021

<https://www.heritage.org/energy-economics/commentary/great-power-competition-putting-planet-earth-risk>

It is time to move beyond the unrealistic framework of international wish lists and handouts. What we need from Washington is a constructive agenda, not action for show. Congress and the Biden administration should engage with other countries and pursue fiscally responsible policies that empower the private sector and unleash innovation, not supplant it.



21ST CENTURY DEBATE

A DEEPER LEARNING APPROACH TO DEBATE EDUCATION

[CON] ECONOMICS (& Global Trade)

CON: GPC Harms Economic Growth (ex. Unfavorable Trade-off for non-productive military investment)

German Council on Foreign Relations, May 2022.

<https://dgap.org/en/research/publications/economics-great-power-competition>

Viewed from yet another angle, higher non-productive (in an economic sense) defense expenditure represents a drain on a country's future economic production potential. Converting savings into non-productive military 'investment' (effectively: government consumption) limits a country's ability to invest and grow, potentially driving it into economic stagnation and financial collapse. The USSR, for example, was forced to divert a large share of its economic production to support its defense needs, thereby limiting domestic consumption and investment. This 'guns-versus-butter' trade-off proved unsustainable, economically and politically. In this respect, China has far greater leeway than the United States, given its extremely high domestic savings rate, fewer resources allocated to defense (as a share of GDP) and faster economic trend growth. In purely economic terms, the United States and its allies have a challenge on their hands.



21ST CENTURY DEBATE

A DEEPER LEARNING APPROACH TO DEBATE EDUCATION

[CON] ENVIRONMENT (& Climate Change)

CON: Wrong Approach to Climate Challenges (GPC Impractical, Unrealistic, & Ineffective)

The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021

<https://www.heritage.org/energy-economics/commentary/great-power-competition-putting-planet-earth-risk>

Here's What You Need To Remember: The better approach is to break down climate and environmental challenges into important, meaningful and manageable issues. Engage them all on their own terms. This blue dot in space is the only planet we have. We must take care of it. Like any other great challenge, this demands a seriousness of effort paired with the honesty and courage to insist on practical, realistic, efficacious policies.

CON: Erasing Freedom/Sovereignty for Climate (GPC Unnecessary and Unrealistic)

The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021

<https://www.heritage.org/energy-economics/commentary/great-power-competition-putting-planet-earth-risk>

The planet doesn't know we have national borders. We do. It's a reality that can't be ignored and won't change. The idea of erasing the freedoms of peoples and the sovereignty of nations to address environmental issues is unrealistic and unnecessary. Nations will cooperate and compete, just like any other matter of international affairs.

CON: Real Environmental Leadership Comes from Realistic/Sound Decision-making

The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021

<https://www.heritage.org/energy-economics/commentary/great-power-competition-putting-planet-earth-risk>

Rather than thinking about environmental issues as a global crusade or an existential crisis that trumps every concern and national interest, climate and related challenges can be dealt with most effectively by treating it like the foreign policy problem it is. For the United States to truly lead on environmental issues, Washington must have the resolve to deliver real outcomes—solutions that come from realistic foreign policies, sound economic decisions, and unshakeable respect for human freedom.

CON: Engagement, Partnership, & Power Vital to Motivate China (Cooperation for Env Change)

The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021

<https://www.heritage.org/energy-economics/commentary/great-power-competition-putting-planet-earth-risk>

China's bad environmental behavior can be curbed only in the context of an overall strategy. To deal successfully with China, the United States must rely on its own unique strengths, while remaining committed to the principles of economic and political freedom. The United States must also engage all its levers of power, including its strong global presence and partnerships, economic engagement, and clear power projection on the world stage. Anything less won't compel Beijing to act differently.

CON: Not All Environmental Concerns Are Matters of National Security

The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021

<https://www.heritage.org/energy-economics/commentary/great-power-competition-putting-planet-earth-risk>

Task #3: Recognize that Not All Environmental Concerns Are Matters of National Security. While there may be overlap on occasion, these are fundamentally different kinds of public policy issues. National security challenges are about protecting U.S. vital interests from adversarial competitors. Environmental policies are based on weighing costs and benefits in activities that impact the public commons and selecting the policies that achieve the optimum outcomes.

CON: Free Market and Global Partnership is Essential (Improves Infrastructure)

The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021

<https://www.heritage.org/energy-economics/commentary/great-power-competition-putting-planet-earth-risk>

That is not to say that there is no role for government, but that role should be limited to legitimate matters of governance—protecting the rule of law and providing security, not to supplant market choices. A number of initiatives taken by the Trump administration were highly beneficial to facilitating market responses, good governance, and the environment. For example, the United States championed the Blue Dot Network, the Clean Network, and the Three Seas Initiative. All facilitate global partnerships for improving infrastructure and the energy sector. These should serve as model steps for coordinating international responses to shared environmental concerns. We need more programs like this to achieve discreet constructive results with “win-win” partnerships that deliver positive environmental, economic/strategic outcomes. We also need trade liberalization.



21ST CENTURY DEBATE

A DEEPER LEARNING APPROACH TO DEBATE EDUCATION

[CON] ENVIRONMENT (& Climate Change): *Continued...*

CON: Great Power Competition "ill-suited" to Address Environmental Concerns

The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021

<https://www.heritage.org/energy-economics/commentary/great-power-competition-putting-planet-earth-risk>

Moreover, the U.S. national security apparatus is broadly ill-suited to effectively address many environmental concerns. That said, there are environmental challenges where national security instruments play an important and legitimate role. One good example is U.S. Coast Guard's crucial leadership role in protecting world fisheries.

CON: Free Markets Innovate, Improve Efficiency, and Invest in Technology

The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021

<https://www.heritage.org/energy-economics/commentary/great-power-competition-putting-planet-earth-risk>

Innovative American energy production generates many benefits—including lower energy bills and job creation—with little negative effect on climate. In fact, the shale renaissance—which has reduced reliance on coal-burning plants with cleaner-burning natural gas—is largely responsible for a significant reduction in carbon dioxide emissions. U.S.-produced liquefied natural gas exports are doing the same. Further, the energy industry has demonstrated the capacity to innovate, improve efficiency, and invest in state-of-the-art technology. All these efforts generate significant economic and environmental benefits.

CON: Government First Priorities Fail in Comparison to Free Market Approaches

The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021

<https://www.heritage.org/energy-economics/commentary/great-power-competition-putting-planet-earth-risk>

If America's policymakers really want to lead in clean energy production and environmental stewardship, they should reject the government-first policies championed by most countries. Leadership is not about following the pack but blazing new paths forward. As the rest of the world relies on government dictates and limiting the choices of their citizens, the United States should recommit to protecting private property rights, get out of the business of picking corporate energy winners and losers, and unleash America's free-enterprise system to tackle the problems that Americans care about most. It wouldn't take long for the world to see that families and businesses, operating in a free market, will yield far better environmental and economic results than any government policy ever could. And that would be U.S. global leadership.

CON: Human-Induced Climate Change is Humanity's Single Greatest Threat

Chatham House, July 7, 2022

<https://www.chathamhouse.org/2022/07/great-power-competition-and-climate-security-pacific>

'Climate change remains the single greatest threat to the livelihoods, security and wellbeing of the peoples of the Pacific,' according to the 2018 Boe Declaration on Regional Security, outlined by the Pacific Islands Forum. The need for climate security was re-emphasized recently by Fijian Defense Minister, Inia Seruiratu, who stated, 'The single greatest threat to our very existence is [...] human-induced climate change. It threatens our very hopes and dreams of prosperity'.

CON: GPC Fails to Prepare Pacific Nations for Climate Change

Chatham House, July 7, 2022

<https://www.chathamhouse.org/2022/07/great-power-competition-and-climate-security-pacific>

In a region not responsible for anthropogenic changes in the global climate and yet more geographically vulnerable to these changes than most, climate security, not geostrategic competition, should be the priority of external powers seeking to improve security in the region. Few parts of the world are as vulnerable to the disruption of climate change as the Pacific. Many island nations are low-lying and susceptible to sea-level rise, as well as extreme weather, where tropical cyclones have long lasting effects on critical infrastructure in countries under-equipped to deal with them.

CON: US/China Rivalry Threatens Climate Security (ex. Pacific)

Chatham House, July 7, 2022

<https://www.chathamhouse.org/2022/07/great-power-competition-and-climate-security-pacific>

As strategic interest in the Pacific Islands grows, countries seeking to engage more in the region should pay attention to the security interests of the Pacific as outlined by Pacific leaders such as Dame Meg Taylor who warned about the high stakes rivalry between the US and China. Countries need to step up their efforts to support climate security in the Pacific by supporting island nations building resilience to the impacts of climate change. Following the recent election in Australia, the new government announced an increase of development aid to the Pacific -\$525 million to Australia's Official Development Assistance for Pacific countries and Timor-Leste over the next four years-after many years of neglecting Pacific Island development concerns especially on climate change.



21ST CENTURY DEBATE

A DEEPER LEARNING APPROACH TO DEBATE EDUCATION

[CON] HEALTH / SAFETY (& Human Rights)

CON: Biden [GPC] Policy Endangers Disaster Response (GPC Diverts Resources)

The Stimson Center, July 22, 2022

<https://www.stimson.org/2022/great-power-competition-threatens-climate-disaster-response/>

The US military, particularly the National Guard, is instrumental in responding to natural disasters in the United States. As climate change increases the severity and frequency of major disasters, the unique capabilities of the military to conduct disaster response will be in even higher demand. The Biden administration's shifting focus to great-power competition could draw resources and attention away from improving domestic disaster response capabilities, even as these requirements become increasingly urgent. A significant amount of materiel and units need to be available to ensure that effective disaster response can be carried out domestically. Large-scale deployments abroad could endanger national disaster response and ultimately reduce the ability of the United States to successfully engage in future conflicts. The administration should link the planned National Climate Strategy to the National Security Strategy, avoid double-counting units in force planning, develop clear guidelines for when military support is needed for domestic disaster assistance and when it can be withdrawn, and ensure that the National Guard is empowered to train for disaster response.

CON: Growing Demand for Disaster Response (Trade-off: GPC Takes the Resources)

The Atlantic Council, July 22, 2022

<https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/content-series/reality-check/reality-check-13-great-power-competition-threatens-climate-disaster-response/>

The US military, particularly the National Guard, is instrumental in responding to natural disasters in the United States. As climate change increases the severity and frequency of major disasters, the unique capabilities of the military to conduct disaster response will be in even higher demand.

CON: Disaster Response Cannot Keep Up w/o Significant Resources

The Atlantic Council, July 22, 2022

<https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/content-series/reality-check/reality-check-13-great-power-competition-threatens-climate-disaster-response/>

The Biden administration's shifting focus to great-power competition could draw resources and attention away from improving domestic disaster response capabilities, even as these requirements become increasingly urgent. A significant amount of materiel and units need to be available to ensure that effective disaster response can be carried out domestically. Large-scale deployments abroad could endanger national disaster response and ultimately reduce the ability of the United States to successfully engage in future conflicts.

CON: Policy Reduces Ability to Engage in Future Conflict (ex. GPC Drawing away attention & resources)

The Atlantic Council, July 22, 2022

<https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/content-series/reality-check/reality-check-13-great-power-competition-threatens-climate-disaster-response/>

The Biden administration's shifting focus to great-power competition could draw resources and attention away from improving domestic disaster response capabilities, even as these requirements become increasingly urgent. A significant amount of materiel and units need to be available to ensure that effective disaster response can be carried out domestically. Large-scale deployments abroad could endanger national disaster response and ultimately reduce the ability of the United States to successfully engage in future conflicts.

CON: National Guard Effectiveness is Undermined (ex. less time for training)

The Atlantic Council, July 22, 2022

<https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/content-series/reality-check/reality-check-13-great-power-competition-threatens-climate-disaster-response/>

The administration should link the planned National Climate Strategy to the National Security Strategy, avoid double-counting units in force planning, develop clear guidelines for when military support is needed for domestic disaster assistance and when it can be withdrawn, and ensure that the National Guard is empowered to train for disaster response.



21ST CENTURY DEBATE

A DEEPER LEARNING APPROACH TO DEBATE EDUCATION

[CON] HEALTH / SAFETY (& Human Rights): *Continued...*

CON: Ability to Respond to Disasters Threatened by GPC Restructure

The Atlantic Council, July 22, 2022

<https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/content-series/reality-check/reality-check-13-great-power-competition-threatens-climate-disaster-response/>

Today's military planners must contend with two potentially conflicting demands: growing requirements for the US military to respond to disasters and the effort to restructure the force for great-power competition. In the Interim National Security Strategic Guidance, President Joe Biden made clear that he would continue shifting the focus of US forces to potential conflict with China and Russia, writing "In the face of strategic challenges from an increasingly assertive China and destabilizing Russia, we will assess the appropriate structure, capabilities, and sizing of the force. . . ." The military challenges posed by China and Russia are immense in their own right, but they cannot be accurately evaluated without considering the omnipresent and growing needs at home for US military capabilities.

CON: Threats to Readiness a Critical Factor (ex. GPC diverts resources Increasing threat from wildfires!)

The Atlantic Council, July 22, 2022

<https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/content-series/reality-check/reality-check-13-great-power-competition-threatens-climate-disaster-response/>

The readiness of US forces and the ability to maintain the security and productivity of the homeland are critical factors for any and all future conflicts. Policy makers plan for both wars and disasters under the assumption that military resources will be available for such efforts. However, these plans fail when expected resources are otherwise deployed. For example, firefighters in Oregon usually rely on air support from military Chinook helicopters, but during the massive summer wildfires of 2021, these aircraft were 7,000 miles away, participating in the evacuation of Afghanistan, leaving the firefighting response dangerously under-resourced. Conversely, hundreds of active-duty soldiers, including mechanized infantry, have been called upon to fight wildfires in California. If the United States was engaged in a major war, military officials would have to make a choice: reduce warfighting capacity by tasking military resources to disaster response or face major domestic disruption by deploying disaster-response resources overseas.

CON: Current GPC Planning Ignores Disaster Response

The Atlantic Council, July 22, 2022

<https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/content-series/reality-check/reality-check-13-great-power-competition-threatens-climate-disaster-response/>

1. Do not discount disaster response in force planning. Policy makers value DoD's planning and estimates, and these may inform decisions on whether and how to engage in a great-power war. Policy makers should consider that deploying US military units and assets overseas can degrade the ability of the United States to respond to domestic disasters, which can in turn undermine warfighting capabilities. Last year, for example, eight C-130s were deployed for weeks at a time fighting wildfires, flying 945 sorties, with an additional four conventional C-130s required to assist those outfitted to drop fire retardant. Units and assets that could be deployed to fight a major war and are also needed at home to manage the increasing burden of disaster response should not be double counted. Planners should consider changing the primary mission of certain Guard units to disaster response and develop contingencies for replacing those units with civilian volunteers in extreme situations when those Guard units are needed elsewhere. Large-scale deployments abroad, without trained civilian replacements, could endanger national disaster-response and ultimately reduce the ability of the United States to successfully engage in future conflicts.



21ST CENTURY DEBATE

A DEEPER LEARNING APPROACH TO DEBATE EDUCATION

[CON] GLOBAL GOVERNANCE (& Development)

CON: GPC Shifts Pacific Nations Toward China

Chatham House, July 7, 2022

<https://www.chathamhouse.org/2022/07/great-power-competition-and-climate-security-pacific>

Geostrategic competition, while an issue that should not be ignored, has blinded many from the threat of climate change and Chinese efforts at tailoring parts of its economic, diplomatic and aid programmes in the Pacific in order to become the region's partner of choice in the search for climate security.



21ST CENTURY DEBATE

A DEEPER LEARNING APPROACH TO DEBATE EDUCATION

REFERENCES

1. Should U.S. Foreign Policy Focus on Great-Power Competition?
Foreign Affairs, Oct. 13, 2020
<https://www.foreignaffairs.com/ask-the-experts/2020-10-13/should-us-foreign-policy-focus-great-power-competition>
2. Navigating great power competition – A serious planning start
Prof. Bruce Jones, Stanford University (Yale Law School, Fellow), Brookings Institution, August 3, 2022
<https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2022/08/03/navigating-great-power-competition-a-serious-planning-start/>
3. Great Power Competition Is Putting Planet Earth at Risk
Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2021
<https://www.heritage.org/energy-economics/commentary/great-power-competition-putting-planet-earth-risk>
4. Great-power competition threatens climate disaster response
Evan Cooper, and Alec Evans, The Stimson Center, July 22, 2022
<https://www.stimson.org/2022/great-power-competition-threatens-climate-disaster-response/>
5. Reality Check #13: Great-power competition threatens climate disaster response
The Atlantic Council, July 22, 2022
<https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/content-series/reality-check/reality-check-13-great-power-competition-threatens-climate-disaster-response/>
6. Great Power Competition in a Changing Climate
New America, Last Updated: October 23rd, 2019
<https://www.newamerica.org/resource-security/reports/great-power-resource-competition-changing-climate/>
7. National Defense Strategy: Climate Change in the Age of Great Power Competition
American Security Project, National Defense Strategy, 2018
<https://www.americansecurityproject.org/climate-change-in-the-age-of-great-power-competition/>
8. Great power competition and climate security in the Pacific
Chatham House, July 7, 2022
<https://www.chathamhouse.org/2022/07/great-power-competition-and-climate-security-pacific>