# Cards Texas Round 8

## CCP

#### No China add-on

#### 1 – they have conceded modeling doesn’t happen – their evidence says criticism is the same, not policy

#### they concede that China is changing pollution policy now – that’s Xinhua 12

#### 3– ironic for them to say our evidence is old, because theirs is older – pollution impact is from 2002, industrialization should have triggered it

#### 4 – their evidence isn’t conclusive about a collapse from pollution

#### Their Senkaku scenario isn’t in the context of pollution or collapse

#### Also, their new piece of evidence talks about alt causes to solving Chinese pollution like understaffing and lack of funds – no reason the plan would cause modeling changes in financial structure

#### CCP collapse is inevitable

The Australian 5 (10-29, 2005)

THE Chinese Communist Party is "full of confidence" in the political road it has chosen, claims a landmark white paper on Chinese-style democracy. So why do many senior Chinese Communist Party officials consult fortune tellers? A former party secretary from Shandong re-routed a road and built a superfluous bridge because a fortune teller told him he needed a bridge to become prime minister, the official Peoples Daily website soberly reported. And a party secretary from Fujian zealously collected bribes to fulfil a soothsayer's prophecy that he would become a millionaire. Superstition aside, the sense among officials that the status quo is unsustainable has also spawned "perhaps the most voracious official corruption in Chinese history", according to leading China analyst Minxin Pei, a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Washington. "Inexorable forces are arrayed against the long-term survival of the Communist Party in China," so officials are cashing in, he warns in a recent Foreign Policy article. While China is on track to build a modern capitalistic society by 2040, the chances of the party staying in power until then are slim, he argues. A parade of US officials in recent weeks has issued similar warnings, starting with Deputy Secretary of State Robert Zoellick. In the most comprehensive speech yet from the Bush administration on China, Zoellick warned on September 21 that China's closed political system was "simply not sustainable" and urged Beijing to speed up democratic reforms amid growing domestic pressure.5

#### No pollution- China is pressuring regulations now

Xinhua 12 [4-20-12, China vows more transparency in pollution control; English.news.cn 2012-04-20 00:15:24;< <http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/china/2012-04/20/c_131538931.htm>>]

China's environmental watchdog said on Thursday that it will work to promote the prompt disclosure of air quality reports and monitoring results for other types of pollution. The disclosure of information on major pollution sources and radiation levels will also be improved this year, according to a statement from the Ministry of Environmental Protection (MEP). The ministry also pledged to build an Internet-based environmental information platform by 2015 to facilitate the country's environmental protection drive, it added. Chinese citizens voiced significant concerns about air pollution in late 2011 following days of heavy smog in cities including Beijing. Public demand mounted for an official air quality report that would include PM2.5, an air quality standard that allows for the detection of particulate matter with a diameter of 2.5 microns or less. The government responded by promising to start using the PM2.5 standard in several major regions and cities in 2012, adding that it will expand the use of the standard to all cities at or above the prefecture level by 2015. A number of regions and cities, including Beijing, Tianjin and the Pearl River delta in Guangdong Province, made efforts earlier this year to include PM2.5 readings in their air quality measurements.

## Disease

#### No impact to multilateralism.

Azar Gat, July/August 2009, is a researcher and author on military history, he was the Chair of the Department of Political Science at Tel Aviv University, Foreign Affairs, “Which Way Is History Marching?,”<http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/65162/azar-gat-daniel-deudney-and-g-john-ikenberry-and-ronald-inglehar/which-way-is-history-marching?page=show>

UNDILUTED OPTIMISM to the sweeping, blind forces of globalization. A message need not be formulated in universalistic terms to have a broader appea When it comes to the question of how to deal with a nondemocratic superpower China in the international arena, Deudney and Ikenberry, as well as Inglehart and Welzel, exhibit undiluted liberal internationalist optimism. China's free access to the global economy is fueling its massive growth, thereby strengthening the country as a potential rival to the United States -- a problem for the United States not unlike that encountered by the free-trading British Empire when it faced other industrializing great powers in the late nineteenth century. According to Inglehart and Welzel, there is little to worry about, because rapid development will only quicken China's democratization. But it was the United Kingdom's great fortune -- and liberal democracy's -- that its hegemonic status fell into the hands of another liberal democracy, the United States, rather than into those of nondemocratic Germany and Japan, whose future trajectories remained uncertain at best. The liberal democratic countries could have made China's access to the global economy conditional on democratization, but it is doubtful that such a linkage would have been feasible or desirable. After all, China's economic growth has benefited other nations and has made the developed countries -- and the United States in particular -- as dependent on China as China is dependent on them. Furthermore, economic development and interdependence in themselves -- in addition to democracy -- are a major force for peace. Democracies' ability to promote internal democratization in countries much smaller and weaker than China has been very limited, and putting pressure on China could backfire, souring relations with China and diverting its development to a more militant and hostile path. Deudney and Ikenberry suggest that China's admission into the institutions of the liberal international order established after World War II and the Cold War will oblige the country to transform and conform to that order. But large players are unlikely to accept the existing order as it is, and their entrance into the system is as likely to change it as to change them. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights provides a case in point. It was adopted by the United Nations in 1948, in the aftermath of the Nazi horrors and at the high point of liberal hegemony. Yet the UN Commission on Human Rights, and the Human Rights Council that replaced it, has long been dominated by China, Cuba, and Saudi Arabia and has a clear illiberal majority and record. Today, more countries vote with China than with the United States and Europe on human rights issues in the General Assembly of the United Nations. Critics argue that unlike liberalism, nondemocratic capitalist systems have no universal message to offer the world, nothing attractive to sell that people can aspire to, and hence no "soft power" for winning over hearts and minds. But there is a flip side to the universalist coin: many find liberal universalism dogmatic, intrusive, and even oppressive. Resistance to the unipolar world is a reaction not just to the power of the United States but also to the dominance of human rights liberalism. There is a deep and widespread resentment in non-Western societies of being lectured to by the West and of the need to justify themselves according to the standards of a hegemonic liberal morality that preaches individualism to societies that value community as a greater good. Compared to other historical regimes, the global liberal order is in many ways benign, welcoming, and based on mutual prosperity.

#### Diseases can’t cause extinction --- burnout Intervening actors check

Zakaria 9**—**Editor of Newsweek, BA from Yale, PhD in pol sci, Harvard. He serves on the board of Yale University, The Council on Foreign Relations, The Trilateral Commission, and Shakespeare and Company. Named "one of the 21 most important people of the 21st Century" (Fareed, “The Capitalist Manifesto: Greed Is Good,” 13 June 2009, http://www.newsweek.com/id/201935)

Note—Laurie Garrett=science and health writer, winner of the Pulitzer, Polk, and Peabody Prize

It certainly looks like another example of crying wolf. After bracing ourselves for a global pandemic, we've suffered something more like the usual seasonal influenza. Three weeks ago the World Health Organization declared a health emergency, warning countries to "prepare for a pandemic" and said that the only question was the extent of worldwide damage. Senior officials prophesied that millions could be infected by the disease. But as of last week, the WHO had confirmed only 4,800 cases of swine flu, with 61 people having died of it. Obviously, these low numbers are a pleasant surprise, but it does make one wonder, what did we get wrong? Why did the predictions of a pandemic turn out to be so exaggerated? Some people blame an overheated media, but it would have been difficult to ignore major international health organizations and governments when they were warning of catastrophe. I think there is a broader mistake in the way we look at the world. Once we see a problem, we can describe it in great detail, extrapolating all its possible consequences. But we can rarely anticipate the human response to that crisis. Take swine flu. The virus had crucial characteristics that led researchers to worry that it could spread far and fast. They described—and the media reported—what would happen if it went unchecked. But it did not go unchecked. In fact, swine flu was met by an extremely vigorous response at its epicenter, Mexico. The Mexican government reacted quickly and massively, quarantining the infected population, testing others, providing medication to those who needed it. The noted expert on this subject, Laurie Garrett, says, "We should all stand up and scream, 'Gracias, Mexico!' because the Mexican people and the Mexican government have sacrificed on a level that I'm not sure as Americans we would be prepared to do in the exact same circumstances. They shut down their schools. They shut down businesses, restaurants, churches, sporting events. They basically paralyzed their own economy. They've suffered billions of dollars in financial losses still being tallied up, and thereby really brought transmission to a halt." Every time one of these viruses is detected, writers and officials bring up the Spanish influenza epidemic of 1918 in which millions of people died. Indeed, during the last pandemic scare, in 2005, President George W. Bush claimed that he had been reading a history of the Spanish flu to help him understand how to respond. But the world we live in today looks nothing like 1918. Public health-care systems are far better and more widespread than anything that existed during the First World War. Even Mexico, a developing country, has a first-rate public-health system—far better than anything Britain or France had in the early 20th century.