Game Over: The Case For Ending China Arms Embargo

By Vance Trefethen

Game Over: The Case for Ending China Arms Embargo 3

OBSERVATION 1. We offer the following DEFINITIONS. 3

OBSERVATION 2. INHERENCY, or the structure of the Status Quo. Two key FACTS about our current policy towards China 3

FACT 1. US embargo. The US has a strict arms embargo on the People’s Republic of China 3

FACT 2. European Union embargo. US policy is the key factor sustaining the European Union arms embargo on China 3

OBSERVATION 3. We offer the following PLAN, to be implemented by Congress and the President through any necessary amendments to existing law. 4

OBSERVATION 4. JUSTIFICATIONS 4

JUSTIFICATION 1. Counterproductive. 4

The embargo actually strengthens China by motivating them to develop their own defense industrial capabilities. 4

JUSTIFICATION 2. European circumvention 5

Europe has an embargo, but there’s so much circumvention that it’s practically invisible 5

JUSTIFICATION 3. American business losses. We see this in 2 sub-points: 5

A. The Link: European companies sell to China, while US companies are blocked 5

B. The Impact: Billions of dollars worth of new opportunities for US firms. Exports would rise between 45 and 76 billion dollars 6

2A EVIDENCE: END CHINA ARMS EMBARGO 7

INHERENCY 7

US has strict arms embargo on China 7

“US is relaxing controls on military exports to China” –Response: Export control reform will not impact the embargo 8

US embargo is driven by “symbolic value,” not because it really blocks Chinese technology. And it’s the major influence on the EU to keep their embargo 8

JUSTIFICATIONS 9

CHINA DEVELOPS ITS OWN SYSTEMS 9

After the embargo, China developed its own arms industry – and also got technology from Russia, Ukraine and Israel 9

China found alternative methods to obtain military technology, and US businesses lost out to European competitors 9

EUROPE CIRCUMVENTION 10

France is signing big military contracts with China. Example: $18.6 billion for helicopters in 2014 10

Europe is powering China’s military growth 10

Europeans are equipping China’s military 10

US & EUROPEAN BUSINESS LOSSES/GROWTH 11

US business would grow significantly by reducing military export constraints to China 11

New European markets. Lifting the embargo would create new markets for European defense companies 11

DISADVANTAGE RESPONSES 12

“MILITARY STRENGTH OF CHINA” RESPONSES 12

Military / Technological “Containment” of China is hopeless 12

Turn: Containing China makes China feel victimized and more aggressive, increasing security risks 12

Experts agree China is not a threat 13

“HUMAN RIGHTS IN CHINA” RESPONSES 13

Human rights cannot be the sole criterion of foreign policy: we have to consider other factors 13

No universally agreed standards of human rights, and debate about them can even lead to conflict and war 14

Just saying “human rights” doesn’t justify US policy: Policy must be justified by showing how it affects the national interest and the world community. 14

Although she advocates increased attention to human rights in our foreign policy, Roberta Cohen in 2008 nevertheless admits that such concerns do not need to be “front & center” in every situation: 15

We can’t have an effective human rights policy without correcting our own abuses and getting international credibility 15

The U.S. has no international credibility on human rights because of our abusive practices 15

We have to engage other actors besides the US government for human rights policy to be effective. 16

“European embargo pressures China on human rights” – Response: EU has the embargo by inertia, not because it makes any sense. They’ve never set any diplomatic conditions for removing it 16

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS 17

The Chinese government can use the embargo to create a “victim mentality” to avoid criticism 17

France ignores the China embargo 17

Game Over: The Case for Ending China Arms Embargo

The US imposes an embargo on military equipment trade with China. It’s designed to weaken China and punish them for bad behavior. But instead, it strengthens China and punishes the United States. That’s why my partner and I affirm that: The United States federal government should substantially reform its trade policy with one or more of the following nations: China, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan.

OBSERVATION 1. We offer the following DEFINITIONS.


**Trade**: “: the activity or process of buying, selling, or exchanging goods or services” (*Merriam Webster Online Dictionary, copyright 2015 http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/trade)*

**Policy**: “a high-level overall plan embracing the general goals and acceptable procedures especially of a governmental body” (*Merriam Webster Online Dictionary, copyright 2015* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/policy*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/policy))

OBSERVATION 2. INHERENCY, or the structure of the Status Quo. Two key FACTS about our current policy towards China

FACT 1. US embargo. The US has a strict arms embargo on the People’s Republic of China

Oliver Brauner, Mark Bromley and Dr. Mathieu Duchatel 2015. (Brauner – researcher with Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI). Bromley - Co-Director of the *SIPRI* Dual-Use and Arms Trade Control Programme Duchatel - PhD; Senior Researcher and Head China representative at SIPRI. ) STOCKHOLM INTERNATIONAL PEACE RESERCH INSTITUTE, Jan 2015 Western Arms Exports to China SIPRI Policy Paper No. 43 <http://books.sipri.org/files/PP/SIPRIPP43.pdf>



FACT 2. European Union embargo. US policy is the key factor sustaining the European Union arms embargo on China

Oliver Brauner, Mark Bromley and Dr. Mathieu Duchatel 2015. (Brauner – researcher with Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI). Bromley - Co-Director of the *SIPRI* Dual-Use and Arms Trade Control Programme Duchatel - PhD; Senior Researcher and Head China representative at SIPRI. ) STOCKHOLM INTERNATIONAL PEACE RESERCH INSTITUTE, Jan 2015 Western Arms Exports to China SIPRI Policy Paper No. 43 <http://books.sipri.org/files/PP/SIPRIPP43.pdf>

Under President Obama, the USA has maintained its staunch opposition to the lifting of the EU arms embargo, despite the apparent lack of credible support for a policy change within Europe. In 2010 the US Department of State issued an action request ‘for all Embassies in EU countries to reiterate our position that the EU should retain its arms embargo on China’. US pressure is still widely seen as the key factor blocking any move towards an eventual lifting of the EU arms embargo.

OBSERVATION 3. We offer the following PLAN, to be implemented by Congress and the President through any necessary amendments to existing law.


1. US arms export sanctions on China are repealed  
2. The US ends its policy of encouraging other nations to uphold export sanctions on China.  
Funding and enforcement for existing sanctions are canceled.  
Plan takes effect 3 days after an Affirmative ballot.  
And all Affirmative speeches may clarify the plan as needed.

OBSERVATION 4. JUSTIFICATIONS

JUSTIFICATION 1. Counterproductive.

The embargo actually strengthens China by motivating them to develop their own defense industrial capabilities.

Dr Hugo Meijer 2014. (PhD;Lecturer in Defence Studies, King’s College London) “Transatlantic perspectives on China’s military modernization: The case of Europe’s arms embargo against the People’s Republic of China” Oct 2014 (note: “Thales” is pronounced “TALL-ess”) <https://www.google.fr/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0CCEQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.academia.edu%2F9414828%2F_Transatlantic_Perspectives_on_Chinas_Military_Modernization_the_Case_of_Europes_Arms_Embargo_against_the_Peoples_Republic_of_China_Paris_Paris_No._12_Strategic_Research_Institute_of_the_French_Military_Academy_IRSEM_2014&ei=YnFpVYy3CIOBU-2vgbAN&usg=AFQjCNH4KHFX2osAIsXdpIJ6f1o1T63wTQ&sig2=8y5pLodq0hmh9n6-aJW_wA&bvm=bv.94455598,d.ZGU>



JUSTIFICATION 2. European circumvention

Europe has an embargo, but there’s so much circumvention that it’s practically invisible


Dr Hugo Meijer 2014. (PhD;Lecturer in Defence Studies, King’s College London) “Transatlantic perspectives on China’s military modernization: The case of Europe’s arms embargo against the People’s Republic of China” Oct 2014 (note: “Thales” is pronounced “TALL-ess”) <https://www.google.fr/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0CCEQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.academia.edu%2F9414828%2F_Transatlantic_Perspectives_on_Chinas_Military_Modernization_the_Case_of_Europes_Arms_Embargo_against_the_Peoples_Republic_of_China_Paris_Paris_No._12_Strategic_Research_Institute_of_the_French_Military_Academy_IRSEM_2014&ei=YnFpVYy3CIOBU-2vgbAN&usg=AFQjCNH4KHFX2osAIsXdpIJ6f1o1T63wTQ&sig2=8y5pLodq0hmh9n6-aJW_wA&bvm=bv.94455598,d.ZGU>



JUSTIFICATION 3. American business losses. We see this in 2 sub-points:


A. The Link: European companies sell to China, while US companies are blocked

Dr Hugo Meijer 2014. (PhD;Lecturer in Defence Studies, King’s College London) “Transatlantic perspectives on China’s military modernization: The case of Europe’s arms embargo against the People’s Republic of China” Oct 2014 (note: “Thales” is pronounced “TALL-ess”) <https://www.google.fr/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0CCEQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.academia.edu%2F9414828%2F_Transatlantic_Perspectives_on_Chinas_Military_Modernization_the_Case_of_Europes_Arms_Embargo_against_the_Peoples_Republic_of_China_Paris_Paris_No._12_Strategic_Research_Institute_of_the_French_Military_Academy_IRSEM_2014&ei=YnFpVYy3CIOBU-2vgbAN&usg=AFQjCNH4KHFX2osAIsXdpIJ6f1o1T63wTQ&sig2=8y5pLodq0hmh9n6-aJW_wA&bvm=bv.94455598,d.ZGU>



B. The Impact: Billions of dollars worth of new opportunities for US firms. Exports would rise between 45 and 76 billion dollars

Prof. Li Bin & Yang Xiao 2013. (Li Bin – professor of International Relations at Dept of International Relations, Tsinghua University and senior associate at Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Yang Xiao – researcher at China Institute of Contemporary International Relations) Chinese Journal of International Politics, Vol 6 “Measuring Political Barriers in US Exports to China” <https://www.google.fr/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0CCEQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fcjip.oxfordjournals.org%2Fcontent%2F6%2F2%2F133.short&ei=P8dpVZ-RNMToUujtg1g&usg=AFQjCNFWjQZoSqOu57lzK6RHw80EhWLSuA&sig2=zJGkqM4BDmQ3cNxgUFzyWw&bvm=bv.94455598,d.d24>




2A EVIDENCE: END CHINA ARMS EMBARGO

INHERENCY

US has strict arms embargo on China

Dr Hugo Meijer 2014. (PhD;Lecturer in Defence Studies, King’s College London) “Transatlantic perspectives on China’s military modernization: The case of Europe’s arms embargo against the People’s Republic of China” Oct 2014 <https://www.google.fr/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0CCEQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.academia.edu%2F9414828%2F_Transatlantic_Perspectives_on_Chinas_Military_Modernization_the_Case_of_Europes_Arms_Embargo_against_the_Peoples_Republic_of_China_Paris_Paris_No._12_Strategic_Research_Institute_of_the_French_Military_Academy_IRSEM_2014&ei=YnFpVYy3CIOBU-2vgbAN&usg=AFQjCNH4KHFX2osAIsXdpIJ6f1o1T63wTQ&sig2=8y5pLodq0hmh9n6-aJW_wA&bvm=bv.94455598,d.ZGU>




“US is relaxing controls on military exports to China” –Response: Export control reform will not impact the embargo

Oliver Brauner, Mark Bromley and Dr. Mathieu Duchatel 2015. (Brauner – researcher with Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI). Bromley - Co-Director of the *SIPRI* Dual-Use and Arms Trade Control Programme Duchatel - PhD; Senior Researcher and Head China representative at SIPRI. ) STOCKHOLM INTERNATIONAL PEACE RESERCH INSTITUTE, Jan 2015 Western Arms Exports to China SIPRI Policy Paper No. 43 <http://books.sipri.org/files/PP/SIPRIPP43.pdf> (brackets added)

A number of former US officials and commentators have warned that moving items from the USML [US Munitions List] to the CCL [Commerce Control List] and decontrolling others will increase the range of goods that can be shipped to companies acting as fronts for the Chinese military, thereby generating new proliferation risks. However, US officials argue that the reforms will have no impact on exports to China and that controls that were in place prior to 2009 will remain in force. According to one Department of Commerce official, ‘we have bent over backwards in all our training materials and preamble material to say we are maintaining the same embargo on China’. In particular, officials note that most of the items moving to the CCL will be subject to additional controls—such as a presumption of denial—that will prevent their export to China.

US embargo is driven by “symbolic value,” not because it really blocks Chinese technology. And it’s the major influence on the EU to keep their embargo

Oliver Brauner, Mark Bromley and Dr. Mathieu Duchatel 2015. (Brauner – researcher with Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI). Bromley - Co-Director of the *SIPRI* Dual-Use and Arms Trade Control Programme Duchatel - PhD; Senior Researcher and Head China representative at SIPRI. ) STOCKHOLM INTERNATIONAL PEACE RESERCH INSTITUTE, Jan 2015 Western Arms Exports to China SIPRI Policy Paper No. 43 <http://books.sipri.org/files/PP/SIPRIPP43.pdf>




JUSTIFICATIONS

CHINA DEVELOPS ITS OWN SYSTEMS


After the embargo, China developed its own arms industry – and also got technology from Russia, Ukraine and Israel

Oliver Brauner, Mark Bromley and Dr. Mathieu Duchatel 2015. (Brauner – researcher with Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI). Bromley - Co-Director of the *SIPRI* Dual-Use and Arms Trade Control Programme Duchatel - PhD; Senior Researcher and Head China representative at SIPRI. ) STOCKHOLM INTERNATIONAL PEACE RESERCH INSTITUTE, Jan 2015 Western Arms Exports to China SIPRI Policy Paper No. 43 <http://books.sipri.org/files/PP/SIPRIPP43.pdf> (brackets added)



China found alternative methods to obtain military technology, and US businesses lost out to European competitors


Dr. Lyle Goldstein 2015 (PhD; associate professor in the China Maritime Studies Institute at US Naval War College) Meeting China Halfway: How to Defuse the Emerging US-China Rivalry <https://books.google.fr/books?id=r73hBwAAQBAJ&pg=PA101&lpg=PA101&dq=china+earthquake+%22arms+embargo%22&source=bl&ots=C1fbvJI2Od&sig=ZHEDYlZZlfRiCMC2B9X2DJk5tDQ&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0CFIQ6AEwCWoVChMI-_7r7eKHyAIVitUaCh05oQuH#v=onepage&q=china%20earthquake%20%22arms%20embargo%22&f=false>



EUROPE CIRCUMVENTION

France is signing big military contracts with China. Example: $18.6 billion for helicopters in 2014

Oliver Brauner, Mark Bromley and Dr. Mathieu Duchatel 2015. (Brauner – researcher with Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI). Bromley - Co-Director of the *SIPRI* Dual-Use and Arms Trade Control Programme Duchatel - PhD; Senior Researcher and Head China representative at SIPRI. ) STOCKHOLM INTERNATIONAL PEACE RESERCH INSTITUTE, Jan 2015 Western Arms Exports to China SIPRI Policy Paper No. 43 <http://books.sipri.org/files/PP/SIPRIPP43.pdf>



Europe is powering China’s military growth

RT NEWS 2014. 30 Apr 2014 EU states strike lucrative military contracts with China overriding embargo – report <http://www.rt.com/news/155868-europe-exports-china-military/>

French designed helicopters bolstering China’s air force, British jet engines driving fighter bombers and anti-ship strike aircraft, German and French engines providing the rudder to the Chinese navy – the role European exports play in China’s military is undeniable. *“Without European technology, the Chinese navy would not be able to move,"* Andrei Chang, editor of the Hong Kong-based Kanwa Asian Defense Review, told AFP. EU weapons manufactures received licenses to export equipment worth three billion euros ($4.1 billion) to China in the decade to 2012, annual EU reports on trade reveal.

Europeans are equipping China’s military


Reuters news service 2013. “Chinese Military's Secret to Success: European Engineering” 19 Dec 2013 <http://www.voanews.com/content/chinese-military-secret-to-success-european-engineering/1814104.html>

Most of China's advanced surface warships are powered by German and French-designed diesel engines. Chinese destroyers have French sonar, anti-submarine-warfare helicopters and surface-to-air missiles. Above the battlefield, British jet engines drive PLA fighter bombers and anti-ship strike aircraft. The latest Chinese surveillance aircraft are fitted with British airborne early warning radars. Some of China's best attack and transport helicopters rely on designs from Eurocopter, a subsidiary of pan-European aerospace and defense giant EADS. But perhaps the most strategic item obtained by China on its European shopping spree is below the waterline: the German-engineered diesels inside its submarines.

US & EUROPEAN BUSINESS LOSSES/GROWTH

US business would grow significantly by reducing military export constraints to China

Prof. Li Bin & Yang Xiao 2013. (Li Bin – professor of International Relations at Dept of International Relations, Tsinghua University and senior associate at Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Yang Xiao – researcher at China Institute of Contemporary International Relations) Chinese Journal of International Politics, Vol 6 “Measuring Political Barriers in US Exports to China” <https://www.google.fr/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0CCEQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fcjip.oxfordjournals.org%2Fcontent%2F6%2F2%2F133.short&ei=P8dpVZ-RNMToUujtg1g&usg=AFQjCNFWjQZoSqOu57lzK6RHw80EhWLSuA&sig2=zJGkqM4BDmQ3cNxgUFzyWw&bvm=bv.94455598,d.d24>



New European markets. Lifting the embargo would create new markets for European defense companies

Dr Hugo Meijer 2014. (PhD;Lecturer in Defence Studies, King’s College London) “Transatlantic perspectives on China’s military modernization: The case of Europe’s arms embargo against the People’s Republic of China” Oct 2014 (note: “Thales” is pronounced “TALL-ess”) <https://www.google.fr/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0CCEQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.academia.edu%2F9414828%2F_Transatlantic_Perspectives_on_Chinas_Military_Modernization_the_Case_of_Europes_Arms_Embargo_against_the_Peoples_Republic_of_China_Paris_Paris_No._12_Strategic_Research_Institute_of_the_French_Military_Academy_IRSEM_2014&ei=YnFpVYy3CIOBU-2vgbAN&usg=AFQjCNH4KHFX2osAIsXdpIJ6f1o1T63wTQ&sig2=8y5pLodq0hmh9n6-aJW_wA&bvm=bv.94455598,d.ZGU>


Since the mid-2000s, European defense budgets have decreased steadily, with expenditure shrinking from €201 billion in 2006 (1.77% of GDP) to €194 billion in 2010 (1.61% of GDP), that is a decrease of approximately 2% annually and of 7% in cumulative percentage.  In fact, the only region in the world where the purchasing power in military spending has not increased since the 2000s is Western Europe. The “assault to external markets”  has therefore become, by necessity, a key adaptation strategy for the arms industry. In this perspective, if the EU arms embargo were to be lifted, China could become a vital customer for major European defense companies such as Thales or EADS  –  among others.

DISADVANTAGE RESPONSES

“MILITARY STRENGTH OF CHINA” RESPONSES

Military / Technological “Containment” of China is hopeless

Dr Hugo Meijer 2014. (PhD;Lecturer in Defence Studies, King’s College London) “Transatlantic perspectives on China’s military modernization: The case of Europe’s arms embargo against the People’s Republic of China” Oct 2014 (brackets and ellipses in original) <https://www.google.fr/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0CCEQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.academia.edu%2F9414828%2F_Transatlantic_Perspectives_on_Chinas_Military_Modernization_the_Case_of_Europes_Arms_Embargo_against_the_Peoples_Republic_of_China_Paris_Paris_No._12_Strategic_Research_Institute_of_the_French_Military_Academy_IRSEM_2014&ei=YnFpVYy3CIOBU-2vgbAN&usg=AFQjCNH4KHFX2osAIsXdpIJ6f1o1T63wTQ&sig2=8y5pLodq0hmh9n6-aJW_wA&bvm=bv.94455598,d.ZGU>




Turn: Containing China makes China feel victimized and more aggressive, increasing security risks

Cortez A. Cooper 2006 (Director, East Asia Studies, Hicks & Associates, Inc.) testimony at the HEARING BEFORE THE U.S.-CHINA ECONOMIC AND SECURITY REVIEW COMMISSION, ONE HUNDRED NINTH CONGRESS, 16-17 March 2006 <http://origin.www.uscc.gov/sites/default/files/transcripts/3.16-17.06HearingT.pdf>

China retains a “victim mentality” that is not easily vitiated—this mentality raises the likelihood that otherwise manageable tensions could spiral into a security dilemma. If U.S. security initiatives in the region appear to marginalize the development of mutually beneficial security frameworks in favor of “encirclement,” then China will be more likely to respond aggressively on all fronts. The resulting dilemma will force regional actors to make decisions based on an “opposing camps” security structure—decisions that they are trying very hard to avoid.

Experts agree China is not a threat

Roger Irvine 2015. (PhD in Asian Studies at Univer­sity of Adelaide, South Australia) FORECASTING CHINA’S FUTURE: Dominance or collapse? (note about the date: the book is available on google-books online and shows a copyright date of 2016. Since we were able to access it on 18 Aug 2015, we used 2015 as a more accurate date) (brackets added) <https://books.google.com/books?id=TbkBCgAAQBAJ&pg=PA164&lpg=PA164&dq=china+military+threat+exaggerated&source=bl&ots=wPbnP1MlWT&sig=957MTu5yDRLQkRT3LewcCGNllto&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0CEgQ6AEwB2oVChMI7YfOgqazxwIVSpeACh3kfwrl#v=onepage&q=china%20military%20threat%20exaggerated&f=false>



“HUMAN RIGHTS IN CHINA” RESPONSES

Human rights cannot be the sole criterion of foreign policy: we have to consider other factors

Dr. Uche Ofodile 2009. (Associate Professor, University of Arkansas School of Law. S.J.D., Harvard Law School; LL.M.. Harvard Law School; LL.M. (International Business Law), University College London. Fellow, Carnegie Council on Ethics and International Affairs) “Trade, Aid and Human Rights: China’s Africa Policy in Perspective” JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL COMMERCIAL LAW & TECHNOLOGY Vol. 4 Issue 2   
[www.jiclt.com/index.php/jiclt/article/download/73/72](http://www.jiclt.com/index.php/jiclt/article/download/73/72)

Indeed, when confronted with the issue of a U.S. human rights policy, Kissinger, at his confirmation as the Secretary of State, stated: “I believe it is dangerous for us to make the domestic policy of countries around the world a direct objective of U.S. foreign policy.” In a 1977 article, Kissinger argued that one of the basic challenges of foreign policy was “the perennial tension between morality and pragmatism.” Although admitting that human rights “must be an essential component” of U.S. foreign policy, he argued that to pursue it effectively, the U.S. “must take the measure of the dangers and dilemmas along the way.” Kissinger cautioned that because human rights advocacy is a powerful political weapon, the U.S. must be careful that in its application, all moral dividing lines are not eroded.

No universally agreed standards of human rights, and debate about them can even lead to conflict and war

Dr. Benjamin Rivlin & Peter J. Hoffman 2008. (Rivlin - PhD Harvard, international relations & government Director Emeritus of the Ralph Bunche Institute on United Nations and Professor Emeritus of Political Science, City University of New York Graduate School & University Center. Hoffman - Research Associate, Ralph Bunche Institute for International Studies, City Univ of New York) “The United Nations Human Rights Council (2008): A U.S. Foreign Policy Dilemma” 28 May 2008  
<http://www.ncafp.org/articles/08%20UN%20Human%20Rights%20COuncil.pdf>

The declaration, also referred to as the International Bill of Human Rights, affirmed the  
commitments of member states to respect a wide range of rights. However, in trying to specify and  
operationalize those norms, disputes appeared. Those divisions are exemplified by two international  
agreements: the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant  
on Social, Economic, and Cultural Rights. Accordingly, although there is one Universal Declaration,  
there are two covenants; that is, when rival frameworks could not be reconciled into one document,  
the deadlock was acknowledged by issuing separate agreements for different categories of rights. In  
short, during the cold war, human rights became a weapon. Instead of being based on the universal  
application of consensus-derived principles, human rights were used to embarrass or otherwise  
undermine political opponents. In addition to differences rooted in the ideological conflict of the cold war, an overarching fracture that fueled contestations over the meaning of human rights resurfaced in international politics in the 1990s in a slightly altered guise, the so-called clash of civilizations. This perspective argues that contrasts in cultural identities invariably lead to conflict and war. The divide between civil/political rights and  
social/economic/cultural rights became a prominent symptom of political dissension.

Just saying “human rights” doesn’t justify US policy: Policy must be justified by showing how it affects the national interest and the world community.

Prof. Stephen Bronner 2011. (Professor of Political Science and Director of Civic Diplomacy and Human Rights at the Institute for World Challenges: Rutgers University) “On Judging American Foreign Policy: Human Rights, Political Realism, and the Arrogance of Power” LOGOS A Journal of Modern Society & Culture, <http://logosjournal.com/2011/summer_bronner/>

There are policymakers who never encountered a crisis for which American intervention wasn’t a remedy: Richard Barnett called them “white collar militarists.” But, then, hundreds of wars, thousands of human rights abuses are taking place as these words are being read. It is always legitimate to ask how egregious is *this* particular breach of human rights? Why is *this* particular nation the target? How does *this* crisis affect the national interest and the world community? One size does not fit all when it comes to foreign policy and the pursuit of human rights. This only makes the justification for any particular action in any particular instance more important.

Although she advocates increased attention to human rights in our foreign policy, Roberta Cohen in 2008 nevertheless admits that such concerns do not need to be “front & center” in every situation:

Roberta Cohen 2008. (MA with distinction from the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies; former Deputy Assistant Secretary for Human Rights at the State Department and Senior Adviser to the US Delegation to the U.N., is Senior Associate at the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University) INTEGRATING HUMAN RIGHTS IN US FOREIGN POLICY: THE HISTORY, THE CHALLENGES, AND THE CRITERIA FOR AN EFFECTIVE POLICY , Statement at the Foreigin Service Institute, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/speeches/2008/4/human%20rights%20cohen/04_human_rights_cohen.pdf>

This is not to suggest that human rights concerns must be front and center in every situation. There may be sound political and strategic reasons for placing human rights in a secondary position. In the case of China, for example, in 1979, normalizing relations with its government based on national security objectives like containing Soviet power and gaining influence in Asia understandably moved human rights concerns aside. Today, in the case of North Korea, reaching a nuclear agreement obviously has to take priority over introducing human rights concerns into the six-party talks. However, it is always important to distinguish between genuine strategic or political interests that may have to move human rights to the side, and shortsightedness, ignorance about the importance of including such concerns or simply not wanting to complicate cozy relationships with governments or warlords.

We can’t have an effective human rights policy without correcting our own abuses and getting international credibility

Roberta Cohen 2008. (MA with distinction from the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies; former Deputy Assistant Secretary for Human Rights at the State Department and Senior Adviser to the US Delegation to the U.N., is Senior Associate at the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University) INTEGRATING HUMAN RIGHTS IN US FOREIGN POLICY: THE HISTORY, THE CHALLENGES, AND THE CRITERIA FOR AN EFFECTIVE POLICY , Statement at the Foreigin Service Institute, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/speeches/2008/4/human%20rights%20cohen/04_human_rights_cohen.pdf>

What is necessary for an effective human rights policy? Here are ten suggested criteria. The first is credibility. A government cannot effectively promote human rights abroad if it is not observing them at home. If a government considers that habeas corpus and guarantees against torture are at variance with its national security, then it will not be able to urge other governments to respect these rights.

The U.S. has no international credibility on human rights because of our abusive practices

Prof. Manfred Nowak 2008. (Prof. Dr. Manfred Nowak, Professor for International Human Rights Protection, University of Vienna; United Nations Special Rapporteur on Torture) CIA- »EXTRAORDINARY RENDITION« FLIGHTS,TORTURE AND ACCOUNTABILITY –A EUROPEAN APPROACH; EDITED BY: EUROPEAN CENTER FOR CONSTITUTIONAL AND HUMAN RIGHTS E.V. (ECCHR), SECOND EDITION, [http://www.academia.edu/2092801/Pending\_Investigations\_and\_Court\_Cases\_with\_Denise\_Bentele\_und\_Georgios\_Sotiriadis\_](http://www.google.com/url?q=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.academia.edu%2F2092801%2FPending_Investigations_and_Court_Cases_with_Denise_Bentele_und_Georgios_Sotiriadis_&sa=D&sntz=1&usg=AFQjCNEPhjGRhodSrlh7BM3IEET_KOFOMQ" \t "_blank)

The United States and Europe, once at the forefront of human rights protection worldwide, have lost much of their credibility as global human rights defenders in the “War on Terror.” In addition, by compromising their principles of combating global terrorism within the boundaries of international human rights law and the rule of law, Western government have in fact played into the hands of terrorists who aim to reveal and criticize the hypocrisy of Western human rights policies. Furthermore, the systematic practice of rendition, torture and disappearance by the United States and its allies has provided an extremely negative example to other states with disastrous consequences. Time and again, I was confronted with one simple question by governments in all regions of the world that I visited in my function as UN Special Rapporteur on Torture: “Why do you criticize us for torture if even the United States of America is officially using this practice? Is torture not legitimate in our common fight against the evil of global terrorism?”

We have to engage other actors besides the US government for human rights policy to be effective.

**Analysis: Cross apply the 1ac cards that say other countries are bypassing the embargo. If they don’t support us, we can’t be effective.**

Roberta Cohen 2008. (MA with distinction from the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies; former Deputy Assistant Secretary for Human Rights at the State Department and Senior Adviser to the US Delegation to the U.N., is Senior Associate at the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University) INTEGRATING HUMAN RIGHTS IN US FOREIGN POLICY: THE HISTORY, THE CHALLENGES, AND THE CRITERIA FOR AN EFFECTIVE POLICY , Statement at the Foreigin Service Institute, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/speeches/2008/4/human%20rights%20cohen/04_human_rights_cohen.pdf>

Fourth, the policy must be realistic. It cannot overestimate US power to reform countries or democratize them or make them into miniature Americas. When policies become too strident or overblown, the Administration invariably has to retreat. Jimmy Carter had to step back after affirming in his inaugural address that the US commitment to human rights would be “absolute.” President Bush has had to backtrack on his overblown goal of bringing democracy to the Arab Middle East not to speak of his inaugural pledge to end tyranny in the entire world. A realistic policy will also not rely solely on American power and actions but encourage a broad range of actors to become involved -- other governments, in particular a coalition of democracies, multilateral and regional organizations, NGOs, and corporations.

“European embargo pressures China on human rights” – Response: EU has the embargo by inertia, not because it makes any sense. They’ve never set any diplomatic conditions for removing it

Carolina Laos. Lund University Centre for East and South-East Asian Studies. 2014. (Laos received her Masters in foreign policy from Lund University) (The Centre's task is the encouragement and furtherance of research in Sweden concerning modern East and South-East Asia, including the rapidly changing societies, developing economies and political institutions in the region) “Reviewing the EU-China Foreign Affairs: The case study of the EU arms embargo on China” SPRING 2014. <http://lup.lub.lu.se/luur/download?func=downloadFile&recordOId=4499617&fileOId=4499618>

The question of lifting the arms embargo is complex since it is a mixture of political, military and human rights issues. In addition it is a great example of the difficulty of the EU foreign policy decision-making process and illustrates the development of the EU-China relations since 1989. For China the main task is to enhance the economy and the government is very careful with reforming politics and human rights situation, since the Soviet Union was a good example, showing what happens, when political changes take place too fast. For China economic rights are more important than political rights. Thus, there is a conceptual gap with the EU, who prioritizes democracy and human rights. However, even the EU itself finds it difficult to decide, whether to stand for its normative power or strong economic interests. One of the biggest controversies within the embargo issue is that the EU expects China to take some significant action, so that it would be worth the price of lifting the ban, but the EU has not set any specific conditions for China. That is another proof that the EU is acting based on the path dependence theory: it is safe to follow the old and well-known road in decision making, even if it there is not too much logic behind it.

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

**These cards were researched and were in the brief, but at publication time the web site had gone down. If this web site comes back up, these cards could be valuable for this case. We don’t recommend using them until you can verify that the website is active again.**

The Chinese government can use the embargo to create a “victim mentality” to avoid criticism

[Zhong ZHONG CHEN](http://www.theeuros.eu/_Zhong-ZHONG-CHEN_.html) 2010 (PhD candidate and Masters degree in History of International Relations from London School of Economics)) 1 Mar 2010 The European Arms Embargo on China : 20 (and a half) Years Later <http://www.theeuros.eu/The-European-Arms-Embargo-on-China,3545.html?lang=fr> (brackets added)

Most agree that it is absolutely pertinent that the EU [European Union] continue to encourage China to step up its human-rights record. It should remind China that with Great-Power status come Great-Power responsibilites and it should therefore step up to the plate on issues such as climate change, responsible arms sales and peacekeeping. But, in the present era of Chinese confidence, is a drawn-out argument over an archaeic treaty that has long been discredited and circumvented really progressing any of these debates ? In the end, any prolonged argument about the embargo will only benefit China’s internal political situation. The CCP [Chinese Communist Party] has often sought external factors in mobilizing national sentiment against the ‘West’ and using it as a rallying force for its domestic policies. With the robust economy quickly replacing communist doctrine as the true legitimizing force in Beijing and China striving to return to double-digit GDP growth, embargo dialogue that would allow the Chinese government to re-awaken a ‘victim mentality’ among the people in order to unite the populace and deflect criticism over recent corruption scandals would even be welcome.

France ignores the China embargo

[Zhong ZHONG CHEN](http://www.theeuros.eu/_Zhong-ZHONG-CHEN_.html) 2010 (PhD candidate and Masters degree in History of International Relations from London School of Economics)) 1 Mar 2010 The European Arms Embargo on China : 20 (and a half) Years Later http://www.theeuros.eu/The-European-Arms-Embargo-on-China,3545.html?lang=fr

Adherence to the embargo in the EU has also been sporadic at best. Major European players such as France, according to data collected by leading arms and military think-tank SIPRI, continue to largely ignore the sanctions. According to the trend-indicator provided by SIPRI, French arms sales to China in 1994 even climbed to 90 million U.S. dollars from 74 million U.S. dollars in 1989 (millions of US$ expressed in constant (1990) prices). Moreover, in the period 1989 - 2004 France accounted for 73.2% of total EU arms sales to China. Indeed, annual data shows that France never interrupted its sales to China despite the existence of the embargo, which leads to the question of who in the EU is for the embargo and who isn’t.