

Resolved: The G7 is Redundant.

I negate the resolution.

Redundant is defined by Merriam Webster as: “not or no longer needed or useful”

G7 is needed for economic connections and unity.

[CSIS 23](#)

China’s economic coercion has become part and parcel of its foreign policy.... Countries that interact with Taiwan, support democracy in Hong Kong, oppose genocide in Xinjiang or offend any other “core interests” of China face discriminatory, non-WTO-conforming sanctions and embargoes... Eighteen Western and Asian countries, including Japan, Lithuania, Norway, and Australia, and over 123 private companies... have been targeted precipitating tens of billions of dollars in economic damage.

[Asia Pacific Initiative ‘23](#) notes:

G7 governments need to clarify procedures for imposing countermeasures against [Chinese economic coercion] and share them with industries ... to gain their understanding of the need to take the steps for the sake of national security, even if it means squeezing their profits. These countermeasures are necessary for G7 members to jointly protect themselves, because in a globalized market, it is impossible for a country to achieve economic security just by itself.

CSIS 23 furthers

The G7 can ... practice economic deterrence by promising collective retaliation on high-dependence goods should China act against any one member. Forcing China to find a new supplier for one item is not enough to change Beijing’s behavior. However, joining together in an Article 5-type of collective economic defense framework could ... deter future predatory behavior. Collective resilience ... is a necessary competitive strategy to protect the liberal international order.

[The Hill](#), five days ago, noted the G7 can also “provide economic assistance to the target of China’s wrath, helping it weather the negative consequences of China’s coercion. This could include facilitating exports of goods that China has banned or direct financial assistance.” This makes the G7 essential to even non-members.

The G7 is especially needed now to protect the interests of G7 members and the world. The [Journal of Democracy ‘22](#) notes that China’s ideological threat against democracy is significant.

First, its global reach is more pervasive than that of any prior illiberal power both economically and diplomatically. Second, growing authoritarianism is creating uniquely fertile ground for Chinese actions. And Third, the technological revolution enhances Chinese influence while opening new opportunities for Chinese action.

EXTRA:

G7 is a unified defense against the threats from Russia & China.

[CNN '23](#) states that [The G7] “will seek to project a unified response to an increasingly assertive China and the perceived threat it poses to the stability and economic security of a world already shaken by Russia’s ongoing war on Ukraine. While much of the attention will be focused on Ukraine – including how to further tighten the screws on Russia and defuse rising nuclear tensions – the summit also provides an opportunity for G7 leaders to recalibrate and coordinate their approach toward China, which has refused to condemn the invasion and instead bolstered ties with Moscow.” This is not as easily accomplishable with an organization such as the UN which has China/Russia as members.

A2 Doesn’t deliver on promises/is inefficient:

Just because it may not be 100% perfect/efficient, does not give cause to get rid of the alliance itself or its programs. Still does deliver on several things and pushes for significant initiatives valuable to members.

A2 Use UN

China and Russian vetoes on the Sec Council mean that the UN can’t be a body capable of taking action.

A2 Use G20

G20 includes China Russia and other leaning authoritarian nations (Saudi, Turkey, India)

A2 Exclusion of others

- 1) Smaller growing economies are better served by collective action with similar economies instead of being a minor or subservient partner against more established economies.
- 2) Representation is still achieved on econ diplomacy with bigger membership orgs like the G20

- 3) International bodies are not inherently democratic institutions, because there is no easy way to balance one-nation, one-vote, with size of population and GPD.