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1NC NK Aggression Adv.

US military presence in South Korea deters North Korean aggression

Jackson**,** Major, United States Air Force Director of Operations 5th Reconnaissance Squadron Osan AB, Republic of Korea, 10/9/2008

Although experts believe Korea will eventually unite into a formidable regional power, the peninsula seems likely to stay politically divided for some time. A more stable relationship between North and South Korea suits the short term interests of the international economy. Peace on the peninsula, no matter what form it takes, relieves some of the tension in the region and allows the economic markets to continue their unprecedented growth. Under the umbrella of U.S. diplomatic agreements and security promises, North and South can participate in a constructive dialogue that is beneficial for both nations. In the broader scheme of international relations, the Korean conflict can only be resolved through inter-Korean cooperation. In order to facilitate a North-South normalization process, North Korea must maintain some semblance of a viable nation-state. North Korea's future in the short term depends on whether Pyongyang can achieve a degree of international recognition. Mimicking the unification rhetoric, Pyongyang finds itself in a position to obtain economic assistance long enough to stabilize its failing regime, a condition essential to maintaining the current peninsula balance of power. Establishing economic ties with non-communists nations, similar to the Chinese model, offers Pyongyang the benefits of foreign capital investment, technology exchange, and exportation of weapons technology, critical to obtaining needed revenues and rebuilding the DPRK's economy. An important criterion to prepare the way for normalization is the success of Kim Jong Il's political and economic reforms. Without some type of reform, it is doubtful that the regime could survive the concessions the international community would demand in payment for recognition. The essential ingredient for maintaining the status quo on the Korean Peninsula is the "deterrent value" of combined U.S.-ROK forces. "This deterrent value of United States and South Korean military forces has maintained the peace on the Korean Peninsula for four decades and continues to maintain it today."[(10)](http://www.airpower.maxwell.af.mil/airchronicles/cc/jackson.html#N_10_) Without U.S. forces and the promise of an immediate retaliatory response to North Korean aggression, the ROK leadership would be reluctant to rely on DPRK compliance to any North-South agreement. Currently, North Korea is presenting itself to the international community as a cooperative and rational player in the peace process. Political maneuvering like the 1994 U.S.-North Korean Framework Agreement on nuclear programs makes it appear to the world that Pyongyang is moving toward normalization of relations with Japan and South Korea. However, with the recent events of failing communist regimes in Eastern Europe as an indicator, the leadership in Pyongyang has limited choices to secure their position on the peninsula. If Pyongyang rejects a North-South cooperative strategy, the DPRK will be condemned to continued isolation and economic hardship. Further international isolation will increase the pressure on an already crippled nation to the point of collapse, forcing Kim Jong Il's hand. The result would most likely be the worst-case scenario: an immediate and violent response.

Reduction of troops from South Korea destroys US credibility and bolsters North Koreas Nuclear program

[Wolfsthal](http://www.carnegie.ru/experts/?fa=34), deputy director of the Non-Proliferation Project, June **8,** 2004

Jon [Wolfsthal](http://www.carnegie.ru/experts/?fa=34) , “US Troop Reductions Risk War in Korea,” http://www.carnegie.ru/publications/?fa=1581

The security situation in Iraq is bad and continues to worsen. While the recent appointment of interim leaders in Iraq is a positive political step,it is increasingly clear that the United States has mismanaged its occupation of Iraq and that the prolonged post-war chaos shows no signs of improving any time soon. The need for additional US troops in Iraq has become so acute that the United States has announced the reduction and transfer of US troops from South Korea to Iraq. While the realignment of US forces in South Korea has been a joint goal for the US and the Republic of Korea for several years, the timing and decision to redeploy those troop directly to Iraq sends the wrong signal to US allies and enemies in the region and raises questions about the willingness of the US to stand by its friends in East Asia. In fact, the US should be looking to increase its military capabilities in the region, not reduce them. The decision to move 3,600 support troops out of South Korea does not directly affect the ability of the United States to help defend South Korea from any attack by the North. Moreover, it is not clear that the troops add any significant capability to US forces in Iraq. By some estimates, many tens of thousands of additional troops are needed in Iraq to secure cities and borders with neighboring countries. But the symbolism is clear around the world - the US is in trouble in Iraq and appears to be scavenging troops from anywhere and everywhere to bolster its position in the Middle East. If troops had to be removed from South Korea, they should have been rotated back to the United States or better yet on temporary assignment to Japan. The events in Iraq, however, are not the only reason the timing of this move was a mistake. The continued progress of North Korea' nuclear program that may now include up to 9 nuclear weapons has influenced the way the troop realignment may be seen on Pyongyang and elsewhere. While it is always difficult to understand North Korean perceptions, it is possible that Pyongyang will interpret the US troop move as a sign of weakness and further embolden Kim Jong Il to advance his nuclear program as a way of encouraging further US military reductions. The current US administration has approach on North Korea's nuclear program has failed. Pyongyang's capabilities have increased in the 3 plus years this administration has been in office with no real progress in site. It is time to face the increasingly realistic possibility that North Korea may never give up its nuclear program -or may never be offered a deal attractive enough to tempt it to do so. The United States, South Korea, Japan and China must quickly begin to make adjustments in its political and military positions to ensure that North Korea is deterred from taking any provocative military action and that the alliances between the ROK, Japan and the United States are reinforced. To ensure the future credibility of US security commitments to both South Korea and Japan, the United States should consider increasing, not decreasing, the level of troops in the region as well as continuing to enhance regional military capabilities. This would send a clear signal to North Korea that its continued nuclear efforts are worsening its security situation, while reassuring US allies that Washington remains committed to their protection. Lastly, it is time for the United States to communicate a new set of messages or red lines to North Korea, including what North Korean moves the US would consider so dangerous as to warrant military action. Among these are any attempt by North Korea to export any nuclear materials and any moves to conduct a nuclear weapons test. Most importantly, the US should make it clear to Pyongyang that any signs that North Korea is preparing to launch a long-range ballistic missile would be interpreted as possible preparation for a nuclear attack against the United States or one of its allies.

Ext – US Presence Solves War

United States military maintains peace throughout Korean Peninsula

Jackson**,** Major, United States Air Force Director of Operations 5th Reconnaissance Squadron Osan AB, Republic of Korea, 10/9/2008

There is widespread resistance in nations throughout the world to incurring large costs, military or otherwise, to deal with threats that do not seem immediately serious to vital national interests (an understandable position considering that nations act to ensure their own security). Henry Kissinger asserts that a vital national interest is "a change in the international environment so likely to undermine the national security that it must be resisted no matter what form the threat takes or how ostensibly legitimate it appears."[(7)](http://www.airpower.maxwell.af.mil/airchronicles/cc/jackson.html#N_7_) Relating Kissinger's definition of vital national interest to U.S. East-Asian security strategy, the uncertainty of a change in the political environment in Korea is likely to undermine the security of the Asia-Pacific region which is a direct threat to America's national security. Viewpoints vary, but the general consensus of national security analysts is that the stability of the East-Asian littoral and western Pacific region is linked to a strong U.S. military presence which discourages rivalries from escalating or a single power with regional hegemonic desires from asserting itself. Notwithstanding a more vibrant multilateral and regional security architecture through collective security arrangements, an important role remains for the armed forces of the United States forward deployed in Korea. Today, the DPRK is in the midst of a political, economic, and military decline with little expectation of recovery. North Korea's deteriorating situation threatens the peace and stability of the peninsula with the promise of an uncertain future. The North's unremitting decline provides the conditions for three possible geopolitical scenarios to emerge, each posing a different set of challenges for U.S. strategists: reunification of the Korean peninsula; a more stable relationship between the two nation-states; or resumption of the Korean War.[(8)](http://www.airpower.maxwell.af.mil/airchronicles/cc/jackson.html#N_8_) Forward deployed forces in Korea ensure a rapid and flexible response capability and enhance America's ability to influence events across the spectrum of confrontation.

US military presence in South Korea prevents any threat of North Korean attack

Scobell**, Dr** Andrew Scobell is an associate research professor at the Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, and adjunct professor of political science, Sanford, U.S. Navy Captain, 2007

Andrew Scobell and John M Sanford, “North Korea’s Military THREAT: PYONGYANG’S CONVENTIONAL FORCES, WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION, and BALLISTIC MISSILES,” http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub771.pdf

Over the past 2 decades, due largely to economic decline and lack of financial resources, as well as force improvements and urban build-up in South Korea and the continued presence of U.S. forces in South Korea, North Korea’s conventional forces have become weaker, relative to those of South Korea and the United States. As a result, any North Korean option to invade South Korea has become less credible.5 While causing tremendous damage, a North Korean attack on South Korea would most likely be defeated by a U.S.–South Korean counterattack. Nonetheless, the credibility of North Korea’s conventional military forces remains largely intact in terms of their potential to defend the state and to inflict substantial damage on South Korea—especially Seoul—which remains hostage to North Korea’s artillery massed along the Demilitarized Zone (DMZ).6 By the same token, options for U.S. and allied forces to launch strikes against selected North Korean military targets are fraught with steep risks. The United States probably could destroy known nuclear and missile facilities in a preemptive strike, but not hidden facilities and weapons that would survive such a preemptive attack. In any event, Pyongyang would regard an attack on its strategic assets as a dire threat to its vital interests (i.e., regime survival) and could retaliate in ways that might escalate quickly to a wider conflict. The United States and South Korea would more than likely prevail in a full-scale war, but the human and material costs would be very high— even if unconventional weapons were not employed. In essence, the military standoff that marked the end of the Korean War prevails 50 years later.7

Ext - Unification Good

Unification of South Korea brings economic success to Korean penninsula

Thatcher, Based in Seoul since 2006, lead Reuters coverage out of the Korean peninsula, Sep 21, 2009

Johnathan Thatcher,“United Korea economy could pass Japan: Goldman Sachs,” http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE58K0OA20090921

(Reuters) - A united Korea -- combining Asia's fourth biggest economy with one of its poorest -- could surpass that of Germany or [Japan](http://www.reuters.com/places/japan) in economic might in the next 30-40 years, U.S. investment bank Goldman Sachs said on Monday. Though [North Korea](http://www.reuters.com/places/north-korea)'s planned economy system looks to be on the edge of collapse, it offers a large and cheap workforce, a wealth of minerals that the resource-poor South currently has to import to feed its industry and the likelihood of gains in productivity and its currency once economic reforms take hold. "We project that a united Korea could overtake France, Germany and possibly [Japan](http://www.reuters.com/places/japan) in 30-40 years in terms of GDP in U.S. dollar terms," it said in a report. The two Koreas have been separated for more than half a century and have yet to sign a peace treaty to formally end the 1950-53 Korean War. The Goldman Sachs report was published just as the communist North has shown signs of being willing to reengage with the outside world, from which it has been all but cut off after a series of nuclear and missile tests this year. It also comes as the conservative government in Seoul has turned increasingly hard-nosed in dealings with its prickly neighbor, ending years of aid until Pyongyang starts to dismantle its nuclear weapons programme. The cost of reunification has long been seen as one of the biggest risks facing the [South Korea](http://www.reuters.com/places/south-korea)n economy. Many analysts warn the South's rise to an economic powerhouse in the region could be undone by the burden of absorbing its neighbor, whose per capita income is about 5 percent the size. But Goldman Sachs said it could be affordable by having the appropriate policies and by following the China/Hong Kong reunification model which allows two political and economic systems to co-exist, with limited inter-Korean migration. The report was written by the bank's [South Korea](http://www.reuters.com/places/south-korea) economist, Goohoon Kwon, and included input from one of the economists who co-authored the bank's influential prediction earlier this decade that the economies of Brazil, Russia, India and China -- the so-called BRICs -- would turn dominant by the mid-century. It argued that there remained a spirit of reconciliation despite the hardening in Seoul and that the political backdrop in the region was supportive of peaceful and gradual integration. [North Korea](http://www.reuters.com/places/north-korea)'s increasing lag behind other former planned economies, such as Russia, China and Vietnam, "could eventually spark powerful political and economic changes in North Korea which, with the recent political changes in the U.S. and Japan, could transform the nature and magnitude of North Korea risks".

Ext - North Korea Not Aggressive

North Korea will not attack, they just want peace talks

General B. B.Bell**,** served to command American and South Korean Forces from 2006 and 2008, May 24**,** 2010

General B. B. Bell, “General Bell: What's Really Going on in North Korea,” http://www.chattanoogan.com/articles/article\_176315.asp

In watching North Korea over the years (I was honored to command American and South Korean Forces from 2006 and 2008), one can logically conclude that Pyongyang (capital of North Korea) must be on a suicide mission. Believe me, they are not. But how can they continue to provoke South Korea with periodic lethal attacks and get away with them? The most recent attack on and sinking of a South Korean warship, the Cheonan, by North Korea and the loss of 46 South Korean sailors would argue that North Korea is very willing to conduct acts of war against South Korea, and it is not particularly worried about any consequences. So, what's really going on in Pyongyang? First, let there be no doubt that North Korean leader Kim Jung-Il is very unstable, while ruling the military run government of the north with an iron fist. However, he is not stupid. He deeply believes that the "revolution" begun by his father (Kim Il-Sung) at the end of WW II to unite the Korean Peninsula under an autocratic cult-like communist rule must be sustained until ultimately achieved. Kim also knows that he is no longer capable of re-uniting Korea with armed force as his military is no match for that of South Korea and the United States. Thus, he has moved into a fall-back position of "regime survival." The north is committed to a path that they hope will result in security guarantees from the United States, and ultimate diplomatic recognition as an independent nation. In other words, Kim is seeking a peace treaty with both South Korea and the U.S. that will recognize the north as a legitimate state fully separate from the south. He also wants non-aggression security guarantees from both the United States and South Korea. With this legitimization, Kim believes that he can continue to build the north into the utopia envisioned by his father, "the Great Leader and Eternal President." He believes the time will come (he is patient) when his future great nation will be able to invade the south and unite the Korean Peninsula under a single autocratic communist rule. That's Kim Jung Il's plan. Of course the U.S. cannot agree to a peace treaty as envisioned by the north. We are allied with South Korea and we remain, as we should, committed to the precepts of the 1953 Korean War Armistice Agreement which requires a political settlement and ultimate peaceful reunification of a single Korea through diplomatic negotiation processes. There is simply no way we can or should recognize North Korea as a separate and independent country. Such a move would psychologically crush our important South Korean ally, break faith with those who gave their lives defending the South from the North, and result in a major diplomatic split between South Korea and the United States. It would also likely push South Korea into the sphere of influence of China, something we do not want and frankly cannot afford. Kim Jung Il knows all this, but he is not deterred. He knows that there is only one way to get the United States to the negotiating table with the hope of obtaining a peace treaty and full recognition as an independent country. That path is to periodically attack South Korea with just enough force so as to not -- not -- provoke a general war, but instead set the conditions for "talks to resolve the dispute." Kim hopes these "talks" will lead to the coveted peace treaty and diplomatic recognition. We have seen this tactic time and again since the end of the Cold War. In this climate, the United States should inform the north that any potential for negotiations in any context is over -- forget it. We should not reward Kim's continued aggression by showing up at a diplomatic table to discuss anything -- nuclear weapons, north - south relations, or otherwise. Nothing. We should drop "engagement" with the north as a policy, and initiate a full containment regimen with the help of South Korea and Japan, similar to what we pursued against the Soviet Union in the Cold War. Meanwhile, South Korea should build up its military and "lay in wait" for the next lethal provocation -- it will come for sure. Over the past couple of decades Seoul, with our nudging of course, has been very reticent to retaliate against the north's repeated provocative attacks. Next time around Seoul's response should be quick and decisive, with a measured lethal response. I would suggest taking out the north's submarine pens and key national command and control facilities. While the north will certainly be vociferous in their protest, it is my judgment that they are not capable of launching a full scale invasion of the south, so they won't. They simply cannot project power and sustain forces in a general offensive against the south. Quick military response measures by the south will educate the north and Kim Jung Il that lethal provocations will be met with lethal counter-attacks against key North Korean military facilities. This is the Israeli strategy in the Middle East. It works and it needs to be South Korea's strategy on the Korean Peninsula. North Korea is totally isolated in the world today and a policy by the United States of no negotiations and containment, while supporting our South Korean ally in defending itself, is the right approach. Our best hope is that the current sick and ailing Kim Jung Il will be followed by a more pragmatic and open successor, thus opening the door to meaningful negotiations. Until then, containment and lethal counter-attack responses to North Korean aggression should be the allied strategy.

1NC Demining Adv.

South Korea already demining the DMZ.

Landmine and Cluster Munition Monitor, 2009 (“Republic of Korea: Demining” 2008 http://www.the-monitor.org/index.php/publications/display?url=lm/2008/countries/south\_korea.html)

South Korea has undertaken limited demining in the DMZ and CCZ but has concentrated most efforts on demining military bases in rear areas. Clearance operations are conducted by the South Korean army.[[29]](http://www.the-monitor.org/index.php/publications/display?url=lm/2008/countries/south_korea.html" \l "footnote-7613-29) The government said in 2008 there are no civilian demining companies in South Korea but that it is drafting legislation to allow private companies to engage in mine clearance operations on private land.[[30]](http://www.the-monitor.org/index.php/publications/display?url=lm/2008/countries/south_korea.html" \l "footnote-7613-30) Press reports cited the Ministry of National Defense as saying the legislation would be passed in September 2008.[[31]](http://www.the-monitor.org/index.php/publications/display?url=lm/2008/countries/south_korea.html" \l "footnote-7613-31) However, unofficial reports say land speculators are buying mine-contaminated land inside the CCZ, having the land cleared and selling it for a profit.[[32]](http://www.the-monitor.org/index.php/publications/display?url=lm/2008/countries/south_korea.html" \l "footnote-7613-32) In 2007, South Korea reported it spent KOR515 million ($554,377/€404,330) on demining and used around 53,000 soldiers to clear some 169,000m2 between CCZ and Seoul, removing about 2,300 mines.[[33]](http://www.the-monitor.org/index.php/publications/display?url=lm/2008/countries/south_korea.html" \l "footnote-7613-33) South Korea’s 2007 CCW Article 13 report stated that demining work was underway on 14 “military bases or sites,” including three unconfirmed minefields, and that the work would be completed in 2009.[[34]](http://www.the-monitor.org/index.php/publications/display?url=lm/2008/countries/south_korea.html" \l "footnote-7613-34) In March 2008, Mechem deployed mine detection dogs and mini-flails to South Korea under a contract from the US Army Corps.[[35]](http://www.the-monitor.org/index.php/publications/display?url=lm/2008/countries/south_korea.html" \l "footnote-7613-35)

**South Korea Cares for Mine Victims**

Landmine and Cluster Munition Monitor, 2009 (“Republic of Korea: Demining” 2008 http://www.the-monitor.org/index.php/publications/display?url=lm/2008/countries/south\_korea.html)

South Korea has a well-developed healthcare system considered one of the best in the region.[[46]](http://www.the-monitor.org/index.php/publications/display?url=lm/2008/countries/south_korea.html" \l "footnote-7613-46) Civilian mine survivors are covered by the national health insurance system and soldiers injured on duty receive free medical services from the Veterans Hospital.[[47]](http://www.the-monitor.org/index.php/publications/display?url=lm/2008/countries/south_korea.html" \l "footnote-7613-47) Mine survivors and other persons with disabilities can benefit from the “Health Care Development Plan for the 21st Century” of the Ministry of Health and Welfare (MHW). One of the objectives of the plan is to “secure income and increase employment opportunities for the disabled.”[[48]](http://www.the-monitor.org/index.php/publications/display?url=lm/2008/countries/south_korea.html" \l "footnote-7613-48) In 2007, the MHW created part-time employment schemes to increase opportunities for persons with disabilities, but employment rates remained low.[[49]](http://www.the-monitor.org/index.php/publications/display?url=lm/2008/countries/south_korea.html" \l "footnote-7613-49) Within the MoHW, the Disabled Welfare Officer was responsible for strategic planning, physical accessibility and support for physical rehabilitation for persons with disabilities.[[50]](http://www.the-monitor.org/index.php/publications/display?url=lm/2008/countries/south_korea.html" \l "footnote-7613-50) Civilian mine survivors are eligible for government compensation through the State Compensation Act, but few survivors have received benefits through this act. In 2007, one claim in Seoul resulted in approximately $60,000 awarded to the widow of a man killed by a mine in a military zone in Chorwon county (Gangwon-do province) near the DMZ in May 2005.[[51]](http://www.the-monitor.org/index.php/publications/display?url=lm/2008/countries/south_korea.html" \l "footnote-7613-51) Two more claims by men allegedly injured by mines were submitted in 2007 but were still under consideration by the Ministry of National Defense as of May 2008.[[52]](http://www.the-monitor.org/index.php/publications/display?url=lm/2008/countries/south_korea.html" \l "footnote-7613-52) No updates were available on a draft Special Act for Compensation of Mine Victims submitted to the National Congress by the KCBL.[[53]](http://www.the-monitor.org/index.php/publications/display?url=lm/2008/countries/south_korea.html" \l "footnote-7613-53) South Korea has legislation to protect the rights of persons with disabilities and discrimination against persons with disabilities is illegal.[[54]](http://www.the-monitor.org/index.php/publications/display?url=lm/2008/countries/south_korea.html" \l "footnote-7613-54) The National Human Rights Commission received 155 cases of disability-related discrimination in 2007.[[55]](http://www.the-monitor.org/index.php/publications/display?url=lm/2008/countries/south_korea.html" \l "footnote-7613-55) In January 2008, human rights organizations called on the government to reform existing legislation to strengthen and monitor provisions prohibiting discrimination of persons with disabilities in employment. They also called for the creation of a regulating body to oversee service provision to persons with disabilities.[[56]](http://www.the-monitor.org/index.php/publications/display?url=lm/2008/countries/south_korea.html" \l "footnote-7613-56) On 30 March 2007, South Korea signed the UN Convention on Rights of Persons with Disabilities, but not its Optional Protocol. As of 31 July 2008, South Korea had not ratified the convention. On 5–8 September 2007, South Korea hosted a world assembly on disability focussing on the UN Convention; more than 2,000 participants attended.[[57]](http://www.the-monitor.org/index.php/publications/display?url=lm/2008/countries/south_korea.html" \l "footnote-7613-57)

South Korea already demining DMZ.

Yonhap 2009 (Sam Kim, “1,300 land mines cleared from areas bordering N. Korea this year” 12-21-2009, http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/national/2009/12/21/60/0301000000AEN20091221002000315F.HTML)

The South Korean military said Monday it has removed some 1,300 land mines this year from the country's rural areas bordering North Korea, a reminder of the tense 1950-53 Korean War that ended in a truce. In the operations that lasted from April to November, the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) mobilized 3,300 personnel to remove mines from a total of 100,000 square meters of land south of the Demilitarized Zone (DMZ), it said in a release. Since starting the operations in 1999, JCS has cleared 65,000 mines. "It was a rewarding operation as we moved carefully not to disrupt the natural environment of the areas we cleared," Maj. Jeong Heon-min, operation chief, was quoted as saying. Land mines pose a threat to civilians working in remote areas near the DMZ, especially farmers. JCS said it plans to clear 140,000 square meters of land next year. The areas covered this year included Yeoncheon-gun on the west and Goseong-gun on the east. Both abut the military demarcation line with North Korea.    The Koreas remain theoretically at war with each other after their fratricidal war that killed millions of civilians and soldiers on both sides and implicated foreign powers.

1NC Demining Adv. - Impact Turn

Landmines key part of U.S and South Korean military strategy.

New York Times, 1997(Nicholas D. Kristof, “South Korea Extols Some of the Benefits of Land Mines” 9-3-1997, http://www.nytimes.com/1997/09/03/world/south-korea-extols-some-of-the-benefits-of-land-mines.html?)

Military planners say that mines are not the only way to stop invaders, but that the alternatives would be costly and might mean more casualties. One American military study suggested that without the land mines, the United States would need an additional 20,000 or more troops in South Korea to stop a North Korean invasion. Another computer simulation, cited by South Korean officials, estimated that if land mines were not used against a North Korean attack, there would be an additional 2,500 to 3,000 South Korean and American casualties each day of a conflict. ''Land mines are an integral part of our policy against the North Korean military threat,'' said General Park, the Deputy Defense Minister. ''North Korea possesses a large number of tanks and military artillery, and it's imperative to delay North Korean mechanized troops north of Seoul. ''From a military standpoint and from a humanitarian standpoint,'' he argued, ''it is clear that we need to use land mines.''

Landmines Deter Korean War.

New York Times, 1997(Nicholas D. Kristof, “South Korea Extols Some of the Benefits of Land Mines” 9-3-1997, http://www.nytimes.com/1997/09/03/world/south-korea-extols-some-of-the-benefits-of-land-mines.html?)

The reason the Administration favors the continuing use of mines in Korea is that if the usual image associated with land mines is that of Angolan or Cambodian children without legs, here it is a bit different. In South Korea, there are countless land mines, but they are in restricted areas that cause few casualties, and many American troops and South Korean civilians alike feel safer because of the minefields. Indeed, as supporters of mines here see it, land mines in South Korea are virtually a symbol of peace and security. ''Many people talk about the humanitarian aspects of land mines,'' said Lieut. Gen. Park Yong Ok, the Deputy Defense Minister and a fervent defender of the mines. ''Deterrence of war is more humanitarian than anything. If we fail to deter war, a tremendous number of civilians will be killed. And the use of land mines is a very effective way of deterring war.'' It may be very difficult to win approval for the Korea exemption in the negotiations, because the talks -- called the Ottawa process, since Canada is leading the way -- are dominated by countries that are firmly opposed to the mines. Some major mine-producing countries, like Russia, China and North Korea, are not joining the talks and are not expected to adhere to any ban they produce.

Impact is Nuke War

Bloomberg 07-23(Bomi Lim and Bill Varner, “North Korea Warns of Nuclear Response to Naval Exercise” 7-23-2010 http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2010-07-23/north-korea-claims-innocence-over-sinking-of-south-s-ship-won-t-apologize.html)

North Korea said it would counter U.S. and South Korean joint naval exercises with “nuclear deterrence” after the Obama administration said the government in Pyongyang shouldn’t take any provocative steps. North Korea will “legitimately counter with their powerful nuclear deterrence the largest-ever nuclear war exercises to be staged by the U.S. and the South Korean puppet forces,” the National Defense Commission said, according to the Korean Central News Agency. The maneuvers, which involve 20 vessels and 200 aircraft from the U.S. and South Korea, pose a threat to the country’s sovereignty and security, Ri Tong Il, an official with North Korea’s delegation to the [Asean](http://www.aseanregionalforum.org) Security Forum, told reporters in Hanoi yesterday. Ri’s comments came after North Korean Foreign Minister [Pak Ui Chun](http://search.bloomberg.com/search?q=Pak%20Ui%20Chun&site=wnews&client=wnews&proxystylesheet=en10_wnews&output=xml_no_dtd&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&filter=p&getfields=wnnis&sort=date:D:S:d1&partialfields=-wnnis:NOAVSYND&lr=-lang_ja) sat in the same room with Secretary of State [Hillary Clinton](http://search.bloomberg.com/search?q=Hillary%20Clinton&site=wnews&client=wnews&proxystylesheet=wnews&output=xml_no_dtd&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&filter=p&getfields=wnnis&sort=date:D:S:d1&partialfields=-wnnis:NOAVSYND&lr=-lang_ja) in Hanoi for a security meeting of Asia’s largest powers. Clinton condemned North Korea for being “on a campaign of provocative, dangerous behavior,” urging [Kim Jong Il](http://search.bloomberg.com/search?q=Kim%20Jong%20Il&site=wnews&client=wnews&proxystylesheet=wnews&output=xml_no_dtd&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&filter=p&getfields=wnnis&sort=date:D:S:d1&partialfields=-wnnis:NOAVSYND&lr=-lang_ja)’s regime to change. Still, the “door remains open for North Korea,” Clinton later told reporters. “We are willing to meet with them, willing to negotiate, to move toward normal relations” if North Korea commits itself to giving up its nuclear weapons program, she said. U.S. State Department spokesman [Philip J. Crowley](http://search.bloomberg.com/search?q=Philip%20J.%20Crowley&site=wnews&client=wnews&proxystylesheet=wnews&output=xml_no_dtd&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&filter=p&getfields=wnnis&sort=date:D:S:d1&partialfields=-wnnis:NOAVSYND&lr=-lang_ja) said in Washington yesterday that North Korea “would be better served by reflecting on the current situation, not taking any further aggressive actions or provocative steps.” USS George Washington The U.S. said this week it will intensify sanctions against North Korea and conduct military exercises with South Korea in waters surrounding the peninsula. The [USS George Washington](http://gw.ffc.navy.mil/), a nuclear-powered carrier, and three destroyers called into South Korean ports this week in a show of force. “North Korea may very well go ahead with missile launches or even a third nuclear test to show it won’t bend to U.S. pressure,” said [Yang Moo Jin](http://search.bloomberg.com/search?q=Yang%20Moo%20Jin&site=wnews&client=wnews&proxystylesheet=wnews&output=xml_no_dtd&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&filter=p&getfields=wnnis&sort=date:D:S:d1&partialfields=-wnnis:NOAVSYND&lr=-lang_ja), a professor at the University of North Korean Studies in Seoul. “North Korea must have sensed that the U.S. and South Korea are after its regime’s collapse.” Ri said the George Washington’s presence threatened security on the peninsula, which has been divided for more than half a century. Pak maintained the need for a peace treaty to replace a cease-fire, signed in 1953, to guarantee the peninsula’s security, Ri said. “It’s no longer the 19th century with gunboat diplomacy,” Ri said. “It is a new century and the Asian countries are in need of peace and development.” Cheonan Sinking An international panel concluded that the March 26 sinking of the corvette Cheonan was caused by a torpedo fired from a North Korean mini-submarine. The United Nations Security Council condemned the attack, which killed 46 sailors, without naming a culprit. The investigation’s results have been “fabricated,” Ri said, adding that North Korea wouldn’t apologize for the incident as demanded by South Korea. “If anyone should apologize, it should be South Korea, responsible for driving the situation on the Korean peninsula to the brink of an explosion,” Ri said. “We won’t tolerate any attempt to put the blame on us.” North Korea’s economy has been battered by UN sanctions limiting cross-border financial transactions, imposed after its nuclear tests in 2006 and last year. North Korea is willing to return to the so-called six-party talks on its nuclear weapons program “on an equal footing,” Ri said, repeating demands that the sanctions be removed. Japan Role The disarmament talks, also involving China, Japan, Russia, South Korea and the U.S., haven’t convened since December 2008. All members of that forum attended this week’s security meeting in Vietnam. Japan will send four naval officers to the drills, the government’s top spokesman said today. Four officers of Japan’s Maritime Self-Defense Force will board a U.S. ship as observers for the joint military exercise from tomorrow to July 28 in the sea between South Korea and Japan, said [Yoshito Sengoku](http://search.bloomberg.com/search?q=Yoshito%20Sengoku&site=wnews&client=wnews&proxystylesheet=wnews&output=xml_no_dtd&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&filter=p&getfields=wnnis&sort=date:D:S:d1&partialfields=-wnnis:NOAVSYND&lr=-lang_ja), chief cabinet secretary. “It’s important to promote coordination among Japan, U.S. and South Korea,” Sengoku told reporters in Tokyo.
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Removal of landmines reunites the Koreas – Destroys wildlife in the DMZ.

Stars and Stripes 2009(Jon Rabiroff , “Relatively untouched DMZ is home to a number of natural wonders” 10-13-2009 http://www.stripes.com/news/relatively-untouched-dmz-is-home-to-a-number-of-natural-wonders-1.96409)

DEMILITARIZED ZONE, Korea — The water deer nibbled away on the vegetation on the gently sloping bend along the Imjin River, seemingly unaware of the dozen people pointing and staring at it through a field scope from the opposite shoreline. Nearby, the group observed a family of white-naped cranes feeding, something the endangered species does when wintering in the relative solitude of the Demilitarized Zone that divides North and South Korea. While mention of the DMZ conjures images of stone-faced soldiers, barbed-wire fences, guns and guard towers, the area between North and South Korea has remained virtually untouched by humans for more than 55 years. As a result, the DMZ has essentially become a 2.5-mile-wide, 155-mile-long nature park that is home to more than 50 species of mammals, roughly 200 kinds of birds and in excess of 1,000 plant species. Some of the birds and animals that live or visit here are threatened or endangered. Now a movement is under way to protect the natural wonders of the DMZ from perhaps their greatest threat — peace and the reunification of the peninsula. Ecologist Jeon Seon-hee, who regularly leads eco-tours into the area, said the land is a one-of-a-kind treasure, serving as a "green belt" from coast to coast and including a variety of ecosystems — ocean fronts, rivers, wetlands, mountains, valleys and heavily wooded areas. "What I realize from talking with visitors from all over the world is that we are all curious about the ecological features of this area," she said through an interpreter. "This is the kind of natural heritage we should deliver to our next generation." The threat certainly seems remote that the DMZ — surrounded on all sides by soldiers and barbed wire and harboring an estimated 3 million landmines — might someday be filled with highways, railways and apartment buildings. But even though the two Koreas have been technically at war since 1950 — an armistice halted hostilities in 1953 — many South Koreans believe a reunification will come, and some think it will happen sooner rather than later. So, in an odd twist of fate, the biggest threat to this peaceful area would be an official peace. "I hope [the DMZ] would be retained as a conservation area. It would be a shame if it wasn’t," said Richard Widdows, a Purdue University professor spending a year teaching at Seoul National University. "I’m just blown away by the wildlife here," he said on a recent eco-tour. "There are species here you won’t see anywhere else, and certainly not in the numbers that they have here." A number of organizations and individuals are cataloguing the area’s various species, endangered and otherwise, with an eye toward preserving vast tracts of the DMZ if and when Korea is reunited. Jeon, for example, has spent the past five years documenting endangered species she has seen in the western DMZ and the adjacent Civilian Control Zone, a buffer region on the South Korean side of the border. The eco-tours she leads are designed, in part, to garner public support for preserving the DMZ. The rare animals she has spotted include white-tailed sea eagles, cinereous vultures and red-crowned cranes. Experts say Asian black bears, leopards, Amur goral, seals and otters also have been spotted in and around the DMZ in recent years. The wildlife can sometimes provide a welcome distraction to U.S. servicemembers serving in the DMZ. "I don’t think I’ll become a zoologist or anything like that, but I’ve found it very interesting," said Sgt. Frank Murillo, a security escort in the Joint Security Area. He said his strangest encounters have been with musk deer, also known as vampire deer, which many believe are mythical beasts until they see one of the long-fanged creatures face-to-face. In the summer, Murillo said, an area near The Bridge of No Return becomes a nesting area for thousands of egrets and cranes. "It stinks, but it’s really beautiful," he said. Murillo said that while he has yet to see or hear any evidence of it, it is safe to assume that wildlife sometimes end up on the short end in their encounters with landmines. That, he said, is his first thought any time he sees vultures circling overhead. On an observation deck overlooking a guard tower manned by three South Korean soldiers, Jeon watched thousands of birds resting along the glimmering Imjin River in the distance. She said the Civilian Control Zone — where some farming and only a limited number of people are allowed — is already being compromised. "When I used to come here several times per month, and I saw nature, I was comforted by it," she told a group of visitors. "But, if you look at the surroundings of this area, the habitats are rapidly being destroyed." Pointing to rice paddies and ginseng fields carved into hillsides and recently erected military buildings nearby, Jeon said, "Let’s just leave the scenery intact, as it is. "Far away, you can easily see the skyscrapers and the apartment buildings," she said, gesturing to the south. "If North and South Korea were reunited, and this area turns into an area like that … then the birds would not come to this area anymore, and our lives would become dry." Eco-tourist Karen Hamilton of Seattle said she’s "already a little worried." "I hope, like in the United States, where we have kept our park system intact, they would set [the DMZ] aside for animals you couldn’t find anyplace else."

Biodiversity is crucial.

Science Clarified 05-23 (“Biodiversity” 05-23-2010 http://www.scienceclarified.com/As-Bi/Biodiversity.html)

The term biodiversity refers to the wide range of organisms—plants and animals—that exist within any given geographical region. That region may consist of a plot of land no more than a few square meters or yards, a whole continent, or the entire planet. Most commonly, discussions of biodiversity consider all the organisms that interact with each other in an extended geographical region, such as a tropical rain forest or a subtropical desert. Concerns about biodiversity are relatively new. Only during the last quarter of the twentieth century did scientists begin to appreciate the vast number of organisms found on Earth and the complex ways in which they interact with each other and with their environments. Biologists have now discovered and named about 1.7 million distinct species of plants and animals. As many as 50 million species, however, are thought to exist. Biodiversity in the tropics is of special interest since the richness of species found there is so great. According to some estimates, 90 percent of all plant, animal, and insect species exist in tropical regions. At the same time, surveys of organisms in the tropics have been very limited. Those studies that have been conducted provide only a hint of the range of life that may exist there. As an example, one study of a 108-square kilometer (42-square mile) reserve of dry forest in Costa Rica found about 700 plant species, 400 vertebrate species, and 13,000 species of insects. Included among the latter group were 3,140 species of moths and butterflies alone. Human threats to biodiversity One reason for the growing interest in biodiversity is the threat that human activities may pose for plant and animal species. As humans take over more land for agriculture, cities, highways, and other uses, natural habitats are seriously disrupted. Whole populations may be destroyed, upsetting the balance of nature that exists in an area. The loss of a single plant, for example, may result in the loss of animals that depend on that plant for food. The loss of those animals may, in turn, result in the loss of predators who prey on those animals. As human populations grow, the threat to biodiversity will continue to grow with it. And as more people place greater stress on the natural environment, greater will be the loss of resources plant and animal communities need to survive. Why is biodiversity important? Maintaining biodiversity in a region and across the planet is important for a number of reasons. First, some people argue that all species— because they exist—have a right to continue to exist in their own natural habitats, untouched by human development. Second, humans depend on many of the plants and animals that make up an ecological community. For example, one-quarter of all the CONTINUED - NO TEXT REMOVED...
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CONTINUED - NO TEXT REMOVED...

prescription drugs in the United States contain ingredients obtained from plants. And third, humans themselves benefit from the interaction among organisms in a biologically diverse community: plants help clean the water and air, provide oxygen in the atmosphere, and control erosion. "Biodiversity," according to the biologist Peter Raven, "keeps the planet habitable and ecosystems functional." Protection of threatened biodiversity One of the great issues in environmental science today is how biodiversity can be preserved both in specific geographical regions and across the planet. One proposal that has been made involves the use of ecological reserves. Ecological reserves are protected areas established for the preservation of habitats of endangered species, threatened ecological communities, or representative examples of widespread communities. By the end of the 1990s, there were about 7,000 protected areas globally with an area of 651 million hectares (1.6 billion acres). Of this total, about 2,400 sites comprising 379 million hectares (936 million acres) were fully protected and could be considered to be true ecological reserves. Ideally, the design of a national system of ecological reserves would provide for the longer-term protection of all native species and their natural communities including terrestrial (land-dwelling), freshwater, and marine (saltwater) systems. So far, however, no country has put in place a comprehensive system of ecological reserves to fully protect its natural biodiversity. Moreover, in many cases existing reserves are relatively small and are threatened by environmental change, illegal poaching of animals and plants, and tourism. The World Conservation Union, World Resources Institute, and United Nations Environment Program are three important agencies whose purpose is to conserve and protect the world's biodiversity. These agencies have developed the Global Biodiversity Strategy, an international program to help protect plant and animal habitats for this and future generations. Because this program began only in the late 1970s, it is too early to evaluate its success. However, the existence of this comprehensive international effort is encouraging, as is the participation of most of Earth's countries, representing all stages of economic development.

Ext - North Korean Conflict Destroy Econ.

North Korean conflicts destroy world econ.

Market Watch 2010 (Myra P. Saefong “Korea conflict fuels 'overblown' market reaction Equities 'absolutely undervalued,' say analysts” 06-25-2010, http://www.marketwatch.com/story/korean-conflict-fuels-overblown-market-reaction-2010-05-25)

TOKYO (MarketWatch) -- South Korea's benchmark Kospi dropped nearly 6% last week but may soon show signs of recovery, along with the nation's currency, as analysts see the market's concerns over conflict with North Korea and potential spread of European debt troubles as overdone. "The Kospi and the [won] have seen significant sell-offs over the past several days on recent signs of increased contagion risk from the fiscal debt woes facing several weak [European Union] countries, impacting global credit markets and global growth, and growing geopolitical tension," analysts at Credit Suisse said in a note to clients Wednesday. The benchmark Kospi has already logged declines in five out of the previous eight sessions and lost nearly 6% last week. On Wednesday in Seoul, the index opened higher but moved 0.2% lower in late morning trading. The South Korean won has also weakened, with the U.S. dollar gaining nearly 4% against the won on Tuesday alone. In Wednesday morning trade, however, the won regained some lost ground with the greenback buying 1,251.90 won, down from 1,256.65 won Tuesday afternoon in Seoul. The South Korean government sought to talk up the currency Wednesday, saying it would take aggressive steps to stabilize the won, saying its recent fall was "excessive." "Sovereign risks are surfacing with the South Korean government's announcement confirming North Korea is responsible for the attack on the Cheonan naval chip," analysts at Hyundai Securities said in a research note Tuesday. "Past cases show, however, the new development will have a limited impact." On Monday, Republic of Korea President Lee Myung-bak announced a suspension of trade ties with the North after a multinational team of investigators concluded earlier that a torpedo fired by a North Korean submarine sank one of Seoul's naval ships on March 26, resulting in the loss of 46 South Korean lives. "The South Korea foreign ministry urged a 'stern' global response, prompting a threat of 'all out war' from the North," Erik Lueth, an analyst at the Royal Bank of Scotland, said in Tuesday note to clients. "The revelations have had a major impact on Korean financial markets," he said. But "the financial market response is overblown." Doubtful impact Many analysts agreed. "It seems that the market is overreacting to concerns over European economic slowdown," said analysts at Hyundai Securities. "As for the intrinsic risk factor of the Korean market, its impact will be temporary and limited, as long as there are no additional armed conflicts between the two Koreas." And Lueth doesn't expect the conflict to worsen.

Topicality - South Korea Demining

A. Interpretation - South Korea boundary excludes DMZ.

Mongbay 2005(Mongbay “South Korea – Geography” 2005 http://www.mongabay.com/reference/country\_studies/south-korea/GEOGRAPHY.html)

The Korean Peninsula extends for about 1,000 kilometers southward from the northeast part of the Asian continental landmass. The Japanese islands of Honshu and Kyushu are located some 200 kilometers to the southeast across the Korea Strait; the Shandong Peninsula of China lies 190 kilometers to the west. The west coast of the peninsula is bordered by the Korea Bay to the north and the Yellow Sea to the south; the east coast is bordered by the Sea of Japan (known in Korea as the East Sea). The 8,640- kilometer coastline is highly indented. Some 3,579 islands lie adjacent to the peninsula. Most of them are found along the south and west coasts. The northern land border of the Korean Peninsula is formed by the Yalu and Tumen rivers, which separate Korea from the provinces of Jilin and Liaoning in China. The original border between the two Korean states was the thirty-eighth parallel of atitude. After the Korean War, the Demilitarized Zone (DMZ) formed the boundary between the two. The DMZ is a heavily guarded, 4,000-meter-wide strip of land that runs along the line of cease-fire, the Demarcation Line, from the east to the west coasts for a distance of 241 kilometers (238 kilometers of that line form the land boundary with North Korea). The total land area of the peninsula, including the islands, is 220,847 square kilometers. Some 44.6 percent (98,477 square kilometers) of this total, excluding the area within the DMZ, constitutes the territory of the Republic of Korea. The combined territories of North Korea and South Korea are about the same size as the state of Minnesota. South Korea alone is about the size of Portugal or Hungary, and is slightly larger than the state of Indiana. The largest island, Cheju, lies off the southwest corner of the peninsula and has a land area of 1,825 square kilometers. Other important islands include Ullung in the Sea of Japan and Kanghwa Island at the mouth of the Han River. Although the eastern coastline of South Korea is generally unindented, the southern and western coasts are jagged and irregular. The difference is caused by the fact that the eastern coast is gradually rising, while the southern and western coasts are subsiding. Lacking formidable land or sea barriers along its borders and occupying a central position among East Asian nations, the Korean Peninsula has served as a cultural bridge between the mainland and the Japanese archipelago. Korea contributed greatly to the development of Japan by transmitting both Indian Buddhist and Chinese Confucian culture, art, and religion. At the same time, Korea's exposed geographical position left it vulnerable to invasion by its stronger neighbors. When, in the late nineteenth century, British statesman Lord George Curzon described Korea as a "sort of political Tom Tiddler's ground between China, Russia, and Japan," he was describing a situation that had prevailed for several millennia, as would be tragically apparent during the twentieth century.

B. Violation - The Aff plan withdraws landmines, which are located in the DMZ, and therefore not located in nation state of South Korea.

C. Voting Issue –

1. Limits – Including topic areas not included under the resolution, allows the Aff to withdraw any form of “military presence” from anywhere in the world. This explodes the literature base.

2. Negative Ground – Including non-topic areas avoids core negative disads and counter-plans, and makes it impossible to adequately research the topic.

3. Education – Limiting the Aff to only the 6 topic countries allows for a more in depth research and learning within each of the countries. Better for education.

1NC Prostitution Adv.

Prostitution is not sex trafficking – eliminating prostitution will not solve for the subordination of women.

Cheng 2004**(Sealing Cheng is a** Rockefeller post-doctoral fellow in the Program for the Study of Sexuality, Gender, Health, and Human Rights at Columbia University, New York. She is an anthropologist who has been researching on prostitution-related issues in Korea since 1998*.* **“Korean sex trade 'victims' strike for rights,”** <http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Korea/FL22Dg01.html>**)**

The Sex Trade Prevention Act, at first glance, looks like a welcome departure from the old law that penalized all women in prostitution as "fallen women". It offers protection for "victims" and penalizes all involvement in the sex trade. While clients, brothel owners, and pimps can get jail sentences and fines, "victims" are entitled to shelter, health services, vocational training, and even alternative-business start-up funds. This all sounds good. What could be so wrong with the new law that those whom it intends to protect are protesting so vehemently against it? What could they possibly object to? They object to the loss of their livelihoods. They object to police crackdowns that are forcing them to work clandestinely, exposing them to great danger, and threatening their well-being and that of their families (sex workers have families too). They object to being arrested along with clients, brothel owners and pimps. For the sex workers, the new law is in effect an instrument of harassment. The law protects only women who want to leave the sex trade but penalizes those who want to stay. Only "victims" who have been coerced into the sex trade are eligible for services. Yet those who cannot prove their victimhood, such as independent sex workers, could be charged with violating the law, and penalized. The underlying assumption of the law, therefore, is wrong. **Not all women in the sex trade are "victims" who want to be rescued from the brothels. That they want to be free from exploitation and abuse does not mean that they want to be out of a job.** Instead, this law is subjecting them to violence (through police harassment) by assuming that women could be forced out of prostitution. The principles of human rights demand that governments do no harm to a person and take extra care to promote the rights of people who are already marginalized. South Korean sex workers are now publicly demanding what other workers take for granted: their right to a livelihood. Their constitutional right as citizens to pursue happiness with dignity and worth as human beings. And with that, the recognition of sex work as a legitimate form of work. To the sex workers, the current attempts of the government and women's organizations to eradicate prostitution are in effect destroying their lives. Their public petition eloquently declares: We feel only forsaken by the good-for-show policy of the Ministry of Gender Equality that has no correspondence with our realities. Those who are wealthy and in lack of nothing seem not even interested in how difficult and urgent our immediate realities are. They are drowned in their own illusion, thinking that they are helping us but in effect they have pushed us to this cold and bleak place. Why are the Korean government and women's organizations ignoring the voices of the sex workers? Why the rush to eradicate prostitution after years of tolerance of this illegal trade? The South Korean government has been under relentless pressure from the United States to demonstrate its commitment to combat trafficking in women and girls. As part of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) passed in 2000, the US State Department publishes the yearly Trafficking in Persons Report to monitor world efforts to combat trafficking. In 2001, it identified South Korea along with other lowest-ranking countries such as Sudan and Myanmar. This represented a huge international embarrassment to the South Korean government, which has taken pride as a regional leader in democracy. (Persistent violations can carry sanctions by the US.) The South Korean government thus set out to prove its anti-trafficking commitments. While "trafficking" refers to the use of force, fraud, and deception in exploiting labor in all sectors, the US administration of President George W Bush has implemented its anti-trafficking policy with a preoccupation with prostitution. In this context, a momentous shift from tolerance to "zero-tolerance" in the Korean government's approach to prostitution followed, with a big push from women's organizations. The fervor of women's organizations to eradicate prostitution is rooted in the conviction that prostitution is the key issue to women's subordination in South Korea. They believe that prostitution is a form of male violence against women, and that no woman engages in prostitution voluntarily. For well over a month, the hunger strike and mass protests clearly have disproved this last point - that no one does it voluntarily. Women in sex work do experience violence and discrimination, but this is because they are marginalized and denied the rights that everyone should enjoy. Two fires in 2000 and 2002 killed 20 sex workers who had been locked inside their workplaces by their employers. These tragedies should never have been allowed to happen. But it would be a mistake to extrapolate from these bad experiences to imply that all sex work is violence. The most visible sex workers are often the hardest hit by state persecution in times of a moral panic against prostitution. The thousands of protesting sex workers come from red-light districts all over South Korea, the chief targets of police raids and arrests. Yet it is no news that some teenage girls, university students, and housewives have engaged in the exchange of sex for material rewards, a phenomenon exclusive neither to prostitution nor to Korea. The bold suggestion in their petition, therefore, is a protest not only against their persecution but also their stigmatization: "Do you not think that strategic marriages among the families of large corporations (*chaebol*) are prostitution?" Exploitation is a problem faced by all women, not just prostitutes, and it needs to be tackled at its roots - in the family, the workplace and schools; class inequalities and restrictive ideas about sexuality also need to be addressed, among other issues. Women's subordination and their impeded access to valuable resources are entrenched in these social institutions. Prostitution is only an expression, not the cause, of such inequalities. An effective intervention must be based on sincere interactions with the very women whom law enforcement and women's organizations are trying to assist. Those who have good intentions must realize that **dealing with violence in the sex trade does not mean eradicating prostitution. Prostitution is not identical to violence or sex trafficking.**

1NC Prostitution Adv.

Status quo solves – militarized prostitution in South Korea dropping.

Rowland9-26-08(Ashley, Stars and Stripes graduated from the University of Alabama, and worked as a reporter at the Gainesville Sun and the Chattanooga Times Free Press before coming to Stars and Stripes’ Seoul bureau in April 2007. She is currently working on a master’s degree in international relations at Troy University, "Prostitution crimes down among troops in S. Korea," <http://www.stripes.com/news/prostitution-crimes-down-among-troops-in-s-korea-1.83440>)

As South Korea continues a nationwide prostitution crackdown, a U.S. Forces Korea official said this week that the number of American troops visiting brothels in South Korea has dropped in recent years and is now "very low." Chuck Johnson, action officer for USFK’s Prostitution and Human Trafficking Working Group, said U.S. troops’ participation in prostitution was "a major issue" when the group formed five years ago. Now, about five servicemembers a year get into trouble for prostitution-related crimes, and the lack of business has forced some brothels outside U.S. military installations to close, he said. Johnson said educating troops about human trafficking is working. Servicemembers are required to complete computer-based training on prostitution before or when they arrive in South Korea, and additional training is required twice a year while they’re on the peninsula. "It’s a sustained, continuous operation," he said. South Korean police began a nationwide, three-month crackdown on prostitution in July. Police said earlier this month they planned to begin raiding brothels in the "glass house" area near Yongsan Station and on Itaewon’s infamous Hooker Hill in mid-September. Both locations are within walking distance of Yongsan Garrison, home to the headquarters for the U.S. military in South Korea.

Women are oppressed by Capitalism – patriarchy isn’t the root cause.

Sociology Books 2010(“Marxist Feminism,” <http://sociologyindex.com/marxist_feminism.htm>)

Marxist Feminism is a form of **feminism** which believes that women's oppression is a symptom of a more fundamental form of oppression. Marxist Feminism postulates that women are not oppressed by men or by sexism, but by capitalism itself. If all women are to be liberated, capitalism must be replaced with **socialism**. Marxist feminists believe that private property leads to economic inequality and negetive social relations between men and women. According to Marxist feminism theory capitalism should be replaced with socialism in order to achieve equality and positive social relations between men and women. . In Frederick Engels' (1820-1895) writing, women's oppression originated with the development of private property and of regulated family and marital relationships. Men's control of economic resources develops with settled society and the development of separate spheres of life for the two sexes. In capitalist societies, women become segregated into the domestic sphere and men into the outer world of paid work. Economic and social inequality between the sexes is increased and women's' subordination in marriage, the family and in society in general is intensified. Engels assumed that socialist revolution, through which the means of production would become common property, would result in the development of equal access to paid work for both men and women and the consequent disappearance of gendered inequality between the sexes.

Utilitarian calculations is the highest moral standing.

Mill 1863(John Stuart, "Utilitarianism," <http://www.utilitarianism.com/mill2.htm>)

Though it is only in a very imperfect state of the world's arrangements that any one can best serve the happiness of others by the absolute sacrifice of his own, yet so long as the world is in that imperfect state, I fully acknowledge that the readiness to make such a sacrifice is the highest virtue which can be found in man. I will add, that in this condition the world, paradoxical as the assertion may be, the conscious ability to do without happiness gives the best prospect of realising, such happiness as is attainable. For nothing except that consciousness can raise a person above the chances of life, by making him feel that, let fate and fortune do their worst, they have not power to subdue him: which, once felt, frees him from excess of anxiety concerning the evils of life, and enables him, like many a Stoic in the worst times of the Roman Empire, to cultivate in tranquillity the sources of satisfaction accessible to him, without concerning himself about the uncertainty of their duration, any more than about their inevitable end. Meanwhile, let utilitarians never cease to claim the morality of self devotion as a possession which belongs by as good a right to them, as either to the Stoic or to the Transcendentalist. The utilitarian morality does recognise in human beings the power of sacrificing their own greatest good for the good of others. It only refuses to admit that the sacrifice is itself a good. A sacrifice which does not increase, or tend to increase, the sum total of happiness, it considers as wasted. The only self-renunciation which it applauds, is devotion to the happiness, or to some of the means of happiness, of others; either of mankind collectively, or of individuals within the limits imposed by the collective interests of mankind. I must again repeat, what the assailants of utilitarianism seldom have the justice to acknowledge, that the happiness which forms the utilitarian standard of what is right in conduct, is not the agent's own happiness, but that of all concerned. As between his own happiness and that of others, utilitarianism requires him to be as strictly impartial as a disinterested and benevolent spectator. In the golden rule of Jesus of Nazareth, we read the complete spirit of the ethics of utility. To do as you would be done by, and to love your neighbour as yourself, constitute the ideal perfection of utilitarian morality. As the means of making the nearest approach to this ideal, utility would enjoin, first, that laws and social arrangements should place the happiness, or (as speaking practically it may be called) the interest, of every individual, as nearly as possible in harmony with the interest of the whole; and secondly, that education and opinion, which have so vast a power over human character, should so use that power as to establish in the mind of every individual an indissoluble association between his own happiness and the good of the whole; especially between his own happiness and the practice of such modes of conduct, negative and positive, as regard for the universal happiness prescribes; so that not only he may be unable to conceive the possibility of happiness to himself, consistently with conduct opposed to the general good, but also that a direct impulse to promote the general good may be in every individual one of the habitual motives of action, and the sentiments connected therewith may fill a large and prominent place in every human being's sentient existence. If the, impugners of the utilitarian morality represented it to their own minds in this its, true character, I know not what recommendation possessed by any other morality they could possibly affirm to be wanting to it; what more beautiful or more exalted developments of human nature any other ethical system can be supposed to foster, or what springs of action, not accessible to the utilitarian, such systems rely on for giving effect to their mandates.
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Speaking for the oppressed only cements their oppression.

Alcoff 1991(Linda Martin, Department of Philosophy; Syracuse University, This was published in *Cultural Critique* (Winter 1991-92), pp. 5-32; revised and reprinted in Who Can Speak? Authority and Critical Identity edited by Judith Roof and Robyn Wiegman, University of Illinois Press, 1996; and in Feminist Nightmares: Women at Odds edited by Susan Weisser and Jennifer Fleischner, (New York: New York University Press, 1994); and also in Racism and Sexism: Differences and Connections eds. David Blumenfeld and Linda Bell, Rowman and Littlefield, 1995. “The Problem of Speaking for Others,” <http://www.alcoff.com/content/speaothers.html>)

The recognition that there is a problem in speaking for others has followed from the widespread acceptance of two claims. First, there has been a growing awareness that where one speaks from affects both the meaning and truth of what one says, and thus that one cannot assume an ability to transcend her location. In other words, a speaker's location (which I take here to refer to her social location or social identity) has an epistemically significant impact on that speaker's claims, and can serve either to authorize or dis-authorize one's speech. The creation of Women's Studies and African American Studies departments were founded on this very belief: that both the study of and the advocacy for the oppressed must come to be done principally by the oppressed themselves, and that we must finally acknowledge that systematic divergences in social location between speakers and those spoken for will have a significant effect on the content of what is said. The unspoken premise here is simply that a speaker's location is epistemically salient. I shall explore this issue further in the next section. The second claim holds that not only is location epistemically salient, but certain privileged locations are discursively dangerous.[5](http://www.alcoff.com/content/speaothers.html#footnote5) In particular, the practice of privileged persons speaking for or on behalf of less privileged persons has actually resulted (in many cases) in increasing or reenforcing the oppression of the group spoken for. This was part of the argument made against Anne Cameron's speaking for Native women: Cameron's intentions were never in question, but the effects of her writing were argued to be harmful to the needs of Native authors because it is Cameron rather than they who will be listened to and whose books will be bought by readers interested in Native women. Persons from dominant groups who speak for others are often treated as authenticating presences that confer legitimacy and credibility on the demands of subjugated speakers; such speaking for others does nothing to disrupt the discursive hierarchies that operate in public spaces. For this reason, the work of privileged authors who speak on behalf of the oppressed is becoming increasingly criticized by members of those oppressed groups themselves.[6](http://www.alcoff.com/content/speaothers.html#footnote6)

The Aff ignores the reality of female violence – their authors promote political interests through bias.

Pizzey et al. 2k(Erin Pizzey, J.R. Shackleton, Peter Urwin, CIVITAS: Institute for the Study of Civil Society, London "Women or Men - Who Are the Victims?," pp. viii, <http://www.civitas.org.uk/pdf/cs09.pdf>)

Erin Pizzey became famous in the 1970s as the founder of a refuge for women escaping from their violent male partners. Initially she was embraced by the ultra-feminists of that time, but when she pointed out in a public lecture that 62 of the first 100 women who came into the refuge were as violent as the men they had left, she was denounced. Erin Pizzey had taken her stand against violence and in favour of justice for all, but she found that the ultra-feminists did not aspire to equal justice. Her essay is a powerful, autobiographical tale of how a movement which initially sought fair treatment for all was captured by extremists who wanted preferments for the few. The strategy of ultra-feminists was to define women as a victim group oppressed by men. But for the strategy to succeed, no exceptions could be admitted and, consequently, any evidence which called into question the victim status of women had to be suppressed. Erin Pizzey’s account shows, not only how evidence of female violence was disregarded, but also how the prevalence of female child abuse has been neglected. Ultra-feminists sought victim status because it is a politically useful means of gaining preferential treatment and, perhaps, cash compensation. Throughout history there have always been groups seeking to turn the powers of government to their own advantage. Today, they frequently call for ‘rights’, but preferential public policies should be sharply distinguished from the traditional universal rights which give everyone a chance of success; the rights demanded by self-defined victim groups are better understood as legally sanctioned privileges which have more in common with the preferments awarded by pre-democracy monarchs to their favourites.

South Korean government relies on prostitution for economic support

NYT January 7, 2009 (Choe Sang-Hun "Ex-Prostitutes Say South Korea and U.S. Enabled Sex Trade Near Bases," <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/01/08/world/asia/08korea.html?_r=3&pagewanted=all>)

Now, a group of former prostitutes in South Korea have accused some of their country’s former leaders of a different kind of abuse: encouraging them to have sex with the American soldiers who protected South Korea from North Korea. They also accuse past South Korean governments, and the United States military, of taking a direct hand in the sex trade from the 1960s through the 1980s, working together to build a testing and treatment system to ensure that prostitutes were disease-free for American troops. While the women have made no claims that they were coerced into prostitution by South Korean or American officials during those years, they accuse successive Korean governments of hypocrisy in calling for reparations from Japan while refusing to take a hard look at South Korea’s own history. “Our government was one big pimp for the U.S. military,” one of the women, Kim Ae-ran, 58, said in a recent interview. Scholars on the issue say that the South Korean government was motivated in part by fears that the American military would leave, and that it wanted to do whatever it could to prevent that. But the women suggest that the government also viewed them as commodities to be used to shore up the country’s struggling economy in the decades after the Korean War. They say the government not only sponsored classes for them in basic English and etiquette — meant to help them sell themselves more effectively — but also sent bureaucrats to praise them for earning dollars when South Korea was desperate for foreign currency. “They urged us to sell as much as possible to the G.I.’s, praising us as ‘dollar-earning patriots,’ ” Ms. Kim said. The United States military, the scholars say, became involved in attempts to regulate the trade in so-called camp towns surrounding the bases because of worries about sexually transmitted diseases.

Ext - Status Quo Solves

South Korea’s zero tolerance policy is cracking down on militarized prostitution.

Army Times 04-26-10 (William H. McMichael - Staff writer, "Lawmaker demands Korea prostitution crackdown," <http://www.armytimes.com/news/2010/04/military_korea_womenabuse_042310w/>)

“Close government scrutiny of the juicy bars is lacking,” Smith wrote. “Officials of Korean government and police agencies said they suspect prostitution occurs inside juicy bars, but none said their agency has primary responsibility for addressing the problem.” Smith, who co-chairs the U.S. Congressional Caucus on Human Trafficking, is re-introducing legislation, first proposed in 2005, that would create a new assistant defense secretary for trafficking issues to ensure greater oversight of the ongoing problem, according to his Washington staff. The treatment of the young women — many of them foreigners attracted by the promise of good money who end up forced into slave-like conditions that include forced prostitution — was highlighted in a 2002 Military Times investigation. U.S. Forces Korea insists that it keeps a close eye on the nightclubs near U.S. bases and works with Korean National Police to enforce the USFK regulation that bans U.S. service members from frequenting “houses of prostitution.” “USFK has a zero-tolerance policy and aggressively investigates reports” of prostitution and human trafficking, Army Col. Jane Crichton, spokeswoman for the command, said in a statement. “Any establishment taking part in those criminal activities is referred to the Armed Forces Disciplinary Control Board, which has the authority to place the venue off limits to USFK military and civilian personnel, to include invited contractors, after a full hearing.” Fifty-six establishments currently are off limits because of prostitution and trafficking issues; 45 are near Seoul’s Itaewon commercial district, which is heavily frequented by U.S. military personnel, according to David Oten, a USFK spokesman.

1NC South Korea Economy Adv.

1. South Korean economy improving in the status quo

Letzing, MarketWatch reporter, 2010 [John, “South Korea Economy Grows 1.8% in First Quarter Economic Report,” 4-26, http://www.marketwatch.com/story/south-korea-economy-grows-18-in-first-quarter-2010-04-26]

South Korea's real gross domestic product grew 1.8% during the first quarter of this year, propelled by an increase in manufacturing, according to data published Tuesday by the Bank of Korea. The BOK said in a statement that the country's manufacturing sector "shifted to a positive growth rate of 3.6%," due mainly to an upturn in electrical and electronic equipment manufacturing. The quarter-on-quarter expansion was faster than the fourth quarter's 0.2% growth and managed to beat the BOK's 1.6% forecast, issued earlier this month. Compared to the first quarter of 2009, inflation-adjusted GDP rose 7.8%. The central bank also raised its full-year forecast for the economy, predicting 5.2% growth for 2010, compared to a previous 4.6% expansion forecast. Details Export of goods -- key for Korea's trade-focused economy -- grew 3.4%, thanks to an upswing in exports of cars and semiconductors, among other items, the central bank said. Import of goods rose 5.4%, according to the data. The construction sector rose 1.6%, while services rose 1.5%, due partly to growth in transport and storage. Private consumption rose slightly in the first quarter, by 0.6%, the BOK said, while government consumption rose 5.7%, "with a boost in social-security expenditure."

2. Withdrawal would lead to loss of US economic influence in Asia

Cha and Kang, D. S. Song-Korea Foundation Chair in Asian Studies and Government and Professor at the University of Southern California, 2003 [Victor and David, “The Korea Crisis,” May/June, http://www.jstor.org/stable/3183619?seq=1]

"The United States Should Pull Its Troops Out of an Ungrateful South Korea” Not yet. Massive demonstrations, Molotov cocktails hurled into U.S. bases, and American soldiers stabbed on the streets of Seoul have stoked anger in Congress and on the op-ed pages of major newspapers about South Korea. As North Korea appears on the nuclear brink, Americans are puzzled by the groundswell of anti-Americanism. They cringe at a younger generation of Koreans who tell CBS television’s investigative program 60 Minutes that Bush is more threatening than Kim, and they worry about reports that South Korea’s new president, Roh Moo-hyun, was avowedly anti-American in his younger days. Most Koreans have complicated feelings about the United States. Some of them are anti-American, to be sure, but many are grateful. South Korea has historically been one of the strongest allies of the United States. Yet it would be naive to dismiss the concerns of South Koreans about U.S. policy and the continued presence of U.S. forces as merely emotional. Imagine, for example, how Washingtonians might feel about the concrete economic impact of thousands of foreign soldiers monopolizing prime real estate downtown in the nation’s capital, as U.S. forces do in Seoul. But hasty withdrawal of US forces is hardly the answer to such trans-Pacific anxiety, particularly as the U.S.-South Korean alliance enters uncharted territory. The North Koreans would claim victory, and the United States would lose influence in one of the most dynamic economic regions in the world-- an outcome it neither wants nor can afford. In the long term, such a withdrawal would also pave the way for Chinese regional dominance. Some South Koreans might welcome a larger role for China-a romantic and uninformed notion at best. Betting on China, after all, did not make South Korea the 12th largest economy and one of the most vibrant liberal democracies in the world. The alternatives to the alliance are not appealing to either South Koreans or Americans. Seoul would have to boost its relatively low level of defense spending (which, at roughly 3 percent of gross domestic product, is less than that of Israel and Saudi Arabia, for example). Washington would run the risk of its military presence across East Asia, as a U.S. withdrawal from the peninsula raised questions about the raison d’être for keeping its troops in Japan. A revision in the U.S. military presence in Korea is likely within the next five years, but withdrawal of that presence and abrogation of its alliance are not.

1NC South Korea Economy Adv.

3. US withdrawal destroys Korean economy—empirical proof

Moon, chair of Asian Studies at Wellesley College, 1997 [Katharine Hyung-Sun, “Sex Among Allies: Military Prostitution in U.S./Korea Relations”]

Washington’s systematic calculations of troop reduction in Korea generated into social, economic, and political disarray and tensions for Koreans and Americans in the kijich’on areas. With the reduction of U.S. forces by 20,000 (7th ID), military units were disbanded and reorganized, and the remaining troops were redeployed. The 2d Infantry Division (2d ID), whose home had been in the Munsan/Yiingiugol region, moved to Tongduch'on to occupy the camps left behind by the 7th Division, while camptowns in that region were virtually shut down. Together with the flux of U.S. soldiers, Koreans helped reshape kijich’on commerce and social life. Club owners, prostitutes, and others moved away from areas being deserted by the troops to those where the troops were concentrated. Officials from both the U.S. military authorities and the ROK government agreed that [t]he drawdown of U.S. forces introduced new elements of tension into traditionally friendly relationships. Accompanying base closures and restationing of U.S. Forces resulted in widespread dislocations among Koreans living in villages adjacent to U.S. bases . . . and resulted in increased competition among bar owners, “business girls,” and merchants.” (The above appears in capital letters in the original document.) The withdrawal of U.S. troops caused economic havoc for the thousands of Korean nationals dependent on U.S. bases for jobs and income. The Korea Herald reported that by June 1971, 6,000 Koreans (out of a total of 32,000) employed at various U.S. installations were to be laid off.” Real estate prices in most camptown regions sank with the rise in the Korean residents’ insecurity about the future of the U.S. military presence in their towns.” The camptown businesses, in particular, were severely hit. According to one official of the Korea Special Tourist Association,” “[t]he withdrawal put over 100 clubs out of business. Many of these people just threw away [abandoned] their establishments and left the area because there was no one to sell them to."“ Newspapers reported that “[b]ar owners who used to clear $200 to $300 a night now [following the withdrawal] eke out a living on $4 to $5.” Prostitutes also suffered economic losses and geographical dislocation. The village of Yéngjugol, which in the summer of 1970 had “boasted a total of over 2,200 ‘entertainers’ who catered to the needs and wants of about 18,000 soldiers from the 2nd Inf. Div. and other units in the area,” marked a mere 200 women remaining in July 1971.‘° Hundreds moved to camptowns in Seoul (lt’aew6n), Osan, and Tongduch’6n. “Others . . . quietly slipped back into their families and [went] to work as taxi drivers, beauty shop operators, or secretaries.”“ The Korean press reported that “[t]he business slump has hit the Korean girls catering to the GI’s. They number about 5,000. Up until last September, their earnings averaged about W100,000 a month per person. In recent months, the figure dropped to W5,000 to W7,000.”

4. China is more important to the Korean economy than the US

Gaulier, PhD on economic integration and real convergences, research associate with the CEPII, 2007 [Guillaume, “China’s Integration in East Asia: Production Sharing, FDI & High-Tech Trade,” http://www.economieinternationale.fr/anglaisgraph/workpap/pdf/2005/wp05-09.pdf]

Since 1980, China’s economy has grown at the rate of 9% a year and its foreign trade has expanded at the pace of almost 15% a year. Its share in world trade rose from less than 1% to about 5% in 20023. The emergence of China as a great economic and trade power is bringing far reaching changes in the world economy and in international economic relations. China’s now holds large world market shares in traditional industries (accounting for about one third of world exports in leather and shoes, one fifth in clothing), but is also rapidly enlarging its shares in electrical and electronic exports, the fastest growing segments of world trade. In 2002 China recorded one fifth of world exports of consumer electronics and of domestic appliance. For East Asian countries, China has become a major partner, their first partner in the region. In 2003, for Japan, China was the second export market, behind the US, and its first supplier. For South- Korea, China was the first export market and its second supplier behind the US. In 2003 and 2004, the accelerated increase of China’s import demand (+40% and 37% respectively) has been the engine of economic growth in East Asia. The aim of the paper is to help understand how China has achieved such outstanding trade performance and to bring to the fore the factors underlying China’s competitiveness in world markets. It shows China’s involvement in the international segmentation of production processes and its integration in Asian production networks are at the core of its rapid trade expansion.

Ext – Status quo Solves

South Korean economy improving—no recession

BBC 2009 [“S Korea Avoids Entering Recession,” 4-24, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/business/8015918.stm]

South Korea has narrowly avoided entering recession after its economy grew by 0.1% between January and March compared with the last quarter of 2008. The growth, which followed a 5.1% fall between October and December, came as the government started spending a $37bn (£25bn) economic stimulus plan. The central bank has also moved to lift the economy through a series of interest rate cuts since October. However, first quarter economic output was still 4.3% lower than a year ago. Construction spending - the key beneficiary of the government's stimulus action - rose at its fastest quarterly rate in 16 years between January and March. Domestic consumption also rose, while exports fell. The South Korean economy was last in recession in 1998. A country is generally considered to be in recession following two consecutive quarters of economic contraction. "The economy is in much better shape than feared earlier, and we may see a faster recovery than expected," said Kim Jae-eun, economist at Hana Daetoo Securities.

South Korean government stimulating the economy in the squo

Wall Street Journal 2009 [In-Soo Nam, “South Korean Economy Avoids Recession, Grows 0.1%,” 4-24, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB124053088380050309.html]

South Korea's central bank said Friday the country's economy averted a recession in the first quarter of this year on unprecedented interest-rate cuts and government spending. Gross domestic product rose a seasonally adjusted 0.1% in the January-March period from the fourth quarter of 2008, when the economy shrank 5.1% from the earlier quarter, the Bank of Korea said. Some economists had forecast the economy would continue to contract in the first quarter, slipping into its first recession in more than a decade. Asia's fourth-largest economy shrank 4.3% in the first quarter from the same period in 2008, after contracting 3.4% on year in the final quarter of last year, the BOK said. The first-quarter performance was in line with the median 0.1% on-quarter growth -- and 4.5% on-year decline -- forecast by economists polled by Dow Jones Newswires. The first-quarter results, however, came below the BOK's initial estimate. The central bank had said early this month GDP likely grew a seasonally adjusted 0.2% on quarter but shrank 4.2% on year. For all of 2009, the export-dependent economy is expected to contract 2.4% after growing 2.2% in 2008, the BOK said. The government has unveiled a series of measures to boost the economy, including a 28.9 trillion won ($21.3 billion) stimulus package announced last month. Earlier this month, the central bank kept its benchmark interest rate unchanged at an all-time low of 2.00% for a second straight month amid some signs the economy is improving. The BOK had slashed its base rate by 3.25 percentage points since October to prop up the $1 trillion economy.

Ext – China Solves

**China has a larger stake in South Korea’s economy than the US**

Gaulier, PhD on economic integration and real convergences, research associate with the CEPII, 2007 [Guillaume, “China’s Integration in East Asia: Production Sharing, FDI & High-Tech Trade,” http://www.economieinternationale.fr/anglaisgraph/workpap/pdf/2005/wp05-09.pdf]

Japanese FDI in China (like in ASEAN\* countries) is cost reduction (*Fung et alii, 2003; Masuyama, 2004*). Japanese foreign affiliates in China export more than half of their production. The strategy of Japanese firms has evolved as their affiliates have strengthened their links with local firms and increased local procurements (vs. imports). However, Japanese firms tend to lag behind other foreign investors and to face strong competition both from other foreign affiliates and from the local producers in the domestic market. For South Korean firms, China has overtaken the US as the first host country for FDI in 2001. In a first stage, South Korean investment in China has been driven by cost considerations and has been mostly export-oriented. However in the late nineties, a new wave of FDI has been driven by large corporations (Chaebols) aimed at China’s domestic market. The recent rise of South Korean FDI in relatively capital and technology intensive industries and in capital goods has raised the fear that the South Korean manufacturing industry may be facing the risk of hollowing out, as it has happened in Taiwan (*Lee and Kim, 2004*). Taiwanese investment in China has been export oriented, concentrated in labor-intensive industries, and led by small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs). However, recent trends show an evolution towards larger and more technology and capital intensive projects. In electronic industries, Taiwanese firms have extensively relocated their production in China. In 2002, almost half of Taiwan’s information technology products are produced in the mainland (*Fung et alii, 2003*).

Link - W/Drawal = SK/China Alliance

WITHDRAWAL OF U.S. TROOPS FROM SOUTH KOREA WOULD ENCOURAGE THE ROK TO FORGE AN ALLIANCE WITH CHINA

Cummings 5-3-04(Colonel John P., United States Army, “USAC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT: SHOULD THE U.S. CONTINUE TO MAINTAIN FORCES IN SOUTH KOREA?,” <http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA423298>)

Richard Halloran, former correspondent for Business Week, The Washington Post, and The New York Times, currently a freelance journalist, describes and analyzes five options the Bush administration has in confronting these demands: - Seek to retain the status quo with cosmetic changes to appease critics. This option has worked in the past. However, Halloran dismisses this plan. Given the emotional anti-Americanism that seems to be plaguing Korea today, this option is unlikely to satisfy the nationalistic South Koreans. - Move the headquarters of U.S. forces from Seoul to the southern part of the Peninsula where it would be less visible. Today the headquarters sits on prime real estate in Seoul. This option has been and is under consideration. The U.S. has offered to move if the South Koreans would pay for it. The South Koreans have so far declined, but the current wave of anti-American demonstrations may make this a viable option. - Level up the rhetoric and the reality of the U.S. alliance with South Korea to that of the U.S. alliance with Japan. Many Koreans are irked by their perception of America’s favoritism toward Japan. For example, Koreans believe that the U.S. Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA) with Japan favors Japanese citizens more than the U.S. SOFA with South Korea favors its citizens. Halloran favors this option combined with option two. Leveling up the U.S. – Korea alliance would require a huge change in American thinking. Combined with moving the headquarters out of Seoul, this could be the start of a far more satisfactory alliance for both Americans and Koreans. - Offer to negotiate a reduction of U.S. forces in Korea in return for a North Korean pullback of its forces from the vicinity of the DMZ. It is unlikely that this option would be considered by the Bush administration given the heightened suspicions between Washington and Pyongyang. - Stage a unilateral withdrawal of U.S. forces and abrogate the security treaty between Washington and Seoul. The South Koreans would be left to fend for themselves and would perhaps seek an alliance with China. Halloran cites this option as the least desirable alternative. He states that it would be “tantamount to surrender and a nonstarter all around.”

1NC TURKEY ADV FRONTLINE – US/TURKEY RELATIONS

**FIRST, ALTERNATE CAUSALITIES TO RELATIONS -**

**a. ARMENIAN GENOCIDE RULING**

**Lobe 10** [Staff writer for antiwar.com, “Armenian Genocide Vote Threatens US-Turkey Relations at key Moment”, Mar. 2010, <http://original.antiwar.com/lobe/2010/03/05/armenian-genocide-vote-threatens-us-turkish-ties-at-key-moment/>] denno

Thursday’s vote by a Congressional committee condemning the deaths of up to 1.5 million Armenians during World War I as "genocide" is almost certain to complicate U.S. ties with Turkey, a long-time strategic ally and increasingly influential player in the Middle East and central and southwest Asia. The 23-22 vote by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives prompted the immediate recall of Turkey’s ambassador here and an announcement by Ankara that ratification of a pending U.S.-backed treaty with Armenia will be frozen. And the government of Recep Tayyip Erdogan, which sent several senior Turkish lawmakers and hired a high-priced public relations firm, as well as a former House speaker, to lobby against the resolution, is likely to take much stronger measures if it reaches the House floor later this year, according to both U.S. and Turkish analysts. "We are seriously concerned that the adoption of this draft resolution …will harm Turkey-U.S. relations and impede the efforts for the normalization of Turkey-Armenia relations," the Turkish embassy said in a release after the vote.

**b. FLOTILLA INCIDENT**

**The Jerusalem Post 10** [“US-Turkey Tensions at new heights”, Jul. 2010, <http://www.jpost.com/International/Article.aspx?id=181602>] denno

WASHINGTON – Turkish media reports have exposed increased tensions between the US and Turkey in recent days, with disagreements flaring over the Gaza flotilla incident and efforts to stop Iran’s nuclear program. Earlier this week, Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan bashed the US for not taking more action following the death of a Turkish-American dual citizen in Israel’s raid on a Turkish-flagged ship attempting to break the blockade of the Hamas-controlled Gaza Strip. “It is significant that the US administration has not taken action regarding Furkan Dogan. We expect them to follow this case,” Erdogan was quoted as saying. “Are you not defending Furkan’s rights because he was Turkish?” In response, US Ambassador to Turkey James Jeffrey told the Turkish newspaper *Zaman* that the US was concerned about Dogan’s case but took umbrage at Erdogan’s remarks.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

“If the press report is true, we – the United States and I – personally find it deeply disappointing and worrying,” he was quoted as saying. He went on to chide Turkey for not being more helpful with the investigation, and providing the autopsy results on the deaths to the Turkish group IHH, which participated in the flotilla, but not to the United States, according to media accounts. “We requested it from the Turkish authorities many times, most recently on July 7,” he reportedly said. “We find it difficult to understand why we can’t have the autopsy report despite our requests while IHH already has been given it.” A [State Department](http://jpost.headup.com/Services/FrontService/Horizon/RenderStatic.aspx?uri=http://schemas.semantinet.com/Info/name/United%20States%20Department%20of%20State/displaytype//dbpediaSubject/United_States_Department_of_State/&name=State%20Department) official said Thursday that Turkey had subsequently provided the autopsy reports. The tensions come shortly after US [President Barack Obama](http://jpost.headup.com/Services/FrontService/Horizon/RenderStatic.aspx?uri=http://schemas.semantinet.com/Person/name/Barack%20Obama/displaytype/President/dbpediaSubject/Barack_Obama/&name=President%20Barack%20Obama) warmly received Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu at the White House last week, a meeting that was originally scheduled for the day after the flotilla incident occurred. Netanyahu cancelled to return to Israel in the wake of the raid. Israeli analysts have assessed the tense exchange between Erdogan and American officials stems at least in part from ire on the part of the former at Netanyahu’s friendly reception while the flotilla incident has yet to be resolved.

US/TURKEY RELATIONS EXTS - #1 – ALTERNATE CAUSALITIES

**BLOCKING GENOCIDE RES KEY TO SAVING US\_TURKEY AND THE ARMENIAN PEACE PROCESS**

**Press TV**, Citing Turkish Foreign Minister Davutoglu, **10** [Press TV, “Blocking Genocide Resolution ‘Critical’ for US-Turkey Ties, Mar. 2010, <http://www.presstv.com/detail.aspx?id=121936&sectionid=351020204>] DENNO

Turkey has urged the United States to block a bill branding the World War I killing of Armenians as genocide, saying Washington's stance in this regard is “critical” for the two countries' relations.  In a telephone conversation, Turkish Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoglu asked US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton on Sunday to stop the resolution from advancing to a full vote at the House of Representatives.  Davutoglu said blocking the resolution would be "of critical importance to eliminate the negative impact it has had" on Turkish-US relations and on efforts aimed at bringing peace between Turkey and Armenia, Foreign Ministry spokesman Burak Ozugergin said.  The genocide bill was approved by Foreign Affairs Committee of the US House by a tiny margin in early March, drawing sharp criticism from Turkey, which recalled its ambassador from Washington. The non-binding resolution calls on President Barack Obama to ensure that US foreign policy reflects an understanding of the genocide and to label the mass killings of Armenians under the Ottoman Empire as such in his annual statement on the issue. Clinton has urged the committee not to hold the vote, citing fears that the move might harm ties with Muslim majority Turkey — Washington's key ally in the Middle East — and Turkish-Armenian reconciliation. The row has cast doubt on Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan's April visit to Washington for a nuclear security summit. Yerevan accuses Turkey of killing up to 1.5 million Armenians in orchestrated killings and deportations under the Ottoman Empire in 1915-1917. But Turkey puts the death toll at something between 300,000 to 500,000, arguing that at least as many Turks died in what Ankara calls a civil strife in the aftermath of Armenians' siding with Russian troops against their Ottoman rulers.

1NC Turkey Adv Frontline – Turkey/Iran Relations

1. First, Turkey and Iran are deepening relations in the Squo

**BBC Trans Caucasus Unit 2010 [**BBC**,** Iran president, new Turkish envoy hail mutual ties, 6/29/10, Lexis, <http://www.lexisnexis.com.turing.library.northwestern.edu/hottopics/lnacademic/>] mike

Tehran, 29 April: IRI [the Islamic Republic of Iran] President Mahmud Ahmadinezhad said in a meeting with new Turkish ambassador that Iran and Turkey are side by side of each other in constructive missions in the world. According to IRNA from the Internet website of the President, Ahmadinezhad reiterated, "Safeguarding the regional security and efforts aimed at influencing the new world order are the most important duties of our two countries." Pointing out that the Iranian and Turkish governments are standing side by side of one another in advancement and in establishment of security and wellbeing, he said, "Tehran and Ankara have lots of shared historic moments and interests and at the international scene, too, our standpoints are quite close to one another." The President of the Islamic Republic of Iran added, "Iran and Turkey are also the centre of the entire Muslims' reliance within the Islamic world, too." He also referred to the broad potentials of the two countries for deepening relations, arguing, "Good agreements have been made in this respect all of which have to be implemented. Tehran has no limits in improvement of relations with Turkey." Turkey's new ambassador to Tehran, too, after delivering a copy of his credentials to President Ahmadinezhad said, "Iran and Turkey have lots of shared values and Ankara is willing to improve comprehensive relation with Iran in entire fields." Referring to the position and significance of the Islamic Republic of Iran in the region and the world, he said, "Iran is a country with an ancient history and Turkey attaches extraordinary importance to expansion of its relations with Iran."

AND, TURN – STRENGTHENING TURKEY/IRAN RELATIONS HURTS US/TURKEY RELATIONS

Washington Post 5/24/10 [Janine Zacharia, Dispute over Iran may undermine U.S.-Turkey ties;

SPLIT OVER SANCTIONS Ankara-mediated deal could imperil U.N. push, Lexis, <http://www.lexisnexis.com.turing.library.northwestern.edu/hottopics/lnacademic/>] mike

A rougher patch in relations could be on the horizon if Turkey -- a key Muslim NATO ally crucial to U.S. efforts to stabilize Afghanistan and Iraq -- works to forestall a sanctions vote or votes against sanctions on Iran. "We're always going to have important issues with Turkey that we're going to cooperate on. But, of course, on a matter so important to us, it will inevitably have an impact on the way Americans and Congress and the president will interact with Turkey," a senior administration official said. The clash over Iran follows a rough patch in the relationship that emerged earlier this year after a House committee labeled as "genocide" Ottoman Turkey's killing of 1.5 million Armenians in 1915. In response, Turkey temporarily recalled its ambassador to Washington. To defuse the diplomatic spat, Obama refrained from using the word "genocide" in a statement he issued last month to commemorate the deaths. This month's spat resulted not only because of ideological differences over the best way to deal with Iran's nuclear program, but also as a consequence of growing Turkish confidence as it seeks to assert itself as a regional power. Turkey's leaders "want to increase the independence of Turkish foreign policy from the U.S. They see these kinds of things as an opportunity to form a more independent foreign policy," said Gokhan Bacik, an associate professor of international relations at Turkey's Zirve University. A day after Turkey reached the deal with Iran, negotiated with Brazil, Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton announced an agreement among the five permanent members of the Security Council on a fourth round of sanctions on Iran. Her quick declaration was widely perceived as a sign of U.S. irritation with Turkey, a non-permanent council member, and a slap in the face to Turkey's diplomatic efforts. On Wednesday, Obama spent more than an hour on the telephone explaining to Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan why the deal his country cut with Iran was incongruous with a U.S. push to isolate the Islamic republic over its nuclear program, according to U.S. and Turkish officials. Obama acknowledged Turkey's mediation efforts and "stressed the international community's continuing and fundamental concerns about Iran's overall nuclear program as well as Iran's failure to live up to its international obligations," the White House said in a statement. Obama also told Erdogan that the sanctions push would continue, despite Turkey's opposition to new U.N. penalties on Iran. The U.S. official described the conversation as "frank." Iran's agreement to ship 2,640 pounds of its low-enriched uranium out of the country was heralded in Turkey as a sign of Ankara's diplomatic prowess. Turkey, which aims to keep tensions in the Middle East low and improve economic and diplomatic ties with Iran, also saw the deal as a way to avert a further confrontation with the West and as a preliminary step toward bringing Iran back to the negotiating table. "People in Washington think we're just trying to undermine the efforts of the U.S. and other allies at the U.N. Security Council, which is quite far from the truth. Actually, we know that this is not a solution to the overall problem. We have no such claim," a Turkish official said. "What we are trying to do is to create a sort of a basis to attract the Iranians and bring them back to the table to discuss the overall nuclear issue." Still, U.S. officials said the deal fell short because Iran did not agree to freeze uranium enrichment and because it would still retain enough low-enriched uranium for a bomb if it decided to enrich the material to a higher level. "For the Turks, it might be a Pyrrhic victory," said Henri Barkey, a Turkey expert and visiting scholar at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Washington. "They look great in the Third World that they thumbed their nose at the United States. But they are really screwing up the relationship with the U.S."

**1NC Turkey Adv Frontline – Turkey/Iran Relations**

3. The presence of US TNWs and counterproliferation deters states from proliferating their nukes

Meier, member of the arms control association, 2008 [Olivier Meier, The German debate of Tactical Nuclear Weapons, http://www.frstrategie.org/barreFRS/publications/rd/RD\_20080129.pdf] mike

Conservatives, to be found on this issue among Christian Democrats and in the Ministry Defence, are sceptical whether German or NATO initiatives on tactical nuclear weapons would strengthen the nonproliferation regime. First, conservatives believe that nuclear proliferation is driven mainly by regional security considerations which have little to do with the policies of nuclear weapon states. Secondly, some like Karl Heinz Kamp, believe that the nuclear nonproliferation regime has lost relevance as a global framework for addressing the root causes of proliferation. While recognising the operational advantages of the NPT (mainly as a basis for addressing non-compliant behaviour and
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detecting treaty breaches through safeguards), they argue that security assurances and counterproliferation efforts have gained importance.19 Conservatives believe that unilateral tactical nuclear weapons reductions by NATO states will have little effect on Russian willingness to open up, let alone reduce its arsenal of tactical nuclear weapons. They believe that Russia still assesses the value of its own stockpile of short-range nuclear weapons as an important asset based on security considerations which have nothing to do with NATO nuclear deployments in Europe. At the same time, it is argued that NATO’s tactical nuclear weapons reductions since the end of the Cold War adequately reflect the new security environment. The 2006 Defence White Paper states in this context: “At the same time, the Federal Government continues to pursue the goal of worldwide abolition of all weapons of mass destruction. Germany itself has entered into a binding obligation under international law to renounce possession of such weapons. Since the early nineties, NATO member states have reduced the number of sub-strategic nuclear weapons in Europe by more than 85 percent. They are being kept to the minimum level needed to safeguard peace and stability.”

**And, The presence of US gravity bombs in Turkey, deters Iran from establishing regional dominance through nuclear power**

Bell and Loehrke 2009 (Alexandra and Benjamin, Ploughshares Fund, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, <http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/features/the-status-of-us-nuclear-weapons-turkey>) mike

For more than 40 years, Turkey has been a quiet custodian of U.S. tactical nuclear weapons. During the Cold War, Washington positioned intermediate-range nuclear missiles and bombers there to serve as a bulwark against the Soviet Union (i.e., to defend the region against Soviet attack and to influence Soviet strategic calculations). In the event of a Soviet assault on Europe, the weapons were to be fired as one of the first retaliatory shots. But as the Cold War waned, so, too, did the weapons' strategic value. Thus, over the last few decades, the United States has removed all of its intermediate-range missiles from Turkey and reduced its other nuclear weapons there through gradual redeployments and arms control agreements. Today, Turkey hosts an estimated 90 B61 gravity bombs at Incirlik Air Base. Fifty of these bombs are reportedly PDF assigned for delivery by U.S. pilots, and forty are assigned for delivery by the Turkish Air Force. However, no permanent nuclear-capable U.S. fighter wing is based at Incirlik, and the Turkish Air Force is reportedly PDF not certified for NATO nuclear missions, meaning nuclear-capable F-16s from other U.S. bases would need to be brought in if Turkey's bombs were ever needed. Such a relaxed posture makes clear just how little NATO relies on tactical nuclear weapons for its defense anymore. In fact, the readiness of NATO's nuclear forces now is measured in months as opposed to hours or days. Supposedly, the weapons are still deployed as a matter of deterrence, but the crux of deterrence is sustaining an aggressor's perception of guaranteed rapid reprisal--a perception the nuclear bombs deployed in Turkey cannot significantly add to because they are unable to be rapidly launched. Aggressors are more likely to be deterred by NATO's conventional power or the larger strategic forces supporting its nuclear umbrella. So in effect, U.S. tactical nuclear weapons in Turkey are without military value or purpose. That means removing them from the country should be simple, right? Unfortunately, matters of national and international security are never that easy. Roadblocks to removal. In 2005, when NATO's top commander at the time, Gen. James L. Jones, supported the elimination of U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe, he was met with fierce political resistance. (In addition to the 90 B61 bombs in Turkey, there are another 110 or so U.S. bombs located at bases in Belgium, Germany, Italy, and the Netherlands.) Four years later, some U.S. and European officials still maintain that the political value of the nuclear weapons is enough to keep them deployed across Europe. In particular, they argue PDF that the weapons are "an essential political and military link" between NATO members and help maintain alliance cohesion. The Defense Department's 2008 report PDF on nuclear weapons management concurred: "As long as our allies value [the nuclear weapons'] political contribution, the United States is obligated to provide and maintain the nuclear weapon capability." Those who hold this view believe that nuclear sharing is both symbolic of alliance cohesion and a demonstration of how the United States and NATO have committed to defending each other in the event of an attack. They argue that removing the weapons would dangerously undermine such cohesion and raise questions about how committed Washington is to its NATO allies. But NATO's post-Cold War struggles with cohesion are a result of far more than disagreement over tactical nuclear deployments. NATO has given Turkey plenty of reasons to doubt its members' commitment to Ankara on several recent occasions. For example, before both Iraq wars, some NATO members hesitated to provide Turkey with air defenses or to assist it with displaced persons who had fled into its territory. Moreover, Turkey, which values NATO as a direct connection to Washington, witnessed the United States completely ignore its vehement opposition to the most recent Iraq War. Additionally, Ankara is dismayed by the reluctance of some of its NATO allies to label the Kurdistan Workers' Party, which has caused violent chaos along the Turkish border, as a terrorist organization. Then there is the issue of Tehran's nuclear program, which seriously complicates any discussion of the United States removing its tactical nuclear weapons from Turkey. An Iranian nuclear capability could spark an arms race in the Middle East and bring about a "proliferation cascade," which could cause Turkey to reconsider its nuclear options--especially if the United States pulls its nuclear weapons from Incirlik. When asked directly about its response to an Iranian nuclear weapon, a high-ranking Foreign Ministry official said that Turkey would immediately arm itself with a bomb. This isn't Ankara's official policy, but it seems to indicate a general feeling among its leaders. Whether Turkey is primarily concerned about security or prestige, the bottom line is that it would not sit idly by as Iran established a regional hegemony.

Turkey/Iran Relations Exts – #1 economy

Turkey and Iran’s cooperation is based on strong economic ties

Wellman,manages the Iran Soft Power Project and has contributed to the Iran Tracker Working Paper Series, 7/4/10 [Ariel-Farrah Wellman, , Turkey - Iran Foreign Relations, Iran Tracker, http://www.irantracker.org/foreign-relations/turkey-iran-foreign-relations]

Over the past few years, Turkey and Iran have increased their financial cooperation gradually, largely through oil, deepening their relationship through growing trade and bilateral investment. As Turkey’s energy needs have increased, Iran has actively sought new markets for its most important export, providing an excellent base with which to develop greater avenues of cooperation. Although Ankara has a favorable status with regard to American interests in its near abroad, it recently increased its bilateral trade with Tehran significantly, and the two have discussed the construction of a pipeline that would deliver Iranian oil across Turkey to Italy, thus greatly expanding the scope of Iran’s oil markets in Western Europe.[28] This multinational agreement is often referred to as the Nabucco Project named after the future pipeline linking the East and the West. Even beyond a significant increase in oil and gas trade, Turkey has increased its non-energy trade deficit to Iran, which reached about $2 billion early in 2008.[29] Despite repeated economic sanctions by the United States and the UN to halt international investment in Iran’s energy sector, Turkey has stated that such sanctions will not prevent its cooperation with Iran in supplying its own and Europe’s growing energy needs.[30]

Turkey/Iran Relations Exts – #1 oil

Gas deals have become formal political ties

Turkey and Iran’s cooperation is based on strong economic ties

Wellman, manages the Iran Soft Power Project and has contributed to the IranTracker Working Paper Series 7/4/10 [Ariel-Farrah Wellman, Turkey - Iran Foreign Relations, Iran Tracker, http://www.irantracker.org/foreign-relations/turkey-iran-foreign-relations]

Iran has used its recent oil and gas deals with Turkey—a NATO member, U.S. ally, and candidate for EU membership—to improve political relations between the two, despite the U.S. government’s disapproval.[47] Iran began courting Turkey as a powerful new partner in 2002, when Turkish president Ahmet Necdet Sezer made an unprecedented visit to Iran. It seems that Tehran hoped to enhance complicated political and security ties and improve trade and economic relations.[48] The visit, was a qualified success: though “politically at odds with Iran over many regional issues, the Turkish president [held] awkward discussions with his Iranian hosts amid signs of improving economic relations.”[49] Since 2002, as economic cooperation has deepened between Tehran and Ankara, the political relationship between the two countries has improved.

Since August 2008, when Ahmadinejad made an official visit to meet with Turkey’s president and prime minister, Turkey and Iran have begun to formalize political relations. During Ahmadinejad’s visit, the two countries’ presidents signed five memorandums of understanding on security cooperation, combating organized crime, economic cooperation, and education.[50] In January 2009, Iranian Parliamentary Speaker Ali Larijani made an official visit to meet with Turkish President Abdullah Gul, and in March 2009, Gul attended the summit of the Economic Cooperation Organization in Tehran. The two countries have declared 2009 the “Iran-Turkey Culture Year” and began holding cultural relations conferences since January 2009.[51

Turkey/Iran Relations Exts – #1 refugees

Iranian refugees are fleeing into Turkey and damaging relations between the two countries

Schleifer, correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor and the Eurasianet website, 7/7/10 [Yigal schleifer, The plight of Iranian refugees into Turkey, Eurasianet, http://www.eurasianet.org/taxonomy/term/2322?page=1]

Since last year's controversial elections in Iran, a large number of Iranian refugees -- many of them political activists -- have made their way across the border to Turkey. Although their lives are no longer in danger, these refugees are now finding themselves forced to deal with different hardships in Turkey. As The Times' Martin Fletcher reports: Since the election in June last year more than 2300 Iranians have applied to the UN High Commission for Refugees for asylum in Turkey. Some are homosexuals or members of persecuted faiths but most are political and human rights activists, journalists, students, artists and ordinary Iranians goaded into action by the regime's denial of democracy. The majority are young and single, some of the brightest and bravest of their generation, forced to flee secretly to avoid arrest at airports or border posts. Turkey, which has diplomatic and economic relations with Iran, tolerates but hardly welcomes these dissidents. It denies them permanent refugee status and disperses them to 32 small cities around the country for the three years that it can take the UNHCR's overstretched officials to assess their asylum claims and find countries that will accept them. The exiles, delivered from the terror of Iran, find themselves caught in another kind of prison - unable to speak Turkish, forbidden from leaving their assigned cities, in effect barred from working or engaging in political activity, and with no means of support beyond the little money they brought with them. They must pay a $US200 resident fee that few can afford and report to the police twice weekly. They live in the worst housing, sometimes sleeping several to a room. A few work illegally but earn less than $US10 a day.

Turkey/Iran Relations Exts – #1 construction

Turkey and Iran just signed a cooperation act regarding the construction sector

BBC monitoring 7/19/10 [BBC, Turkey, Iran sign accord on cooperation in construction sector, Lexis, http://www.lexisnexis.com.turing.library.northwestern.edu/hottopics/lnacademic/]

Turkey and Iran signed Monday [19 July] a memorandum of understanding envisaging cooperation in the construction sector. The memorandum, signed by Turkish Public Works and Housing Minister Mustafa Demir and Iranian Minister of Housing and Development Ali Nikzad in Tehran, envisages exchange of information and experiences regarding the construction sector, cooperation in public housing projects, research and training of experts, production of construction materials and utilization of products of latest technology. According to the memorandum, the Turkish and Iranian ministries of housing will set up technical committees to discuss areas of cooperation, moreover, officials from both ministries will pay mutual visits once a year. Speaking at the signing ceremony, Turkish Minister Demir said his visit to Iran had been fruitful and it would contribute to the further improvement of relations between the two countries. Demir said that Turkish construction companies had started to take part in several projects in Iran, adding they were eager to participate in a public housing project aiming at building 1 million residences. The cooperation in construction sector could contribute to achieving 30bn-dollar trade volume between Turkey and Iran, Demir also noted. Iranian Minister Nikzad said in his part that Iran wanted to strengthen its cooperation with Turkey in all areas. Nikzad said the memorandum of understanding envisaging cooperation in construction sector would contribute to the improvement of bilateral relations between Turkey and Iran. As part of his visit to Iran, Minister Demir earlier held talks with Iranian Minister of Industries & Mining Ali Akbar Mehrabian and Minister of Labour and Social Affairs Abdol Reza Shaykh-ol-Eslami. Demir is expected to return to Turkey on Tuesday.

Turkey/Iran Relations – Turk Nuke Turn

Iran’s nuclear weapons are upsetting the balance of power in the ME especially Turkey

Kibaroglu and Caglar, Dr. Kibaroglu teaches courses on arms control and disarmament in the

Department of International Relations at Bilkent University in Ankara. Mr. Caglar is a doctoral student and research assistant in that department, 2008, [Kibaroglu, Caglar, Impications of a Nuclear Iran for turkey, http://www.mustafakibaroglu.com/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/Kibaroglu-Caglar-MEP-04December2008.pdf]

Regarding Turkey, however, the presence of nuclear weapons in the Iranian military arsenal will upset the delicate balance that has existed between the two nations since the Treaty of Kasr-i Shirin in 1639, in favor of Iran.4 The topographic and demographic characteristics of the region and the presence of more or less equal military capabilities on both sides of the border have since forced the parties to refrain from confronting each other. Turkish authorities, both civilian and military, would be expected to have raised much more serious concerns about Iran’s efforts to become a nuclear power, especially following the revelations in August 2002 by an Iranian opposition group of Iran’s secret uranium-enrichment and heavy-water production facilities, which are clear indications of Iran’s long-term ambitions.5 Nevertheless, Turkey has been reluctant to assume a higher profile about this matter; this would probably not have been the case until only a few years ago.

Iran’s nuclear program will affect the relations between Turkey and Iran

Kibaroglu and Caglar, Dr. Kibaroglu teaches courses on arms control and disarmament in the

Department of International Relations at Bilkent University in Ankara. Mr. Caglar is a doctoral student and research assistant in that department, 2008, [Kibaroglu, Caglar, Impications of a Nuclear Iran for turkey, http://www.mustafakibaroglu.com/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/Kibaroglu-Caglar-MEP-04December2008.pdf]

As a result of the events leading up to the U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003, however, the relationship between Turkey and Iran has entered a new phase. Similar concerns about the probable consequences of developments in Iraq may have motivated the two countries to merge their political stances with respect to regional political issues. Since then, there has been an unprecedented rapprochement between Turkey and Iran resulting in an increase in high-level official visits. Despite these positive signs, it is still too early to say that relations between Turkey and Iran will stay on the same track for the long term. The nature as well as the extent of Iran’s nuclear program is highly likely to have a decisive impact on the future of Turkish-Iranian relations. However, there are too many unknown factors that require further cooperation between Iran and the international community and its neighbors in order to provide more transparency about its nuclear program.

Turkey will have to change their reluctant policy towards Iran if Iran develops nuclear weapons, this will force Turkey to attack Iran

Kibaroglu and Caglar, Dr. Kibaroglu teaches courses on arms control and disarmament in the

Department of International Relations at Bilkent University in Ankara. Mr. Caglar is a doctoral student and research assistant in that department, 2008, [Kibaroglu, Caglar, Impications of a Nuclear Iran for turkey, http://www.mustafakibaroglu.com/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/Kibaroglu-Caglar-MEP-04December2008.pdf]

There is little wonder that public sentiment toward other nations affects the foreign policies of governments everywhere in the world. AKP governments, since 2002, have proved not to be exceptions to this rule; they are reluctant to challenge Iran on the nuclear issue due to the support among the Turkish public for Iran’s nuclear program. However, governments have a primary duty to pursue the vital interests of their nations. This requires, among other things, avoiding emotional approaches to the formulation of foreign and security policies. Therefore, Turkey, even under the current AKP government, may be forced to change its reluctant attitude, if and when Iran advances its nuclear capabilities and gets closer to the threshold of nuclear-weapons manufacturing. Moreover, Turkey has been elected to the UN Security Council as a non-permanent member and also to the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) for the next couple of years. It is highly likely that Iran and its nuclear program will figure heavily on the agendas of both organizations. Turkey will have to vote one way or another on these matters and may make significant constructive contributions in the eventual peaceful resolution of the dispute between Iran and the West.

Turkey/Iran Relations – Turk Nuke Turn

Iranian nukes will lead to Turkish Nukes which boost the morale of the Turkish people

Kibaroglu and Caglar, Dr. Kibaroglu teaches courses on arms control and disarmament in the

Department of International Relations at Bilkent University in Ankara. Mr. Caglar is a doctoral student and research assistant in that department, 2008, [Kibaroglu, Caglar, Impications of a Nuclear Iran for turkey, http://www.mustafakibaroglu.com/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/Kibaroglu-Caglar-MEP-04December2008.pdf]

Dogan Heper, a columnist in the daily Milliyet argued in January 2006, “Following the end of the Cold War, the world has entered a process of turmoil or a process of restructuring. Even though, today, it is not possible to give a lucid answer to the question of how long this process will continue and what the shapes of the states will be, in order not to regret at the end of this process Turkey should take preventive measures, that is, it should be strong.” For Heper, the first condition of being strong is “not to compromise the unity and the integrity of Turkey and to attach importance to nuclear research and development.” Heper states three main reasons to bolster the argument that it is essential for Turkey to develop nuclear weapons. First, possessing nuclear weapons is a means to protect the unity and integrity of Turkey and its standing in the region. Second, in addition to buoying its standing in the region, an army possessing such a capability would render Turkey an arbiter, a determining power in its region. Third, a success in the nuclear arena would boost the morale of the Turkish people. This, in turn, would unite 70 million people and consolidate their pride in being Turkish citizens. For Heper, Turkey’s elevation to the status of a nuclear power seems to be a somewhat inevitable outcome, because, he contends, “new conditions in the world are compelling Turkey to develop nuclear weapons.”59 Assoc. Prof. Celalettin Yavuz, Navy Captain (ret.), argued in February 2006, “Nuclear energy technology is an impetus for space research and for possessing nuclearweapons technology in order to contribute to Turkey’s deterrence capability.”

Turkey/Iran Relations Nuke Turn - #1 exts.

Iran nuclear facilities are causing Turkey to develop nuclear weapons as a means of security

Kibaroglu and Caglar, Dr. Kibaroglu teaches courses on arms control and disarmament in the

Department of International Relations at Bilkent University in Ankara. Mr. Caglar is a doctoral student and research assistant in that department, 2008, [Kibaroglu, Caglar, Impications of a Nuclear Iran for turkey, http://www.mustafakibaroglu.com/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/Kibaroglu-Caglar-MEP-04December2008.pdf]

Turkey officially recognizes the right of Iran, a member of the Treaty on the Non- Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), to develop nuclear technology, provided that it remains on a peaceful track and allows for the application of full-scope safeguard inspections by the IAEA in a way that would lend the utmost confidence to the international community about its intentions. Prime Minister Erdogan has made statements to this effect on a number of occasions. In an interview with the Kuwaiti newspaper El Anba in March 2007, he reiterated the diplomatic position of his government: “States have the right to possess nuclear energy to utilize for peaceful purposes.” He also emphasized that Turkey has good neighborly relations with Iran and that the two countries have developed mechanisms for the purpose of cooperation on security issues.23 More recently, at the Munich Security Conference in February 2008, Prime Minister Erdogan responded to a journalist’s question as to “why Turkey did not seem to be worried” about Iran’s nuclear program: “Our Iranian colleagues tell us that they want nuclear energy for peaceful purposes to satisfy their energy needs, not for weapons.” Erdogan reiterated that the work in the nuclear field would soon start in Turkey: “I’m afraid some people may accuse us of having ambitions for producing weapons of mass destruction, too.”24 In addition to the pressure emanating from the warm attitude of the Turkish people toward Iran on the nuclear issue, especially among the constituents of the AKP government — partly because Turkey will soon launch yet another bid to establish its first nuclear reactor, and partly due to the fact that no clear violations of Iran’s NPT obligations have been reported — Turkey’s official position regarding Iran’s nuclear program has been lowprofile, at least for the time being.

Turkey’s only option to Iranian nuclear weaponization is to develop their own nuclear weapons

Kibaroglu and Caglar, Dr. Kibaroglu teaches courses on arms control and disarmament in the

Department of International Relations at Bilkent University in Ankara. Mr. Caglar is a doctoral student and research assistant in that department, 2008, [Kibaroglu, Caglar, Impications of a Nuclear Iran for turkey, http://www.mustafakibaroglu.com/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/Kibaroglu-Caglar-MEP-04December2008.pdf]

Notwithstanding the current apparent reluctance of Turkey to challenge Iran, which is due partly to the lack of a coherent approach toward Iran in the international arena, the above statements suggest that Turkey is indeed carefully monitoring the situation from a wider perspective. At the same time, Ankara is determining alternative policies to minimize the possible negative effects to its national interests and security of the eventual weaponization of Iran’s nuclear program. Nevertheless, Turkey does not have a wide array of choices due to a number of limitations

Turkey/Iran Relations Nuke Turn - NPT

The failure of NPT to stop Iran from nuclearizing undermines Turkey’s confidence in the NPT

Kibaroglu and Caglar, Dr. Kibaroglu teaches courses on arms control and disarmament in the

Department of International Relations at Bilkent University in Ankara. Mr. Caglar is a doctoral student and research assistant in that department, 2008, [Kibaroglu, Caglar, Impications of a Nuclear Iran for turkey, http://www.mustafakibaroglu.com/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/Kibaroglu-Caglar-MEP-04December2008.pdf]

Regarding the danger of the spread of WMD in the world, Turkey’s fundamental policy has long been to support international initiatives that aim at strengthening the chemical, biological and nuclear nonproliferation regimes, with special emphasis on their inspection and verification mechanisms. However, a series of developments over the last decade has cast doubts on the future prospects of the NPT regime: North Korea’s nuclear detonation; revelations about Iran’s secret facilities suitable for fissilematerial production; the U.S.-India nuclear deal; failure to get the ratification of the IAEA Additional Protocol from all concerned states, including Iran; failure to urge the enforcement of the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT); and failure to start negotiations for a Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty (FMCT). This list could be expanded. Added to these has been the unequal and unacceptable treatment of Turkey by the major Western suppliers of nuclear technology, such as the United States, Germany and Canada, resulting in the failure to install nuclear power plants in the country.39 This situation caused a loss of confidence among the Turks in the value of the “bargain” inherent in the NPT: in return for denouncing nuclear weapons, member states would benefit from nuclear technology transfer from other countries and/or develop as much as they needed indigenously under international safeguards. Turkey has acted as a responsible member of the nuclear-non-proliferation community and will remain so for the foreseeable future. Therefore, it is not easy to argue with great confidence that the next generations of Turkish decisionmakers will display similar unequivocal loyalty to the nuclear non-proliferation regime, if Iran, under the NPT provisions, cannot be prevented from manufacturing nuclear weapons or from developing breakout capabilities that may enable it to assemble weapons in a short period of time.40

Turkey/Iran Relations Nuke Turn - NATO

NATO continues to refuse assistance to Turkey when it needs it most – so they would not be able to stop Turkey from nuclearizing like Iran

Kibaroglu and Caglar, Dr. Kibaroglu teaches courses on arms control and disarmament in the

Department of International Relations at Bilkent University in Ankara. Mr. Caglar is a doctoral student and research assistant in that department, 2008, [Kibaroglu, Caglar, Impications of a Nuclear Iran for turkey, http://www.mustafakibaroglu.com/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/Kibaroglu-Caglar-MEP-04December2008.pdf]

Membership in NATO has meant more than security guarantees for most Turks. NATO has been perceived as part of Turkey’s “Western” identity. Throughout the Cold War years, Turkey entertained an undisputed status as a staunch ally of the West. However, the collapse of the Warsaw Pact and the disintegration of the Soviet Union brought down its reputation as an indispensible ally and a bulwark against the Communist threat. Soon after, the alliance failed the first immediate test of solidarity with Turkey, when Turkish President Turgut Ozal called upon NATO in 1991 to deploy the Rapid Reaction Force in Turkey against the threat posed by Saddam Hussein’s Iraq following its invasion of Kuwait in August 1990. The Western European members of NATO, in particular, have dragged their feet in living up to their Article 5 commitments, arguing that the Middle East was “out of the area” of NATO’s operation zone.41 A similar situation arose in 2003, when Turkey formally asked the North Atlantic Council to activate Article 4 of the Washington treaty with a view to starting deliberations on the possible measures that each member nation would have to take in the run-up to the second Gulf War, in order to protect Turkey against Iraq’s missiles and WMD. NATO members once again failed to honor their treaty obligations toward Turkey. Added to these, the process of the transformation of the alliance from a collective-defense organization with a “hard power” stance to a collectivesecurity organization with a perceived “soft power” attitude, has further diluted the image of NATO in the eyes of most Turks. No less important is the effect of anti- American sentiments among the Turkish public in undermining the significance of NATO, which is starting to be seen as serving primarily the interests of the United States and helping it to establish its world hegemony.42 A number of remarks have already been made publicly by high-ranking military officers, civilian bureaucrats and politicians suggesting that Turkey withdraw from NATO and intensify relations with other regional organizations instead.43 Although immature at this stage, the anti- NATO attitude may grow to a significant level, as long as the alliance remains indifferent to Turkey’s fight against the PKK, some of whose members have long found refuge in the territories of the allied countries. Top military commanders, diplomats and politicians in Turkey have, time and again, emphasized the need for the alliance to display its solidarity with Turkey in its fight against terrorism. The lack of such solidarity only exacerbates the frustration of the Turkish public.44

Turkey/Iran Relations Nuke Turn - EU

The EU has rejected the idea of having a Muslim country part of the EU

Kibaroglu and Caglar, Dr. Kibaroglu teaches courses on arms control and disarmament in the

Department of International Relations at Bilkent University in Ankara. Mr. Caglar is a doctoral student and research assistant in that department, 2008, [Kibaroglu, Caglar, Impications of a Nuclear Iran for turkey, http://www.mustafakibaroglu.com/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/Kibaroglu-Caglar-MEP-04December2008.pdf]

Turkey has been striving to be a part of the European integration process for nearly half a century. Turkey and the European Economic Community (EEC) signed the Ankara Treaty in 1963, giving Turkey, in theory, a full-membership perspective. However, only after a long period of ups and downs did Turkey manage to get a date in 2004 to start formal accession negotiations with the EU — and with conditions attached. Despite the fact that the start of accession talks has brought Turkey institutionally closer to the EU, the optimistic mood among the Turks and the Europeans soon took a negative turn. Suspicions of Turkey’s suitability for membership have grown ever since.45 European public opinion is wary of the presence of a Muslim community in the EU. If the question of Turkey’s eventual accession were put to public referenda, overwhelming majorities in countries like Austria and France would likely cast negative votes.46 Recently, objections to Turkey’s membership on the basis of identity-related considerations have increased, while arguments in favor of Turkish accession on the basis of cost-benefit calculations have lost ground. With the rise of Islamophobic sentiments across the European continent in the aftermath of the September 11 attacks, coupled with growing security concerns over the existence of approximately 20 million Muslims, the EU has increasingly become reluctant to develop a strong geopolitical commitment to Turkey’s eventual accession.47 Worst of all, accession negotiations were suspended on eight of some 35 chapters, each of which must be successfully completed for full membership, only a year after the start of the process, because of Turkey’s resistance to European requests to open its sea and air ports to Greek Cypriot naval vessels and airplanes. Against this background, it would not be unfounded to argue that prospects for Turkey’s accession talks to be completed at an early date are not promising. They are likely to take a long time, due to a number of structural problems in the relations between Turkey and the EU.48

Turkey/Iran Relations Turkish People Turn

The Turkish public supports Iran building its nukes – here’s three reasons

Kibaroglu and Caglar, Dr. Kibaroglu teaches courses on arms control and disarmament in the

Department of International Relations at Bilkent University in Ankara. Mr. Caglar is a doctoral student and research assistant in that department, 2008, [Kibaroglu, Caglar, Impications of a Nuclear Iran for turkey, http://www.mustafakibaroglu.com/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/Kibaroglu-Caglar-MEP-04December2008.pdf]

Iran’s nuclear ambitions are mostly welcome among the Turks for a number of reasons.50 First, Iran’s defiance of U.S. pressure to halt its enrichment program is considered to be a dignified stance by a small country against a global hegemonic power. Second, Islam is a common denominator between the Turks and the Iranians, and the emergence of another Muslim nation — after Pakistan — with atomic power to deter the Christian and Jewish bombs is considered a necessary equalizer. Third, and in relation to the second, anti-American and anti-Israeli sentiments built up since the U.S. invasion of Iraq, are so intense that anything seen as hurting American or Israeli interests is usually welcome. There are hundreds of Internet sites, blogs and chat rooms in which Turks exchange their views on whether Iran’s nuclear ambitions constitute a threat to Turkey and whether Turkey should possess nuclear weapons. The majority of Turks do not believe that Iran, as a friendly Muslim nation, would want to threaten Turkey with its nuclear weapons, today or in the future, especially when Israel is considered Iran’s prime target. The prevailing view among Turks supports the possession of nuclear weapons, for reasons similar to those expressed in the past by other countries.

Turkey/Iran Relations Turkish People Turn

Turkey developing nuclear weapons will more bad for the country than good\

Kibaroglu and Caglar, Dr. Kibaroglu teaches courses on arms control and disarmament in the

Department of International Relations at Bilkent University in Ankara. Mr. Caglar is a doctoral student and research assistant in that department, 2008, [Kibaroglu, Caglar, Impications of a Nuclear Iran for turkey, http://www.mustafakibaroglu.com/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/Kibaroglu-Caglar-MEP-04December2008.pdf]

If improved relations can be achieved between Turkey and the United States as well as the EU, and the nuclear nonproliferation regime can be further strengthened, Turkey’s acquisition of nuclear technology will not necessarily become a cause for serious concern. Turkey will be under the scrutiny of the international community through the effective implementation of IAEA safeguards as a state party to the NPT. This must be kept in mind, particularly by those in Turkey who might still aspire to nuclear-power status. Another factor to remember is that virtually no state has developed nuclear weapons without substantial support and effective cover from a superpower or technologically advanced country. It is not just speculation that the United Kingdom and France received various degrees of scientific or technological support from the United States at various stages of their nuclear-weapons programs. Israel received support from France and Norway in overcoming scientific and technological barriers in the construction of the Dimona reactor, which is central to its “opaque” nuclear capacity.67 Similarly, South Africa benefited from its nuclear ties with foreign countries, particularly Israel, in building its nuclear weapons.68 On the other hand, Pakistan gained technology from many sources. This extensive assistance is reported to have included, among other things, uranium-enrichment technology from Europe and blueprints for a small nuclear weapon from China, along with missile technology.69 The Indian nuclearweapons program might not have been possible without the technology and material provided by Canada and the United States.70 China received partial support from the Soviet Union when their relationship was permissive, and China in turn provided support to the Pakistani and North Korean nuclear programs. In the case of Iran, the role of China and Russia cannot be overlooked. Hence, one particular condition for Turkey to go nuclear would be to secure the endorsement of such a power. This, however, is not imminent. Short of such support, the only possible way of meeting the scientific and technological requirements would be through an illegal network similar to that of Abdel Qader Khan, the “father of the Pakistani bomb,” now under house arrest in Pakistan. The magnitude and scope of illegal acquisition would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, in a country like Turkey, where there are still small but effective groups of concerned people who would do their best to reveal such critical information to the world. Should such a development take place, Turkey would be treated as a “rogue state,”something unthinkable and unacceptable given Turkey’s record of nonproliferation efforts. Notwithstanding these difficulties, even if one considers for a moment that Turkey has decided to go nuclear and managed to get the support of a nuclear power, or that it has established a clandestine nuclearweapons procurement network and gotten away with it without being noticed, what will be the role of nuclear weapons in Turkey’s security and foreign policies? Will nuclear weapons enhance Turkey’s security? Or, will they simply harm Turkey’s interests? The lead author of this article has spent years studying military history, superpower rivalry, arms control, disarmament and nonproliferation. Even when looked at from these rich perspectives, no feasible scenarios are imaginable under which nuclear weapons would bring additional security to Turkey. On the contrary, any attempt to illegally pursue, let alone acquire, nuclear weapons will be extremely damaging to Turkey’s vital interests. Turkey is passing through a difficult domestic and international political conjuncture in which there are many sensitive issues (social, economic, political) to be exploited by its rivals. In addition, at a time when its relations with the United States and the EU are in decline, these countries may be of no help in dealing with the problems that will arise. If one imagines for a moment that Turkey has acquired nuclear weapons capability, under which scenarios and against whom will these weapons have added value in Turkey’s foreign and security policies? It is hard to give a meaningful answer to this question. Out of Turkey’s neighbors, Iraq is under U.S. occupation and will be its protectorate possibly for a long period to come. Even if the United States withdrew fully from Iraq, its commitment to the security of that country will most likely remain the same. Syria, even with its ballistic missiles and chemical-weapons arsenal, could not deter.

Turkey/Iran Relations People Turn – exts

Turkey’s participation in NATO, NPT, and CTBT, are reasons why Turkey wont develop nuclear weapons to fight Iran

Kibaroglu and Caglar, Dr. Kibaroglu teaches courses on arms control and disarmament in the

Department of International Relations at Bilkent University in Ankara. Mr. Caglar is a doctoral student and research assistant in that department, 2008, [Kibaroglu, Caglar, Impications of a Nuclear Iran for turkey, http://www.mustafakibaroglu.com/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/Kibaroglu-Caglar-MEP-04December2008.pdf]

All three reasons mentioned above suggest that Turkey will not follow the path of Iran by developing a dubious nuclear infrastructure that may have weapons implications in the future. However, will the current standing of Turkey remain the same for a long time to come? It is difficult to give an affirmative answer to this question with great confidence, due to changing circumstances both inside and outside of Turkey. Relations with the above-mentioned institutions, which are presented as insurance policies against Turkey’s potential inclination toward “going nuclear,” may not remain on the same track in the long term.

1NC AFGHANISTAN ADV FRONTLINE – OPIUM

**FIRST, STATUS QUO SOLVES – WE ARE DRAWING DOWN OUR COUNTER-NARCOTICS EFFORTS IN AFGHANISTAN NOW**

**Youngers 10**(Cola, Alternet, May 11, 2010, “Is Obama Serious About Ending the War on Drugs?” <http://www.alternet.org/drugs/146823/is_obama_serious_about_ending_the_war_on_drugs?page=entire>) connor

Last year, the U.S. government ceased its funding for forced eradication in Afghanistan and is instead channeling that funding into interdiction and economic development programs. This U.S. policy development is in line with a growing number of countries and international donors advocating for an "[alternative livelihoods](http://www.wola.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=viewp&id=1073&Itemid=33)" approach to reducing coca and poppy production by enhancing the welfare of poor farmers via comprehensive development strategies that include improving local governance and citizen security.

**AND, POLICY CHANGE IN AFGHANSISTAN IS IRRELAVENT—AS LONG AS WE KEEP BUYING, THEY’LL KEEP FARMING**

**Mercille 10** (Julien, US Foreign Policy and Geopolitics Lecturer and University College, “Why Afghanistan’s Poppies Aren’t the Problem,” June 30, 2010, <http://www.counterpunch.org/mercile06302010.html>)connor

For years, there has been much discussion about the best strategy to rid Afghanistan of its poppies. Eradication, says Bush. Interdiction and alternative livelihoods, retorts Obama. Licensing and production for medicinal purposes, suggested the Senlis Council. The issues have been fiercely debated: Would there be enough demand for Afghanistan’s legal morphine? Is the government too corrupt to implement this or that scheme? To what extent will eradication alienate farmers? Which crops should we substitute for poppies?

These questions are not unimportant, but fundamentally, they do not address the primary source of Afghan drug production: the West’s (and Russia’s) insatiable demand for drugs. Afghanistan accounts for about 90% of global illicit opium production. Western Europe and Russia are its two largest markets in terms of quantities consumed and market value (the United States is not an important market for Afghan opiates, importing the drugs from Latin America instead). Western Europe (26%) and Russia (21%) together consume almost half (47%) the heroin produced in the world, with four countries accounting for 60% of the European market: the United Kingdom, Italy, France and Germany. In economic terms, the world’s opiates market is valued at $65 billion, of which heroin accounts for $55 billion. Nearly half of the overall opiate market value is accounted for by Europe (some $20 billion) and Russia ($13 billion). (Iran is also a large consumer of opium, with smaller amounts of heroin). The situation is similar for cocaine, for which the US and Europe are the two dominant markets (virtually all coca cultivation takes place in Colombia, Peru and Bolivia). [1] In short, it is the West that has a drug problem, not producer countries like Afghanistan (or Colombia): demand is king and drives the global industry. How should we reduce opiate consumption(?)and its negative consequences in the West and Russia? Drug policy research has typically offered four methods. There is a wide consensus among researchers that such methods should be ranked as follows, from most to least effective: 1) treatment of addicts, 2) prevention, 3) enforcement, and 4) overseas operations in producer countries. For example, twelve established analysts reached the following conclusions, published a few months ago [2]: “Efforts by wealthy countries to curtail cultivation of drug-producing plants in poor countries have not reduced aggregate drug supply or use in downstream markets, and probably never will… it will fail even if current efforts are multiplied many times over.” “A substantial expansion of [treatment] services, particularly for people dependent on opiates, is likely to produce the broadest range of benefits… yet, most societies invest in these services at a low level.” Also, a widely cited 1994 RAND study concluded that targeting “source countries” is 23 times less cost effective than “treatment” for addicts domestically, the most effective method; “interdiction” was estimated to be 11 times less cost effective and “domestic enforcement” 7 times. [3] The problem is that the West’s drug policy strategy has for years emphasized enforcement, combined to overseas adventures, to the detriment of treatment and prevention.

1NC AFGHANISTAN ADV FRONTLINE – OPIUM

AND, NO LINK FROM OPIUM MONEY TO TALIBAN – TALIBAN GETTING FUNDING FROM OTHER SOURCES

**Washington Post 9** (“Diverse Sources Fund Insurgency in Afghanistan,” September 27, 2009, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/09/26/AR2009092602707.html>) connor

As the insurgency has grown in strength, the Taliban and its affiliates have embraced a strategy favored by multinational corporations: diversification. With money pouring in from so many sources, the Taliban has been able to expand the insurgency across the country with relative ease, U.S. and Afghan officials said. In an Aug. 30 report assessing the overall state of the war, Gen. Stanley A. McChrystal, commander of U.S. and NATO forces in Afghanistan, said the Taliban's range of financial resources made it difficult to weaken the movement Eliminating insurgent access to narco-profits -- even if possible, and while disruptive -- would not destroy their ability to operate so long as other funding sources remained intact," McChrystal wrote. U.S. officials said reliable estimates of the Taliban's overall cash flow are difficult to calculate because the insurgency is a decentralized movement comprising many factions and commanders. But annual revenue is thought to total hundreds of millions of dollars. Money skimmed from the narcotics business -- Afghanistan is the world's top opium producer -- still offers crucial support to Taliban operations, particularly in the southern provinces where opium-producing poppies grow in abundance, officials said. The U.S. military has estimated that the Taliban collects $70 million annually from poppy farmers and narcotics traffickers. The U.N. Office on Drugs and Crime, which monitors opium production, earlier projected that the Taliban and its affiliates earned as much as $400 million a year from the drug trade. The agency later revised the figure sharply downward, to about $100 million a year. "The international community and the Americans have been deceiving themselves for the past seven years, saying the Taliban has been getting all of their money from drugs," said Waheed Mojda, who served as a Foreign Ministry official for the Taliban before the U.S.-led invasion of Afghanistan in late 2001. Increasingly, Taliban commanders are paying for their operations through a variety of extortion schemes, U.S. and Afghan officials said. Many insurgent leaders impose a "tax" on local Afghans or take a cut from gemstone, timber or antiquity smugglers. Ransoms from kidnappings in Afghanistan and Pakistan also have proven lucrative. Another rich source of revenue: extortion payments from Afghan and Western subcontractors forced to cough up "protection money" to safeguard redevelopment projects, according to U.S and Afghan officials. "The Taliban know they cannot rely on just one source of money," said Hekmat Karzai, director of the Center for Conflict and Peace Studies in Kabul. "Any of these sources could potentially evaporate." This year, the U.S. government created a special investigative unit called the Afghan Threat Finance Cell. Modeled after a similar U.S. unit in Iraq, it gathers financial information about the Taliban for law-enforcement and intelligence purposes. The cell has about two-dozen members drawn from the Drug Enforcement Administration, U.S. Central Command, the Treasury Department and the CIA. The FBI is expected to join soon. Kirk E. Meyer, a DEA official who directs the cell's operations in Afghanistan, said the mission is to understand how the Taliban-led insurgency is financing its operations, as well as to find ways to put pressure on its money supply. "I think it's possible to have an impact on certain areas," he said. "It is not going to be the silver bullet, but if it's integrated with what everybody else is doing, like DEA and the military, it's got to have an impact."

**AND, FIXING THE POPPY PROBLEM WON’T SOLVE POVERTY—THERE EXISTS A LAUNDRY LIST OF ALTERNATE CASUALITIES**

**Shaaker 5** (Wali, Political Analyst, “Why Poverty Exists in Afghanistan,” AD 7.7.10 <http://www.institute-for-afghan-studies.org/Contributions/Reports/WaliShaaker/WhyPovertyPersistsinAfghanistan.htm>,)  connor

Finding the causes of poverty is no arduous task.  The drought of the nineties, the destruction of basic infrastructure, the damage to the state's institutional organization, the scarcity of skilled and experienced professionals, and most recently the influx of millions of repatriates increasing the supply of cheap labor, are among the primary causes of widespread poverty.  More than two decades of war and foreign invasion has greatly distorted Afghanistan’s political and social map, and essentially destroyed its economy.  Yet, after almost four years of economic reconstruction and billions of dollars in expenditure, it is fair to ask why poverty remains at such high level.

OPIUM EXTS - #1 – STATUS QUO SOLVING

**POPPY TRADE IS BECOMING INCREASINGLY LESS LUCRATIVE**

**The Guardian 8** (“Afghans Swap Poppies for Wheat as Food Costs Soar,” May 13, 2008, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2008/may/13/afghanistan>) connor

Afghan farmers hope to capitalise on soaring food costs by growing wheat instead of poppy crops, with the fall in heroin prices further fuelling the switch. The price of a tonne of wheat in Afghanistan has almost trebled this year, causing acute food shortages. A changeover of crops has begun in key agricultural regions, said Tekeste Tekie, country representative for the UN's Food and Agriculture Organisation. He said a significant increase in wheat crops is expected from next year's harvest. "The high price of commodities has encouraged farmers to switch from poppy cultivation to wheat. In fact, we are already seeing evidence of this happening, for instance in the Bamian region, where some farmers have planted half wheat and half poppy crops," Tekie said. The growing season runs from November to June in Afghanistan. If wheat prices stay near their current level, supported by regional subsidies, an Afghan farmer can make up to a third more on wheat than poppy by next year's harvest, according to figures from the Ministry of Agriculture. Haji Dawood, a farmer who used to cultivate poppy but now farms wheat in the Daman district, near Kandahar in the south, said his family had benefited from the wheat boom. "It's the first time since I planted wheat that I can afford to feed my family ... it's going well because the price of opium has come down, and the price for my wheat has gone up. Each new season we get more money from the crop than from the previous one," he said. Mir Dad Panjsheri, the chief adviser to the Ministry of Agriculture, said some regions from the south may be off limits because of instability. "We expect a more than 30% increase in wheat crops next year in places like Kunduz, Baghlam and Faryab. But the Taliban stronghold areas remain [key locations] for poppy farming ... most farmers there are afraid to start planting wheat yet," he said. Panjsheri said farmers may be put off by difficulties in getting their crops to market. "Some roads are dangerous, not just because of the Taliban, but there are other problems like bandits, who may try to rob your money on your way back from the market. The Taliban can offer protection if you are selling poppies," he said. Critics say international initiatives on poppy eradication have been too focused on trying to stop the Taliban's key source of funding. Yet these efforts have not helped the Afghan farmers become more self-sufficient. "Not enough money has been devoted into developing a decent agriculture sector. We need millions, if not billions, more in this country," said one non-governmental organisation executive, who preferred to remain anonymous. "It's a cruel twist of irony that when the British forces were deployed in Helmand ... poppy eradication was one of the key priorities, but it is the global economic situation that is doing the job for them."

OPIUM EXTS - #1 – STATUS QUO SOLVING

**OBAMA KNOWS ERADICATION ISN’T WORKING—HE’S CHANGED HIS POLICIES ACCORDINGLY**

**Smith 9**(Philip, StopTheDrugWar.org, “Feature; US Gives up on Eradicating Afghan Opium Poppies, Will Target Traffickers Instead,” July 3, 2009, <http://stopthedrugwar.org/chronicle/2009/jul/03/feature_us_gives_eradicating_afg>) connor

Thousands of US Marines poured into Afghanistan's southern Helmand province this week to take the battle against the Taliban to the foe's stronghold. But in a startling departure from decades of US anti-drug policy, eradicating Helmand's massive opium poppy crop will not be part of their larger mission. US envoy to Pakistan and Afghanistan Richard Holbrooke told members of the G-8 group of industrialized nations Saturday that attempting to quash the opium and heroin trade through eradication was counterproductive and bad policy. Instead, the US would concentrate on alternative development, security, and targeting drug labs and traffickers. Afghan anti-drug artwork, Nejat Center, Kabul "Eradication is a waste of money," Holbrooke told the[Associated Press](http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/world/la-fg-afghan-drugs28-2009jun28,0,7732272.story) during a break in the G-8 foreign ministers meeting on Afghanistan. "The Western policies against the opium crop, the poppy crop, have been a failure. It might destroy some acreage, but it didn't reduce the amount of money the Taliban got by one dollar. It just helped the Taliban, so we're going to phase out eradication," he said. "The farmers are not our enemy; they're just growing a crop to make a living. It's the drug system," Holbrooke continued. "So the US policy was driving people into the hands of the Taliban."

OPIUM EXTS - #2 – FARMING INEVITABLE

**NO ALTERNATIVE TO POPPY—SAFFRON FAILS**

**Christian Science Monitor 6-10** (“Why some Afghan Farmers Are Turning from Poppy to Saffron,” <http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Asia-South-Central/2010/0610/Why-some-Afghanistan-opium-farmers-turn-from-poppies-to-saffron>) connor

Saffron production, processing, and marketing should grow together,” he says. “But production has increased very fast, processing has increased very slowly, and marketing is very weak.” In the 1990s in Peru, US efforts to encourage farmers to stop producing coca leaves (for the illegal cocaine market) and replace them with cocoa beans (for chocolate) initially failed because coca farmers were taught only how to grow alternative crops, but did little connect them with the niche markets that brought the best prices. That [crop replacement program in Peru](http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Americas/2010/0201/Peru-farmers-drop-cocaine-in-favor-of-cocoa/(page)/2) has since become successful. Without proper processing, saffron loses its distinctive coloring and taste. Harmful bacteria can also take root in the plant. Consequently, a poorly rendered batch of the crop sells at about 40 percent below market rates – if at all. Few people inside Afghanistan use saffron, so if farmers cannot produce a product that is viable in the international marketplace, they may not be able to sell it at all. Last year, a number of farmers experienced this problem, which dealt a blow to the appeal of growing saffron, says Sayed Wahidullah Aqil, the provincial management adviser for the US Department of Agriculture in Herat. “Farmers in Afghanistan get their information from their neighbors. If there is a farmer who is cultivating saffron and this year he cannot sell his product, his neighbors will see this and this may decrease their interest in saffron,” he says.

OPIUM EXTS - #3 – NO TALIBAN FUNDING

**DRUG MONEY ISN’T KEY TO TALIBAN FUNDING**

**Reuters 9** (“Who is Funding the Taliban? You Don’t Want to Know,” August 13, 2009 <http://blogs.reuters.com/global/2009/08/13/who-is-funding-the-afghan-taliban-you-dont-want-to-know/>) connor

Up until quite recently, most experts thought that drug money accounted for the bulk of Taliban funding. But even here opinion was divided on actual amounts. Some reports gauged the total annual income at about $100 million, while others placed the figure as high as $300 million — still a small fraction of the $4 billion poppy industry. Now administration officials have launched a search for Taliban sponsors. Richard Holbrooke, U.S. special envoy for Afghanistan and Pakistan, told a press conference in Islamabad last month that drugs accounted for less of a share of Taliban coffers than was previously thought. “In the past there was a kind of feeling that the money all came from drugs in Afghanistan,” said Holbrooke, according to media reports. “That is simply not true.” The new feeling is that less than half of the Taliban’s war chest comes from poppy, with a variety of sources, including private contributions from Persian Gulf states, accounting for much of the rest. Holbrooke told reporters that he would add a member of the Treasury Department to his staff to pursue the question of Taliban funding.

OPIUM EXTS - #4 – POVERTY

**LACK OF A COHERENT ECONOMIC MODEL WILL KEEP AFGHANISTAN IN POVERTY REGARDLESS OF ACTION ON POPPY**

**Shaaker 5** (Wali, Political Analyst, “Why Poverty Exists in Afghanistan,” AD 7.7.10 <http://www.institute-for-afghan-studies.org/Contributions/Reports/WaliShaaker/WhyPovertyPersistsinAfghanistan.htm>,)  connor

Furthermore, (the) state’s weakness in creating a safer environment for the investors and business owners discourages their participation in the economy in full capacity.  This could negatively impact the creation of new jobs, particularly in rural parts of the country where the state’s power is highly destabilized by the presence of various militant groups.  If Afghanistan is to achieve any substantial gains in its quest for eradicating poverty, the formation of an empowered state with the economic capacity to provide basic social services such as health, education, and employment opportunity is an absolute necessity. Thus, the question is how could the government augment its economic power in order to fight corruption, and help the poor to rise above poverty?    
One of the main venues through which a government is able to generate revenue is to collect sales, payroll and property taxes.  Nevertheless, the Afghan state has limited or no institutional and technological capacity to do so.  In the absence of sufficient military power, the state's authority is limited in collecting taxes from small business, property owners, and producers of agricultural products.  The fact that total tax revenue relative to GDP is only four percentmeans that the state, in the absence of any other major revenue sources, continues to remain weak and dependant on foreign aid.  In another words, economically it remains fragile because it has insufficient capacity to generate budgetary revenue.  Consequently, the government is unable to offer competitive salaries to its own employees, and afford sufficient controlling and or guiding measures for the overall growth and direction of the economy.

1NC AFGHANISTAN ADV FRONTLINE – HUMAN RIGHTS

**FIRST, US CAN NOT SERVE AS A MODEL FOR INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS NORMS – TRANSPARENT SELECTIVITY**

Stork 99 [Joe, American political activist and Deputy Director for Middle East and North Africa at Human Rights Watch, 3/1/99, *Human Rights and U.S. Policy*, <http://www.fpif.org/reports/human_rights_and_us_policy>] tanner

The most crippling feature of U.S. human rights policy abroad is its transparent selectivity. Nowhere is this so pronounced as in the Middle East. From Morocco to Bahrain, human rights concerns are consistently trumped either by questions of military and corporate access or by the "peace process." The exceptions are Libya, Iraq, Sudan, and Iran, where criticism of their atrocious human rights records meshes with broader U.S. efforts to stigmatize and delegitimize. Israel and Egypt—which account for 91% of global U.S. military and economic aid—and Saudi Arabia—the largest customer for U.S. weapons—are insulated from even the mildest and most indirect forms of public rebuke, and the U.S. has made no discernible effort to use its leading role as donor and arms supplier to promote human rights. This selectivity undermines efforts by Middle Eastern activists and organizations to build strong human rights movements.

**AND, STATUS QUO SOLVING – OBAMA HAS CLEANED UP VIOLATIONS AT BAGRAM**

Gude 2009 [Ken, the Associate Director of the International Rights and Responsibility Program at American Progress, 12/10/09, *Excessive Secrecy Undermining Obama's Human Rights Achievements*, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2009/12/obama_human_rights_day.html>] tanner

The Obama administration has banned torture and so-called “enhanced interrogation techniques.” There are no loopholes for military necessity or exceptions that allow the intelligence community or government contractors to abuse detainees to gain intelligence or for any other reason. This, of course, only makes it more puzzling why the Obama administration would use broad assertions of secrecy to restrict access to past activities it opposes and prohibited.

Credible allegations have now surfaced that abusive interrogation by U.S. military forces persists in Afghanistan in spite of Obama barring the practice. Two young Afghans told *The Washington Post* that “they were beaten by American guards, photographed naked, deprived of sleep and held in solitary confinement for at least two weeks,” all violations of the Army Field Manual for interrogation and the Detainee Treatment Act of 2005

In a separate account, several former detainees told *The* *New York Times* that Special Operations forces operate a secret, black jail at Bagram Air Base separate from the Bagram Theater Internment Facility. These detainees are allegedly hidden from the Red Cross at the secret prison for weeks at a time, again a violation of the procedures governing detainee treatment.

The Obama administration’s response has been woefully inadequate. Lt. Col. Mark Wright, described by the *Post* as a Defense Department spokesman, claimed the military does not respond to each allegation of detainee abuse and then added the remarkable assertion, “Department of Defense policy is and always has been to treat detainees humanely.”

There is a massive difference between officially sanctioned torture and abuse at the hands of individuals expressly violating established procedures designed to prohibit that very conduct. This distinction is important for Americans but meaningless to the victims, and, of additional concern, could further erode international and particularly Afghan support for the now expanded U.S. military mission.

After the horrors of the Bush years, the U.S. government has lost the benefit of the doubt regarding what is official policy and what is not. Genuine urgency is required to get to the bottom of these allegations and the results of any investigation must be disclosed to the public in a manner that builds confidence it its conclusion, not add to the questions surrounding the incidents.

The Obama administration must fulfill its pledge of greater transparency

The Obama administration has made vital changes to U.S. policies to improve America’s respect for human rights and the rule of law. It was important to make these changes not only for our moral responsibilities and the legacy of American leadership, but because the stain of the Bush administration had become a strategic problem for the United States. It remains a national security imperative that the Obama administration close the prison at Guantanamo Bay, unequivocally renounce torture and abusive interrogation, and shut down CIA-run secret prisons.

In the 21st century, American national security begins with the credibility of American leadership. The meaningful improvements in America’s human rights policies are only the beginning of a process to restore faith and confidence in the American government. That process has only been made more important by President Obama’s own words that have committed his administration to an irreversible path toward greater transparency and respect for human rights**. A sustained retreat from these goals will undermine early accomplishments, erode the credibility of President Obama, and weaken the United States and our security.**

HUMAN RIGHTS EXTS - #1 – US NOT EFFECTIVE SIGNAL

DEATH PENALTY GUTS ABILITY FOR US TO SERVE AS EFFECTIVE MODEL

U.S. Human Rights Network 03 [*Something Inside So Strong: A Resource Guide on Human Rights in the United States*, <http://www.ushrnetwork.org/files/ushrn/images/linkfiles/Something_Inside_So_Strong.pdf>] tanner

Since the reinstatement of the death penalty in the mid-1970’s, the modern anti-death penalty movement has identified capital punishment as a violation of human rights and has used international standards as a corner- stone of its efforts to end the death penalty in the United States. Over the last two decades, as U.S. death penalty practices have worsened, the international community has become increasingly abolitionist. Opposition to the death penalty is clearly articulated in a number of important international treaties and by various international human rights bodies (see appendix B). The unity of opposition to the death penalty among European countries in particular, serves as important touchstone for those in the United States committed to complete abolition.

U.S. anti-death penalty advocates often rely on human rights standards for legislative, organizing, and education efforts. U.S. advocates use these human rights standards in part due to an absence of remedies within the U.S. court system and because there is an overwhelming perception of the death penalty as a human rights violation by the international community.

Throughout the 1980’s and 1990’s anti-death penalty advocates from the United States have utilized international pressure and human rights standards to advance activism in this country. Some of these activities have included meeting with United Nations Special Rapporteurs, writing ‘shadow reports’ to the Committee for the Convention on All Forms of Racial Discrimination, meeting with members of the European Union, European Parliament, the International Committee of Jurists, and filing petitions with the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights. Reports and observations of these international bodies have all been critical of the death penalty in the United States.

No global modeling—laundry list…death penalty, torture, due process

Jarolímek-Proner and Searle 07 [Frank, Executive Director at the End to Capital Punishment Movement, Martin, conducts research for End to Capital Punishment Movement USA, 8/7/07, *Death Penalty Widens Moral Chasm Between U.S. and World*, <http://www.cceia.org/resources/ethics_online/0012.html>] tanner

The issue of capital punishment remains a source of friction between the United States and the international community. At the opening of the 62nd UN General Assembly session this September, the European Union, in continuing its campaign for the promotion and entrenchment of human rights, will once more introduce a resolution calling for a global moratorium on executions. Despite the expected backing of a majority in the General Assembly and 58 percent of Americans believing a moratorium is necessary while the capital process is thoroughly reviewed,[1](http://www.cceia.org/resources/ethics_online/0012.html#_ftn1) few will dispute Nobel Peace Prize recipient [Jody Williams](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jody_Williams), a supporter of the resolution, in her assessment, "It is quite unlikely that a UN approved moratorium will influence the U.S. on the death penalty."

Yet, the United States has always been explicitly committed to promulgating international human rights. Indeed, the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights [2](http://www.cceia.org/resources/ethics_online/0012.html#_ftn2), signed in 1948, is largely the result of successful diplomatic endeavors to export American constitutional values to the rest of the world. More recently, an Executive Order signed by President Bill Clinton on the 50th anniversary of the UN's Declaration on Human Rights in 1998 stated that:

It shall also be the policy and practice of the Government of the United States to promote respect for international human rights, both in our relationships with all other countries and by working with and strengthening the various international mechanisms for the promotion of human rights, including . . . those of the United Nations . . .[3](http://www.cceia.org/resources/ethics_online/0012.html#_ftn3)

The United States has signed numerous treaties that codify and protect human rights held as universal and inalienable. The furthest reaching of these, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR),[4](http://www.cceia.org/resources/ethics_online/0012.html#_ftn4) was signed by 148 countries and described by the U.S. State Department as "the most complete and authoritative articulation of international human rights law that has emerged in the years following World War II."[5](http://www.cceia.org/resources/ethics_online/0012.html#_ftn5) The United States has consistently ratified such treaties with specific reservations regarding provisions that could affect its policies on capital punishment, or not ratified them at all.[6](http://www.cceia.org/resources/ethics_online/0012.html#_ftn6) This has produced a divergence between international human rights norms and those of the United States, and as a result, triggered accusations of human rights violations.[7](http://www.cceia.org/resources/ethics_online/0012.html#_ftn7)

As a result, many argue that the United States is eroding its moral authority, gradually becoming an anti-model rather than a role model at a time of mounting need for international cooperation and coordination to maintain peace and security. This is becoming clear as global and internal concerns emerge over policies on human right issues such as torture, due process, extraordinary rendition, and lethal injection.

1NC AFGHANISTAN ADV FRONTLINE - SHANGHAI COOPERATION ORGANIZATION

FIRST - SQUO SOVES- SCO and NATO Cooperation Now

BBC 2009 (BBC Monitoring South Asia. “Russia wants "strong presence" in Afghanistan – paper” March 31) anjay

The continuing violence in Afghanistan has forced the eastern countries to make attempts to resolve the problem in Afghanistan and show presence in the political and economic scene. The international conference in Moscow in which the members of the Shanghai [Cooperation Organization] states play a significant role is an important sign of the above assumption. The international conference held under supervision of Shanghai Cooperation Organization [SCO] is attended by foreign ministers and deputy foreign ministers of SCO member states, secretary-general of the UN, director-general of the Islamic Conference, director-general of the European Security and Cooperation Organization, foreign ministers of Afghanistan, Turkey, Pakistan and Turkmenistan and deputy foreign minister of Iran for Asia Pacific. Various viewpoints were expressed by participants in the meeting. The most important topic of the conference was the fight against terrorism and drugs trafficking. Afghan Foreign Minister Rangin Dadfar Spanta, representing Afghanistan in the meeting, said: Afghanistan has not achieved permanent stability and hopes for the continuous support of the international community. We can be a stable and progressive country with your support. The Russian president said: Russia is prepared to actively cooperate with Afghanistan to stabilize the situation and help in Afghanistan's peaceful development. The Afghan nation and government is focusing on building its infrastructure and economy but it would not be possible without stability and security. Afghanistan needs support and aid more than before now. UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon said in his speeches: A large part of the Afghan narcotics is for the international market. It is converted into high cash outside the country. Military presence should be improved in that country. The key word for Afghanistan is cooperation. We want clear stance in supporting peace and security in Afghanistan. Role of SCO is very important for the stability of Afghanistan. UN is ready to take part in the decision-making process on Afghanistan. Iranian Deputy Foreign Minister Mr Akhondzada demanded financial cooperation with regional countries in particular Tajikistan, Pakistan and Afghanistan. The one-day meeting ended with issuing a statement which said: Fighting against drug trafficking, terrorism and organized crime should be in accordance to the rules of the UN Security Council. Opportunistic movements should be prevented in the fight against terrorism in Afghanistan. Fighting against current crisis in Afghanistan should be coordinated and comprehensive aids should be provided for stability, economic development and welfare of Afghanistan. The statement invited foreign countries to help in capacity building and improving the Afghan National Army. It urged that the coalition forces should coordinate their operations with security services of Afghanistan. Many conferences have taken place on Afghanistan. Nice political terms were used in this conference in Moscow. We hope this conference can lead to development in Afghanistan because every country in this conference was talking about multilateral cooperation and coordination and emphasized the principle of fighting against terrorism. All previous international meetings over Afghanistan ended with big aid promises. But in reality, nothing improved. Therefore, every national or international conference should focus on security and stability rather than aids. The Moscow conference was important because for the first time eastern countries have initiated a summit on Afghanistan. It is almost the third year that Russia is trying to find its place in Afghanistan. SCO can, in the long-term, guarantee the ground for influence of Russia and other eastern powers in Afghanistan. Afghanistan only has an observer status in the SCO and will gain its membership eventually. When Russia stood on its feet after the fall of the [former] Soviet Union and [Vladimir] Putin took charge of the country, the gap between the east and west slowly increased. But still Russia continued to help the West in the fight against terrorism in Afghanistan. It was in the interest of Russia too. If the Talebanization further improved in the region, Muslim-populated areas of Russia would have been bigger problem for the country than the West. Therefore, Russia welcomed the American and NATO attack on Afghanistan. Now, Russia's attempt includes its target of having political and economic influence over Afghanistan. Russian companies are planning to take over big projects in Afghanistan. It is trying not to be isolated in the Afghanistan game.

**AND, TURN – US WITHDRAWAL CREATES REGIONAL COMPETITION, NOT COOPERATION, TO FILL THE VACUUM**

Kagan 2007 (Robert Kagan, senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and senior transatlantic fellow at the German Marshall Fund, August-September 2007, “End of Dreams, Return of History,” Hoover Policy Review, online: <http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/8552512.html>) anjay

The subtraction of American power from any region would not end conflict but would simply change the equation. In the Middle East, competition for influence among powers both inside and outside the region has raged for at least two centuries. The rise of Islamic fundamentalism doesn ’t change this. It only adds a new and more threatening dimension to the competition, which neither a sudden end to the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians nor an immediate American withdrawal from Iraq would change. The alternative to American predominance in the region is not balance and peace. It is further competition. The region and the states within it remain relatively weak. A diminution of American influence would not be followed by a diminution of other external influences. One could expect deeper involvement by both China and Russia, if only to secure their interests. 18 And one could also expect the more powerful states of the region, particularly Iran, to expand and fill the vacuum. It is doubtful that any American administration would voluntarily take actions that could shift the balance of power in the Middle East further toward Russia, China, or Iran. The world hasn ’t changed that much. An American withdrawal from Iraq will not return things to “normal” or to a new kind of stability in the region. It will produce a new instability, one likely to draw the United States back in again.

1NC AFGHANISTAN ADV FRONTLINE - SHANGHAI COOPERATION ORGANIZATION

AND, NO INTERNAL LINK – SCO MEMBERS ARE NOT INTERESTED IN REGIONAL INFLUENCE – THEY ARE FOCUSED ON INTERNAL ISSUES

DARLING 05-26-2010 [Daniel - an international military markets analyst with Forecast International Inc., an aerospace and defense research company, “[The SCO: A Sino-Russian Counterweight to NATO?](http://thefastertimes.com/defensespending/2010/05/26/the-sco-a-sino-russian-counterweight-to-nato/)”, <http://thefastertimes.com/defensespending/2010/05/26/the-sco-a-sino-russian-counterweight-to-nato/>) anjay

But fears of a militarized SCO - particularly one serving as a counterweight to NATO - remain ungrounded for now. Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan are foremost concerned with internal - not external - security. They are also reluctant to fall under too tight of a Chinese or Russian embrace. Thus any ties with both powers are balanced by productive relations with the U.S. and NATO. Indeed, each of these countries is involved in NATO’s bilateral Partnership for Peace program. Meanwhile Iranian membership in the SCO - something that would be seen by the U.S. and other NATO members as indicative of an anti-Western tilt - remains little more than hypothetical so long as Tehran is under U.N. sanctions.

SCO COOPERATION EXTS - #1 – COOPERATION NOW

NATO –SCO Relations high now

Asia Times 2009 (Kaveh L Afrasiabi. “Unlikely bedfellows in Afghanistan” Mar 18 http://www.atimes.com/atimes/South\_Asia/KC18Df02.html)

NATO secretary general Japp de Hoop Scheffer is reportedly planning to attend the SCO meeting, which will focus on the "situation in Afghanistan and its influence on neighboring states, boosting joint efforts by the international community to counteract terrorism, the illegal drug trade and trans-border organized crime from Afghan territory", according to an official SCO statement. The SCO is an inter-governmental regional organization that comprises Russia, China, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan. Iran, India, Mongolia and Pakistan have observer status. According to the US envoy to Moscow, John Beryle, the US will send a high-level delegation led by a senior diplomat. This is a positive gesture by US President Barack Obama that is bound to smooth the groundwork for his much-anticipated summit with his Russian counterpart, Dmitry Medvedev, who announced the Moscow conference in January. Due to their geographical proximity to Afghanistan and the threats of conflict spillover, the SCO members are naturally concerned about the security meltdown in Afghanistan. As a result, it is not far-fetched to anticipate a near-term breakthrough over SCO-NATO cooperation on Afghanistan. This would be despite lingering SCO suspicions of NATO's "out of area" operations in their backyard. NATO's decision to put on hold the accession of Georgia and Ukraine dampens these suspicions. The key issue is the nature of any possible SCO-NATO cooperation. In 2005, the SCO and Afghanistan set up a liaison group based in Beijing to deal with drug trafficking, cross-border crime and intelligence-sharing. But not much has happened and then-president Vladimir Putin's 2004 call for a SCO "security belt" around Afghanistan to stop the drug trade has not materialized. This is partly because the SCO is still in the process of self-definition, and unlike NATO, or for that matter the Moscow-dominated Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO), it lacks the identity of a military bloc. In a recent interview, the SCO secretary general, Bolat Nurgaliev, stated that "any physical involvement by the SCO in Afghanistan has not been contemplated so far". But with NATO admittedly failing to secure Afghanistan, the NATO leadership may now be amenable to the idea of a co-security partnership with SCO. This could begin with the low-security issues of drug trafficking and arms smuggling. This would parcel out a slice of the Afghan security pie to the SCO, traditionally viewed with suspicion in the US and European capitals as a potential rival to NATO.

1NC IRAQ ADV FRONTLINE – HEG/OVERSTRETCH

**FIRST, WITHDRAWAL OF US TROOPS FROM IRAQ NOW ENSURES LOSS OF REGIONAL INFLUENCE AND CREDIBILITY**

**Times Union 07-16-10** (“U.S. needs to be a bigger player in Iraq,” July 16, Times Union - <http://www.timesunion.com/AspStories/story.asp?storyID=951229&category=OPINION>) LUKE

One big reason Iraq has not managed to form a new government more than four months after its parliamentary election, says Foreign Minister Hoshyar Zebari, is conflicting interventions by its neighbors. "Every country is a player on a different side," he said Wednesday during a meeting with Washington Post editors and reporters. Another big reason: The Obama administration has not been enough of a player. "Their role has not been active, to be honest with you," he said. The administration will dispute this assessment. Even as a drawdown of U.S. troops proceeds this summer, senior administration officials have been trying to nudge the four large political blocs that emerged from the March 7 voting to strike a deal on a government. Vice President Joe Biden visited Baghdad over the July 4 weekend; Ambassador Christopher Hill and military commander Gen. Raymond Odierno have been making the rounds. But Zebari says the U.S. involvement has not been sufficient -- especially given the far more hands-on approach of countries in the region. The United States "could do more," he said. "To say 'this is a problem for Iraqis, you deal with it,' is fine -- but after more than four months we are not making progress. There is an impasse." Saudi Arabia, the Persian Gulf emirates, Syria and Jordan are backing favorites in Iraq's political horse-trading. But Iran and Turkey have emerged as the biggest players, Zebari said, and as rivals. Turkey's government supports the Sunni parties and their leader, secular Shiite Ayad Allawi, who emerged with a tiny plurality of seats March 7. Iran is pushing the two Shiite blocs, including that of Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki, to settle on a common candidate for prime minister to ensure that the next government will be Shiite-dominated. Both Iran and Turkey are pushing for regional leadership, and the outcome in Iraq could be crucial to their ambitions. "They believe that the United States is withdrawing from Iraq, and that there will be a vacuum," Zebari said. "Both of them are working hard to fill that vacuum." He'd like the United States to remain involved to counter such power grabs. Despite this summer's withdrawals, 50,000 U.S. troops will remain -- officially in a noncombat role -- until the end of 2011. The administration says it fully intends to stay engaged. But retaining U.S. influence, and preventing Iraq's destabilization, may require Washington to step up efforts soon. If Iraq does not have a government by the start of the monthlong Muslim holiday of Ramadan on Aug. 11, the political and security situation could start to unravel. Though it can't impose a solution, the United States retains the power of convocation. It can call all the main players together, perhaps in cooperation with U.N. mediators.

**AND, REMOVAL OF TROOPS FROM IRAQ WON’T SOLVE TROOP OVERSTRETCH OR MILITARY STRAIN – WE WILL JUST REDEPLOY THEM ELSEWHERE**

Wilson 2010. ["Iraq exit will be on time, Biden says." *Washington Post*, May 27, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/05/26/AR2010052605349.html>] ttate

Speaking Saturday at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y., Obama said that the U.S. commitment to Iraq endures and that, as U.S. troops depart, "a strong American civilian presence will help Iraqis forge political and economic progress." He also reiterated his definition of success: "an Iraq that provides no haven to terrorists; a democratic Iraq that is sovereign and stable and self-reliant." On the day Obama spoke, the number of U.S. troops in Iraq dipped below the number in Afghanistan for the first time since the 2003 invasion of Iraq. Biden, once a leading skeptic of U.S. involvement in Iraq, is now among the country's most ardent cheerleaders. He is seeking to balance Obama's determination to leave Iraq against growing concerns among some conservative critics that the current circumstances make a swift U.S. withdrawal too dangerous. Senior administration officials counter that Iraq's fledgling democracy, now defended by improved domestic security forces, is sturdy enough to solve the country's problems with far fewer U.S. troops on hand. But even some of the administration's supporters say that analysis is grounded more in the rising demands of the war in Afghanistan -- where U.S. troop levels are expected to reach 100,000 by the end of the summer -- than in an impartial assessment of Iraq's progress. The withdrawal plan calls for reducing U.S. troops in Iraq from 92,000 today to 50,000 by the end of August, down from a peak of about 170,000 during 2007. The last U.S. troops are scheduled to exit at the end of 2011. "Leaving Iraq is not only a public relations issue, but a recovery-of-force issue," said John A. Nagl, president of the Center for a New American Security, who served as an Army officer in Iraq and helped write the Army's counterinsurgency field manual. "The Army has not recovered from its surge into Iraq, and now it is surging in Afghanistan, which hasn't turned the corner at all." "There are many connections between the two wars," Nagl said, "and the fact we only have one Army is one of them. We just don't have enough Army to do everything we want it to do right now."

1NC IRAQ ADV FRONTLINE – HEG/OVERSTRETCH

**AND, TURN – INEFFECTIVE IRAQ MILITARY**

**WITHDRAWAL OF US TROOPS NOW GUARANTEES THAT IRAQ FORCES WON’T BE SUSTAINABLE ON THEIR OWN**

**AP 7/25** (“Despite Years of Training, Funding, Iraqi Forces Still Struggling as US Turns Over Mission,” July 25, Fox News - <http://www.foxnews.com/world/2010/07/25/despite-years-training-funding-iraqi-forces-struggling-turns-mission/>) luke

MOSUL, Iraq (AP) — When the U.S. ends its combat mission in Iraq five weeks from now, the nation's safety will be in the hands of its homegrown, American-trained security forces. The army is almost up to the job, the police are hit-and-miss, and the Kurdish militia is nowhere close to ready.

Iraq's military chief says that without a U.S. presence, the Iraqi forces won't be able to fully fend for themselves before 2020. Anthony Cordesman, a former director of intelligence assessment in the Pentagon, agrees it will take years.

That view has also come across in conversations on various sides of the sectarian divide in recent months as The Associated Press spent time with the military, police and Kurdish militia on the job to get a sense of their strengths and weaknesses as they prepare for the Aug. 31 deadline for the U.S. combat mission to end.

**AND, THIS LEADS TO LOSS OF US HEGEMONY AND IRANIAN TAKE-OVER**

Kabalan 7/23 (Marwan Al Kabalan, professor of Media Studies and International Relations at the Communication and Political Science faculty in the University of Damascus, “US and Iran are competing in Iraq” July 23, 2010, Gulf News - http://gulfnews.com/opinions/columnists/us-and-iran-are-competing-in-iraq-1.658023) luke

As the US prepares to withdraw the bulk of its combat forces from Iraq by the end of next month, concerns over the lack of progress in the formation of a new government grow. The four-month stalemate is interpreted as being a result of the standoff between the US and Iran, the two key foreign powers in Iraq. Each hopes to redraw the political map of the country in a way that suits its own interests. Most analysts tend to believe now that **Iraq, and not nuclear weapons, is the key bone of contention** between the two countries. Iran is eager to see the US withdraw from Iraq so that a formidable obstacle to it establishing military dominance in the Gulf is removed. Another Iranian objective is to prevent the emergence of a pro-US government in Baghdad that would eventually resist its regional ambitions. Washington, on the other hand, wants to withdraw from Iraq because it faces growing challenges in Afghanistan — but without handing Iraq to Iran on a silver platter. The US, therefore, seeks to find a way to counterbalance Iran by establishing a client government in Baghdad. The nuclear issue in this case is seen simply as an element of a broader geopolitical struggle between the two powers in the region. Historically, Iraq has always been regarded by both the US and Iran as a strategic challenge. After the 1958 military coup, which ousted the monarchy in Iraq, the US supported the shah to contain the aspirations of pro-Moscow Iraqi officers. Similarly, following the 1979 Islamic revolution in Iran, Washington relied on Iraq to tame the revolutionary ambitions of the cleric's regime in Tehran. When Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990, Washington led an international coalition to expel the Iraqi forces and prevent Saddam Hussain from accumulating too much wealth and power. Throughout the 1990s, Washington tried to keep the Iranian and Iraqi threats at bay through its Dual Containment policy. When, from the late 1990s onwards, Iraq was moving toward ending its political isolation, Washington regarded that as an extremely destabilising development for its national interests in the Gulf. Until the 2003 invasion, regional stability from Washington's viewpoint was based on the Iran-Iraq balance of power. The US invaded Iraq on the assumption that it could quickly defeat and dismantle its government and replace it with a pro-American regime, thereby restoring the balance of power. When that assessment proved inaccurate, Washington was forced to assume a policing role as well as acting as a shield to prevent Iran from dominating the country and thereby gaining control of the Gulf. Regime change. Indeed, the US and Iran both wanted to eliminate Saddam's regime, and they collaborated to some extent during the invasion. But from there, their goals diverged. The Iranians hoped to establish a Shiite regime in Baghdad that would be under Tehran's influence. Washington sought to establish a regime that would thwart the Iranians. From the very beginning, US strategy in Iraq was in shambles, to say the least. The de-Baathification process drove most of the Sunnis into opposition. At the same time, the Americans were trying to prevent Iran from installing a client government in Baghdad. **The end result was conflict. What was intended to be a short-term operation turned into an extended war, requiring long-term US military commitment.** The US could not leave because it had created a situation in which Iraq was too weak to act as a counterbalance to Iran. The Obama administration believes that the formation of a friendly Iraqi government with sufficient military capability to enforce law internally and to prevent Iran from having too much influence in the country is the only hope to salvage the US strategy. At the very least, Washington believes, any Iraqi government would have to be able to act independently from Iranian influence. This raises several questions. **Can the US form such a government before it leaves by the end of the summer**? Can the Iraqis agree on the formation of a relatively strong government that is also on good terms with the US? What about Iran? Would it accept such a government? So far, neither the US nor Iran have been able to put an appealing government in power. But as the stalemate persists and the date of the US withdrawal approaches, Iraq is set to pay the heaviest price for this struggle of wills between foreign powers.

1NC IRAQ ADV FRONTLINE – HEG/OVERSTRETCH

AND, OUR PREMATURE WITHDRAWAL WILL BE SEEN AS APPEASEMENT TO AL QAEDA – HURTS OUR GLOBAL CREDIBILITY

Balanced Politics 2007 [Political Social Issues, September 2007, <http://www.balancedpolitics.org/iraq_withdrawal.htm>] ttate

It would give Al Qaeda a symbolic victory and become the basis of future recruiting propaganda. Osama bin Laden's own recruiting videos cite the examples of Vietnam, Beirut, and Somalia as evidence of America's tendency to cut-and-run when the going gets tough. The terrorist attacks on innocent Iraqi civilians have no other purpose than to manipulate the news media and weaken the will of the American public. If we retreat once again before the job is done, it would provide the best example yet of how terrorism works. It would reinforce the Al Qaeda propaganda that America is indeed a "paper tiger" that doesn't have the will to fight.

AND, ALTERNATE CAUSALITY TO MILITARY STRAIN – RECRUITING CRISIS

**KAPLAN 2008** [journalist on International Relations and foreign policy, “Dumb and Dumber: The US Army lowers recruitment standards…again”, <http://www.slate.com/id/2182752>] ttate

The Army is lowering recruitment standards to levels not seen in at least two decades, and the implications are severe—not only for the future of the Army, but also for the direction of U.S. foreign policy. The [latest statistics](http://www.nationalpriorities.org/militaryrecruiting2007)—compiled by the Defense Department. and obtained through the Freedom of Information Act by the Boston-based [National Priorities Project](http://www.nationalpriorities.org/)—are grim. They show that the percentage of new Army recruits with high-school diplomas has plunged from 94 percent in 2003 to 83.5 percent in 2005 to 70.7 percent in 2007. (The Pentagon's longstanding goal is 90 percent.) The percentage of what the Army calls "high-quality" recruits—those who have high-school diplomas andwho score in the upper 50th percentile on the Armed Forces' aptitude tests—has declined from 56.2 percent in 2005 to 44.6 percent in 2007. In order to meet recruitment targets, the Army has even had to scour the bottom of the barrel. There used to be a regulation that no more than 2 percent of all recruits could be "Category IV"—defined as applicants who score in the 10th to 30th percentile on the aptitude tests. In 2004, just 0.6 percent of new soldiers scored so low. In 2005, as the Army had a hard time recruiting, the cap was raised to 4 percent. And in 2007, according to the new data, the Army exceeded even that limit—4.1 percent of new recruits last year were Cat IVs. These trends are worrisome in at least four ways. First, and most broadly, it's not a good idea—for a host of social, political, and moral reasons—to place the burdens of national defense so disproportionately on the most downtrodden citizens. Second, and more practically, high-school dropouts tend to drop out of the military, too. The National Priorities Project cites Army studies finding that 80 percent of high-school graduates finish their first terms of enlistment in the Army—compared with only about half of those with a General Equivalency Degree or no diploma. In other words, taking in more dropouts is a short-sighted method of boosting recruitment numbers. The Army will just have to recruit even more young men and women in the next couple of years, because a lot of the ones they recruited last year will need to be replaced. Third, a dumber army is a weaker army. A study by the [RAND Corporation](http://www.slate.com/id/2133908/), commissioned by the Pentagon and published in 2005, evaluated several factors that affect military performance—experience, training, aptitude, and so forth—and found that aptitude is key. This was true even of basic combat skills, such as shooting straight. Replacing a tank gunner who had scored Category IV with one who'd scored Category IIIA (in the 50th to 64th percentile) improved the chances of hitting a target by 34 percent. Today's Army, of course, is much more high-tech, from top to bottom. The problem is that when tasks get more technical, aptitude makes an even bigger difference. In one Army study cited by the RAND report, three-man teams from the Army's active-duty signal battalions were told to make a communications system operational. Teams consisting of Category IIIA personnel had a 67 percent chance of succeeding. Teams with Category IIIB soldiers (who had ranked in the 31st to 49th percentile) had a 47 percent chance. Those with Category IVs had only a 29 percent chance. The study also showed that adding a high-scoring soldier to a three-man team increased its chance of success by 8 percent. (This also means that adding a low-scoring soldier to a team reduces its chance by a similar margin.) Fourth, today's Army needs particularly bright soldiers—and it needs, even more, to weed out particularly dim ones—given the direction that at least some of its senior officers want it to take. When the Army was geared to fight large-scaled battles against enemies of comparable strength, imaginative thinking wasn't much required except at a command level. However, now that it's focusing on "asymmetric warfare," especially counterinsurgency campaigns, such as those in Iraq and Afghanistan, the requirements are different. The crucial engagements—in many ways, the crucial decisions—take place in the streets, door to door, not by armored divisions or brigades but by infantry companies and squads. And when the targets include hearts and minds, every soldier's judgment and actions have an impact.

**AND, NO RISK OF IMPACT - No overstretch, hegemony won’t collapse, and econ is stable**

**Levey and Brown 2005** (David H. Levey, previously retired Managing Director of Moody's Sovereign Ratings Service, and Stuart S. Brown, Professor of Economics and International Relations in the Moynihan Institute of Global Affairs at Syracuse University's Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs. “The Overstretch Myth,” April, Foreign Affairs - <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/author/stuart-s-brown>) luke

Despite the persistence and pervasiveness of this doomsday prophecy, U.S. hegemony is in reality solidly grounded: it rests on an economy that is continually extending its lead in the innovation and application of new technology, ensuring its continued appeal for foreign central banks and private investors. The dollar's role as the global monetary standard is not threatened, and the risk to U.S. financial stability posed by large foreign liabilities has been exaggerated. To be sure, the economy will at some point have to adjust to a decline in the dollar and a rise in interest rates. But these trends will at worst slow the growth of U.S. consumers' standard of living, not undermine the United States' role as global pacesetter. If anything, the world's appetite for U.S. assets bolsters U.S. predominance rather than undermines it.

HEG/OVERSTRETCH EXTS - #1 – REGIONAL POWER VACUUM

Withdrawal causes power vacuum - Presence k/ hegemony and solves internal problems – Biden concedes

**Wilson 10** (Scott Wilson, staff writer for the wonderful Washington Post, “U.S. withdrawal from Iraq will be on time, Vice President Biden says,” May 27, Washington Post - http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/05/26/AR2010052605349.html) luke

Rival factions have yet to establish a new government, nearly three months after close national elections, and politicians have begun warning of a power vacuum as neighboring Iran works to influence the outcome. Adel Abdul Mahdi, one of Iraq's vice presidents, urged all parties this month to agree quickly on a new leader to head off attempts by "terrorist gangs to use the circumstances in the country to hurt the Iraqi people and the armed forces."

Some recent attacks have had sectarian hallmarks that Iraqis fear could revive the divisions within their security forces that existed during the 2006 civil war. Iraq's factions also have yet to resolve such essential long-term issues as how to share oil revenue among regions and how to settle territorial disputes rooted in history.

Speaking Saturday at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y., Obama said that the U.S. commitment to Iraq endures and that, as U.S. troops depart, "a strong American civilian presence will help Iraqis forge political and economic progress." He also reiterated his definition of success: "an Iraq that provides no haven to terrorists; a democratic Iraq that is sovereign and stable and self-reliant." On the day Obama spoke, the number of U.S. troops in Iraq dipped below the number in Afghanistan for the first time since the 2003 invasion of Iraq.

Biden, once a leading skeptic of U.S. involvement in Iraq, is now among the country's most ardent cheerleaders. He is seeking to balance Obama's determination to leave Iraq against growing concerns among some conservative critics that the current circumstances make a swift U.S. withdrawal too dangerous.

Senior administration officials counter that Iraq's fledgling democracy, now defended by improved domestic security forces, is sturdy enough to solve the country's problems with far fewer U.S. troops on hand.

PREMATURE WITHDRAWAL LEADS TO CORRUPT AND UNSTABLE IRAQI GOVERNMENT – CAUSES LOSS OF US INFLUENCE IN MIDDLE EAST

Schwartz 2010 [Michael, professor of sociology @ New York State, “Is the U.S. losing its grip in Iraq?,”, April, <http://socialistworker.org/2010/04/02/losing-the-grip-in-iraq>] ttate

The presumptive winners want absolutely no alteration of the withdrawal process. They want radically changed government policies. And they have—at least rhetorically—registered their resistance to the oil deals because of their accommodation with international oil companies. Of course, the U.S. complains that these arrangements are not sufficiently accommodating .So it does look like the outcome of the election is going to create yet another set of problems for the U.S. ambition that Iraq become the headquarters of U.S. hegemony in the Middle East. But these difficulties may not even approach what the U.S. military says it fears: a “breakdown” of order. Keep in mind that this government has almost no presence outside the Green Zone. Whatever debates occur will largely be about Green Zone policies that have only tangential impact in the rest of the country, with the exception of the policies involving oil, which could—if they produce new revenues—result in resources that could have a profound impact on daily life.

HEG/OVERSTRETCH EXTS - #3 – IRAN AGGRESSION

**Iraq afraid that if US withdraws Iran will fill the vacuum**

Al-lly, a staff writer, 2009

(Naseer Al-lly, "Iraq Welcomes US Pullout Decision but Fear Iran Might Fill Vacuum," January 2009 http://www.aawsat.com/english/news.asp?section=1&id=15906//gh-ag)

Baghdad, Asharq Al-Awsat- While most Iraqi parliamentary blocs welcomed US President Barack Obama's statements about withdrawal from Iraq and said this shows that the US administration is serious about implementing the security agreement, ending the military presence in Iraq, and letting it govern itself, some blocs expressed their fears that the vacuum which the US forces will leave behind in Iraq might revive Iran's ambitions in Iraq and interference in its internal affairs by exploiting its influence there. This is in addition to internal problems which they said the US administration needs to resolve before the pullout from Iraq, especially the oil issue and sharing it; Kirkuk; and other problems. But Iraqi deputies warned against an early US withdrawal. Deputy Osama al-Nujayfi from the Iraqi List said the US forces' withdrawal would create a vacuum and told Asharq Al-Awsat: "The US forces will leave a vacuum in Iraq if they withdraw and this vacuum will be filled by the Iraqis if they can achieve national reconciliation and build the state of institutions and a professional army loyal to the homeland and capable of filling the Americans' vacuum and achieving security. But if the Iraqis are unable to reach real reconciliation and deal with the pending issues in the constitution, the displaced, Kirkuk, and the sectarian and racial groupings, then I believe that it will be Iran which will fill the vacuum and Iraq will become easy prey for international ambitions and violations." On his part, Walid al-Sharakah from the Kurdistan Alliance said his bloc and the other political entities support the US forces' departure but added that this should be done "after organizing the Iraqi house and getting rid of the sectarian feuds." He told Asharq Al-Awsat that "everyone knows that Iraq has achieved 75 per cent security but this does not mean that we have finished or reached the target. There are potentials in the interior and defense ministries which need to be completed." He warned: "There are problems between the central government and the [Kurdistan] Region and these problems should be resolved as a failure to do so will lead to many problems and Iraq might find itself in a dangerous position that no one has imagined." Qasim Dawud, deputy from the Unified Iraqi Coalition in parliament, told Asharq Al-Awsat: "We have repeatedly called for linking the US pullout to the preparedness of the Iraqi forces. This is our basic stand on the withdrawal and we do not want a unilateral one but hope that the US administration's withdrawal will be objective and on the basis of a timetable that takes into account the security conditions in Iraq.

1NC IRAQ PMC ADV FRONTLINE – IRAQ INSTABILITY

FIRST, SQ solving for PMC failures- International regulations being adopted to govern behavior

Isenberg 09 (independent analyst specializing in military, foreign policy, and international security issues. Worked for British American Security Information council, Center for Defense Information, US navy veteran) David Isenberg, April 10 2009 “Lions and Contractors and Robots. Oh My!” United Press International <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=10114/> fri

Another positive development is that there is increasing movement toward international regulation. The International Peace Institute recently released a study that identified five different frameworks -- global watchdog, accreditation regime, arbitral tribunal, harmonization scheme and a global-security-industry club -- that go beyond market mechanisms and national regulations that can be applied to what it calls the global security industry. Although the world has yet to figure out just where and how private military and security contractors fit into international humanitarian law, far more thought and effort is being devoted to it. On the other hand, the White House has also promised to decide what work should stay in government and what's acceptable to outsource. The introduction to Obama's budget for 2010 noted, "The administration also will clarify what is inherently a governmental function and what is a commercial one; critical government functions will not be performed by the private sector for purely ideological reasons." Good luck with that. Many others have tried and failed. The bad news is that most people's thinking on private contractors is far too limited. Thanks to their use in Desert Storm in 1991, then in the Balkans in the mid-1990s and now in Iraq and Afghanistan, it is assumed that this is an issue mainly for the Defense and State departments. But the fact is that there is not a single department of the U.S. government that is not heavily dependent on the use of private contractors. The 16 agencies in the intelligence community, along with the departments of Homeland Security and Energy, are all heavily dependent on contractors. How many there are, what they do and how much they cost are not known, at least not publicly. If the press is the fourth branch of government, then contractors are the fifth. One does not have to be a lefty critic of the private sector to understand that without greater transparency of their actions and greater ability of the government to monitor them, problems are inevitable. The problem, especially for the United States as the world's leading user of private contractors, to return to the American Express card metaphor, is this: Right or wrong, the United States assumes the role of guarantor of global stability. This is not a polemical statement, just a dispassionate reality. The U.S. military is the only one in the world that has a Unified Command Plan, dividing up the world into military domains.

AND, PMCs solving instability- Only private military can connect with local community

Isenberg 09 (independent analyst specializing in military, foreign policy, and international security issues. Worked for British American Security Information council, Center for Defense Information, US navy veteran) David Isenberg, Published in 2009 “Shadow Force: Private Security Contractors in Iraq” Page 43 / fri

The typical SOF soldier is far more accustomed to interacting with foreign nationals than the average service member. Language skills and cultural appreciation are taught in their military training and carried over into the professional approach taken as a civilian specialist. Reconnaissance and tactical analysis of intelligence are a basic part of any special operations mission; within the conventional military, analysis is the realm of a limited few. Because they work in a local environment, less isolated than that of military personnel, security contractors can establish relationships with members of the community that are denied to the military locked up on a base. Although they lack a strategic or “big picture” view, in most instances that is unnecessary. They have more intimate knowledge of the issues that pertain to their small area of responsibility: protecting their clients and assets

1NC IRAQ PMC ADV FRONTLINE – IRAQ INSTABILITY

AND, PMCs more effective than US troops – deployed more quickly, more experienced, reduces political costs

Grange 06 (retired US Army Major General, CEO of McCormick Foundation, Chief Executive Officer PPD LLC, Founder of ViaGlobal Group) David L Grange May 11, 2006 “Understanding the Privatization of National Security” McCormick Foundation <http://www.mccormickfoundation.org/publications/privatization2006.pdf>) fri

Why outsource? Smaller military and the need for surge capacity: When government resources are inadequate, private contractors play an important role in achieving national security objectives and ramping up the government’s capability to respond quickly in a crisis or emergency situation. Ease and speed of deployment: Government bureaucracy is often the root cause behind the decision to outsource. Private contractors can quickly pull together highly qualified people and respond to a situation. High-tech skills and subject-matter expertise: Historically, the government has turned to private contractors for certain complex tasks that require specific technical, regional or tactical expertise. Today, with military equipment and systems constantly evolving, those skills continue to be more readily available through PMCs. Reducing political costs: Outsourcing can reduce the political costs to policy- makers. Injuries and fatalities among PMCs are not judged by the public as severely as injuries and fatalities among soldiers. Flexibility: PMCs can be more easily used for short-term projects. Cost: Depending on the situation, deploying PMCs can be less expensive than military.

**AND, PMC USE IS INEVITABLE – PMCs WILL JUST BE CONTRACTED FOR OTHER CONFLICTS**

**KUPCU, ET AL, 2008** [Maria - , “Changing the culture of Pentagon contracting”, NEW AMERICA FOUNDATION, <http://newamerica.net/publications/policy/changing_culture_pentagon_contracting>] fri

While the U.S. military has long relied on private contractors, the outsourcing of key national security functions has increased dramatically over the past five and a half years. From intelligence gathering and logistical support to personal security services, training, and operational support tasks, the efforts of contractors are now integral to the success of America's security and stabilization missions around the world. Since the beginning of the Iraq War, one dollar out of every five has been spent on private contractors. By most estimates, there are more private contractors in Iraq than uniformed military. Numerous observers have raised questions about the legal accountability of contractors and the efficacy of utilizing private actors in an active battle space, but few studies have examined the culture of contracting and the larger failure of the military to effectively account for and integrate contractors into U.S. military planning, training, and operations. This report in intended to help policymakers, both in the executive and legislative branches as well as the uniformed military, develop solutions to the growing challenge of integrating contractors more effectively into U.S. national security operations. A failure to accept the inevitability of contractors as a key element of the military force structure has contributed to inertia and an abdication of responsibility for managing the interaction between government departments and private contractors. While it is important to acknowledge that in recent years there have been significant improvements in oversight of private contractors, particularly by the Department of Defense, serious systemic and institutional problems persist. A cultural shift is required in which civilian and military leaders take steps to fully integrate private contractors not only into the force structure but also into mission requirements. Without this sort of institutional change, the problems we have experienced in connection with contractors in Iraq and Afghanistan will continue, significantly retarding the military's ability to adjust to the evolving security challenges of the 21st century.

PMC IRAQ INSTABILITY EXTS - #3 – PMCs PREFERABLE

PMC controversies are the exception, not the rule- Their great successes over 8 years in all aspects of the war are overshadowed

Singer 06 (Director of 21st Century Defense Initiative, Senior Fellow Project of US Relations with the Islamic World, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Instructor at Intternational Peace Academy, Balkans Task force) Peter Singer “Humanitarian principles, private military agents: some implications of the privatized military industry for the humanitarian community” Brookings Institution <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Files/rc/articles/2006/02defenseindustry_singer/singer20060307.pdf>) FRI

Iraq is the world’s single largest marketplace for the private military industry. Over 80 firms employing more than 20,000 private, non-Iraqi personnel carry out military functions there.26 To put this in context, the private military industry has contributed more forces to Iraq than all of the non-US countries in the Coalition combined. More than 280 private military employees are thought to have been killed, and as many as 3,000 wounded. Again, these numbers are greater than the rest of the Coalition put together, and larger than the losses suffered by any single US army division (Singer, 2005). PMFs have been involved in all stages of the operation, from war-gaming and field training before the invasion to logistics and support in the build-up to war (the massive US complex at Camp Doha in Kuwait, which served as the launch-pad for the invasion, was built by private contractors and is operated and guarded by private companies).27 During the invasion private contractors and operated weapons systems, and in its aftermath they have secured significant reconstruction contracts. Halliburton’s KBR division is thought to have secured work worth as much as $13 billion (an amount roughly two and a half times greater than the cost to the US of the 1991 Gulf war). Other roles PMFs have played in Iraq include security sector reform and training for local forces. PMFs also carry out tactical military functions, such as protecting key installations and leaders (Paul Bremer, the head of the Coalition Provisional Authority (CPA), was guarded by a Blackwater team with its own armed helicopters) and escorting convoys. PMFs have, in short, been essential to the overall Coalition effort in Iraq. At the same time, however, some of the most controversial aspects of the war have also involved PMFs. These include the allegations of war profiteering around Vice-President Dick Cheney’s old firm Halliburton, the brutal killing of Blackwater employees at Fallujah by Iraqi insurgents, which was captured on television, and the fighting and lawsuits that followed, and the role of CACI and Titan contractors working as military interrogators and translators at Abu Ghraib prison. Humanitarian agencies in Iraq have also contracted PMFs, particularly the wake of the bombing of the UN headquarters in Baghdad in August 2003 (a week before the attack, a private firm had approached the UN offering hired protection, but had been turned down). Agencies including Save the Children and CARE have hired security advisors and former military personnel. Triple Canopy and Erinys have provided protection for USAID. The contracting of PMFs by humanitarian agencies is coordinated through a centre operated by Aegis, a private military firm owned and operated by Tim Spicer, whose firm Sandline has been involved in controversial contracts in Africa and Papua New Guinea (Flaherty, 2004; Singer, 2004). Subsequent investigations have examined aspects of Aegis’ operations, including the screening and training of its employees.

PMCs provide plethora of potential advantages- lack of ties with government prevents political backlash

Singer 06 (Director of 21st Century Defense Initiative, Senior Fellow Project of US Relations with the Islamic World, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Instructor at Intternational Peace Academy, Balkans Task force) Peter Singer “Humanitarian principles, private military agents: some implications of the privatized military industry for the humanitarian community” Brookings Institution <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Files/rc/articles/2006/02defenseindustry_singer/singer20060307.pdf>) FRI

For a client hiring a private military firm, the potential advantages stem from its location in a domain – business – in which rules of efficiency and expediency are paramount. Thus, PMFs offer the potential of greater flexibility and agility than state or international organisations. By drawing on a global pool of military labour, PMFs can often call on personnel who are more experienced and better trained than state or local forces, and thus they may be able to operate more effectively on the ground, and in fewer numbers. The political consequences of soldiers being killed or wounded in action are also ‘outsourced’, in the sense that casualties among private contractors are less likely to cause political difficulties and domestic pressure for withdrawal, such as that seen in the US exit from Somalia in the early 1990s. Financial savings are also often cited as an advantage, though this is rarely a causal factor in whether PMFs are hired; few clients ever do cost estimates or competitive market analysis. Many contracts are funded via budget supplementals, which means that they do not impinge on regular appropriations. The key benefit to humanitarian actors of engaging a PMF is that such an arrangement regularises the provision of security. Many humanitarian organisations operating in dangerous places already pay for protection – sometimes at the request of the state or simply by virtue of high levels of violent insecurity – by hiring armed escorts or guards affiliated with local warlords. Many working in countries like Afghanistan, Russia, the DRC, Yemen and Somalia have had to develop quasi-contractual relationships with local ‘security’ units, clans or warlord groups to protect their staff and allow their operations to continue. In reality, these relationships are more in the nature of a protection racket (guards are paid off mainly to prevent them or affiliates from attacking an agency’s assets or staff) than a professional relationship, and may further empower local criminal groups (Johns Hopkins, 2004). The more formal business alternative that PMFs offer could be preferable.

PMC IRAQ INSTABILITY EXTS – EXTS #3 - PMCs PREFERABLE

We must rely on professionals in the modern world- faults are of the US government not of PMCs as a principle

Douthat 07 (Senior editor for The Atlantic, Op-ed columnist for the New York times, Published author, film critic) Ross Douthat September 28, 2007 “Reighan: Why Private Military Contractors are a good thing” The Atlantic <http://rossdouthat.theatlantic.com/archives/2007/09/reihan_why_private_military_co.php>) FRI

A debate has erupted over US reliance on [private military contractors](http://www.nytimes.com/2007/09/28/opinion/28krugman.html?_r=2&hp&oref=slogin&oref=slogin) in Iraq and elsewhere. My sense is that the brilliant and decidedly uneven [Robert Young Pelton](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert_Young_Pelton), a staunch critic of PMCs, has set the tone for the debate. My own view is different. We do depend on PMCs, we're likely to depend on them even more over time, and this is a very good thing. Consider John Robb's [thoughts on the subject](http://globalguerrillas.typepad.com/globalguerrillas/2007/09/journal-an-inco.html). The defining fact of our time, as John Mueller has argued, is [the decline of war](http://www.amazon.com/Remnants-Cornell-Studies-Security-Affairs/dp/0801442397). This, of couse, contradicts the [Colin Gray view](http://www.amazon.co.uk/Another-Bloody-Century-Future-Warfare/dp/0297846272) and I can see how it might seem strange given the bloody conflicts that dominate the headlines. But this doesn't change the normative shift that has taken place over the last century, from a time when military aggression was seen as both inevitable and acceptable to the present, when it is seen as an offense against all things good and decent. A similar normative shift was behind the decline of enslavement in the West, which began long before the vile practice became [economically impracticable](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert_Fogel). Ideology matters. The kind of conflicts we're seeing and are likely to see are far more like crime, pervasive and opportunistic, than like conventional interstate warfare. The patriotic sentiments that motivated volunteer armies in the past are harder to apply to campaigns designed to strengthen vulnerable foreign states, or to limit the extent of bunkering and other criminal activities that have no obvious ideological valence. And so we will need to rely on skilled professionals to help police the world. To be sure, there are legitimate concerns about abuses committed by PMCs. That is a failure of the US and Iraqi governments, but not of PMCs as a matter of principle.

PMC IRAQ INSTABILITY EXTS - #4 – PMCs INEVITABLE

PMC inevitable- Contractors have become a fourth branch of US government

International Herald Tribune 07, February 4, 2007 “US Contractors Becoming a Virtual Fourth Branch of Government” <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/02/04/world/americas/04iht-contracts.4466257.html/> fri

Without a public debate or formal policy decision, contractors have become a virtual fourth branch of government. On the rise for decades, spending on federal contracts has soared during the Bush administration, to about $400 billion in 2006 from $207 billion in 2000, fueled by the war in Iraq, domestic security and Hurricane Katrina, but also by a philosophy that encourages outsourcing almost everything government does. Contractors still build ships and satellites, but they also collect income taxes and work up agency budgets, fly pilotless spy aircraft and take the minutes at policy meetings on the war. They sit next to federal employees at nearly every agency; far more people work under contracts than are directly employed by the government. The contracting explosion raises questions about propriety, cost and accountability that have long troubled monitoring groups and are coming under scrutiny from the new Democratic majority in Congress. While flagrant cases of fraud and waste make headlines, the concerns go far beyond outright wrongdoing. Among them: Competition, intended to produce savings, appears to have sharply eroded. An analysis by The New York Times shows that fewer than half of all "contract actions" — new contracts and payments against existing contracts — are now subject to full and open competition. Just 48 percent were competitive in 2005, down from 79 percent in 2001. The most secret and politically delicate government jobs, like intelligence collection and budget preparation, are increasingly contracted out, despite regulations forbidding the outsourcing of "inherently governmental" work. Agencies are crippled in their ability to seek low prices, supervise contractors and intervene when work goes off course because the number of government workers overseeing contracts has remained level as spending has shot up. The most successful contractors are not necessarily those doing the best work, but those who have mastered the special skill of selling to Uncle Sam. The top 20 service contractors have spent nearly $300 million since 2000 on lobbying and have donated $23 million to political campaigns. A just-completed study by experts appointed by the White House and Congress, the Acquisition Advisory Panel, found that the trend "poses a threat to the government's long-term ability to perform its mission" and could "undermine the integrity of the government's decision making." The House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, whose new Democratic chairman, Representative Henry Waxman of California, added the word "oversight" to signal his intentions, will begin a series of investigative hearings on Tuesday focusing on contracts in Iraq and at the Department of Homeland Security. "Billions of dollars are being squandered, and the taxpayer is being taken to the cleaners," Waxman said. David Walker, who as the U.S. comptroller general leads the Government Accountability Office, has urged the new Congress to take a hard look at the proper limits of contracting. "There's something civil servants have that the private sector doesn't," he said in an interview. "And that is the duty of loyalty to the greater good — the duty of loyalty to the collective best interest of all." He added, "Companies have duties of loyalty to their shareholders, not to the country." Even the most outspoken critics acknowledge that the government cannot operate without contractors, which provide the capacity to handle crises without expanding the permanent bureaucracy. Contractors provide specialized skills the government does not have. Stan Soloway, president of the Professional Services Council, which represents government contractors, acknowledged occasional chicanery by contractors and too little competition in some areas. But he asserted that critics had exaggerated the contracting problems. "I don't happen to think the system is fundamentally broken," he said. "It's remarkable how well it works, given the dollar volume."

1NC Iraq Advantage Frontline – Green Energy transition

FIRST, NO LINK - The US does not depend on oil from Iraq or the Middle East

Kiernan, works as a Middle East and energy analyst, 2008

(Peter Kiernan, "America is not as Dependent on Pursian Gulf as some might think," June 2008, http://international-politics.suite101.com/article.cfm/the\_us\_and\_middle\_east\_oil//gh-ag)

As oil prices continue to climb energy security has become a prominent topic of debate in the US, particularly as 2008 is a presidential election year. Both Democratic and Republican presidential candidates have promised Americans “energy independence” which would, theoretically, relieve the American consumer of having to buy petroleum from oil producers in the Middle East. But how dependent is the US on oil supplies from the Middle East? Well, not nearly as much as people think. In fact the bulk of the US’ imported oil supplies come from closer to home and not from the Persian Gulf. Europe, Japan and China are actually more dependent on Middle East oil than the US is. According to data from the US Department of Energy, of the top five suppliers of crude oil to the US only one, Saudi Arabia, is a Middle East exporter. In March 2008, the US imported 1.795 million barrels per day (b/d) from Canada, 1.535 million b/d from Saudi Arabia, 1.214 million b/d from Mexico, 1.154 million b/d from Nigeria, and 858,000 b/d from Venezuela. These top five suppliers accounted for 68 percent of total US crude oil imports for that month. When looking at the top ten foreign suppliers of crude oil to the US, only two more Middle East exporters make the list: Iraq (sixth), which exported 773,000 b/d to the US in March 2008, and Kuwait (tenth), which exported 199,000 b/d. The top ten suppliers of crude oil to the US accounted for 87 percent of total US imports for that month. Other importers that made up the top ten were Angola (sixth, 368,000 b/d), Algeria (seventh, 247,000 b/d), and Ecuador (eighth, 231,000 b/d).

**AND, TURN – GAS PRICES - Withdrawal from Iraq causes steep rise in gas prices**

Las Vegas Review Journal, 2007

(Las Vegas Review Journal, " Porter ties U.S. withdrawal from Iraq to $9 gasoline " August 2007, http://www.lvrj.com/news/9466252.html//gh-ag)

Gasoline prices could rise to about $9 per gallon if the United States withdraws troops from Iraq prematurely, Rep. Jon Porter said he was told on a trip to Iraq that ended this week. The Nevada Republican, who returned Tuesday from his fourth trip to Iraq, met with U.S. Army Gen. David Petraeus, U.S. Ambassador Ryan Crocker, Iraqi Deputy President Tariq al-Hashimi and Iraqi Deputy Prime Minister Barham Saleh. To a person, they said there would be genocide, gas prices in the U.S. would rise to eight or nine dollars a gallon, al-Qaida would continue its expansion, and Iran would take over that portion of the world if we leave," Porter said Wednesday in a phone interview from Las Vegas. Porter did not elaborate on the assessment that gasoline prices could spike. His spokesman, Matt Leffingwell, said afterward that the scenario "makes sense if Iran moves into Iraq." Porter "can't speculate directly on what is going to happen with gas prices, but the market prices for oil reflect the stability in that region," Leffingwell said. Petraeus and Crocker offered a "blunt" assessment of the situation, Porter said. Although Petraeus did not discuss the much anticipated Iraq status report he plans to release in September, Porter said the general told him the U.S. troop surge was working. But Porter stopped short of saying he would support Petraeus' report. "This was not unlike my trip there in January. I saw a lot of successes, and I noticed substantial improvement in Baghdad," said Porter, who has traveled to Iraq three times in the past 18 months. As lawmakers warm up for a renewal of the Iraq war debate in the fall, Porter accused Democrats of failing to offer solutions to the war and avoiding a debate on the ramifications of withdrawal.

**1NC IRAQ ADVANTAGE FRONTLINE – GREEN ENERGY**

AND, High Oil prices will cause a recession

CSM, 2004 (Christian Science Monitor, "Economic risks of high oil prices," August 2004, http://www.csmonitor.com/2004/0806/p01s02-usec.html//gh-ag)

Record-high oil prices signal new danger to the economy, as rising costs ripple into everything from floral deliveries to the production of plastic toys and orange juice. Crude-oil costs of $50 per barrel suddenly don't seem far-fetched, not in a week that has seen costs top $44 for the first time in 21 years of government reporting. Experts differ on how much the recent spike is affecting economic growth - and whether the current US expansion is now at risk. But at the very least, consumers and businesses face a new headwind. Already, rising energy costs have been tagged as a factor behind a slackening of consumer spending. Growth in the nation's gross domestic product (GDP) expanded at a slower-than-expected 3 percent annual pace from April to June, down from a 4.5 percent rate for the year's first quarter. Today's economy is in some ways insulated from the oil factor. Equipment in factories and appliances in homes have become more energy efficient. Commerce in a service economy happens increasingly over fiber-optic cables rather than roads. But oil still matters. Consider that each recession in recent decades was preceded by a rise in oil prices. Today's spike hits hardest for airlines, truckers, and people who drive a lot. But few sectors of the economy are wholly unaffected. "It's a very tight market. There's just no excess capacity out there. And there is a lot of uncertainty," says Mark Baxter, director of Southern Methodist University's Maguire Energy Institute in Dallas. "And going into the election, naturally President Bush doesn't want to see [slower economic growth]. But the problem is, there is no short-term fix before November." Prices remain far from their historic peaks - such as the early 1980s - when adjusted for inflation. But costs have jumped a long way from the late-1990s era of gasoline below $1 a gallon. Most economists expect prices to stay high in the near future, as demand from expanding economies, like China, devours a stretched supply. OPEC countries, particularly top exporter Saudi Arabia, have some room to boost production, says Dave Costello, an economist at the US Energy Information Agency. But he says the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries is getting close to capacity. So extra supplies are not expected to help deflate the market, at least for the next year, he says. This Wednesday oil prices reached 21-year record highs at $44.34 in overnight trade. That's the highest price since oil futures were launched on the New York Mercantile Exchange in 1983. Oil prices have risen by more than a third since the end of 2003. Because the market is so tight, "any disruption, however minor, causes prices to spike," says Mr. Baxter. There's the continuing violence in Iraq, including fresh pipeline sabotage this week, concerns over other terrorist activities in the Gulf region and elsewhere, an Aug. 15 referendum on Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez, and labor unrest in Nigeria. The spiked prices on Wednesday were due in large part to instability in Russia, where the Kremlin had demanded billions of dollars in taxes for the year 2000 from Yukos, the country's largest oil company. Consumers - and consumer spending - has already been affected. A family with two cars, for example, that logs 22,000 miles a year at an average of 20 miles a gallon, will spend an additional $550 a year if gas prices go up 50 cents, Mr. Costello says. Some analysts say higher gasoline prices have already affected annual economic growth - by perhaps 0.8 percentage points. "In terms of the little guy, already fuel prices have affected the airlines, trucking companies, and orange-juice manufacturers, for instance - and that is passed on to the consumer," says Amy Jaffe, the associate director of the energy program at Rice University in Houston. To be sure, high oil prices affect the economy much less now than historically because the economy is much more service-oriented, she says. For all the new uncertainty about the economic recovery, Costello says he expects "pretty much normal" GDP growth next year of 3.2 percent, down from 4.6 percent this year. John Felmy, chief economist for the American Petroleum Institute in Washington, disagrees. "The combination of high petroleum and high natural gas prices is a real drag on the economy," he says. "Many economists speculate that a large share of [slower GDP growth expected for next year] is due to ... energy prices." One positive sign: prices retreated a bit late Wednesday. "That is a big deal, because I really think we are looking at the top here," says Sarah Emerson of Energy Security Analysis in Wakefield, Mass. "I think this is the worst of the crisis." Meanwhile, demand is not expected to slow down. Ms. Jaffe says gasoline price spikes usually don't affect the economy for at least two years. She does, however, believe that energy will be part of the presidential debate. "We still don't have an energy policy. And while there is a lot of blame to go around for that, the fact of the matter is Bush was president." Mr. Felmy agrees on the need for conservation steps, new infrastructure, and other energy policies. "We have problems we need to address," he says. "Without those adjustments, it's like we're in the movie Groundhog Day."

**1NC IRAQ ADVANTAGE FRONTLINE – GREEN ENERGY**

**AND, TURN – IRAQI ECONOMY – THEY ARE DEPENDENT ON US FOR OIL ECONOMY**

Howard , he is a writer and broadcaster on international relations, 2008. (Roger Howard, The Wall Street Journal, "An Ode to Oil," November 2008, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122791647562165587.html//gh-ag)

Oil lies at the heart of bitter civil wars in several parts of the world, notably West Africa, while several governments have recently been scrambling to stake their claims over the newly discovered deposits of the Arctic. Above all, it is often regarded as America's strategic Achilles' heel. President-elect Barack Obama has promised to end U.S. "foreign oil dependency," claiming that it can be used as a "weapon" that allows overseas governments, particularly "unstable, undemocratic governments...to wield undue influence over America's national security." Last weekend, Mr. Obama announced his plan to create a major economic stimulus package, including spending on alternate energy. Alarming as these scenarios are, they disguise the true picture, one that is really much more complicated and much more reassuring. While there are, of course, circumstances in which oil can exacerbate tensions and be a source of conflict, it can also act as a peacemaker and source of stability. So to identify America's "foreign oil dependency" as a source of vulnerability and weakness is just too neat and easy. This identification wholly ignores the dependency of foreign oil producers on their consumers, above all on the world's largest single market -- the United States. Despite efforts to diversify their economies, all of the world's key exporters are highly dependent on oil's proceeds and have always lived in fear of the moment that has now become real -- when global demand slackens and prices fall. The recent, dramatic fall in price per barrel -- now standing at around $54, less than four months after peaking at $147 -- perfectly exemplifies the producers' predicament. So even if such a move were possible in today's global market, no oil exporter is ever in a position to alienate its customers. Supposed threats of embargoes ring hollow because no producer can assume that its own economy will be damaged any less than that of any importing country. What's more, a supply disruption would always seriously damp global demand. Even in the best of times, a prolonged price spike could easily tip the world into economic recession, prompt consumers to shake off their gasoline dependency, or accelerate a scientific drive to find alternative fuels. Fearful of this "demand destruction" when crude prices soared so spectacularly in the summer, the Saudis pledged to pump their wells at full tilt. It seems that their worst fears were realized: Americans drove 9.6 billion fewer miles in July this year compared with last, according to the Department of Transportation. Instead, the dependency of foreign oil producers on their customers plays straight into America's strategic hands. Washington is conceivably in a position to hold producers to ransom by threatening to accelerate a drive to develop or implement alternative fuels, realizing the warning once uttered by Sheikh Ahmed Zaki Yamani, the former Saudi oil minister who pointed out that "the Stone Age did not end for lack of stone." Back in 1973, as they protested at Washington's stance on the Arab-Israeli dispute, Middle East producers were in a position to impose an oil embargo on the Western world. But a generation later, technological advances, and the strength of public and scientific concern about global warming, have turned the tables. The United States has powerful political leverage over producers because it holds the key to future oil supply as well as market demand. The age of "easy oil" is over, and as fears grow that oil is becoming harder to get, so too will the dependency of producers on increasingly sophisticated Western technology and expertise. Such skills will be particularly important in two key areas of oil production. One is finding and extracting offshore deposits, like the massive reserves reckoned to be under the Caspian and Arctic seas, or in Brazil's recently discovered Tupi field. The other is prolonging the lifespan of declining wells through enhanced "tertiary" recovery. Because Western companies have a clear technological edge over their global competitors in these hugely demanding areas, Washington exerts some powerful political leverage over exporters, many of whom openly anticipate the moment when their production peaks before gradually starting to decline. Syria illustrates how this leverage can work. Although oil has been the primary source of national income for more than 40 years, production has recently waned dramatically: Output is now nearly half of the peak it reached in the mid-1990s, when a daily output of 600,000 barrels made up 60% of gross domestic product, and can barely sustain rapidly growing domestic demand fueled by a very high rate of population growth. With enough foreign investment Syrian oil could be much more productive and enduring, but Washington has sent foreign companies, as well as American firms, a tough message to steer well clear. It is not surprising, then, that the Damascus regime regards a rapprochement with the U.S. as a political lifeline and in recent months has shown signs of a new willingness to compromise. The same predicament confronted Libya's Col. Moammar Gadhafi, who first offered to surrender weapons of mass destruction during secret negotiations with U.S. officials in May 1999. Facing a deepening economic crisis that he could not resolve without increasing the production of his main export, oil, Col. Gadhafi was prepared to bow to Washington's demands and eventually struck a path-breaking accord in December 2003. Col. Gadhafi had been the "Mad Dog" of the Reagan years, but oil's influence had initiated what President Bush hailed as "the process of rejoining the community of nations." Oil could also help the outside world frustrate the nuclear ambitions of Iran, whose output is likely to steadily decline over the coming years unless it has access to the latest Western technology. Many wells are aging rapidly and the Iranians cannot improve recovery rates, or exploit their new discoveries, unless Washington lifts sanctions, which have been highly successful in deterring international investment. Sometimes the markets will prove at least as effective as any American sanctions in keeping a tight political rein on oil producers. For example, when Russian forces attacked South Ossetia and Georgia on Aug. 8, Russia's stock market -- of which energy stocks comprise 60% -- plunged by nearly 7%, and within a week capital outflow reached a massive $16 billion, suddenly squeezing domestic credit while the ruble collapsed in value. A month later, the country was facing its worst crisis since the default of August 1998. But the future of the oil sector is so dependent on attracting massive foreign investment, and the wider Russian economy so heavily dependent on petrodollars, that the Kremlin simply can't afford to unnecessarily unnerve investors.

1NC IRAQ ADV FRONTLINE – GREEN ENERGY

AND, Oil is Iraq’s economy – Economy key to stability – turns back case

USA Today, 2009 (USA Today. "Iraq's economy sputter as oil prices drop," January 2009, pg online @ http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/iraq/2009-01-28-iraqecon\_N.htm//gh-ag)

BAGHDAD — Wisam al-Uqabi keeps an eye on oil prices these days with the same vigilance he uses to track soccer scores. And just like his beloved Iraqi national team, al-Uqabi says, the oil market is proving to be a regular disappointment. His obsession is unusual for a 27-year-old government worker, who a few months ago couldn't tell you the price of crude. But as dropping oil prices hurt Iraq's economy, al-Uqabi says his own future also rises and falls with the price of a barrel of oil. For the second time in less than three months, the Iraqi government announced this week that it would slash government spending in 2009 because of tumbling oil prices. Oil accounts for more than 90% of Iraq's revenue. "7 there is rising anxiety about Iraq's unsteady economy — even more than security issues from years of war and sectarian violence. Iraq's finance minister, Bayan Jabr, has cautioned government workers repeatedly over the last several weeks that "hard times" are ahead. He urges them to make saving a priority. He even suggested they buy gold. The U.S. military has said Iraqi leaders must improve basic services — like electricity, water and roads — and combat high unemployment in order to maintain the security gains made over the past year. Lt. Col. William McDonough, an intelligence officer with the division that oversees central Iraq, says Iraq's economy and basic services are now the No. 1 threat to the nation's stability. "Providing essential services and getting the budget issues solved are key to keeping Iraq on the right track," he says. The latest budget cut would bring Iraq's spending plan for 2009 to $64 billion, a steep drop from $78.4 billion unveiled in September. The original budget was based on forecasts that oil prices would stay above $80 per barrel, a conservative estimate at the time considering prices had peaked at $147 a few months earlier. On Wednesday, the price for a barrel of oil was $42. The latest budget, which was approved by the Iraqi Cabinet this week but still needs to pass parliament, figures that Iraq can pump 2 million barrels of oil a day, with prices that average $50 per barrel. "Neither of these assumptions are valid," says parliament member Ahmed Chalabi. He points out that oil has been trading between $40 and $45 per barrel for most of the last month, and Iraq's production hovers around 1.85 million barrels a day. Chalabi says Iraq's economy has "fundamental structural problems," because more money is spent on security than on developing basic services, agriculture and health care combined. Outgoing U.S. Ambassador Ryan Crocker says expanding production would keep Iraq out of a protracted economic malaise if oil prices stay low into 2010 and beyond. "Whatever the price, if you're selling more of it, you're making more," he says. "This country is, and will remain for some time, really hydrocarbon-dependent

AND, Renewable Energy hurts the environment

**Masters** **in** **Renewable** **Energy** **Engineering**, **2009**

Masters in Renewable Energy Engineering, "Negative consequences of renewable technology,"November 2009, http://ioemsre.wordpress.com/2009/11/05/renewable-energy-negative-consequences//gh-ag)

To combat global warming and the other problems associated with fossil fuels, the all nations must switch to renewable energy sources like sunlight, wind, and biomass. However, all renewable energy technologies are not appropriate to all applications or locations. As with conventional energy production, there are environmental issues to be considered. Some of the key environmental impacts associated with renewable technologies especially hydropower is given below. Hydropower The development of hydropower has become increasingly problematic in the United States and other developed nations. And small-scale hydro development has not met expectations either. Environmental regulations affect existing projects as well as new ones. For example, a series of large facilities on the Columbia River in Washington will probably be forced to reduce their peak output by 1,000 MW to save an endangered species of salmon. Salmon numbers have declined rapidly because the young are forced to make a long and arduous trip downstream through several power plants, risking death from turbine blades at each stage. To ease this trip, hydropower plants may be required to divert water around their turbines at those times of the year when the fish attempt the trip. And in New England and the Northwest, there is a growing popular movement to dismantle small hydropower plants in an attempt to restore native trout and salmon populations. That environmental concerns would constrain hydropower development in Nepal is perhaps ironic, since these plants produce no air pollution or greenhouse gases. Yet, as the salmon example makes clear, they affect the environment. The impact of very large dams is so great that there is almost no chance that any more will be built in the United States, although large projects continue to be build in many developing countries. The reservoirs created by such projects frequently inundate/submerge large areas of forest, farmland, wildlife habitats, scenic areas, and even towns. In addition, the dams can cause radical changes in river ecosystems both upstream and downstream. Small hydropower plants using reservoirs can cause similar types of damage, but on a smaller scale. Some of the impacts on fish can be mitigated by installing “ladders” or other devices to allow fish to migrate over dams, and by maintaining minimum river-flow rates; screens can also be installed to keep fish away from turbine blades. In one case, flashing underwater lights placed in the Susquehanna River in Pennsylvania direct night-migrating American shad around turbines at a hydroelectric station. As environmental regulations have become more stringent, developing cost-effective mitigation measures such as these is essential. Despite these efforts, however, hydropower is almost certainly approaching the limit of its potential in the United States. Although existing hydro facilities can be upgraded with more efficient turbines, other plants can be refurbished, and some new small plants can be added, the total capacity and annual generation from hydro will probably not increase by more than 10 to 20 percent and may decline over the long term because of increased demand on water resources for agriculture and drinking water, declining rainfall (perhaps caused by global warming), and efforts to protect or restore endangered fish and wildlife. In most of the developed countries like US , hydropower may decline over the long term because of increased demand on water resources for agriculture and drinking water, declining rainfall (perhaps caused by global warming), and efforts to protect or restore endangered fish and wildlife.

**GREEN ENERGY EXTS - #1 – US NOT DEPENDENT**

The US is not dependent on Iraq for Oil

US Energy Information Administration, 6-29 (US Energy Information Administration, "Crude Oil and Total Pertoleum Imports Top 15 Countries," June 29 2010, pg online @ <http://www.eia.doe.gov/pub/oil_gas/petroleum/data_publications/company_level_imports/current/import.html//gh-ag>)

Monthly data on the origins of crude oil imports in April 2010 has been released and it shows that four countries exported more than 1.00 million barrels per day to the United States (see table below). The top five exporting countries accounted for 64 percent of United States crude oil imports in April while the top ten sources accounted for approximately 84 percent of all U.S. crude oil imports. The top five sources of US crude oil imports for April were Canada (1.883 million barrels per day), Saudi Arabia (1.245 million barrels per day), Mexico (1.134 million barrels per day), Nigeria (1.092 million barrels per day), and Venezuela (0.851 million barrels per day). The rest of the top ten sources, in order, were Angola (0.508 million barrels per day), Iraq (0.490 million barrels per day), Colombia (0.364 million barrels per day), Algeria (0.292 million barrels per day), and Brazil (0.289 million barrels per day). Total crude oil imports averaged 9.741 million barrels per day in April, which is an increase of 0.449 million barrels per day from March 2010. Canada remained the largest exporter of total petroleum in April, exporting 2.486 million barrels per day to the United States, which is a decrease from last month (2.517 thousand barrels per day). The second largest exporter of total petroleum was Mexico with 1.276 million barrels per day.

GREEN ENERGY EXTS - #4 – IRAQI ECONOMY TURN

Oil is Iraq’s economy

Hamad, 2009

(Qassim Khidhir Hamad, "oil dispute threaten iraqi economy," April 2009, pg online @ http://www.niqash.org/content.php?contentTypeID=28&id=2428&lang=0//gh-ag)

Fears are rising that parliament’s failure to pass an oil law may worsen the effects of the global economic crisis on Iraq. Without a law the development of the country’s oil capacity remains restricted, limiting Iraqi output and revenues. Continued disputes between the Kurdish regional government and the central government over the level of regional control over oil resources and revenues are blocking the passage of the law. “If the oil price remains the same, US $50 per barrel, the Iraqi budget will be cut by about 50 percent next year,” Ali Hussein Balo, a Kurdish MP and chairman of parliament's Oil and Gas Committee told Niqash, pointing to the potential for severe strains on the economy. In March parliament passed a US $58.6 billion budget after agreeing to sharp cuts amid falling oil prices. The government's original budget for 2009 was US $79 billion but it was cut as oil prices fell from a high of US $150 to their current price of US $45. Oil exports constitute 86 percent of the country’s overall revenues. Currently, the country produces 2.5 million barrels per day, well below the country's capability of more than four million. Iraq’s draft oil law has been stuck in parliament since 2006 as a result of disagreements between the Kurdish region and the central government. Baghdad wants the oil issue to be centralized while the Kurdish region is calling for a decentralized system with federal regions controlling their own oil fields.

**GREEN ENERGY EXTS - #6 - ENVIRONMENT TURNS**

Renewable Energy bad for Wildlife

FOX NEWS, 2009 (FOX NEWS, "Clean Energy may be bad for Wildlife," September 2009, <http://www.myfoxaustin.com/dpp/news/local/0915109_Clean_Energy_May_Be_Bad_for_Wildlife>) arjun

Austin, TX – If you have to pay for wind power, Texas Parks and Wildlife says clean energy may not be as green as most people think. The state agency is holding a conservation conference in downtown Austin this week to address the idea that sometimes clean energy, like wind power, can actually be bad for wildlife. Not only that, critics of wind farms say there are a slew of other reasons not to invest in those towering turbines. “It’s variable, inefficient, you can’t store it. For every 10 megawatts of wind energy, you need nine megawatts of conventional energy to back it up,” said Jack Hunt of King Ranch. Texas billionaire and energy mogul T. Boone Pickens was also in attendance. Pickens has been an outspoken advocate of wind energy for years, but recently he abandoned plans for a massive wind farm in East Texas because of problems with delivering the power.

Green Energy Exts: AT: Resource Wars – Oil

Turn - Oil good - Oil acts as a stabilizer and peacemaker among nations

Howard , he is a writer and broadcaster on international relations, 2008.

(Roger Howard, The Wall Street Journal, "An Ode to Oil," November 2008, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122791647562165587.html//gh-ag)

This seems paradoxical for it has sometimes been said that the Kremlin's attack on South Ossetia and Georgia was prompted by an ambition to seize control of local pipelines. But although this was an aggravating factor, it was not the primary cause because Russian leaders would have felt threatened -- reasonably or not -- by the presence of NATO in what they regard as their own backyard even if the region was not an energy hub. They were also reportedly eyeing Ukraine, which has no petroleum deposits of its own and poses no threat to the dominance of their giant energy company, Gazprom. Oil can also act as a peacemaker and source of stability because many conflicts, in almost every part of the world, can threaten a disruption of supply and instantly send crude prices spiraling. Despite the recent price falls, the market is still vulnerable to sudden supply shocks, and a sharp increase would massively affect the wider global economy. This would have potentially disastrous social and political results, just as in the summer many countries, including France, Nepal and Indonesia, were rocked by violent protests at dramatic price increases in gasoline. Haunted by the specter of higher oil prices at a time of such economic fragility, many governments have a very strong incentive to use diplomacy, not force, to resolve their own disputes, and to help heal other people's. This is true not just of oil consumers but producers, which would also be keen not to watch global demand stifled by such price spikes. Consider the events of last fall, when the Ankara government was set to retaliate against the Iraq-based Kurdish guerrillas who had killed 17 Turkish soldiers and taken others prisoner in a cross-border raid on Oct. 21, 2007. Even the mere prospect of such an attack sent the price of a barrel surging to a then record high of $85 because the markets knew that the insurgents could respond by damaging a key pipeline which moves 750,000 barrels of oil across Turkish territory every day.

1NC Japan Environment Adv

**Japanese Businesses are causing harm to the Environment**

**NPR 07**

Madeleine Brand,“Public Works endanger Japan’s Envirnment”,10/9/10, http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=15117373

Japan is the place where the Kyoto Treaty on global warming was signed. It is also a place with a long history of conservationism. Shinto is a distinctly Japanese religion. It is animistic, attributing personalized souls to animals, vegetables and even rocks. But Japan struggles with environmental issues like climate change brought about in part by decades of rampant construction driven by massive public works projects. The projects have turned Japan into the world's ugliest country, according to Alex Kerr, author of Dogs and Demons, which chronicles the destruction of Japan's natural beauty. In Chichibu, a small town an hour outside of Tokyo, the spirit of Shintoism and Japan's drive to industrialize comes together in stark contrast. Chichibu's sacred mountain, Mount Bukozan, has been the location for the Shinto Shrine for more than 2,000 years. It is also a mountain rich in limestone and has for decades been gouged out by cement companies. All this concrete ends up lining streams and waterfalls, but it also has contributed to the "heat island" effect in Tokyo. The temperature has risen four times more than the global average in the past century. The Tokyo government's answer is to stipulate that all new skyscrapers build rooftop gardens to mitigate the effects of warming in the largely concrete city.

Air pollution is inevitable in the Japanese Environment

**Encyclopedia of Nations 09**

Encyclopedia of Nation, ”Japan- Environment”, 2009, http://www.nationsencyclopedia.com/Asia-and-Oceania/Japan-ENVIRONMENT.html

Rapid industrialization has imposed severe pressures on the environment. Japan's Basic Law for Environmental Pollution Control was enacted in 1967 and the Environment Agency was established four years later. Air pollution is a serious environmental problem in Japan, particularly in urban centers. Toxic pollutants from power plant emissions have led to the appearance of acid rain throughout the country. In the mid-1990s, Japan had the world's fourth highest level of industrial carbon dioxide emissions, which totaled 1.09 billion metric tons per year, a per capita level of 8.79 metric tons per year. Air quality is regulated under the Air Pollution Control Law of 1968; by 1984, compensation had been provided to 91,118 air-pollution victims suffering from bronchitis, bronchial asthma, and related conditions. However, the "polluter pays" principle was significantly weakened in 1987 as a result of years of business opposition. Nationwide smog alerts, issued when oxidant density levels reach or exceed 0.12 parts per million, peaked at 328 in 1973 but had declined to 85 (85% of which took place in the Tokyo and Osaka areas) by 1986, following imposition of stringent automobile emissions standards.

Alternative Cause to water Pollution – Japan causes environmental problem

**Encyclopedia of Nations 09**

Encyclopedia of Nation, ”Japan- Environment”, 2009, http://www.nationsencyclopedia.com/Asia-and-Oceania/Japan-ENVIRONMENT.html

Water pollution is another area of concern in Japan. The nation has 430 cu km of renewable water resources with 64% used in farming activity and 17% used for industrial purposes. Increase in acid levels due to industrial pollutants has affected lakes, rivers, and the waters surrounding Japan. Other sources of pollution include DDT, BMC, and mercury. Environmental damage by industrial effluents has slowed since the promulgation of the Water Pollution Control Law of 1971, but there is still widespread pollution of lakes and rivers from household sources, especially by untreated sewage and phosphate-rich detergents. Factory noise levels are regulated under a 1968 law. Airplanes may not take off or land after 10 PM and the Shinkansen trains must reduce speed while traveling through large cities and their suburbs. Most of the nation's forests, which play a critical role in retarding runoff and soil erosion in the many mountainous areas, are protected under the Nature Conservation Law of 1972, and large areas have been reforested. Parks and wildlife are covered by the National Parks Law of 1967. In 2001, 6.8% of Japan's total land areas was protected. Japan, one of the world's chief whaling nations, vigorously opposed the 1982 resolution of the IWC calling for a phaseout of commercial whaling by 1986/87. However, since most of its trading partners, including the United States, supported the measure and threatened retaliatory measures if whaling continued, Japan finally agreed to comply with the ban. Of Japan's mammal species, 29 are endangered, as are 33 bird species, and 537 plants. As of 2001, endangered species in Japan included the Ryukyu sika, Ryukyu rabbit, Iriomote cat, Southern Ryukyu robin, Okinawa woodpecker, Oriental white stork, short-tailed albatross, green sea turtle, and tailless blue butterfly. The Ryukyu pigeon, Bonin thrush, Japanese sea lion, and Okinawa flying fox have become extinct.

Ext - Environmental decline inevitable

**Japan is responsible for environmental problems**

**Time 70**

{Time, “Environment: Smog Goes Global: A Bad Week in the Cities”, 8-10-70, http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,876745,00.html}

**THE world will end with to feel like canaries in coal mines—**obliged to perish in order to warn others of potential disaster. Rarely before had man's dependence on the fragile biosphere been so dramatically illustrated on a global scale. In the U.S., polluted air hung like a filthy muslin curtain along the entire Atlantic Coast, from Boston south to Atlanta. Because of unusually stagnant winds and humid heat in the high 90s, Washington, D.C., was on the verge of the first smog alert in the capital's history. The hardest hit of all U.S. cities was New York (see following story), which declared a first-stage pollution alert and simultaneously reeled under a severe power shortage**. The worst conditions of all were in Japan, where a vast economic expansion has outraced the country's feeble efforts to control industrial and automobile pollution.** Unlike the cars it exports to the U.S., for example, Japan's domestic autos are still not equipped with emission controls**. In Tokyo, a long and dreary rainy season was broken by a surge of windless warm weather that suddenly worsened the poisoned air.** Bright sunlight reacted with suspended auto exhaust to produce a photochemical miasma called "white smog." One day a group of children playing in a schoolyard had trouble breathing and began collapsing; they were treated for smog poisoning. In five choking days, more than 8,000 people in Tokyo were treated in hospitals for smarting eyes and sore throats. Thousands more carefully stayed indoors or tried not to exert themselves when venturing outside. Belated Action. Stung by criticism as well as smog, Premier Eisaku Sato set up a central headquarters in Tokyo to coordinate efforts to deal with the pollution. City officials, meanwhile, rushed to complete what is ambitiously billed as "the world's quickest photochemical-smog warning system"—which means daily bulletins issued via radio and TV**. So far, the smog is seeping across Japan faster than humans can chart it. On a hot, bright day last week, it reached Shikoku, smallest of Japan's four main islands, where more schoolchildren were suddenly afflicted with sore throats and eyes. Pollution experts later surmised that a freak wind had blown pollutants 70 miles across the Inland Sea from the industrial cities of Kobe, Kyoto and Osaka. Japan had plenty of company**. In Australia last week, residents of Sydney were outraged by an enveloping stink of rotten eggs, which turned out to be a massive belch of hydrogen sulfide. Though officials blamed the offensive odor on an oil company plant, they were unable to prosecute for "lack of sufficient evidence." Like the Japanese, though, they did begin at last to strengthen antipollution laws and enforcement measures of the kind that have lately been applied to Sydney's famous beaches, which are now fouled by a daily outpouring of 200 million gallons of sewage. In Saigon, the proliferation of heavy military vehicles and hordes of civilian motor scooters has so increased smog that the once leafy shade trees of the city's elegant French-built boulevards are being reduced to skeletons. The famous umbrella pines along the Appian Way leading out of Rome are suffering the same fate. Dirty air is rotting the ancient Greek bronze horses in Venice's St. Mark's Square, and eating away the stone sculptures of West Germany's Cologne Cathedral. In Western Europe, air pollutants cross borders as easily as tourists. Sweden and Norway, for example, were recently caked with "black snow"—noxious particles, including high concentrations of sulfuric acid, wafted over from factories in the Ruhr, according to some Scandinavian scientists. Because of the smog problem, the Soviet Union has begun moving factories away from cities and building new ones in rural areas. Families are moving out of Johannesburg to escape a gray smog that blots out the bloodred South African sun. In Santiago, Chile's capital, a pall of smoke from autos, industries and incinerators often obscures the snowy peaks of the towering Andes. At the University of Buenos Aires last week, scientists staged a meeting to consider ways of combating thick columns of black smoke emitted by the city's buses. The plethora of smog was a harbinger of things to come—unless cities around the globe take much faster and firmer steps to control the effluence of affluence that is rapidly making too many of them uninhabitablea cough, a wheeze, a mass gasp of emphysema. So it seemed last week, a bad week, as dirty air smothered cities around the earth. Millions of smog-choked city dwellers began

Japan is a threat to endangered Humpback whales

Washington Times 06 [Mark J. Broderick, “Japanese whaling 'illegal'; Greenpeace criticizes rise in yearly kills”, 1/18/2006, http://www.lexisnexis.com.turing.library.northwestern.edu/hottopics/lnacademic/]

Greenpeace yesterday criticized Japanese plans to boost the number of whales it kills this year and charged that commercial whalers were hunting illegally in an Antarctic sanctuary."The Japanese whaling industry plans to double its illegal slaughter of whales in spite of the global ban on whale killing," Greenpeace Executive Director John Passacantando said at a press conference. He said endangered species of whale, such as the humpback, are among those to be hunted. Japan and other nations agreed to a moratorium on whaling in 1985, but Japan continues to hunt whales under an exception allowing for scientific research. The country has announced its intention to kill 935 minke whales and 10 fin whales this hunting season in the Antarctic or Southern Ocean for what it describes as scientific research. Critics argue that the whaling exceeds any legitimate research needs. Greenpeace also is concerned that the Antarctic whaling will take place within the bounds of a Southern Ocean Whale Sanctuary established by the International Whaling Commission in December 1994. The Japanese government has said openly that "the purpose of 'research' whaling is to pave the way for the resumption of large-scale commercial whaling in the Antarctic," Greenpeace charged in a press release yesterday. Bloomberg news reported that 17 member nations of the whaling commission issued a written protest, delivered to Tokyo yesterday, that urged Japan to "cease all its lethal scientific research on whales." The environmental watchdog said the Japanese whaling industry has reorganized itself to take advantage of the research loophole. The Japanese Embassy did not return a call requesting comment on the charges. Gavin Carter, an adviser to the Institute of Cetacean Research, a nonprofit Japanese research organization, said Japanese quotas for whale kills are well below the mammals' reproductive rates. "The purpose of this research," Mr. Carter said, "is to create a knowledge bank, which the government can then use to facilitate a regulated whaling industry." Greenpeace said Japan sets "larger and larger annual quotas" for the industry. The total of 935 minke whales permitted to be killed this year is up from 330 whales in 1991. Mr. Carter urged critics of commercial whaling to be sensitive to other nations' cultural differences, noting that Japanese have "used whales for centuries. They eat the whole thing. They use every part." "Who are we to tell them what to eat, or what not to kill?" he asked.
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Rape Inevitable

Mendelson 04 **(**Senior Fellow Center for Strategic and International Studies before the House Armed Services Committee Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, Implementation of DOD Policy with Regard to Trafficking in Humans, <http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/trafficking_testimony-sem-20sept04.pdf> )

More generally, what the inspectors understood as constituting a problem seems to have been shaped by a general organizational culture inside DOD that was not invested in combating trafficking. My observation of the IG’s Bosnia and Kosovo trafficking assessment led me to wonder what the inspectors meant by “zero tolerance.” The inspectors had begun one meeting with trafficking experts from the OSCE by stating, “We have a zero tolerance policy, but we understand that there will always be instances and always be bad apples.” Other times, they would begin meetings explaining “our issue is larger than following individuals engaging in misconduct. This is about larger systemic issues versus onesies and twosies.” This suggested they perceived DOD would only respond if the numbers got above a certain, unspecified threshold. These observations have led me to conclude it is possible to have a zero tolerance policy that masks a culture of tolerance.

Rape Harm over exaggerated

Baber 02 How Bad is Rape?” <http://home.sandiego.edu/~baber/research/rape.pdf> Director of Philosophy, University of San Diego

Now there is a tendency to exaggerate the *harmfulness* of rape, that is, to make much of the incapacitating psychological traumas that some victims suffer as a result of being raped One motive for such claims is the recognition that the harm of rape *per se* is often underestimated and hence that, in some quarters, rape is not taken as seriously as it ought to be taken Rape has not been treated in the same way as other crimes of violence A person, whether male or female, who is mugged is not asked to produce witnesses, to provide evidence of his good character or display bodily injuries as evidence of his unwillingness to surrender his wallet to his assailant In the past, however, the burden of proof has been placed wrongfully on the victims of rape to show their respectability and their unwillingness, the assumption being that

(heterosexual) rape is merely a sexual act rather than an act of violence and that sex acts can be presumed to be desired by the participants unless there is strong evidence to the contrary This is not so Writers who stress the traumas rape victims suffer cite the deleterious consequences of rape in response to such assumptions

If this is made clear, there is no compelling reason to harp on the suffering of rape victims Furthermore, arguably, on balance, it may be undesirable to do so First, making much of the traumas rape vic­tims allegedly suffer tends to reinforce the pervasive sexist assumption that women are cowards who break under stress and are incapable of dealing with physical danger or violence Secondly, it would seem that conceiving of such traumas as normal, expected consequences of rape does a disservice to victims who might otherwise be considerably less traumatized by their experiences.

Rape not the worst impact

Baber 02 How Bad is Rape?” <http://home.sandiego.edu/~baber/research/rape.pdf> Director of Philosophy, University of San Diego

Now in light of these considerations it should be apparent, first, that rape is a serious harm but. secondly, that it is not among the most serious harms thai can befall a person It is a serious offense because everyone has an interest m liberty construed in the broadest sense not merely as freedom from state regulation but as freedom to go about one's business without interference Whenever a person's projects are impeded, whether by a public agency or a private individual, he is, to that extent, harmed Rape interferes with a person's freedom to pur­sue his own projects and is, to (hat extent, a harm It does not, however, render a person altogether incapable of pursuing his ulterior interests Having a certain minimally tolerable amount of liberty is a welfare in­terest without which a person cannot pursue any further projects While rape diminishes one's liberty, it does not diminish it to such an extent that the victim is precluded from pursuing other projects which are in his interest. No doubt most rape victims, like victims of violent crime generally, are traumatized Some rape victims indeed may be so severely traumatiz­ed (hat they incur long-term, severe psychological injury and are rendered incapable of pursuing other projects For the standard per­son however, for whom sexuality is a peripheral matter on which relatively little hangs.' being raped, though it constitutes a serious assault on the person, does not violate a welfare interest There is no evidence to suggest that most rape victims are permanently incapacitated by their experiences nor that in the long run their lives are much poorer than they otherwise would have been Again, this is not to minimize the harm of rape rape is a grave harm, nevertheless some harms are graver still and, in the long run, more harmful
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Toyota recall has already put pressure on US-Japan relations on top of Okinawa - no conflict yet

AP, '10 ("Japan worried that Toyota's problems could hurt U. S. ties", 2/14/10, http://www.japantoday.com/category/politics/view/japan-worried-that-toyotas-problems-could-hurt-us-ties

As pressure intensifies for Toyota’s chief to testify before Congress about the automaker’s safety lapses, Japanese political leaders and experts worry that the problem—if handled poorly—could damage ties between the two nations. Relations between Washington and Tokyo are already strained by a dispute between the two governments over the relocation of a key U.S. Marine base on the southern island of Okinawa. Political tension rose a notch Thursday when a Republican in the House of Representatives said he would support issuing a subpoena to compel Toyota President Akio Toyoda to appear before congressional committees later this month to examine the company’s string of safety problems. Toyota said Toyoda is expected to visit the U.S. in early March, but the company declined to confirm Japanese media reports that he would attend the Washington hearings. Toyota’s North American head, Yoshimi Inaba, will appear before the committees, the company said. Even before the world’s biggest automaker announced its latest recall Tuesday of nearly 440,000 Prius and other hybrids, bringing its global total to 8.5 million vehicles for faulty gas pedals and brakes, Foreign Minister Katsuya Okada expressed concern about that the problem could become a political headache. Further underscoring Toyota’s woes, the automaker said Friday it is recalling about 8,000 Tacoma pickup trucks from the 2010 model year to fix a problem with the front propeller shaft that could cause the vehicle to lose control. “I’m worried,” Okada said last Friday. “It’s not just the problem of one company but a diplomatic issue,” noting that the fiasco comes at a particularly difficult time for the automobile industry, including General Motors Corp.‘s bankruptcy filing. Japan has also been criticized for its tax incentive program for “green” cars that Washington said unfairly excluded American vehicles. The program has since been expanded to include more U.S. cars.

US-Japan relations weakening in status quo

Harris, 7-16 (Tobias, "Japan-U.S. Relations Could Get Bumpy", 2010, [http://www.newsweek.com/2010/07/16/a-fragile-alliance.print.html //](http://www.newsweek.com/2010/07/16/a-fragile-alliance.print.html%20//) GH-AS)

A mere month later, Japan is once again mired in political confusion. In July the DPJ fell well short of a majority in the upper-house elections. It will now have to find either permanent coalition partners or, failing that, parties willing to cooperate on an issue-by-issue basis. Kan has survived his party’s defeat but faces a party leadership election in September that looks certain to be contentious. The result is that the DPJ government will have little choice but to moderate its goals. Accordingly, for U.S. policymakers interested in strengthening the relationship often described as “the cornerstone of peace and security” in East Asia, Japan’s domestic political environment will continue to serve as an obstacle. For the foreseeable future, no government will be in a position to advance major new initiatives, especially those pertaining to Japan’s security policy. And the sad reality is that even if the DPJ had won a convincing victory, Washington’s interest in a more active security partnership—in which Japan would spend more on its armed forces, participate more in overseas operations, and perhaps even revise or reinterpret its Constitution to permit self-defense within the alliance—would continue to face serious obstacles. As the government’s fiscal situation worsens, it becomes less and less likely that Tokyo will take up an ambitious security policy agenda. Fixing the government’s finances is a key step to addressing the other pocketbook issues with which voters are concerned. It is unlikely that a government implementing controversial budget cuts and tax increases would also take up the contentious question of how it should contribute to the defense of Japan and security in East and Central Asia. Its fear would be that the public would punish leaders perceived as focused on problems far from Japanese shores as it implements policies that hurt Japanese households. Moreover, for a cash-strapped government, the status quo, in which Japan limits its defense spending while subsidizing U.S. bases in Japan, continues to suit Japan’s interests. The logic of the Yoshida doctrine—which was formulated during the early postwar period, and which called for low defense spending combined with an alliance founded on U.S. bases in Japan—remains relevant today: Japanese leaders once saw the doctrine as the key to postwar economic development, and now the same policies provide resources for shoring up Japan’s social safety net and halting economic decline. The irony, then, is that despite the DPJ’s desire for a more equal relationship with the United States, the political and economic logic of austerity suggests that Japan will likely grow even more dependent on the U.S. for its security, with the difference being that the relationship will be more fragile. For Japan, every U.S. initiative toward China will be scrutinized for signs that the U.S. is abandoning Japan in the region. Similarly, for Washington, every initiative to deepen cooperation within East Asia that excludes the U.S. will be questioned and may prompt grumbling about Japanese free-riding. In other words, these are the makings of a tumultuous decade for the alliance.

**1NC Japan Missile Defense Adv. 1/5**

**1. STATUS QUO solves –**

**A.** Obama will prevent from being fully functional

Kennedy '09 [Brian T. Kennedy, president of national security affairs at Clairmont, 11/9/09, "Japanese Missile Defense Matters", pg. online @ http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704402404574524620869945450.html// gh-bprp]

On the eve of President Obama's first Asia visit, Japanese policy makers should be mindful that their island nation sits between two great countries—the United States and China—going in opposite strategic directions. Whether it is the basing of American forces or the commitment to missile defense, the choices Japan makes now over its defense relationship with the United States will have existential implications for the indefinite future. Tokyo needs absolute clarity over what is at stake, particularly when it comes to Japan's need for missile defenses. Yet this seems to be in short supply at the moment. A Diet member and influential policy maker within the ruling Democratic Party of Japan, Tsuyoshi Yamaguchi, stated in September that missile defense is "almost totally useless" and accordingly the new government may cut missile defense spending. Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama and his government are still weighing the issue, and this is a decision of major import that requires greater analysis. Unfortunately both the new Japanese and the U.S. administrations appear to share an ideological predisposition against missile defense. Mr. Obama believes that ballistic missile defense—in which the Japanese have invested billions in recent years—is an unnecessary component of American and allied defense. The president has scaled back funding and, while it is politically difficult to kill the missile defense program entirely, it appears that it will be administered so that it never becomes fully operational or effective during his presidency. The White House apparently believes such defenses will be unnecessary because President Obama will work toward nuclear-weapons reductions and a plan for eventual nuclear disarmament. In terms of Asia, this amounts to a bet that China will become a commercial republic whose economic growth and democratic reforms will dampen its desire for a large and deadly nuclear arsenal.

B. **Japan will cut**

Presse '09 [Agence France-Presse, writer for Defense News online publication, 12/17/2009, “Japan Cuts Funds For Joint Missile Defense Program”, pg. online @ http://www.defensenews.com/story.php?i=4423809/// gh-bprp]

Japan Cuts Funds For Joint Missile Defense Program TOKYO - Japan's centre-left government, which took power three months ago, will suspend new funds for its joint missile defense system with the United States next year, officials said Dec. 17. The cabinet approved defense spending guidelines for the 2010-11 financial year, including a delay in the deployment of new Patriot Advanced Capability-3 (PAC-3) surface-to-air interceptors until after April 2011. Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama's government also postponed a major review of defense policy guidelines by a year to "thoroughly review the important issue of national defense after the historic change of government." Defense Minister Toshimi Kitazawa told reporters that "regarding the deployment of PAC-3 units at three more bases, we will wait for the new defense guidelines to be issued before proceeding with the plans." Hatoyama's Democratic Party of Japan and its left-leaning and pacifist coalition partners have signaled a shift from supporting military missions to humanitarian aid in a break with their more hawkish conservative predecessors. The government has scrapped a naval refueling mission in the Indian Ocean that has supported the U.S.-led campaign in Afghanistan and announced a review of a 2006 pact on relocating U.S. bases in Japan. Japan and the United States, its main post-war security ally, have for years jointly developed a missile shield of land- and sea-based interceptors against possible attacks, pointing at the threat of communist North Korea. "The freeze certainly raises questions about how Japan would address contingencies, for example in North Korea, in its alliance with the United States," said Takehiko Yamamoto, a professor of international relations. "The freeze could simply be lifted a year later," added Yamamoto of Waseda University. "After all, there are few other options [than missile defense] if you understand the basics of security in this region."

**2. Impacts are inevitable – laundry list of alternate causalities**

Strategy Page '10 [Strategy Page, website on wars and constantly evolving foreign events, 4/21/2010, "Scare Thy Neighbors", pg. online @ http://www.strategypage.com/qnd/china/articles/20100421.aspx//// gh-bprp]

April 21, 2010: There are plenty of places the Chinese Navy can send its ships for training. Sending them to international waters near Okinawa has the added advantage of reminding Japan that China could use force to assert its rights over small islands Japan also claims. Some of these islands have oil and natural gas deposits nearby. Chinese leaders are very concerned about energy supplies, because China has to import nearly all its petroleum, and consumption is growing rapidly. Thus China blocks Western attempts to impose strong sanctions on Iran, which is a major oil supplier to China. In return, China is believed to have also helped Iran with its ballistic missile and nuclear weapons programs. China is also still very concerned with Japanese military and economic power. Add to that the smoldering resentment for Japanese occupation and atrocities from the 1880s to the 1940s, and you have potential for war that is little appreciated outside the region. In fact, China has tense relationships with all its neighbors, in addition to a long history of Chinese aggression. The growing economic power of China is seen, by Chinese neighbors, as another weapon the Chinese will use against them. Internet security experts in North America and India have uncovered a major Cyber War operation, coming out of China, and aimed at the Indian military and defense industries. The security researchers caught the hackers in the act, and traced them back to China. The Chinese deny everything, but the evidence keeps piling up that China has, for years, been stealing huge quantities of commercial, military and government data. April 19, 2010: China sentenced an Australian mining executive to ten years in jail, for bribery CONTINUED - NO TEXT REMOVED...
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and stealing trade secrets. China is a major buyer of Australian raw materials, and likes to play hard ball when it comes to prices and other terms. When Australian firms resisted the Chinese pressure, Australian mining executives in China were arrested and accused of crimes that were, for most businesses in China, normal operating procedures. Australian mining firms are moving more of their Chinese offices to Singapore, partly to get away from the Chinese secret police, who like to bug your offices and tap your phone lines and Internet connections. April 18, 2010: The Japanese military announced that it was assigning more resources to keeping an eye on the Chinese military, and what developments there might mean for Japan. April 15, 2010: Responding to Japanese media reports of menacing Chinese warships off Okinawa, China announced that these were Chinese navy ships engaged in training in international waters. Nothing special. Just training. Trust us. April 14, 2010: There was a major earthquake in Tibet, killing over two thousand people, injuring over 12,000 and putting many more out of their homes. The Chinese were somewhat dismayed at the suspicion and resentment some of the 13,000 military and police relief workers received from some of the Tibetan earthquake victims. The Tibetans tend to blame China for everything that goes wrong, and bad relations between the Tibetans and ethnic (Han) Chinese remain even during a natural disaster. April 10, 2010: Japanese air patrols spotted two Chinese submarines moving, on the surface, south of Okinawa, along with seven other combat and support ships. This caused consternation in the Japanese media, and demands that China explain what so many of its warships were doing less than 200 kilometers from Okinawa. April 9, 2010: A crusading lawyer, Gao Zhisheng, has reappeared after having disappeared for a year. The government announced they were going to prosecute him for subversion. He would not say what he had been doing for the past year, but he was much thinner and subdued. He said he was giving up his crusading ways, and hoped to be reunited with his family (his wife, and two children fled, the country after Gao Zhisheng disappeared.) He and his family had been increasingly harassed by the police. The government was upset that Gao Zhisheng would take up unpopular (to government officials) cases, and make the point that Chinese law granted citizens far more legal rights than the government would like to acknowledge. More people like Gao Zhisheng are showing up. There are also a growing numbers of public demonstrations, many turning into riots, protesting corruption and officials being inept. These events are so common that even foreign tourists often see them. April 8, 2010: In China, nine journalists were convicted of taking bribes from a mine owner, to play down a major accident at the mine. The government often orders journalists to do the same thing, but taking money from a non-government organizations to not report something is generally forbidden. April 6, 2010: China's military has been given detailed instructions on how to improve their computer defenses against Cyber War attacks. This covers Internet based communications, as well as wireless equipment (radios and satellite based comms). China is introducing more communications equipment in the military, and is trying to improve and standardize security procedures and standards. It's an old Chinese tradition for troops to do only as much as they have to in order to appear ready for combat. But with Internet based communications, there is always a war going on, and patriotic hackers have been reporting that Chinese military networks are embarrassingly vulnerable.

**3. Turn:** Japan’s missile defense is key to stop multiple missile threats to the US

Izzadeen '10 [Ameen Izzadeen, writer of world watch on daily mirror, 2/23/2010, "The Story behind the nuclear scare", pg. online @ http://www.dailymirror.lk/print/index.php/opinion1/8766.html//// gh-bprp]

In more than one respect, the crisis over Iran's nuclear programme is similar to the North Korean nuclear dispute. The United States has labelled North Korea and Iran as rogue states and the labelling certainly serves Washington's global interests and agenda. The neocon-scripted document titled Project for the New American Century, which some critics have slammed as Washington's Mein Kampf, expresses concern over US security interests in both East Asia and West Asia. On East Asia, the document says, "the security of this strategically significant and increasingly tumultuous region has suffered from American neglect". It notes that East Asia has long been an area of great interest to China. "In recent years, China has gradually increased its presence and operations in the region." The PNAC recommends that raising US military strength in East Asia is the key to coping with the rise of China to great-power status. "For this to proceed peacefully, US armed forces must retain their military preeminence and thereby reassure our regional allies. In Northeast Asia, the United States must maintain and tighten its ties with the Republic of Korea and Japan," says the document authored by hardcore neocons such as former Vice-President Dick Cheney, his top national security assistant, Lewis Libby; former Defence Secretary Donald Rumsfeld; his deputy Paul Wolfowitz; former Texas governor Jeb Bush and leading Bush administration figures such as John Bolton, Richard Perle and Eliot Abrams among others. Former President George W. Bush adopted the PNAC document as his foreign and defence policy guide. When Bush lumped together Iran, Iraq and North Korea and said these countries belonged to an axis of evil, he was simply implementing the recommendations of the PNAC. Though Bush has now retired and Barack Obama has taken the reins, the PNAC has not ceased to be a part of US policy guidelines. It appears that what the Bush administration did crudely the present administration is doing subtly under cover of a pacifist image that Obama has built up for himself. That Obama gave the defence portfolio to Robert Gates, the man who held it during the last years of the Bush administration, is also an indication that the overall US defence policy remains largely unchanged and what the administration so far has done or undone is largely cosmetic. In a recent policy statement on nuclear weapons, Obama gave a pledge to nations that the US would not use nuclear weapons as first strike. But he added a rider saying he was carving out an exception for countries like Iran and North Korea that had violated or renounced the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). In other words, Obama was saying he would not hesitate to use nuclear weapons against Iran and North Korea. Even hawkish Bush did not go to the extreme of threatening these countries with nuclear strikes. But, shockingly, Obama has. Strengthening the US military presence in North-East Asia began even before Bush came to office. The Clinton administration, making use of its dispute with North Korea over the latter's nuclear programme, sent more troops to South Korea in 1994, along with heavy weapons including Patriot missiles that are capable of shooting incoming enemy missiles in the air. This came barely a few years after the US removed nuclear weapons from South Korea. The fortification was also aimed at countering possible threats from China. The Bush administration continued the same policy of making a bogey out of North Korea and further strengthened its military presence in South Korea and Japan. Such military presence and fortification can be justified only if North Korea — with whom the US has not formally ended its war — remains a rogue state with dangerous weapons that threaten to destabilize the region. This is probably why the US is not keen on a Korean unification. A peaceful and unified Korea or a confederated Korea may end the US military presence in the region with people in both Korea and Japan questioning the need for US bases in their countries and agitating for their removal. Similarly, a rogue state in Iran also serves the US interest. In North-East Asia, the US maintains bases in South Korea and Japan citing the threat from North Korea. In West Asia, the US pointing to the threat from Iran seeks to maintain its numerous bases in Iraq, Qatar and Kuwait. Not only has the US moved into the region, but its allies such as Britain and France have also done the same. France recently opened a massive military base in Abu Dhabi while Britain has its bases in Oman and Bahrain. The crisis in Yemen where two insurrections — one led by the Islamists and the other by the Houti Shiites — have drawn CONTINUED - NO TEXT REMOVED...
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world attention also offers an opportunity for the US to move in and set up base there. The heavy US military presence in West Asia can be justified only if Iran remains a rogue state with an obscure nuclear programme. A rogue state with nuclear and missile capabilities will increase the demand for US weapons from states that believe the US scare stories and see Iran as a threat. Usually the bulk of the weapons orders goes to the US. With Iran and North Korea testing long-range missiles, the demand for missile interceptors has also gone up. Japan has already invested more than one billion US dollars in joint ventures with US weapons companies to develop and procure missile interceptors. Besides, the Obama administration is also set to infuse US$ 700 million into missile defence programmes in its 2011 budget. Reviving the bogey, a top US Defence Department official on Wednesday told the Senate Armed Services Committee hearing that defending the United States from the threat of missile attacks by regional actors such as North Korea or Iran was a top priority. James Miller, Principal Deputy Defence Undersecretary for Policy, said both North Korea and Iran were developing missiles that could carry biological, chemical or nuclear warheads. He said that by 2015, Iran would be able to develop an intercontinental ballistic missile that could reach the US. Stressing the need for effective anti-missile defence shields, Miller called on the Obama administration to beef up domestic defences against a possible ballistic missile strike and protect allies and US troops deployed abroad from missile attacks by rogue states. He also recommended that the US go ahead with its planned European missile shield that include deployment of sea- and land-based missile interceptors around the continent as a safeguard against potential missile attacks from Iran. Earlier, attempts by the US to set up such missile shields in Poland and the Czech Republic evoked angry responses from Russia. Moscow insisted that Washington should abandon the plan because it saw the missile interceptors as being largely aimed at Russian missiles. To maintain its military presence in West Asia, to deploy anti-missile interceptors in Europe and to boost its armament industry, the US needs a big enemy — an enemy larger than Osama bin Laden's al-Qaeda or so called Islamic terrorists. A nuclear Iran with missile capabilities fits that description. The irony is that the US interests are served only if the enemy is sustained. Therefore, the talk of a possible US attack on Iran is hogwash. A US Defence Department secret memorandum to the White House this week states that Washington has no long-term, effective policy to stop Iran from building a nuclear bomb. A question that looms large is why the US cannot solve the crises with North Korea and Iran through diplomacy. Unconditional peace talks aimed at normalizing relations can produce outstanding results. North Korea, for instance, has said, time and again, that it is willing to dismantle its nuclear programme provided the US normalises relations and offers an array of concessions. But the US has spurned such offers, describing them as blackmail. The US has even scuttled agreements reached at the six-party talks involving the two Koreas, the US, China, Japan and Russia, provoking Pyongyang to withdraw from the talks. Both Iran and North Korea understand the US design and play cat-and-mouse games with Washington — a game that has helped them to take forward their nuclear programmes. Washington, of course, will continue to apply pressure on Iran and North Korea through UN sanctions. Analysts say that both Iran and North Korea are capable of surviving such sanctions.

**4. Turn: Japanese Missile Defense is key to conducting effective diplomacy with North Korea**

Tajima, Tosaki, Kobayashi, and Kaneda '07 [Hideaki Kaneda, Kazumasa Kobayashi, Hiroshi Tajima, and Hirofumi Tosaki, the Japan Institure of nternational affais, March 2007, "Japan's Missile Defense : Diplomatic and Security Policies in a Changing Strategic Environment", pg. online @ http://www2.jiia.or.jp/en/pdf/polcy\_report/pr200703-jmd.pdf// gh-bprp]

When North Korea launched its missiles July 2006, Japan had no system capable of intercepting ballistic missiles. However, since Japan was in the process of developing such systems, it was able to successfully detect and track some of the North Korean missiles in cooperation with the US. Japan’s capabilities to obtain such precise information on a timely basis were an important factor that allowed Japan to take a proactive and crucial role in “dissuasion diplomacy” at the UN Security Council. After the detection of North Korea’s preparations for launching a Taepo Dong 2, several countries, including China, had attempted to dissuade North Korea from actually launching, but North Korea did not heed the requests of these countries. One would argue that the fact that both Japan and the US had yet to possess the capability for intercepting ballistic missiles coming toward Japan might have been a factor in North Korea’s decision to launch the missiles. However, even if Japan and the US had such an effective capability, the missiles would not have been intercepted because their impact areas were far from Japanese or US territory. Since North Korea did not have the intention of attacking Japan or the US, it was unlikely that the US would have attempted preemptive strikes on North Korean missile launchers. North Korea might have thought that launching ballistic missiles would let them achieve political purposes, and that Japan and the US would not implement strong countermeasures. However, its attempts failed partly because both Japan and the US clearly adopted steadfast postures of not yielding to countries trying to achieve their goals by intimidation. Such postures were strongly reflected in their subsequent diplomacy. Although Japan and the US could not prevent North Korea’s missile launches, it is important to note that both countries set the precedent that strong measures would also be taken if similar events were to occur in the future. In order to conduct effective diplomacy without yielding to intimidation, “power” is still imperative in the current international community. Japan’s development of deterrence by denial is essential in terms of reinforcing its diplomatic power. If Japan develops deterrence by denial that includes capabilities for offensive defense, active defense and passive defense, such reckless acts by North Korea may be deterred more effectively. North Korea may be forced to realize that it cannot achieve expected outcomes through using or threatening to use ballistic missiles, and be dissuaded from conducting such an attack. Here lies the significance of Japan developing its “deterrence posture.”
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**And a lack of diplomacy with North Korea leads to nuclear war**

Lim and Varner '10 [Bomi Lim, reporter in Hanoi and Bill Varner, from the United Nations, 7/23/2010, "North Korea Warns of Nuclear Response to Naval Exercises, pg. online @ http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2010-07-23/north-korea-claims-innocence-over-sinking-of-south-s-ship-won-t-apologize.html// gh-bprp]

North Korea said it would counter U.S. and South Korean joint naval exercises with “nuclear deterrence” after the Obama administration said the government in Pyongyang shouldn’t take any provocative steps. North Korea will “legitimately counter with their powerful nuclear deterrence the largest-ever nuclear war exercises to be staged by the U.S. and the South Korean puppet forces,” the National Defense Commission said, according to the Korean Central News Agency. The maneuvers, which involve 20 vessels and 200 aircraft from the U.S. and South Korea, pose a threat to the country’s sovereignty and security, Ri Tong Il, an official with North Korea’s delegation to the Asean Security Forum, told reporters in Hanoi yesterday. Ri’s comments came after North Korean Foreign Minister Pak Ui Chun sat in the same room with Secretary of State Hillary Clinton in Hanoi for a security meeting of Asia’s largest powers. Clinton condemned North Korea for being “on a campaign of provocative, dangerous behavior,” urging Kim Jong Il’s regime to change. Still, the “door remains open for North Korea,” Clinton later told reporters. “We are willing to meet with them, willing to negotiate, to move toward normal relations” if North Korea commits itself to giving up its nuclear weapons program, she said. U.S. State Department spokesman Philip J. Crowley said in Washington yesterday that North Korea “would be better served by reflecting on the current situation, not taking any further aggressive actions or provocative steps.” USS George Washington The U.S. said this week it will intensify sanctions against North Korea and conduct military exercises with South Korea in waters surrounding the peninsula. The USS George Washington, a nuclear-powered carrier, and three destroyers called into South Korean ports this week in a show of force. “North Korea may very well go ahead with missile launches or even a third nuclear test to show it won’t bend to U.S. pressure,” said Yang Moo Jin, a professor at the University of North Korean Studies in Seoul. “North Korea must have sensed that the U.S. and South Korea are after its regime’s collapse.” Ri said the George Washington’s presence threatened security on the peninsula, which has been divided for more than half a century. Pak maintained the need for a peace treaty to replace a cease-fire, signed in 1953, to guarantee the peninsula’s security, Ri said. “It’s no longer the 19th century with gunboat diplomacy,” Ri said. “It is a new century and the Asian countries are in need of peace and development.” Cheonan Sinking An international panel concluded that the March 26 sinking of the corvette Cheonan was caused by a torpedo fired from a North Korean mini-submarine. The United Nations Security Council condemned the attack, which killed 46 sailors, without naming a culprit. The investigation’s results have been “fabricated,” Ri said, adding that North Korea wouldn’t apologize for the incident as demanded by South Korea. “If anyone should apologize, it should be South Korea, responsible for driving the situation on the Korean peninsula to the brink of an explosion,” Ri said. “We won’t tolerate any attempt to put the blame on us.” North Korea’s economy has been battered by UN sanctions limiting cross-border financial transactions, imposed after its nuclear tests in 2006 and last year. North Korea is willing to return to the so-called six-party talks on its nuclear weapons program “on an equal footing,” Ri said, repeating demands that the sanctions be removed. Japan Role The disarmament talks, also involving China, Japan, Russia, South Korea and the U.S., haven’t convened since December 2008. All members of that forum attended this week’s security meeting in Vietnam. Japan will send four naval officers to the drills, the government’s top spokesman said today. Four officers of Japan’s Maritime Self-Defense Force will board a U.S. ship as observers for the joint military exercise from tomorrow to July 28 in the sea between South Korea and Japan, said Yoshito Sengoku, chief cabinet secretary. “It’s important to promote coordination among Japan, U.S. and South Korea,” Sengoku told reporters in Tokyo.

5. Impacts are inevitable – Chinese-US conflict will escalate in the status quo – multiple reasons

A. Cyber war

Navarro and Autry '10 [Peter Navarro and Greg Autry, UC Irvine professors and authors of The Coming China Wars, 1/15/10, "China's war on the U.S. economy", pg. online @ http://articles.sfgate.com/2010-01-15/opinion/17828392\_1\_security-review-commission-china-s-internet-currency-manipulation// gh-bprp]

China's recent cyberattacks against Google and as many as 33 other U.S. corporations open up a dangerous new industrial espionage front in Beijing's war on American business. China's objective was not that of a rogue hacker - to create chaos. Rather, the target was any intellectual property that would give Chinese enterprises a competitive edge - from trade secrets and new technologies to software such as Google's proprietary source code. Chinese cyberattacks are hardly new. China's military regularly hacks into America's defense networks to acquire military technologies. A glaring case in point: the highly sophisticated penetration last April of the Pentagon's $300 billion Joint Strike Fighter project. Chinese industrial espionage, along with other illegal means to acquire American business technology, is hardly new either. For example, an American manufacturer such as GM or Intel that produces in China must surrender some of its technology. Such forced technology transfer is clearly illegal under World Trade Organization rules, but U.S. executives meekly kowtow for a piece of the action. Similarly, on the industrial espionage front, a shadow network of Chinese visitors to American soil regularly troll for new designs, processes, products and software that can be copied or reverse-engineered. The standard joke: What do they call an American patent in China? A blueprint. More broadly, according to the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission: "China is the most aggressive country conducting espionage against the United States." Of course, once intellectual property is stolen and exported, China gains yet another competitive edge - even as China's economy booms and America's goes bust. What's new and alarming about China's latest wave of cyberattacks is the extension of Beijing's flagrant industrial espionage to cyberspace. If the bank accounts, client lists, trade secrets, patented technologies and proprietary software of American corporations are not safe from Chinese hackers, this becomes an issue not only of economic policy but also of national security. Predictably, Chinese government officials deny any culpability. This is supremely disingenuous, given the tight control of China's Internet by its vast army of cybercops and the sophistication of the attacks. At the dawn of this new cold cyberwar, President Obama and Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton must be clear: Any attack on America - from Pentagon hackings and industrial espionage to forced technology transfer and mercantilist weapons like currency manipulation - represents an act of aggression and will not be tolerated.
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B. Taiwan conflict

Foster '10 [Peter Foster, reporter for Telegraph.co stationed in Beijing, 2/1/2010, "China attacks US 'Cold War' Mentality over Taiwan Arms Sales", pg. online @ http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/china/7128275/China-attacks-US-Cold-War-mentality-over-Taiwan-arms-sales.html// gh-bprp]

The rhetoric in a series of venemous editorials in the government-controlled media was exceeded by thousands of anti-American comments on China's main internet portals, including a petition against the arms package that attracted more than 50,000 signatures in just a few hours. Beijing has already announced the suspension of some key military-to-military contacts follow the announcement of the arms sales at thet weekend, but has also made the highly unusual threaten of economic sanctions against US companies supplying the arms, including the aircraft maker Boeing. The vehement Chinese reaction followed warnings from the foreign minister, Yang Jiechi, the US risked "damaging broader relations" with China if it did not respect Beijing's sensitivities over Taiwan. "When it comes down to it, the United States is still drawing lines based on ideology and coming up with a million ways to stymie China's development and progress," warned an editorial in the overseas edition of the People's Daily, the Communist Party's main mouthpiece. "If the United States stubbornly persists in this Cold War thinking and ignores China's core interests and grave concerns, the United States will further damage the development of bilateral ties and the great task of world peace. In the end, it will reap what it has sown." The Global Times urged the government to make the US manufacturers "pay a price for hurting China" while the China Daily said that China's response "no matter how vehement" is justified. Ordinary people commenting on the internet appeared to rally to the cry, calling in sometimes bellicose, nationalistic language for boycotts of US companies like McDonalds and urging the government to get tough with the Obama administration. Others suggested that China sell arms to Iran to see how the US would react to another nation interfering in its core security interests. Aviation industry experts gathering in Singapore for Asia's biggest air show were waiting nervously for the details of any sanctions at a time when the civilian aircraft makers are already under pressure from the financial crisis.. Boeing China said it has yet to receive any notice of intentions, adding that China was a "very important" market for the company where it competes with Europe's Airbus. Sikorsky, which will supply Black Hawk helicopters as part of the deal, also said it was not aware the situation. The US administration has said that it hopes the arms sales will not broader damage relations with China but made clear it would not change its stance on the issue. "The United States is also obligated to ensure Taiwan's self-defence capability and the United States fully intends to meet every one of our obligations there and we will continue to do so into the future," said Wallace Gregson, the US assistant defence secretary.

**Ext - Missile Defense Good**

US presence is key to regional stability

Christensen '99 [Thomas J. Christensen, princeton professor of politics and international affairs, Spring, 1999, "Chine, the U.S.-Japan Alliance, and the Security Dilemma in East Asia", pg. online @ http://www.jstor.org/stable/2539294?seq=3// gh-bprp]

If security dilemma theory is applied to East Asia, the chance for spirals of tension in the area seems great, particularly in the absence of a U.S. military presence in the region. The theory states that, in an uncertain and anarchic international system, mistrust between two or more potential adversaries can lead each side to take precautionary and defensively motivated measures that are perceived as offensive threats. This can lead to countermeasures in kind, thus ratcheting up regional tensions, reducing security and creating self- fulfilling prophecies about the danger of one's security environment. If we look at the variables that might fuel security dilemma dynamics, East Asia appears quite dangerous. From a standard realist perspective, not only could dramatic and unpredictable changes in the distribution of capabilities in East Asia increase uncertainty and mistrust, but the importance of sea-lanes and secure energy supplies to almost all regional actors could encourage a destabilizing competition to develop power-projection capabilities on the seas and in the skies. Because they are perceived as offensive threats, power-projection forces are more likely to spark spirals of tension than weapons that can defend only a nation's homeland. Perhaps even more important in East Asia than these more commonly considered variables are psychological factors (such as the historically based mistrust and animosity among regional actors) and political geography issues relating to the Taiwan question, which make even defensive weapons in the region appear threatening to Chinese security\* One way to ameliorate security dilemmas and prevent spirals of tension is to have an outside arbiter play a policing role, lessening the perceived need for regional actors to begin destabilizing security competitions. For this reason, most scholars, regardless of theoretical persuasion, seem to agree with U.S. Officials and local leaders that a major factor in containing potential tensions in East Asia is the continuing presence of the U.S. military particularly in Japan. The historically based mistrust among the actors in Northeast Asia is so intense that not only is the maintenance of a U.S. presence in Japan critical, but the form the U.S.-Japan alliance takes also has potentially important implications for regional stability in particular; the sensitivity in China to almost all changes in the Cold War version of the U.S.-Japan alliance poses major challenges for leaders in Washington who want to shore up the alliance for the long haul by encouraging greater Japanese burden sharing, but still want the U.S. presence in Japan to be a force for reassurance in the region. To meet these somewhat contradictory goals, for the most part the United States wisely has encouraged Japan to adopt nonoffensive roles that should be relatively un- threatening to Japan’s neighbors.

**Ext – Status Quo Solves**

Status quo solves – Japan plans to cut funding

Sakamaki '09 [Sachiko Sakamaki, Bloomberg's reporter in Tokyo, 9/11/2009, "Japan Should Cut 'Useless' Missile Defense, DPJ Official Says - Bloomberg", pg. online @ http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=newsarchive&sid=aruidIvvQ2bc/// gh-bprp]

A Patriot Advanced Capability-3 (PAC-3) missile unit Sept. 11 (Bloomberg) -- Japan’s new government will likely cut missile defense spending because it isn’t effective in thwarting attacks from countries such as North Korea, a senior Democratic Party of Japan official said. “Missile defense is almost totally useless,” said Tsuyoshi Yamaguchi, a Lower House lawmaker who served as the party’s deputy defense spokesman prior to its Aug. 30 election victory. “Only one or two out of 100 are ever effective,” he said yesterday in an interview in his Tokyo office. Reducing missile defense would come as North Korea, Japan’s closest military threat, boosts its nuclear and missile capability. Yamaguchi, the author of a book on the U.S.-Japan defense alliance, said trimming military expenditures is necessary to offset Prime Minister-designate Yukio Hatoyama’splans to increase social welfare spending and tuition aid. Japan is developing a missile shield using the land-based Patriot PAC-3 system and the Standard Missile-3 used on Aegis- equipped destroyers, both built by Raytheon Co., the world’s largest missile maker. The defense ministry requested a 58 percent increase on missile defense to 176.1 billion yen ($1.9 billion) next year, as part of 4.85 trillion yen budget, up three percent from this year. ‘No Number’ “Regardless of the threat from North Korea, defense specialists must know that no number of SM3s or PAC3s can directly protect us,” Yamaguchi, 54, said. North Korea, which in May tested a second nuclear device, last week said it’s in the final stages of weaponizing plutonium and can either engage in negotiations or accelerate its program. The communist country has also tested several short and medium- range missiles this year, and in April walked out of disarmament talks involving the U.S., China, Russia, South Korea and Japan. Any reduction in missile defense development would contrast with the outgoing administration of the Liberal Democratic Party, which has governed Japan for all but 10 months since 1955. The party in June suggested Japan consider possessing the capability to attack enemy bases after North Korea fired a ballistic missile that flew over Japan in April. Hatoyama said on Aug. 11 that the DPJ “doesn’t intend to increase the defense budget significantly.” He is set to become prime minister in a special parliamentary session on Sept. 16. “We’ll probably cut” the overall defense budget, said Yamaguchi, who holds a Ph.D. in international politics from Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore. “There’s so much else we have to do, such as child-care allowance, education, health care and pensions.”

**The status quo solves – Obama has pledged to cut missile defense funding**

Missle Threat '08 [Missle Threat, 2/29/2008, "Obama Pledges Cuts in MIssile Defense, Space, and Nuclear Weapons Programs", http://www.missilethreat.com/archives/id.7086/detail.asp/// gh-bprp]

A video has surfaced of Presidential candidate Senator Barack Obama talking on his plans for strategic issues such as nuclear weapons and missile defense. The full text from the video, as released, reads as follows: Thanks so much for the Caucus4Priorities, for the great work you've been doing. As president, I will end misguided defense policies and stand with Caucus4Priorities in fighting special interests in Washington. First, I'll stop spending $9 billion a month in Iraq. I'm the only major candidate who opposed this war from the beginning. And as president I will end it. Second, I will cut tens of billions of dollars in wasteful spending. I will cut investments in unproven missile defense systems. I will not weaponize space. I will slow our development of future combat systems. And I will institute an independent "Defense Priorities Board" to ensure that the Quadrennial Defense Review is not used to justify unnecessary spending. Third, I will set a goal of a world without nuclear weapons. To seek that goal, I will not develop new nuclear weapons; I will seek a global ban on the production of fissile material; and I will negotiate with Russia to take our ICBMs off hair-trigger alert, and to achieve deep cuts in our nuclear arsenals. You know where I stand. I've fought for open, ethical and accountable government my entire public life. I don't switch positions or make promises that can't be kept. I don't posture on defense policy and I don't take money from federal lobbyists for powerful defense contractors. As president, my sole priority for defense spending will be protecting the American people. Thanks so much.

Ext – Impacts Non-Unique

**Japan’s system is already functional – impacts should have already happened**

AFP '07 [Assosiated Press, 12/17/2007, "Japan shoots down test missile in space: defence minister", pg. online @ http://afp.google.com/article/ALeqM5hYKNf5janYHfOLxdsRH\_\_KSNXVNw/// gh-bprp]

TOKYO (AFP) — Japan said Tuesday it had shot down a ballistic missile in space high above the Pacific Ocean as part of joint efforts with the United States to erect a shield against a possible North Korean attack. Japan tested the US-developed Standard Missile 3 (SM-3) interceptor from a warship in waters off Hawaii, becoming the first US ally to intercept a target using the system. Defence Minister Shigeru Ishiba described the successful test as "extremely significant." "We will continue to strive to increase the system's credibility," he told reporters, insisting the missile shield was worth the high cost. "We can't talk about how much money should be spent when human lives are at stake." Japan plans to spend a total of 127 billion yen (11.2 billion dollars) over the four years to March 2008 on missile defence using the US-developed Aegis combat system, according to the defence ministry. The naval destroyer Kongou launched the SM-3 which, at 2212 GMT Monday, or 7:12am Tuesday in Japan, intercepted the missile fired from onshore earlier, the navy said in a statement. Officials said the interception was made around 100 miles (160 kilometres) above the Pacific. The test was "a major milestone in the growing cooperation between Japan and the US," Japanese Rear Admiral Katsutoshi Kawano and Lieutenant General Henry Obering, director of the US Missile Defense Agency, said in a joint statement. Washington and Tokyo have been working jointly to erect a missile shield against possible attacks from North Korea, which fired a missile over Japan's main island and into the Pacific Ocean in 1998. However the missile defence system could affect Japan's relations with its neighbours "by arousing suspicion in enemy countries," said Yoshikazu Sakamoto, professor emeritus of the University of Tokyo. "With regards to North Korea, Japan needs to enhance efforts in diplomatic negotiations to seriously address Pyongyang's military threat," he said. China offered a muted reaction to Japan's anti-missile test, saying only it hoped Tokyo's actions would be positive for peace and trust in Asia. "We hope that the actions of Japan are beneficial to the peace and stability of the region and conducive to mutual trust of the countries in the region," China's foreign ministry spokesman Qin Gang told journalists. But the test angered peace activists in Japan. Missile defence tests "facilitate military unification of Japan and the United States" and defy Japan's pacifist constitution, said Koji Sugihara, a member of a civic group campaigning against nuclear and missile tests. Japan plans to install the missile shield on four Aegis-equipped destroyers by March 2011, including the Kongou. The success of the SM-3 test paves the way for completion of Japan's missile defence involving missiles fired from warships and ground-based launchers. If the SM-3 system fails to intercept its target in space, the second stage of the shield uses ground-based Patriot Advanced Capability 3 (PAC-3) missile interceptors to try to shoot it down. Japan introduced its first PAC-3 missile launcher at the Iruma air force base north of Tokyo in March, one year ahead of schedule amid tense relations with North Korea which, in October last year, tested a nuclear device for the first time. Japanese authorities aim to increase the number of locations equipped with the PAC-3 system to 14 by March 2011.

China – US relations are crumbling now aside from the issue of missile defense – laundry list of problems

Cooke '10 [Shamus Cooke, a social service worker, trade unionist and writer for workers actions, 2/3/2010, "Another U.S. War? Obama Threatens China and Iran", pg. online @ http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/print.html?path=HL1002/S00031.htm// gh-bprp]

The possibility of yet another U.S. war became more real last week, when the Obama administration sharply confronted both China and Iran. The first aggressive act was performed by Obama’s Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton, who “warned” China that it must support serious economic sanctions against Iran (an act of war). Clinton said: “ China will be under a lot of pressure to recognize the destabilizing effect that a nuclear-armed Iran would have, from which they receive a significant percentage of their oil supply.” The implication here is that China will be cut off from a major energy source if they do not support U.S. foreign policy — this, too, would equal an act of war. A more direct military provocation occurred later when Obama agreed to honor a Bush-era military pact with Taiwan , a small island that lies off the mainland coast of China , and is claimed by China as its own territory. Taiwan has been a U.S. client state ever since the defeated nationalist forces fled there from China in the aftermath of the 1949 revolution. Taiwan has remained a bastion of U.S. intrigue and anti-China agitation for the past six decades. Obama has recently upped the ante by approving a $6.4 billion arms sale to Taiwan , including: “... 60 Black Hawk helicopters, Patriot interceptor missiles, advanced Harpoon missiles that can be used against land or ship targets and two refurbished minesweepers.” (The New York Times, January 30, 2010 ). The same article quotes a Chinese government official who responded, accurately, by calling the arms sale “… a gross intervention intoChina’s internal affairs, [and] seriously endanger[ing] China ’s national security…” In 1962, When Russia supplied missiles to Cuba , nearFlorida’s coast, the U.S. interpreted this to be an act of war. China responded harshly to the Taiwan arms deals, imposing “an unusually broad series of retaliatory measures… including sanctions against American companies that supply the weapon systems for the arms sales.” These U.S. arms manufacturers are giant corporations who have huge political influence in the Obama administration, and are likely to further push the U.S. government towards an even more aggressive response. Obama’s polices against China have been far more aggressive than Bush’s, making a farce out of his campaign promises of a more peaceful foreign policy. Obama’s same, deceitful approach is used inSouth America, where he promised “non-intervention” and then proceeded to build military bases in Colombia on Venezuela’s border, while giving a green light to the coup in Honduras. Hillary Clinton also threatened China about internet censorship last week, while Obama consciously provoked China by agreeing to talks with the Dalai Lama, who advocates the removal of Chinese influence from Tibet . Still fresh in the memories of both the U.S. and China is the recent trade flair up, when Obama imposed taxes on Chinese imports; and China responded with protectionist measures against U.S. companies, which brings us to the heart of the matter. The attitude of the U.S. government towards China has nothing to do with the Dalai Lama, internet censorship, or human rights. These excuses are used as diplomatic CONTINUED - NO TEXT REMOVED...
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CONTINUED - NO TEXT REMOVED...

jabs in the framework of a larger, geopolitical brawl. Chinese corporations are expanding rapidly in the wake of the decline of the U.S. business class, and Obama is using a variety of measures to counteract this dynamic, with all roads leading to war. This grand chessboard of corporate and military maneuvering reached a dangerous standoff yesterday, with the U.S. military provoking Iran . The New York Times explains: “The Obama administration is accelerating the deployment of new defenses against possible Iranian missile attacks in the Persian Gulf , placing special ships [war ships] off the Iranian coast and antimissile systems in at least four [surrounding] Arab countries, according to administration and military officials.” ( January 30, 2010 ). The same article mentions that U.S. General Petraeus admitted that “… the United States was now keeping Aegis cruisers on patrol in the Persian Gulf [Iran’s border] at all times. Those cruisers are equipped with advanced radar and antimissile systems designed to intercept medium-range missiles.” Iran knows full well that “antimissile systems” are perfectly capable of going on the offensive — their real purpose. Iran is completely surrounded by countries occupied by the U.S military, whether it be the mass occupation in Iraq and Afghanistan , or the U.S. puppet states that house U.S. military bases in Arab nations. Contrary to the statements of President Obama, Iran is already well contained militarily. Iran ’s government — however repressive it may be — has every right to defend itself in this context. It is possible that these aggressive U.S. actions will eventually force Iran ’s government to act out militarily, giving the U.S. military the “defensive” excuse it’s been waiting for, so the tempers of the U.S. population can be cooled. A separate New York Times editorial outlines the basic agreement onIran shared by the Democrats and the Republicans. It says: “It is time for President Obama and other leaders to ratchet up the pressure with tougher sanctions.” And: “If the [UN] Security Council does not act quickly, then the United States and Europe must apply more pressure on their own [Bush's Iraq war strategy]. The Senate on Thursday approved a bill that would punish companies for exporting gasoline to Iran or helping Iran expand its own petroleum refining capability [another act of war]” (January 29, 2010). The U.S. anti-war movement must organize and mobilize to confront the plans of the Obama administration. Obama’s policies not only mirror Bush’s, but have the potential to be far more devastating, with the real possibility of creating a wider, regional war. Iran and China are far more militarily capable than puny Afghanistan or Iraq ; the consequences of a war with either will cause countless more deaths.

Cyber war is harming US China relations

Reuters '10 [Reuters, Jan 14 2010, "US-China cyber war may get ugly", pg. online @ http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/world/china/US-China-cyber-war-may-get-ugly-/articleshow/5442573.cms//gh-bprp]

SAN FRANCISCO/BEIJING: With China the largest lender to the United States, holding $800 billion in Treasury bills, internet tensions will make steering this vast, fast-evolving relationship all the more tricky, especially with the US Congress in an election year. China has been taking a harder line, said Shi Yinhong , an expert on relations with the United States at Renmin University in Beijing . The next few months are going to see some turbulence in China-US relations . We may see some tactical concessions from China , but the general trend isnt towards compromise. China has said it does not sponsor hacking. Pressing China for an explanation , US secretary of state Hillary Clinton said, The ability to operate with confidence in cyberspace is critical in a modern society and economy. We have been briefed by Google on these allegations, which raise very serious concerns. Chinese industry analysts said the issue had snowballed beyond Google and its problems.If this becomes heavily politicized, and there are signs that it is, and people in the Chinese government say, This is good. It serves you right, and we wont bow our heads to the United States, then therell be no way out, said Xie Wen, a former executive in China for Yahoo and other big internet companies Chinas policy of filtering and restricting access to websites has been a frequent source of tension with the US and tech companies, such as Google and Yahoo. Google’s announcement suggested the recent intrusions were more than isolated hacker attacks. These attacks and the surveillance they have uncovered combined with the attempts over the past year to further limit free speech on the web have led us to conclude that we should review the feasibility of our business operations in China, Googles chief legal officer David Drummond said.

1NC JASA Adv.

1. Turn - China hates JASA – fear of Japanese militarism

Wolf, senior research fellow at Hoover Institution, 02 (Charles Jr., "Straddling Economics and Politics: Cross-Cutting Issues in Asia, the United States, and the Global Economy" ch. 36, http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph\_reports/MR1571/MR1571.ch36.pdf // GH - AS)

In the next few weeks, the crucial dilemma facing U.S. security policy in the Asia-Pacific region will be highlighted when the new guidelines for the Japan American Security Alliance (JASA) are finalized on September 24th, and one month later China’s president Jiang Zemin arrives in Washington for his first state visit with President Clinton. The dilemma arises because the two principal elements of U.S. security policy in the region—“revitalizing” JASA, and “engagement” of China—are in conflict with one another. Advancing the first retards the second. The two impending events are reflective of this conflict. The conflict springs from several sources: inherent ambiguity of the term “engagement,” and Chinese suspicions that it is really a euphemism for a U.S. strategy of “containment” designed to keep China’s ascending power in check; Chinese concerns that a revitalized JASA is a part of this strategy, and may weigh (adversely, from China’s standpoint) in the balance of forces affecting Taiwan’s future; China’s fears that—intentionally or inadvertently—revitalizing JASA runs the risk of re-igniting Japanese militarism; and residual Chinese resentment of Japan’s depredations in Manchuria in the 1930s, its atrocities in World War II, and its continued unwillingness to formally acknowledge its guilt for this history (as Germany has long since done). While the precise import of renewing and revitalizing JASA is still to be worked out, its various facets are likely to include an expanded role for Japan’s naval forces in protecting sea lines of communication (SLOCs) extending from Japan, closer linkages between American and Japanese command, control, and communication (C3) systems, closer coupling of logistic support and maintenance, and collaborative R&D activities perhaps encompassing theater missile defense technologies. (JASA’s role, if any, in the event of a possible Taiwan contingency is likely to be deliberately omitted from the new guidelines.) Any of these measures, let alone all of them, will heighten previously existing Chinese suspicions that U.S. pronouncements about “engagement” are just empty rhetoric. The term’s inherent ambiguity doesn’t help matters—for example, in one context it implies an abiding commitment of unity, while in another a commitment to combat (recall Napoleon’s dictum about military strategy: “on s’engage, et puis on voit”). Chinese suspicions are not allayed by the fact that the Chinese ideograph most closely approximating the term “engagement” is the same as that which connotes “containment.” So, from China’s standpoint, the reality of actions provided for or planned in revitalizing JASA contrast unfavorably with the vagueness and elusiveness of the “engagement” rhetoric espoused by the United States.

2. Alt cause to relations and no brink- Toyota recall has already put pressure on US-Japan relations on top of Okinawa - should have caused impacts

AP, '10 ("Japan worried that Toyota's problems could hurt U. S. ties", 2/14/10, [http://www.japantoday.com/category/politics/view/japan-worried-that-toyotas-problems-could-hurt-us-ties //](http://www.japantoday.com/category/politics/view/japan-worried-that-toyotas-problems-could-hurt-us-ties%20//) GH-AS)

As pressure intensifies for Toyota’s chief to testify before Congress about the automaker’s safety lapses, Japanese political leaders and experts worry that the problem—if handled poorly—could damage ties between the two nations. Relations between Washington and Tokyo are already strained by a dispute between the two governments over the relocation of a key U.S. Marine base on the southern island of Okinawa. Political tension rose a notch Thursday when a Republican in the House of Representatives said he would support issuing a subpoena to compel Toyota President Akio Toyoda to appear before congressional committees later this month to examine the company’s string of safety problems. Toyota said Toyoda is expected to visit the U.S. in early March, but the company declined to confirm Japanese media reports that he would attend the Washington hearings. Toyota’s North American head, Yoshimi Inaba, will appear before the committees, the company said. Even before the world’s biggest automaker announced its latest recall Tuesday of nearly 440,000 Prius and other hybrids, bringing its global total to 8.5 million vehicles for faulty gas pedals and brakes, Foreign Minister Katsuya Okada expressed concern about that the problem could become a political headache. Further underscoring Toyota’s woes, the automaker said Friday it is recalling about 8,000 Tacoma pickup trucks from the 2010 model year to fix a problem with the front propeller shaft that could cause the vehicle to lose control. “I’m worried,” Okada said last Friday. “It’s not just the problem of one company but a diplomatic issue,” noting that the fiasco comes at a particularly difficult time for the automobile industry, including General Motors Corp.‘s bankruptcy filing. Japan has also been criticized for its tax incentive program for “green” cars that Washington said unfairly excluded American vehicles. The program has since been expanded to include more U.S. cars.

1NC JASA Adv.

3. Status Quo solves - the DPJ will mend Japan-Sino relations – claim responsibility for wars

Lynch, interview with Gerald Curtis, a Columbia University political science professor and expert on Japanese politics, government and society, '09 (Elizabeth M. Lynch, "The Future of Japanese-Chinese Relations Under Japan’s New Government: An Expert Weighs In", 10/5/9, http://www.thechinabeat.org/?p=940 // GH-AS)

But little has been made of the impact of Japan’s new government on its relation with its large and imposing neighbor to the west: China. Will the Hatoyama government seek to work with China or further alienate China by continuing to glorify Japan’s World War II past? Is Japan’s goal to look inward to Asia at the expense of its relationship with the U.S.? To answer these questions, I spoke with Gerald Curtis, a Columbia University political science professor and expert on Japanese politics, government and society. In analyzing the future of Japanese-Chinese relations, Professor Curtis left me with another word that has been used frequently in recent elections: hope. Transcript of Interview with Prof. Gerald Curtis EL: My first question is: how do you envision the China-Japanese relationship changing with the change of government in Japan? GC: Well, I think it’s going to get better. It’s already gotten better in the last few years, but it will get better. One reason being Hatoyama’s view on the so-called history issue, on Japan’s responsibility for its behavior during the War and the years leading up to the War, is very heartfelt and the Chinese will appreciate his view on the history issue. Unlike some of the LDP leaders who apologized but didn’t really mean it, Hatoyama believes Japan was behaving very badly and will say so. So I think that will be very good. Also, he wants to see a stronger relationship with China. He’s not going to go to the Yakasuni shrine which has been a source of difficulty. He wants to create an alternative site in which foreign leaders can go, as well as Japanese leaders, to pay respects to all those who died in the War regardless of nationality. He wants to encourage greater cooperation on issues like environmental, pollution control and so on, which the Chinese desperately need. And I think he understands well that improving relations with China doesn’t come at the expense of relations with the U.S. The U.S. wants to improve relations with China, so does Japan, but the U.S. and Japan together can do a lot in dealing with China and some of the problems it faces. So I think the relationship is likely to get better.

4. No Impact - US-China war will never happen – economies are intertwined

Barnett, American military geostrategist, '04 (Thomas, "Why China will never Risk War with the US over Taiwan...", http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1361719/posts

"Three key pillars control the vast bulk of long-term investments. Not surprisingly, these three constitute the Old Core of Globalization II: the United States, the (now) European Union, and Japan. This relatively small slice of the global population (approximately one-eighth) controls over four-fifths of the money. If you want to join the Core, you must be able to access that money-plain and simple. That fundamental reality of the global economy explains why we won't be going to war with China. The Pentagon can plan for it all it wants, but it does so purely within the sterile logic of war, and not with and logical reference to the larger flows of globalization. Simply put, those flows continue to reshape the international security environment that the Defense Department often imagines it manages all by its lonesome. Let me paint you the same basic picture I love to draw each time I give my brief to Pentagon strategists and, by doing so, give you a realistic sense of what China would be up against if it chose to challenge the United States-led globalization process wing military means. China has to double its energy consumption in a generation if all the growth it is planning is actually going to occur. We know where the Chinese have to go for the energy: Russia, Central Asia, and the Gulf. That's a lot of new friends to make and one significant past enemy to romance (Moscow). But Beijing will pull it off, because they have no choice. To make all that energy happen, China has to build an amazing amount of infrastructure to import it, process it, generate the needed energy products, and deliver it to buildings and wehicles all over the country (though mostly along the coast). That infrastructure will cost a lot, and it's common when talking to development experts to hear the "T" word-as in "trillions"-casually tossed around. Where is China going to go for all that money? Certainly it will tap its biggest trade partner, Japan, for all it can. But when it really wnat to tap the big sources of money, there are only two financial communities that can handle that sort of a request: Wall Street and the European Union. So when you add it all up, for China to get its way on development, it needs to be friends with the Americans, the Europeans, the Muslims, and the Slavs. Doesn't exactly leave a lot of civilizations to clash with, does it?

Ext – China hates JASA

Turn – China hates US-Japan alliance – seen as a containment strategy

Yuan, Director of the East Asia Nonproliferation Program, '07 (Jing-dong, "Chinese Perspectives on the U.S.-Japan Alliance" p. 6-7, 3/3/07, http://www.allacademic.com//meta/p\_mla\_apa\_research\_citation/1/8/1/3/9/pages181396/p181396-1.php

The changing U.S.-China and Sino-Japanese relations influence how Beijing views the U.S.-Japan alliance. Chinese attitudes toward the U.S.-Japan alliance have over the years shifted from outright condemnation and opposition in the 1960s, to tacit acquiescence in the 1970s and 1980s, to growing criticisms since the end of the Cold War. In the past the alliance in Beijing’s eyes served a useful purpose of keeping Tokyo from seeking re- militarization, it is now increasingly viewed as a security threat. 14 While in the past, China remained less than outspoken about the U.S.-Japan alliance as it was more narrowly focused on defending Japan, that reticence is increasingly being replaced with publicly expressed concerns over the new direction of the alliance and especially the expanded role for Japan in the revised defense guidelines. 15 For the Chinese, the fundamental issue is whether the alliance will continue to serve as a useful means to keep a lid on Japan’s military ambition or it will become a launch pad for Japan to justify the expansion of the JSDF’s role in support of much expanded alliance missions beyond the defense of Japan. China reacted negatively to the April 1996 U.S.-Japan Joint Declaration on Security and the September 1997 U.S.-Japanese Defense Cooperation Guidelines. The continued presence of U.S .military forces in the region, and a resilient U.S.-Japan security alliance at a time of much reduced security threats in the region only caused the Chinese to ponder on their true intentions and implications for its own security. 16 First, Beijing considers the revitalized U.S.-Japan military alliance as part of Washington’s containment strategy against China. After all, the alliance was established during the Cold War years with the defense of Japanese territories as its primary mission. Now the Cold War has ended, the very raison d’être – protecting Japan from Soviet aggression – no longer exists. The alliance therefore reflects Cold War mentality and actually justifies and facilitates continued U.S. military presence in the region with unmistakably clear objectives: to maintain American primacy against China as a potential future adversary. Second, the revitalized alliance allows the Japanese Self Defense Force to take on additional responsibilities. Beijing has become increasingly worried that a more assertive Japan actively involved in the region’s security affairs and seeking to be a “normal” power will emerge as a result. 17 The new defense guidelines in effect give Japan the green light to go beyond the original exclusive self-defense to a collective defense function therefore providing justification for Japan to intervene in regional security affairs. 18 As Beijing sees it, Japan already has one of the largest defense budgets in the world and has a reasonably sized (given its peace constitution) but the best-equipped military in the region. In addition, Japan’s industrial and technological wherewithal will provide it with ready resources should it decide to become a military great power at short notice, including the acquisition of nuclear weapons

Ext – Alt Cause

Alternate Causality to relations declining - US-Japan relations weakening in status quo from US-China interactions

Harris, 7-16 (Tobias, "Japan-U.S. Relations Could Get Bumpy", 2010, [http://www.newsweek.com/2010/07/16/a-fragile-alliance.print.html //](http://www.newsweek.com/2010/07/16/a-fragile-alliance.print.html%20//) GH-AS)

A mere month later, Japan is once again mired in political confusion. In July the DPJ fell well short of a majority in the upper-house elections. It will now have to find either permanent coalition partners or, failing that, parties willing to cooperate on an issue-by-issue basis. Kan has survived his party’s defeat but faces a party leadership election in September that looks certain to be contentious. The result is that the DPJ government will have little choice but to moderate its goals. Accordingly, for U.S. policymakers interested in strengthening the relationship often described as “the cornerstone of peace and security” in East Asia, Japan’s domestic political environment will continue to serve as an obstacle. For the foreseeable future, no government will be in a position to advance major new initiatives, especially those pertaining to Japan’s security policy. And the sad reality is that even if the DPJ had won a convincing victory, Washington’s interest in a more active security partnership—in which Japan would spend more on its armed forces, participate more in overseas operations, and perhaps even revise or reinterpret its Constitution to permit self-defense within the alliance—would continue to face serious obstacles. As the government’s fiscal situation worsens, it becomes less and less likely that Tokyo will take up an ambitious security policy agenda. Fixing the government’s finances is a key step to addressing the other pocketbook issues with which voters are concerned. It is unlikely that a government implementing controversial budget cuts and tax increases would also take up the contentious question of how it should contribute to the defense of Japan and security in East and Central Asia. Its fear would be that the public would punish leaders perceived as focused on problems far from Japanese shores as it implements policies that hurt Japanese households. Moreover, for a cash-strapped government, the status quo, in which Japan limits its defense spending while subsidizing U.S. bases in Japan, continues to suit Japan’s interests. The logic of the Yoshida doctrine—which was formulated during the early postwar period, and which called for low defense spending combined with an alliance founded on U.S. bases in Japan—remains relevant today: Japanese leaders once saw the doctrine as the key to postwar economic development, and now the same policies provide resources for shoring up Japan’s social safety net and halting economic decline. The irony, then, is that despite the DPJ’s desire for a more equal relationship with the United States, the political and economic logic of austerity suggests that Japan will likely grow even more dependent on the U.S. for its security, with the difference being that the relationship will be more fragile. For Japan, every U.S. initiative toward China will be scrutinized for signs that the U.S. is abandoning Japan in the region. Similarly, for Washington, every initiative to deepen cooperation within East Asia that excludes the U.S. will be questioned and may prompt grumbling about Japanese free-riding. In other words, these are the makings of a tumultuous decade for the alliance.

Ext – SQ solves

Status Quo Solves - Sino-Japanese relations improving through bilateral economic ties

Xinhau News, '10 ("China-Japan relations enjoy continuous improvement, says Premier Wen", 5/12/10, [http://news.xinhuanet.com/english2010/china/2010-05/12/c\_13290740.htm //](http://news.xinhuanet.com/english2010/china/2010-05/12/c_13290740.htm%20//) GH-AS)

BEIJING, May 12 (Xinhua) -- Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao Wednesday said Sino-Japanese relations are continuously improving and developing. "This lays an important political foundation for the two sides to jointly cope with the international financial crisis and increase cooperation," Wen said when meeting with a delegation of the Japan Business Federation. Wen hailed the important contribution of China-Japan economic and trade cooperation in promoting economic growth of the two nations and East Asia at large. He said the acceleration of economic restructuring, changing development modes, and achieving sustainable development were common issues for China and Japan, and this was a challenge and opportunity as well for economic and trade relations. Wen hoped the businesses would increase cooperation in energy saving, environmental protection and new energies. Members of the Japanese delegation said Japan was glad to see the strategic and mutually beneficial direction of bilateral ties. China's economy first broke away from the impact of the international financial crisis and had maintained rapid growth. This offered favorable conditions for deepening Japan-China economic and trade cooperation, they said.

Status Quo solves - Japan-Sino relations will improve through economic ties

Xinhau, 7-22 ("Japanese PM Instructs New Envoy to Further Develop Ties with China", 7-22-10, http://english.cri.cn/6909/2010/07/22/1781s584451.htm

Prime Minister Naoto Kan on Thursday instructed Uichiro Niwa, Japan's new ambassador to China, to further develop Japan-China relations, public broadcaster NHK reported. Kan made the instruction while meeting with Niwa, who is about to go to China to assume office, at the prime minister's residence. Kan said that he spent some 10 years studying Japan-China relations, and voiced his hope that Niwa will make determined efforts to further strengthen bilateral ties. After the meeting, Niwa told reporters that Japan will be left behind if it does not seek to cement ties with China in the economic area. Following the direction of economic ties, Japan will strengthen political relations with China, he added.

Ext – No Impact

No Impact - US-China war long way away – Chinese domestic issues prevent military conflict

Walt, professor of international affairs at Harvard, '10 (Stephen M., "China's new strategy", 4/26/10, http://walt.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2010/04/25/chinas\_new\_strategy?sms\_ss=email

For the past fifteen years or so, there's been a continuing debate on the likelihood of a serious rivalry between the United States and China. On one side are realists who believe that if China continues to increase its economic power, then significant security competition between the two countries is virtually inevitable. On the other side are those (mostly liberal) theorists who believe that the potential for trouble will be muted by economic interdependence and the socializing effects of China's growing participation in various international institutions. (This was Bill Clinton's rationale for getting China into the World Trade Organization, for example). And if China were to make a gradual transition to democracy, so the argument runs, then democratic peace theory will kick in and there's nothing to worry about. On Saturday, the New York Times published an important story supporting the realist view. It described the rapid expansion of China's naval capabilities (a classic manifestation of great power status), as well as the more ambitious new strategy that this growing capacity is designed to serve. Briefly, as China's economic power and dependence on overseas raw materials (e.g., oil) has grown, it is seeking to acquire the ability to protect its access. In practice, China's new strategy of "far sea defense" means acquiring the ability to project naval power into key ocean areas (including the Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf), while denying other naval powers the ability to operate with impunity in areas close to China. Needless to say, this is precisely what realism would predict, and some prominent realists (e.g., my co-author John Mearsheimer) have already explained the logic behind this prediction very clearly. And the one country that shouldn't be at all surprised is the United States, because China appears to be doing something akin to what we did during the latter part of the 19th century. To be specific: Beijing is seeking to build its economy, then expand its military capacity, achieve a position of regional dominance, and then exclude other major powers from its immediate neighborhood. In the U.S. case, we expanded across North America ("Manifest Destiny") and other great powers to stay out of the Western hemisphere (the Monroe Doctrine). It took a long time before the United States was strong enough to enforce the latter idea, but eventually we could and we did. This position has been a huge strategic advantage ever since: not only is the United States the only great power that didn't have to worry about foreign invasion (because it had no great power rivals nearby), this position also allowed us to intervene all over the globe without having to devote much blood or treasure to defending our own shores. If you were a Chinese strategist, wouldn't you like to be in similar position? Ideally, you'd like to be the strongest power in East Asia and you wouldn't want any other great powers (like the United States) to have a major strategic role there. Achieving that goal is not easy, however, because China has some strong neighbors (Japan, India, Vietnam, etc.) and many Asian states already have close security ties with the United States. So here's what I'd expect to see over the next few decades. I'd expect China to speak softly (for the most part) while it builds a bigger stick. If they are smart, they won't throw their weight around too much lest they provoke more vigorous balancing behavior by their neighbors (and the United States). I would also expect them to continuing developing military capabilities designed to make it more dangerous for the United States to operate near China, and eventually build power projection capabilities that will complicate our operations in other areas that matter (like the Persian Gulf). At the same time, look for them to forge relations in some areas that have been traditional U.S. "spheres of interest," so that the United States has to devote more time and attention to these regions too. I'd expect them to play "divide-and-conquer" closer to home as well, and try to persuade some of their neighbors to distance themselves from Washington. Lastly, Beijing would dearly love to keep the United States bogged down in places like Afghanistan, distracted by disputes over Iran's nuclear program, and stymied by the interminable Israeli-Palestinian conflict, while they exploit the anti-American sentiments that these problems exacerbate and stay focused on the bigger picture. So don't expect a lot of help from them on those fronts. There are at least three caveats worth noting in this otherwise gloomy picture. First, as the Times article makes clear, China remains much weaker than the United States today, and it has a long way to go before it becomes a true "peer competitor." So there's no need for panic, just a timely and prudent response. The good news (such as it is) is that China's rise should make it relatively easy for the United States to stay on good terms with its current Asian allies. Second, Chinese economic growth is likely to slow in the years ahead, especially as its population ages and as its emerging middle class demands additional social benefits. This situation will force Beijing to make some hard choices about domestic and international priorities and may limit the speed with which economic might is translated into military power and overseas presence. Third, and most important, nothing I've said above implies that open war between the United States and China is inevitable. Nuclear deterrence is likely to keep the competition within bounds, and prudent and sensible diplomacy may be able to defuse or limit potential clashes of interest. Nonetheless, if China continues on the course laid out here, you should expect significant security competition between Washington and Beijing in the decades ahead. To expect anything else is . . . well . . . unrealistic.

No Impact - developing Chinese democracy will prevent US-China war

Friedberg, worked in the office of the Vice President of the United States as deputy assistant for national-security affairs and director of policy planning under Bush, ’05 (Aaron L., “The Future of U.S.-China Relations Is Conflict Inevitable?”, muse.jhu.edu/journals/international\_security/.../30.2friedberg.pdf // GH-AS)

Above all else, liberal optimists believe that democracy is a force for peace. Regimes that rely for their power and legitimacy on the consent of the governed are less likely to enter lightly into military adventures or to engage in wars whose true purpose is to line the pockets, and satisfy the vainglory, of their leaders. Although democracies may at times behave belligerently toward nondemocracies, they have rarely, if ever, gone to war with one another. As the number of democracies in the world increases (as it has quite dramatically, albeit at an uneven pace, over the course of the last two centuries), the likelihood of international conºict should diminish.19 Liberal optimists believe that, although it is still far from finished, the process of democratization is already well under way in China.20 This process is being driven largely by economic development, which, in turn, is being accelerated by China’s increasing openness to trade. Rising per capita incomes are creating a growing Chinese middle class. In Europe and North America, and more recently in Asia, those whose rising incomes allow them to do more than attend to the struggle for daily existence have been the prime movers behind progress toward democracy, and there is every reason to hope that they will play a similar role in China.21 Liberals also believe that, in addition to stirring the desire for political rights, economic development creates an objective, functional need for political liberalization. Without courts, contracts, and a reliable rule of law, economic progress will surely falter. Moreover, in an era in which sustained growth depends increasingly on free flows of information, regimes that seek to restrict speech and control communications will be at a fatal disadvantage. Over time, if it wishes even to approach the levels of well-being already attained by its advanced industrial counterparts (all of which are democracies), China too must become democratic.22 As it does, the liberal optimists expect that its relations with the United States will stabilize and that, ultimately, it will enter into the democratic “zone of peace.” Although the process may take time fully to unfold, before too long open conflict between the United States and a democratic China will be as improbable as war among the members of the European Union appears to be today.

1NC Japan Econ Adv.

**Okinawa Economy good because of US bases.**

**Sumida, 05**

[Chiyomi Sumida](mailto:sumidac@pstripes.osd.mil), president of the Japan-U.S. Housing Association, “Okinawa business leaders fear impact of U.S. drawdown Economist, real estate chief see significant monetary losses for island”, Pacific edition, Sunday, November 27, 2005, <http://www.stripes.com/article.asp?section=104&article=33278>

“Downsizing of the military presence means downsizing the local economy,” said Moritake Tomikawa, professor of economics at the Okinawa International University. Tomikawa said most post-return base reuse plans are missing one important element. “There are plans drawn on paper, showing where business zones will be or where roads will be built,” he said. “But what is lacking are reutilization plans based on solid market mechanism to secure capital.” And if the bases are downsized, so too will be the economic support provided by the national government, he said. According to data released by the prefectural government, Okinawa received $7.56 billion from the national coffer in 2002, the latest figure available. In addition, Tokyo paid $1.62 billion on the U.S. bases, an income second only to the amount the tourism industry brings in — $2.952 billion. A lot of what Tokyo gives Okinawa is associated with the military presence, Tomikawa said. “And if the military presence is reduced, the income related to the military would decline accordingly,” he said. “It’s a double whammy.”

**Okinawa key to sustaining Japanese Economy.**

**Brainard, 10**

Lael Brainard was a Brookings senior fellow from 2001 to 2009. Brainard left Brookings for the U.S. Treasury Department, to serve as under secretary of the Treasury for international affairs, April 22, 2010, “A New Conjuncture in the U.S.-Japan Economic Relationship”, http://www.brookings.edu/speeches/2001/04globaleconomics\_brainard.aspx,

Let me simply conclude by saying that I am one of those who believes that Japan and Okinawa have a very bright future. Japan will again become a powerhouse. It has all the necessary attributes to compete and win in the new economy once the banking mess is cleaned up. I look forward to coming back here one day, not in the distant future, when Japan again is the model to study and Okinawa is a vibrant hub in that Japanese economy.

**Economic collapse in Japan causes global economic collapse.**

**THE AMERICAN, 07**  
“Make way for Japan”, July/Aug. 2007, pp. 60-69, http://sks.sirs.com/cgi-bin/hst-article-display?id=SIL0324-0-7353&artno=0000276399&type=ART&shfilter=U&key=japan%20economy%20key%20to%20global%20economy&title=Make%20Way%20for%20Japan&res=Y&ren=N&gov=N&lnk=N&ic=N

While China gets all the attention, Japan, still firmly ensconced in second place among the world's economic powers, is quietly enjoying its longest period of sustained growth since World War II. Japan's global brands have never been stronger: Toyota surpassed General Motors in car and truck sales for the first quarter of 2007, knocking it out of the world's top spot for the first time in 76 years; patent royalties deriving from Japanese inventiveness hit $4.2 billion in 2006. Sony and Canon, Honda and Panasonic, Fujitsu and Hitachi: throughout the world, Japanese brands are respected and profitable. By contrast, despite the best efforts of personal-computer giant Lenovo and white-goods producer Haier, China has yet to build a single brand that most Americans could name. Japan is back.

**Collapse of Japan’s Economy is likely**

**Porteous, 06**

Bruce Porteous is currently Head of Financial and Operational Risk with Standard Life Bank, “The Coming Economic Collapse”, 2-26-6, http://www.rense.com/general69/econm.htm

Meanwhile, Japan since the late Eighties had been wrestling with a stagnant economy, deflation, and a rising currency.  The Bank of Japan was already printing money prior to Sept 11th to support its own debt-ridden banks and to stimulate the domestic economy, and has continued with this policy ever since: printing yen to purchase American dollars.  Japan has been able avoid inflation through having high domestic savings, and by investing heavily outside the country.   This has kept the Yen from appreciating against the dollar, enabled Japan's export sector to remain competitive, and kept interest rates at near zero.  As much of Japan's external investments have been in the USA, it has resulted in Japan holding assets worth trillions of US dollars, many of which are invested in US Treasury Bonds and Mutual Funds. Printing money to solve a nation's economic problem can never be sustained.  Eventually, it will lead to the debasing of a nations currency and run-away inflation.  Yet for a short period, it can create an artificial prosperity, deluding the masses into believing this new prosperity can be sustained.  The long-term consequences of inflating their money supply will spell disaster for America and Japan, and have dire consequences for the global economy.

Ext – Base Key to Okinawa Econ

Base Supports Economy of Okinawa

**Kuhn, 10** Anthony Kuhn is NPR's foreign correspondent based in London, “In Okinawa, Elections Renew Debate Over U.S. Bases”, 1-25-10, http://www.scpr.org/news/2010/01/25/in-okinawa-elections-renew-debate-over-us-bases/

The U.S. administered Okinawa from 1945 to 1972. During that time, Ota says, U.S. and Japanese officials showered supporters of the military bases with money and pork barrel construction projects. Previous mayors in Nago have supported the bases, saying it's both in the national interest and good for the local economy. Yasunari Yamashiro, a retired cement company manager, is an adviser to Yoshikazu Shimabukuro, the former mayor of Nago who lost in Sunday's election. "Look at Nago, it's so rural," Yamashiro says. "Jobs are few and incomes are low. Young folks all move to the cities and never come back. We are increasingly isolated. Our former mayors have always tried to develop this small city, which is why I support the incumbent."

**Okinawa Economy supported by Base.**

**Japan Focus, 08**

“US Bases, Japan and the Reality of Okinawa as a Military Colony”, August 19, 2008 http://www.japanfocus.org/-Yoshida-Kensei/2857

Other factors that influence the prolonged stationing of the USF is Japan’s ‘sympathy budget’ that far exceeds any other country’s US base budget, as well as the Okinawan economy’s dependenc on the bases. Japan’s contribution towards the cost of the stationing of US bases, which the US calls ‘host nation support’, consists of direct support (Japanese employees’ salaries, land rents, housing, utilities, relocation costs of training facilities – all added to the annual budget) and indirect support (tax waivers, road tolls and port use fees etc.). Every year, Japan’s financial support far exceeds the total of such support by NATO member nations, including Germany, Italy, and the UK. (The total amount of support by the 18 NATO member nations other than the US in 2002 was $2.5 billion or ¥300 billion; Japan’s support was $4.4 billion or ¥530 billion). Japan is one of the military superpowers of the world along with the UK, France, and China, with a defense budget of $44.3 billion. Japan’s ‘sympathy budget’ provides 75% of the total costs of the USF stationed in Japan (The NATO total is 27%, of which 97% is indirect contributions). Part of the contribution comes back to the Okinawan economy in the form of land rents, salaries, material purchases, construction work etc. In addition, cities, towns, and villages that host US bases can claim from the Japanese state base-related expenses such as noise prevention measures, fishing industry compensation, and other subsidies and grants. The cities, towns and villages that receive the relocated bases will receive new reorganisation subsidies from the government. Okinawa has a very low proportion – about 30% - of independent revenue such as prefectural taxes. For the rest, it relies on reallocating local taxes and national Treasury disbursement; in addition, in such places as Kin, Ginowan, Onna, and Kadena, base-related revenue accounts for more than 20% of total revenues. The long-term presence of the bases has hindered Okinawa’s autonomous economy (the bases did contribute to the civil engineering and construction business, food and drink industries and supply industries). And Okinawa’s reversion to Japan led to the maintenance of infrastructure such as roads and public facilities. However, neither laid a foundation for long-term autonomy such as manufacturing industry, and Okinawa has fallen into the pathology of the ‘carrot and stick’ ideology the Japanese government set up.

**U.S. Base keeps Okinawa economy from collapsing.**

**Sumida, 05**

Chiyomi Sumida president of the Japan- U.S. Housing Association, “Okinawa Business leaders fear impact of U.S. drawdown, November 25,2005, http://www.stripes.com/article.asp?section=104&article=33278

And that’s bad news for a prefecture already suffering from an unemployment rate more than double the national average — 8.9 percent in October, compared to the national average of 4.2 percent. Okinawa also has the lowest per capita income in the country, according to national statistics. On Oct. 29, the U.S. and Japan agreed on an interim report on the realignment of U.S. troops that calls for building a new airport in northern Okinawa to replace Marine Corps Air Station Futenma and moving 7,000 troops assigned to the III Marine Expeditionary Force off the island. “Okinawa is not fully ready to face the reality that comes with the changes,” Tomikawa said. “There has been little discussion about post-return.” Tomikawa’s school is adjacent to MCAS Futenma. In August 2004, a Marine CH-53D Sea Stallion helicopter crashed on the campus. Although the crew survived and no civilian injuries were reported, the incident underscored calls to move Marine bases from Okinawa’s urban areas. “I witnessed firsthand the adverse impact of the military presence,” Tomikawa said. “It would be easy to abandon oneself to anger and demand the base be closed. But we have to be cautious against such emotionally charged arguments. “What we need now is to know where Okinawa’s economy stands and how much impact the military presence gives to the local economy,” he said. “It is alarming that not many people give serious thought to the economic contributions the military makes on Okinawa.” One group that has thought long and hard about that subject is the housing agencies that serve the American service members. “There are about 35 housing agencies for military families on Okinawa with 140 to 150 employees,” said Yasuhiko Okae, chairman of the Okinawa Real Estate Federation and former president of the Japan-U.S. Housing Association. The annual income from renting about 3,000 homes to Americans on Okinawa is estimated to be about 5 billion yen ($42 million), he said. “It is a big industry on Okinawa,” he said.

Ext – Econ Collapse Inev

Collapse of Japan’s Economy Likely

**MSNBC, 2002**

“Japan’s economy at risk of collapse”, 11 December 2002, http://www.ratical.org/ratville/CAH/linkscopy/JEaRoC.html,

The scope of the crisis is daunting. The Japanese economy hasn't grown in more than 12-years. The stock market, down 76 percent from its peak, is hovering near a 19-year low. The country's budget deficit is now 140 percent of GDP -- the highest of any developed nation. And, to add insult to injury, the nation's assets are deflating. Prices, including home values, are coming down. At the heart of it all: a banking crisis that makes America's 1980s savings and loan industry scandal look like chump change. Japanese banks are thought to be carrying $1 trillion in bad loans on their books. Simply postponing that problem will not solve it; time will not heal this," said Robert Feldman, chief economist for Morgan Stanley in Tokyo. "I think the rest of the world has seen 10 to 12 years of not addressing the problem. And if you talk to Japanese -- who are even more cynical than foreign investors -- they will say that no matter who is the prime minister, who is in the cabinet, the bureaucracy will always get them." Indeed, Japan has seemed paralyzed: unable or unwilling to implement the kind of reform the world says it must if it is to keep its economy from imploding. And the world is now pinning its hopes on two outsiders to take on an entrenched political bureaucracy. Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi and his economics minister Heizo Takenaka are reformers who are trying to patch together a plan to clean up the banks' balance sheets. But in a shrinking economy, new bad debts pile up almost as quickly as the banks clear out the old ones. As many as 200,000 Japanese companies have all but failed. They're being kept on life support by the banks, and a socialist government afraid that allowing the companies to fail and default on their loans will kill the banks and put huge numbers of Japanese out of work. So the economy limps along. The irony here in Japan is that despite this economic crisis, there are no bread lines. There are no unemployment queues. This country still enjoys one of the highest standards of living in the world. For the average Japanese, there isn't much pain. "Although there is clearly a large hole in the bottom of the ship and people are drowning in regions of Japan, if you look at the people on deck and in the first class cabins -- they're still drinking champagne" said Noriko Hama, an economist at the highly regarded Mitsubishi think tank.

Link - North Korea Aggression

U.S. troops in Okinawa key to deterrence against a North Korean attack

Donga, 4/28/2010 “US Base in Okinawa” <http://english.donga.com/srv/service.php3?biid=2010042821218>

Unlike U.S. forces in mainland Japan, U.S. troops in Okinawa are also in charge of defending the Asia-Pacific region as well as Japan. The island also serves as the primary launch pad for the U.S. military in the event of war on the Korean Peninsula. Seen from Kadena Air Base, which is armed with high-tech aircraft, Seoul is situated within the base’s operational radius of less than an hour. The 18,000-strong “instant mobile troops” of the U.S. Marines stationed there can be deployed anywhere in Asia and the Pacific within six to 48 hours. It would take 21 days if the Marines are dispatched from the U.S. mainland. Their mission is to remove weapons of mass destruction in North Korea if war breaks out on the peninsula. Futenma Air Base in south central Okinawa is the air hub of the U.S. Marines stationed on the island. Surrounded by residential and commercial districts, the base is the cause of many complaints from residents. Washington and Tokyo agreed in 2006 to relocate the base to Schwab Base in northeastern Okinawa. Conflict flared, however, after the Democratic Party of Japan promised to relocate the base outside of Okinawa as a campaign pledge before taking power. Japanese Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama is agonizing over whether to choose Japan’s national interest or political considerations until the deadline of late May. Japan is increasing its troop presence in Okinawa in view of China’s rising influence. If U.S. Marines are pulled from the island, not only will it cause a disruption in the U.S. defense strategy for the Asia-Pacific region, including the Korean Peninsula, but will deal Japan a major loss in its national defense. The sinking of the South Korean naval patrol boat Cheonan is something Japan can ill afford to ignore, as mounting evidence suggests the North was involved. Tokyo must be wary of Pyongyang’s nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles, and must also guard against an underwater attack from North Korea. Japan should reconsider the relocation of the Futenma base as deterrence in its defense against North Korea.

Politics Link

Politics link - Cutting all funding is politically challenging

Kennedy '09 [Brian T. Kennedy, president of national security affairs at Clairmont, 11/9/09, "Japanese Missile Defense Matters", pg. online @ http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704402404574524620869945450.html// gh-bprp]

On the eve of President Obama's first Asia visit, Japanese policy makers should be mindful that their island nation sits between two great countries—the United States and China—going in opposite strategic directions. Whether it is the basing of American forces or the commitment to missile defense, the choices Japan makes now over its defense relationship with the United States will have existential implications for the indefinite future. Tokyo needs absolute clarity over what is at stake, particularly when it comes to Japan's need for missile defenses. Yet this seems to be in short supply at the moment. A Diet member and influential policy maker within the ruling Democratic Party of Japan, Tsuyoshi Yamaguchi, stated in September that missile defense is "almost totally useless" and accordingly the new government may cut missile defense spending. Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama and his government are still weighing the issue, and this is a decision of major import that requires greater analysis. Unfortunately both the new Japanese and the U.S. administrations appear to share an ideological predisposition against missile defense. Mr. Obama believes that ballistic missile defense—in which the Japanese have invested billions in recent years—is an unnecessary component of American and allied defense. The president has scaled back funding and, while it is politically difficult to kill the missile defense program entirely, it appears that it will be administered so that it never becomes fully operational or effective during his presidency. The White House apparently believes such defenses will be unnecessary because President Obama will work toward nuclear-weapons reductions and a plan for eventual nuclear disarmament. In terms of Asia, this amounts to a bet that China will become a commercial republic whose economic growth and democratic reforms will dampen its desire for a large and deadly nuclear arsenal.

1NC KUWAIT ADVANTAGE FRONTLINE – OVERSTRETCH

FIRST, Kuwait key to training exercises - we cannot mirror terrain in the US for Middle East missions.

**Cpl. Holt,** 15th Marine Expeditionary Unit Public Affairs**, 08** [Cpl. Stephen Holt, "15th MEU Weapons Company 2/5 Conducts Sustainment Training in Kuwait", 7-21-08, <http://www.navy.mil/search/display.asp?story_id=38485>] erik

CAMP BUEHRING, Kuwait (NNS) -- Marines and Sailors with Weapons Company, Battalion Landing Team 2/5, 15th Marine Expeditionary Unit (MEU), honed their infantry skills in the sands of Kuwait from June 24-July 9. For the past two months, they were embarked aboard USS Peleliu (LHA 5) and USS Pearl Harbor (LSD 52), but came ashore to Kuwait in late June to conduct sustainment training. The **Kuwait sustainment training package provided Weapons Company with open desert space for driving and shooting, explained 1st Lt. Matthew Lampert, light armored vehicle platoon commander. "Before we got off the ship we started planning. We want to use the desert environment to our advantage by doing a lot of long-range shooting and long-range driving**," said Lampert, a native of Big Sky, Mont. One of the **main objectives for the company included practicing driving skills in the wide-open spaces of Kuwait's desert. "It's great out here because the terrain and open desert allows us to maneuver freely and set up vehicle formations and to exercise vehicle tactics**," said Sgt. Eduardo Chaidez, light armored vehicle crewman. "**While training back in the States you only get a few square kilometers to train in, but out here we can get a few hundred square kilometers to work with." Few places in the United States mirror the conditions and environment of a Middle Eastern desert,** explained Chaidez, native of Sylmar, Calif. **Back at Camp Pendleton the terrain is very different and is filled with vegetation and hills. At Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center Twentynine Palms, Calif. the environment is rocky. A second key advantage to training in Kuwait's vast spaces is the flexibility to conduct training that is normally not permitted at Camp Pendleton.** Marines were able to shoot using a simulated street curb as cover and shooting while lying on their backs. **This type of flexibility added a lot of value to the training the Marines were getting, explained Sgt. Mike E. Ray, a section leader with Combined Anti-Armor Team 1. "Being out here, we had a lot of flexibility for what we could do with the Marines**," said Ray. **"We were able to do things like shoot using a simulated street curb for cover and shooting lying directly on our backs, which is typically something we can't do back in the States**." It's nice to get here and build our own training packages that can hone skills to the specifications we feel are important. This allows us to identify weaknesses and deficiencies and build courses to help correct them." Because there are fewer units training in Kuwait than in the United States, weapons company has more time to address shortcomings rather than rush off the range to make way for another unit, explained Ray. **"It's great to get these younger Marines out here to see camels, actual Arabic writing and people who live in the Middle East,**" added Ray**. For the younger Marines who have never deployed, the realism of training in Kuwait helped build their combat mindset**. **"I can't get over how hot it is, but I feel that if I were called to Iraq in the future, I'd feel a lot more comfortable going because I've spent time in the Middle East and feel that I know more of what to expect**," said Xiang, a 19-year old native of San Francisco. The Camp Pendleton, Calif.-based 15th MEU is comprised of approximately 2,200 Marines and Sailors and is a forward deployed force of readiness capable of conducting numerous operations, such as non-combatant evacuation operations, humanitarian assistance operations and a wide range of amphibious missions.

1NC KUWAIT ADVANTAGE – WESTERN IMPERIALISM

FIRST, OUR PRESENCE IN KUWAIT IS NOT AN EXAMPLE OF WESTERN IMPERIAL OVERREACH – KUWAIT WANTS US THERE – THEY BUILT AND FUNDED CAMP ARIFJAN

Global Security, 2005 [Global Security, "Camp Arifjan [Camden Yards] 28ᵒ 54'N 48ᵒ 11' E", April 26, 2005, <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/facility/camp-arifjan.htm>] erik

Camp Arifjan is a new $200 million state-of-the-art facility built courtesy of the Kuwaiti government. This new army base has literally risen out of the sand. The base will provide permanent support facilities for American troops in Kuwait, replacing temporary facilities that have been used since the Gulf War. The Army component of US Central Command (USCENTCOM), [US Army](http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/facility/camp-arifjan.htm) Forces Central Command (ARCENT), maintains a forward presence in the region. Government-to-government agreements were negotiated with the Qatar and Kuwait to allow the prepositioning of military assets. The Army has met major milestones in its security strategy in the Middle East by completing a prepositioning facility in Qatar, and by the rapid pace of construction on a new installation in Kuwait. These facilities support USCENTCOM's efforts to protect US interests in this region in accordance with the National Security Strategy. US forces use these facilities under a variety of agreements, which include host nation involvement with providing and managing the facilities. A new prepositioning facility is under construction by the Kuwait [government](http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/facility/camp-arifjan.htm) at Arifjan, south of Kuwait City [Arifjan is also known as Araifjan, Arefjan and Urayfijan]. When complete, the facility will replace Camp Doha, a former industrial warehouse complex that has been converted for use as an Army installation. Camp Doha was leased by the Kuwait Ministry of Defense and provided to the Army to support its three major missions in Kuwait -- to maintain prepositioned equipment, supplies and materials; direct joint exercises with the Kuwait armed forces; and ensure the security of Kuwait. Camp Doha was intended as a temporary facility until the permanent installation was designed and built at Arifjan. A full brigade set of equipment is stored at Camp Doha, much of it outside. The new facility will have most of the equipment sets stored in large warehouses, similar to the ones built in Qatar, to protect them from the harsh desert environment. While troops jokingly call the pair of tall smokestacks near Camp Doha the "Scud goal posts," commanders have had to install makeshift measures around the facility to keep troops protected from terrorist threats. All that will change when the Army shifts its operations to a new facility now being built south of Kuwait City near the village of Arifjan and the headquarters of a Kuwait armored brigade**.** It will be absolutely state of the art, from force protection to life support. For starters, troops will live in actual barracks instead of the beehives carved out of the warehouses. Instead of hanging Kevlar netting across windows to protect against blasts, the new facility will use shatterproof Mylar glass. Armored vehicles will get special maintenance bays for the contracted mechanics who keep the equipment at one of the highest availability rates in the Army. The Arifjan installation is a joint project between the engineering organizations of USCENTCOM, ARCENT, Army Corps of Engineers Transatlantic Programs Center [TAC], and Kuwait's Military Engineering Projects (MEP) office, the engineering arm of the Kuwait [Ministry of Defense](http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/facility/camp-arifjan.htm). TAC did major portions of the design, while MEP handled other designs. The US [Army Corps of Engineers](http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/facility/camp-arifjan.htm) (USACE) designed the facilities to support US Army operations, and provided [quality assurance](http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/facility/camp-arifjan.htm) services to Kuwait's Defence Ministry during construction of the installation at the Arifjan base which will be used by US forces**.** For construction purposes, the Kuwait government divided the facility into four packages and has awarded three construction contracts, according to Ron Rhodes, chief of TAC's Arifjan Quality Assurance (QA) Office. The packages are: Zone I, administrative and quality of life facilities. Awarded July 1999, estimated completion spring 2002 (TAC design). Zone II, industrial area, with warehousing, maintenance, and storage facilities. Awarded July 1999, estimated completion fall 2001 (TAC design). Zone III, ammunition storage area. Construction complete (MEP design). Zone IV, [infrastructure](http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/facility/camp-arifjan.htm) (roads and utilities). Awaiting award (MEP design). The Arifjan QA Office, with nine TAC team members, is responsible for assisting MEP's resident engineer staffs for each of the zones. They advise and assist the Kuwait resident engineers in accordance with their procedures. Their role is to provide construction management and quality assurance advice and to interpret specifications that involve literally hundreds of submittal reviews and requests for technical information. They also assist in joint inspections and, ultimately, turnover to the Army. Besides the ongoing construction, ARCENT has identified additional needs at Arifjan. TAC is designing an enhancement package that includes expanded administrative and housing areas, operational facilities, and furniture and furnishings, according to [project manager](http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/facility/camp-arifjan.htm) Donn Booker. Although the move was canceled in August, 1999, the Doha-Arifjan, Kuwait Installation Transition and Movement SOW showed how LOGCAP contractor assistance can result in a plan to systematically move and transition all installation personnel and materiel from Camp Doha to a newly erected Arifjan installation. During these moves, personnel life support had to be maintained with a force capability to defend and counter-attack, if necessary.

1NC KUWAIT ADV FRONTLINE – WESTERN IMPERIALISM

AND, OUR INTERVENTION IN THE GULF WAR WAS JUSTIFIED – PREVENTING FURTHER GENOCIDE AND VIOLENCE FROM SADDAM HUSSEIN

InDepthInfo 10 (“US interests in the Gulf War”, <http://www.indepthinfo.com/iraq/interests.shtml>) dhara

The response in the United States to Saddam Hussein's moves was first shock and then dismay. Strategist, statesmen and the general public quickly came to understand that the United States had significant interests in making certain that Saudi Arabia was not conquered by Saddam's juggernaut. Having rolled over Kuwait, Saddam already controlled over 20 percent of the world's oil reserves. Saudi Arabia contained an additional 20 percent. Since the world economy was primarily driven by fossil fuels, what Saddam could do with these resources could easily be imagined. Besides economic factors affecting the daily lives of every American there were other considerations, perhaps even more weighty. Iraq, in its invasion of Kuwait had perpetrated many atrocities on the Kuwaiti people, from summary executions, to wholesale confiscation of movable property, to the torture and degradation of individuals. Such crimes could not be ignored, and Americans had every reason to expect that this kind of behavior would continue and even accelerate should Iraqi forces move into Saudi Arabia.

IMPERIALISM EXTS - #2 – GULF WAR INTERVENTION JUSTIFIED

The Gulf War was justified- 4 reasons: **Iraqi aggression, the invasion was a last resort, competent authority authorized the war, and stopping the human rights violations perpetrated by the Iraqi army**

Grose 97 (Jason, Captain and Regional Adjutant, “ The Gulf War: Just or Unjust”, <http://www.grose.us/academic/gulfwar.html>") dhara

Aggression On August 2, 1990, the Iraqi army crossed two lines. The first line was the border separating the two sovereign countries of Iraq and Kuwait. Internationally recognized as a legitimate state since 1961, Kuwait was overrun by the large Iraqi military. The second line was the biggest qualifier for a just war against Iraq: Aggression. Using the legalist paradigm, Walzer views aggression as the largest, if only, justification for war. In performing this act of aggression, Iraq unleashed the floodgates of war which Walzer describes as the crime of war (Walzer 1977). Because of Iraqi aggression against Kuwait, the international coalition was morally forced to wage war. Of all the arguments for the war against Iraq, stopping aggression was the strongest platform. Even though oil was a central issue, the coalition required Iraq to give back the property, land, and people seized in the invasion. To ignore the Iraqi invasion would be to reward "naked aggression" (Blonston 1991). Last Resort After the initial invasion, diplomatic efforts were made to avoid fighting. For six months, every opportunity was given to Hussein to withdraw from Kuwait and avoid a war. Yet some critics claim that another major point in just-war theory was not met. According to the theory, not only must a war be a response to aggression, but also be a last resort. But Walzer points out that the concept of last resort would nullify any war as just. There can never be a true end to attempts to avoid war. In practice, a point is reached when it is decided that all reasonable attempts have been made to avoid conflict. But here lies the problem. Who makes that decision? Once it is made, there will always be those who question if all possibilities had been explored. The Gulf war raised many such arguments. Even General Powell, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, expressed his desire for more time to allow the blockade around Iraq to force Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait. But with the prospect of a fortified country such as Iraq holding out for possibly years until the blockade finally worked, the coalition decided that the only answer was to remove Iraq from Kuwait by force. Iraq was given every reasonable opportunity to leave but chose to remain in Kuwait. The coalition, therefore, fulfilled the just-war requirement of last resort and hostilities were soon to follow. Competent Authority By what authority did the coalition use to wage war against Iraq? Many critics in the early stages of the war asked this question which was soon answered. Once Congress backed President Bush, competent authority was fulfilled because the ruling body, representing the American nation, provided the authority to wage war against another sovereign country. But opponents still argued that proper authority does not reside in the country that simply agrees as a whole to fight. If the competent authority that authorized the Gulf War was the American Congress, then the United States could be accused of aggression or intervention. But there was a higher power. As much as the world would like to believe that the Gulf War was the United States against Iraq, that was not the case. While it is true that America was the leader during the crisis, the entire coalition effort was sanctioned by the United Nations. This body of leaders, an international assembly of representatives, provided the competent authority to wage war against Iraq. Any more justification than that, if possible, would be hard to come by. Regardless, there was more. Humanitarian Intervention Along with aggression, the Iraqis were guilty of atrocities in Kuwait. While these acts fall under jus in bello (justice in war), the fact that the atrocities were performed on the civilian population qualifies another justification for just war: humanitarian intervention. According to just-war theory, an ally of a country is justified to intervene in a crisis when conditions exist that are morally and ethically inexcusable. Here again is the problem of judgment on the part of the intervening power. But on the broad scale of the Kuwaiti invasion, the coalition's use of force was a humanitarian intervention because no one could argue that the systematic slaughter of civilian Kuwaitis was anything but evil.

1NC KUWAIT ADVANTAGE FRONTLINE – IRAQ WAR BAD

FIRST, KUWAIT BASING NOT KEY TO IRAQ WAR

1. TURKEY BASING

Sobecki 2009 [Nichole Sobecki, staff writer, "Turkey Offers the US a path out of Iraq", March 18, 2009, <http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/turkey/090318/turkey-offers-the-us-path-out-iraq>] erik

ISTANBUL — **The sprawling Incirlik Air Base in remote southern Turkey serves as the passageway for 70 percent of the air cargo bound for American troops in Iraq. By land, the Habur Gate — a dust-blown checkpoint — is used to ship construction materials, food, fuel and other non-lethal items from Turkey into Iraq**. **As the U.S. prepares to pull out of Iraq, Turkey is likely to play an important role, both as a strategic ally and as a route through which to transfer troops and equipment out of the country. Turkey has unique advantages over prospective alternative exit points in Kuwait and Jordan. It is less likely than its counterparts to be hostile, and is advantageously located to remove troops and materials north of Baghdad**. “Turkey is going to play a pivotal role in the U.S. withdrawal from Iraq,” said Stephen Flanagan, a senior analyst at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, D.C. But several issues stand in the way of a smooth Turkey-aided U.S. withdrawal from Iraq, not least some apparent last-minute maneuvering by elements in the Ankara government to force the Obama administration's hand on the sensitive issue of the Armenian genocide. During the presidential campaign, [Barack Obama pledged](http://www.barackobama.com/2008/01/19/barack_obama_on_the_importance.php) to officially designate the 1915 killings of Armenians by the Ottoman Turks as genocide. Many Armenian-Americans, who are descendants of the victims and survivors, have long sought such a declaration. But as president, Obama is hesitating, fearful of alienating Turkey when U.S. officials badly want its help. The Turks have warned that an official U.S. statement would imperil Turkey's help not only on Iraq, but other security issues such as Afghanistan, and Iran.

1. **JORDAN BASING**

Carter 2009 [Chelsea J. Carter, staff writer, "Military testing exit routes out of Iraq", February 21, 2009,http://www.armytimes.com/news/2009/02/ap\_iraq\_exit\_routes\_022109/] erik

**The American military is shipping battlefield equipment through Jordan** and Kuwait, **testing possible exit routes in advance of a U.S. withdrawal in Iraq, military officials said**. The convoys — carrying armored vehicles, weapons and other items — mark the Pentagon’s first steps in confronting the complex logistics of transporting the huge arsenal stockpiled in Iraq over nearly six years. It’s also part of a wider assessment, ordered by U.S. Central Command, to decide what items the military can transfer, donate, sell or toss away once a full-scale withdrawal is under way, Marine Corps and Army officials told The Associated Press. “Because they are starting to see a potential reduction of forces, they are looking to get more stuff out,” Terry Moores, the deputy assistant chief of staff for logistics for Marine Corps Central Command, said Saturday. “We started slow,” Moores said, but added “it’s picked up speed” in recent months. The Iraqi-U.S. security pact, which took effect Jan. 1, calls for American troops to withdraw from Iraq’s cities by June 30 and completely pull out troops by 2012 — a timeline that could speed up if President Barack Obama keeps to a campaign promise to have troops out of Iraq within 16 months of taking office.In testimony before the U.S. House of Representative earlier this month, the independent Government Accountability Office said the Pentagon needed to redefine its withdrawal strategy, saying it did not take into account either the security pact deadline or Obama’s possible accelerated timeframe. The biggest obstacle is the question of how to move tens of thousands of personnel and millions of tons of equipment out of Iraq, according to testimony by a GAO managing director. The U.S. brought most of its material in through Kuwait, one of the main staging grounds for the 2003 invasion. There are currently more than 140,000 U.S. troops in Iraq. “The capacity of facilities in Kuwait and other neighboring countries may limit the speed at which equipment and material can be moved out of Iraq,” the GAO report said. **It recommended looking at multiple routes through Jordan, Kuwait and Turkey, where the U.S. has already constructed bridge overpasses for heavy tanks on the road between the Iraqi border and the Mediterranean ports of Iskenderun and Mersin. Adm. Mike Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has said the Pentagon has already examined exit routes through Turkey and Jordan.** **Both countries, longtime U.S. allies, support the withdrawal planning contingencies, Mullen said. The Marines have made 17 shipments of vehicles and weapons — totaling 20,000 items — through Jordan’s Aqaba port, using contractors to haul the items to either commercial container ships or U.S. Navy ship**s, Moores said in a telephone interview from Bahrain, the base of the U.S. 5th Fleet. “**Jordan and Kuwait offer a great mix of routes and great infrastructure to get our stuff out,” he said. The shipments through Jordan also has given the leaders in Amman an “understanding about what it takes to move equipment and personnel**,” he said. “**They have already said that if we are willing to move more through Jordan as we draw down, they are willing” to allow it**, Moores said. Though Jordan has close ties to Washington, popular sentiment has been solidly against the war in Iraq. The route to Jordan would take the military through the desert province of Anbar, which was the hub of the Sunni insurgency and where Marines and Iraqi soldiers fought some of their bloodiest battles. An uprising by local Sunni tribes in late 2006 forced insurgents from their Anbar strongholds in one of the pivotal moments of the war. Meanwhile, the Army has shipped hundreds of armored and non-armored vehicles to Kuwait, said Army. Col. Ed Dorman, who works on logistics and supply for Multi-National Corps Iraq. “We’re already reducing what we have on hand,” he said, adding that the equipment has been returned to bases in Kuwait or the United States. Much of the Army equipment being moved is material no longer used, such as older mine-resistant vehicles — known as MRAPs — that can be used for training. Even if the United States sticks to the longer-range withdrawal plans, it still has less than three years to determine how to get its forces and equipment out of Iraq. “You don’t take everything out,” Moores said, adding that some items, such as food, water, barricades and sandbags may be left. Moores said the Corps has been working on a withdrawal plan with a 2010 deadline in mind for the Marines, which has been preparing to expand its presence in Afghanistan. “If our focus is correct and our thought process is correct, we are well on our way with our planning,” he said. “It won’t be a mass exodus. It will be a gradual withdrawal.”

IRAQ WAR BAD EXTS - #1 – TURKEY KEY

TURKEY IS OUR KEY BASING SIGHT FOR IRAQ TROOP DEPLOYMENT

Hurriyet 2008 [Hurriyet, "U.S. welcomes Turkey's greenlight to help withdrawal from Iraq", 2008, <http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/english/world/11283174.asp>] erik

**Turkey’s signal this week that it would be willing to let U.S. troops transit the country as forces leave Iraq is a sign of improved relations**, but it is not yet certain the route will be needed, a top U.S. Army commander said on Tuesday. "We're in the process now of trying to re-establish what had been a long standing positive relationship," Gen. Carter Ham, who commands U.S. Army Europe, told the AP. "I’m not aware that there are any plans from Central Command to move troops through Turkey but the fact that the (Turkish) prime minister said he would consider that is a positive sign." **Turkish Prime Minister Tayyip Erdogan said he would be receptive to allowing U.S. troops to leave Iraq through Turkish territory, provided President** [**Barack Obama**](http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/index/Barack_Obama/)**’s administration asked permission, CNN reported Sunday**. Ham's remarks came after he wrapped up a two-day meeting with Turkish defense officials in [Ankara](http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/index/Ankara/), but he said the topic was not a part of those discussions. **Fuel and other supplies for U.S. forces in Iraq come in through Turkey, which could also be used to take heavy equipment out of Iraq. Were U.S. troops were to leave through Turkey, they would likely fly out of Incirlik Air Base.**  U.S. relations with Turkey soured in 2003 when [Washington](http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/index/washington/)’s plans to send the 4th Infantry Division to invade Iraq from the north as other troops moved in from the south were thwarted when Turkish lawmakers voted against letting American soldiers move through the country. Since then, relations have gradually warmed between the two fellow members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Ham said that, since the drawdown of U.S. forces in Iraq is expected to be gradual, many troops would likely leave the country through ports in Kuwait and airports in Iraq. Still, he said it was too early to discount Turkey as another avenue. "It’s always good to have more options, but it may not be a requirement," he said. "It would only make sense if the pace of the deployment meant that you were stacking up stuff at the port in Kuwait, but well see how this plays out."