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\*\*\*1AC Components

The Plan

The United States federal government should renegotiate the *Agreement Between the Government of Japan and the Government of the United States of America Concerning the Implementation of the Relocation of III Marine Expeditionary Force Personnel and Their Dependents from Okinawa to Guam* to relocate to the point of elimination the United States Marine Corps presence from the Okinawa Prefecture of Japan.

1AC—DPJ Advantage

Advantage \_\_\_: The DPJ

First—the recent Upper House election jeopardizes the DPJ’s agenda—the Okinawa issue is the lynchpin of a crisis in Japanese governance.

Stars and Stripes—an independent news source that operates from inside the United States Department of Defense but is editorially separate from it, 2010 (“Japan election could impede Futenma progress,” Byline David Allen and Chiyomi Sumida, July 14th, Available Online at http://www.stripes.com/news/japan-election-could-impede-futenma-progress-1.110973, Accessed 07-19-2010)

The poor showing of Japan’s ruling party in Upper House elections Sunday could hamper any progress in closing the Marine air base that sits in the middle of this city of 90,000, experts say. Although the U.S. and Japan in May reaffirmed a 2006 plan to close Marine Corps Air Station Futenma and move air operations to a new facility on Okinawa’s northeast shore, Prime Minister Naoto Kan and his Democratic Party of Japan may be too weak to act assertively on the controversial move, regional experts say. Most Okinawans are against the 2006 agreement and the implementation of that pact could be stalled by Okinawa’s next governor. “Futenma is a scab that they would not want to pick,” said Masaaki Gabe, professor of International Relations and director of the Institute of International Okinawa Studies at the University of the Ryukyus. Kan will try to stay away from the issue as much as possible, Gabe said, pointing out that the party’s inability to keep a campaign promise made last summer to move the Marines outside Okinawa soured islanders so much that the party did not run an Okinawan candidate in the recent election. Some U.S. experts on Japanese politics concur. “The Japanese are going to be embroiled in their own domestic politics for a while,” Dan Sneider, a Japan expert at Stanford University told Kyodo News Tuesday. “Kan and the DPJ’s ability to overcome opposition in Okinawa is going to be impacted by their weakening on the national level,” Sneider said. “The weaker the government is in Tokyo, the less able it is to strong arm the Okinawans.” Jeffrey Kingston, director of Asian studies at Temple University in Tokyo, also doubted there will be much progress on the Futenma issue, even though the two sides agreed in May that construction details were to be worked out in August prior to a meeting by the U.S. and Japan defense and foreign ministers in the fall. “Kan agreed to go forward with the 2006 plan, but will the Okinawans let him? Anger is high there,” Kingston told Stars and Stripes. “This issue is not going to die. The Okinawans are promising to disrupt construction of any offshore runway. It’s definitely going to be a problem for Kan.” The election for Okinawa governor is in November. Whoever’s elected will have the power to delay — if not quash — the Futenma relocation project because the governor must sign off on any construction that would affect the island’s waters. The current air facility plan calls for runways to stretch from the lower part of Camp Schwab onto a landfill in Oura Bay. “The outcome of the election weakened the capacities of the Kan administration,” said Kazuya Sakamoto, professor of Japan and U.S. relations at Osaka University’s Graduate School of Law and Politics. Kan’s position as head of the party and prime minister also could be at risk. During a meeting of top DPJ members Monday, there were calls for Kan to resign. Kan said he has no plans to do so. If he does eventually resign, he would be the fifth prime minister in four years to step down. He became prime minister in June after Yukio Hatoyama quit after admitting defeat on the Futenma issue. Most minority parties have already discounted forming a coalition with the DPJ. Sakamoto predicted Kan and his party will have to form a closer alliance with their political nemesis, the Liberal Democratic Party, which they unseated last September after the more conservative party’s almost unbroken 50-year rule. “Now that the LDP has regained strength, the DPJ will have no choice but to be influenced by the LDP,” he said. Minister of Foreign Affairs Katsuya Okada alluded to such a possibility during a press conference Tuesday in Tokyo. Using the term “Twisted Diet” to describe the situation, he said “we are headed for some tough maneuvering,” according to a transcript. “It is a fact that this issue cannot move forward without the understanding of Okinawa,” Okada said.

1AC—DPJ Advantage

Second—renegotiation of the Guam Agreement is the only hope for Kan and the DPJ—continued U.S. pressure to build the Futenma Replacement Facility in Okinawa will back him into an un-winnable corner—*only* the plan allows him to keep his promises.

The Irish Times, 2010 (“Okinawa's US base took one PM down, can it take another?,” Byline David McNeill, June 26th, Available Online at http://www.irishtimes.com/newspaper/world/2010/0626/ 1224273366535.html, Accessed 07-19-2010)

There can be few prettier prime ministerial graveyards: waves from a coral-rich, emerald-green sea lick the sandy shore of a pristine white beach. A sleepy fishing village pokes through the humming tropical green in the background. Local fishermen say dolphins and the endangered dugong sea cow can sometimes be spotted swimming in the local waters. Only a razor-wire fence and signs warning of the threat of arrest by US troops hint at the smell of political cordite. For over a decade, Henoko beach on Japan’s southernmost prefecture of Okinawa has been the site of a battle that has pitted pensioners against government surveyors, corroded relations between Tokyo and Washington, and arguably claimed the scalp of Japan’s last prime minister, Yukio Hatoyama. Locals warn that his successor, Naoto Kan, will follow him to the political gallows if he follows through on a promise to build a US marine heliport, with a huge runway, off this beach. “I think 100,000 people or more will come to stop it,” predicts Michio Sakima, who curates a local museum dedicated to remembering the 1945 Battle of Okinawa. “He’ll have to send in the army and the riot police and there would be war. There’s no way that’s going to happen.” Okinawa Prefecture is home to one of the world’s largest concentrations of US military bases. The Americans invaded in 1945, mounting an attack that left 223,000 Japanese soldiers and civilians dead – roughly a quarter of the local population – and 50,000 US troops killed or injured. In 1972 the islands reverted to Japanese rule, but most of the bases remained. Today they occupy nearly a fifth of the main island and include Kadena, the biggest and most active US Air Force facility in East Asia, and Futenma, which occupies the centre of Ginowan city. Local people like Sakima call these bases war spoils, and want them returned to Japanese control. “It makes me very angry when I think what we could do with all that land,” he says from the roof of the museum, which overlooks Futenma. His voice is occasionally drowned out by the drone of giant transport aircraft that fly in and out of the base. As he admits, however, while “most” Okinawans are against the US presence, many are financially tied to it. The bases reportedly employ more than 8,000 local people, and the Tokyo government has pumped billions of yen into the island in an attempt to smooth the friction that comes with living beside more than 20,000 often battle-scarred young soldiers. In 1995 that friction climaxed after the gang rape of a 12-year-old girl which sparked the largest protests in the prefecture’s history. After years of promises to scale down the military presence, protesters finally extracted a promise from Tokyo and Washington to close Futenma. But the plan eventually hatched by the two sides – largely shutting out Okinawa – simply shifted the functions of the ageing facility to the coast off Camp Schwab base near Henoko, in the sleepier northern half of the main island. In 2006 the deal was inked: a giant seaport, including an 1,800-metre runway, would be built off Okinawa’s pristine coastline – all paid for with Japanese taxes. For many Okinawans, the deal compounded an epic feeling of unfairness. The prefecture hosts 75 per cent of all US military facilities in the country. That arrangement on an island hundreds of miles from the mainland means about 99 per cent of Japanese never need to face the consequences of the country’s military alliance with Washington, or its central conundrum: a war-renouncing nation sheltering under the world’s largest nuclear umbrella. Tackling that contradiction would mean dismantling much of Japan’s postwar defence architecture, including its 1947 “pacifist” constitution, a huge can of worms that few politicians have ever shown the stomach for. It would mean confronting the US over its claims that the bases are needed to defend Japan, claims which many on Okinawa reject. “We were told that the bases were protecting us, but few here believe that now,” says Mao Ishikawa, an Okinawa-based photographer.

(continued on next page—no text deleted)
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(continued from previous page—no text deleted)

“Soviet Russia is gone, we’re friendlier with China, and North Korea is a powerless country that would be destroyed if it ever considered attacking us. Everybody knows the bases are for America’s convenience.” Last September, the islanders thought they finally had a leader in Tokyo who might recalibrate the military scales when Yukio Hatoyama was elected prime minister, ending more than a half a century of rule by Washington’s staunch Cold War allies, the Liberal Democrats. Before taking office, Hatoyama had openly called for the US bases to be ejected from Japan. He promised to reject the 2006 deal and shift Futenma out of the prefecture. Instead, under pressure from President Barack Obama, he embarked on a long, torturous journey back to square one. When he finally told Okinawa in May that the 2006 deal would stand after all, the islanders were furious, recalls Doug Lummis, a former US marine and now political scientist who lives on the island. “He had got their hopes up,” he says, pointing out that last April the islanders staged their biggest anti-base protest since the 1995 gang rape. “Hatoyama should have learned from Machiavelli: If you’re going to do something very unpopular, you ought to do it straight away.” Hatoyama’s bungling on Futenma lost him his government’s coalition partner and much political credibility. He resigned this month, leaving Futenma in the hands of his wilier successor, Naoto Kan. “This is only the second time in post-war Japan that a popular grassroots movement has brought down a government,” says Lummis, alluding to the fierce protests over the 1960 US-Japan Security Treaty that precipitated the resignation of prime minister Nobusuke Kishi. “Something has changed here.” Kan, who as a citizen’s activist once protested against the US bases himself, has been careful so far not to stir up this hornets’ nest. This week he visited the island to commemorate the 65th anniversary of the Battle of Okinawa, apologising “as a representative of all Japanese people” and promising to “ease the burden” of hosting the bases. Okinawa’s contribution has helped secure the peace and stability of the Asia-Pacific region, he added. Nobody can see how his dilemma can be resolved. Voters in Nago, the nearest administrative city to Henoko, this year elected anti-base politician Susumu Inamine as mayor. Newspaper polls put opposition to the base as high as 80-90 per cent. But in a Henoko grocery store where young Jarheads from Camp Schwab shop for cigarettes and beer, owner Masayoshi Kyoda says the town needs the money the base brings. “Without it, we would go bankrupt.” “Emotionally everyone is against the bases, but the reality is a bit different.” In local bars selling Miller beer and tacos, young soldiers on leave drink and play pool. A young marine from Kansas is happy to talk anonymously. “People here have been real nice – I don’t want to go home,” he laughs. “I’ve heard the protesters are here not because they don’t want the Henoko base but because they don’t want us here at all,” he says. “But if the North Koreans were to come here they’d destroy this place. That’s why we’re needed.” On the nearby beach, a small group of activists and students stand guard over a permanent protest outpost, marking the time since their watch began: 2,253 days. “People here are furious that the Hatoyama government let them down,” says Tomohiro Inafuku. “It seems whoever is in government the result is the same.” In the past, these pensioners have gone toe-to-toe with engineers trying to survey the sea for the offshore runway. If the prime minister brings more engineers or – heaven forbid – riot police, they say their children and grandchildren will join them. “I think the Kan government has made a terrible mistake,” says Lummis. “It’s going to be impossible to build this base, and it’s very poor politics to promise something you can’t do.”
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Third—pressure puts Kan in a no-win situation—giving in to the U.S. will crush the DPJ.

The Asahi Shimbun—the second most circulated newspaper in Japan, 2010 (“Japan dumps pier plan, to use reclaimed land for Futenma move,” July 16th, Available Online at http://www.asahi.com/english/TKY201007150512.html, Accessed 07-19-2010)

The deadline for a Japan-U.S. agreement on details of the construction method has been set for late August. But the Kan administration, hoping to avoid being criticized as kowtowing to the United States, wants to leave such details as the number of runways undecided for the time being. The government "could consider preparing multiple plans that are feasible," a senior Japanese government official said Wednesday. If Kan appears weak with the United States, it could undermine his chances for re-election as DPJ president in September. His leadership has already been called into question over the party's stinging defeat in the Upper House election last Sunday. The original agreement calls for two runways converging in a V-shape. But some officials say only one runway should be built. The Kan administration must also contend with opposition in Okinawa Prefecture against the relocation to Nago. The government plans to promote the reclamation method as a way to provide much-needed business for the local construction industry. The prefecture is bracing for a series of political showdowns this fall, including the Nago city assembly election on Sept. 12 and the Okinawa gubernatorial election on Nov. 28. If the governor, who holds the executive power to authorize a reclamation project, opposes the Futenma plan, the entire relocation project could be suspended. Washington hopes to wrap up negotiations with Tokyo on the Futenma relocation before autumn, when Congress starts budget deliberations, including the costs of transferring thousands of Marines and their families from Okinawa to Guam, which is also part of the 2006 agreement. Stalled Japan-U.S. negotiations could become a source of embarrassment in summit talks during U.S. President Barack Obama's scheduled visit to Japan in November.
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Fourth—U.S. accommodation is key to save Kan’s administration—pressure will decimate the fragile DPJ coalition.

The Globe and Mail—a Canadian English language nationally distributed newspaper, 2010 (“Obama’s blunder on Okinawa,” editorial, June 2nd, Available Online at http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/opinions/editorials/obamas-blunder-on-okinawa/article1601528/, Accessed 07-19-2010)

President Barack Obama has not shown toward Japan the respectful multilateralism that he has generally professed, with the result that he has undermined the growth of a genuine two-party system in that country. Yukio Hatoyama, the former prime minister who resigned last week, had tried to amend the arrangements for the military presence of the United States on the island of Okinawa, which was a key point in the election platform of the Democratic Party of Japan, which is arguably the first Japanese party to offer a viable, organized alternative to the long-ruling Liberal Democratic Party – and the voters of Okinawa are a vital part of the DPJ's base. One of the DPJ's coalition partners had threatened to leave the government because of Mr. Hatoyama's failure to obtain acknowledgment of his concerns from Mr. Obama, who showed his displeasure by only according him a few minutes at a meeting in April. Robert Gates, the U.S. Secretary of Defence, has behaved likewise. This ineffectiveness led to Mr. Hatoyama's departure only nine months after he won a seemingly historic parliamentary majority. On the other hand, it is quite possible that the new Prime Minister, Naoto Kan, formerly the minister of finance, will fare better. Mr. Hatoyama and all four of his predecessors are all children or grandchildren of former Liberal Democratic prime ministers or cabinet minister. Mr. Kan does not belong to a hereditary political crisis; he comes from modest origins and has been an entrepreneur. The Liberal Democrats are a brokerage party with a history of deferring to the civil service on policy. The DPJ is not itself a paragon of policy formation, but it has arisen from an impetus for a politics in which parties seek real mandates for their programs from the voters, rather than juggling special interests. The United States has had a propensity to take Japan for granted ever since the postwar occupation. The Obama administration, perhaps unthinkingly, has fallen into this pattern as by default. In order to encourage healthy democracy in East Asia – in the neighbourhood of China and North Korea – Mr. Obama and his colleagues should be more accommodating.

Fifth—resolution of the Futenma dispute is key to effective DPJ coalition-building—that’s key to their agenda.

Kyodo News, 2010 (“Two small parties to form up for Diet session,” July 16th, Available Online at http://search.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/nn20100716a8.html, Accessed 07-20-2010)

The Social Democratic Party said Thursday it will negotiate with Kokumin Shinto (People's New Party) to form a parliamentary group in the Upper House, but not in the lower chamber. Kokumin Shinto, a junior ally of the ruling Democratic Party of Japan, proposed forming a group in both chambers of the Diet in an apparent bid to allow the passage of bills even if decisions are divided between the opposition-controlled Upper House and the DPJ-dominated Lower House. But the SDP chose to form the group only in the House of Councilors because its cooperation with the ruling coalition in the Lower House would run counter to its earlier departure from the coalition in protest over the DPJ's decision to relocate the U.S. Futenma base within Okinawa.

We’ll isolate several impacts.

1AC—DPJ Advantage—Afghanistan Scenario

Subpoint \_\_\_: Afghanistan

First—renegotiations are occurring now, but the stalemate over Futenma prevents further U.S.-Japan cooperation on international issues like Afghanistan.

Bernama—a news agency of the government of Malaysia, 2010 (“US Concerned About Impact Of Japan's Election,” July 12th, Available Online at http://www.bernama.com/bernama/v5/ newsworld.php?id=512775, Accessed 07-19-2010)

The US government is concerned that the Democratic Party of Japan-led government may become unstable following the party's defeat in the House of Councillors election Sunday, Japan's Jiji Press reported. US officials fear the loss of an Upper House majority by the DPJ-led ruling camp could result in an unstable government, causing negative effects on efforts to relocate a US Marine Corps based in Okinawa Prefecture and deepen the bilateral alliance. In hopes of reducing uncertainties ahead, Washington has already started arrangements with Tokyo to resume discussions between the two nations' defence and foreign affairs experts as soon as possible, according to Jiji Press. The US side worries that Prime Minister Naoto Kan may have little time and energy to spend on foreign affairs as he is likely to fight an uphill battle in running his government. Meanwhile, many Okinawa citizens remain opposed to a plan to relocate the Marines' Futenma air station from Ginowan to Camp Schwab in Nago of the same prefecture, posing uncertainties over the result of an upcoming gubernatorial election. Washington hopes to conclude discussions on the construction method for the substitute facility for the Futenma base and other issues related to the relocation by the end of August as agreed on between the two nations. This is because US President Barack Obama is set to meet with Japan's leader in September and November. The US policy is "likely to continue to focus on the Futenma relocation effort," said Sheila Smith, senior fellow for Japan studies at the Council on Foreign Relations. Smith served as a key adviser to Obama on Japan affairs. Washington hopes to resolve the Futenma issue as early as possible so that the two nations can move on to enhance their cooperation in a wider range of issues including Iran's nuclear programme, further assistance to Afghanistan and measures to ensure global economic recovery. The United States will be eager to take advantage of the bilateral alliance to promote joint interests in Asia, if "a strong prime minister emerges in Japan, with a clear national policy," said Michael Auslin, director of Japan studies at the American Enterprise Institute. Smith also noted the importance of a government that can remain stable over a long period.

1AC—DPJ Advantage—Afghanistan Scenario

Specifically—an effective DPJ is key to peace in Afghanistan—Japan’s reputation is vital to the reconciliation process.

Josh Rogin, covered defense and foreign policy as a staff writer for Congressional Quarterly, writing extensively on Iraq, Afghanistan, Guantánamo Bay, U.S.-Asia relations, defense budgeting and appropriations, and the defense lobbying and contracting industries, graduate of George Washington University's Elliott School of International Affairs, worked at the Japanese embassy, 2009 (“Can Japan bring peace to Afghanistan?,” *The Cable*—a *Foreign Policy* blog, November 26th, Available Online at http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2009/11/25/ can\_japan\_bring\_peace\_to\_afghanistan, Accessed 07-16-2010)

As far as we know, the U.S. government isn't focused on engaging the Taliban or other militants waging war on the Afghan government and international forces, but there is one country actively working on a plan to reconcile the warring factions in Afghanistan: Japan. A conference held behind closed doors in Tokyo finished the last of its three days of meetings Wednesday, bringing together representatives of the governments of Afghanistan, Iran, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and others to discuss how a peace within Afghanistan might be negotiated. Among the participants was Mohammad Masoom Stanekzai, an advisor on reconciliation to Afghan President Hamid Karzai. Stanekzai has often advocated for internal Afghan reconciliation and in his capacity as a visiting fellow at the U.S. Institute of Peace last year, he wrote that "A multitude of factors suggest that the time is ripe for a reconciliatory process," and "A comprehensive and coordinated political reconciliation process must be started." The conference ended with a list of recommendations, obtained by The Cable, that will now be sent to Japanese Foreign Minister Katsuya Okada as he charts out Japan's future policy on Afghanistan. The Japanese government, now led by the Democratic Party of Japan, has been searching for a new role in Afghanistan after announcing it would end its military refueling mission there but also increase its aid contribution by $5 billion. Leading an international effort to negotiate a détente between the Afghan Taliban and the Afghan government could be *how the DPJ forges a new identity for Japan's foreign policy*, which has long been tethered to U.S. foreign policy. The DPJ has called for a more independent position in the Japanese alliance with Washington. "Since Japan enjoys an excellent reputation with Afghanistan and the immediate neighbors of Afghanistan, it is highly desirable that Japan play a key role within the international community in supporting the peace and reintegration program led by the Afghan government," the recommendations state. Earlier this year, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton set out the conditions under which she believes reconciliation with certain members of the Taliban could be achieved. "We understand that not all those who fight with the Taliban support al-Qaida, or believe in the extremist policies the Taliban pursued when in power," she said at the Council of Foreign Relations on July 15, "And today we and our Afghan allies stand ready to welcome anyone supporting the Taliban who renounces al-Qaida, lays down their arms, and is willing to participate in the free and open society that is enshrined in the Afghan Constitution." But Special Representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan Richard Holbrooke said Nov. 23 that "there has been no direct meetings between American officials and Taliban officials ... we are not having direct contacts with the Taliban."
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Third—Kan is committed to aiding the Karzai government—that’s key to restore peace and stability in Afghanistan.

Yamaguchi 10 (Mari, 17 June 2010, Afghan vows to use Japan's aid effectively, http://www.signonsandiego.com/news/2010/jun/17/afghan-vows-to-use-japans-aid-effectively/, accessed 19 July 2010)

Afghan President Hamid Karzai promised Thursday to use Japanese aid effectively to restore peace and stability in his country, as he sought to allay Tokyo's concerns that its support may be wasted on his corrupt and faltering government. Tokyo announced in November a five-year pledge of $5 billion to help the war-torn nation strengthen its police force as well as support agriculture and infrastructure projects. The Japanese have abandoned a refueling mission that supported troops in Afghanistan and now only offer humanitarian support. Japan is one of Afghanistan's biggest donors, but there has been no indication additional aid will be forthcoming on Karzai's five-day visit. Instead, Karzai is seeking to convince Tokyo that his government will use money already promised well. "I guarantee Mr. Prime Minister that Afghan people would do their best to have their money spent in Afghanistan for the best purposes of development and stability in Afghanistan," Karzai said in a joint news conference after holding talks with Japanese Prime Minster Naoto Kan, who took office earlier this month. Karzai is the first foreign leader to meet with Kan. The comments came a day after Japanese Foreign Minister Katsuya Okada warned Afghan Finance Minister Omar Zakhilwal that Kabul must tackle the problems of security, corruption and flagging public support "so that (Japanese) taxpayers' money is effectively used." On Thursday, Karzai and Kan discussed the Afghan government's recent efforts to strengthen governance and improve security, as well as implementation of Japanese aid measures. Kan said that Afghanistan is key to world peace and pledged Tokyo's continuing support. But he stressed the need for the Afghan government to improve security and fight corruption. "I certainly hope that $5 billion would be used to benefit the Afghan people and the global peace, and I offered to continue our support to achieve the goal," Kan said. Over the past nine years, billions in aid and the presence of international forces have failed to decisively turn the tide of the war, and the Afghan government continues to struggle to assert its authority over wide swaths of the country. Widespread corruption in Karzai's administration is believed to have attracted Afghans into the insurgency. Karzai met with Emperor Akihito earlier Thursday. He is also scheduled to speak at a seminar, pray at Hiroshima's peace park for the victims of the U.S. atomic bombing and visit Japan's ancient capital of Nara before leaving Sunday.
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Finally—continued instability in Afghanistan results in a Taliban caliphate, the break-up of Pakistan, and nuclear war.

Morgan 7 [Stephen J. former member of the British Labour Party Executive Committee, political writer including books such as The Mind of a Terrorist Fundamentalist – the Cult of Al Qaeda -- “Better Another Taliban Afghanistan, than a Taliban NUCLEAR Pakistan” March 4 -- http://ezinearticles.com/?Better-Another-Taliban-Afghanistan,-than-a-Taliban-NUCLEAR-Pakistan?&id=475808]

However events may prove him sorely wrong. Indeed, his policy could completely backfire upon him. As the war intensifies, he has no guarantees that the current autonomy may yet burgeon into a separatist movement. Appetite comes with eating, as they say. Moreover, should the Taliban fail to re-conquer al of Afghanistan, as looks likely, but captures at least half of the country, then a Taliban Pashtun caliphate could be established which would act as a magnet to separatist Pashtuns in Pakistan. Then, the likely break up of Afghanistan along ethnic lines, could, indeed, lead the way to the break up of Pakistan, as well. Strong centrifugal forces have always bedevilled the stability and unity of Pakistan, and, in the context of the new world situation, the country could be faced with civil wars and popular fundamentalist uprisings, probably including a military-fundamentalist coup d’état. Fundamentalism is deeply rooted in Pakistan society. The fact that in the year following 9/11, the most popular name given to male children born that year was “Osama” (not a Pakistani name) is a small indication of the mood. Given the weakening base of the traditional, secular opposition parties, conditions would be ripe for a coup d’état by the fundamentalist wing of the Army and ISI, leaning on the radicalised masses to take power. Some form of radical, military Islamic regime, where legal powers would shift to Islamic courts and forms of shira law would be likely. Although, even then, this might not take place outside of a protracted crisis of upheaval and civil war conditions, mixing fundamentalist movements with nationalist uprisings and sectarian violence between the Sunni and minority Shia populations. The nightmare that is now Iraq would take on gothic proportions across the continent. The prophesy of an arc of civil war over Lebanon, Palestine and Iraq would spread to south Asia, stretching from Pakistan to Palestine, through Afghanistan into Iraq and up to the Mediterranean coast. Undoubtedly, this would also spill over into India both with regards to the Muslim community and Kashmir. Border clashes, terrorist attacks, sectarian pogroms and insurgency would break out. A new war, and possibly nuclear war, between Pakistan and India could not be ruled out. Atomic Al Qaeda Should Pakistan break down completely, a Taliban-style government with strong Al Qaeda influence is a real possibility. Such deep chaos would, of course, open a “Pandora's box” for the region and the world. With the possibility of unstable clerical and military fundamentalist elements being in control of the Pakistan nuclear arsenal, not only their use against India, but Israel becomes a possibility, as well as the acquisition of nuclear and other deadly weapons secrets by Al Qaeda. Invading Pakistan would not be an option for America. Therefore a nuclear war would now again become a real strategic possibility. This would bring a shift in the tectonic plates of global relations. It could usher in a new Cold War with China and Russia pitted against the US.
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Subpoint \_\_\_: Economy

First—an effective DPJ is key to push through financial reforms—tax policy is key.

Agence France Presse, 2010 (“Japan minister: tax hike needed despite poll rout,” July 12th, Available Online at http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5haTSJJ9qAi9XxHmxvomsGy8AvKEw, Accessed 07-20-2010)

Japan's finance minister said Tuesday that a sales tax hike was inevitable in order to reduce massive public debt, even though the issue was key to the government's weekend poll defeat. The ruling Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ) on Sunday suffered a major setback at elections to the upper house of parliament, spelling the loss of its slim majority and creating obstacles for much-need fiscal reforms. "I take the people's election results seriously," Finance Minister Yoshihiko Noda told reporters after a cabinet meeting. But he added: "We will make a start by calling for cooperation from other parties on a drastic tax reform, including the consumption tax." He admitted there was "no doubt" the tax debate had affected the poll result. Speaking at a separate event, Noda said he wanted to treat the tax issue "with great care", Dow Jones Newswires reported. Prime Minister Naoto Kan had before the election raised the issue of doubling the five percent consumption tax to help reduce public debt that is nearing 200 percent of gross domestic product, the world's highest. The tax discussion was seen as central to the government's poor showing at the ballot box -- a result that has made it more difficult for the party to pass legislation and means it must scramble to find new allies. Ratings agency Standard & Poor's warned Monday it might lower Japan's credit rating if the government fails to implement "meaningful" fiscal reforms, as the election raised the spectre of policy gridlock. Kan at the cabinet meeting asked his ministers to stay united and help push forward reforms, reports said, even as some lawmakers in his party have called for him to stand down after just one month in office. Chief Cabinet Secretary Yoshito Sengoku quoted Kan as saying: "I hope you will cooperate with me as I have decided to address issues facing this country and seek reforms with a united cabinet."

**Second—financial reforms are vital to prevent Japanese economic collapse.**

International Monetary Fund, 2010 (“IMF Calls for Japan to Rein In Debt,” July 14th, Available Online at http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/survey/so/2010/CAR071410B.htm, Accessed 07-20-2010)

Despite the projected upturn, the recent turmoil in Europe has highlighted Japan’s vulnerability to sovereign risk. At a meeting of the IMF’s Executive Board last week to discuss the findings of the report, the Board’s directors voiced support for comprehensive tax reform, limits on non-social security spending growth, and reforms to entitlement programs. They also encouraged authorities to strengthen the credibility of their fiscal plans by introducing a cap on public debt. “A fiscal rule capping the level of public debt and targeting a primary surplus would strengthen credibility and help lock-in fiscal gains,” said the report, which followed consultations carried out in May between IMF economists and authorities in the country. Tokyo has acknowledged the need to curb its unprecedented levels of debt and has committed itself to halving the government primary deficit by 2015 and achieving a primary surplus by FY2020 at the latest. The Japanese Prime Minister, Naoto Kan, gave his personal backing for greater fiscal discipline. Last month, in his first major speech since taking over as premier, he warned that the country was at "risk of collapse" under its huge debt mountain without fiscal reforms. As part of its drive to reform the economy, last month Kan’s cabinet published a “New Growth Strategy”. The plan aims to raise growth above 2 percent on average over the next decade and targets an unemployment rate below 4 percent, from the current 5 percent range. It identifies seven key areas for development, ranging from the promotion of new “green” markets, encouraging more tourism, and strengthening health care to raising women’s participation in the labor force. The IMF report supports structural reforms to raise the country’s potential growth rate and notes that higher growth would aid fiscal consolidation. “Such reforms would cover important new growth areas, such as health care and the environment. If complemented with measures to boost start-ups, employment, and competition, the strategy could raise productivity, increase labor participation, and make Japan a more attractive destination for foreign investment,” said Gordon.
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Finally—Japanese economic collapse causes global economic decline, protectionism, collapse of democracy, and Asian conflict.

Michael Auslin, resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, February 17, 2009, Wall Street Journal, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB123483257056995903.html

Recently, many economists and scholars in the U.S. have been looking backward to Japan's banking disaster of the 1990s, hoping to learn lessons for America's current crisis. Instead, they should be looking ahead to what might occur if Japan goes into a full-fledged depression. If Japan's economy collapses, supply chains across the globe will be affected and numerous economies will face severe disruptions, most notably China's. China is currently Japan's largest import provider, and the Japanese slowdown is creating tremendous pressure on Chinese factories. Just last week, the Chinese government announced that 20 million rural migrants had lost their jobs. Closer to home, Japan may also start running out of surplus cash, which it has used to purchase U.S. securities for years. For the first time in a generation, Tokyo is running trade deficits -- five months in a row so far. The political and social fallout from a Japanese depression also would be devastating. In the face of economic instability, other Asian nations may feel forced to turn to more centralized -- even authoritarian -- control to try to limit the damage. Free-trade agreements may be rolled back and political freedom curtailed. Social stability in emerging, middle-class societies will be severely tested, and newly democratized states may find it impossible to maintain power. Progress toward a more open, integrated Asia is at risk, with the potential for increased political tension in the world's most heavily armed region.
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Subpoint \_\_\_: Soft Power

First—resolving Okinawa is key to Japanese soft power—only consolidating DPJ strength can allow Japan to extend its influence and bolster Asian multilateralism.

Hitoshi Tanaka, Senior Fellow at the Japan Center for International Exchange, visiting professor at the Graduate School of Public Policy, University of Tokyo, former Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan, Spring 2009, Global Asia (Vol 4 No 1), http://globalasia.org/pdf/issue9/Hitoshi\_Tanaka.pdf

While it is clear that there are a number of important foreign policy issues in East Asia that demand immediate attention, the current domestic political situation does not lend itself well to efforts to engage in proactive diplomacy. Since former Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi stepped down in September 2006, the ruling Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) has anointed a series of relatively ineffectual prime ministers. Voter frustration with the LDP has reached a boiling point and most polls show that the upcoming general election — which must be called by September — portends the end of the LDP’s nearly uninterrupted 54-year run at the top of Japanese politics. This climate of uncertainty risks creating a situation in which policymaking — including foreign policy — is held hostage to political stagnation. Gridlock in the Diet between the LDP and the opposition Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ), which has controlled the House of Councillors for nearly two years, has already shown that this is a legitimate concern. Recent meetings between Japanese and US leaders have made it clear that the US-Japan partnership will continue to play a central role in ensuring stability in East Asia in the coming decades. The administration of US President Barack Obama is certain to distance itself from the widely criticized unilateral approach to diplomacy adopted by the previous US administration and embrace multilateralism as it tackles global and regional challenges. Japan can most effectively contribute to this effort by working to consolidate a multilateral framework in East Asia. This effort must begin at home. Japan needs political leaders with a strong mandate to govern and it is hoped that the contending political parties will achieve a modus vivendi as soon as possible in the best interests of the nation. Japan cannot afford to retreat from proactive diplomacy in East Asia, and it must quickly develop a flexible foreign policy that can respond to a rapidly changing regional environment. The following policy measures will help to ensure that this effort is successful.

Second—East Asian multilateralism is key to solve the spread of infectious diseases.

Hitoshi Tanaka, Senior Fellow at the Japan Center for International Exchange, April 2007, East Asia Insights, http://www.jcie.or.jp/insights/2-2.html)

The East Asian region today barely resembles that of only a decade ago. The recent proliferation of ministerial conferences and multilateral dialogues, along with increasing calls for the creation of an "East Asia Community," are welcome developments that will go toward building confidence between states and ensuring stability in the midst of such a rapid transformation. However, to this day the primary impetus for enhancing regionalism and East Asian economic integration has been more or less market driven. Enhanced cooperation between states in a wider range of areas would greatly facilitate the realization of a more cooperative, comprehensive, and stable regional community. While much of the regional transformation in recent years has been positive, particularly in the economic sphere, challenges abound, such as proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), infectious disease, and trafficking in people and drugs, that have the potential to destabilize the region and reverse recent achievements. The creation of a multi-lateral institution to efficiently deal with such nontraditional and transnational security issues would not only foster a more secure environment for continued economic expansion but also—through joint action on issues of common concern—push the regional community-building process forward. One effective way to achieve these goals is the creation of an "East Asia Security Forum."
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Finally—diseases cause human extinction.

Frank Ryan, M.D., 1997, Virus X, p. 366

How might the human race appear to such an aggressively emerging virus? That teeming, globally intrusive species, with its transcontinental air travel, massively congested cities, sexual promiscuity, and in the less affluent regions — where the virus is most likely to first emerge — a vulnerable lack of hygiene with regard to food and water supplies and hospitality to biting insects' The virus is best seen, in John Hollands excellent analogy, as a swarm of competing mutations, with each individual strain subjected to furious forces of natural selection for the strain, or strains, most likely to amplify and evolve in the new ecological habitat.3 With such a promising new opportunity in the invaded species, natural selection must eventually come to dominate viral behavior. In time the dynamics of infection will select for a more resistant human population. Such a coevolution takes rather longer in "human" time — too long, given the ease of spread within the global village. A rapidly lethal and quickly spreading virus simply would not have time to switch from aggression to coevolution. And there lies the danger. Joshua Lederbergs prediction can now be seen to be an altogether logical one. Pandemics are inevitable. Our incredibly rapid human evolution, our overwhelming global needs, the advances of our complex industrial society, all have moved the natural goalposts. The advance of society, the very science of change, has greatly augmented the potential for the emergence of a pandemic strain. It is hardly surprising that Avrion Mitchison, scientific director of Deutsches Rheuma Forschungszentrum in Berlin, asks the question: "Will we survive!” We have invaded every biome on earth and we continue to destroy other species so very rapidly that one eminent scientist foresees the day when no life exists on earth apart from the human monoculture and the small volume of species useful to it. An increasing multitude of disturbed viral-host symbiotic cycles are provoked into self-protective counterattacks. This is a dangerous situation. And we have seen in the previous chapter how ill-prepared the world is to cope with it. It begs the most frightening question of all: could such a pandemic virus cause the extinction of the human species?
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Subpoint \_\_\_: Warming

First—a strong DPJ is key to passing climate legislation.

Risa Maeda and Chisa Fujoka, “Japan aims to pass climate bill by year end Climate talks”, 6-16-2010; Reporters for Eco-Business.Com,

http://www.eco-business.com/news/2010/jun/16/japan-aims-pass-climate-bill-yr-end-un-talks/

Japan will aim to pass a shelved climate bill setting tough emission reduction targets before an annual U.N. meeting in Mexico later this year, the environment minister said on Tuesday. The ruling Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ)-led government had hoped to enact the bill, which paves the way for a mandatory emissions trading system, by the end of the current session of parliament ending on Wednesday. But with time having run out for deliberations, the bill will be delayed. The government now plans to resubmit the bill to parliament after an upper house election expected on July 11. Environment Minister Sakihito Ozawa said he wanted to have the bill enacted by a U.N. meeting in Mexico from Nov. 29-Dec. 10, where negotiations will take place for a global agreement on fighting climate change. “We want to complete the bill by COP 16, so we can show our determination (on climate policy),” Ozawa told a news conference. Japan is the world’s fifth-biggest greenhouse gas emitter and its pledge to cut emissions by 25 percent from 1990 levels by 2020 is government policy and part of the bill. Ozawa could not rule out the possibility of the bill being watered down if the DPJ failed to win an outright majority in the upper house election, but said the government aimed to enact the bill in its current form. The DPJ has a comfortable majority in the more powerful lower house, but a weak outcome for the party in the upper house election would force it to rely on help from smaller parties to pass bills smoothly, since the upper chamber can stall bills. “We think the bill is the best proposal, so we don’t plan to make any changes,” Ozawa said. CLIMATE BILL The bill includes a plan for Japan to consider imposing an environment tax from 2011, an aim to boost renewable energy sources to 10 percent of primary energy supply by 2020 and a target to cut emissions by 80 percent by 2050. Ozawa also said he hoped plans for a mandatory emissions trading system would remain on track despite the bill’s delay. The climate bill calls for the government to draft separate legislation to design the trading scheme within a year after the climate bill is enacted. The government had initially planned to enact an emissions trading bill in the next regular parliamentary session in early 2011, aiming to launch a compulsory carbon market either in 2012 or in 2013. Eisaku Toda, director of the environment ministry’s market mechanism office, said experts and industry officials have been discussing details on when and how to launch a new carbon market to make proposals to the government. Currently, Japan only has a voluntary carbon market at the national level based on companies’ pledged goals, which are mostly caps on emissions per unit of production and leave room for rises in emissions when output grows. BILATERAL CREDITS Linking a new compulsory carbon market with those abroad would be a supplementary step to keep domestic carbon credit prices from rising too high, Toda said at a Tokyo seminar. His ministry is also looking into the usage of offset credits proposed in a climate bill in the United States now under Congress debate. “We understand a U.S. bill would accept both domestic and bilateral offsets. We’ll study and learn more about this feature by exchanging views with the United States,” Toda said. His comments underlined a report on June 1 by Japan’s trade ministry proposing Tokyo seek bilateral agreements with developing countries to reflect in its 2020 goal the value of emission cuts through transferring its low-carbon technology and products. The trade ministry’s proposal is expected to be included in a mid- to long-term economic growth strategy the government is set to announce as early as on June 18, paving the way for making such bilateral carbon credits a part of Tokyo’s foreign policy goals in climate change talks, including COP 16.
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Second—domestic action on climate change is key to bolster Japanese leadership on climate – that’s key to global action.

Monir Hossain Moni, May 2009, “Why Japan’s Development Aid Matters Most for Dealing with Global Environmental Problems”, Asia Pacific Review: Volume 16, Issue 1, Pages 8-36; Ph.D, Graduate School of Asia-Pacific Studies, Professor at the Univresity of Dhaka in Bangladesh, Japan Foreign Policy expert; d/a 7-19; Accessed via Informaworld Journals

Environmental ODA has been the cornerstone of Japan's economic foreign policy since the beginning of the 1990s. While Tokyo intends to engage in environmental cooperation with developing countries worldwide, how far its environment-related aid diplomacy can more persuasively reach its target is a key question. It is clear that a plethora of challenges emanating from all levels (multilateral, regional, bilateral, and domestic) impede the Japanese ODA role in responding to global environmental problems. At the multilateral level   Notwithstanding all the diplomatic niceties, Tokyo has been struggling for many years to hold a more dominating role in deciding the course of international politics. Japan's considerable contribution to the UN is doomed to anonymity on the global scene, and its commitment has often been misperceived. While giving billions of yen, Tokyo was deeply humiliated by a barrage of criticism that it engaged solely in “checkbook diplomacy.” The principal reason for such misperception is that Japan's global role has been directed in terms of various mutual security arrangements with the US. In other words, the idea of Japan's “UN-centrism” [kokuren chushin shugi] was solidly influenced by the US, while Tokyo oftentimes seems to be busy with serving the purpose of Washington's politico-diplomatic interests mainly in the Middle East. Thus, its positive response to this universal body was restrained and frequently tended to be fuzzy. In short, Tokyo lacks its own steadfast diplomatic vision. Consequently, given Japan's economic clout and its huge financial contribution to the whole UN system, the roots and levels of Japan's progress has yet necessarily been taken as “springboard thinking” about its overdue position on the United Nations Security Council (UNSC). Despite its relentless and consistent efforts over more than three decades, Tokyo has not been successful in obtaining its long-aspired permanent seat on the UNSC.[21](http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/section?content=a912653693&fulltext=713240928#EN0021) More crucially, Japan behind the US, China, India, and Russia is the world's fifth biggest emitter of greenhouse gases (GHG) blamed for global warming. To be more concrete, Japan is far behind on the nation's global warming targets with its poor record on curbing GHG emissions, most of them coming from the transport sector. In fact, there is a collective feeling among Japanese companies that it is difficult to meet Kyoto targets,[22](http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/section?content=a912653693&fulltext=713240928#EN0022) while the current recession in Japan has added to this gloomy prediction. Though Japan and its corporate sector are officially supporting the Kyoto Protocol, the country is aware of domestic and international opposition to the US. This is indeed behind Japan's lack of all-out support to its closest ally, while Japan cannot overlook the needs of two of its major Asian partners (China and India) which are staunchly opposed to making commitments on par with industrialized nations. In contrast, the EU extends strong support for Kyoto targets even without the US backing. Nevertheless, while the Japanese MOFA frames a wide range of global environmental issues, it has not identified a specific problem area where ODA should give highest prominence. It has nowadays become perceptible that cooperative partnership is a “key marker” in the process of aid coordination, country leadership, broad-based participation, local ownership as well as development dynamism of the international aid organizations. To reduce the administrative costs of program implementation and to untie aid or remove the requirement that aid should be in the form of donor country exports, better coordination among multilateral aid agencies seems very urgent. Nonetheless, Japan has been the object of criticism for its restricted inclination to involve itself in multilateral partnerships. Moreover, when development aid by other donors principally concentrates on bolstering pro-poor policy and self-help grass-root assistance schemes to achieve their poverty alleviation targets, Japan is often criticized because of its emphasis on loan-finance for infrastructure projects. In fact, Japan is gradually losing its single voice in the world development forum, in spite of its status as an important donor. Finally, it is true that Japan has somewhat advanced its ODA diplomacy with an emphasis on the “human security” [*ningen no anzenhosho*] paradigm in recent years.
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But it is really alarming that Japan is at the same time increasing its defense expenditure in line with its growth of gross domestic product (GDP).[23](http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/section?content=a912653693&fulltext=713240928#EN0023) This simply contradicts Japanese Foreign Ministry's recently-adopted notion of “human security,”[24](http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/section?content=a912653693&fulltext=713240928#EN0024) especially from the global environmental security viewpoint. [Section Skipped-Next Subset of Article] Despite the great expectations placed on Tokyo's “art of statecraft” regarding the issues centering on climate change, development, and aid to Africa, the 2008 G8 Hokkaido Toyako Summit may be perceived as a step with little sign of progress due to ineffectual diplomatic leadership on Japan's part. Indeed, demonstrating leadership as the host of this Summit was not an easy task for the Fukuda administration, when Japan failed to attain its own goal for reducing GHG emissions under the Kyoto Protocol. Unless Japan achieves this goal, it will be a hurdle for Tokyo to lead negotiations on a new global carbon-capping framework to succeed the Kyoto Protocol after it expires in 2012. Also, it appears to be a desperate measure for the world's second largest economy to secure funds to tackle global warming in a time of serious fiscal woes. In addition to the loopholes of Japan's internal legal system, the ecological conservation groups and Tokyo's aid recipient countries have long complained that using ODA funds for the mega-scale clean development mechanism (CDM) projects might adversely affect the flow of money to other environmental schemes. However, as Japan hopes to play a more proactive leadership role in the field of global environmental cooperation, it really needs to craft an effective post-Kyoto framework. Japan's domestic reality, which makes national self-interest as the focal determinant of future foreign aid, deserves careful attention by those in authority. In spite of having some limitations at its internal level, Japan adroitly responded td the oil shocks of the 1970s, instituting tight energy conservation goals and investing heavily in the promotion of renewable technology. It is also notable that Japan's public transport system ranks among the best throughout the world for widespread diffusion, low cost, and long-term reliability. This is a fact not only in the case of Tokyo, Osaka, and other major cities, but also of the nation's high-speed rail network. Moreover, the big strides by Germany and other countries in reaching renewable targets (as a percentage of electrical power output) suggest that Japan, equipped with its smarter energy and environmental policy, could readily shave 10% to 20% off this outflow of fund, and use it instead to revitalize its local economies as well as its global role as an environmental leader.[61](http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/section?content=a912653693&fulltext=713240928#EN0061) After surviving its own era of environmental destruction, Japan surely knows how to transform developing economies from energy wasters to energy savers. When Japan has all these constructive features, it has not been able to prove its claim by convincing evidence that it justifies a position as a global environmental leader. However, it is unquestionable that Japan's success in transforming itself from one of the world's worst industrial polluters to one of the cleanest advanced economies could make it a “wonderful role model” for many developing nations. There is no country like Japan when it comes to an incredible experience in the fruitful integration of the environment with its economy. In this light, while it is perceived that Japan can lead the world along this new pathway to a secure and sustainable future, the country has not been successful in demonstrating a clearly clarified approach why it deserves a global environmental leadership position. While professing an eagerness to establish leadership on global environmental issues, government dithering continues to sink Japan's expectations for such a status. The environment is one potentiality Japan could really take leadership on, but Tokyo finds itself coping with something of an uphill battle in winning international recognition of its plans to play a more strong-willed role in the environmental governance. Undoubtedly, Japan's wide range of financial contributions apart from logistic support show that the nation merits a stronger voice to assert in the world community for the management of environmental crises. But the hesitation of the Japanese government to move beyond a mediator status has actually labeled the country as one of the worst in the international environmental protection efforts. Also, while slashing GHG emissions offers environmental and economic benefits for Japan itself, these alluring opportunities are ultimately evaporating. As our planet is in peril now, it is time for Japan to restore its reputation. With greater emphasis on the following proactive steps, Japan can achieve its genuine leadership position on the global environmental realm. To advance its environmental foreign policymaking, Tokyo must use its ODA as a more sophisticated diplomatic and strategic tool in the days to come, while getting smarter on global issues, particularly when eyeing more green ODA projects.
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Japan at the same time needs to see its prospective “third sector” as the available avenue to more persuasively wield its global influence in the environmental arena when encountering the new globalization impulses. By making the best use of its available abundant technical assistance, Japan could definitely become a major environmental power globally, beyond the regional stage. If the world is to move in the direction of more sustainability, then the advanced industrialized nations must take a transformative leadership role. There are in fact growing calls for a reshaping of the environmemtal management towards greater emphasis on social aspects, perhaps to move the field closer to human geography to ensure that it is not alienated from the key issues of human-environment interaction. Therefore, Japan as an ever-committed global player should be able to transform itself and the nation's thinking in response urgently to an ever-more-joint environment. It is also proposed that, at every level from communities and businesses to national governments and the UN, Japan requires leaders more than at any time in its history. These leaders who are dynamic, confident, imaginative, and flexible would be the real “agents for change.” They would create urgency, develop an inspiring vision as well as mobilize people to take action toward realizing their environmental mission. Indeed, when the institutions of higher learning have a special responsibility for encouraging such environmental stewardship, it sounds appropriate that Japanese universities are right now moving toward environmental change through varied environmental training programs.[64](http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/section?content=a912653693&fulltext=713240928#EN0064) Conclusively, Japan should have a strong promise for delivering such much-needed true leadership to deal with global environmental problems.

Finally—warming causes extinction.

Bill Henderson, 8-19-2006, Counter Currents, http://www.countercurrents.org/cc-henderson190806.htm

The scientific debate about human induced global warming is over but policy makers - let alone the happily shopping general public - still seem to not understand the scope of the impending tragedy. Global warming isn't just warmer temperatures, heat waves, melting ice and threatened polar bears. Scientific understanding increasingly points to runaway global warming leading to human extinction. If impossibly Draconian security measures are not immediately put in place to keep further emissions of greenhouse gases out of the atmosphere we are looking at the death of billions, the end of civilization as we know it and in all probability the end of man's several million year old existence, along with the extinction of most flora and fauna beloved to man in the world we share.
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Advantage \_\_\_: Defense Independence

First—continued U.S. military presence discourages Japan from pursuing defense independence—the plan would force Japan to reconsider its global posture.

Doug Bandow, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, former Special Assistant to President Ronald Reagan and Senior Policy Analyst in the 1980 Reagan for President Campaign, holds a B.A. in Economics from Florida State University and a J.D. from Stanford University, 2010 (“Japan Can Defend Itself,” *The National Interest Online*, May 12th, Available Online at http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=11804, Accessed 07-20-2010)

World War II ended 65 years ago. The Cold War disappeared 21 years ago. Yet America's military deployments have little changed. Nowhere is that more evident than on the Japanese island of Okinawa. Okinawans are tired of the heavy U.S. military presence. Some 90,000 — nearly 10 percent of the island's population — gathered in protest at the end of April. It is time for Washington to lighten Okinawa's burden. An independent kingdom swallowed by imperial Japan, Okinawa was the site of a brutal battle as the United States closed in on Japan in early 1945. After Tokyo's surrender, Washington filled the main prefecture island with bases and didn't return it to Japan until 1972. America's military presence has only been modestly reduced since. The facilities grew out of the mutual defense treaty between America and Japan, by which the former promised to defend the latter, which was disarmed after its defeat. The island provided a convenient home for American units. Most Japanese people also preferred to keep the U.S. military presence on Japan's most distant and poorest province, forcing Okinawans to carry a disproportionate burden of the alliance. Whatever the justifications of this arrangement during the Cold War, the necessity of both U.S. ground forces in Japan and the larger mutual defense treaty between the two nations has disappeared. It's time to reconsider both Tokyo's and Washington's regional roles. The United States imposed the so-called "peace constitution" on Japan, Article 9 of which prohibits the use of force and even creation of a military. However, American officials soon realized that Washington could use military assistance. Today's "Self-Defense Force" is a widely accepted verbal evasion of a clear constitutional provision. Nevertheless, both domestic pacifism and regional opposition have discouraged reconsideration of Japan's military role. Washington's willingness to continue defending an increasingly wealthy Japan made a rethink unnecessary. Fears of a more dangerous North Korea and a more assertive People's Republic of China have recently increased support in Japan for a more robust security stance. The threat of piracy has even caused Tokyo to open its first overseas military facility in the African state of Djibouti. Nevertheless, Japan's activities remain minimal compared to its stake in East Asia's stability. Thus, Tokyo remains heavily dependent on Washington for its security. The then opposition Democratic Party of Japan promised to "do away with the dependent relationship in which Japan ultimately has no alternative but to act in accordance with U.S. wishes." The party later moderated its program, calling for a "close and equal Japan-U.S. alliance." However, the government promised to reconsider a previous agreement to relocate the Marines Corps Air Station at Futenma elsewhere on Okinawa. The majority of residents want to send the base elsewhere. The Obama administration responded badly, insisting that Tokyo fulfill its past promises. Only reluctantly did Washington indicate a willingness to consider alternatives — after imposing seemingly impossible conditions. Still, the primary problem is Japan. So long as Tokyo requests American military protection, it cannot easily reject Washington's request for bases. Thus, Okinawan residents must do more than demand fairness. They must advocate defense independence.
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Second—the plan is key to avoid catastrophic U.S. involvement in regional quagmires—only exiting Okinawa can refashion the U.S.-Japan alliance to secure regional stability.

Doug Bandow, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, former Special Assistant to President Ronald Reagan and Senior Policy Analyst in the 1980 Reagan for President Campaign, holds a B.A. in Economics from Florida State University and a J.D. from Stanford University, 2010 (“Japan Can Defend Itself,” *The National Interest Online*, May 12th, Available Online at http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=11804)

With Tokyo retreating from its commitment to chart a more independent course, it is up to the United States to reorder the relationship. Washington policy makers long have enjoyed America's quasi-imperial role. But U.S. citizens are paying for and dying in Washington's quasi-imperial wars. An expansive American role made sense during the Cold War in the aftermath of World War II. That world disappeared two decades ago. Promiscuous intervention in today's world inflates the power of Washington policy makers but harms the interests of U.S. citizens. American forces and personnel are expected to be at perpetual risk guaranteeing the interests of other states, including Japan. Thus the U.S. reliance on Okinawa. Lieutenant General Keith Stalder, the Marine Corps Pacific commander, said the island deployment is "the perfect model" for the alliance's objectives of "deterring, defending and defeating potential adversaries." For years the most obvious target of the American forces was North Korea, with the 3rd Marine Expeditionary Force (MEF) expected to reinforce the Republic of Korea in the event of war. Yet the ROK is both financially and manpower rich. More recently some Americans have talked about deploying the MEF to seize Pyongyang's nuclear weapons in the event of a North Korean collapse. Alas, so far the North has proved to be surprisingly resilient, so the Marines might wait a long time to undertake this mission. Checking China is next on the potential Okinawa mission list. However, no one expects the United States to launch a ground invasion of the People's Republic of China irrespective of the future course of events. Thus, the MEF wouldn't be very useful in any conflict. In any case, a stronger Japanese military — which already possesses potent capabilities — would be a far better mechanism for encouraging responsible Chinese development. There's also the kitchen sink argument: the Marines are to maintain regional "stability." Pentagon officials draw expanding circles around Okinawa to illustrate potential areas of operation. The mind boggles, however. Should U.S. troops be sent to resolve, say, the long-running Burmese guerrilla war in that nation's east, a flare-up of secessionist sentiment in Indonesia, violent opposition to Fiji's military dictator, or border skirmishes between Cambodia and Thailand? It hard to imagine any reason for Washington to jump into any local conflict. America's presumption should be noninvolvement rather than intervention in other nations' wars. Making fewer promises to intervene would allow the United States to reduce the number of military personnel and overseas bases. A good place to start in cutting international installations would be Okinawa. America's post-Cold War dominance is coming to an end. Michael Schuman argued in Time: "Anyone who thinks the balance of power in Asia is not changing — and with it, the strength of the U.S., even among its old allies — hasn't been there lately." Many analysts nevertheless want the United States to attempt to maintain its unnatural dominance. Rather than accommodate a more powerful China, they want America to contain a wealthier and more influential Beijing. Rather than expect its allies to defend themselves and promote regional stability, they want Washington to keep its friends dependent. To coin a phrase, it's time for a change. U.S. intransigence over Okinawa has badly roiled the bilateral relationship. But even a more flexible basing policy would not be enough. Washington is risking the lives and wasting the money of the American people to defend other populous and prosperous states. Washington should close Futenma — as a start to refashioning the alliance with Japan. Rather than a unilateral promise by the United States to defend Japan, the relationship should become one of equals working together on issues of mutual interest. Responsibility for protecting Japan should become that of Japan. Both Okinawans and Americans deserve justice. It's time for Washington to deliver.
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We’ll isolate two scenarios—first is China:

Current strategy puts the U.S. on a collision course with China—this makes war inevitable.

Christopher Layne, Associate Professor in the Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University and Research Fellow with the Center on Peace and Liberty at The Independent Institute, 2007 ("The Case Against the American Empire," *American Empire: A Debate*, Published by Routledge, ISBN 0415952034, p. 73-74)

To be sure, the United States should not ignore the potential strategic ramifications of China’s arrival on the world stage as a great power. After all, the lesson of history is that the emergence of new great powers in the international system leads to conflict, not peace. On this score, the notion—propagated by Beijing—that China’s will be a “peaceful rise” is just as fanciful as claims by American policy-makers that China has no need to build up its military capabilities because it is unthreatened by any other state. Still, this does not mean that the United States and China inevitably are on a collision course that will culminate in the next decade or two in a war. Whether Washington and Beijing actually come to blows, however, depends largely on what strategy the United States chooses to adopt toward China, because the United States has the “last clear chance” to adopt a grand strategy that will serve its interests in balancing Chinese power without running the risk of an armed clash with [end page 73] Beijing. If the United States continues to aim at upholding its current primacy, however, Sino-American conflict is virtually certain.

1AC—Defense Independence Advantage

This risks extinction.

Straits Times (Singapore), 2000 (“Regional Fallout: No one gains in war over Taiwan,” June 25th, Available Online via Lexis-Nexis)

The high-intensity scenario postulates a cross-strait war escalating into a full-scale war between the US and China. If Washington were to conclude that splitting China would better serve its national interests, then a full-scale war becomes unavoidable. Conflict on such a scale would embroil other countries far and near and -- horror of horrors -- raise the possibility of a nuclear war. Beijing has already told the US and Japan privately that it considers any country providing bases and logistics support to any US forces attacking China as belligerent parties open to its retaliation. In the region, this means South Korea, Japan, the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Singapore. If China were to retaliate, east Asia will be set on fire. And the conflagration may not end there as opportunistic powers elsewhere may try to overturn the existing world order. With the US distracted, Russia may seek to redefine Europe's political landscape. The balance of power in the Middle East may be similarly upset by the likes of Iraq. In south Asia, hostilities between India and Pakistan, each armed with its own nuclear arsenal, could enter a new and dangerous phase. Will a full-scale Sino-US war lead to a nuclear war? According to General Matthew Ridgeway, commander of the US Eighth Army which fought against the Chinese in the Korean War, the US had at the time thought of using nuclear weapons against China to save the US from military defeat. In his book The Korean War, a personal account of the military and political aspects of the conflict and its implications on future US foreign policy, Gen Ridgeway said that US was confronted with two choices in Korea -- truce or a broadened war, which could have led to the use of nuclear weapons. If the US had to resort to nuclear weaponry to defeat China long before the latter acquired a similar capability, there is little hope of winning a war against China 50 years later, short of using nuclear weapons. The US estimates that China possesses about 20 nuclear warheads that can destroy major American cities. Beijing also seems prepared to go for the nuclear option. A Chinese military officer disclosed recently that Beijing was considering a review of its "non first use" principle regarding nuclear weapons. Major-General Pan Zhangqiang, president of the military-funded Institute for Strategic Studies, told a gathering at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars in Washington that although the government still abided by that principle, there were strong pressures from the military to drop it. He said military leaders considered the use of nuclear weapons mandatory if the country risked dismemberment as a result of foreign intervention. Gen Ridgeway said that should that come to pass, we would see the destruction of civilisation. There would be no victors in such a war. While the prospect of a nuclear Armaggedon over Taiwan might seem inconceivable, it cannot be ruled out entirely, for China puts sovereignty above everything else.

The plan solves—exiting Okinawa is key to deter China without drawing in the U.S.

Doug Bandow, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, former Special Assistant to President Ronald Reagan and Senior Policy Analyst in the 1980 Reagan for President Campaign, holds a B.A. in Economics from Florida State University and a J.D. from Stanford University, 2010 (“Get Out of Japan,” *The National Interest Online*, June 18th, Available Online at http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=23592)

Do U.S. bases in Okinawa help dampen regional arms spending? That’s another point more often asserted than proven. Even if so, however, that isn’t necessarily to Washington’s benefit. The best way to ensure a responsible Chinese foreign and military policy is for Beijing’s neighbors to be well-armed and willing to cooperate among themselves. Then local or regional conflicts would be much less likely to end up in Washington.

1AC—Defense Independence Advantage

Subpoint B is North Korea:

Continued military presence risks entanglement with North Korea—this would draw the U.S. into a bloody conflict.

Doug Bandow, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, former Special Assistant to President Ronald Reagan and Senior Policy Analyst in the 1980 Reagan for President Campaign, holds a B.A. in Economics from Florida State University and a J.D. from Stanford University, 2010 (“Avoiding Pyongyang,” *The National Interest Online*, May 24th, Available Online at http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=23432)

The sinking of the Cheonan was an outrage, but it was an outrage against the ROK. It should not be an issue of great concern to America, which normally would offer diplomatic backing but not military support to a democratic friend. Yet American analysts have been producing articles and studies carrying such titles as “America Must Show Resolve over North Korea” and “U.S. Must Respond Firmly to North Korean Naval Attack.” The question is: why? No American forces were attacked. None are likely to be targeted. The U.S. military already is very busy, especially in Afghanistan. There’s no reason for Washington to risk war over an assault on another state, especially one well able to defend itself. Were the ROK still a helpless economic wreck, one could concoct an argument for American aid. But the South vastly outranges the DPRK on every measure of national power. The ongoing debate about whether Seoul is ready to take over operational control (“OPCON”) of its own forces along with any U.S. troops during a war is symptomatic of the extreme dependency in which South Korea finds itself. For the ROK to cower fearfully before Pyongyang is roughly the equivalent of the U.S. running to Brussels to request European troops to deter a Mexican attack. At least the alliance provides an obvious benefit to Seoul: a source of military reinforcement from the global superpower. Still, the South finds its decision-making, even on the question of its national survival, affected and directed by American policy makers half a world away. Virtually every American, from think-tank analyst to Obama administration staffer, has called on South Korea to exercise “restraint.” They say the ROK’s response should be “measured.” They urge Seoul to be “cautious.” And so on. That makes sense from America’s standpoint. Indeed, the Obama administration has reason to be making much stronger representations privately. It would be folly for the United States to get into a war over the sinking of the Cheonan. It doesn’t matter that the act was criminal; it doesn’t matter that the deaths have greatly pained South Koreans; it doesn’t matter that Seoul might calculate the costs and benefits of a tough response differently. Washington’s top priority is avoiding another war, one that likely would be costly, brutal, and bloody—and of no conceivable benefit to America. Obviously, South Koreans have an even greater incentive to avoid war, since their nation would be the principal battleground. However, they might decide that to exhibit weakness in the face of the North’s provocation would make the chance of war even greater in the future. If Pyongyang believes that it can sink a South Korean ship without consequence, what might the Kim regime do next?

1AC—Defense Independence Advantage

The impact is global nuclear war.

Peter Hayes, Professor of International Relations at RMIT University (Australia) and Director of the Nautilus Institute in San Francisco, and Michael Hamel-Green, Dean of and Professor in the Faculty of Arts, Education and Human Development at Victoria University (Australia), 2009 (“The Path Not Taken, The Way Still Open: Denuclearizing The Korean Peninsula And Northeast Asia,” *The Asia-Pacific Journal*, December 14th, Available Online at http://www.japanfocus.org/-Peter-Hayes/3267)

At worst, there is the possibility of nuclear attack1, whether by intention, miscalculation, or merely accident, leading to the resumption of Korean War hostilities. On the Korean Peninsula itself, key population centres are well within short or medium range missiles. The whole of Japan is likely to come within North Korean missile range. Pyongyang has a population of over 2 million, Seoul (close to the North Korean border) 11 million, and Tokyo over 20 million. Even a limited nuclear exchange would result in a holocaust of unprecedented proportions. But the catastrophe within the region would not be the only outcome. New research indicates that even a limited nuclear war in the region would rearrange our global climate far more quickly than global warming. Westberg draws attention to new studies modelling the effects of even a limited nuclear exchange involving approximately 100 Hiroshima-sized 15 kt bombs2 (by comparison it should be noted that the United States currently deploys warheads in the range 100 to 477 kt, that is, individual warheads equivalent in yield to a range of 6 to 32 Hiroshimas).The studies indicate that the soot from the fires produced would lead to a decrease in global temperature by 1.25 degrees Celsius for a period of 6-8 years.3 In Westberg’s view: That is not global winter, but the nuclear darkness will cause a deeper drop in temperature than at any time during the last 1000 years. The temperature over the continents would decrease substantially more than the global average. A decrease in rainfall over the continents would also follow…The period of nuclear darkness will cause much greater decrease in grain production than 5% and it will continue for many years...hundreds of millions of people will die from hunger…To make matters even worse, such amounts of smoke injected into the stratosphere would cause a huge reduction in the Earth’s protective ozone.4 These, of course, are not the only consequences. Reactors might also be targeted, causing further mayhem and downwind radiation effects, superimposed on a smoking, radiating ruin left by nuclear next-use. Millions of refugees would flee the affected regions. The direct impacts, and the follow-on impacts on the global economy via ecological and food insecurity, could make the present global financial crisis pale by comparison. How the great powers, especially the nuclear weapons states respond to such a crisis, and in particular, whether nuclear weapons are used in response to nuclear first-use, could make or break the global non proliferation and disarmament regimes. There could be many unanticipated impacts on regional and global security relationships5, with subsequent nuclear breakout and geopolitical turbulence, including possible loss-of-control over fissile material or warheads in the chaos of nuclear war, and aftermath chain-reaction affects involving other potential proliferant states. The Korean nuclear proliferation issue is not just a regional threat but a global one that warrants priority consideration from the international community.

Cooperative agreements with Japan solve the impact.

Doug Bandow, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, former Special Assistant to President Ronald Reagan and Senior Policy Analyst in the 1980 Reagan for President Campaign, holds a B.A. in Economics from Florida State University and a J.D. from Stanford University, 2010 (“Get Out of Japan,” *The National Interest Online*, June 18th, Available Online at http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=23592)

Anyway, the best way to assuage regional concerns is to construct cooperative agreements and structures between Japan and its neighbors. Democratic countries from South Korea to Australia to India have an interest in working with Tokyo to ensure that the Asia-Pacific remains peaceful and prosperous. Japan has much at stake and could contribute much. Tokyo could still choose to do little. But it shouldn’t expect America to fill any defense gap.

1AC—Defense Independence Advantage

Finally—no risk of offense—relocating the Marine Corps outside of Okinawa is comparatively better for U.S. strategic interests.

Seigen Miyasato, Chairman of the Study Group of Okinawa External Affairs and Professor and Director of the Center for Japan-U.S. Relations at the International University of Japan, et al., with 17 co-signers, 2009 (“A Letter to President Obama from Okinawans,” Close The Base—a project of the Institute For Policy Studies, November 9th, Available Online at http://closethebase.org/background/letter-to-the-president/)

Dear President Barack Hussein Obama, We are residents of Okinawa and we would like to express our views regarding the United States Marine Corps Futenma Air Station and the current agreement to build a new base in Nago City, Okinawa. We urge you to withdraw all of USMC from Okinawa. The people of Okinawa have been and will continue to be firmly opposed to the current US plan to relocate the dangerous Futenma Air Station to another location within Okinawa. We demand that the Futenma Air Station be shut down and returned unconditionally. The USMC has been stationed in Okinawa since the mid 1950s. The only real solution to the Futenma problem is a total withdrawal of the USMC from Okinawa. Here we respectfully state the reasons for our demand. First, the current agreement between the US and Japanese governments regarding the construction of a new USMC base in Nago City was reached without consultation with the government or the people of Okinawa in 2005 and 2006. As many recent election results and public opinion polls show, Okinawa’s people have been calling for relocating Futenma out of Okinawa. Second, the sea area of the new base, located off shore of USMC Camp Schwab in Nago City, is a habitat for various endangered species, including jugong, the Asian manatee. It is unacceptable to destroy the highly valuable ocean environment with the construction of a military base. Third, the US and Japanese governments agreed to close the USMC Futenma and return its land to Okinawa in 1996, with the condition that a replacement facility be constructed in Okinawa. However, the new facility has not yet been built. The fourteen years since have proven that it is simply not possible to squeeze a new military base in Okinawa, which has long suffered an overburden of US military presence. Finally, when the closure of Futenma Air Station was first discussed, it was assumed that the ground combat element and logistic combat element would remain in Okinawa. However, since there is virtually no possibility of building a new air station in Okinawa, the USMC should relocate both the ground combat element and aviation combat element out of Okinawa. Indeed, it would be more logical and beneficial for the USMC if all the elements of the Marine Air-Ground Task Force were relocated together. Our proposal of a total withdrawal of USMC from Okinawa would actually fit the necessity of the MAGTF’s integration of elements most effectively. By withdrawing from Okinawa, the USMC could avoid the unreasonable arrangement of keeping some troops in Okinawa and stationing others in Guam or Hawaii. It would be more desirable for the USMC, while at the same time preserving the highly valuable ocean environment and satisfying the demands of the people of Okinawa. In conclusion, we wish to urge the United States and Japanese governments to begin the process of planning for a total withdrawal of the USMC from Okinawa. Now is the time to act for “CHANGE” to create a better relationship between Japan and the United States. Both countries would benefit from a break with the status quo and a fresh perspective on the Futenma issue.

\*\*\*DPJ Advantage Arguments

Coalition-Building Key To DPJ Agenda

The DPJ can’t get their agenda passed in the status quo—coalition-building is key.

Tobias Harris, Japanese politics specialist who worked for a DPJ member of the upper house of the Diet from 2006-2007, currently a Ph.D. student in political science at MIT, has been published in the *Wall Street Journal Asia* and the *Far Eastern Economic Review* and has provided commentary for CNBC Asia, Bloomberg, BBC, and NPR, 2010 (“Japan-U.S. Relations Could Get Bumpy,” *Newsweek*, July 16th, Available Online at http://www.newsweek.com/2010/07/16/a-fragile-alliance.print.html, Accessed 07-19-2010)

For a brief moment, Naoto Kan looked like the anchor who could end Japan’s drift. Where his predecessor, Yukio Hatoyama, was a patrician dogged by corruption scandals and perceived as incapable of leading his own government, Kan came into the premiership stressing his own middle-class background. He pledged to recommit the governing Democratic Party of Japan to its ambitious agenda: reversing the country’s long decline by reforming its bureaucracy and social safety net while jump-starting the economy. Moreover, his commitment to replace an aging U.S. air base on Okinawa signaled a possible end to a dispute that had soured relations with Washington and led to Hatoyama’s resignation. 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.

U.S. Pressure Undermines The DPJ

Continued U.S. pressure over Okinawa undermines DPJ credibility.

Jeff Kingston, Director of Asian Studies at Temple University, 2010 (“Can Anyone Govern Japan?,” *Foreign Policy*, July 9th, Available Online at http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/07/09/ can\_anyone\_govern\_japan, Accessed 07-19-2010)

But the DPJ's biggest problems are with Washington, which held firm on a 2006 deal between the United States and Japan over Futenma. Hatoyama had pledged in his campaign to relocate the base, but backed down under intense U.S. pressure. Okinawans felt betrayed, and the reversal exposed the prime minister as feckless, precipitating his sudden downfall in June. Kan has sought to defuse tension by saying that he will abide by the 2006 agreement. But anger over the DPJ's backtracking and ineffectual leadership has undermined the party's credibility. Barack Obama will visit Japan while Okinawa has gubernatorial elections in November, raising the risk that the U.S. president will get embroiled in Japan's increasingly lively domestic politics.

A2: Status Quo Solves Relocation Dispute

Kan has just kicked the can down the road—tension over U.S. military presence in Okinawa is inevitable.

Xinhua News Agency—the official press agency of the People's Republic of China, 2010 (“U.S. military presence to remain thorn in relations with Japan: experts,” Byline Daisuke Wakabayashi and Yuka Hayashi, July 10th, Available Online at http://news.xinhuanet.com/english2010/indepth/2010-07/10/c\_13393108.htm, Accessed 07-19-2010)

The U.S. military presence in Japan will remain a long term source of consternation between the two allies, in spite of a recent easing of tensions, some experts said. "All you need is another rape case and it comes up as a high profile issue," said Rodger Baker, director of East Asia analysis at global intelligence company Stratfor. Residents of Okinawa, a Japanese island that hosts about two-thirds of Japan's 40,000 U.S. troops, still recall the 1995 case in which three U.S. servicemen kidnapped and raped a 12-year-old Japanese girl. They continue to complain about noise from overhead U.S. aircraft and the island has seen mass demonstrations calling for U.S. forces to leave. Last year, then Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama sparked a row when he called for a "partnership of equals" in a relationship dominated by Washington since the end of World War II. When the dust cleared, Hatoyama resigned because of a broken campaign promise to shutter Futenma, a U.S. air base located in Okinawa. The relationship underwent a public reset at the recent G20 summit in Toronto. Japan's new Prime Minister Naoto Kan pledged he will stick to a previous agreement with Washington to move Futenma to the north of the island, even though Okinawans want the base gone altogether. U.S. President Barack Obama responded that he understands the delicacy of the matter and that he would strive to make the U.S. military presence more palatable to Tokyo. Still, analysts said the problem is not going away. "The issue is not dead," Baker said, adding that tensions are high with locals wherever U.S. troops are deployed overseas. In South Korea, for example, dissatisfaction with the U.S. military presence has led to a number of mass demonstrations over the years. Doug Bandow, senior fellow at the Cato Institute, said the issue could become messy for Japan's ruling party, as Okinawans are unlikely to compromise over the issue. The Kan administration may, however, take a cue from the former ruling Liberal Democratic Party, which in 2006 agreed to move Futenma but dithered on the relocation so as not to arouse anger in Okinawa, Bandow said. "Kan's best hope is to kick the can down the road," he said. Ichiro Fujisaki, Japanese Ambassador to the United States, said in a speech from Washington on Thursday that "we have to lessen the burden" on the people of Okinawa, but that the U.S.-Japan alliance "will be honored." Richard Bush, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, said Japan's leadership deemed the former prime minister's approach a political loser. "They needed to cut their losses, they did so and that brought about an immediate improvement in U.S.-Japan relations," he said. While the party will continue to deal with expectations raised by former Prime Minister Hatoyama, Kan is deflating those expectations, he said. While Kan will feel Washington's pull on one side and Okinawa's tug on the other, he will respond more to the former, Bush said. For now, both Washington and Tokyo are downplaying the military issue and Japan's leadership is focusing on the economy in the face of an ongoing global recession.

A2: Status Quo Solves Relocation Dispute

There is no chance Kan will be able to push through the relocation—Okinawan opposition remains too strong.

Mike Shuster, award-winning diplomatic correspondent and roving foreign correspondent for National Public Radio News, 2010 (“Japan's PM Faces Test Over U.S. Base On Okinawa,” *NPR*, June 21st, Available Online at http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=127932447, Accessed 07-19-2010)

In Japan, the problem that led to the dissolution of former Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama's government now is vexing the new government. Earlier this month, Hatoyama resigned over the controversy about the continued presence of thousands of U.S. troops stationed on the Japanese island of Okinawa. He promised but failed to bring about their relocation. The new government in Tokyo is facing the same problem with little prospect of a solution. Many of the 18,000 U.S. Marines based in Japan are located at the Marine Corps Air Station Futenma on Okinawa. Over the years, Okinawans have pressed harder and harder to move the base away from their island. After the opposition Democratic Party of Japan pulled off a historic electoral victory last year, Hatoyama got caught by promises to close the base that he couldn't keep. He resigned after only eight months in office. His successor, Naoto Kan, took office earlier this month. It is not clear how he will deal with the problem of Okinawa, says political analyst Masatoshi Honda of the National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies. "He hasn't made any clear statement about Futenma before and even right now. He just said he will follow the decision of the previous prime minister. So we cannot see what he really wants to do on this issue," Honda says. U.S. Presence A Sore Point The Marine base at Futenma has been a sore point between the U.S. and Japan for years. The noise of the base's aircraft and the rowdy and drunken behavior of some Marines have made the base unpopular in Okinawa and elsewhere in Japan. Several times in recent years, the U.S. offered a proposal to solve the problem, but it would still leave much of Futenma intact, says Koichi Nakano, a political analyst at Sophia University. "The U.S. government [has] repeatedly said that [it wants] to relocate to a place where [it] will be welcome. That welcome is simply not there in Okinawa at the moment," Nakano says. The U.S. says it will transfer 8,000 Marines to Guam and move a portion of the base to another part of Okinawa. Kan, the new prime minister, has pledged to seek a solution that is in line with this offer, but he still faces overwhelming opposition on Okinawa, Honda says. "So far mayors, governors and local politicians in Okinawa, everybody [is] against the proposal of the new government. So he will be completely blocked by this," he says.

The current U.S. stance creates a double standard that tanks Okinawan support for internal relocation.

Yomiuri Shimbun—the largest daily newspaper in Japan, 2010 (“U.S. rethinks marine corps' shift to Guam / Wants to keep command unit in Okinawa,” Byline Satoshi Ogawa, July 3rd, Available Online at http://www.yomiuri.co.jp/dy/national/T100702004810.htm, Accessed 07-19-2010)

However, handling of the matter remains unclear. Concerning the relocation of Futenma Air Station, the U.S. side has often repeated that the 2006 road map is the "best policy." It refused policy changes such as relocating the base outside the prefecture as requested by the former administration under Yukio Hatoyama. Now the United States says it plans to change the makeup of the units to be transferred to Guam. Projecting the image that such changes are natural for military reasons could complicate government efforts to reach an agreement with Okinawa authorities on the Futenma relocation. The consent of the people of Okinawa Prefecture, as well as local and prefectural governments, will be needed to realize the Futenma Air Station relocation.

A2: Status Quo Solves Relocation Dispute

The Upper House election has sapped Kan’s political capital—he won’t be able to push through the Futenma relocation in the face of massive opposition.

Wall Street Journal, 2010 (“Weakened Kan Faces Deadlines on Okinawa,” Byline Daisuke Wakabayashi and Yuka Hayashi, July 12th, Available Online at http://online.wsj.com/article/ SB10001424052748703580104575360660021162180.html, Accessed 07-19-2010)

Japanese Prime Minister Naoto Kan, badly bruised in Sunday's national elections, soon must turn to the issue of a U.S. military base on Okinawa—a politically charged matter that forced the resignation of his predecessor just over a month ago. The base wasn't a prominent factor in the campaign, but Sunday's results could make it harder for the weakened Mr. Kan to keep the promises the Japanese government made to the Obama administration. The prime minister told the U.S. he would move forward with the plan, aimed at keeping a large Marine presence on the southern island. The first test comes at the end of August: The previous prime minister, Yukio Hatoyama, had promised Washington an agreement with the U.S. on details of the controversial base location plan, including configuration and construction methods, by then. Mr. Kan has pledged to follow Mr. Hatoyama's commitments on Okinawa. In the months following that deadline, local elections in Okinawa could further lock local politicians into opposing Tokyo's attempts to move the American base to a new community. The Pentagon declined immediate comment on the vote. The tensions revolve around a 2006 agreement between the two countries to shuffle U.S. troops in Okinawa to make them more politically acceptable to the local population. The agreement calls for the U.S. to move 8,000 Marines to Guam by 2014 and to shift part of an existing Okinawa helicopter facility to a rural part of the island from a densely populated area. The aim is to diminish local hostility to the Marine presence, which has been stoked by a rape case and a helicopter crash. While the deal reduces the number of Marines on Okinawa, it leaves thousands there, and it doesn't go far enough for many Okinawans, who want the base moved off the island entirely. The ruling Democratic Party of Japan had endorsed that view last year and promised base opponents it would support their cause. But Mr. Hatoyama changed his position under pressure from the U.S.

A2: Upper House Elections Doom Kan/DPJ

The Upper House elections didn’t doom Kan and the DPJ—the next few months are key.

Paul Jackson, Tokyo-based freelance writer and co-author of *Tokyo Notes: Analysis on Japan, From Japan*—a blog by *The Diplomat*, 2010 (“Through Kan’s Fingers,” *Tokyo Notes: Analysis on Japan, From Japan*—a blog by *The Diplomat*, July 13th, Available Online at http://the-diplomat.com/tokyo-notes/2010/07/13/slipping-through-kan%E2%80%99s-fingers/, Accessed 07-19-2010)

Still, given that Kan has only had a month in office, the election result should be seen more as a judgment on the DPJ’s ten months in power rather than Kan’s leadership. While it looked as if Kan was capable of turning the party’s fortunes round in an instant, the reality was that voter dissatisfaction ran far deeper than that. Having failed to complete his rescue mission, Kan will now have to perform in an unfavorable political environment in which he has no upper house majority to secure the passage of DPJ bills. He will also have more difficulty in keeping the Ozawa contingent of the party ‘quiet.’ Ozawa has already been huffing and puffing about Kan’s leadership, the sales tax issue and broken manifesto promises. If he can make a favorable impression under these circumstances his fortunes could change. But with a DPJ leadership election looming in September, Kan now knows the timescale in which he has to show his party that he was indeed the right man to replace Hatoyama.

\*\*\*U.S.-Japan Relations Arguments

Okinawa Disagreement Tanks Relations

The clash over Okinawa jeopardizes U.S.-Japan relations—empirically proven.

Daniel Sneider, Associate Research Director at the Shorenstein Asia-Pacific Research Center at Stanford University, 2010 (“What It All Means: The Experts Opine, Part 3,” *Japan Real Time*—a blog of the *Wall Street Journal*, July 12th, Available Online at http://blogs.wsj.com/japanrealtime/2010/07/12/what-it-all-means-the-experts-opine-part-3/, Accessed 07-19-2010)

Even though driven by domestic issues, the election defeat of the DPJ has significant implications for foreign policy. The Japanese government that emerges from this vote will be notably weaker, less able to push through important legislation, with a leadership facing challenges from within and outside the DPJ. Key international issues now loom on the immediate horizon, from finalizing negotiations on the base dispute with the U.S. to coping with a rising China, not to mention responding to signs of new slowdown in the global economy. Renewed pressures on an already tender U.S.-Japan relationship could easily flow from this election. American officials were vocally irritated by the Hatoyama cabinet’s focus on “local politics” at the expense of national security. Japan will now be even more mired in political uncertainty, with a government less able and less willing to push through unpopular measures like the Okinawa base agreement. The Obama administration is heading towards its own date with unhappy voters. Can both governments demonstrate the patience and the leadership to keep the alliance on keel during a time of political turbulence?

Abandoning the promise to Washington will tank the alliance.

Michael J. Green, Senior Advisor and Japan Chair at the Center for Strategic and International Studies and Associate Professor of International Relations at Georgetown University, 2010 (“Mr. Kan Can Fix U.S.-Japan Ties,” *Wall Street Journal*, June 14th, Available Online at http://online.wsj.com/article/ SB30001424052748703433704575303592164774492.html, Accessed 07-19-2010)

Both governments will also need a strategy to rebuild support in Okinawa for the air base replacement facility. Mr. Hatoyama's flip-flopping and populism have left Mr. Kan with a real political mess on the island. In the worst-case scenario, an antibase candidate could capitalize on mounting frustration with Tokyo to win the gubernatorial election in November. Mr. Kan would then have to abandon his pledge to Washington on base realignment or pass legislation in the Diet overruling the governor. The damage to Mr. Kan and the alliance would be bad either way.

Withdrawing from Okinawa is key to preserve U.S.-Japan relations—it’s the key issue.

Guardian 10 [Simon Tisdall, 3/9/10, "World briefing: Japan and US huff and puff - but need each other more than ever", lexis]

A long-running row about relocating a US Marine Corps base on Okinawa is threatening to boil over, with Yukio Hatoyama, Japan's prime minister, admitting at the weekend that failure to resolve the dispute could force his resignation. Given that his Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ) swept to a watershed election victory only last August, such an outcome could be deeply embarrassing for the US and deeply resented in Japan. Despite its stated intention to pay greater attention to Asia, the Obama administration is making a hash of relations with Japan. Its insistence that Tokyo's new centre-left leaders honour a 2006 deal on the Futenma base between George Bush and their long-entrenched conservative predecessors looks like an attempt to ride roughshod over Japan's democratic process. Blame for rising bilateral strains also lies with Hatoyama, who seems to have promised more than he can deliver. Shigeru Ishiba, a senior Liberal Democrat party opposition leader, openly mocked the prime minister last week for supposedly making an election pledge he had "no idea" how to fulfil. The Okinawa dispute reflects broader differences. Hatoyama's view that Japan needs a more "balanced" relationship with Washington after 65 years of polite subservience in the security sphere, and his related interest in developing an EEC-style east Asian economic community including China, have produced sharply critical reactions in Washington. Hatoyama, meanwhile, is paying the price for appearing indecisive, with only one in four voters now intending to support the DPJ in upper-house parliamentary elections in July. "The relationship between the US and Japan is in its worst state ever," wrote Hisahiko Okazaki, a former ambassador, in the daily newspaper Sankei Shimbun. "The Japan-US alliance is too valuable an asset to lose," he added.

Relations Are On The Brink

Relations are on the brink—both sides are skeptical of the other.

Tobias Harris, Japanese politics specialist who worked for a DPJ member of the upper house of the Diet from 2006-2007, currently a Ph.D. student in political science at MIT, has been published in the *Wall Street Journal Asia* and the *Far Eastern Economic Review* and has provided commentary for CNBC Asia, Bloomberg, BBC, and NPR, 2010 (“Japan-U.S. Relations Could Get Bumpy,” *Newsweek*, July 16th, Available Online at http://www.newsweek.com/2010/07/16/a-fragile-alliance.print.html, Accessed 07-19-2010)

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.

A2: Alternate Causalities Trump Okinawa

Plan solves the alternate causalities—compromising over Okinawa is key.

Tobias Harris, Japanese politics specialist who worked for a DPJ member of the upper house of the Diet from 2006-2007, currently a Ph.D. student in political science at MIT, has been published in the *Wall Street Journal Asia* and the *Far Eastern Economic Review* and has provided commentary for CNBC Asia, Bloomberg, BBC, and NPR, 2010 (“Japan-U.S. Relations Could Get Bumpy,” *Newsweek*, July 16th, Available Online at http://www.newsweek.com/2010/07/16/a-fragile-alliance.print.html, Accessed 07-19-2010)

What can Washington do to minimize the friction? To a certain extent, the Obama administration has already taken several steps in the right direction. Unlike its predecessor, the current administration is less wedded to Japanese military contributions and gladly accepted a sizable Japanese financial contribution to the reconstruction of Afghanistan. When not feuding over Okinawa, the administration has made clear that it wants to work with Tokyo in areas like climate change. But the U.S. needs to be patient—especially on Okinawa. It needs to accept that in the months and years to come, anything beyond a limited military alliance focused on the defense of Japan is a nonstarter for Japan’s beleaguered politicians.

A2: Withdrawal Tanks The Alliance

Withdrawal doesn’t jeopardize the alliance—putting the onus on Japan to develop a realistic security policy is net-better for U.S.-Japan relations.

Doug Bandow, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, former Special Assistant to President Ronald Reagan and Senior Policy Analyst in the 1980 Reagan for President Campaign, holds a B.A. in Economics from Florida State University and a J.D. from Stanford University, 2010 (“Okinawa and the Problem of Empire,” *The Huffington Post*, March 25th, Available Online at http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=11617)

The Japanese government needs to assess future dangers and decide on appropriate responses — without assuming that the U.S. Marines will show up to the rescue. It is Japan's decision, but it should not be based on the presumption of American intervention. Having made its decision, then Tokyo should reconfigure its forces. Fairness suggests a major drawdown from Okinawa irrespective of whose military is protecting Japan. If the U.S. disengaged militarily, these decisions could be made without pressure from Washington. The two countries would still have much to cooperate about, including security. Leaving responsibility for Japan's defense with Tokyo would simply eliminate the unrealistic expectations engendered by the alliance on both sides. The governments could focus on issues of mutual interest, sharing intelligence, preparing emergency base access, and otherwise cooperating to meet international challenges. The best way for Americans to help residents of Okinawa is to press Washington to reshape U.S. foreign policy, making it more appropriate for a republic than a pseudo-empire. With the rise of numerous prosperous allied and friendly states — most notably Japan, but also South Korea, Australia, India, and others — the U.S. should step back, prepared to deal with an aggressive hegemon should one arise but determined to avoid being dragged into routine geopolitical squabbles. Then Tokyo could chart its own destiny, including deciding what forces to raise and where to base them. The Japanese government could no longer use American pressure as an excuse for inaction in Okinawa. Then Okinawans finally might gain justice — after 65 long years.

Their disad doesn’t assume changing conditions—the alliance is an outdated relic.

Doug Bandow, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, former Special Assistant to President Ronald Reagan and Senior Policy Analyst in the 1980 Reagan for President Campaign, holds a B.A. in Economics from Florida State University and a J.D. from Stanford University, 2010 (“Get Out of Japan,” *The National Interest Online*, June 18th, Available Online at http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=23592)

Yet what is most curious about the issue is the dogged insistence of American officials in maintaining the Japanese protectorate. The world in which the security treaty was signed has disappeared. Admits Kent E. Calder of SAIS, “the international political-economic context of the alliance and the domestic context in both nations have changed profoundly.” There is no reason to assume that a relationship created for one purpose in one context makes sense for another purpose in another context. The one-sided alliance—the United States agrees to defend Japan, Japan agrees to be defended—made sense in the aftermath of World War II. But sixty-five years later Japan possesses the second-largest economy on earth and has the potential to defend itself and help safeguard its region. “All of my Marines on Okinawa are willing to die if it is necessary for the security of Japan,” Lieutenant General Keith Stalder, the Pacific commander of the Marine Corps, observed in February. Yet “Japan does not have a reciprocal obligation to defend the United States.” How does that make sense for America today? Washington officials naturally want to believe that their role is essential. Countries which prefer to rely on America are happy to maintain the pretense. However, keeping the United States as guarantor of the security of Japan—and virtually every other populous, prosperous industrial state in the world—is not in the interest of the American people.

A2: Withdrawal Tanks The Alliance

Withdrawal won’t tank relations—economic and cultural ties and security cooperation will continue.

Doug Bandow, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, former Special Assistant to President Ronald Reagan and Senior Policy Analyst in the 1980 Reagan for President Campaign, holds a B.A. in Economics from Florida State University and a J.D. from Stanford University, 2010 (“Get Out of Japan,” *The National Interest Online*, June 18th, Available Online at http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=23592)

None of this means that the Japanese and American peoples should not be linked economically and culturally, or that the two governments should not cooperate on security issues. But there no longer is any reason for America to guarantee Japan’s security or permanently station forces on Japanese soil. The Obama administration’s foreign policy looks an awful lot like the Bush administration’s foreign policy. The U.S. insists on dominating the globe and imposing its will on its allies. This approach is likely to prove self-defeating in the long-term. U.S. arrogance will only advance the point when increasingly wealthy and influential friends insist on taking policy into their own hands. Before that, however, Washington’s insistence on defending prosperous and populous allies risks bankrupting America. Washington must begin scaling back foreign commitments and deployments. Japan would be a good place to start.

\*\*\*Japanese Economy Arguments

DPJ Key To Japan Economy

Continuing Kan’s reign is the only way to save Japan’s economy

Harris 10—former aide to a DPJ legislator, a doctoral student in political science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Tobias, 18 June 2010, Yes He Kan?, http://www.newsweek.com/2010/06/18/yes-he-kan.html, accessed 16 July 2010)

With the election of Naoto Kan, the ruling Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ) has achieved a miracle. Following the resignations of embattled Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama and scandal-tainted secretary-general Ichiro Ozawa, the public has returned to the party that won a majority of historic proportions less than a year ago. According to Japanese daily Asahi Shimbun, the new government boasts a 60 percent approval rating, compared with 17 percent for the Hatoyama government in May. The Yomiuri Shimbun, another daily, found that government support among independent voters—by far the most important bloc—swelled from 9 to 52 percent. More significantly, the DPJ’s chances of winning a majority in upper-house elections in July have improved dramatically. The lesson is that the public has by no means lost faith in the DPJ as an agent of political change. If anything, low public approval reflected the idea that Hatoyama and Ozawa were insufficiently distinct from LDP rule and its pathologies. Kan does not suffer from that problem. Having begun his career as a member of a small center-left party and earned a reputation as a crusader for clean government and participatory democracy, Kan will enable the DPJ to reclaim the platform that first brought it to power: the creation of a transparent government that answers to the public’s fears about Japan’s economic future. The problems facing Kan are no less daunting than those that greeted his predecessors. The IMF recently predicted that Japan’s national debt will reach 250 percent of GDP by 2015. Like previous governments, Kan’s has to find a way to rein in public spending while providing for Japan’s aging population, promoting new forms of economic growth, and reducing carbon emissions. In Kan, Japan may have its best chance to make progress on these fronts. As the son of a salaryman, Kan has Everyman credentials that his patrician predecessors lacked. It will be easier for a middle-class prime minister to ask for sacrifices like a consumption-tax increase than for prime ministers like Aso and Hatoyama, who hailed from wealthy political dynasties. Moreover, for Kan, improving Japan’s democracy is not just political boilerplate: he has spent his career working on behalf of greater public participation in government and more communication between policymakers and citizens. He is the right leader for restoring public confidence in the government through greater transparency. It helps that Kan and his top advisers, especially Yukio Edano, the new DPJ secretary-general, have sought to distance the new government from Ozawa. More than any policy issue, Ozawa had become the main polarizing force within the party, as members debated the reforms that concentrated power in his office, as well as his response to the ongoing investigation of his campaign funds. One of Kan’s first decisions as party leader was to create a new party policymaking outfit that would facilitate communication between the government and DPJ M.P.s. By restoring the confidence of party members in party leadership, Kan will be better able to ask them to support ambitious policies to attack the country’s economic problems. A leading advocate of introducing Westminster-style cabinet government to Japan, Kan sees the cabinet as the fount of democratic leadership, a force for creative policymaking in contrast to Japan’s bureaucracy. And unlike Hatoyama, Kan may be capable of making cabinet government a reality. Having served as a cabinet minister—first as health minister in 1996 and again as finance minister and minister for national strategy under Hatoyama—Kan has managerial experience that his predecessor wholly lacked, which may prove useful for managing cabinet debates. Furthermore, while Kan retained 11 ministers from the Hatoyama government, the new ministers are, if anything, even more committed to restoring Japan’s finances and reforming the policymaking process. Still, there is no guarantee that the Kan government will be able to overcome Japan’s economic challenges—or win enough seats in this summer’s elections to free the DPJ of its dependence on coalition partners. But headed by a prime minister with the common touch who stresses transparency, the Kan government may be Japan’s best chance—yes, better than Koizumi—of restoring the public’s trust and making the decisions necessary to overcome Japan’s profound economic insecurity.

DPJ Key To Japan Economy

The DPJ will increase the consumption tax – key to reduce debt and solve the economy

Hayashi 10 (Yuka, WSJ Writer, 16 June 2010, Japan's Kan Plans Major Tax Increase, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704289504575312071898013814.html, accessed 19 July 2010)

Japan's new prime minister told voters to brace themselves for the pain of a major tax increase as a way to avoid a Greek-style debt crisis, adopting a higher sales tax as the centerpiece of his economic and political platforms. Only nine days after taking the helm of the center-left Democratic Party of Japan, Naoto Kan delivered a bombshell announcement that the government will aim for doubling the nation's broad sales tax from the current 5% over the next few years, and backed away from the party's earlier promise that such an increase wouldn't take place at least until 2013. Mr. Kan made the vow at a news conference called to unveil a package of campaign pledges ahead of elections scheduled for July 11, a key event for the new ruling party to solidify its hold on power. Under a new slogan "Reviving a Healthy Japan," the party said it will expand the economy by an average nominal rate of 3% over the next decade, a level Japan hasn't seen since the early 1990s. But stepping away from previous growth strategies that focused on big spending, Mr. Kan said the first step to lifting Japan's economy is to cut national debts that already amount to 180% of gross domestic product. To do so, the DPJ plans to cap next year's debt issuance at the current fiscal year's level and aim to balance its main budget within 10 years. "We can't be an idle spectator of the turmoil in Europe started by the fiscal collapse in Greece," said Mr. Kan, who has repeatedly mentioned the Greek crisis as a warning to Japan in his previous capacity as finance minister. The consumption tax plan is part of a broader growth blueprint, which Mr. Kan's government released separately Friday morning. In that 113-page document, his cabinet said it would try to lift growth over the next decade by encouraging investment in promising areas such as the environment and health care, and by attracting more foreign investment and tourism. The blueprint also makes clear that while the government is eying higher taxes on consumption, it's looking to cut some taxes, particularly on businesses. It calls for gradually cutting the nation's 40% effective corporate tax rate to 25%, in line with other major countries, to make domestic companies more competitive internationally and attract more foreign firms to do business in Japan. The Japanese government's new embrace of debt reduction mirrors similar moves in the U.S. and Europe, where the Greek crisis appears to have rippled through politics around the world, making fiscal rectitude a popular political slogan. With his aggressive campaign to rein in runaway borrowing, Mr. Kan is pitching the DPJ to the voters as a responsible ruling party with solutions to the nation's deep economic problems. Despite its historic victory in general elections in August, popular support for the party had sunk to perilously low levels in recent months before bouncing back with Mr. Kan's appointment. The party was hurt by campaign-funds scandals involving top leaders and inconsistent handling of the relocation of U.S. military bases. Following the surprise resignation by Yukio Hatoyama, his predecessor, Mr. Kan took over the challenge of mending the party's reputation in time for the July 11 elections. Polls have shown that the Japanese public, perhaps spooked by scenarios of potential fiscal crises, are warming up to the idea of eventual tax pains. Still, running an election campaign on a platform of a big tax increase is a gamble for Mr. Kan. Despite Japan's deteriorating fiscal conditions, the country's political leaders have avoided touching the consumption tax since 1997, afraid of losing popular support. Even Mr. Hatoyama had promised last year the current tax rate would be maintained at least until 2013 and that the DPJ would instead focus on eliminating wasteful government spending. Some opposition parties are already ready for an attack. "Boosting the economy with a tax hike? That's an obscene stretch," said Yoshimi Watanabe, leader of Your Party, a popular start-up party seeking a small government in an interview. The prime minister said the government will decide on the details of the tax increase, such as the exact size of the increase and the measures to ease the pain for lower-income earners, by the end of March. To implement the step swiftly, the DPJ plans to initiate negotiations with opposition parties, with the hopes of getting cooperation from the Liberal Democratic Party, the former ruling party that has unveiled its own economic rehabilitation blueprint—a program that also includes raising the controversial tax to 10%. Mr. Kan said that level is a "reference point for the time being." If agreement with opposition parties is reached smoothly, the tax could be raised as soon as the fall of 2012, said Koichiro Genba, chief of the DPJ's policy research council. Many economists have argued that raising the sales tax is the most effective way to reduce Japan's mounting national debt and secure a steady stream of funds for caring for the nation's growing elderly population. The rate of the tax in Japan is far lower than in most other developed nations, they say, and it's so broad-based that a small increase will quickly boost tax revenues. Naoki Tsuchiyama, a market economist for Mizuho Securities Co., said a rise in the consumption tax to 10% would increase the tax revenue annually by 10 trillion yen ($110 billion). "That's a substantial amount and definitely positive for the debt market," he said.

DPJ Key To Japan Economy

Strong leadership from Kan is critical to reign-in debt and reform social welfare.

Kyodo News 6-22, “Kan's leadership vital for achieving ambitious fiscal reform goals.” Japanese News Organization, Accessed 7-16-2010, http://www.thefreelibrary.com/ANALYSIS%3A+Kan%27s+leadership+vital+for+achieving+ambitious+fiscal...-a0229987467)

**Japan has finally gotten down to work on a fiscal reform plan, unveiling Tuesday a set of targets for fiscal** 2020 [to rein in](http://www.thefreedictionary.com/To+rein+in) to check **the speed of, or cause to stop**, by drawing the reins. to cause (a person) to slow down or cease some **activity**; - to rein in is used commonly of superiors in a chain of command, ordering a subordinate to moderate or cease some activity deemed excessive. See also: Rein Rein **.....** Click the link for more information. state debts, **but without strong political leadership from** Prime Minister [Naoto Kan](http://encyclopedia.thefreedictionary.com/Naoto+Kan) Naoto Kan (菅 直人 *Kan Naoto*, b. October 10 1946) is a Japanese politician who was the former **leader of the** Democratic Party of Japan (**DPJ**), the largest opposition party in the Diet. Kan was former Minister for Health and Welfare**.  it could turn out to be pie in the sky. The fiscal management plan includes targets to achieve a primary surplus in fiscal 2020, cap annual spending below 71 trillion yen for three years from fiscal 2011 and introduce a pay-as-you-go scheme to secure resources to fund policies.** Calling it ''a step toward strong finances,'' Kan on Tuesday urged all of his Cabinet members to share the goal and work hard toward restoring the nation's fiscal health**. Markets basically welcomed the plan, released at a time when Japan's public debt is approaching almost 200 percent of its gross domestic product**, but the lack of a detailed blueprint for achieving the targets has come in for criticism. ''It is certainly important to set goals, but we've seen similar ones ending in failure over and over,'' said Hideki Matsumura, senior economist at the Japan Research Institute. ''What's more important is to lay out the process of how to get there.'' Kan is set to present the plan at the upcoming summit meetings in Canada, but with few specifics it is unclear how it will be greeted by other major nations, which are broadly struggling to rebuild their own finances after massive stimulus spending. **To realize a fiscal overhaul, Kan will also need to press ahead with a sweeping tax reform and reconstruction of the social welfare system, as well as a reassessment of the current expenditure structure so that it can pay for a growth strategy unveiled last week.** To secure a stable supply of funds, the premier has proposed doubling the 5 percent [sales tax](http://encyclopedia2.thefreedictionary.com/Sales+tax) sales tax, levy on the sale of goods or services, generally calculated as a percentage of the selling price, and sometimes called a purchase tax. It is usually collected in the form of an extra charge by the retailer, who remits the tax to the government.  after two or three years, but this suggestion has already provoked a fierce backlash among lawmakers from his ruling Democratic Party of Japan ahead of the July 11 House of Councillors election. Kan's plan has also met with stiff opposition from Shizuka Kamei, an outspoken politician who leads the [People's New Party](http://encyclopedia.thefreedictionary.com/People%27s+New+Party) the DPJ's coalition partner, who advocates big spending to help further boost the economy. ''Fiscal reforms, which will be a challenging task for any prime minister, cannot be implemented without powerful political leadership,'' Yoko Takeda at the Mitsubishi Research Institute said. She said the reforms need to proceed without [sectionalism](http://www.thefreedictionary.com/sectionalism) at government offices and that the National Policy Unit, which was set up last September when the DPJ swept into power, could take the lead in organizing cross-sectional reforms.

DPJ Key To Japan Economy

DPJ is key to a strong yen

Nakamichi 9 (Takashi, 13 August 2009, Japan's DPJ Signals Tolerance for Strong Yen, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB125009822585426457.html, accessed 16 July 2010)

The Democratic Party of Japan's drive to jump-start domestic demand means it might tolerate a rising yen if it takes power this month, reflecting a view that a strong currency might eventually benefit the ailing economy. DPJ officials have indicated that while their party has no intention to guide the yen higher, it is more attuned to the benefits than to the drawbacks of a strong domestic currency. That means that if the leading opposition party wins the Aug. 30 general election, as is widely expected, it will likely stay the course on Japan's five-year-old policy of refraining from intervention in the currency market except in extreme circumstances. While a strong yen would hurt hard-hit exporters, holding the currency down would risk keeping Japan reliant on overseas customers, impeding the party's efforts to build an economy that is led by domestic demand. A strengthening of the currency could benefit Japan's resource-poor economy by making foreign goods and raw materials cheaper as the yen's purchasing power increases, giving the consumer windfall savings and lowering costs for manufacturers. The U.S. dollar has tumbled more than 20% against the yen since June 2007 as the global financial crisis intensified, and while it isn't clear whether the yen will grind higher, a DPJ-led government likely wouldn't stand in the way if it did.

Debt Reduction Key To Japan Economy

Imposing the consumption tax hike is key to alleviating Japan’s massive debt crisis

International Business Times 10 “IMF calls on Japan to increase sales tax as first step to address huge public debt” (july 14, 2010) date accessed: july 15, 2010

<http://www.ibtimes.com/articles/35643/20100715/japan-imf-sales-tax-consumption-naoto-kan-public-debt-fiscal-policy-dpj-europe-debt-crisis-surplus-c.htm>

the [International Monetary Fund](http://www.ibtimes.com/topics/detail/561/international-monetary-fund/) ([IMF](http://www.ibtimes.com/topics/detail/264/imf/)) urged the [Japan](http://www.ibtimes.com/topics/detail/380/japan/)ese government on Wednesday to continue its policy of curtailing [Japan](http://www.ibtimes.com/topics/detail/380/japan/)'s ballooning debt by finally imposing the controversial consumption tax hike as it stressed that fiscal reforms policy should ideally commence next year with the sales levy setting its footprint on the economy in a gradual pace. The [IMF](http://www.ibtimes.com/topics/detail/264/imf/) also emphasised that such measures must be supported by deliberate efforts to reduce the structural primary deficit over the next decade as the institution reacted to Tokyo's apparent backpedalling on its fiscal reforms commitments in view of the electoral rout suffered last Sunday by Prime Minister Naoto Kan's party, the Democratic Party of Japan. Prevalent public sentiments published by local newspapers showed that most Japanese gravitate towards a debate on raising the sales tax to buttress the country's public coffers, possibly replenishing the national treasury in order to address a public debt that has reached a point twice the size of the economy.In its annual report and following careful consultations with Tokyo, the IMF said that the spillover effect of the European debt crisis further heightened the uncertainty and downside risks on Japan's economic outlook, consequently underscoring the attention begged for by the country's massive debt woes. The IMF said that dealing with Japan's public debt, which is one the world's most advanced economies, would constitute "a large and protracted adjustment that will be made more credible by an early increase in the consumption tax." It added that Tokyo would be served well once it gets around on effecting "a fiscal rule featuring a public debt cap and a primary surplus target," which should lead to a more solid credibility for its financial policy and secured fiscal advancements.

Japan’s debt situation will proliferate into economic collapse- Greece empirically proves

IDSA 10 (Institute for Defense Studies and Analysis july 16, 2010. By: Rajaram Panda. Ph.D. (1981) in Japanese Studies from the School of International Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi. Expertise in Japan’s Foreign and Economic Policy, Security and Strategic Perspectives, Resource Diplomacy, India-Japan Relations, Emerging Power Equilibrium in the Asia-Pacific Region, Prospects of Security Architecture in the Asia-Pacific Region, Diaspora and migration remittance issues.) Date Accessed: july 17, 2010. <http://www.idsa.in/idsacomments/TumultuousPhaseaheadinJapanesePoliticsasDPJlosesPollsinUpperHouse_rpanda_160710>

Kan warned the people that what happened to Greece could happen to Japan as well if the debt situation was not checked in time. For, Japan has “the highest proportion of outstanding debt in relation to GDP among major economies.” According to the Ministry of Finance, Japan’s gross national debt in 2010 was 181 per cent of GDP. Kan is aware that Japan needs to issue 44.3 trillion yen worth of new government bonds to pay for the 92.3 trillion yen budget of 2010. Tax revenue for the year is expected to fetch the exchequer only 37.4 trillion yen. “Servicing the national debt now uses 22.4 per cent of that budget, well in excess of spending on public works, education, science and defence spending combined.” The Kan government faces the real predicament of avoiding a Greece-like financial meltdown. Even if it were to go ahead with raising the consumption tax from the current 5 to 10 per cent, it would be inadequate to repair the country’s finances.5

Debt Reduction Key To Japan Economy

Increasing Japan’s tax revenue is key to keeping the world’s largest public debt in check

Bloomberg 07 “Tanigaki Says Japan May Need to Increase Tax to Balance Books” (by: Sachiko Sakamaki and Takashi Hirokawa - October 17, 2007) date accessed: 7-15-10. <http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=newsarchive&sid=a0Wk3z.JB0qY&refer=japan>

Japan needs to consider increasing tax revenue to cope with rising social security costs and balance the budget by 2011, the ruling Liberal Democratic Party's policy chief said. Balancing the budget through spending cuts alone has ``become quite tight,'' [Sadakazu Tanigaki](http://search.bloomberg.com/search?q=Sadakazu+Tanigaki&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), 62, said today at a press conference in Tokyo. ``We should use both tax revenue and expenditure cuts.'' Prime Minister [Yasuo Fukuda](http://search.bloomberg.com/search?q=Yasuo+Fukuda&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), who replaced Shinzo Abe last month, wants to eliminate the budget deficit by 2011 to reduce the world's largest public debt. Tanigaki's comments represent a shift from Abe's emphasis on cutting spending and spurring [economic growth](http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/quote?ticker=JGDPAGDP:IND) for extra tax revenue. Tanigaki, a former finance minister, said the government plans to increase the portion of pensions funded by taxes to half from 2009. Currently a third of the government's pension bill is paid for by taxes and the remaining two thirds from pensioners' premiums. ``It's not set in stone that we should do it by raising the sales tax, but the debate will eventually focus on the sales tax,'' he said. ``We need to discuss how to secure the path for a safe pension system.'' The government is discussing whether Japan's consumption tax needs to be raised from 5 percent. [Kaoru Yosano](http://search.bloomberg.com/search?q=Kaoru+Yosano&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), the LDP's tax policy chief, says it should be increased to at least 7 percent, the Mainichi newspaper reported today.

A2: DPJ Bad—Turn Shield

No turns-even if realignment is good in the long-term, failure to get coalition partners results in chaos and ineffective government-it tanks reform

Tobian Harris 7-17-2010, “Japan’s Momentous Election” ; Ph.D in Political Science and International Relations, University of Cambridge. Also worked as Private Secretary to the former Senior official of the DPJ; d/a 7-14-2010, http://asiasecurity.macfound.org/blog/entry/111japans\_momentous\_election/

On Sunday, the Japanese people go to the polls to vote for members of Japan’s House of Councillors. It is no exaggeration to say that the fate of the Democratic Party of Japan-led government, now headed by Prime Minister Kan Naoto, rests on the results of this election. The House of Councillors, the “upper house” of Japan’s Diet, is a powerful actor in the policymaking process. While the “lower” House of Representatives has precedence in budgeting and the election of prime ministers, the upper house is effectively able to veto legislation passed by the lower house. Article 59 of the Japanese constitution stipulates that in the event that the upper house rejects a bill (or fails to act on a bill within sixty days), the lower house can only overrule the upper chamber with a two-thirds majority. As the LDP was reminded in 2007 when it lost control of the upper house for the second time in its history, failing to wield a majority in the upper house can trip up a government, even a government that, like LDP governments 2007-2009, wielded a two-thirds majority in the lower house. The stakes, then, are clear. Going into the election, the DPJ, together with two small parties it caucuses with, has 122 seats, one seat more than an absolute majority in the 242-seat chamber. If the DPJ and its partners can hon on to or build upon the slim majority, the Kan government will have at most three years (the deadline for another lower house election as well as the year for the next upper house election) to implement the DPJ’s legislative agenda with few obstacles in its path. To the extent that the campaign has had a policy theme, it has been Kan’s intention to raise Japan’s consumption tax from 5% to 10%, viewed by Japan’s finance ministry and international economic organizations as a critical first step towards fixing the government’s finances. But the consumption tax is but one example of what a DPJ-led government in control of both houses would be able to do. The next three years could be critical for Japan’s future as its government tries to fix Japan’s mounting debt problem (Kan himself alluded to the specter of Greece when stressing the importance of deficit reduction in his first speech as prime minister), shore up the strained social security system, and rejuvenate an economy that is still dogged by deflation, to say nothing of the tricky task of balancing Japan’s indispensable security relationship with the United States and its need for a constructive relationship with China. Without effective governance — for which control of both houses is essential — it seems unlikely that the Japanese government will be able to make progress on all of these issues. So the choice facing the Japanese people is simple: effective government or handicapped government. The LDP is still disorganized, as is its one-time coalition partner Komeitō. The rising neo-liberal Your Party has a distinct message, but is still a bit player in the political system. The rabble of conservative parties that have split off from the LDP over the past year effectively stand for little but denying the DPJ control of the upper house. If these parties succeed in denying the DPJ a majority, the Kan government will be hamstrung, forced to bring on board new coalition partners — although going into the election it is not clear which opposition party is open to a coalition with the DPJ. With new coalition partners, the government will still be hampered, as the DPJ has learned over the past year with the People’s New Party and its now former coalition partner the Social Democratic Party. Without new coalition partners, there is the danger that the party system will fracture, producing the realignment that many in Japanese politics have long awaited. Whatever the long-term benefits of a realignment, in the near term it would surely result in chaos and ineffective government.

Japan Economy Impact—Laundry List

Japanese economic collapse causes global economic decline, protectionism, collapse of democracy and Asian conflict.

Michael Auslin, resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, February 17, 2009, Wall Street Journal, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB123483257056995903.html

Recently, many economists and scholars in the U.S. have been looking backward to Japan's banking disaster of the 1990s, hoping to learn lessons for America's current crisis. Instead, they should be looking ahead to what might occur if Japan goes into a full-fledged depression. If Japan's economy collapses, supply chains across the globe will be affected and numerous economies will face severe disruptions, most notably China's. China is currently Japan's largest import provider, and the Japanese slowdown is creating tremendous pressure on Chinese factories. Just last week, the Chinese government announced that 20 million rural migrants had lost their jobs. Closer to home, Japan may also start running out of surplus cash, which it has used to purchase U.S. securities for years. For the first time in a generation, Tokyo is running trade deficits -- five months in a row so far. The political and social fallout from a Japanese depression also would be devastating. In the face of economic instability, other Asian nations may feel forced to turn to more centralized -- even authoritarian -- control to try to limit the damage. Free-trade agreements may be rolled back and political freedom curtailed. Social stability in emerging, middle-class societies will be severely tested, and newly democratized states may find it impossible to maintain power. Progress toward a more open, integrated Asia is at risk, with the potential for increased political tension in the world's most heavily armed region.

\*\* Note: this card is in the 1AC Economy Scenario of the DPJ Advantage

Japan Economy Impact—Key To Global Economy

Japanese economy key to the US and global economies.

Senior Treasury Department Official (Unidentified), November 10, 2009, FD (Fair Disclosure) Wire, “Senior Treasury Department Official Holds a News Briefing Via Teleconference on Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner's Upcoming Trip to Asia – Final,” Lexis Academic

This is clearly part of the determination by the administration, by the secretary to re-emphasize the importance of Asia to the United States. The United States is an Asia-Pacific nation. Asia is the most dynamic region of the globe. It already takes about a quarter of U.S. exports, accounting for about 1.6 million U.S. jobs. And we expect both of those figures to continue to grow in the future. APEC members of the Asia-Pacific economy ought to be critical to the efforts to rebalance global growth and bring about the G-20 goal of sustained balance to global growth. The APEC members account for roughly half of global GDP, roughly half of global trade. It's a rapidly growing region. And APEC also has many of the major surplus -- current account surplus and current account deficit countries. So, the actions by APEC members will largely determine the success of achieving the G-20's goal of more balanced and sustainable global growth. Within the Asia-Pacific region, Japan plays a particularly important role. The United States and Japan are the two largest economies in the world. We have deep, extensive and largely unheralded operation with Japan across the full range of economic and financial issues, from the response to the crisis, strengthening financial sector supervision and regulation, bringing about balanced and sustainable global growth, reform of the international financial institutions and measures that address climate change. The election of DPJ government in Japan was a major event. And we are and will continue to work closely with them. Secretary Geithner just concluded a dinner with Japanese Finance Minister Fujii. In that dinner, he welcomed the determination of the Hatoyama administration, the commitment of the administration, to emphasize domestic demand growth in Japan, and shift the orientation of the Japanese economy away from exports and towards domestic demand. This is important for ensuring sustained growth in Japan, and important for assuring sustained growth in the global economy.

Japan is key to the global economy.

Jennifer Amyx, joined the Penn faculty in 2002 after teaching and carrying out research previously as a Post-Doctoral Fellow (1998-99) and Research Fellow (2000-2001) at the Australian National University (Canberra), Japan's Financial Crisis: Institutional Rigidity and Reluctant Change, 2004

Japan's financial crisis has also had important international and regional spillover effects. Depressed economic output, weak consumer demand, and slowed credit flows from Japan--all by-products of the unresolved banking problems--have profoundly affected other economies. The negative impact was felt in particular by Japan's regional neighbors in the wake of the 1997-98 Asian financial crisis. Japan accounts for approximately 60 percent of the goods and services produced in Asia, and is an important export market for its regional neighbors. The country's protracted downturn has left it unable to absorb exports as in the past. The inability to fix the banks--a prerequisite to reviving both domestic demand and sustained growth--has also led the government to support an export-oriented recovery and weak yen, policy choices that tend to generate trade conflict and foster resentment of Japan within East Asia. As the second largest economy in the world, producing one-eighth of global GDP, Japan's financial woes and protracted malaise also affect the operation of global capital markets, trade flows, and exchange rates. In 1998, in particular, the conjunction of acute domestic financial crisis with crises elsewhere in global markets generated widespread fear that Japan might collapse and take the rest of the world with it. The large-scale withdrawal of most Japanese banks from overseas business since 1998 alleviates some of this concern. Nonetheless, stagnation in Japan is clearly a negative for the global economy--particularly when its problems coincide with economic malaise in the United States.

Japan Economy Impact—Key To Mid-East Oil

Strong Japanese Economy key to Middle Eastern oil production

BBC 12/7/09 “Japan raises stakes in development of Arab economies” BBC Worldwide Monitoring Lexis accessed 7/16/10

Tokyo, Dec. 7 Kyodo: Japan's government and leading firms took a further step Monday to deepen their involvement in the economic development of oil-rich, investment-thirsty Arab nations as the two sides held their first full-scale economic forum in Tokyo. Japan, widely seen as competitive in developing environmentally friendly technologies but left behind by nations such as China and European countries in tapping into fast-growing Arab states, aims to encourage connections between key private-sector players by removing obstacles due to differences in business practices. The two-day Japan-Arab Economic Forum started with a ministerial meeting involving economy ministers and government officials from the League of Arab States. "We hope to contribute to a balanced economic growth in the Arab world by fully utilizing Japan's experiences at both public and private sectors, economic power and human resources," Japanese Foreign Minister Katsuya Okada, a host of the forum, said in his opening remarks. "Peace and stability in the Middle East are closely linked to the social and economic development in the region and, at the same time, to the peace and stability all over the world," said Okada, who added Japan is ready to continue to be involved in the peace process in the region, including maintaining its support to Palestinians. Amr Moussa, secretary general of the League of Arab States, stressed the importance of the Japan-Arab economic relationship, underlining that the trade volume between the two sides expanded to $184 billion in 2008 from $48 billion in 2003. "We are looking to develop this Japan-Arab economic forum to include all aspects of international cooperation at a time when we are facing the new challenges imposed by globalization and the global financial crisis as well as climate change," Moussa told other participants. The 22-member Arab League involves Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates and Qatar - the three biggest crude oil exporters to Japan - as well as Jordan, Kuwait and Egypt. Japan is the third-biggest trading partner for the Arab nations after the European Union and the United States. Japanese investment into Arab states stood at about $3.1 billion in 2007, compared with some $1 billion in 2004.

\*\*\*Japanese Soft Power Arguments

ODA Key to Japanese Soft Power

ODA budget key to expanding Japanese soft power.

Hitoshi Tanaka, Senior Fellow at the Japan Center for International Exchange, visiting professor at the Graduate School of Public Policy, University of Tokyo, former Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan, Spring 2009, Global Asia (Vol 4 No 1), http://globalasia.org/pdf/issue9/Hitoshi\_Tanaka.pdf

Fourth, as part of its effort to consolidate a rule-based economic community in East Asia, Japan should significantly increase its overseas development assistance. By doing so, core issues such as income disparities and human resource shortages can be addressed more effectively. Throughout the post-war era, ODA has been one of Japan’s most important diplomatic tools. Unfortunately, despite the various pledges made in recent years to significantly expand Japan’s ODA program, the budget has shrunk by 40 percent over the past decade. If Japanese leaders are sincere in their desire to play a leadership role in the region, then Japan’s East Asia policy needs to place greater emphasis on expanding ODA and other soft-power resources.

ODA key to Japanese influence.

Hitoshi Tanaka, Senior Fellow at the Japan Center for International Exchange and former Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan, November 2007, Asia-Pacific Review, InformaWorld Online

Overseas Development Assistance is one of the most powerful diplomatic tools that Japan has to exercise and should be used to improve Japan's standing in East Asia. Unfortunately, far from increasing its efforts in pursuit of such goals, current policy seems to be running in the opposite direction. Despite Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi's pledge at the 2005 G8 Conference to increase Japanese ODA by $10 billion in the coming years and the government's commitment to meet the UN Millennium Development Goals of increasing overseas aid to a level representing 0.7 percent of GDP, Japan's ODA budget continues to shrink, having fallen by 40 percent over the past decade. Japan, the top ODA donor nation throughout most of the 1990s, was replaced by the United States in 2001 and has now fallen to position number three (after the United Kingdom). If these budget cuts continue, Japan will soon find itself out of the top five. Recent changes in the ODA budget can largely be attributed to the government's efforts to reduce expenditures in the face of massive public debt, on the surface an entirely reasonable policy. On the other hand, however, Japanese politicians simultaneously campaign for Japan to adopt a more assertive role in global affairs. Recent ODA budget cuts run contrary to such rhetoric. If Japan wants to be thought of as a true leader in East Asia, then it needs to start acting like one. Doing so will require a greater emphasis on developing its soft power resources. ODA policy is an important place to start.

Japan’s value oriented foreign policy and ODA are key to soft power

Sohn 10 – Professor of International Studies at Yonsei University (Yuhl, July 3, “Japan's New Regionalism: China Shock, Values, and the East Asian Community.” Asian Survey, 50, 497-519, Proquest)

Tokyo went further. What is called “value-oriented diplomacy” was added as a new pillar of foreign policy. Japan will be acting in partnership with nations that share its values (universal values) in an effort to jointly create a society that can realize those values. Along with the EAC came the “Arc of Freedom and Prosperity” strategy that supports budding democracies lining the outer limits of the Eurasian Continent from Northern Europe to Northeast Asia. The strategy stresses that Japan works to facilitate the attainment of universal values by cooperating in the areas of trade and investment, as well as ODA to provide basic human needs and enable democracy to take root.69 Abe Shinzo, who succeeded Koizumi as prime minister, was no less insistent on a foreign policy that includes universal values. Abe articulated a vision of increased cooperation among the four great Asian-Pacific democracies, Australia, Japan, India, and the U.S., in Asia: a democratic alliance. In short, universal values had become the primary source of soft power in Japan’s foreign policy.70

ODA Key to Japanese Soft Power

Japanese aid, particularly ODA, is a crucial instrument for regional soft power

Dennis D. Trinidad 2007 (“JAPAN’S ODA AT THE CROSSROADS: DISBURSEMENT PATTERNS OF JAPAN’S DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE TO SOUTHEAST ASIA” ASIAN PERSPECTIVE, Vol. 31, No. 2, 2007, pp. 95-125< http://www.asianperspective.org/articles/v31n2-e.pdf>)

The analysis of aid focuses on either donor or recipient. In donor-oriented analysis, aid is viewed as an instrument of foreign policy that helps serve the interests of donors. Recipientcentered analysis belongs to the area of comparative politics, and here aid is considered an instrument of domestic policy. The donor-oriented study of aid is close to classical realism, which assumes that a state’s behavior in international politics is driven by national interest. In the realist’s view, power is the ultimate goal and aid practice is one of the many facets of soft power. One scholar gave a counterintuitive view of aid where aid practice is seen as a moral obligation of donors.13 White argued that the political aspect of aid lies in the donor’s motive.14 One way of understanding a donor’s motivation is by analyzing the geographical distribution of aid. A study of motivations of four donor countries—the United States, Japan, France, and Sweden—in Africa from 1981 to 1989 confirmed the early findings on donor motivations: that humanitarian need, strategic importance, economic potential, cultural similarity, ideological stance, and regional affinity were used as criteria for aid allocation. 15 Thus, a typical pattern of aid distribution is based on the donor’s close geographical, historical, cultural, political, and economic affinities with recipients.16 Likewise, historical events such as the end of the cold war were found to have dramatic impact on the behavior of donors.17 In the same way, national interests also shape Japan’s aid behavior in Southeast Asia. In one study, aid allocation was affected by Japan’s responsiveness to the United States due to “asymmetry of interdependence.”18 The end of the cold war and the 1991 Persian Gulf War led to the reassessment of Japan’s regional and global roles. Some of the more proactive rather than passive roles19 identified include: acting as the Asia-Pacific region’s main capital supplier, source of technology and intermediate goods, and absorber of East Asia’s exports;20 activism in multilateral diplomacy;21 and more recently, *a more prominent role in addressing human security-related issues and problems.* Since the postwar period and until settling into its two-track arrangement, Japan’s aid allocation went through discernable shifts, some simple and others more complex. Highlighted by these transformations, ODA has become the most accepted instrument of Japanese diplomacy.

Japan Soft Power Impact—Laundry List

Japanese soft power key to fighting terrorism, improving UN PKOs, and reduce Poverty and wars in Africa

Okada, 2005 (Katsuya, “Toward Realization of Enlightened National Interest—Living Harmoniously with Asia and the World”, <http://www.dpj.or.jp/vision/vision-e/summary.html>)

In this highly globalized world, it would be in Japan's enlightened national interest to achieve peace and prosperity in the international communityas a whole. Millions of people are still suffering from poverty and war in Africa and other areas of the world, and we want to feel pride as Japanese in living together with the people of the world, by preserving and enhancing human securityand the like. The new government ofJapan will upgrade its official development assistance(ODA),both qualitatively and quantitatively, to facilitate sustainable development of developing countries and, at the same time, to obtain an effective tool of foreign policy. It will thoroughly review the current ODA process and eliminate inefficiency and unfairness. The new government of Japan will actively extend contributions to U.N. peace-building activities, particularly in Asia. It will review and revise the current five principles of PKO participation in alignment with the international standard. It intends to mobilize not only the Self-Defense Forces but also the civilian police force for the sake of international cooperation.It will promote the conclusion of new arms reduction and arms control treaties as well as the expansion of the number of signatories to existing treatiesincluding the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) in order to prevent proliferation ofweapons of mass destruction (WMD). The Japanese government will prevent the occurrence of failed statesby means of ODA and human resource provisions and eliminate breeding grounds for terrorism. Japan should become a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council and tackle the issue of enhancement of global governance through the United Nations as well as reform of international organizations. Enhancing Soft Power and the Infrastructure of Foreign Policy To carry out the above new foreign and security policy, Japan will need power, leadership, and a foreign policy infrastructure. The new Japan under the new leadership will have a larger say in the international community through its foreign policy based on its soft power such as its economic affluence, distinct culture, high technology, and safe society. As the first priority, the new government of Japan will mobilize an all Japan effort, encompassing both governmental and nongovernmental resources, to consolidate a foreign policy infrastructure. It will immediately strengthen the office of the Prime Minister, reform the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and upgrade intelligence capabilities. The government will create the permanent post of a special adviser on foreign and security policy reporting directly to the Prime Minister as well as greatly strengthening the capability of the Security Council. These two entities will engage in the drafting of the national strategy and other important policy legislation, while the Ministry of Foreign Affairs will be essentially an executive organ of foreign policy. The new governmentwill also simultaneously tackle the task of integrating and strengthening of the intelligence institutions.

\*\*\*Afghanistan Arguments

Japan Key To Afghanistan Stability

Japan will send aid to Afghanistan—solves stability and peace

Bloomberg 9 (Sachiko Sakamaki and Takashi Hirokawa, 9 November 2009, Japan to Give $5 Billion in Afghan Aid Over 5 Years (Update1), http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=newsarchive&sid=a7iWqnoBHnlI, accessed 19 July 2010)

Japan said it will spend as much as $5 billion over the next five years to help the reconstruction of war-torn Afghanistan. Japan “has been studying ways to assist the region as contributing to peace and stability in the international community meets our national interest,” Chief Cabinet Secretary Hirofumi Hirano said in announcing the package. The first 80 billion yen ($889 million) dispersal will be made “for urgent needs,” according to a statement. The aid includes vocational training for former Taliban fighters, salaries for police officers and agricultural experts to restore farmland. The funds will be distributed through the Japan International Cooperation Agency. JICA head Sadako Ogata said in an interview last week that “there are significant expectations for Japan’s civilian power” in rebuilding Afghanistan. The assistance bolsters Japan’s role in the region after pledging $1 billion in aid over two years to Pakistan in April. The announcement comes ahead of President Barack Obama’s visit this week and may soothe any U.S. resentment over Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama’s decision to end a naval refueling mission in support of the war in Afghanistan. Japan’s navy has been refueling warships in the Indian Ocean to support U.S.-led military operations in Afghanistan since 2001. Hatoyama has said he won’t re-authorize the mission when it expires in January. Defense Minister Toshimi Kitazawa said today the international community will understand the decision to boost civilian support for Afghanistan instead. “The amount is fairly big and the content of support is substantial,” Kitazawa told reporters.

Kan/DPJ Key To Afghanistan Stability

Karzai is meeting with Kan—if it goes well, it solves security and insurgency

AP 10 (Mary Yamaguchi, 16 June 2010, Afghan president in Japan to seek Tokyo’s support for funds, aid projects, http://blog.taragana.com/politics/2010/06/16/afghan-president-in-japan-to-seek-tokyos-support-for-funds-aid-projects-43596/, accessed 19 July 2010)

Afghan President Hamid Karzai is seeking financial and political support from Japan, already one of his country’s biggest donors, during a visit that began Wednesday. Karzai will be the first foreign leader to meet with Japanese Prime Minister Naoto Kan since he took office earlier this month. The Afghan leader will be discussing his government’s efforts to strengthen governance and improve security, according to Japanese Foreign Ministry spokesman Kazuo Kodama. The two leaders are also expected to tackle Thursday the implementation of aid measures that Tokyo announced last year, including a five-year pledge of $5 billion in fresh aid in November to help the war-torn nation strengthen its police force as well as support agriculture and infrastructure projects. Under former Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama, Japan ended a naval refueling mission in the Indian Ocean in support of the U.S.-led war in Afghanistan, saying it should focus on humanitarian rather than military support. Karzai, taking along his foreign and economics ministers, is hoping for Japanese funding to help support a plan to lure insurgents from the battlefield with jobs and economic opportunities.

Negotiations Are Key To Afghanistan Stability

Instability is increasing now – negotiations are key

US Peace Institute 9 (no date given but latest cited is 10 July 2009, Negotiating with the Taliban: Reconciliation in Afghanistan and Pakistan?, http://www.usip.org/events/negotiating-the-taliban-reconciliation-in-afghanistan-and-pakistan, accessed 20 July 2010, RBatra)

June 2009 was the most violent month in Afghanistan since 2001, and in July coalition forces launched a large-scale counter-insurgency campaign in the volatile Helmand Province. While kinetic operations continue to expand, U.S. and coalition commanders have repeatedly made clear that military means alone will not create the conditions for long-term peace and stability. Economic development and political reconciliation with disenfranchised actors must take place. Thus, it is increasingly necessary to explore the potential for negotiations to resolve the on-going armed conflict on both sides of the Durand Line—the 1,610 mile border between Pakistan and Afghanistan.

Military force alone is insufficient—aid programs are key to defeat insurgency

Afghanistan Peace Roundtable 9 (RECOMMENDATION FROM THE ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION ON RECONCILIATION AND PEACE PROSPECTS FOR SHARED SECURITY IN AFGHANISTAN, 23-25 November 2009, Tokyo, http://kyoichisugino.blogspot.com/2009/12/blog-post.html, accessed 20 July 2010)

Reconstruction Efforts: Military force alone will not defeat the insurgency. The Afghan Government, drawing on best practices, needs to carry out the long term development program necessary to make reintegration and reconciliation lasting and sustainable. However, distinguishing between the reconcilable and irreconcilable elements of the insurgency will allow us to devise a strategy that will bring greater synergy between military and civilian force to stabilize Afghanistan. Success of reconstruction efforts such as poverty reduction, socio-economic development, anti-narcotics, anti-corruption, and aid efficiency will contribute to the stabilisation of Afghanistan.

Military solutions for Afghanistan fail. Reconciliation is key, especially with countries other than the US

Partlow 10 (Joshua, 4 February 2010, Karzai's Taliban reconciliation strategy raises ethnic, rights concerns at home, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/02/03/AR2010020303737.html, accessed 20 July 2010)

Decades of war have shaped a broad consensus that fighting cannot end the conflict in Afghanistan, but such early opposition to reconciliation with insurgents points to the difficult road ahead for a process Karzai has deemed a top priority in his second term. Some worry that funneling millions of dollars into Taliban-held villages in the south could unfairly benefit ethnic Pashtuns and reward those who have fought the government. Others fear that accommodating the Taliban leadership could bring a retreat from women's rights. Former Taliban officials, meanwhile, say that without a shift in American policy, their commanders are unlikely to negotiate with the U.S.-backed government. "There is no clear strategy for negotiations," said Abdul Salam Zaeef, who served as ambassador to Pakistan under the Taliban government. "The Taliban were deceived so many times. They will not be deceived again and again. They need concrete guarantees." Although U.S. officials have expressed general support for Karzai's initiative, the two governments disagree on the way forward. U.S. officials prefer to focus on low-level fighters while hoping that an additional 30,000 troops can pummel the Taliban into a weaker negotiating position. Karzai's government, on the other hand, has stressed the need to reach out to the Islamist movement's leadership. Karzai spent Wednesday in Saudi Arabia seeking the kingdom's help in encouraging Taliban representatives to attend an upcoming conference in Kabul, according to a senior Afghan official.

The Taliban will negotiate—just not with the US

Partlow 10 (Joshua, 4 February 2010, Karzai's Taliban reconciliation strategy raises ethnic, rights concerns at home, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/02/03/AR2010020303737.html, accessed 20 July 2010)

"They want to negotiate," said Arsallah Rahmani, a former Taliban minister. "The problem is the Taliban doesn't trust the Americans."

\*\*\*Global Warming Arguments

Strong DPJ Key To Climate Bill

Now is key—the DPJ’s economic reforms are critical to the effectiveness of Japan’s climate policy.

Llewelyn Hughes, December 2009, “Climate Change and Japan’s Post Copenhagen Challenge”; Assistant Professor of Political Science and International Relations, George Washington University, Brookings Institution Contributor; d/a 7-15-2010

The problem for this picture is that the DPJ’s GHG emissions target goes far beyond that of the former governing LDP, which committed Japan to reducing emissions by 8 percent from 1990 levels by 2020. (It should also be noted that Japan was failing to meet its commitments under the Kyoto Protocol through the existing policy regime.) This step undoubtedly represents a much stronger commitment to climate change and environmental politics within the DPJ; current Minister for Foreign Affairs and senior DPJ MP Katsuya Okada, for example, was a scathing critic of the LDP’s target when it was announced, and he is committed to dealing with climate change. Yet despite the momentum generated by the its electoral victory, and the international focus on the COP15 conference, the DPJ faces two big questions in the post-Copenhagen environment. First, in the short-term it is not clear how quickly it can remove regulatory uncertainty in the energy and environmental sectors while also meeting its public commitment to fundamentally reform Japan’s decision-making institutions. Failing to effectively coordinate its twin goals of leading in climate change and reforming governance could delay the implementation and effectiveness of some policies—particularly those designed to stimulate climate-friendly investment. Second, in the longer-term, it remains to be seen how the DPJ will go about reaching its ambitious target if the consensus between government and industry on the means for achieving GHG emissions reductions is undermined. The DPJ has been admirably clear about its intentions, at least. In 2008 the party tabled a climate change bill while still in opposition, and the environment was an important component of its 2009 electoral manifesto. Its agenda includes putting a cap-and-trade system in place, introducing a carbon tax as one component of a broad reorganization of energy-related taxes, expanding the use of feed-in-tariffs for renewable energies, and increasing ER3D subsidies. Nevertheless, the DPJ will need to dispel regulatory uncertainty as it pursues its climate change policy, while also seeking to fundamentally change the way decisions are reached in Japan. In fact, the defining characteristic of the new government—more than any new approach to climate change or foreign policy—lies in its commitment to transform the institutions of decision-making to increase transparency and reduce the role of Japan’s ministries and agencies. The potential for uncertainty as the DPJ sets about pursuing these twin goals is already evident. In late November, project teams rewriting the 2010 budget voted to cut subsidies for promoting the uptake of solar by households, although the decision is yet to be ratified at the ministerial level. They also voted to significantly reduce other programs funding the deployment of renewable energies. This does not mean that the party is divided on the merits of market intervention: each project team noted that the existing set of subsidies should be recalibrated, rather than abolished, in order to better meet the DPJ’s long-term target and to reduce waste. But if the new government plays a stronger role in policymaking but does not move quickly to establish a new regulatory framework, then uncertainty is bound to slow investment. The possibility of uncertainty extends to how the DPJ plans to reorganize taxes which provide a significant share of the revenues used for public investment in energy research, development, demonstration and deployment (ER3D). Japan has a number of special taxes earmarked for use in promoting fuel diversification and demand management. In its electoral manifesto the DPJ committed to review these in line with its commitment to increase transparency, and it has further promised to reorganize energy-related taxes in order to better utilize them to meet climate change goals. But the details of how the taxation system will be restructured and what projects they will be used to fund remain a subject for future debate. In the longer-term there is a more significant obstacle to be overcome. The previous government’s approach to setting climate change policy was largely consensus-based. But given the inevitably serious distributional effects associated with the DPJ’s new GHG emissions target a consensus on policy can no longer be assumed. There are already clear signals from industry, for example, it intends oppose legislation that harms competitiveness—including the introduction of the proposed carbon tax if it adds to the overall tax burden. It is not clear what the DPJ’s strategy is for dealing with such resistance. Ultimately, the DPJ’s willingness to tear up the rulebook on how decisions are made in Japan’s political economy holds great promise for reducing waste and focusing spending on legitimate public policy goals in general. It could also enable the government pursue its climate target more effectively, thereby helping to maintain Japanese leadership in climate change and energy issues in the post-Copenhagen environment. But the uncertainty introduced as the DPJ goes about doing this, as well as inevitable opposition to climate policies with serious distributional effects, means the new emissions target is not the only ambitious challenge Mr. Hatoyama has set himself.

Strong DPJ Key To Climate Bill

DPJ is leader in climate policy- Weak DPJ means weak bill

Reuters 7/12/2010 Japan ETS plan hits electoral snag. Republished on 7/13/2010 on Carbon Positive. <http://www.carbonpositive.net/viewarticle.aspx?articleID=2049> 7/19/2010

An upper-house election in Japan on the weekend has cast doubt on the government’s plans to develop an emissions trading scheme to meet an ambitious carbon reduction target. The government of the ruling Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ), under the recently appointed prime minister, Naoto Kan, lost its majority in the upper house and must now negotiate with other parties to secure passage of legislation. This includes a contentious climate bill. Japan has been looked upon as a climate change leader among rich nations since the DPJ government came to power promising the most stringent emissions reduction target of any industrialised economy – 25 per cent below 1990 levels by 2020. A wide ranging climate bill could not be passed before the upper house election that would enshrine the target in law. It would also commit the government to producing an emission trading scheme legislative blueprint within a year. Climate policy analysts are concerned that the government might now move to water down the climate bill to win its passage through parliament, including dropping plans for an economy-wide cap and trade scheme.

Japan Climate Bill Key to International Leadership

Strong emissions cuts by the DPJ are key to environmental leadership

Celine Pajon, May 2010, “Japan’s Ambivalent Diplomacy on Climate Change”, Health and Environmental Reports Program at the IFRI; Expert on Global Climate Change Politics, d/a 7-18, via Informaworld

Japan was able to make a highly visible international contribution to the discourse on climate change prevention by hosting COP 3 in Kyoto. The problems at hand resonated quite effectively with several key domestic concerns such as national and energy security, economic growth, the national struggles against industrial pollution, and cultural values, so that the problem of climate change could become an ―appropriate‖ objective of national interest. 174 However, the fact that symbolic commitments are made at the international level does not necessarily mean that all the players on the domestic level share a single approach to the issue of climate change prevention. While the public opinion consistently supports more stringent efforts, the arguments of actors in the industrial and energetic sectors, relayed by the industry, METI, and most of the LDP, remain prevalent. The influence of this unified camp have led to the soft, ―cheap‖ measures currently being taken to tackle climate change and achieve the Kyoto target. It is important to note, however, that Japanese action on the issue of climate change prevention has had a positive impact regionally in that it has moved the issue higher up on the agendas of neighboring states. Finally, Japanese diplomacy on climate change has become more and more proactive and innovative with time, even if sometimes it seems to challenge some of the core principles of the Kyoto Protocol. Because of these contrasting results, the Japanese policy on climate change appears ambiguous and contradictory. The gap between its objectives and its actual position and influence within the climate change regime originates mainly in Japan‘s inability to frame a consistent policy on climate change. A report written by a research committee of the Japanese House of Councillors even acknowledges the lack of a strategic vision: *Japan should maintain an unwavering foothold based on such scientific rationales as the findings of the IPCC. It should correct its practices of adopting different stances according to its perceived distance from the other countries. 175* This attitude is typical of the diplomatic practice of ―middle-powers,‖ 176 who usually seek to play the role of mediator on the international stage, and attempt to exert their influence in diplomatic niches that fit their interests, skills, and power. 177 If Japan does not perfectly fit the ―middle-power‖ categorization, due to its economic might and its central role in the politics of the Asian region, one could argue that the practice of Japanese diplomacy resembles that of a middle-power because of the domestic political constraints to which it is subjected. Japan‘s constrained diplomacy is a characteristic that can help explain the lack of consistency of Japan‘s climate change policy. While Japan has difficulties playing a strong and visible leadership role in international climate change negotiations, 178 it is nevertheless very active in promoting and diffusing the norm of climate change prevention in its region. This is also a characteristic of middle-powers diplomacy: *The middle-power[’s] role is to affirm the principle of adherence to acceptable rules of conduct by all powers, great and small. 179* Despite its reluctance to accept some of the core principles of the international regime related to the prevention of climate change, I argue that Japan has attempted to act as a ―directional leader,‖ making an important contribution to the advancement of the climate change prevention agenda domestically, regionally, and to a lesser extent, internationally. Gupta and Grubb propose a typology of actor leadership in multilateral negotiations. 180 Among the different types outlined, they single out three: (1) *structural leadership,* characterized by the use of ―carrots and sticks‖ as a way of constraining other actors to act in certain ways, (2) *instrumental leadership,* which involves ―crafting structures and apply[ing] diplomatic skill to create winning coalitions,‖ 181 and (3) *directional leadership,* which implies ―the development of perceptions and solutions [and] their dissemination internationally.‖ 182 Japan‘s ambition to lead by example on the climate change issue, and its willingness to disseminate its ―model,‖ is representative of this kind of leadership. A number of elements throw the success of Japan‘s attempt to act as a ―directional leader‖ into question. First, Japan is far from reaching its Kyoto emissions reduction targets. Second, Japan has been very reluctant to commit to a high reduction target, and has attempted to unravel some of the core principles of the climate change regime.
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Finally, Japan has resisted the introduction of cost-effective measures such as market instruments and taxes to curb its GHG emissions at the domestic level. That said, Japan has made an important contribution as a directional leader to the prevention of climate change, by putting forward alternative visions and solutions. Because some of these provisions have not been considered by NGOs and frontrunner countries as ―appropriate‖ ones for the development of a strong and ambitious climate change regime, Japan has not managed to emerge as a natural leader on this issue. However, the policies promoted by Japan have been acknowledged as useful tools by several international institutions. The OECD and the IEA, for example, issued a report on the sectoral approach as a tool to measure and promote the reduction of GHG emissions. 183 Japan‘s policies might also help to engage new players on the climate change issue by making alternative and flexible approaches available in the struggle against global warming. Even if Tokyo has not always acted in line with the core principles of the climate change regime enshrined in the UNFCCC, the broader concern for climate change prevention resonates deeply and is embedded in Japanese politics and society. 184 The Japanese commitment on climate change prevention has actually led to significant developments, including the increase in media coverage on issues of climate change, the growth of a dynamic epistemic community, and the proliferation of innovation strategies within the industrial sector. The objective of climate change prevention has become highly significant in Japan. This can partly account for the political breakthrough made by the Democratic Party of Japan last September as it committed itself, unlike the LDP, to an ambitious reduction target of -25% by 2020.

Japan Soft Power Key To Solve Warming

Japanese soft power key to global efforts against climate change – official aid programs key to global adoption of Japanese norms.

Yee-Kuang Heng, Lecturer in the School of International Relations, University of St Andrews, May 2010, International Relations of the Asia-Pacific, Volume 10, pp.288-90

Japan though appears to be thinking seriously about norm-alignment and value-promotion. The Council for the Promotion of Cultural Diplomacy reported in 2005 that harmony, compassion, and coexistence are core values that Japan could use to bridge diverse cultures (Kondo, 2008, p. 201). Its experience of atomic warfare and subsequent peace diplomacy are appealing traits. Tokyo also derives ‘soft’ power from its liberal democratic government, as a ‘civilian power’ (Inoguchi and Bacon, 2006) with a Pacifist Constitution. Besides attractive domestic values, the Asahi Shimbun (2007) and Nye (2007) propose that Japan can play a ‘leading role with “soft” power’ to tackle global problems such as poverty, aging, climate change, and ‘providing global public goods’ including stabilizing financial institutions. Tokyo should also provide the ‘catalyst for solving global health problems’ (Kondo, 2009), having put malaria on the G8 agenda. Showing how to resolve these global problems, Japanese diplomats argue, would provide a great source of ‘soft’ power (Monji, 2009). Some recent initiatives illustrate this rationale. The ‘Cool Earth Partnership’ helps African countries manage climate challenges, while reconstructing Afghanistan ‘symbolizes strength in “soft” power building’ (Noguchi, 2008). A January 2009 $17 billion aid package for Asian countries to avert protectionism reflects Japan’s support for global norms ‘that the flow of trade and investment not be prohibited’ (BBC News, 2009a). Another $100 billion loan to the IMF ‘demonstrated Japan’s leadership on a multilateral approach to global financial challenges’, declared IMF chief Dominique Strauss-Kahn, hoping Tokyo’s example attracts ‘other countries to follow suit’ (Bangkok Post, 2009). While Strauss-Kahn’s statement could be a rhetorical device to ensure continued Japanese support, primary sources such as the June 2009 annual report of the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry too recommend Japan redefine itself as the world’s troubleshooter on such global issues. Consistent with Nye’s argument that ‘soft’ power can attract others to cooperatively deal with trans-national challenges such as climate change, Japan is beginning to ‘position itself as a leader in the world’s urgent quest to live greener’ (Newcomb, 2008b), while China is lambasted for lax environmental regulations. Providing ‘environmental and sustainability education might be a global “soft power” niche for Japanese universities to fill’ (Hesse, 2009). The Kyoto Protocol, ‘green’ technologies such as Prius hybrid cars, and recycling initiatives help make Japan attractive to others learning about environmentally sustainable development. These also demonstrate a long-standing Japanese ideal: the notion of mottainai (waste not). Launching the first ever satellite to monitor greenhouse emissions, the Japanese Space Agency will ‘contribute to the international effort toward prevention of (global) warming’ (BBC News, 2009b). This demonstrates Japan’s alignment with global environmental norms, and Nye’s (1990, p. 154) observation that ‘a country that stands astride popular channels of communication has more opportunities to get its messages across and to affect the preferences of others’. 3.4 Economic resources Although economic initiatives occupied an ambiguous position in Nye’s ‘soft’ power pantheon, Beijing and Tokyo appear less ambivalent at first glance. Using commercial diplomacy and overseas development aid (ODA) from Latin America to Africa, China has signed numerous agreements to boost its image as a constructive actor, especially in nations possessing strategic resources (Kurlantzick, 2007, p. 48). Its economic growth serves as a veritable ‘promised land’ for impoverished neighbors (Kurlantzick, 2007, p. 56). Although Nye stressed political values, the Chinese discourse prefers the attractiveness of Chinese economic development (Cho and Jeong, 2008; Wang and Lu, 2008, p. 431). While most secondary Western literature equates Chinese commercial diplomacy with ‘soft’ power, Chinese sources are less clear-cut. Whereas Chinese officials clearly present its cultural activities as ‘soft’ power, it has yet to do the same with its commercial diplomacy. This suggests that Beijing might not quite view its commercial diplomacy as tantamount to its cultural ‘soft’ power activities. Furthermore, it seems difficult to maintain a strict theoretical distinction between attraction and inducement.
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China’s growth is undoubtedly attractive, but Beijing is also capitalizing on this underlying attraction by offering incentives to induce at the same time. For instance, doubts remain over whether Chinese ODA and trade agreements constitute attractive ‘soft’ power or merely another form of inducement. Since ODA is channeled to sympathetic rather than needy organizations, recipients realize that accepting aid means giving donor countries influence (Austin and Harris, 2001). Providing a quid pro quo rather than simply attraction per se, ODA can be a type of ‘carrot’ to ‘purchase’ power (Arase, 1995). Furthermore, Chinese economic tools seemingly emphasize ‘hard’ power needs (raw materials) over values. While China refrains from explicitly and officially promoting values through its commercial diplomacy, Japan sees its’ economic influence reflecting attractive values. Ostensibly concerned about China’s activities there, Tokyo, in May 2008, doubled its aid targets to Africa by 2012. Then-PM Aso called ODA a ‘respectable means to export Japanese culture and to disseminate Japanese values’ (cited in Beech, 2008). These include the Japanese work ethic of meeting deadlines and manufacturing excellence, as well as helping countries like Cambodia draft legal and civil codes (Aso, 2009a, b). Japan’s Meiji-era modernization and post-WW2 economic recovery, reaching Western living standards while retaining its cultural identity, served as a model of attraction for other Asian states like Singapore, the so-called flying geese model. How Japan modernized without losing its soul is something that many Japanese are keen to promote (Ogoura cited in Beech, 2008).

Global Clean Energy Good Impacts

Global demand for energy will continue to massively increase in the status quo—this will put clean energy alternatives beyond the reach of billions of people.

Mark Muro, Fellow and Policy Director of the Metropolitan Policy Program at the Brookings Institution, and Teryn Norris, Project Director of the Breakthrough Institute, 2009 (“To Make Clean Energy Cheaper, U.S. Needs Bold Research Push,” Yale Environment 360, May 1st, Available Online at http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2009/ 0430\_clean\_energy\_muro.aspx?p=1, Accessed 07-19-2010)

Such an ambitious plan is needed to meet the enormous challenges we face: Over the next four decades, global energy demand is expected to triple. At the same time, global greenhouse gas emissions must fall rapidly, decreasing at least 50 to 85 percent by mid-century to avert disruptive climate change. Most of the growth in energy demand will occur in the developing world, as nations like China, India, and Brazil continue to lift their citizens out of poverty and build modern societies. Overall, that’s a very good thing: Increased access to energy brings electricity to pump and treat potable water, lights to read and study by, access to modern health care, relief from backbreaking physical labor, and much more. The problem, however, is that fossil fuels remain cheap and abundant. That means that in the absence of similarly affordable and large-scale clean energy sources, the nations of the developing world will turn to coal and other fossil fuels to power their development, just as we in the United States have done. And that would virtually assure massive climatic destabilization, regardless of what occurs in the developed nations of the world. Hence the dominant climate policy agenda of our time: Captivated by market logic and sophisticated regulatory schemes, mainstream climate policy advocates have focused above all on utilizing market-based mechanisms and price signals — such as carbon taxes and cap-and-trade plans — to make dirty energy more expensive. According to this approach, the resulting price signals would spur private-sector investment and innovation in clean energy alternatives and secure the energy technology transformation we need. But there is one complication: Policymakers and the public alike are reluctant to increase the price of energy significantly through higher prices on carbon emissions. At a time of deep economic recession, public tolerance for higher energy prices wanes. In the developing world, the message is even clearer, summed up by one Chinese official, Lu Xuedu, of the Office of Global Environmental Affairs. “You cannot tell people who are struggling to earn enough to eat that they need to reduce their emissions,” declared Lu.

This condemns three million people to preventable deaths every year—lack of access to clean electricity kills almost as many people as AIDS.

Dr. Benjamin K. Sovacool, Research Fellow in the Energy Governance Program at the Centre on Asia and Globalization at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy at the National University of Singapore and Adjunct Assistant Professor at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University, and Christopher Cooper, Principal Partner for Oomph Consulting, LLC, and former Executive Director of the Network for New Energy Choices—a New York-based nonprofit interest group devoted to analyzing utility policy and making recommendations for increasing efficiency and expanding the use of renewable resources, 2008 (“Nuclear Nonsense: Why Nuclear Power is No Answer to Climate Change and the World's Post-Kyoto Energy Challenges,” William and Mary Environmental Law and Policy Review (33 Wm. & Mary Envtl. L. & Pol'y Rev. 1), Fall, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via Lexis-Nexis Academic)

First, denying electricity and the services it can provide to those in need promotes discrimination in the vein of what Reverend Benjamin Chavis, Jr., called "environmental racism." n85 The United Nations reports that at least one billion people-roughly one-sixth the global population-have little to no access to electricity. n86 Without electricity, millions of women and children are typically forced to spend significant amounts of time searching for firewood, and then combusting wood and charcoal [\*16] indoors to heat their homes or prepare meals. n87 The health consequences alone of this combustion are monumental. Scientists estimate that indoor air pollution kills 2.8 million people every year—almost equal with the number dying annually from HIV/AIDS. n88 Close to one million of these deaths—910,000—occur in children under the age of five that must suffer their final months of life dealing with debilitating respiratory infections, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, and lung cancer. n89

Global Clean Energy Good Impacts

Another half-million people die each year because of pollution caused by fossil fuel emissions—this is a devastating, systemic impact.

Dr. Gideon Polya, Reader in Biochemistry at La Trobe University (Australia), scientist, lecturer, and writer who has authored over 130 works during his four-decade career, 2008 (“Pollutants from coal-based electricity generation kill 170,000 people annually,” Green Blog, June 14th, Available Online at http://www.green-blog.org/2008/06/14/pollutants-from-coal-based-electricity-generation-kill-170000-people-annually/, Accessed 07-19-2010)

Greenhouse gas pollution – mostly due to carbon dioxide (CO2) from fossil fuel burning – is driving global warming and attendant species extinctions, droughts, sea level rise, decreased agricultural production and increased human death. However a major reality that is generally ignored is the death toll associated with pollutants other than CO2 generated by fossil fuel burning, notably carbon monoxide, sulphur dioxide, particulates, volatile organic components, nitrogen oxides and heavy metals such as mercury. As outlined below an upper limit of about 0.3 million people die avoidably each year in the world due to the effects of toxic pollutants from fossil fuel burning. The Ministry of Energy of Ontario, Canada, commissioned a report into “true cost” of coal-fired power plants i.e. the “true cost” taking into account the environmental cost and the human impact in terms of mortality (deaths) and morbidity (illness) (see: “Cost Benefit Analysis: Replacing Ontario’s Coal-Fired Electricity Generation” (PDF) by DSS Management Consultants Inc. and RWDI Air Inc., for the Ontario Ministry of Energy, April, 2005, 93 pages). The report found that the “true cost” of coal-based electricity was 4-5 times the “market price” depending upon whether one valued a human life at $4 million or $5 million. Of crucial importance to analysis of human deaths from coal-based electricity generation, the Canadian report found that 668 Ontarians die due to 27 TWh (27 trillion Watt hours) of electricity generation (for a summary see: http://evworld.com). Canada and Ontario in particular have excellent medical services that are readily accessed by all members of society. Further, the population density in Ontario is much lower than in other countries (indeed even continental Australia most of the coal-fired power stations and most of the population are confined to relatively densely populated coastal regions). Accordingly, estimates of “annual coal-based electricity deaths” in other countries based on the Ontario ratio of 668 avoidable deaths per annum /27 TWh = 24.7 deaths per TWh are likely to be UNDER-estimates. Coal, gas and oil burning all produce toxic agents such as carbon monoxide, sulphur dioxide, particulates, nitrogen dioxide, ozone, volatile organic components and heavy metals, notably mercury (Hg) (see: http://dar.csiro.au/…/urbanpollution.html). Sulphur (S) content varies and mercury (Hg) pollution from combusted petroleum and natural gas is about 10 times less than that which derives from coal (66 Mg/y in the US); however this estimate was based on Hg from US fuel oil of 1,500 kg/y whereas the US EPA estimates Hg from fuel oil at 10,000 kg/y (10 Mg/y: http://www.epa.gov/…/.pdf). “This could each year save some 25,000 lives, reduce respiratory and cardiovascular illnesses, avert potential neurological damage for 630,000 babies, and erase a health care bill of over $160 billion.” We will initially ASSUME for arithmetic simplicity and “ball-park estimation” that the oil, gas and coal combustibles used to generate electricity are equally dirty in terms of toxic products and deadly impact – and then go back to assess coal-specific electricity generation using available data on the percentage of fossil–fuel-based electricity generation due to coal burning. For authoritative information on energy usage we can refer to the US Energy Information Administration (US EIA) that reports official energy statistics from the US Government covering the last quarter century. For all US EIA International data see: http://eia.doe.gov/international and for US EIA data on 2005 thermal electricity production, see http://eia.doe.gov/…/electricitygeneration.html. The Ontario Ministry of Energy study indicated 668 deaths /27 TWh of coal-based electricity generation = 24.7 deaths/TWh. Using this figure we can estimate annual deaths from fossil fuel-based electricity generation (assuming equality in toxicity of coal, oil and gas burning and other factors such as medical services, population density and environmental protection services). Since Canada has excellent, publicly-accessible medical services, low population density and good environmental protection our estimate for other countries will be under-estimated - however the assumption that coal-burning is no more toxic than the burning of other fossil fuels may lead to over-estimation of the death toll.
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Before providing these mortality estimates for all major fossil fuel-burning nations, it is useful to compare the estimates of annual deaths from fossil fuel-based electricity generation (“annual fossil fuel-based electricity deaths”) with those from coal-based electricity generation (”annual coal-based electricity deaths”) for several key countries. Thus “annual fossil fuel-based electricity deaths” for the US, the UK, Australia, Canada and New Zealand are 71,877, 6,854, 5,394, 3,760 and 355, respectively (2005). These estimates are compared with estimates for “annual coal-based electricity deaths” for these countries. The US “annual coal-based electricity deaths” have been estimated at 30,000 [2002]: “Coal-burning air pollution harms human heath in several different ways. Tiny particles of sulfur and nitrogen from coal burners lodge deep in our lungs, causing as many as 30,000 premature deaths per year, according to the most up-to-date study by EPA consultant Abt Associates“. According to Janet Larsen of The Earth Policy Institute it is 25,100 [2004]: “By moving beyond coal, the United States could avoid a legacy of smog-filled skies, acid rain, polluted waterways, contaminated fish, and scarred landscapes. This could each year save some 25,000 lives, reduce respiratory and cardiovascular illnesses, avert potential neurological damage for 630,000 babies, and erase a health care bill of over $160 billion”. 49% of US electricity of 4,065 TWh is from coal i.e. 1,991 TWh (2006: Sources: Wikipedia and EIA) indicating 49,153 [2006] ”annual coal-based electricity deaths” as compared to 71,887 “total annual fossil fuel-based electricity deaths”. The UK produced 409 TWh of electricity in 2005 of which 33.6% was coal-based i.e. 137.4 TWh, this corresponding to 137.4 TWh x 668/27 TWh = 3,399 [2005] “annual coal-based electricity deaths” as compared to 6,854 “total annual fossil fuel-based electricity deaths”. Australia produced 255 TWh of electricity in 2006 of which 92% was from fossil fuels and 77% was from burning black or brown coal, this yielding an estimate of 0.77 x 255 TWh x 668/27 TWh = 4,858[2006] ”annual coal-based electricity deaths” as compared to 0.77 x 5,394/0.92 = 4,515 [2005] ”annual coal-based electricity deaths” (see above) and total ”annual fossil fuel-based electricity deaths” of 5,395 (2005; see above). Canada produced 567 TWh of electricity in 2003 of which 28% was from fossil fuels and 19% was from coal burning i.e.107.7 TWh and we can calculate 107.7 TWh x 668/27 TWh = 2,665 [2003] ”annual coal-based electricity deaths” as compared to 0.19 x 3,760/0.28= 2,551 [2005] ”annual coal-based electricity deaths” and 3,760 [2005] “total annual fossil fuel-based electricity deaths”. New Zealand produced 41.6 TWh of electricity in 2005. In 2004, 73% of the total input into electricity generation was from renewable resources(predominantly hydro), 16% was from gas and 11% was from coal i.e. 4.6TWh (2005) corresponding to 114 [2005] “annual coal-based electricity deaths” as compared to 355 “total annual fossil fuel-based electricity deaths”. It is useful to compare the above figures from the “Anglo” countries with those for the World and the major non-European Developing countries China and India using data from the US Energy Information Administration, the World Coal Institute and the Pew Centre on Climate Change (see: http://pewclimate.org/…/coalfacts.cfm). Thus the “total annual fossil fuel-based electricity deaths” for India, China and the World can be estimated to be 13,319, 47,477 and 282, 945, respectively. In India 69% of electricity is from coal i.e. 456.5 TWh/y corresponding to 11, 276 “annual coal-based electricity deaths”. In China about 80% of electricity is from coal, corresponding to 1,898 TWh/y and 46,868 “annual coal-based electricity deaths”. For the World as a whole coal provides 40% of the total electricity i.e. 6,940 TWh/y and corresponding to 171,418 “annual coal-based electricity deaths”. The World is not responding to warnings from top climate scientists such as NASA’s Dr James Hansen and his colleagues who are calling for a “negative CO2 emissions” policy to reduce atmospheric CO2 to a safe level of no more than 350 ppm from the current already dangerous level of 385 ppm (see: http://arxiv.org/…/.pdf and http://mwcnews.net/…/23119/42/). The warnings of such eminent scientists are obfuscated by self-interested climate scepticism, especially from the leading per capita CO2 polluters, the US and Australia. However the above analysis shows that there is a horrendous reality ALREADY of about 170,000 deaths annually throughout the world from the effects of coal-based electricity generation and as many as 0.3 million deaths annually from pollutants from fossil fuel-based electricity generation in general – a huge death toll that cannot be ignored. Please tell everyone you can.

Global Clean Energy Good Impacts

Affordability is the key – making renewable energy cost-effective is our only hope.

Teryn Norris, Founder of the Breakthrough Institute’s Breakthrough Generation Program, and Jesse Jenkins, Director of Energy and Climate Policy at the Breakthrough Institute, 2009 (“Want to Save the World? Make Clean Energy Cheap,” The Huffington Post, March 10th, Available Online at http://www.huffingtonpost.com/teryn-norris/want-to-save-the-world-ma\_b\_173482.html?view=print, Accessed 07-19-2010)

Whatever the cause, we have very little chance of overcoming climate change without enlisting young innovators at a drastically greater scale. Simply put, they represent one of the most important catalysts for creating a clean energy economy and achieving long-term prosperity. The reason is this: at its core, climate change is a challenge of technology innovation. Over the next four decades, global energy demand will approximately double. Most of this growth will happen in developing nations as they continue lifting their citizens out of poverty and building modern societies. But over the same period, global greenhouse gas emissions must fall dramatically to avert the worst consequences of climate change. Shortly before his untimely death in 2005, the Nobel Prize-winning physicist Richard Smalley coined this the "Terawatt Challenge": increasing global energy production from roughly 15 terawatts in 2005 to 60 terawatts annually by 2100 in a way that simultaneously confronts the challenges of global warming, poverty alleviation, and resource depletion. The single greatest obstacle to meeting the Terawatt Challenge is the "technology gap" between dirty and clean energy sources. Low-carbon energy technologies remain significantly more expensive than fossil fuels. For example, solar photovoltaic electricity costs up to three to five times that of coal electricity, and plug-in hybrid and electric vehicles can be twice as expensive as their gasoline-fueled competitors. Unless this technology gap is bridged and clean energy technologies become affordable and scalable, poor and rich nations alike will continue opposing significant prices on their carbon emissions and will continue relying primarily upon coal and other fossil fuels to power their development. This will virtually assure massive climate destabilization. So the task is clear: to avoid climate catastrophe and create a new energy economy, we must unleash our forces of innovation - namely, scientists, engineers and entrepreneurs- to invent a new portfolio of truly scalable clean energy technologies, chart new paths to bring these technologies to market, and ensure they are affordable enough to deploy throughout the world. In short, to save the world we must make clean energy cheap.

\*\*\*Defense Independence Arguments

Renegotiation Links Are Non-Unique

DAs to renegotiation are non-unique—the U.S. is unilaterally changing its relocation plans in the status quo.

Yomiuri Shimbun—the largest daily newspaper in Japan, 2010 (“U.S. rethinks marine corps' shift to Guam / Wants to keep command unit in Okinawa,” Byline Satoshi Ogawa, July 3rd, Available Online at http://www.yomiuri.co.jp/dy/national/T100702004810.htm, Accessed 07-19-2010)

The U.S. government is reconsidering the relocation of some marine corps personnel from Okinawa Prefecture to Guam to enhance its rapid-response capability due to uncertain security conditions on the Korean Peninsula and in China, it has been learned. The relocation, as stipulated under the 2006 Japan-U.S. Roadmap for Realignment Implementation, will proceed but the United States has drafted modifications to the unit composition of personnel bound for Guam as it wants to maintain a command-unit presence in Okinawa. According to sources close to both governments, Washington has told Tokyo that some of the approximately 8,000 III Marine Expeditionary Force (MEF) personnel now stationed in Okinawa will remain there—a change from the original plan of relocating all MEF personnel to Guam.

A2: Hostile Japan DA

There’s no risk of a revived Japanese empire.

Doug Bandow, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, former Special Assistant to President Ronald Reagan and Senior Policy Analyst in the 1980 Reagan for President Campaign, holds a B.A. in Economics from Florida State University and a J.D. from Stanford University, 2010 (“Japan Can Defend Itself,” *The National Interest Online*, May 12th, Available Online at http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=11804)

Who should protect Japan? Japan. Tokyo's neighbors remain uneasy in varying degrees about the prospect of a more active Japan, but World War II is over. A revived Japanese empire is about as likely as a revived Mongol empire. Both Japan and India could play a much larger role in preserving regional security. Many Japanese citizens are equally opposed to a larger Japanese military and more expansive foreign policy. Their feelings are understandable, given the horrors of World War II. However, the most fundamental duty of any national government is defense. If the Japanese people want a minimal (or no) military, that is their right. But they should not expect other nations to fill the defense gap.

Their argument is ridiculous.

Doug Bandow, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, former Special Assistant to President Ronald Reagan and Senior Policy Analyst in the 1980 Reagan for President Campaign, holds a B.A. in Economics from Florida State University and a J.D. from Stanford University, 2010 (“Get Out of Japan,” *The National Interest Online*, June 18th, Available Online at http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=23592)

Of course, several of Japan’s neighbors, along with some Americans, remain nervous about any Japanese military activity given the Tokyo’s wartime depredations. However, the Japanese people do not have a double dose of original sin. Everyone who planned and most everyone who carried out those aggressions are dead. A country which goes through political convulsions before it will send unarmed peacekeepers abroad is not likely to engage in a new round of conquest.

Plan Key To U.S. Credibility

Refusal to compromise on Okinawa hurts U.S. credibility—it’s perceived as a double-standard.

The Hankyoreh—a daily newspaper in South Korea, 2010 (“U.S. receives criticism for contrasting Korea-Japan policies,” June 26th, Available Online at http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english\_edition/ e\_national/427627.html, Accessed 07-19-2010)

The Barack Obama administration’s contrasting attitudes regarding moving the Marine Corps Air Station Futenma in Japan and the transfer of wartime operational control (OPCON) in South Korea have become a source of controversy. This is because the United States has shaken off requests by Japan’s Democratic Party government to renegotiate the deal to move Futenma outside Okinawa prefecture, with Washington basing its rejection on a deal worked out with the previous Japanese government led by the Liberal Democratic Party. Meanwhile, the United States has reportedly agreed to discuss delaying the transfer of wartime operational control to South Korea when President Obama meets with President Lee Myung-bak in Toronto on Saturday, leaving behind an agreement made with the Roh Moo-hyun administration. The United States ignored a request to renegotiate by the former Democratic Party government of Hatoyama Yukio, who pledged in last August’s general election that he would move Marine Corps Air Station Futenma to, at the very least, a location outside of Okinawa. The United States pressured Tokyo to carry out an agreement made in May 2006 to move Futenma to Camp Schwab in Henoko, a coastal location near the city of Naho in northeast Okinawa, and the Democratic Party government was forced to “surrender.” As a result, the Social Democratic Party left the coalition government and the Hatoyama cabinet collapsed. In response to “double moves” regarding major pending security issues in South Korea and Japan, the Center for Peace and Disarmament of the People’s Solidarity for Participatory Democracy (PSPD) released a critical editorial Thursday saying it could not help but be suspicious of the policy consistency and credibility of the Obama administration. PSPD also sent an official letter to the U.S. embassy in South Korea asking that it reveal the U.S. government’s official direction on the issue. A former high-ranking official said Friday that the United States absolutely needs the original plan for the Futenma move to be executed, but it is likely willing to delay the wartime operational command transfer in South Korea because Washington has made the determination that a short delay would not harm the overall transfer, and that it can receive a number of concessions from South Korea in return. The official also said that in either case, U.S. policy consistency and credibility would necessarily take a hit.

A2: Okinawa Presence Key To Rapid Response

Their argument is nonsensical—rapid response isn’t key, and even if it *is*, Okinawa isn’t close enough to any potential flashpoint.

Yoshio Shimoji, former Professor of English and English linguistics at the University of the Ryukyus, M.S. from Georgetown University, 2010 (“The Futenma Base and the U.S.-Japan Controversy: an Okinawan perspective,” *The Asia-Pacific Journal*, May 3rd, Available Online at http://www.asahi.com/english/ TKY201007150512.html, Accessed 07-19-2010)

Washington persists in saying that Henoko is the best site for the relocation of Futenma if Japan wishes to continue to maintain the American military deterrence capability, warning that contingencies could occur in the Pacific region, for example, in the Korean Peninsula or the Taiwan Straits, requiring the Marines' presence as essential deterrence. On January 6, 2010, the U.S. Marine Corps Okinawa announced its position on the relocation of Futenma. In order to counter contingencies effectively, a helicopter squadron must be deployed within a 20-minute distance from a base where ground forces are standing by. This is why they claim Futenma's function must be relocated to Henoko, which is adjacent to Camp Schwab and Camp Hansen where the Marines' ground troops are stationed. Note that this is an argument based on tactical rather than strategic reasoning. According to this explanation, a helicopter squadron must pick up ground troops in 20 minutes and transport them to the frontline in a short span of time (perhaps one hour). But can one realistically imagine such a situation in and around Okinawa Island? Do the Marines think a ground battle similar to the World War II Battle of Okinawa will be replicated in the southern section of this island? Is Okinawa still a war zone in their thinking? Suppose war occurred in the Korean Peninsula and the Marines from Okinawa successfully landed there in one hour. Would 17,000 Marines go into battle against North Korea's 1.2 million standing army? The same issue pertains to the Taiwan Straits. As is well known, China has a 1.6 million regular army. Or can they function as a bulwark against potential missile attacks, say, by North Korea, China or Russia? Of course, the Marines alone may not work as deterrents against outside threats; they may be an integral part of the USF Japan together with the Navy and the Air Force. However, if contingencies occurred in the Korean Peninsula or in the Taiwan Straits, they would certainly have to increase their number substantially, probably to 500,000 troops at a minimum. But assembling troops takes several weeks or even months as the Persian Gulf War and the initial stage of the Iraq War demonstrated. Consequently, the explanation by the Marines and Washington that a helicopter squadron must be deployed within a 20-minute distance from a base where ground forces stand by and, therefore, the claim that Henoko is the best relocation site for Futenma's operations lacks credibility.

A2: Okinawa Presence Key To Regional Stability

Every neg example of a potential need for forces to be deployed in Okinawa is farfetched and unnecessary to preserve national security.

Doug Bandow, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, former Special Assistant to President Ronald Reagan and Senior Policy Analyst in the 1980 Reagan for President Campaign, holds a B.A. in Economics from Florida State University and a J.D. from Stanford University, 2010 (“Okinawa and the Problem of Empire,” *The Huffington Post*, March 25th, Available Online at http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=11617)

If the 3rd Marine Expeditionary Force located on Okinawa is not needed to defend Japan, then what is it for? South Korea vastly outranges the North on virtually every measure of power and can do whatever is necessary to deter North Korean adventurism. There also is much talk, offered unceasingly and uncritically, about maintaining regional stability. But what invasions, border fights, naval clashes, missile threats, and full-scale wars are the Marines preventing? And if conflict broke out, what would the Marines do? Launch a surprise landing in Beijing's Tiananmen Square during a war over Taiwan? Aid Indonesia, really the Javan Empire, in suppressing one or another group of secessionists? Help Thailand in a scrape with Burma triggered by the latter's guerrilla conflict spilling over the border? America has no reason to enter conflicts which threaten neither the U.S. nor a critical ally.

There is no strategic need for the Marines to stay in Okinawa—their authors are heavy on rhetoric and light on common sense.

Doug Bandow, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, former Special Assistant to President Ronald Reagan and Senior Policy Analyst in the 1980 Reagan for President Campaign, holds a B.A. in Economics from Florida State University and a J.D. from Stanford University, 2010 (“Get Out of Japan,” *The National Interest Online*, June 18th, Available Online at http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=23592)

The claim is oft-made that the presence of American forces also help promote regional stability beyond Japan. How never seems to be explained. Bruce Klingner of the Heritage Foundation contends: “the Marines on Okinawa are an indispensable and irreplaceable element of any U.S. response to an Asian crisis.” But the 3rd Marine Expeditionary Force (MEF), while packing a potent military punch, actually has little to do. The MEF isn’t necessary to support manpower-rich South Korea, which is capable of deterring a North Korean attack. The Marines wouldn’t be useful in a war against China, unless the Pentagon is planning a surprise landing in Tiananmen Square to seize Mao Zedong’s mausoleum. If conflict breaks out over Taiwan or various contested islands, America would rely on air and naval units. Where real instability might arise on the ground, only a fool would introduce U.S. troops—insurgency in Indonesia, civil strife in the Solomon Islands or Fiji, border skirmishes between Thailand and Burma or Cambodia. General Ronald Fogleman, a former Air Force Chief of Staff, argued that the Marines “serve no military function. They don’t need to be in Okinawa to meet any time line in any war plan. I’d bring them back to California. The reason they don’t want to bring them back to California is that everyone would look at them and say, ‘Why do you need these twenty thousand?’”

A2: Okinawa Presence Key To Regional Stability

Their argument incorrectly assumes that Japan’s Guam Agreement obligations will be fulfilled—that’s extremely unlikely.

Doug Bandow, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, former Special Assistant to President Ronald Reagan and Senior Policy Analyst in the 1980 Reagan for President Campaign, holds a B.A. in Economics from Florida State University and a J.D. from Stanford University, 2010 (“Get Out of Japan,” *The National Interest Online*, June 18th, Available Online at http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=23592)

When World War II ended, the U.S. occupied Japan and effectively colonized the island of Okinawa, seized in a bitter battle shortly before Tokyo surrendered. The U.S. loaded Okinawa with bases and only returned it to Japanese sovereignty in 1972. Four decades later nearly 20 percent of the island remains occupied by American military facilities. The U.S. military likes Okinawa because it is centrally located. Most Japanese like Okinawa because it is the most distant prefecture. Concentrating military facilities on the island—half of U.S. personnel and three-quarters of U.S. bases (by area) in Japan are located in a territory making up just .6 percent of the country—is convenient for everyone except the people who live there. Okinawans have been protesting against the bases for years. In 1995 the rape of a teenage girl set off vigorous demonstrations and led to various proposals to lighten the island’s burden. In 2006 the Japanese government agreed to help pay for some Marines to move to Guam while relocating the Futenma facility to the less populated Okinawan community of Henoko. But residents wanted the base moved off of the island and the government delayed implementation of the agreement. During last year’s parliamentary election the opposition Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ) promised to move the installation elsewhere. Prime Minister Hatoyama later said: “It must never happen that we accept the existing plan.” However, the Obama administration refused to reconsider and threatened the U.S.-Japanese relationship. That unsettled a public which had voted the DPJ into power primarily for economic reasons. Prime Minister Hatoyama wanted to turn the unbalanced alliance into a more equal partnership but the Japanese people weren’t ready. Said Hatoyama as he left office: “Someday, the time will come when Japan’s peace will have to be ensured by the Japanese people themselves.” Washington’s victory appeared to be complete. The Japanese government succumbed to U.S. demands. A new, more pliant prime minister took over. The Japanese nation again acknowledged its humiliating dependency on America. Yet the win may prove hollow. Although Hatoyama’s replacement, Prime Minister Naoto Kan, gives lip service to the plan to relocate the Marine Corps Air Station at Futenma within Okinawa, the move may never occur. There’s a reason Tokyo has essentially kicked the can down the road since 1996. Some 90,000 people, roughly one-tenth of Okinawa’s population, turned out for a protest rally in April. With no way to satisfy both Okinawans and Americans, the Kan government may decide to follow its predecessors and kick the can for a few more years. Moreover, there is talk of activists mounting a campaign of civil disobedience. Public frustration is high: in mid-May, a human chain of 17,000 surrounded Futenma. Local government officials oppose the relocation plan and would hesitate to use force against protestors. Naoto Kan could find himself following his predecessor into retirement if he forcibly intervened. Even a small number of demonstrators would embarrass U.S. and Japanese officials alike.

A2: Okinawa Presence Key To Protect Japan

Japan should assess that risk and respond appropriately, not rely on the U.S.

Doug Bandow, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, former Special Assistant to President Ronald Reagan and Senior Policy Analyst in the 1980 Reagan for President Campaign, holds a B.A. in Economics from Florida State University and a J.D. from Stanford University, 2010 (“Japan Can Defend Itself,” *The National Interest Online*, May 12th, Available Online at http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=11804)

The other important question is, defend Japan from what? Today Tokyo faces few obvious security threats. For this reason, many Japanese see little cause for an enlarged Japanese military. However, North Korea's uncertain future and China's ongoing growth should give the Japanese people pause for concern. East Asia might not look so friendly in coming decades. Richard Lawless, assistant secretary of defense for Asian and Pacific security affairs in the Bush administration, claimed: "observers perceive a Japan that is seemingly content to marginalize itself, a Japan that appears to almost intentionally ignore the increasingly complex and dangerous neighborhood in which it is located." Nevertheless, only the Japanese can assess the threats which concern them rather than Washington. And only the Japanese can decide how best to respond to any perceived threats.

Japan can defend itself—there is no vital national interest served by continued U.S. military presence.

Doug Bandow, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, former Special Assistant to President Ronald Reagan and Senior Policy Analyst in the 1980 Reagan for President Campaign, holds a B.A. in Economics from Florida State University and a J.D. from Stanford University, 2010 (“Okinawa and the Problem of Empire,” *The Huffington Post*, March 25th, Available Online at http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=11617)

In fact, there's no reason for the U.S. to do either. Allies are a means to an end; the defense of America, not allies, is America's vital interest. Sometimes protecting other nations is necessary for U.S. security, as during the Cold War. But that world disappeared long ago. Enemy threats are far fewer and allied capabilities are far greater. True, politicians and analysts alike routinely term America's alliances "cornerstones" and "linchpins" of U.S. security, regional stability, and world peace. In reality, today's alliance are unnecessary at best and dangerous transmission belts of conflict and war at worst. Consider Japan. President Barack Obama says that "America's commitment to Japan's security is unshakable," but does that mean the U.S. forever must defend that nation? The 1951 military treaty committed Japan to "increasingly assume responsibility for its own defense against direct and indirect aggression." In fact, Tokyo is capable of defending itself. Foreign Minister Katsuya Okada recently expressed doubt that "Japan on its own can face up to such risks" as China, but Tokyo needs a deterrent capability, not superiority. That is well within Japan's means. Certainly the U.S. would be far more secure if its allies and friends created forces to discourage aggression and worked together to encourage regional stability, rather than depended on Washington.

A2: F-22 to Japan DA

Their DA doesn’t make sense – we’re halting production of F-22s.

JEN 2010 (Japan Economic Newswire, 01/10/2010, Lexis Academic)

The United States has already deployed fifth-generation F-22 fighter planes. Japan had aimed to acquire the U.S. F-22 stealth fighter to replace its aging F-4EJ fighter fleet, but U.S. law prohibits export of the F-22 and the United States has announced that it plans to halt production. The United States has urged Japan to study introducing F-35s as its mainstay fighter instead.

No shot of F-22 revival for export – uniqueness overwhelms the link.

Macon Sun News, 2010 (3/11/2010, http://www.macon.com/2010/03/11/1054812/senator-upset-over-f-35-delays.html)

Production of the F-22 was ended last summer by a Senate floor vote. President Obama had threatened to veto any defense spending measure that included funds for the F-22 beyond the 187 aircraft already purchased for the Air Force fleet. Chambliss acknowledged that any effort to revive the F-22 production line would be quixotic at best. Hopes that the Boeing-Lockheed Martin F-22 production team could continue producing the F-22 to sell the aircraft to the Japanese government also have faded. “Frankly, the Pentagon’s done everything in their power to shut down any foreign military sales,” Chambliss said.

No shot we sell F22’s to Japan – multiple barriers on both sides

Weston S. Konishi, fellow @ Mansfield Foundation and Robert Dujarric, head of Inst. Of Contemporary Japanese Studies @ Temple, 5-16-2009, “Hurdles to a Japanese F-22,” Japan Times, http://search.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/eo20090516a1.html

There are, however, serious obstacles to such an acquisition. On the legal front, the U.S. Congress currently prohibits the sale of this highly sensitive military technology to any foreign air force. Moreover, recent leaks by Japanese personnel of classified U.S. data have hurt the country's credibility when it comes to protecting secrets. On the diplomatic front, selling F-22s to Japan would make it harder for the Obama administration to resist pressure from other allies who may have an interest in procuring the aircraft. A selloff of F-22s to other countries could disrupt delicate balances of power in Asia and other key regions. There are also numerous hurdles on the Japanese side. Even if Washington were willing to sell the F-22 at a foreclosure price of $140 million per unit, a very small number of planes, say 40, would increase Tokyo's defense expenditures by $5.6 billion. Operating costs would bring that figure much higher. In order for Tokyo to pay for a viable F-22 program, it would either have to cut pet projects, such as its spy satellite system, or shatter the 1-percent-of-GDP cap on defense spending, which most Japanese voters support. Either scenario requires significant political groundwork that has simply not been attempted and seems unlikely to succeed at this point. Furthermore, for several decades, Japan has opted for the domestic manufacture of its combat aircraft under license from U.S. contractors. Such an option for the F-22 would make it even harder to go ahead with the Raptor. License manufacturing in Japan is a budgetary black hole, where billions can vanish as small production runs and other inefficiencies exponentially raise costs. According to experts, per unit costs under these licensed production programs are twice those of the U.S.-made versions and sometimes even higher. Moreover, a made-in-Japan F-22 would create extra concerns in the U.S. Congress about technology transfers to a country that is considered an economic competitor. In sum, Japan's acquisition of the F-22 would involve significantly increasing defense spending, rethinking the domestic production of weapons platforms and implementing a more robust legal and enforcement framework to protect classified information. Under current circumstances, these developments are not in the cards. In the past two decades, China has invested heavily in its military and North Korea in its missile and nuclear arsenals. But Japan's defense budget has been kept flat, or sometimes slightly lowered. Despite its enormous maritime interests, it took Tokyo months to approve the deployment of a few vessels to Somalia under very restrictive rules of engagement. Consequently, it is not realistic to expect the Japanese government and Diet to suddenly summon the willpower to boost military outlays, cut down on wasteful domestic production (which gives jobs and money to voters and campaign contributors), and pass draconian laws to safeguard classified information.

A2: F-22 to Japan DA

Japanese F22’s are good – boost the US economy, don’t leak, and help heg

Lawrence Korb, senior fellow @ Center for American Progress, and Peter Juul, research associate, 9-4-2009, “Multiple Benefits if Japan Buys F-22,” Atlanta Journal-Constitution, ln

Moreover, the Japanese are willing to pay for the cost of developing and testing these changes and have an excellent record of safeguarding sensitive technology. The sale of the F-22s to Japan will have substantial economic and security benefits for the U.S. Japan would pay about $10 billion for 40 of the planes, thus helping our balance of payments situation and keeping tens of thousands of workers employed until 2017. Moreover, the F-22 would make U.S and Japanese forces more interoperable, allow the U.S. to have a smaller footprint in East Asia, and obviate the need for the Air Force to purchase more F-22s. Finally, by giving the Japanese a weapon that they are sure can be used to penetrate North Korean air defenses to attack a missile site in that rogue nation, it will lessen their incentive to go nuclear.

Selling F-22’s to Japan is key to regional stability – checks aggression

Ed Timperlake, Former Marine CO, 6-19-2009, “F-22 to Japan and Israel,” American Thinker, http://www.americanthinker.com/2009/07/f22\_to\_japan\_and\_israel\_a\_debt.html

Currently the Administration's challenge to the rogue actions of North Korea's "Dear Leader is to use stronger "Diplo speak" language and nothing more except still giving the PRC diplomatic credit for being helpful. The reality is The Peoples Liberation Army Air Force (PLAAF) is rapidly modernizing in both quantity and quality and the PRC is enabling North Korea and the Dear Leader to go crazy. Japan is facing their most significant military problem since they renounced offensive war. The F-22 would be a huge and unambiguous signal of American support in this increasingly dangerous time in Asia. Meanwhile, on the other side of the world, Iran is questing for a nuke to wipe Israel off the map. Both Israel and Japan are longtime trusted allies desperately needing the best Fighter America can provide. Bad actors such as Iran, North Korea and the PRC, should know their actions will trigger real world consequences from America. The F-22 Raptor puts a marker down that America stands with our allies when it really counts. The F-22 is the ultimate deterrent Aircraft for Israel and Japan, because it is so dominant and therefore would increase stability in both regions. Any adversary will think twice before attacking because it has no defense against F-22 including hiding behind a Russian state-of-the-art S-300 Air defense missile system.

\*\*\*Add-Ons

2AC—Demographic Crisis Add-On

Japan is facing a demographic crisis – kills the economy and Japanese soft power.

Er 9—Professor of Political Science at National University, Ph.D. from Columbia University and had visiting appointments at Keio University, the Japan Institute of International Affairs and Rikkyo University (Lam Peng, 26 February 2009, EAI Background Brief No. 433, DECLINING FERTILITY RATES IN JAPAN: AN AGEING CRISIS AHEAD, www.eai.nus.edu.sg/BB433.pdf, Accessed 19 July 2010)

Japan is facing a looming demographic crisis due to declining fertility rates coupled with rising longevity. By 2007, 21.5 percent of the Japanese population was over 65 years old; by 2055, it is projected to be 40.5 percent. 2. The average life expectancy for Japanese women and men in 2007 was 86 and 79 years, respectively; it is projected to increase to 90 and 84 years by 2055. The total fertility rate dipped from 2.13 in 1970 to 1.34 in 2007. 3. By 2010, there will be fewer than three workers supporting a retiree; by 2025, the estimated ratio is two workers for every aged dependent member. Moreover, the population of Japan will shrink from 127.77 million in 2007 to 95.15 million in 2050. 4. In 2006, the percentage of Japanese workers in the manufacturing sector was 18.7 percent. The contribution of manufacturing to Japan’s GDP has been fairly constant around 23 percent over the past decade and a half. 5. Although Japan has been quite successful thus far in keeping manufacturing as the key component and dynamo of its economy, it will increasingly face difficulties in retaining its substantial manufacturing base (which underpins its export-led growth and status as an economic giant), given the inexorable shrinking of its workforce. 6. Conceivably, Tokyo will exercise less clout in global and regional affairs in the years ahead if its economic and demographic weight continues to diminish unabatedly, especially against the backdrop of a rising China.

DPJ solves—increased birth rates.

Er 9—Professor of Political Science at National University, Ph.D. from Columbia University and had visiting appointments at Keio University, the Japan Institute of International Affairs and Rikkyo University (Lam Peng, 26 February 2009, EAI Background Brief No. 433, DECLINING FERTILITY RATES IN JAPAN: AN AGEING CRISIS AHEAD, www.eai.nus.edu.sg/BB433.pdf, Accessed 19 July 2010)

The main opposition Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ) is placing pressure on the ruling LDP by promising populist measures to boost the birth rate of the nation. Hoping to displace the LDP in the forthcoming Lower House Election, a key feature of the opposition party’s manifesto is the proposal that a DPJ-led government will provide a per capita child allowance of 26,000 yen per month until the child graduates from junior high school.29

Biggest and most probable impact.

Peter G. Peterson is the author of Gray Dawn: How the Coming Age Wave Will Transform America-and the World. He is Chairman of The Blackstone Group, a private investment bank, Chairman of The Institute for International Economics, Deputy Chairman of The Federal Reserve Bank of New York, Co-founder and President of The Concord Coalition, and Chairman of The Council on Foreign Relations, “The Global Aging Crisis,” *Foreign Affairs*, 1999, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/54620/peter-g-peterson/gray-dawn-the-global-aging-crisis)

We face a threat more grave and certain than those posed by chemical weapons, nuclear proliferation, or ethnic strife: the "age wave." As life expectancy grows and fertility rates decline, senior citizens will make up an ever-larger share of the total population. The effects of this demographic shift will be staggering. It will come with a whopping price tag, which will place a massive burden on an ever-smaller working-age population. Economic, social, and even military policy throughout the next century will have to respond to this unalterable trend. Unless the West recognizes the challenges to come and devises a strategy to meet them, the future will be gray and bleak.

2AC—Environmental Destruction Add-On

The planned Futenma Replacement Facility will decimate the natural environment—U.S. military presence will be the death knell of one of the world’s most sacred ecosystems.

The Center for Biological Diversity—a national, nonprofit conservation organization with more than 240,000 members and online activists dedicated to the protection of endangered species and wild places, et al., co-signed by representatives of conservation, animal protection, and peace and justice groups representing more than 10 million Americans, 2009 (“RE: Proposed U.S. Military Air Base Expansion Near Henoko, Okinawa,” Letter To The Obama Administration, December 3rd, Available Online at http://www.biologicaldiversity.org/species/ mammals/Okinawa\_dugong/pdfs/dugongletter.pdf)

The island of Okinawa has been called the “Galápagos of the East” because of the incredible variety of marine and terrestrial life it supports. Unfortunately, a joint military project proposed by the U.S. and Japanese governments threatens to destroy one of the last healthy coral-reef ecosystems in Okinawa, pushing many magnificent species to the brink of extinction. You have the power to protect these unique and priceless creatures. Under a 2006 bilateral agreement, U.S. and Japanese governments agreed to relocate the contentious U.S. Marine Corps’ Futenma Air Station to Camp Schwab and Henoko Bay. This shortsighted plan does not take into consideration that the relocation will destroy a valued ecosystem, including the nearly 400 types of coral that form Okinawa’s reefs and support more than 1,000 species of fish. It will also hurt imperiled sea turtles and marine mammals. Current plans call for construction of the new military base near Henoko and Oura bays in Okinawa. But the habitat this project would destroy supports numerous endangered species — animals protected by American, Japanese, and international law for their biological and cultural importance. These species include: Okinawa dugong: The critically endangered and culturally treasured dugong, a manatee-like creature, relies on this habitat for its very survival in Okinawa. Japan’s Mammalogical Society placed the dugong on its “Red List of Mammals,” estimating the population in Okinawa to be critically endangered. The U.S. government’s Marine Mammal Commission and the United Nations Environmental Program fear the project would pose a serious threat to this mammal’s survival. The World Conservation Union’s dugong specialists have expressed similar concerns and have placed the dugong on its Red List of threatened species. The Okinawa dugong is also a federally listed endangered species under the U.S. Endangered Species Act. The Okinawa dugong has extreme cultural significance to the Okinawan people, and only about 50 dugongs are thought to remain in these waters. The base construction will crush the last remaining critical habitat for the Okinawa dugong, destroying feeding trails and seagrass beds essential for dugong survival. Sea turtles: Three types of endangered sea turtle — the hawksbill, loggerhead, and green — also depend on this ecosystem. These turtles are listed under the U.S. Endangered Species Act and the global Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species. The turtles use nearby beaches to feed and lay their eggs. The construction and operation of the new base will cause water and air pollution, create artificial light pollution, and increase human activity — all of which are harmful to sea turtle survival. Many plant and animal species are still being discovered in Henoko Bay. Since the base plan was announced, new types of seagrass — a vital staple food for the dugong — and mollusks have been discovered on the project site. New wonders of nature are found here each year. The base plan would devastate dugong habitat in Henoko Bay and nearby Oura Bay, and would be extremely harmful to turtles, fish, coral, and other marine life. The recently elected Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama and the Democratic Party of Japan have expressed the desire to renegotiate the 2006 agreement and cancel plans to relocate the base. You have the ability and duty to alter the course of this devastating plan, but time is of the essence. We urge you to direct the U.S. secretaries of defense and state to cancel this project immediately. By canceling the plan to expand an airbase near Henoko and Oura bays, you will protect a globally important ocean ecosystem and some of the best remaining habitat for the Okinawa dugong. IUCN has designated the 2010 Year for Biodiversity as the year of the dugong. Please cancel this destructive project and ensure that the Okinawa dugong has a fighting chance at celebrating its importance in 2010 and years to come.

2AC—Environmental Destruction Add-On

Second—this risks extinction—there’s an invisible threshold.

David N. Diner, Major in the Judge Advocate General's Corps of the United States Army, 1994 (“The Army And The Endangered Species Act: Who's Endangering Whom?,” *Military Law Review* (143 Mil. L. Rev. 161), Winter, Available Online via Lexis-Nexis)

4. Biological Diversity. – The main premise of species preservation is that diversity is better than simplicity. 77 As the current mass extinction has progressed, the world's biological diversity generally has decreased. This trend occurs within ecosystems by reducing the number of species, and within species by reducing the number of individuals. Both trends carry serious future implications. 78 [\*173] Biologically diverse ecosystems are characterized by a large number of specialist species, filling narrow ecological niches. These ecosystems inherently are more stable than less diverse systems. "The more complex the ecosystem, the more successfully it can resist a stress. . . . [l]ike a net, in which each knot is connected to others by several strands, such a fabric can resist collapse better than a simple, unbranched circle of threads -- which if cut anywhere breaks down as a whole." 79 By causing widespread extinctions, humans have artificially simplified many ecosystems. As biologic simplicity increases, so does the risk of ecosystem failure. The spreading Sahara Desert in Africa, and the dustbowl conditions of the 1930s in the United States are relatively mild examples of what might be expected if this trend continues. Theoretically, each new animal or plant extinction, with all its dimly perceived and intertwined affects, could cause total ecosystem collapse and human extinction. Each new extinction increases the risk of disaster. Like a mechanic removing, one by one, the rivets from an aircraft's wings, 80 mankind may be edging closer to the abyss.

2AC—Environmental Destruction Add-On

Finally—this is particularly true in this instance—healthy ocean ecosystems are key to human survival.

Robin Kundis Craig, Associate Professor of Law at the Indiana University School of Law, 2003 (“Taking Steps Toward Marine Wilderness Protection? Fishing and Coral Reef Marine Reserves in Florida and Hawaii,” *McGeorge Law Review* (34 McGeorge L. Rev. 155), Winter, Available Online via Subscribing Institutions via Lexis-Nexis)

Biodiversity and ecosystem function arguments for conserving marine ecosystems also exist, just as they do for terrestrial ecosystems, but these arguments have thus far rarely been raised in political debates. For example, besides significant tourism values - the most economically valuable ecosystem service coral reefs provide, worldwide - coral reefs protect against storms and dampen other environmental fluctuations, services worth more than ten times the reefs' value for food production. n856 Waste treatment is another significant, non-extractive ecosystem function that intact coral reef ecosystems provide. n857 More generally, "ocean ecosystems play a major role in the global geochemical cycling of all the elements that represent the basic building blocks of living organisms, carbon, nitrogen, oxygen, phosphorus, and sulfur, as well as other less abundant but necessary elements." n858 In a very real and direct sense, therefore, human degradation of marine ecosystems impairs the planet's ability to support life. Maintaining biodiversity is often critical to maintaining the functions of marine ecosystems. Current evidence shows that, in general, an ecosystem's ability to keep functioning in the face of disturbance is strongly dependent on its biodiversity, "indicating that more diverse ecosystems are more stable." n859 Coral reef ecosystems are particularly dependent on their biodiversity. [\*265] Most ecologists agree that the complexity of interactions and degree of interrelatedness among component species is higher on coral reefs than in any other marine environment. This implies that the ecosystem functioning that produces the most highly valued components is also complex and that many otherwise insignificant species have strong effects on sustaining the rest of the reef system. n860 Thus, maintaining and restoring the biodiversity of marine ecosystems is critical to maintaining and restoring the ecosystem services that they provide. Non-use biodiversity values for marine ecosystems have been calculated in the wake of marine disasters, like the Exxon Valdez oil spill in Alaska. n861 Similar calculations could derive preservation values for marine wilderness. However, economic value, or economic value equivalents, should not be "the sole or even primary justification for conservation of ocean ecosystems. Ethical arguments also have considerable force and merit." n862 At the forefront of such arguments should be a recognition of how little we know about the sea - and about the actual effect of human activities on marine ecosystems. The United States has traditionally failed to protect marine ecosystems because it was difficult to detect anthropogenic harm to the oceans, but we now know that such harm is occurring - even though we are not completely sure about causation or about how to fix every problem. Ecosystems like the NWHI coral reef ecosystem should inspire lawmakers and policymakers to admit that most of the time we really do not know what we are doing to the sea and hence should be preserving marine wilderness whenever we can - especially when the United States has within its territory relatively pristine marine ecosystems that may be unique in the world. We may not know much about the sea, but we do know this much: if we kill the ocean we kill ourselves, and we will take most of the biosphere with us. The Black Sea is almost dead, n863 its once-complex and productive ecosystem almost entirely replaced by a monoculture of comb jellies, "starving out fish and dolphins, emptying fishermen's nets, and converting the web of life into brainless, wraith-like blobs of jelly." n864 More importantly, the Black Sea is not necessarily unique.

2AC—Economy Add-On

The U.S. can’t afford its global military commitments—debt is piling up.

Doug Bandow, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, former Special Assistant to President Ronald Reagan and Senior Policy Analyst in the 1980 Reagan for President Campaign, holds a B.A. in Economics from Florida State University and a J.D. from Stanford University, 2010 (“Get Out of Japan,” *The National Interest Online*, June 18th, Available Online at http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=23592)

The days when Uncle Sam could afford to maintain a quasi-empire are over. The national debt already exceeds $13 trillion. America is running a $1.6 trillion deficit this year. Red ink is likely to run another $10 trillion over the next decade—assuming Washington doesn’t have to bail out more failed banks, pension funds and whatever else. Social Security and Medicare have a total unfunded liability in excess of $100 trillion. In short, the U.S. government is piling debt on top of debt in order to defend a country well able to protect itself.

And—the plan saves billions.

Doloris Cogan, writer/editor of the Guam Echo, sent by the Institute of Ethnic Affairs to Guam from 1947 to 1950, worked as Pacific Area assistant in the Department of the Interior from 1951 to 1955, 2010 (“Move Okinawa Marines to the US,” *Pacific Daily News*, June 25th, Available Online at http://www.guampdn.com/article/20100625/OPINION02/6250316)

While the conference referred to a $20 billion buildup of the Marianas, the move of troops away from Futenma has been estimated to cost about $26 billion, $10 billion of which would come from U.S. taxpayers and $16 billion through a loan from Japan. Sources of funding do not yet seem clear. The U.S. has already borrowed billions of dollars from China and Japan to keep our federal government afloat. I would hate to see us borrowing more that we would have to pay back with interest in order to make this move. I have recommended transporting the 8,600 troops, and their dependents, back to the mainland, where there are plenty of empty barracks and unemployed workers to build whatever else is necessary. That would save billions of dollars and be a win-win situation.

Third—that’s key to prevent stagflation—investors will dump the dollar, tanking the economy.

Evan Bayh, U.S. Senator (Democratic) from Indiana, former Governor of Indiana, B.A. in Business Economics and Public Policy from the Kelley School of Business at the University of Indiana, J.D. from the University of Virginia Law School, 2009 (“Why Democrats Must Restrain Spending,” *Wall Street Journal*, September 18th, Available Online at http://online.wsj.com/article/ SB10001424052970204518504574416843940486508.html)

Last month the Office of Management and Budget predicted that the national debt will increase by $9 trillion over the next decade—$2 trillion more than forecast just four months earlier. Government net interest payments exceed $1 trillion in 2019, up from $382 billion this year. Because projected deficits exceed projected economic growth, the gap will be self-perpetuating. The consequences of all this will not be benign. A world saturated with U.S. currency will eventually look elsewhere to invest, causing the dollar's value to drop; foreign creditors, their confidence shaken by our fiscal profligacy, will demand higher payments to keep holding our debt. The net effect will be "stagflation," that pernicious combination of slower growth, higher inflation and interest rates, and lower living standards Americans suffered through in the 1970s. These events will diminish our global influence, because fiscal strength is essential to diplomatic leverage, military might and national significance. No great nation can rely upon the generosity of strangers or the forbearance of potential adversaries to meet its security needs. America is doing both. China uses its monetary reserves to curry favor in developing countries once in the U.S. sphere of influence; we must borrow to pay for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

2AC—Economy Add-On

Fourth—this causes a global Great Depression.

Bradley R. Schiller, Professor of Economics at American University's School of Public Affairs, 1997 (“The Deficit Problem Is Far From Over,” *Los Angeles Times*, May 6th, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via Lexis-Nexis)

The ever-cautious budget office hints at the kind of disaster that might ensue: "Foreign investors might suddenly stop investing in U.S. securities, causing the exchange value of the dollar to plunge, interest rates to shoot up and the economy to stumble into a severe recession . . . Higher levels of debt might also ignite fears of inflation in the nation's financial markets, which would push up interest rates even further. Amid the anticipation of declining profits and rising rates, the stock market might collapse, and consumers, fearing economic catastrophe, might suddenly reduce their spending. Moreover, severe economic problems in this country could spill over to the rest of the world and might seriously affect the economics of U.S. trading partners, undermining international trade." In other words, the projected U.S. deficit might trigger another Great Depression.

The terminal impact is global nuclear war.

Walter Russell Mead, Senior Fellow in U.S. Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, 2009 (“Only Makes You Stronger,” *The New Republic*, February 4th, Available Online at http://www.tnr.com/story\_print.html?id=571cbbb9-2887-4d81-8542-92e83915f5f8)

None of which means that we can just sit back and enjoy the recession. History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads—but it has other, less reassuring messages as well. If financial crises have been a normal part of life during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, so has war. The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war: The list of wars is almost as long as the list of financial crises. Bad economic times can breed wars. Europe was a pretty peaceful place in 1928, but the Depression poisoned German public opinion and helped bring Adolf Hitler to power. If the current crisis turns into a depression, what rough beasts might start slouching toward Moscow, Karachi, Beijing, or New Delhi to be born? The United States may not, yet, decline, but, if we can't get the world economy back on track, we may still have to fight.

\*\*\*Politics

Link Turn – Plan Key to Obama

Plan key to Obama - looks like a key victory and motivates voter turn-out.

Lowell Grant, weekly columnist for the Record-Bee, July 13, 2010, Lake County Record-Bee, http://www.record-bee.com/ci\_15507535

Democrats seem to be completely tone-deaf as they stumble along snatching defeat from the jaws of victory by ignoring the legitimate concerns of so many. Instead of validating their anger by acknowledging their concerns, Democrats are taking the stance that ignoring them will be a winning strategy because when middle ground voters actually face the moment of truth in November, having to choose between radical extremists of the far right they will return instead to the Democratic candidate. Many citizens resent that illegal aliens are able to tap into and abuse our system of social programs. Many are upset about the possibility of aliens, legal or not, being able to vote. This is a perfect opportunity for Democratic leadership to make this issue theirs by calling for a photo ID card identifying the holder as a citizen and to mandate this card to be used when voting in federal elections. Drivers' licenses already require photos and thumb prints; what's the problem? Fiscal responsibility is suddenly all the rage after an eight-year orgy of record deficits. It's true that with the consumer on the sidelines and out of work, 70 percent of the economy is stalled, leaving government the only realistic way to jump-start economic growth. Fortunately there is no shortage of job producing, economy stimulating projects that we desperately need but we must cut other wasteful spending to avoid increasing the deficit while accomplishing this. Pay as you go, or "pay go" was eliminated during the Bush era. Obama stated he wants to return to that policy, yet we have not seen the wasteful foreign military bases closed on Okinawa or in Germany for instance, costing hundreds of billions each year despite contributing nothing to our security. Peace came to Japan and Germany 65 years ago; our troops there are no longer needed nor serve any purpose. It is argued that Okinawa is important to our presence in Asia but North Korea has been a rogue state since 1950. They've gone nuclear and attacked both U.S. and South Korean ships, all while our 50,000 troops served as a hollow threat, totally ignored. Close those bases and put many of those troops on our borders and in our ports instead. Invest the savings to help America rebuild long neglected infrastructure, creating real economic stimulus. Ron Paul is exactly right on this. You would think the Democrats would have the courage to adopt this obvious logic, but there's no sign of that. Obama recently authorized $2 billion for green energy initiatives, a meaningless drop in the bucket, hardly even window dressing. We send about $400 billion a year to foreign countries for oil now, much of which is invested toward our destruction by those who hate us, not for our freedom of course, but because we feel free to invade, occupy and reduce their countries to rubble so that we can buy oil from the Middle East "cheap." It verges on insanity for us to fail to realize how much less safe we are because of our addiction to oil and to be clueless about what we really pay per barrel when military costs are included. Democrats need to take a serious "1942" approach to energy and quit fooling around. Democrats are like the marathon runner who has crossed the finish line and collapsed after winning, without realizing that was not the finish but just the beginning of the herculean task of saving this country from the destruction visited upon us by the Republicans. They could have simply reinstated the 10-page Glass-Steagall act to repair the damage done by banking deregulation but instead came up with 1,100 pages with loopholes for every occasion. They could have simply made Medicare available to every citizen who pays the cost of coverage but spent a year and all their political capital on a mediocre program that won't take effect until 2014. There may still be time to make a real difference and to give citizens a reason to be enthusiastic but so far the Democrats have dropped every ball they've picked up. Sadly, subtlety has no place in current politics. Obama's calm demeanor is not registering with the middle; he needs to fight fire by finding some of his own.

Link Turn – Plan Bipartisan

Plan is bipartisan – Frank and Paul are rallying support for cutting Okinawa base.

NPR, July 2, 2010, All Things Considered, http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=128434888&ft=1&f=1122

Governments around the country are feeling the strain of budget pressures, and in Washington, at least, that strain is producing some strange alliances. Take Congressmen Ron Paul and Barney Frank: The libertarian Republican and the liberal Democrat co-wrote a piece for Huffington Post this past week that takes aim at a longtime budgetary sacred cow: U.S. military spending. The unlikely pair want to trim the Pentagon's budget by $1 trillion over the next 10 years, significantly reducing U.S. military presence around the world, including Europe. Frank tells NPR's Lynn Neary that it's time the nation updated its military approach. "This hangover from the Cold War, when America was seen as the superpower that had to protect everybody everywhere from everything, is outdated. In fact, it's often counterproductive." If America doesn't scale back its military footprint, Frank says, the price will be cutting domestic programs and increased taxes. "That's what we're talking about," he says. "We're talking about, in particular, the overreach, the overview that America as a world power has this responsibility to protect military power everywhere — and it's enormously expensive." Scaling Back America's Military Footprint One target in Frank's sights: the U.S. military base in Okinawa. "We don't need 15,000 marines in Okinawa – they're a hangover from a war that ended 65 years ago. And Japan now ought to be able to defend itself." Frank says U.S. sea and air power can deal with any threats from China, so having troops stationed nearby is unnecessary. "No one thinks you're going to land 15,000 Marines on the Chinese mainland to confront millions of Chinese military." Same goes for Europe. "NATO was a great accomplishment 61 years ago," Frank points out. "I don't see why we need troops in Okinawa or why we need troops in Germany, why we need troops in Italy." Some have argued that it's normal to position troops in ally countries. "Well, if that's the case, where are the Belgian troops in Arizona? Where are the French troops in South Dakota?" Besides closing bases, Frank sees another place for major cost savings. "During the Cold War, we had three ways of destroying the Soviet Union with thermonuclear weapons," he says. "We had nuclear submarines; we had the intercontinental ballistic missile and the strategic air command." These days, Russia's not the threat it used to be. Frank's proposal to the Pentagon is simple: "You know these three ways you have of destroying what's now Russia? Why don't you keep two and give up one? And save us tens of billions a year." A Bipartisan Task Force To look for more ways to trim the military budget, Frank set up a bipartisan commission. The Sustainable Defense Task Force includes people from the libertarian think tank the Cato Institute as well as "people with environmental and peace credentials," Frank says. The task force has already proposed plans that it says would save $100 billion a year through military cuts. It's a proactive attempt to direct the attention of President Obama's deficit reduction commission. "What Ron Paul and I are doing," Frank says, "is writing to them and saying, 'Don't just come to us and say we're going to raise taxes and we're going to limit Social Security and cut EPA, etc., etc. There needs to be proportional reductions in the military budget." "And we are going to tell them that if they don't add that, we don't vote for their program." The bipartisan nature of the task force suggests that support for Frank and Paul's proposals comes from all corners of the political spectrum. Frank is clear that he is willing to work with nearly anyone in this effort – even the Tea Party. "There are always going to be points of common ground," he says, and budget cuts are one of the Tea Party's priorities. Frank says he may disagree with them on a number of things, but he'd welcome their support. But trimming the military's budget might be as far as that bipartisan compact might go. What happens to any savings will be another matter. Frank says that's a debate for another day. Right now the objective is clear.

Link Turn – Frank/Paul/Jones

Frank, Paul, and Jones support the plan – cutting military spending.

Representative Barney Frank, July 7, 2010, MSNBC “Morning Joe” Interview, Federal News Service, Lexis Academic

And with us now from Boston, Democratic representative from Massachusetts and chairman of the Financial Services Committee, Congressman Barney Frank. Congressman Frank, thank you for joining us.

REP. FRANK: Good to be here.

MS. BRZEZINSKI: You've written an article with Representative Ron Paul, "Why we Must Reduce Military Spending." And in light of this conversation we're having about the cost of Afghanistan, you say this: "We're not talking about cutting the money needed to supply American troops in the field, and we're not talking about cutting essential funds for combating terrorism." Then what are you talking about, sir, in this very, very complicated and dangerous world we live in?

REP. FRANK: Well, let me begin with NATO and, in particular, the fact -- The New York Times had an interesting article about a month ago in which they talked about the level of welfare benefits in Western Europe. We're not talking about poor countries. They're talking about England, Denmark, Germany, France. The point was that they are able to sustain a higher level of expenditure on domestic benefits because they have a military budget which is tiny because they can depend on America. I think the time has some for us to tell the countries of Western Europe that we're no longer in the business of defending them, for two reasons. First of all, I have no idea what we are defending them against. Secondly -- and the Cold War is over. Yes, it was important when the Soviet Union was menacing Europe. That's no longer the case. Secondly, they are collectively as wealthy as we are. So we begin by reducing the extent to which we are offering this nuclear umbrella, et cetera, to Western Europe. And another example, we have 15,000 Marines on Okinawa. Most people, I think, that I talk to, thought the Marines left Okinawa when John Wayne died. It's unclear to me what they're doing there. I don't want to see China given a free hand over there vis-a-vis Taiwan, but 15,000 Marines aren't going to land on the Chinese mainland and confront millions of Chinese soldiers. You need some air power and sea power. A third thing is with regard to the Soviet Union. We had three ways of dropping nuclear weapons on the Soviet Union -- air, submarines -- airplanes, submarines and missiles. I'm ready to give up one. Keep two ways of defeating the Soviet Union, which has been succeeded by a much weaker Russia.

MS. BRZEZINSKI: Okay. Mike Barnicle.

MR. BARNICLE: Hey, Congressman, to that point of troops in Europe, how many American troops are on the ground in Europe? How much does it cost us, the American taxpayer, to keep them there?

REP. FRANK: Well, clearly, tens of billions (of dollars). It's hard to get the Pentagon to acknowledge it. Walter Jones, who's another Republican who's been in on this deal with us, has counted up to hundreds of bases. But we have tens of thousands of troops in Europe. We also have, as I said, the 15,000 in Okinawa, in many bases. And the whole defense structure of Europe is based, as The New York Times points out, the European countries, the Western European wealthy nations have scaled their military budgets to a percentage of their gross domestic product that's half or less than ours. And it's explicitly because they can defend (sic) on America to defend them.

That’s key – Frank’s clout is growing – especially on this issue.

Wall Street Journal 7/12/2010 (http://blogs.wsj.com/japanrealtime/2010/07/12/okinawa-marines-out-says-barney-frank/)

It’s unclear just how far Mr. Frank can go with his crusade. While he is influential within his party, his clout is greatest in the House Financial Services Committee, which he chairs — not military policy. But at a time of economic angst, and growing pressure to cut spending, Mr. Frank’s rhetoric could gain traction, especially as leaders in Okinawa make clear they don’t want the bases there either. “We don’t get any jobs out of Marines in Okinawa…,” Mr. Frank asserted to MSNBC host Keith Olbermann.

Link Turn – Military Cuts Bipartisan

Their links are outdated – the recession has turned the tide on cutting military spending – lots of political and military support.

Courier News, July 9, 2010, http://www.mycentraljersey.com/article/20100709/OPINION03/7090314/Heed-the-voices-calling-for-halt-to-runaway-military-spending

When one of the most liberal members of Congress joins forces with the most libertarian member of Congress for a cause that is also supported by a group of far-right Republicans, it's safe to say a political tipping point has been reached. And so it goes with the United States military budget which, for too long, has been off the table in terms of spirited political debate regarding funding cuts. The 2010 Pentagon budget towers at a gargantuan level of $693 billion — more than all other discretionary spending programs in the U.S. combined. In a time of national fiscal crisis, military spending is now rightfully drawing serious scrutiny from all quarters of the political spectrum — not to mention U.S. Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, who has wanted to trim $100 billion from the annual budget for well over a year now. This is all welcome, and the varied voices across the political landscape are what's necessary in identifying the types of cuts that will not compromise our national security, our current military offensives or our global war on terror. What should be targeted is waste and inefficiency in the form of outdated bases, unnecessary military hardware and personnel. And while that may sound like typical rhetoric, many presumably wise people believe that plenty of such waste exists. Recently, Congressmen Barney Frank, D-Mass., and Ron Paul, R-Texas — who aren't exactly ideological brothers — penned a joint column calling for cuts in the sections of the budget they feel serve no real purpose in national defense. Frank noted that the U.S. has hundreds of bases in 38 countries that do not, in most of those cases, advance American security. There are still, for example, 15,000 Marines on Okinawa. The U.S. spends more now on its military spending than it did during the Cold War — topping the military spending of Russia, China, all the Middle East, all of NATO and all the rest of Europe combined. It is our spending and military presence in Europe that allows our allies there to spend less on their own defenses and more on social programs which benefit them. The reality is that every dollar spent on the military in our discretionary spending budget is a dollar that does not get spent elsewhere on things like environmental protection and improved health care. As Rep. Frank noted, if you don't cut the military in a climate of deficit reduction "everything else gets butchered." Congressmen Frank and Paul are looking to cut about $100 billion a year over the next 10 years for a $1 trillion savings. Echoing their sentiments on the need to make tough choices are North Carolina conservative Republican Walter Jones as well as the conservative think tank, the Cato Institute.

Link Turn – Military Cuts Bipartisan

Tea Party supporters have swung the Republicans –they support military cuts.

John Bresnahan, capitol bureau chief of Politico, June 7, 2010, “Robert Gates may get lift from tea parties,” Politico, http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0610/38182.html

As Defense Secretary Robert Gates takes on General Electric, Boeing, Lockheed Martin and other “powerful people” in seeking cuts to major weapons programs, he may get help from an unexpected ally — the tea party movement. Key tea party players, on and off Capitol Hill, are expressing a willingness to put the Pentagon budget on the chopping block if it will help rein in federal spending and eliminate a projected trillion-dollar-plus budget deficit. Although generally hawkish and conservative with a libertarian streak — “we’re for strong defense” is an oft-repeated mantra in the movement — tea party leaders and allies contacted by POLITICO said that both fairness and common sense dictate that the military budget be scrutinized for such cuts, a view that puts them in sync with House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) and some of the most liberal members of Congress. “Everything is on the table,” insisted Mark Meckler, a national coordinator with the group Tea Party Patriots. “I have yet to hear anyone say, ‘We can’t touch defense spending,’ or any other issue. ... Any tea partier who says something else lacks integrity.” Tea partiers say they are concerned about “waste, fraud and abuse” within all government programs. To them, anything that government touches is riddled with inefficiency and corruption. Yet, any tea party support for Gates’s efforts to rein in military spending may be more philosophical than tactical. Social spending, “corporate bailouts” and President Barack Obama’s health care plan are much more popular targets of tea partiers’ anger than the Pentagon. And parochial politics — including jobs for constituents of tea party sympathizers on Capitol Hill — will come into play as well, as evidenced by the congressional battle over the second engine for the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter program, built jointly by GE and Rolls-Royce. Gates and Obama have threatened a veto of the fiscal 2011 defense authorization bill over the second engine, but the House approved $485 million for the program anyway. “Possibly, the tea party movement could help in that regard,” said Rep. Paul Broun (R-Ga.), a tea party favorite, when asked about whether tea partiers would back Gates. “Most of these people want to look at all federal spending and put it all on the table. They want to spend on strong defense, they want to support our troops, but they want to get rid of all the fluff, the fraud, the abuse, the waste in the federal government. They want to see the federal government shrink in size.” Broun, a bitter critic of Obama — and no fan of Gates or the history of U.S. military intervention since World War II, including NATO — said the country “cannot be a protector of the whole world. We cannot do that any longer. We don’t have the money to do it anyway.” “I think it will help Gates,” said Rep. Jeff Flake (R-Ariz.), a longtime opponent of congressional pork-barrel spending. “Republicans too often over the last couple of decades have said, ‘We want to limit spending but leave defense alone.’ But I think we all recognize that if we’re in a situation like Greece, then you’re in worse shape than if you have one fewer aircraft carrier or whatever else.” Similar language is being used by tea party candidates running for the House and Senate in Republican primaries across the country — that the Pentagon has to be included in governmentwide spending cuts.

\*\*\*Topicality Arguments

A2: Topicality “Substantially Reduce”

The plan addresses the central question of U.S. military presence in Japan.

Yoshio Shimoji, former Professor of English and English linguistics at the University of the Ryukyus, M.S. from Georgetown University, 2010 (“The Futenma Base and the U.S.-Japan Controversy: an Okinawan perspective,” *The Asia-Pacific Journal*, May 3rd, Available Online at http://www.asahi.com/english/ TKY201007150512.html, Accessed 07-19-2010)

The Futenma issue started as part of the 1995 Special Actions Committee on Okinawa (SACO) initiative to reduce burdens on Okinawa. But fifteen years later, the burdens remain as heavy, nor will they be lightened if Futenma's operations are moved to another location within Okinawa. Moving the base around in Okinawa or, more broadly, in Japan will clearly signal that Tokyo has yet again consented to a permanent U.S. military presence or "a life-of-the-alliance presence for U.S. forces" in Japan (2006 Road Map), a transparent cover term for the unlimited occupation of Japan. This must be prevented by all means. This is the essential issue concerning Futenma, one which cuts to the very heart of the U.S-Japan strategic alliance.

Their interpretation is arbitrary—substantially means ‘to a great extent or degree’.

WordNet: A Lexical Database for English, last updated in 2009 (Princeton University, Available Online at http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?s=substantially)

Substantially—S: (adv) well, considerably, substantially (to a great extent or degree) "I'm afraid the film was well over budget"; "painting the room white made it seem considerably (or substantially) larger"; "the house has fallen considerably in value"; "the price went up substantially"

Even if quantitative interpretations are good, “substantially reduce” requires only a 25% reduction.

U.S. Code, 2010 (“10 Usc Chapter 148 - National Defense Technology And Industrial Base, Defense Reinvestment, And Defense Conversion,” Available Online at http://uscode.house.gov/download/pls/10C148.txt)

"(f) Definitions. - For purposes of this section: "(1) The term 'major defense program' means a program that is carried out to produce or acquire a major system (as defined in section 2302(5) of title 10, United States Code). "(2) The terms 'substantial reduction' and 'substantially reduced', with respect to a defense contract under a major defense program, mean a reduction of 25 percent or more in the total dollar value of the funds obligated by the contract."

A2: Topicality “Substantially Reduce”

Marines in Okinawa are 28.5% of the U.S. military presence in Japan—we meet this interpretation.

The Japan Times, 2008 (“Basics of the U.S. military presence,” Byline Reiji Yoshida, March 25th, Available Online at http://search.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/nn20080325i1.html)

How many U.S. service members are based in Japan, how many dependents do they have with them here and what is the breakdown by branch of service? According to U.S. Forces Japan headquarters at Yokota Air Base, as of February there were 47,200 service members based in Japan, including 11,700 aboard vessels of the 7th Fleet. In addition, there were 3,510 U.S. civilian personnel and 41,695 family members. Of the 47,200 service members, 17,400 were in the navy, 15,000 in the marines corps, 12,300 in the air force and 2,500 in the army. Okinawa hosts more service members by far than any other prefecture. According to the prefectural government, Okinawa was home to 23,140 U.S. military-related individuals, including 13,480 marines and 7,080 airmen, as of September 2006. [here’s the math: 13,480 marines in Okinawa divided by 47,200 service members based in Japan equals 28.5%]

Okinawa is 3/4ths of the U.S. military bases and 2/3rds of U.S. military personnel in Japan.

Doug Bandow, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, former Special Assistant to President Ronald Reagan and Senior Policy Analyst in the 1980 Reagan for President Campaign, holds a B.A. in Economics from Florida State University and a J.D. from Stanford University, 2010 (“Okinawa and the Problem of Empire,” *The Huffington Post*, March 25th, Available Online at http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=11617)

Finally, there is the prefecture of Okinawa (the largest island of which also is named Okinawa). Okinawa's saga is long and sad. Once independent, the territory was absorbed by Imperial Japan and treated like an untrustworthy stepchild. In April and May 1945 the island suffered through one of the most brutal battles of World War II, during which roughly 100,000 Japanese soldiers and perhaps even more civilians died (estimates vary wildly). After the war the occupying U.S. military loaded the main island with bases. Okinawa was not turned back to Japan until 1972, but with only a modest U.S. military drawdown. Today the prefecture, Japan's smallest with just .6 percent of the country's land area, hosts roughly three-quarters of American military facilities and two-thirds of American military personnel — some 27,000 personnel stationed on 14 major bases — located in Japan. U.S. operations take up about 18 percent of the main island's territory. Although some Okinawans benefit from land rent, construction contracts, and consumer spending, for most residents the inconvenience is monumental, the limits on development costly, and the environmental consequences substantial. No surprise, the vast majority of residents want to reduce or eliminate the American presence.

A2: Topicality “Military Presence”

Contextual evidence proves the plan is a decrease in U.S. military presence in Japan.

GlobalSecurity.org, Last modified in 2009 (“Okinawa, Japan,” Last Updated on November 16th, Available Online at http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/facility/okinawa.htm)

During 2004 Japan and the United States continued discussions on plans to scale back the US military presence in the country. Tokyo will ask Washington to move some Marines now on the southern island of Okinawa outside the country. There is no doubt some changes will be made to the Okinawa forces. The US Marines are a tremendous burden in Okinawa, particularly the infantry and the training needs of the infantry in Okinawa can't really be met on the island, given the sensitivities there. Okinawa accounts for less than one percent of Japan's land, but hosts about two-thirds of the 40,000 American forces in the country. In recent years, Okinawans have grown increasingly angry about the military presence, because of land disputes and highly publicized violent crimes committed by a few U.S. troops. In return for moving troops outside the country, Japan would provide pre-positioning facilities for weapons, fuel and other equipment for the US military.