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\*\*\*TURKEY\*\*\*

Turkey Stability Solves Proliferation

Turkish stability key to deter proliferation

Baç 7 (Meltem Müftüler, Ph.D. in Political Science at Temple U, February 2007 [http://www.iai.it/pdf/Quaderni/Quaderni\_E\_08.pdf]

Since its Association Agreement with the EC in 1963, Turkey’s relations with the EU have been problematic. In the last decade, as the EU began to enlarge towards the Central and Eastern European countries, Turkey’s ambivalent position has become clearer. This paper argued that within the ambivalent position, an important benefit that Turkey’s accession to the EU revolves around the EU’s security concerns. This is, to a large extent, independent of the EU’s security aspirations, whether the EU will continue on the hard road of further integration remains unclear, especially in the light of the referendums in France and the Netherlands for the Constitutional Treaty. What is clear is that the EU will need to take more responsibility for its own security specifically in the post 9/11 international environment. This is why Turkey’s role matters, both in terms of a more abstract level and in terms of concrete military capabilities. If one considers that the EU’s security concerns are mostly on proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, terrorism and trafficking of humans and drugs for the next century, than Turkey’s geographical location becomes critical in furthering security goals based on these concerns. As Ian Lesser notes, “Turkey is most directly affected by a key trend shaping Western security: the erosion of traditional distinctions between the European, Middle Eastern and Eurasian theatres….Turkey is at the center of this phenomenon and the country’s future role will be strongly influenced by it.”25 Thus, this paper argued that within the rational intergovernmentalist theoretical lenses, Turkey’s main potential utility for the EU would be on the EU’s 2nd pillar development. This, however, does not mean that the EU will have to accept Turkey as a member because of these concerns, just the opposite there is already a process well underway and this paper stresses the potential value of Turkey’s accession to the EU from a very narrow perspective, that of security.

Turkish Stability Solves Middle East Instability

Turkish stability ensures Middle East stability

Landback 5[Alex, Editor-in-Chief of the University of Florida International Review, www.polisci.ufl.edu/UF\_Review/documents/turkey\_landback.doc]

With the membership of Turkey, the European Union enhances its international credibility as a global actor. As described before, Turkey can serve as a regional stabilizer and model of liberty in the Middle East. Beyond the politics and ideology involved, there are many linguistic and cultural assets than can be utilized by the European Union (Dervis, et al. 2004, 46). In the EU, as well as in the United States, there is a drastic shortage of Arabic speakers. The inclusion of Turkey in the EU would help it reposition its image from a restrictive club to a multicultural actor with the intention of creating a better world. The influx of qualified Arabic linguists enhances European intelligence in the War on Terror and in any potential conflict involving another Arab state (Desai 2005, 379).

Turkey mediates Middle East stability - negotiator and peace keeping forces

BBC 9 [August 1, Lexis]

As for Ankaras regional profile, Davutoglu said that his country continued to support mediation efforts to bring various sides together. Turkey was involved in indirect mediation between enemies Syria and Israel, an effort that has stalled this year. In January, Turkeys Premier Tayyip Erdogan walked out of the World Economic Conference in Davos, to protest Israeli President Shimon Peres statements on Israels policy on Palestine. "What happens in Palestine affects all of the regional actors," Davutoglu told the journalists gathered at the Movenpick Hotel, stressing the importance of strategic position of Palestine. Asked about Israeli officials concerns over Ankara's impartiality, Davutoglu told The Daily Star that "mediation is not an end, but a means to peace." "Our prime ministers attitude was a humanitarian and moral stance, which we believe serves (the cause of) peace in the Middle East," Davutoglu said, adding that Turkey was open to any demand on its mediation efforts, if it served the interests of security and stability in the region. After the meeting, Davutoglu said the Turkish peacekeeping contingents task in south Lebanon would help the regions stability, which was a guarantee for "everybodys security."

Turkish Stability Solves Middle East Instability/Russian Hegemony

Turkish stability foothold for Iraq and Iran stability and deterring Russian aggression

Giragosian 8 [Richard, analyst specializing in international relations, June 11, Turkish Policy Quarterly, Vol. 6, Pg 39, http://www.esiweb.org/pdf/esi\_turkey\_tpq\_vol6\_no4\_richardgiragosian.pdf]

As Turkey continues on its path toward redefining its strategic orientation, Turkish national security will undergo similar shifts. But the extent of external challenges are particularly daunting and pose what are some of the most pressing threats to Turkish stability and security. These threats are further exacerbated by the near simultaneous set of internal changes now underway within Turkey. Based on this new threat environment, Turkey is now forging a sophisticated strategy of greater engagement coupled with a bolder assertion of power in the region. And while it remains to be seen exactly how this strategic reorientation will conclude, with the instability in neighboring Iraq, the rising threat from the emergence of a Kurdish proto-state and the strengthening position of a nuclearambitious Iran, it seems clear that Turkey faces its most profound test. At the same time, Turkey’s strategic significance is only enhanced by the very same set of threats and, for the West, Turkey offers an essential avenue toward containing threats from both Iraq and Iran, checking a reassertion of Russian power and infl uence, and securing the vital Black-Caspian Seas region. More specifically, Turkey is now engaged in a more robust reassertion of its strategic importance, as a global actor with an emboldened agenda of activity within a number of international organizations, ranging from its traditional partners like NATO and the UN, to the more unconventional, such as GUAM and even the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO).

Turkish Stability Solves Middle East Instability

Turkish stability key to Iraq and Iran stability

Giragosian 8 [Richard, analyst specializing in international relations, June 11, Turkish Policy Quarterly, Vol. 6, Pg 32, http://www.esiweb.org/pdf/esi\_turkey\_tpq\_vol6\_no4\_richardgiragosian.pdf]

The degree of internal change is matched by an equally dynamic readjustment to Turkey’s strategic orientation, bolstered by the imperative to address a set of external challenges. And just as Turkish identity is very much a product of its geography and history, its strategic signifi cance is also rooted in both geopolitics and geography. This convergence of geopolitics and geography as a key driver for Turkey’s enhanced strategic importance is also a refl ection of Turkey’s position as a stable, strong and secular state fi rmly anchored along the European- Middle Eastern axis. As scholar Parag Khanna recently noted in his impressive study of globalization and geopolitics, “Turkey is one of Europe’s two main prongs to the East, and the gateway to the world’s principal danger zone of Syria, Iraq and Iran.”2

Turkish Stability Solves Fundamentalism

Turkish stability solve fundamentalist extremism

Liu 3 [Henry C K, chairman of the New York-based Liu Investment Group. November 20, Asian Times, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle\_East/EK20Ak05.html]

In terms of Turkish security and longer term stability, the impoverished and remote Kurdish regions of Eastern Turkey pose a formidable challenge for the Turkish military. The most productive strategy in dealing with this threat is one of stabilization, through economic development. And as these Kurdish regions would be the fi rst to benefi t from border trade with neighboring Armenia, the reopening of the Turkish-Armenian border offers the only real key to stability and security. Such an economic view of Turkish national security is also essential to ensuring a more comprehensive approach to containing and combating support for extremism. This is especially critical in light of the January 2007 operation by the Turkish police that effectively dismantled an Islamist network (with alleged al-Qaeda links) in fi ve separate Turkish provinces. Thus, the border opening issue represents not only an economic implement to forestall the rise of Kurdish separatism, but also offers an economic instrument to tackle the roots of Islamist extremism.

Turkish Instability Turns Genocide

Turkish instability is used as a justification for genocide- Armenia proves

Bloxham 5 [Donald, Professor of Modern History at Oxford University, Oxford University Press, The Great Game of Genocide, Pg 197, Google Books]

All of this chimed perfectly with the Kemalists' and the CUP's own anti Christian rhetoric, including their politico-economic assault on Christian merchants in the name of creating a Turkish-Muslim bourgeoisie. Furthermore it bore clear similarities to the language employed by some of the theorists of German penetration in the Near East in the 1890'sand later used by proponents of the Christian comprador thesis in the ranks of world systems analysis. Bristol's and Sherrill's sentiments belie the image of simple realists, resignedly acknowledging that temporary unpleasantness was a price worth paying for long term stability. They reveal instead mean actively endorsing a future in which the Ottoman Christians should be marginalized by any means necessary. The Christians of Istanbul were, in their eyes, not just a threat to Turkish stability by an accident of historical intermixing, they were a debilitating element, an alien parasite on a more intrinsically worth host society. And though the NEA could not be seen to endorse further Christian expulsions, the acceptance of forced assimilation as a way to solve the Armenian question was effectively adopted in American policy, while such refugee exoduses as there were presented no grounds for action.

Turkish Instability Turns Economy/Middle East Stability

Turkish stability provides avenues for regional stability and economic productivity

Salem 7/6 [Paul, Director of the Carnegie Middle East Center, 2010, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, http://carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=41113]

For Turkey to continue to grow, it needs access to as many markets as it can secure, and it needs stability and peace to interact with these places. This applies to its orientation towards Europe, which is its biggest market, but also its relationships in the north—towards the Balkans, Caucuses, and Black Sea area—and its relations with Iran, Iraq, Syria, and the Gulf countries in the Arab world. Ankara has annunciated this policy as a “zero problems with its neighbors” strategy and pursued this through vigorous diplomacy, particularly in the Middle East. It is actively trying to find a negotiated solution to the Iranian nuclear crisis, is working with the Iraqis and the Kurds to manage conflict in Iraq, and of course it played a leadership and mediation role between Israel and Syria just a couple of years ago. Ankara was also previously pushing for progress on the peace progress between Arabs and Israelis. So this is what Turkey has been pursuing over the last decade and a half.

Turkey Relations Solves Nuclear Iran

Good relations with Turkey prevents a nuclear Iran

Grossman 7 (Marc Vice Chairman of the Cohen Group “Turkey: Key to US and EU Security and Defense Interests A Reflection,” pages: 116- 123)AQB

Leaders in the United States and Europe are today in danger of committing the strategic error of not paying enough attention to the future of Turkey. In the post-Cold War world, keeping Turkey anchored to the West is a strategic imperative because of what Turkey is -- a secular state both majority Muslim and democratic -- where it is -- at the crossroads of Europe, Eurasia and the Middle East and what it could become -- the antidote to the “clash of civilizations.” It is surely right that Crossroads focuses attention on the continuing importance of Turkey to the security of Europe and the United States. Turkey was key to the West’s collective security from the time it joined NATO in 1952 to the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989. It is even more important today, as the West faces challenges as diverse and complicated as the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the fight against terrorism and extremism, the need to spread the benefits of globalization and to create a secure and sustainable energy future. . Preoccupied with domestic politics and crises elsewhere, American and European leaders watch as an anti-American and anti-European psychology grows in Turkey that will have negative long-term strategic consequences for Turks and for the rest of the West. As this article will try to highlight in more detail, Turkey’s success as a pluralistic, free market, tolerant society greatly improves the West’s ability to meet global challenges. For example, any hope of engineering a soft landing in Iraq will be enhanced by Ankara’s cooperation and assistance. Turkey is a critical ally if we hope to stop Iran’s bomb. As NATO fights Al-Qaeda and a resurgent Taliban in Afghanistan, Turkey’s efforts can be even more important to this Alliance must-win. And if the US and the European Union hope to pursue serious energy security strategies, Turkey’s role in that sphere will also be crucial.

\*\*\*KUWAIT\*\*\*

Kuwait Stability Turns Iraq Stability

Stability in Kuwait is key to Iraqi stability

**BI-ME 8** (Business Intelligence – Middle East, Nov 16 2008, http://www.bi-me.com/main.php?id=27376&t=1&c=33&cg=4&mset=)IM

INTERNATIONAL. Kuwait is seeking to exploit its position as gateway to Iraq after the Gulf Arab state stepped up diplomatic ties with Baghdad, opening the way for companies to play a leading role in reconstructing its larger neighbour. Top executives of Kuwaiti companies and experts told the Reuters Middle East Investment Summit they were setting their eyes on Iraq after Kuwait sent its first ambassador since 1990 and security is improving. Sandwiched between Iraq and Saudi Arabia, Kuwait is the main gateway to Iraq from the south, and the US military moves thousands of soldiers and most of its supplies for operations in Iraq through the small neighbor. Stability in Kuwait will ensure continued access to Iraq for the United States, and Iraqi stability. The Iraqi capital of Baghdad is also closer to Kuwait City than to Amman in Jordan, to the southwest. Kuwait's Prime Minister Sheikh Nasser al-Mohammad al-Sabah is expected to visit Iraq soon, which could pave the way for more deals for Kuwaiti companies spreading out of their home market. Commercial Bank of Kuwait, the country's third-largest lender by market value, is in talks with a Kuwaiti investment firm to buy an unnamed Iraqi lender, Chairman Abdulmajeed al-Shatti told the summit. "Iraq is always on our agenda," Shatti said. Smaller rival Burgan Bank just bought a stake in Baghdad Bank as part of plans to expand and diversify income. Meanwhile, Kuwait's Agility, the Gulf's biggest logistics firm, is setting up platforms in Iraq, betting goods will have to be moved when investors flock to the country after the security situation improves further. "When the security situation improves we will have more local partners to develop the business in Iraq. I think you can see it happening now," Agility Chairman Tarek Sultan said. Agility also wants to buy further into the Iraqi telecoms industry where Kuwait's biggest cell operator, Mobile Telecommunications Co (Zain), is already a big player. "If they have more stability....I think that Kuwait is in an excellent position to have an advantage from its [location]," said Amani Bouresli, a finance professor at Kuwait University.

Stability in Kuwait is key to Iraqi stability

**Al-Ebraheem 6** (Yousef, Middle East Quarterly 3(3), Sept 2006, p. 17)IM

Kuwait has an estimated oil reserve of more than 94 billion barrels, translating into a per citizen oil wealth of 142,000 barrels, which at today's levels is worth $2.1 million per person. Nonetheless, this wealth is threatened by a range of factors, including high population growth (leading to a decline in per capita wealth), non-OPEC oil discoveries, advancement of oil extraction technology, and the uncertainty surrounding demand for oil, especially from the industrial world. The following major factors could affect the financial situation over the next decade: Political stability. Uncertainty and tension in the Gulf region has an immediate impact on Kuwait's financial situation. In October 1994, Saddam Husayn moved Republican Guards toward the Kuwaiti border, and the ensuing mini-crisis cost Kuwait around $500 million (a figure that includes payments to mobilize allied troops). Further, political problems affect capital outflow, domestic economic activity, and the flow of oil. Hence, Kuwait’s financial situation has a substantial effect on issues like the future of Iraq, relations with Iran, and the Arab-Israeli peace process. Oil revenues. Most energy forecast studies predict that oil prices will be stable at the $15 per barrel level in the short term.9 They also predict that world demand for oil, especially in Asia, will continue to increase. But these studies are narrowly based on quantitative models and virtually ignore political factors, thus making them of questionable value.

Kuwait Stability Turns Iran Stability

Stability in Kuwait is key to Iran relations

**Al-Ebraheem 6** (Yousef, Middle East Quarterly 3(3), Sept 2006, p. 17)IM

Kuwait has an estimated oil reserve of more than 94 billion barrels, translating into a per citizen oil wealth of 142,000 barrels, which at today's levels is worth $2.1 million per person. Nonetheless, this wealth is threatened by a range of factors, including high population growth (leading to a decline in per capita wealth), non-OPEC oil discoveries, advancement of oil extraction technology, and the uncertainty surrounding demand for oil, especially from the industrial world. The following major factors could affect the financial situation over the next decade: Political stability. Uncertainty and tension in the Gulf region has an immediate impact on Kuwait's financial situation. In October 1994, Saddam Husayn moved Republican Guards toward the Kuwaiti border, and the ensuing mini-crisis cost Kuwait around $500 million (a figure that includes payments to mobilize allied troops). Further, political problems affect capital outflow, domestic economic activity, and the flow of oil. Hence, Kuwait’s financial situation has a substantial effect on issues like the future of Iraq, relations with Iran, and the Arab-Israeli peace process. Oil revenues. Most energy forecast studies predict that oil prices will be stable at the $15 per barrel level in the short term.9 They also predict that world demand for oil, especially in Asia, will continue to increase. But these studies are narrowly based on quantitative models and virtually ignore political factors, thus making them of questionable value.

Kuwait Stability Turns Afghanistan Stability

Stability in Kuwait is key to Afghan stability

**Al-Ebraheem 6** (Yousef, Middle East Quarterly 3(3), Sept 2006, p. 17)IM

Kuwait has an estimated oil reserve of more than 94 billion barrels, translating into a per citizen oil wealth of 142,000 barrels, which at today's levels is worth $2.1 million per person. Nonetheless, this wealth is threatened by a range of factors, including high population growth (leading to a decline in per capita wealth), non-OPEC oil discoveries, advancement of oil extraction technology, and the uncertainty surrounding demand for oil, especially from the industrial world. The following major factors could affect the financial situation over the next decade: Political stability. Uncertainty and tension in the Gulf region has an immediate impact on Kuwait's financial situation. In October 1994, Saddam Husayn moved Republican Guards toward the Kuwaiti border, and the ensuing mini-crisis cost Kuwait around $500 million (a figure that includes payments to mobilize allied troops). Further, political problems affect capital outflow, domestic economic activity, and the flow of oil. Hence, Kuwait’s financial situation has a substantial effect on issues like the future of Iraq, relations with Iran, and the Afghani peace process. Oil revenues. Most energy forecast studies predict that oil prices will be stable at the $15 per barrel level in the short term.9 They also predict that world demand for oil, especially in Asia, will continue to increase. But these studies are narrowly based on quantitative models and virtually ignore political factors, thus making them of questionable value.

Kuwait Stability Turns Iran/Regional Prolif

Stability in Kuwait is key to prevent Iranian proliferation

**AP 10** (Associated Press, Jan 31 2010, http://www.presstv.ir/detail.aspx?id=117487&sectionid=351020104)IM

US military officials told AP on condition of anonymity that Washington has taken silent steps to increase the capability of land-based Patriot missiles on the territory of some of its Arab allies in the Persian Gulf region. Patriot missile systems were originally deployed to the Persian Gulf region to target aircrafts and shoot down missiles before they reach their target. According to the officials, who were expounding on the classified information in a Sunday interview, the US Navy is also upgrading the presence of ships capable of intercepting missiles. The officials claimed that details are kept secret, because a number of Arab states fear Iran's military capabilities, but at the same time, are cautious about acknowledging their cooperation with the US. Arab states have a long history of housing US military bases and combat equipments. Kuwait plays host to US Patriots, which provide a valuable disincentive to a nuclear Iran, while the United Arab Emirates and Bahrain are home to the US Navy's 5th Fleet headquarters. Qatar is also known to have a modernized US air operations center that has played a central role in the US wars on Iraq and Afghanistan. Central Command Chief David Petraeus, who is responsible for US military operations across the Middle East, in early January warned of a series of 'contingency plans' in dealing with Iran's refusal to accept Western demands over its nuclear program. "It would be almost literally irresponsible if CENTCOM were not to have been thinking about the various 'what ifs' and to make plans for a whole variety of different contingencies," said Petraeus in a break from the Obama administration's oft-stated claims of diplomacy with Tehran. Petraeus has repeatedly asserted in his recent public speeches that the refurbishment of Patriot missiles is directly linked to US plans about Iran. "Other countries have certainly increased their Patriots, a whole host of different systems; Aegis ballistic missile cruisers are in the Gulf at all times now," Petraeus added. The weapons will have to be removed if conditions in Kuwait and surrounding countries were to take a turn for the worse. Equipped with advanced radar systems, the Aegis ships features a missile known as the SM-3, which came to the fore in February 2008 when it was used to shoot down a defective US satellite in space. Meanwhile, Defense Secretary Robert Gates has spoken fervently of a new approach to missile systems, both in Europe and the Persian Gulf. "I don't want to get into it in too much detail," Gates had said earlier in September, "but the reality is we are working both on a bilateral and a multilateral basis in the Gulf to establish the same kind of regional missile defense that would deter regional proliferation and protect our facilities out there as well as our friends and allies." The buildup comes at a critical time in Tehran-Washington affairs. On Thursday, the US Senate passed a bill advocating tough sanctions on any entity, individual, company or even country, which deals in refined petroleum with Iran.

Kuwait Stability Turns Nukes/Regional Instability

Kuwait stability key to prevent nuclear war and regional instability

**Kuwait Times 10** (June 27 2010, http://www.kuwaittimes.net/read\_news.php?newsid=MTAwMjUxMDcwMA==)IM

KUWAIT: A newly released international index has classified Kuwait among the countries given a 'warning' status of stability for the second year running. The Failed State Index (FSI) divides countries into four categories - Alert, Warning, Moderate, and Sustainable. Kuwait remained at 125th place in the index for the second year in a row, despite minor changes in some of the indicators forming the index. The stability of Kuwait has stunning effects on the surrounding region – political turmoil there easily spreads across the Middle East, exploiting ethnic divisions, state rivalries and spurring conflict. In an increasingly nuclear age and absent deterrent U.S. forces the resulting conflict throughout the Middle East could involve nuclear weapons. The classification looks at 12 different indicators to determine the stability of the 177 countries inc luded in the index, which is published by the US-based Foreign Policy magazine. The indicators are divided into three groups, social, economic, and political. The social indicators include Mounting Demographic Pressures, Massive Movement of Refugees or Internally Displaced Persons creating Complex Humanitarian Emergencies, Legacy of Vengeance-Seeking Group Grievance or Group Paranoia, and Chronic and Sustained Human Flight. The economic indicators are Uneven Economic Development along Group Lines, and Sharp and/or Severe Economic Decline.

Kuwait Instability Turns Economy

Kuwait economic stability key to global economy- small investments

Cheng 6/21 [Andria, Market Watch Economist, Wall Street Journal, 2010, http://online.wsj.com/article/BT-CO-20100621-710031.html?mod=WSJ\_latestheadlines] KLS

Alongside the promise of the so-called BRIC countries to the U.S. and other global retailers, smaller emerging markets, including Kuwait and Dubai, are rising as the new crop of global expansion opportunities. About 80% of retailers still consider Brazil, Russia, India and China as key to their short-term international growth plan, according to a survey of 60 global retail executives in the ninth annual Global Retail Development Index study by management consulting firm A.T. Kearney. The study uses 25 macroeconomic and retail-specific variables, including country risk and market saturation, to rank the top 30 emerging countries attractive for retail expansion. However, the BRIC countries tell only part of the story. Kuwait emerged as No. 2 on the list, while Chile, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay and Peru also surfaced in the top 10 along with their BRIC counterparts. The top 10 list represents the most diverse mix of large and small markets in the index's nine-year history. Other countries including Albania and Macedonia, which weren't placed in last year's top 30 rankings, also surfaced on the chart. "Don't underestimate the smaller markets," said Deepa Neary, a consultant in the retail practice at A.T. Kearne, in an interview, adding those markets could also help serve as retailers' entry point to a given region. "There are huge opportunities there as well."

Kuwait Stability Solves Middle East Instability

Kuwait stability provides stability for the Middle East

KUNA 5/2 (Kuna, Kuwait News Agency, [http://www.kuna.net.kw/NewsAgenciesPublicSite/ArticleDetails.aspx?Language=en&id=2080009]

By Mehdi El-Nemer ROME, May 2 (KUNA) -- The State of Kuwait plays a key role in the Gulf and Arab region due to the wise leadership of His Highness the Amir Sheikh Sabah Al-Ahmad Al-Jaber Al-Sabah and the Amir's visit is to have profound results and effect on Kuwaiti-Italian and Gulf-Europe relations. In remarks in an interview, Minister of Infrastructure and Transport Altero Matteoli told KUNA "Kuwait served as a most reliable point of reference in the region in terms of Middle East stability issues and in terms of mutual understanding between the west and the Islamic world." He added that this unique status promoted Italy to come to Kuwait' aid back in 1991 and support the war to liberate the state. Italy still considers Kuwait a balanced partner on the complicated scene of politics and power in the Middle East, the minister noted. On Italian relations with Arab states, the official remarked that the time-honored trade and cultural interaction with the Islamic world underwent major changes after WWII. The situation is complicated as the Arab World seek peace and stability, Israel maintains a right to exist, and Italy and Europe seeking to establish and maintain stable relations with "all" parties in the region. The Arab region being a major energy supplier further complicated the situation, he said. Now, Italy and Kuwait have a heavy political burden to navigate within this climate and mitigate crises, each within its unique dimension. On another point, the minister noted the expertise of Italian companies in the fields of urban development, construction, civilian infrastructure, and transportation can be of great use to Kuwait's development plans. The Amir's visit, Matteoli said, would yield a clearer understanding of the plans and the requirements of implementing them. "Italian companies not only stand to contribute high-standard technology and quality, but the skill of finding harmony within the unique environment they venture in." While Kuwait's particular needs would be made clearer during the visit, the Kuwait side on its part shall find reliable and specialized partners in Italian corporations. "I am particularly hoping that His Highness the Amir accepts to assume a leading role at a G8 Conference on environment and transportation, due in Rome in November, which seeks sustainable solutions for all sectors related to transport on a global scale," the official added. On the need for a Kuwait-Rome aviation route, he said he was "certain this new route would yield more understanding and interaction," adding both states are keen on and willing to work for such progress.

Kuwait Stability Solves Terrorism

Kuwait security efforts are crucial to stop terrorist recruitment in Iran

**Arab Times 10** (May 1 2010, http://www.arabtimesonline.com/NewsDetails/tabid/96/smid/414/Article ID/153217/reftab/36/Default.aspx)IM

KUWAIT CITY, May 1, (Agencies): Security agencies in Kuwait have busted a spy cell working for Iran’s Revolutionary Guards to feed information on Kuwaiti and US targets, a newspaper reported on Saturda Al-Qabas quoted Kuwaiti security sources as saying members of the cell had confessed they were assigned to recruit new members whose ideas were similar to the Revolutionary Guards. Cell members had visited Iran frequently under the guise of tourism, medical treatment or visiting religious places. Kuwait is home to several US military bases. The main base in the emirate is located in Arifjan, 70 kms (45 miles) south of Kuwait City, and houses around 15,000 US soldiers. Kuwait is also used as a transit point for US troops into and out of both Iraq and Afghanistan. The Revolutionary Guards are an elite military, industrial and political force set up to safeguard Iran’s 1979 Islamic revolution from both foreign and domestic threats. They have repeatedly warned they have US bases in Iraq and Afghanistan under watch, implying they will pound these targets and could shut down the sea lanes of the oil-rich Gulf if the United States launches a military attack. It is for this reason the United States’ allies in the region are so crucial. In the case of terrorism Kuwait is particularly prevalent – being the only regional body capable of countering Afghan terrorists. According to sources, the members of the network, especially military personnel, concentrated on monitoring military sites, whether Kuwaiti or American and took photographs and also collected information on dates and places of joint military exercises conducted by Kuwait Army and coalition forces. Reportedly, the suspects admitted that their preliminary work included recruiting elements whose ideas match with those of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard. They also confessed that they sent reports on the political situation in Kuwait, as well as compiled reports on Kuwait’s strength internally.

Kuwait Stability Solves Terrorism

A stable Kuwait is key to prevent al-Qaeda recruitment efforts

**Business Monitor 10** (Mar. 10, Kuwait Defence and Security Report Q2 2010, http://www.reportbuyer.com/countries/middle\_east/kuwait/kuwait\_defence\_security\_report\_q2\_2010.html)IM

Kuwait is slowly recovering from the global crisis aided by an upswing in the oil price, although prospects for anything like a strong recovery in consumer spending remain bleak. Growth is being driven largely by government spending. This government spending has been first and foremost to weather the financial crisis but is also at least in part motivated by keeping raucous critics at bay. The opposition appears to be under control for now there remain threats to domestic political stability with a number of rebel opposition MPs prepared to disrupt the policymaking process. Structural security concerns remain more or less unchanged, some exacerbated by the economic situation. Kuwait's strong pro-US orientation risks antagonising the Shi'a population, a concern that has only intensified in the light of the Shi'a problems Saudi Arabia is currently facing in Yemen and the undoubted willingness of Iran to stoke them. The protest movement in Iran itself heightens these concerns as the leadership in Tehran seeks to draw attention away from domestic problems. There have been no further incidents like the one In August 2009 from al-Qaeda, which planned an attack - foiled by Kuwaiti security -on a US military base south of Kuwait City. That case reached the courts although details remain contradictory. In February 2010, six Kuwaiti citizens were accused by a Kuwaiti secret service officer a statement apparently at odds with the public prosecutor who, when the trial opened in December, withdrew the key conspiracy charge against them. The country continues to face a risk. The Bidoon of Kuwait (not the same as Bedouins), a stateless group numbering up to 140,000. Following the liberation of Kuwait from Iraqi occupation in 1991, they were nearly all removed from positions in the military and police. They remain discriminated against and, with a high rate of unemployment, the Bidoon are targets for al-Qaeda recruitment. Instability within the country would inevitably cause an upswing in recruits. Kuwait has no significant domestic arms industry and can confidently be expected to source equipment from abroad for the foreseeable future. Kuwait has sourced large quantities of advanced hi-tech weapons systems from major supplier countries, including the US, the UK and France. This is largely a consequence of Kuwait's important geostrategic position and generally pro-Western outlook.

Kuwait Stability Solves European Escalation

Any conflict resulting from Kuwaiti instability would involve France and escalate

**Habib Toumi News 10** (Apr. 16 2010, http://www.habibtoumi.com/2010/04/16/france-pledges-to-support-kuwait-if-its-security-is-threatened/)IM

French President Nicolas Sarkozy on Friday said that France “would always support Kuwait” in the event its security is threatened. He also stressed that France would assume its responsibilities to ensure the security and stability of the Gulf region. Sarkozy made the pledge as he received Kuwaiti Prime Minister Shaikh Nasser Al Mohammed Al Ahmad Al Sabah at the Elysee Palace in Paris. Talks focused on “the strategic partnership” between the two countries, especially nuclear cooperation and economic relations, Kuwait News Agency (KUNA) said. The two countries are set to sign a civil nuclear cooperation agreement during the premier’s visit. Accords on the environment, durable development and diplomatic cooperation will also be signed. Diplomatic sources said that Sarkozy “recalled the robust friendship that was forged by the French in their commitment to Kuwait at the time of the Iraqi invasion and the Gulf war” in 1990. The two countries are linked by a defence accord signed in 1992 and updated in October 2009. Sarkozy said that the French base in Abu Dhabi was a further indication that France was ready to “assume its responsibilities for the security and stability of the region which is essential for world balance.” In the modern age of nuclear weapons, terrorist organizations and superpowers with stakes in multiple countries this pledge is increasingly dangerous and creates a promising scenario for dangerously escalating conflict. France is pleased that progress was being made in the political, economic, defence, cultural or industrial relations between Paris and Kuwait City and that there is success in the “transfer of competence and training programmes.” France is also willing to develop an electronuclear affiliate in Kuwait and furnish a complete cycle service that would include an EPR reactor and fuel and reprocessing, KUNA said.

Iraq-Kuwait Relations Solves Stability

Good Iraq-Kuwait relations led to regional stability

**UNSC 10** (United Nations Security Council, June 15 2010, http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2010/sc9955.doc.htm)IM

The members of the Security Council noted that the confidence and cooperation-building period between Iraq and Kuwait, launched in April 2009, had proven to be useful, and welcomed the increased cooperation by the Governments of Iraq and Kuwait that has led to positive developments on the ground, including: the discovery of Iraqi missing persons in Kuwait; and that implementation has begun of an agreed plan to investigate the possibility that Kuwaiti missing persons may be found at new burial sites in Iraq. Nevertheless, the members of the Security Council recognized that no confirmed remains of Kuwaiti or third country nationals have been found during the reporting period, and again expressed their deepest sympathy and condolences to the families of those involved. The members of the Security Council welcomed the positive steps taken by the Government of Iraq, including: publishing the pictures and names of missing persons on the website of the Ministry of Human Rights and requesting anyone with information to come forward; and forming an Iraqi Inter-Ministerial Committee to take work forward on the issue of missing persons. The members of the Security Council took note that limited progress has been made on clarifying the fate of the Kuwaiti national archives. The members of the Security Council welcomed the public announcement made by the Government of Iraq in its official newspaper, calling on anyone in possession of Kuwaiti documents or other property to contact the Iraqi Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The members of the Security Council welcomed the decision of the Kuwaiti Government to fund a $974,000 project, sponsored by the United Nations Assistance Mission for Iraq (UNAMI) and the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS), to help build the capacity of the Iraqi Ministry of Human Rights in mass-grave excavation and identification of missing persons. The members of the Security Council took note of the action plan that was prepared by the Kuwaiti Government and provided to the Technical Subcommittee. The members of the Security Council supported the Secretary-General’s call for Iraq and Kuwait to continue to act in the spirit of the confidence- and cooperation-building process, and apply this to the resolution of a larger set of outstanding issues between the two countries, which should contribute to the further strengthening of their good-neighbourly relations and enhancing regional stability.

Kuwait-US Relations Solves Middle East Instability

Kuwait – US cooperation is key to all regional strategic goals.

Terrill 7 (KUWAITI NATIONAL SECURITY AND THE U.S.-KUWAITI STRATEGIC RELATIONSHIP AFTER SADDAM” W. Andrew the Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) September, http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub788.pdf)KM

 The United States has found no shortage of difficulties in recent years as it has moved forward in implementing its security policies toward the Middle East and especially the Persian/Arabian Gulf. Security threats resulting from an Iraq in turmoil and an assertive Iran are near the top of U.S. concerns about its future security. Efforts to deal with terrorism and to encourage and support the efforts of regional states to stem the rise of violent terrorist groups are also important. Kuwait, while a small country with a limited population, nevertheless has many of the same concerns as the United States in that part of the world. While Kuwait cannot act as a major regional power, it can nevertheless still serve as a valuable ally, whose contributions to regional security and democratization should not be overlooked. These contributions center on strategic geography, economic strength, and a willingness to host U.S. forces that is long-standing in a region where such actions can sometimes be seen as controversial.

Kuwait-US relations are key to checking destabilizing threats in the Middle East.

Terrill 7 (KUWAITI NATIONAL SECURITY AND THE U.S.-KUWAITI STRATEGIC RELATIONSHIP AFTER SADDAM” W. Andrew the Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) September, http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub788.pdf)KM

Yet, despite an enormous sense of relief, Kuwait’s national security problems have not disappeared with Saddam’s removal and death on the gallows. Rather, the end of his dictatorship has created new and extremely serious national security challenges for Kuwait. Iran has viewed Saddam’s replacement with a weak and divided Iraqi government as an opportunity to expand its political influence throughout the Gulf in ways that are potentially threatening to Kuwait. Moreover, a variety of alternative Iraqi political futures concern Kuwait, and whatever future Iraq eventually finds will occur only after a prolonged period of instability and violence that could well involve Kuwait. Additionally, Kuwaitis are concerned about an expansion of terrorism in the Gulf due to increased regional sectarianism and radicalism that may emerge as a by-product of Iraqi factional and intercommunal warfare. All of these problems are of special concern to the United States as well, and addressing them effectively is vital to both nations.

Kuwait-US Relations Solves Democracy

US-Kuwait relations key to democracy- economic exchange

Terril 7 [Dr. W. Andrew, senior international security analyst at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, September Strategic Studies Institute http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/summary.cfm?q=788] KLS

Kuwait has been a close military partner of the United States since a U.S.-led military coalition liberated it from the iron grip of Iraqi occupation in 1991. The U.S.-Kuwait relationship since that time has been consolidated as an important alliance for both countries. Although Kuwait is a small country, it is also strategically located and supports ongoing security relations with the United States. The importance of Kuwait's strategic position can be expected to increase as the United States reduces its presence in postSaddam Iraq but still seeks to influence events there and throughout the Gulf region. Kuwait's strategic importance also increased following the U.S. decision to remove its combat forces from Saudi Arabia in 2003.[3](http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/summary.cfm?q=788#endnotes) Additionally, Kuwait rests upon approximately 10 percent of the world's known oil reserves and is expanding its efforts to explore for natural gas, making it a vital economic ally. More recently, and also of interest to the United States, the Kuwaiti experience is emerging as an especially important ongoing experiment in democratic institution-building and the expansion of democratic practices. This approach to governance is being implemented in ways that support U.S. goals for increased democratization of the region, although elections have also helped to empower some extremely conservative Islamists, such as members of the Kuwaiti Islamic Constitutional Movement, which is the political arm of the Kuwaiti Muslim Brotherhood.[4](http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/summary.cfm?q=788#endnotes)

\*\*\*IRAN\*\*\*

Iran Instability Turns Iraq Stability

Unchecked, Iran poses the highest risk of destabilizing Iraq.

Johnson 8(Ed writer for Bloomberg, “Iran Poses Biggest Threat to Iraq's Stability, Pentagon Says” October 1)AQB

Iranian support for Shiite militia groups poses the biggest threat to long-term stability in Iraq, where recent improvements in security are "fragile," the U.S. Defense Department said. Iran continues to "fund, train, arm and direct" groups intent on destabilizing its neighbor and its influence in Iraq is "malign," the Pentagon said in its quarterly report to Congress. While civilian deaths between June and August were down 77 percent on the same period last year, Iraq faces unresolved issues that may trigger fresh violence, including the status of the oil city of Kirkuk and the integration of Sunni tribesmen into the security forces, according to the report. The Bush administration has repeatedly accused Iran of training and financing insurgents in Iraq and stoking violence between the country's Shiite and Sunni Muslim communities. The Islamic Republic denies the allegations and blames the U.S.-led military occupation for creating conflict among Iraqis.

Iranian instability incites heg mongering, Iraqi instability and aggressive policies

National Post 6 [May 24, Lexis ] KLS

Why does it suddenly seem so hard to stop Iran from going nuclear? The Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad is behaving with such recklessness that it ought to be easy. Last October, he called for Israel to be "wiped off the map." Meanwhile, he has barely disguised his country's intention to move from nuclear energy into weaponry. Iran is the world's biggest sponsor of terrorist organizations. It quite openly aspires to exploit the instability of Iraq to establish hegemony -- if not a new Persian empire -- in the Gulf region and beyond. Yet the West seems paralyzed, watching Ahmadinejad with the same appalled fascination that a docile cow might regard a rearing cobra. It is, of course, always dangerous to draw analogies with the 1930s. Still, in one respect Ahmadinejad really has taken a leaf out of the Fuhrer's book. He has discovered the counter-intuitive truth that it works to talk aggressively before you have acquired weapons of mass destruction.

Iran Prolif Turns Shia-Sunni Conflict

A nuclear Iran would instigate Shia-Sunni conflict

Subrahmanyam 5(K., Prominent Strategic Affairs Analyst@Indian Express, October 5, “If Iran Went Nuclear…”, http://www.indianexpress.com/oldStory/79396/, accessed 7/9/10)jn

Therefore there are two kinds of concerns among the international community arising out of Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons. The first is that Iran may become an Islamic proliferator. Second is that nuclear weapon acquisition by Shia Iran will unleash a Sunni Arab backlash, particularly from Saudi Arabia. A nuclear Iran, if it ever manages to become one, will have a totally destabilising effect over West Asia. Already the US worries about the effect of a second Shia state emerging in Iraq and the impact of Iran on that state. Eastern Saudi Arabia, where the oil fields are located, and many of the Gulf States have a majority Shia population, although they all have Sunni rulers. The Sunni rulers of Saudi Arabia and the Gulf states have kept a tight control over resentful Shia populations. They have depended upon the Gulf Cooperation Council and the US military presence in the Gulf area to keep the Shia populations under control. A resource poor, nuclear Pakistan could only challenge the American and Western powers through jihadi terrorism. It would be a different story in the case of a nuclear Iran which is resource rich, especially in terms of hydrocarbons. Therefore the US and Middle East rulers have real concerns about the authority and influence which the Ayatollahs from Tehran could exercise over the entire Gulf area. Whether this is a real or imaginary fear, it is hard to tell. During Saddam Hussein’s war on Iran, even the Shias of Iran fought loyally on Saddam Hussein’s side and the Shias in the Gulf states did not stage any uprising — not even when Saddam Hussein brutally suppressed the Shias in Southern Iraq.

Iranian Prolif Turns Heg

Iranian prolif undermines heg

Lind 7(Michael, Director of the Economic Growth Program@The New America Foundation, June, “Beyond American Hegemony”, http://www.newamerica.net/publications/articles/2007/beyond\_american\_hegemony\_5381, accessed 7/9/10)jn

American military hegemony in Europe, Asia and the Middle East depends on the ability of the U.S. military to threaten and, if necessary, to use military force to defeat any regional challenge-but at a relatively low cost. This is because the American public is not prepared to pay the costs necessary if the United States is to be a "hyperpower." Given this premise, the obsession with the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and other Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) makes perfect sense. WMD are defensive weapons that offer poor states a possible defensive shield against the sword of unexcelled U.S. conventional military superiority. The success of the United States in using superior conventional force to defeat Serbia and Iraq (twice) may have accelerated the efforts of India, Pakistan, North Korea and Iran to obtain nuclear deterrents. As an Indian admiral observed after the Gulf War, "The lesson is that you should not go to war with the United States unless you have nuclear weapons." Moreover, it is clear that the United States treats countries that possess WMD quite differently from those that do not. So proliferation undermines American regional hegemony in two ways. First, it forces the U.S. military to adopt costly and awkward strategies in wartime. Second, it discourages intimidated neighbors of the nuclear state from allowing American bases and military build-ups on its soil.

Iranian Prolif Turns Econ/Saudi Relations

Iranian proliferation allies Saudi Arabia with Iran, collapsing the U.S. economy

Scoblete 10(Greg, Real Clear World Staff Writer, April 30, “Joining Iran's Camp”, http://www.realclearworld.com/blog/2010/04/joining\_irans\_camp.html, accessed 7/9/10)jn

One of the very legitimate concerns about Iran acquiring nuclear capability is that it would spur other states in the region to acquire their own nuclear weapons as a deterrent. There's some reason to doubt this would happen - Israel fought actual wars with many Arab states and acquired a nuclear arsenal decades ago without causing a cascade of proliferation. But nevertheless non-proliferation experts think it's a very real possibility (and indeed some believe an arms race has [more or less already begun](http://www.ploughshares.org/news-analysis/blog/chain-reaction-how-us-uae-nuclear-deal-could-set-middle-east-arms-race)). But now Evelyn Gordon [raises the opposite worry](http://www.commentarymagazine.com/blogs/index.php/evelyn-gordon/286516): that Arab states, including Saudi Arabia, will jump into Iran's orbit: The prospect of a shift in Saudi Arabia’s allegiance ought to alarm even the Obama administration. Saudi Arabia is not only one of America’s main oil suppliers; it’s also the country Washington relies on to keep world oil markets stable — both by restraining fellow OPEC members from radical production cuts and by upping its own production to compensate for temporary shortfalls elsewhere. Granted, Riyadh is motivated partly by self-interest: unlike some of its OPEC colleagues, it understands that keeping oil prices too high for too long would do more to spur alternative-energy development than any amount of global-warming hysteria. And since its economy depends on oil exports, encouraging alternative energy is the last thing it wants to do. Nevertheless, the fact remains that Saudi Arabia has been generally effective as stabilizer-in-chief of world oil markets and has no plausible replacement in this role. And since the U.S. economy remains highly oil-dependent, a Saudi shift into Iran’s camp would effectively put America’s economy at the mercy of the mullahs in Tehran.

Iranian Prolif Turns Terrorism

Iranian prolif increases the chance of nuclear terrorism

McInnis 5(Kathleen, Director, NATO ISAF Operations in the Office fo the the Secretary of Defense, *The Washington Quarterly*, Summer, pg. 182)jn

Unlike in Asia, where the U.S. deterrent umbrella is more credible, in the Middle East the Iranian proliferation problem presents a different set of challenges. Not only do Iranian connections with terrorist organizations significantly raise fears of nuclear terrorism, but state-based proliferation is more dangerous in this already volatile region. Both concerns present significant, long-term challenges to U.S. security and involvement in the region, especially as extended deterrence may not succeed in assuring regional allies.

Iranian Prolif Turns Prolif

Iranian prolif causes cascading proliferation throughout the middle east

McInnis 5(Kathleen, Director, NATO ISAF Operations in the Office fo the the Secretary of Defense, *The Washington Quarterly*, Summer, pg. 182)jn

The emergence of a nuclear Iran would undoubtedly send shockwaves through the region that could result in a nuclear domino effect. Therein lies the crux of the problem: If Saudi Arabia were to follow Iran’s proliferation route, that would again change the calculations of every other state in the region in a cumulative and potentially dangerous manner. Continuing with Egypt, and with other dominos such as Turkey and Syria poised to fall, the proliferation challenge in the Middle East is uniquely daunting. Perhaps most worrisome is that the United States is left, at present, with few good options in the region to thwart this dangerous trajectory.

Iran Prolif Turns Turkey Prolif

Iranian prolif causes Turkey to proliferate

Clawson 6(Patrick, deputy director for research of the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, June, “Proliferation in the Middle East: Who is Next after Iran?”, https://hsdl.org/?view&doc=65117&coll=public, accessed 7/9/10)jn

Historically Turkey has been at peace with Iran, and the two countries have generally paid relatively little attention to each other, compared to what one might expect from two neighbors with considerable economic interaction. That said, Turkey has many reasons to worry about meddling by an Islamic Republic which is ideologically opposed to Ankara’s secular policies. If Turkey faces serious internal problems—be it from Islamists or from Kurds—Iran might seek to take advantage of that situation, and Iranian nuclear weapons would make Turkey think long and hard about how much it could complain about such Iranian meddling. In other words, an Iranian nuclear capability could make the Turkish General Staff nervous. Faced with a nuclear-armed Iran, Turkey’s first instinct would be to turn to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Turkey places extraordinary value on its NATO membership, which symbolizes the West’s acceptance of Turkey—a delicate issue for a country which feels it is excluded from the EU on civilizational grounds more than for any other reason. The cold reality is that NATO was not designed to defend Turkey: assisting Turkey faced with a general Warsaw Pact invasion of Western Europe is one thing; defending Turkey when it alone faces a threat is an altogether different matter. It is not clear how much NATO members want to take on this burden. It will be only natural for Turkey to wonder how much it can rely on NATO. Were Turkey to decide that it had to proliferate in order to defend itself, it has good industrial and scientific infrastructures which it could draw upon to build nuclear weapons on its own. It would be difficult to prevent a determined Turkey from building nuclear weapons in well under a decade.

Iran Prolif Turns Everything

Iranian proliferation would trigger Middle East Proliferation, de-stabilize Iraq, increase terrorism, provide nuclear weapons to terrorists, kill the economy and U.S. Soft power.

Kyl 10(Senator Jon, June 24, “Congressional Speeches on the Iranian Threat”, http://www.aipac.org/Publications/Congressional\_Statements\_on\_Iranian\_Threat.pdf, accessed 7/9/10)jn

The same would be true if Iran acquired nuclear weapons. Even if the mullahs never actually detonated a nuclear bomb, their acquisition of a nuclear capability would forever change Iran's regional and global influence, and it would certainly forever change the Middle East. If Iran went nuclear, its neighbors--thinking particularly of Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Turkey-- might feel compelled to pursue their own nuclear arsenals. Tehran could easily trigger a dangerous chain reaction of nuclear proliferation. Once they had nuclear weapons, the Iranians would be much more aggressive in supporting terrorist organizations that are killing even American troops, for example, in Iraq. The Iranians would also ramp up their support for Hezbollah and Hamas and possibly provide them with nuclear materials. They would be emboldened to conduct economic warfare against the West, for example, by disrupting oil shipments traveling through the Straits of Hormuz. Iran would also be more confident about expanding its footprint in Latin America, where it has established a close working relationship with Venezuelan strongman Hugo Chavez. Governments around the world would lose faith in America's reliability as a strategic partner. U.S. credibility would be irrevocably weakened.

Iranian Prolif Turns Israeli First Strike

Iranian prolif causes Israeli first strike

The Washington Institute for Near East Policy 9(March, “Preventing a Cascade of Instability”, http://washingtoninstitute.org/pubPDFs/PTF-Iran.pdf, accessed 7/9/10)jn

If the international community appears unable to stop Iran’s nuclear progress, Israel may decide to act unilaterally. Whatever Americans may think, Israeli leaders seem convinced that at least for now, they have a military option. However, Israelis see the option fading over the next one to two years, not only because of Iran’s nuclear progress and dispersion of its program but also because improved Iranian air defenses, especially the expected delivery of the S-300 surface-to-air missile system from Russia, are seen by Israel as seriously limiting its military options. Israel therefore may feel compelled to act before the option disappears. If successful, a strike would be publicly condemned but quietly welcomed by some. Success, however, is an uncertain outcome. Even a successful strike might slow Iran only temporarily. And many would see it as both a failure of and a setback for the treaty-based nonproliferation system. The United States itself may pay a high price for an Israeli strike; many will perceive that Washington gave Israel green light.

Israel-Iran War Turns Nuclear War

Israel-Iran war goes nuclear ending with 21.5 million dead in 21 days

Turkish Journal Weekly 7 [December 24, http://www.turkishweekly.net/news/51112/what-would-happen-in-the-case-of-iran-israel-nuclear-war.html]

If a nuclear war between Israel and Iran were to break out 16-20 million Iranians would lose their lives - as opposed to 200,000-800,000 Israelis, according to a report recently published by the Washington-based Center for Strategic and International Studies, which is headed by Anthony H. Cordesman, formerly an analyst for the US Department of Defense. The document, which is largely theoretical due to the lack of verified knowledge in some areas - specifically in terms of Israel's nuclear capability -, paints various scenarios and attempts to predict the strategies of regional powers, as well as the US. The report assesses that a nuclear war would last approximately three weeks and ultimately end with the annihilation of Iran, due to Israel's alleged possession of weapons with a far larger yield. Israel, according to the assessment, would have a larger chance of survival. The report does not attempt to predict how many deaths would eventually be caused by possible nuclear fallout. Even If Iran gained the knowledge to create nuclear weapons, according to the report it would still be limited to 100 kiloton weapons, which can cause a far smaller radius of destruction than the 1 megaton bombs Israel allegedly possesses. Possible targets for an Iranian strike are the Tel Aviv metropolitan area and Haifa bay, while the list of possible targets in Iran includes the cities Teheran, Tabriz, Qazvin, Esfahan, Shiraz, Yazd, Kerman, Qom, Ahwaz and Kermanshah. The report cites Israel's Arrow missile defense system as an obstacle facing a possible Iranian strike and says that it could shoot down most of the missiles. Israel, on the other hand, would be capable of hitting most of the Iranian cities with pinpoint accuracy due to the high resolution satellite imagery systems at its disposal. Another scenario presented by the report is that Syria would join the bandwagon in case of a war and lob missiles with chemical and biological warheads into Israeli cities. According to the report, up to 800,000 Israelis would be killed if that were to happen. Syria, however, would be forced to grapple with the deaths of approximately 18 million of its citizens were Israel to respond with its nuclear arsenal. Israel, the report says, would launch a nuclear attack on Cairo and additional Egyptian cities, and would destroy the Aswan Dam if Egypt joined the fray.

Iranian Prolif Turns Middle East Stability

Nuclear Iran would destabilize the Middle East

The Washington Institute for Near East Policy 9(March, “Preventing a Cascade of Instability”, http://washingtoninstitute.org/pubPDFs/PTF-Iran.pdf, accessed 7/9/10)jn

In the hands of the Tehran regime, an actual nuclear weapon or the capacity to produce one quickly could profoundly destabilize the region. Given the past behavior of Iranian radicals, Iran on the nuclear brink could exacerbate fears among Gulf Arab states of sabotage and subversion, particularly across the Sunni- Shiite divide, and possible disruption in the flow of oil to world markets. Iran’s threats and actions could push oil prices up and intimidate its Gulf neighbors to bend to its will on issues ranging from border disputes to the presence of third-party military bases throughout the Gulf. Beyond the Gulf, radical groups in Syria, Lebanon, and Gaza, all allies of Iran, would be emboldened by Iranian nuclear progress. A nuclear Iran might more actively portray itself as the voice of Islam by, for example, questioning the status quo on volatile issues like custodianship of key Muslim shrines or Jerusalem, or portraying itself as a champion of Muslim radicals standing up to pro-Western regimes. Shielded by a nuclear deterrent, Iran might be emboldened to step up its support to terrorist groups. In the worst case, Iran might share its technology and nuclear material with its radical friends.

\*\*\*AFGHANISTAN\*\*\*

Afghan Stability Solves Central Asian Stability

Afghan stability is key to promoting stability in Central Asia.

Lal 6(Rollie The RAND Corporation, “Central Asia and Its Asian Neighbors”)AQB

The Asian states neighboring Central Asia have historic links and strong interests in the region. China, Iran, Afghanistan, India, and Pakistan are critical players in the security and economic issues that will determine the future of Central Asia and affect U.S. interests in the region. All of these states are of importance to the United States, whether due to the war on terrorism, economic ties, arms control, nonproliferation, or other reasons. China, Iran, and India have all aggressively sought to build trade ties to and through Central Asia, and China and India have also invigorated security cooperation. But regional states are concerned about the situation in Afghanistan, which they fear might lead to a spillover of conflict onto their soil, and they also fear the possibility of Pakistani activity and influence, which has led them to keep that state at arm’s length. China has indicated that security is a primary interest in the region through its initiative in establishing the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) with Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Russia (pp. 6–7). Concerns regarding China’s Muslim Uighur separatists, as well as concerns of U.S. encirclement, underpin China’s efforts to promote regional security cooperation (pp. 4–6, 9–10). China has also moved aggressively to expand its economic interests in the region through commodity trade and agreements to import oil via pipeline from Kazakhstan (pp. 7–8). Iran has a similar perspective toward its Central Asian neighbors. Stability in Afghanistan lies at the heart of Iran’s concerns, as the Taliban has historically been anathema to Iran (p. 12). Iran mainx Central Asia and Its Neighbors: Security and Commerce at the Crossroads tains that an international, United Nations–led military presence should remain in Afghanistan to prevent a deterioration of the security situation (pp. 11–12). However, U.S. presence there and in Central Asia creates concern in Iran that U.S. intentions are to surround and isolate Iran rather than enhance regional security (p. 16). To increase its leverage in the region, Iran is developing economic links with each country in Central Asia. Transport links are another important initiative, with routes being developed via Afghanistan, connecting Iranian ports and landlocked Uzbekistan (pp. 13–16). India shares Iran’s concerns regarding the threat of militants based in Afghanistan. However, India welcomes U.S. presence in the region as a stabilizing influence (p. 34). Economic ties are growing, and India is developing transport and energy links to the region via Iran and Afghanistan (pp. 33–34). The Central Asian states have close relations with India dating to the years of the Soviet Union and the Afghan war, a history that negatively affects their relations with Pakistan. Pakistan’s relations with Central Asia suffer from lingering memories in the region of Pakistan’s role in supporting the Taliban and Islamic militancy in general. Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, and Kyrgyzstan all remain suspicious of Pakistan’s regional intentions, and trade with Pakistan has been weak as a result (p. 25). The establishment of the Karzai government in Kabul has been a blow to Pakistan’s regional security strategy. Whereas the Taliban regime would have been friendly to Pakistan’s interests, the current government is more open to ties with India (p. 23). Although Pakistan is moving to overcome its regional reputation, robust cooperation will take time and effort (p. 26). Afghanistan remains critical to the future of Central Asia and its neighbors, as instability in Afghanistan has the potential to destabilize the region (pp. 19–20). A potent combination of drugs, weapons, and militants traverse Afghanistan and cross into Central Asia and beyond. Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, and Kyrgyzstan fear that Islamic militants trained in Afghanistan may slip back across their borders (p. 20). Iran remains apprehensive that hostile, anti-Shia elements may take control of Afghanistan, putting Iranian security at risk (p. 12). And Pakistan and India both compete to ensure that the Afghan regime in power is friendly to their interests (pp. 26, 29). Although the countries across Asia do not agree on how to secure Afghanistan against threats, unanimous agreement exists on the fact that a stable Afghanistan is critical to their own security interests. The U.S. presence has led both the Central Asian states and their neighbors to ponder how long the United States plans to keep troops in the region. U.S. intentions in the region have been interpreted in various ways. Both China and Iran are apprehensive that U.S. military presence and security interests in the area have the dual purpose of containment (pp. 3, 9–10, 11–12, 16). Conversely, Afghanistan would like to see a continued strong role for the United States in combating militancy and fostering stability (p. 22), and Pakistan and India see the potential for security cooperation with the United States in the region (pp. 27, 34). Despite the divergent perspectives of their Asian neighbors, the Central Asian states continue to see a role for the United States in promoting stability in the region.

Afghan Stability Solves Middle East Instability

Stability in Afghanistan is critical to Middle East stability.

Lieven 7(Anatol Senior Research Fellow, New America Foundation “Middle East Policy Council”)AQB

So looking at the inevitable consequences of American withdrawal, the situation after America does withdraw, what should we be concerned with most critically? Well, the first is something which is too often not talked about in the context of the Middle East, and that is of course Afghanistan. De facto defeat in Iraq will be bad enough. De facto defeat in Afghanistan would be a catastrophic humiliation for the United States, and would in effect mark defeat in the war on terror as a whole. Now by defeat in Afghanistan I don't mean that the Taliban can actually chase us out like Vietnam in '75. But that we also get into a situation where America, and Britain for that matter, and whoever remains there, which won't be very many allies, I think, are suffering a continual stream of heavy casualties with no prospect of actually creating a successful, halfway successful and stable Afghan state. Now this fits into the Middle East not just because American strategy as a whole in the war on terror, but also because Iran is absolutely critical to the stabilization, the development of Afghanistan. And not just that, but if in the future we ever face the situation in which we are going to withdraw from Afghanistan as well, well then, we go back to the situation before 9/11 in which Iran and Russia were critical to keeping the Northern Alliance going against the prospect of the Taliban conquering the whole country.

Afghan Stability Solves Pakistan Instability

Afghanistan holds strong political, economic and ethnic ties to Pakistan – if Afghanistan collapses so does Pakistan.

**Rhinefield 6**(Jeffrey, Lieutenant, United States Navy National Security Affairs “IMPLICATIONS OF SOCIETAL FRAGMENTATION FOR STATE FORMATION: CAN DEMOCRACY SUCCEED IN AFGHANISTAN?” Pg 86-87)AQB

Like Iran, Pakistan shares a long historical and strong ethnic bond with Afghanistan. More than any other state in the region, the stability and success of Afghanistan is extremely crucial to Pakistan and its national security. These tight bonds create the conditions, unlike any other state in the region, where Afghanistan’s success has a direct impact on Pakistan on many different social and political levels.248 First and foremost, Pakistan’s northern frontier states are inhabited by Pashtuns tribes and clans that share a strong ethnic bond with their Afghan relatives; in some case tribes literally live on both sides of the border of both states and don’t recognize either state’s legitimate rule over them. If Afghanistan fails as a state or is drawn into open civil war, this could have a far reaching negative effect within Pakistan’s borders. As goes the fate of Afghanistan’s Pashtuns, so does that of Pakistan’s Pashtuns. Economically, a sound and stable Afghanistan would be very beneficial to Pakistan as it tries to increase its trade with Central Asia and turn itself into a conduit of natural resources, flowing from the region to the remainder of the globe. A strong Afghan government could “enable Pakistan to secure access to the Central Asian Republics with which they have no common border.” 249 Peimani further writes that “any amount of Central Asian trade conducted via the Pakistani route would be a welcoming economic activity for the Pakistanis because it would provide income in transit fees and generate long term employment.”250 The failed attempts, under the Taliban rule, to secure passage for a pipeline from Central Asia to Pakistan that would transport valuable natural resources, has not been forgotten by the Pakistanis who wish, more than anything, to have an Afghan government that is able to negotiate such deals and provide security for any future pipeline that might be built.

Afghan instability leads to Pakistan economic and political instability

BBC 9 [September 1, Lexis]

Bukhari asks Masood: "If a crisis happens in Kabul, what should we do in terms of steps forward other than what we have done so far? Masood: "We should follow in letter and spirit what we have been saying, that we are not interested in any one individual or party; we are interested in the stability of Afghanistan, because Afghanistan's stability is far more important than beating any individual or group. The whole geo-strategic importance of Pakistan depends on the stability of Afghanistan. On one side, we have India blocking us because of our relationship with them. One the other side, if there is instability in Afghanistan, then Pakistan truly becomes landlocked in the political and economic sense."

Collapse of Afghanistan government collapses Pakistan sparking regional war

Watt and Temko 7 [Nicholas and Ned, Political Editor and Chief Political Correspondent, July 15, The Guardian UK, http://observer.guardian.co.uk/world/story/0,,2126817,00.html]

Britain's most senior generals have issued a blunt warning to Downing Street that the military campaign in Afghanistan is facing a catastrophic failure, a development that could lead to an Islamist government seizing power in neighbouring Pakistan. Amid fears that London and Washington are taking their eye off Afghanistan as they grapple with Iraq, the generals have told Number 10 that the collapse of the government in Afghanistan, headed by Hamid Karzai, would present a grave threat to the security of Britain. Lord Inge, the former chief of the defence staff, highlighted their fears in public last week when he warned of a 'strategic failure' in Afghanistan. The Observer understands that Inge was speaking with the direct authority of the general staff when he made an intervention in a House of Lords debate. 'The situation in Afghanistan is much worse than many people recognise,' Inge told peers. 'We need to face up to that issue, the consequence of strategic failure in Afghanistan and what that would mean for Nato... We need to recognise that the situation - in my view, and I have recently been in Afghanistan - is much, much more serious than people want to recognise.' Inge's remarks reflect the fears of serving generals that the government is so overwhelmed by Iraq that it is in danger of losing sight of the threat of failure in Afghanistan. One source, who is familiar with the fears of the senior officers, told The Observer: 'If you talk privately to the generals they are very very worried. You heard it in Inge's speech. Inge said we are failing and remember Inge speaks for the generals.' Inge made a point in the Lords of endorsing a speech by Lord Ashdown, the former Liberal Democrat leader, who painted a bleak picture during the debate. Ashdown told The Observer that Afghanistan presented a graver threat than Iraq. 'The consequences of failure in Afghanistan are far greater than in Iraq,' he said. 'If we fail in Afghanistan then Pakistan goes down. The security problems for Britain would be massively multiplied. I think you could not then stop a widening regional war that would start off in warlordism but it would become essentially a war in the end between Sunni and Shia right across the Middle East.'

Afghan Stability Solves Indo-Pak War

Stability in Afghanistan prevents conflict between India and Pakistan.

**Rhinefield 6**(Jeffrey, Lieutenant, United States Navy National Security Affairs “IMPLICATIONS OF SOCIETAL FRAGMENTATION FOR STATE FORMATION: CAN DEMOCRACY SUCCEED IN AFGHANISTAN?” Pg 87-88)AQB

India, unlike Pakistan, lacks a common border with Afghanistan, as well as lacks any significant ethnic ties with that nation-state. However, due to Pakistan’s role in Afghanistan and the region, India clearly has a strong interest in the outcome of the political process occurring in Afghanistan today. India wishes for a strong independent Afghanistan that will rely less on Pakistani support and will not allow Pakistan to use Afghanistan as a source of economic and political strength.251 A weak or unstable Afghanistan would allow Pakistan to gain greater access to Afghanistan, as it did during the Taliban regime, and possibly open up Central Asia to direct Pakistani influence, which India would like to avoid at all costs. In addition, failure in Afghanistan can create numerous issues for India’s close friends, Russia and Iran, who would fair poorly due to a failed Afghan state.252 India depends on Russia and Iran, both on the economic front as well as the political one, and any issue that might cause instability in these two states would have a direct impact on India, both on the economic and political realm. A successful Afghan government means that both Iran and Russia will be able to use Afghanistan as a part of a transportation corridor for the flow of natural resources and products which would help decrease the instability of the region. A strong and successful Afghan government will mean Pakistan will have less influence in the region and will also open up another regional actor for India to trade with and establish political ties. So far, the current Afghan government has shown its willingness to have close relations with India and this trend, more than likely, would seem to continue if the current government is successful in the near future.

Afghan Stability Solves Russian Instability

Stability in Afghanistan helps foster stability in Russia,

**Rhinefield 6**(Jeffrey, Lieutenant, United States Navy M.A. in National Security Affairs “IMPLICATIONS OF SOCIETAL FRAGMENTATION FOR STATE FORMATION: CAN DEMOCRACY SUCCEED IN AFGHANISTAN?” Pg 88-89)AQB

Like India, which does not share a common border with Afghanistan, Russia falls into that same category. However, unlike India, Russia maintains strong ties within the region through the Central Asian Republics which allows Russia direct access to natural resources in the region. For Russia, a failed Afghan state would mean the possible spread of this instability into Central Asia and the possibility that this instability would continue into Russia itself.253 Facing the daunting challenges in Chechnya and the Caucasus, the Russian government would welcome any indications of stability from Central Asia and try to prevent any situation that would allow the spread of such “chaos” to other parts of the region it sees as vital for its national security. Historically, “as a by product of any prolonged period of instability and lawlessness in Afghanistan, Afghan based international drug-trafficking could also become a major source of concern for Russia, both for its expanding health hazards and also for its contribution to criminal activities.”254 A concern has been the growth of the drug trade in the region. Of the current six routes that are used by the international drug-trafficking cartels to transport narcotics from this region, four pass directly through Central Asia and Russia as it goes onto Europe and the United States.255 Russia needs a strong Afghan government that would be able to stop the production of illegal narcotics and provide security along its borders in order to reduce the amount of drugs that are transiting the region. A weak Afghan government could be detrimental for Russia and its interests in Central Asia.

Afghan Stability Solves China Instability

Afghan collapse fosters anti-regime groups in china and risks political instability.

**Rhinefield 6**(Jeffrey, Lieutenant, United States Navy M.A. in National Security Affairs “IMPLICATIONS OF SOCIETAL FRAGMENTATION FOR STATE FORMATION: CAN DEMOCRACY SUCCEED IN AFGHANISTAN?” Pg 83-84)AQB

Of all the regional actors in Southwest Asia, China has the least in shared historical commonality with Afghanistan in regards to both politics and ethnicity. China will not benefit from a failed Afghan state or an Afghanistan that might revert back into civil war. Peimani writes that “what has created a stake for the Chinese in Afghanistan has been its potential to become a source of a threat to their stability and national security.”235 These threats can be defined as a fear that Afghanistan would turn into a hostile territory from which anti-Chinese government groups could launch military and political attacks on the regime and second, political developments in Afghanistan, by themselves, could have a negative effect on China’s own internal stability.236 An Afghanistan that is not able to establish control within its borders and territory, as was the case during the civil war years and during the rule of the Taliban, can help create the political vacuum in which there is a potential for the creation of safe havens for organizations that can become a direct threat to China and its rule of its western provinces; provinces which have a substantial amount of Muslims living within their boundaries. For years, China has had a strong concern in the export of fundamentalism and political extremism to these areas from outside the state. Simply put, China must ensure that Afghanistan will not become a hostile territory housing anti-Chinese government groups, today and in the future.237 Like many other regional actors, China is currently progressing towards creating a large economic empire for itself that can globally compete with states like the United States and Japan, while at the same time trying to implement new political reforms that would allow for the economic boom that is occurring domestically. For this reason, “China would wish to avoid Afghanistan becoming a military threat because China requires a long period of time of peace to continue to the process of economic and social transformation.”238 An Afghanistan that might become a failed state creates a great hurdle that China must pass while trying to gain access to Central Asian oil and gas fields, as well as access to the natural resources of the Middle East.

Afghan Stability Solves Terrorism

Afghan stability allows the US to maintain a foothold in the region and deter future growth of terrorist organizations.

**Rhinefield 6**(Jeffrey, Lieutenant, United States Navy M.A. in National Security Affairs “IMPLICATIONS OF SOCIETAL FRAGMENTATION FOR STATE FORMATION: CAN DEMOCRACY SUCCEED IN AFGHANISTAN?” Pg 89-90)AQB

Close ties with Afghanistan also allows the United States to maintain a foothold in a region it historically has not had direct access to. Afghanistan allows the United States to contain the nuclear powers in the region, mainly India, Pakistan, China, and possibly Iran, in the future.260 In addition, the Global War on Terror and the ability of American forces to be stationed in friendly Afghanistan has allowed the United States to contain Russia in the region and increase its influence over the Central Asian Republics.261 A successful Afghan government is imperative for the United States in order to maintain its presence in the region. A democratic Afghanistan can be an example for the Iranian people, as well as the people of Iraq, who are undergoing the same struggle in facing ethnic and religious differences in hopes of creating a democratic and all encompassing government. A failed Afghan government that slips back into lawlessness would mean the United States would have to increase its presence in the region and double its efforts in trying to stop the creation of new and more dangerous anti-Western and anti-American terrorist organizations. More than any other country involved in the region, the United States needs Afghanistan to succeed in its efforts to form a cohesive and strong central government that would allow for the full participation of the Afghan people in the government that would allow for the full participation of the Afghan people in the political process, as well as be able to maintain control over the war-torn state.

Afghan Instability Solves Central Asia War

Afghan stability key to deterring Central Asian conflict

Weinbaum 6 [Marvin, June, Scholar-in-Residence, Middle East Institute http://www.usip.org/resources/afghanistan-and-its-neighbors-ever-dangerous-neighborhood]

The study posits that over much of the last four years Afghanistan's neighbors have assessed that support for a stable, independent, and economically strengthening Afghan state is preferable to any achievable alternatives. None have directly opposed the internationally approved Hamid Karzai as president or seriously tried to manipulate Afghan domestic politics. All have pledged, moreover, some measure of development assistance. Undoubtedly, the presence of foreign military forces and international attention has contributed to their restrained policies. The strategic approaches to Afghanistan by its neighbors are, however, always subject to readjustment. No regional state is prepared to allow another to gain a preponderance of influence in Afghanistan. Moreover, each retains links to client networks that are capable of fractionalizing and incapacitating an emerging Afghanistan. States in the neighborhood may well sponsor destabilizing forces in the event that Kabul governments fail over time to extend their authority and tangibly improve people's lives, or should Afghanistan's international benefactors lose their patience and interest. More immediately, as described below, political currents in several regional countries may be overtaking the economic forces on which more optimistic projections for regional cooperation have been based. Poorly considered policies by international aid givers and the Kabul government have in some cases helped to increase suspicions and tensions with neighbors.

Afghan Instability Turns Terrorism/Nuclear War/US Heg

Afghanistan instability leads to terrorism, nuclear attacks and loss of US leadership

Engelhardt 9 [Tom, Founder of the American Empire Project , October 4, Asian Times, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/South\_Asia/KK04Df01.html]

Now, Afghanistan has become the first domino of our era, and the rest of the falling dominos in the 21st century are, of course, the terrorist attacks to come, once an emboldened al-Qaeda has its "safe haven" and its triumph in the backlands of that country. In other words, first Afghanistan, then Pakistan, then a mushroom cloud over an American city. In both the Vietnam era and today, Washington has also been mesmerized by that supposedly key currency of international stature, "credibility".

Afghan Instability Turns Iranian Nuclearization

Continued Afghan instability prompts Iranian nuclearization

Foer 4 [Frank, Senior Editor of the New York Times December 14, The Bellow http://bellows.blogspot.com/2004\_12\_12\_archive.html]

There are several points worth making on the Iranian situation. First, wouldn't it have been nice if we'd paid some attention to this crisis in the making? Second, trouble in Iran is collateral damage in the continuing Iraq insurgency (and in continuing Afghanistan instability). How much stronger would our position be if we'd taken Iraq with appropriate strength and quickly pacified the country. With decisive victories in Iraq and Afghanistan we have Iran surrounded, both by democracies and by victorious troops. Instead, Iran has the option of assisting the insurgents, nickel and diming our troops to death, and diminishing everyday the will of Americans to take on another military venture should one prove desirable but not absolutely necessary. What do we do? Having put ourselves in this situation, I think the best solution is diplomatic. Not only is invading off the table, but from the sound of things a tactical strike against Iran's nuclear facilities would also have more costs than benefits. It seems to me we should work with Europe, and perhaps try to win assistance from Russia or China, to stall Iran's nuclear development as long as possible, and shine an international light on opposition crackdowns. In the meantime, we need to throw everything we have into establishing safe, prosperous, and secure nations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The longer a power vacuum persists in those regions, and the stronger Iran is allowed to become, the more we invite Iran to directly assert its influence, a move that could have catastrophic effects.

Afghan Instability Turns Local Violence

Afghan instability causes continued fighting

Campion-Smith 7 [Bruce, Staff Writer, July 16, Toronto Star, Lexis]

But he stresses Afghanistan's stability also depends on building up its institutions and economy to offer opportunities to youth now falling under the sway of insurgents. "The whole issue is jobs ... You've got a bunch of young kids who will accept $10 a day to pick up a weapon and come and shoot at us."

Afghan Instability Turns Women

Afgan instability prompts fundamentalist rule- damning female rights.

Webber 3 [Kathryn J. J.D. Candidate, 1998, University of Pennsylvania Law School; B.A., Winter, University of Pennsylvania Journal of International Economic Law, 24 U. Pa. J. Int'l Econ. L. 959, Lexis]

On September 27, 1996, the Taliban, a militant Islamic group, seized control of Afghanistan's capital. [n2](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.uhd.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1278531941247&returnToKey=20_T9699889770&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.85281.6893367444" \l "n2) Comprised of Islamic clerics and students, [n3](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.uhd.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1278531941247&returnToKey=20_T9699889770&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.85281.6893367444" \l "n3) the Taliban established a new fundamentalist Islamic government over two-thirds of Afghanistan. [n4](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.uhd.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1278531941247&returnToKey=20_T9699889770&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.85281.6893367444" \l "n4) Initially, the Afghan population welcomed the Taliban regime, hoping the new government would bring peace [n5](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.uhd.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1278531941247&returnToKey=20_T9699889770&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.85281.6893367444" \l "n5) to this war-torn area. [n6](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.uhd.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1278531941247&returnToKey=20_T9699889770&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.85281.6893367444" \l "n6) The fundamentalist regime, however, would soon bring drastic change to the Afghan society and economy. [n7](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.uhd.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1278531941247&returnToKey=20_T9699889770&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.85281.6893367444" \l "n7) This Comment examines the  [\*961]  Taliban's economic effects on women. Women particularly face a darker side of Taliban rule. For example, one of the Taliban's first actions was to ban women from all employment. [n8](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.uhd.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1278531941247&returnToKey=20_T9699889770&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.85281.6893367444" \l "n8) Moreover, two women were beaten in the street for not wearing proper Islamic dress. [n9](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.uhd.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1278531941247&returnToKey=20_T9699889770&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.85281.6893367444" \l "n9) Understanding the full effect of Taliban's rule on women, however, requires a deeper analysis than a mere listing of current abuses. It requires an examination of Islamic law. The Taliban government has promised that the laws of Islam will be the laws of the state. [n10](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.uhd.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1278531941247&returnToKey=20_T9699889770&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.85281.6893367444" \l "n10) Islamic law, or Shari'a, affects  [\*962]  women in unique ways. The Shari'a has detailed rules concerning women's inheritance rights, dower rights, and marriage duties. These rules have specific economic consequences for Afghan women. Therefore, to understand the economic effects of the Taliban government on women, one must understand the economic effects of Islamic law.

Afghan Instability Turns Terrorism/Opium/Warlords

Afghan instability causes renewed opium trade, terrorism and warlord resurgence

The Guardian 2 [February 19, "Afghan staying power: Karzai needs friends he can count on", The Guardian Newspapers, Lexis]

Amid all this uncertainty and strife, on-off American bombing raids and ground operations persist in the forlorn hope of snaring, even now, the many se nior al-Qaida and Taliban leaders who escaped the Pentagon's dragnet. Such officially sanctioned violence, while too frequently victimising civilian innocents, delays efforts to turn the page on two decades of warfare and start afresh. The longer the Karzai administration fails to take charge and impose order, and the longer Afghanistan remains the US military's biggest, best shooting range and hunting ground, the smaller the chances that the Bonn process can succeed. Nobody could reasonably have expected an Afghan restoration to be either quick or problem-free. But current trends point to two conclusions. One is that Mr Karzai is right to ask the US to send its troops to join Britain in an expanded stabilisation force and that President George Bush is woefully wrong to refuse him. The second is that if security continues to deteriorate, Mr Karzai will ineluctably lose credibility, then control. His downfall will trigger the collapse of most if not all the grand international rehabilitation schemes. With the returning, resurgent warlords, proxy forces and opium barons will come fanatics, ideologues and terrorists. And then, for want of staying power and a bit of nous, it really could be back to square one.

Afghan Instability Turns Biodiversity

Afghan stability sustains biodiversity

WCS 7 [Wildlife Conservation Society, http://www.wcs.org/internationa l/Asia/afghanistan]

A four-year drought has compounded the infrastructural damage caused by fighting, emptying rivers and irrigation canals. With the recently installed government of President Hamid Karzai still exerting only very limited central authority, the hunting of endangered species and widespread smuggling of rare animals that flourished during the chaos of fighting continues unabated. As for the trees, "after very few years the forest will all be gone," says Adil. In their place, the nearly barren land is seeded with mines and unexploded bombs.

Afghan Instability Turns Chinese Stability

Afghan instability threatens Chinese stability

Bhadrakumar 3/30 [M K, Indian *Ambassador to* Soviet Union, South Korea, Sri Lanka, Germany, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Uzbekistan, Kuwait and Turkey*,* 2010, Asian Times, http://inthesenewtimes.com/2010/03/30/karzais-china-iran-dalliance-riles-obama/] KLS

The chaos caused by the war in Afghanistan is threatening security in China’s northwestern region. A weak government in Kabul could mean a poorly manned border, which in turn would facilitate drug trafficking and arms smuggling and allow “East Turkmenistan” separatists to seek shelter in Afghanistan after causing trouble in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region.

\*\*\*IRAQ/CENTRAL ASIA\*\*\*

Iraq Instability Turns Middle East Stability

Instability in Iraq spills over into the entire region

Pollack 4 [Kenneth M, Sr. Fellow & Director of Research @ Saban Center for Middle East Policy, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Files/rc/papers/2004/01iraq\_pollack/20040107.pdf,]

Various political, military, and economic factors make it unlikely that Washington will simply maintain its current economic and military commitments to Iraq indefinitely, however. The key question is whether the Bush Administration adapts its policy to the needs of reconstruction or instead opts to phase out its engagement in Iraq. There is enough good in Iraq and enough positive developments there that if the United States and its Coalition allies are willing to address the challenges listed above, there is every reason to believe that Iraq could be a stable, prosperous, and pluralist society within a period of 5–15 years. In contrast, there is great danger for the United States in disengaging from Iraq. Without a strong American role, at least behind the scenes, the negative forces in the country would almost certainly produce Lebanon-like chaos and civil war that would quickly spill across Iraq’s borders and destabilize politically and economically fragile neighbors such as Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Iran, and Syria, and possibly Turkey and Kuwait as well.

Iraq Instability Turns Turkish Relations

Iraqi Instability destroys US relations with Turkey

**Abramowitz 7** (Morton, senior fellow at The Century Foundation July 24, “How to Save Iraqi Kurdistan from Itself,” Foreign Policy)AQB

With Gaza under the sway of Hamas, Lebanon paralyzed, and Iraq near collapse, the Middle East has never looked more perilous. But if the United States doesn't move to defuse the dangerous situation in Iraqi Kurdistan fast, Washington could find itself with yet another ticking time bomb. As if disaster in Baghdad were not enough, Washington has largely stood by as Iraq's Kurds have become embroiled in a fierce dispute with Turkey that threatens to explode into violence, destabilize northern Iraq, and further embitter relations between the United States and Turkey, a vital strategic ally for 60 years. With parliamentary elections out of the way, Turkey may well invade northern Iraq, a move that—to put it mildly—would complicate an already complicated situation in the Middle East. There is still time for the United States to prevent such a catastrophe, but this season's bloody offensive by the Kurdistan Workers' Party, or PKK, a separatist guerrilla group labeled a terrorist organization by the United States, has brought tensions to a near-boiling point. Turks are enraged that PKK forces can launch bombing attacks in Turkey and then find safety and sympathy in the mountains of Iraqi Kurdistan. The Turkish military increasingly warns that it needs to attack these safe havens, and it has massed tens of thousands of troops at the border. Turkish concerns over northern Iraq, of course, run deeper than the PKK. The mostly autonomous Kurdish entity next door is the threat to Turkey's territorial integrity that its leaders long feared—potentially deepening Kurdish nationalism among its 12 to 15 million-strong Kurdish minority. And then there's Kirkuk, which looms as a litmus test of Kurdish intentions. The Kurdish Regional Government is encouraging Kurds to migrate to this historically mixed city, seeking to hold a referendum by year's end to make the area part of Iraqi Kurdistan. But Kurdish absorption of oil-rich Kirkuk would only vindicate Turkish (and Arab) suspicions that the Kurds are plotting for independence—long a red line for all Turkish governments.

Iraq Instability Turns Economy

Iraqi instability kills the global economy

Ferguson 6 [Niall, Professor of History at Harvard University, http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2006/09/the\_next\_war\_of\_the\_world.html, ]

What makes the escalating civil war in Iraq so disturbing is that it has the potential to spill over into neighboring countries. The Iranian government is already taking more than a casual interest in the politics of post-Saddam Iraq. And yet Iran, with its Sunni and Kurdish minorities, is no more homogeneous than Iraq. Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Syria cannot be expected to look on insouciantly if the Sunni minority in central Iraq begins to lose out to what may seem to be an Iranian-backed tyranny of the majority. The recent history of Lebanon offers a reminder that in the Middle East there is no such thing as a contained civil war. Neighbors are always likely to take an unhealthy interest in any country with fissiparous tendencies. The obvious conclusion is that a new "war of the world" may already be brewing in a region that, incredible though it may seem, has yet to sate its appetite for violence. And the ramifications of such a Middle Eastern conflagration would be truly global. Economically, the world would have to contend with oil at above $100 a barrel. Politically, those countries in western Europe with substantial Muslim populations might also find themselves affected as sectarian tensions radiated outward. Meanwhile, the ethnic war between Jews and Arabs in Israel, the Gaza Strip, and the West Bank shows no sign of abating. Is it credible that the United States will remain unscathed if the Middle East erupts?

Iraq Instability Turns Terrorism

Iraqi instability breeds terrorism.

Xinhua News Agency 9(“Obama underlines U.S.-Turkish cooperation on Iraqi stability, anti-terrorism, Mideast peace” April 7)AQB

ANKARA, April 6 (Xinhua) -- Visiting U.S. President Barack Obama stressed on Monday the U.S. readiness to work with Turkey to secure Iraq's stability, fight terrorism and push for Middle East peace process. "Both Turkey and the United States support a secure and united Iraq that does not serve as a safe-haven for terrorists," Obama said when addressing the Turkish parliament on his first state visit to the Muslim country, the last leg of his maiden European trip. Admitting that the U.S.-led Iraqi war was controversial, Obama said it is time to come together to "end this war responsibly." He said the U.S. troops in Iraq will withdraw by the end of August next year, adding that the United States "will work with Iraq, Turkey, and all of Iraq's neighbors to forge a new dialogue that reconciles differences and advances our common security." Obama termed terrorism as a common threat to Iraq, Turkey and the United States, saying there is no excuse for terror against any nation. He pledged to provide continued support to Turkey against the terrorist activities of the outlawed Kurdish Workers' Party (PKK),adding his hope for increasing cooperation between Turkey, the Iraqi government and Iraq's Kurdish leaders, and more Turkish efforts to promote education and opportunity for Turkey's Kurds.

Iraq Instability Turns Civil War

Instability in Iraq causes Kurdish civil war.

Butters and Arbil 7 (Andrew, American journalist based in the Middle East; and Lee, degrees in history from Brown and Cambridge universities Apr. 12, 2007 “Kurdistan: Iraq's Next Battleground?”)AQB

Iraqi Kurds have been in control of their region since 1991, when, with the help of the U.S.-enforced no-fly zone, they drove Saddam's forces out of northern Iraq. But now, four years after the liberation of the rest of the country, Kurdish Iraq is undergoing an identity crisis. On the one hand, it is a rare success story in the Middle East: a stable territory run by a secular leadership committed to economic and political reform and sitting on a huge pool of oil. On the other hand, it is tiny and landlocked, uncomfortably attached to a war-ravaged nation and surrounded by unfriendly neighbors. Despite the region's outward signs of tranquillity, the fate of Kurdistan--whether it will continue as an inspiring example of what the rest of Iraq could look like or become engulfed by the country's violence--remains unresolved, dependent as much on what happens to the barely functioning Iraqi state as on the Kurds. For the Bush Administration, the central question is how long the Kurds can be persuaded to remain part of a united Iraq. The overwhelming majority of Kurds would like to break free of Iraq and form an independent nation. So far, Kurdish leaders have been a constructive force in holding Iraq together, helping to write and adopt a national constitution that, although it gave great powers to the regions, has kept Iraq intact as a federal state. Kurds are serving at the highest levels of the Iraqi government, including as President, Foreign Minister and Deputy Prime Minister. But it's doubtful that spirit of cooperation will last. The further that Iraq slides into civil war, the more the Kurds will want to insulate themselves from it, by carving out more political and economic autonomy. Even if they stop short of outright secession, the Kurds could still unleash new conflicts in Iraq if their impatience with the fecklessness of the Baghdad government prompts them to take action on their own. The most explosive flashpoint is Kirkuk, the disputed oil-rich city that the Kurds lay claim to. As Iraq's Kurdish President, Massoud Barzani, said on March 22 during the farewell visit of departing U.S. Ambassador Zalmay Khalilzad, "Our patience is not unlimited." So what happens to Iraq when it runs out?

Iraq Instability Turns Genocide

Iraqi instability leads to militant groups targeting and violently killing groups of people.

Maples 6 (Lieutenant General Michael U.S. Army Director, Defense Intelligence Agency “The Current Situation in Iraq and Afghanistan”)AQB

The conflict is unquestionably complex and difficult. The fight to define post-Saddam Iraq has been primarily an intra-Arab struggle to determine how power and authority will be distributed. Iraqi nationalists, ex-Baathists, former military, angry Sunni, Jihadists, foreign fighters, and al Qaida provide an overlapping, complex and multi-polar Sunni insurgent and terrorist environment. Shia militias and Shia militants, some Kurdish Peshmerga, and extensive criminal activity further contribute to violence, instability, and insecurity. The U.S. presence obscured the true nature of this fight between and among competing groups for power as observers focused on insurgent attacks and rhetoric directed at the United States. Today, DIA assesses the conditions for the further deterioration of security and instability exists within this ongoing, violent struggle for power. Although a significant breakdown of central authority has not occurred, Iraq has moved closer to this possibility primarily because of weak governance, increasing security challenges, and no agreement on a national compact. The conflict has changed in character, scope, and dynamics and is increasingly a sectarian struggle for power and the right to define Iraq’s future identity. Overall attacks averaged approximately 180 per day in October 2006, up from approximately 170 the previous month, and 70 in January 2006. Daily average of attacks against Iraqi Security Forces in October more than doubled the number reported in January, approximately 30 compared to 13. Daily average of attacks on civilians in October was four times higher than reported in January, approximately 40 compared to 10. The perception of unchecked violence is creating an atmosphere of fear and hardening sectarianism which is empowering militias and vigilante groups, hastening middle-class exodus, and shaking confidence in government and security forces. Sectarian violence, a weak central government, problems in basic services, and high unemployment are causing more Iraqis to turn to sectarian groups, militias, and insurgents for basic needs, imperiling Iraqi unity.

Iraq Instability Turns Human Rights

An unstable Iraq would foster a humanitarian crisis.

Carroll 8(Conn Assistant Director for The Heritage Foundation's Strategic Communications, “Morning Bell: Iraqi Stability Is in the U.S. Interest” March 31 The Heritage Foundation)AQB

The premature British withdrawal from Basra allowed militias to flourish. Basra is one part of Iraq the surge has never been tried. Absent a strong stabilizing force, like the U.S. troops in Baghdad, rival militias and criminal gangs have filled the security vacuum. While the long-term presence of American combat troops is not in the interests of the United States or the Iraqi government, helping the Iraqis get on the road to peace and stability is clearly in the U.S. interest. The eruption of a full-blown civil war in Iraq and a wide-spread humanitarian crisis could further destabilize the region. Abandoning the people of Iraq would enable Iran’s regional expansion and al Qaeda’s effort to establish a sanctuary in the heart of the Middle East. Turning its back on Iraq would lead America’s other friends and allies, including those trying to finish off al-Qaeda in Afghanistan and Pakistan, to question America’s commitment and resolve. There is no way to achieve these important goals without patiently maintaining a strong American military presence on the ground for at least several years to come.

Iraq Instability Solves Regional Stability

Stability in Iraq helps foster peace and stability in the Middle East.

Carafano and Phillips 8(James Ph.D., is Assistant Director of the Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for International Studies and James Senior Research Fellow for Middle Eastern Affairs in the Allison Center at The Heritage Foundation, “Iraq: Pause in Troop Drawdown Makes Sense” March 28 The Heritage Foundation)AQB

Winning in Iraq and helping the Iraqis get on the road to peace and stability is clearly in America's interest. The eruption of a full-blown civil war in Iraq and a wide-spread humanitarian crisis could further destabilize the region. Abandoning the people of Iraq would enable Iran's regional expansion and al-Qaeda's effort to establish a sanctuary in the heart of the Middle East. Turning its back on Iraq would lead America's other friends and allies, including those trying to finish-off al-Qaeda in Afghanistan and Pakistan, to question American commitment and resolve. Finally, a stable and prosperous Iraq would do much to stimulate progress throughout the region or at least help to prevent it from becoming even more unstable. There is no way to achieve these important goals without patiently maintaining a strong American military presence on the ground for at least several years to come. The Bush Administration and Congress must give the commander on the ground the resources to get the job done. Both should weigh carefully the recommendations of General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker when they testify before Congress next month.

Iraq stability prevents the Taliban from destabilizing the region.

The Jordan Times 6/28/10(“Jordanian king holds talks with Iraqi president, US committee” Lexis)AQB

Amman, 28 June: His Majesty King Abdallah on Sunday [27 June] held talks with Iraq's President Jalal Talabani, which focused on bilateral ties and current regional issues. The two leaders stressed their keenness to boost bilateral relations in all fields, particularly in the economic and commercial fields to serve the interests of the two countries, a Royal Court statement said. During a one-on-one meeting followed by another meeting attended by senior officials from both countries, King Abdullah reiterated Jordan's support for Iraq's efforts in bringing about stability and security in the eastern neighbour, which, he said, is a main pillar of the region's stability and security. King Abdullah and Talabani stressed the need to enforce joint Arab cooperation and to achieve a unified stance to face current issues and challenges. Talks, which continued over a lunch banquet, also covered the latest developments in the region and issues of mutual concern, the statement said. Talabani, who concluded his brief visit to the Kingdom Sunday, was seen off at the airport by Foreign Minister Nasser Judeh. Also yesterday, King Abdullah met with a delegation from the American Jewish Committee (AJC). Talks focused on efforts being exerted to achieve comprehensive and permanent peace in the region. The Monarch highlighted the importance of achieving progress in peace efforts and to end the Palestinian-Israeli conflict on the basis of a two-state solution and within comprehensive regional context. His Majesty noted that security and stability in the region will not be achieved unless a peace agreement is reached that guarantees the rights of all the parties. Prime Minister Samir Rifai and Judeh also discussed Mideast peace in separate meetings with the AJC delegates, whose organization supports the two-state solution.

Iraq Instability Turns Sunni-Shia Conflict

Iraq instability promotes Sunni-Shia violence and nuclear conflict in the Middle East

Williams and Simpson 9 [Dr. Paul, Professor Law and International Relations at American University, Matthew T, Peace Fellow with the Public International Law & Policy Group, 24 Am. U. Int'l L. Rev. 191, Lexis]

A look at the Sunni dominated areas suggests that ethno-sectarian division would only increase the dominance of Sunni Islamist extremist groups over the Sunni insurgents and average Iraqis. n118 If average Iraqi Sunnis are left without oil money (a foreseeable consequence of the ethno-sectarian division of Iraq), Arab Sunni [\*215] states like Egypt and Saudi Arabia, would likely feel the need to lend support, to help prevent Islamist extremists from taking over the Sunni area of Iraq. n119 Turning to the south, the creation of a nine-province Shi'a region would expose it to significant Iranian influence. n120 Although some Shi'a leaders may be receptive to Iranian influence, many other Shi'a are hostile to Iran as they view themselves as Arabs, not Persians, and maintain the allegiances that led them to fight with the regime of Saddam Hussein during the Iran-Iraq war. n121 In addition to the increased role Saudi Arabia may play in a Sunni region, the Saudis object strongly to the idea of a Shi'a region in the south. n122 Saudi Arabia's adherence to the "ultra-strict" Wahhabi Sunni school of Islam has led to strained relations with Shiite Iran and even its own Shi'a population. n123 Saudi Arabia thus has serious reservations about another Shi'a dominated region next door. n124 In the end, the ethno-sectarian division of Iraq could permeate throughout the Middle East and the Arab world, "creating a risk of local conflicts and the kind of religious tension that feeds Islamist extremism." n125 In the words of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad, "Iraq's disintegration will be a bomb that will blow up the Middle East." n126

Iraq instability fuels ethnic wars and marginalization- Sunni-Shia-Kurdish violence

Williams and Simpson 9 [Dr. Paul, Professor Law and International Relations at American University, Matthew T, Peace Fellow with the Public International Law & Policy Group, 24 Am. U. Int'l L. Rev. 191, Lexis]

The ethno-sectarian division of Iraq may condemn residual minorities to discrimination and second-class citizenship and possibly instigate violent instability. n103 One empirical work studied the relationship between ethnicity and political violence and concluded that the highest propensity for ethnic violence exists at extreme polarization; i.e. the highest risk zone for violent conflict exists "when an ethnic bloc may be sufficient in size to permanently exclude others from the exercises of power." n104 Robert Jervis has [\*213] also noted that in most modern civil conflicts both security and predatory motives exist. n105 The ethno-sectarian division of Iraq may thus exacerbate the predatory motives of majority populations against residual minorities. n106 If areas were formed around Shi'a, Sunni, and Kurdish populations, the minority populations located within those newly formed areas may have to conform to the ethnic and cultural persuasions of the area. The ethno-sectarian division of Iraq would prove even more problematic for nomadic minority groups or those dispersed across multiple areas. n107

Central Asian Instability Turns Nuclear War

Central Asian instability goes nuclear

Friedman and Winsbush 8 [Richard E. Professor of Jewish Studies at the University of Georgia S. Enders, Director of the Center for Future Security Strategies December 24, http://www.sam.gov.tr/perceptions/Volume1/March-May1996/CENTRALASIAANDTHEWEST.pdf]

Importantly, Central Asia is the only region in the world where the impact of five nuclear powers comes into play: Russia, China, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, and India. The West's interest in containing nuclear proliferation and in preventing military conflict between or among Central Asian actors is self-evident. With more independent actors and fewer restraints on independent action, Central Asia faces the prospect of greater political instability than at any time since the Soviet takeover. The interests and ambitions of most Asian states, and many Western ones, in some way meet in Central Asia.

\*\*\*INDO-PAK\*\*\*

Indo-Pak Stability Solves Econ

Stability in Southeast Asia is key to economic prosperity

Glardon 5 (Thomas L., Lt. Colonel for USAF, http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/ksil12.pdf) GAT

As well, stability in these two states will provide a basis for future stability in such neighboring states as Afghanistan, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Bhutan, and Bangladesh. In economic prosperity, India has the world’s 12th largest economy with a growth rate of 8% xli (compared to 3.6% for the U.S. in 2003xlii). As mentioned above, this growth is unequal across the country which fosters unrest due to perceived imbalanced 6 development (such as between the more developed South and the less-developed North and East). As a growing economic power, India will prove to be a major economic force in the future, as well as a regional power, if the development can be more equitably distributed. This profound growth provides substantial investment opportunities to the U.S. and a potentially powerful trading partner.

Indo-Pak War Turns Terror

Solving the Kashmir tension is crucial to winning the War on Terror

Koshy 9 (Nina, former Director of International Affairs, Mainstream Weekly, Vol 42, No 11, http://www.mainstreamweekly.net/article1199.html) GAT

THE war on terror has refashioned conflict situations in the region. Two of the most prominent conflict situations may be examined: Kashmir and Sri Lanka. M.K. Narayanan, currently the National Security Adviser, in an article written less than a month after the terror attacks in the USA (in Asian Age online) argued that there was “a connection between the September 11 attacks in the US” and “the ongoing conflict in Jammu and Kashmir”. He concluded that a war against terrorism must address the violence in Kashmir well as in Afghanistan. “Something drastic needs to be done to curb Islamist outfits currently engaged in cascading violence in J&K. ..The Alliance for the Battle Against Terrorism must gear itself to deal with a situation which is fraught with dangerous possibilities.” The dynamics of the Kashmir conflict underwent a drastic change since 9/11 due to dramatic changes wrought by the US war on terror in the region. Three competing perspectives emanated from Islamabad, New Delhi and Washington. Pakistan continued to describe the happenings in Kashmir as ‘liberation struggle’ and insisted Washington should solve the Kashmir problem so that Pakistan can fully participate in the war on terror. India’s support to the war on terror proceeded on the assumption that the US would have to accept that the happenings in Kashmir are due to ‘cross-border terrorism’. India thus tried to combine the issues of war on terror and Kashmir so as to draw the maximum benefit from the changed international opinion in favour of fighting terrorism lock, stock and barrel. India strongly challenged Pakistan’s credentials to be partner of the US in the war on terror and repeatedly urged on the US to include Kashmir in its war on terror. The US, which needed both Pakistan and India in the war on terror, did not do so. A recent statement by David Miliband, the British Foreign Secretary, gave rise to high level of moral indignation in New Delhi. He said in an article in The Guardian: “Although I understand the current difficulties, resolution of the dispute over Kashmir would help deny extremists in the region one of their main calls to arms.”. Actually this statement did not warrant the kind of reaction that came from New Delhi. It only reinforced the impression that when it comes to Kashmir, our rulers adopt a denial mode—that there is no dispute and that if at all there is any problem we know how to deal with it. Indian sensitivities on the Kashmir issue are understandable. India can legitimately take credit for the apparently new political climate in J&K. But to treat the Kashmir problem as solely or primarily due to “international terrorism” is to invite the kind of international intervention which India says it does not want. In spite of the present rupture in relationship between India and Pakistan, diplomacy and peace are the only options.

Terrorism would break out if there was conflict between India and Pakistan

Glardon 5 (Thomas L., Lt. Colonel for USAF, http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/ksil12.pdf) GAT

India and Pakistan suffer internal terrorism and harbor foreign terrorists. Internal terrorism provides more than just a destabilizing influence; it can spark war and threaten such distant nations as the U.S. The 2001 crisis between India and Pakistan began when radical Islamist terrorists (based out of Pakistan) attacked the Indian Parliament in New Delhi.xvi Of greater international threat, though, is the refuge that foreign terrorists find in the remoter areas of both states. The Maoists plaguing Nepal have found sanctuary across the Indian border.xvii In the 1980s, the Tamil Tigers attacking Sri Lanka found refuge and support in India. The greatest threat to the U.S. is the continued presence of the Al-Qaida in Pakistan, whose global activities threatens stability of all nations.xvii

Indo-Pak War Turns Prolif

Indo-Pak war deepens the arms race in Southeast Asia and allows prolif to spread globally

Glardon 5 (Thomas L., Lt. Colonel for USAF, http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/ksil12.pdf) GAT

Finally, nuclear arsenals have complicated relations between India and Pakistan by threatening to ignite an arms race by complicating minor conventional clashes and/or magnifying proliferation concerns. RAND suggests the 1999 crisis taught the belligerents the necessity for an arms race – Pakistan learned that it “may require the largest, most diversified, and most effective arsenal possible …” for early use in conventional crises xxi and India learned it must develop “rapid-response capabilities primarily for shoring up deterrence.”xxii This arms race destabilizes the region and threatens the world because the belligerents appear to view nuclear weapons as a viable alternative to continued conventional clashes. Should a crisis erupt, Pakistan’s conventional inferiority may lead to an escalation that will impact lives across South Asia, and the physical and economic well-being of the world.xxiii As well, the financial crises of Pakistan and the immaturity of both programs conspire to provide questionable security for the nuclear arsenals and a chance for nuclear mistakes. Cordesman states “in theory, such weapons are … under tight security … in practice, no one knows if the Pakistani assurances relating to such weapons are true.”xxiv The U.S. cannot be sure that nuclear technology will not proliferate across borders into such regions as Afghanistan, Iran, Burma … or even to non-state actors such as terrorists or international criminals. Indeed, the proliferation network of A.Q. Khan, former director of the Pakistani atomic research lab, apparently transferred technology to Iran, North Korea, and Libya, and belies such assurances.xxv Thus, these developments magnify the dangers of even minor border skirmishes. In the 2001 crisis, the U.S. launched a “frenzy of high-level activity of diplomatic activity to prevent war” even though observers have suggested the military posturing of both states were more for international attention than for war.xxvi Thus, the regional disputes over a small territory such as Kashmir now can hold the world hostage.

Indo-Pak War Turns China

Sino-Pak alliance ensures that the conflict would draw China in

Sud 8 (Hari, former intl. rel. manager, http://www.upiasia.com/Politics/2008/09/09/the\_china-pakistan\_alliance\_against\_india/2277/) GAT

With Pakistan’s military dictator General Pervez Musharraf gone, it is time to review China and Pakistan relations. In the past nine years during Musharraf’s rule, Pakistan built a very close relationship with China who provided Musharraf with strategic military support when he needed it most, including during the 1999 Kargil conflict with India. Although China did not approve of Musharraf’s military incursion in Kargil, they made it clear to India that Pakistan should not be touched should India follow its victory in Kargil with a military adventure of its own into Pakistan. Historically, China has been Pakistan’s strategic and military ally for the past 50 years. It was China who gave Pakistan the designs for a nuclear bomb in 1984 and then helped them build it. China also assisted Pakistan by providing missile technology via North Korea, Chinese-made fighter jets and specialized small arms. They also helped in the construction of the Gwadar port, a civilian nuclear reactor and have promised to build a large dam on the Indus River. China’s has two purposes behind its assistance to Pakistan. First, it takes Pakistan as a secure friend and ally in the Indian Ocean and second, they share a common interest to contain India. It is no secret that China showered Musharraf with military gifts, mostly Chinese copies of Russian military hardware. In the last ten years, China has stepped up its military presence in Tibet, primarily to contain India. Their aim is to capture as much of Indian Territory as possible, including the town of Tawang – the birthplace of the Dalai Lama – in case of renewed hostilities. A secondary purpose for this buildup is to help Pakistan in any future military conflict with India. In the last 15 years, Pakistani-trained terrorists have caused a reign of terror in Kashmir, killing and bombing Hindus and Muslims alike and damaging civilian property. However, India’s response has been hamstrung by a special situation: Pakistan became friends with the United States, under the pretext of containing the war on terror, and at the same time shared a cordial and friendly relationship with China for the sake of maintaining strategic balance. This has prevented India from punishing Pakistan for all of the bombings and terror activities. With the demise of the former Soviet Union, India has had no one to turn to for strategic support. India is aware of this special situation, which has done little to combat terrorist activities in Kashmir and the rest of India. To free up some military resources and unhinge the China-Pakistan alliance, India has, in last ten years, attempted to engage China in a serious dialogue on these issues, but to no avail. China demands the town of Tawang as a minimum price and it is uncertain whether China would cease its support for Pakistan if India were to concede it. How do China and Pakistan compliment each other’s activities in South Asia? For all of China’s support, Pakistan has returned the favor in kind. First, as stated above, Pakistan could not have built their atomic bomb from stolen centrifuge designs. Someone else had to help them convert the concentrated Uranium 235 into a bomb. China’s assistance was vital. Also, if the bomb could not be miniaturized and loaded into a missile, it would be useless; once again, the Chinese stepped in and persuaded North Korea to help Pakistan build these missiles. Second, the construction project of the Gwadar port was initiated by China. It wanted to monitor the movement of global oil supplies from the Persian Gulf and Pakistan provided this window to them. Soon, China will station their naval fleet at Gwadar, under one pretext or another, and start a cold war in the Indian Ocean. Gwadar is located on Pakistan’s coastline with the Arabian Sea, an area of no economic value whatsoever. The nearest population base is 400 miles away and another US$4 billion is needed to build the civil infrastructure to develop the port. So, the only benefit for Pakistan is that it would serve as another operational base for its navy in the event of any conflict with India. Third, China wanted to lay their hands on American military technology. Pakistan stepped in to provide China with F-16 parts for reverse engineering. China has also engineered copies of stolen hand-held Afghan-Soviet era antiaircraft missiles, thanks to Pakistan, which supplied them. An unexploded Tomahawk cruise missile, which was fired at an Al Qaeda base, under President Clinton’s orders after the 1998 Nairobi bombing, was handed over to the Chinese who have copied it. Thus, China has benefited immensely from its relationship with Pakistan. Strategically, both China and Pakistan are keeping an eye on India. Although China’s military is mostly focused on Taiwan and Russia, from Tibet, China is keeping an eye on India. Due to China’s military commitments elsewhere, it is impossible for China to fight a ground battle with India as it did in 1962. Besides, India has expanded its own military potential immensely and can counter any moves by China. China believes that a strong military thrust could bring its military close to the town of Tawang, which is only 20 miles from the border. But, in response, India could destroy the much-heralded Qinghai-Tibet railway. Its destruction is within India’s capability, since a large portion of the railway is on permafrost. This action would stop the Chinese dead in their tracks and would be a great loss of face for them. In return, China might target India’s economic lifelines. But the superior U.S. and Israeli military technology that India has may frustrate the Chinese efforts. Thus, Pakistan has become very important to China. As China amasses troops for action against India, it may be a cue for Pakistan to do the same. Joint military action between them is completely harmful to India’s interests. During the 1971 India-Pakistan war that led to the liberation of Bangladesh, President Nixon asked China to amass troops in Tibet along India’s border. But a Soviet warning to China stopped it from doing so. With the end of the Soviet Union, replaced by a new Russia with a mind of its own, it is difficult to predict the future with any certainty.

Indo-Pak War Turns China/Russia/Iran

Stable India and Pakistan key to keeping China, Russia and Iran in check

Glardon 5 (Thomas L., Lt. Colonel for USAF, http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/ksil12.pdf) GAT

In addition to resolving the above threats, the U.S. has an unprecedented opportunity to improve U.S. security and economic prosperity through improved relations with India and Pakistan. In security, a stable and friendly Pakistan and India will provide a counterbalance to the regional powers of China, Russia and Iran.

Indo-Pak War Turns Regional Stability

The internal structures of the countries means that any conflict in that area would spill out rapidly

Glardon 5 (Thomas L., Lt. Colonel for USAF, http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/ksil12.pdf) GAT

India and Pakistan suffer from internal unrest that inhibits internal stability and threatens civil war. Both states have multi-ethnic populations, many of which profess separatism and even contempt for their parent state.vi From Sikh unrest in the Punjabvii to the Assam, Nagaland, and Manipur independence movements viii to northern Maoist insurrections,ix India faces destabilizing conflict across its territories. Pakistan, too, faces internal unrest from separatists in such communities as the Sindh,x Pushtuns in western Pakistan, and radical Islamists in remote Waziristan.xi These internal conflicts threaten the internal stability of these states and, in the case of Pakistan, the stability of the regime. As well, the internal conflicts could potentially spill into other states in the region. For example, in the mid 1980s, India claimed Pakistan supported a Sikh Punjab uprising. This belief resulted in military operations along the border of Pakistan, drawing out the Pakistan forces in a face-off.xii Thus a civil conflict does not just threaten the stability of one state, but also that of all South Asia.

Focus on an improbable war between India and Pakistan ignores the real problem of non-traditional intrastate conflicts

Dahal et al 3 (Shiva Hari, Haris Gazdar, S. I. Keethaponcalan, Padmaja Murthy, researchers for the UN Institute for Disarmament Research, http://www.unidir.org/pdf/ouvrages/pdf-1-92-9045-148-3-en.pdf) GAT

The discourse on regional security in South Asia tends to be focused on the inter-state rivalry between the two largest states in the region—India and Pakistan. The overt introduction of a nuclear dimension into the India- Pakistan relationship has generated international interest in a South Asia preoccupied to no small extent with the threat of a nuclear confrontation and its potential effects on regional and global security. During his visit to the region in March 2000, the then President Bill Clinton declared Kashmir to be “the most dangerous place on earth”. His assessment was based not on an evaluation of day-to-day security threats faced by civilians in Kashmir, but on the concern that the territory might become the cause of a nuclear exchange that would have far-reaching effects.3 The importance placed on the conflict between India and Pakistan, with its new nuclear dimension, is not unfounded—the impact of a nuclear war would be felt around the world. At the same time, however, the near exclusive focus on state-to-state relations between the region’s two most militarily significant countries has overshadowed other conflicts that also have had devastating consequences. This imbalance has persevered despite evidence that traditional state-to-state conflict might contribute relatively less to everyday insecurity as experienced by civilian populations than do non-traditional intra-state conflicts. A recent study conducted by the RAND Corporation for the United States army, for example, concluded that the probability of a premeditated, full-scale war between India and Pakistan was virtually negligible in the next decade.4 However, violent confrontation persists. The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) reports that the three most prominent violent internal conflicts in the region in 1999 were each directly responsible for over a thousand deaths.5

\*\*\*CHINA\*\*\*

China Stability Solves Asian Instability

Chinese stability key to Asian stability

DPJ 99 [Democratic Party of Japan, June, http://www.dpj.or.jp/english/policy/security.html]

China is a major player in this region on a par with the United States. It is also likely to become an increasingly important player in the international community. It will be extremely significant for the sake of stability in the Asia-Pacific region if China maintains its economic course of reform and opening, while continuing to follow a path of cooperative diplomacy, starting with its active involvement in bodies such as APEC and ARF. Strengthening the U.S.-China and Japan-China partnerships will be an important factor in promoting regional peace. The DPJ will work to further deepen both Japan-U.S. and Japan-China relations.

China Instability Turns US Economy

Chinese economic instability damns the US economy

Blankenhorn 6 [Dana, business journalist, June 23, http://www.danablankenhorn.com/2006/06/this\_weeks\_clue\_3.html]

Stability. This is China's card. Stability made China an economic power during the 1990s. Stability is the "gift" China now seeks to give the world. At a time when the U.S. is contributing mightily to global instability, other nations have been grabbing Chinese stability as a lifeline. Most Americans have not noticed because stability is quiet. It doesn't make headlines. And, we thought, it didn't impact us. In The Chinese Century I posited an unstable way in which Chinese stability might be imposed on us. I saw things happening in an American way, dramatically, with big sudden events arising from simple misunderstandings. In fact it's happening far more subtly, in a Chinese way. Recently, for instance, U.S. markets tanked. So did European markets. So did commodity prices. Analysts on CNBC were saying things like "nothing is working." Well, something was working. The Chinese Central Bank was working. Zhouxiaochuan What was happening was a subtle shift of Chinese investment out of the dollar. Slower purchases of U.S. assets mean both lower values and higher interest rates. The message we weren't getting from our media, was that we had lost control of our economy. But the markets heard loud and clear. This was followed in China by an attempt to cut lending and slow the Chinese economy. It is being called a "subtle shift" of economic policy, an attempt to create a "soft landing" by a pilot, Zhou Xiaochuan, who has never flown the economic plane before. They have a cold, we catch the flu. China wants to cool off its growth, we slide into recession. The policies which control our economy are being made in Beijing, not in Washington. That's how other economies have had to deal with America's changes for decades. That's what we have to get accustomed to now.

China Instability Turns Nuclear War

 **Instability causes lashout and nuclear war**

**Renxing, 05** (Sen, staff writer, The Epoch Times, August 3, 2005, “CCP Gambles Insanely to Avoid Death”)AQB

Since the Party’s life is “above all else,” it would not be surprising if the CCP resorts to the use of biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons in its attempt to postpone its life. The CCP, that disregards human life, would not hesitate to kill two hundred million Americans, coupled with seven or eight hundred million Chinese, to achieve its ends. The “speech,” free of all disguises, lets the public see the CCP for what it really is: with evil filling its every cell, the CCP intends to fight all of mankind in its desperate attempt to cling to life. And that is the theme of the “speech.” The theme is murderous and utterly evil. We did witness in China beggars who demanded money from people by threatening to stab themselves with knives or prick their throats on long nails. But we have never, until now, seen a rogue who blackmails the world to die with it by wielding biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons. Anyhow, the bloody confession affirmed the CCP’s bloodiness: a monstrous murderer, who has killed 80 million Chinese people, now plans to hold one billion people hostage and gamble with their lives.

China-US Relations Solves North Korean Instability

U.S.-Sino Cooperation Solves North Korea

Wang 1[Hui President of First China Capital, Inc. and a consultant at RAND U.S.-CHINA: BONDS AND TENSIONS Page 265 David Lee]

In terms of security and stability in Northeast Asia, outstanding is North Korea and its nuclear weapon and ballistic missile capabilities. Moreover, North Korea is heavily armed with over one million troops and has also developed other weapons of mass destruction, such as chemical weapons. North Korea’s ideological isolation and economic failure heighten the risk for a military miscalculation. Although dia268 China, the United States, and the Global Economy logue and negotiations with North Korea have increased in recent years, North Korea in general remains one of the most uncertain and explosive regimes in the world. While having much less influence over Pyongyang than most of Kim II Sung’s time, China has been critical in averting a second conflict on the Peninsula. China explicitly opposes any military action from the south against the north, and China still holds the most influence over North Korea in any major crisis. Therefore, although the United States has been making the most initiatives on security issues with North Korea, China’s support and cooperation remains crucial to any lasting success. Such joint diplomacy should include resolving questions about Pyongyang’s nuclear program, persuading North Korea to halt further missile testing, and coordinating humanitarian relief. As members of the Four Party Talks on Korean security, the United States and China should continue their cooperation in dissuading North Korea from obstructing progress or from bolting from the process altogether. The talks remain one of the most important channels to diffuse tensions between North and South Korea—a near-term interest that Washington and Beijing share. Even if there were a potentially dramatic change in North Korea, even beyond the point of North Korea being a threat, the United States needs to cooperate with China regarding the Korea Peninsula. Preparation for a wide range of possible challenges and events of new conflicts or lasting peace requires, at the minimum, the United States to closely consult with China. Likely, the Chinese influence on a unified Korea could grow substantially. Certainly any postunification arrangement in which Washington maintains a military presence in Korea will require some clear understanding with Beijing. Otherwise, China can be expected to exert tremendous, albeit subtle, pressure on the government of a unified Korea to forego any continuing U.S. military presence, leaving Japan domestically vulnerable as the only country in Asia with troops. After all, understanding and cooperation from China on any such security issues require a reasonably good relationship between the United States and China.

**China key to solving North Korea**

Zoellick 5 **[Robert B,** Deputy Secretary of State, September 21, http://www.state.gov/s/d/former/zoellick/rem/53682.htm]

The most pressing opportunity is North Korea. Since hosting the Six-Party Talks at their inception in 2003, China has played a constructive role. This week we achieved a Joint Statement of Principles, with an agreement on the goal of "verifiable denuclearization of the Korean peninsula in a peaceful manner." But the hard work of implementation lies ahead, and China should share our interest in effective and comprehensive compliance. Moreover, the North Korea problem is about more than just the spread of dangerous weapons. Without broad economic and political reform, North Korea poses a threat to itself and others. It is time to move beyond the half century-old armistice on the Korean peninsula to a true peace, with regional security and development. A Korean peninsula without nuclear weapons opens the door to this future. Some 30 years ago America ended its war in Viet Nam. Today Viet Nam looks to the United States to help integrate it into the world market economic system so Viet Nam can improve the lives of its people. By contrast, North Korea, with a 50 year-old cold armistice, just falls further behind. Beijing also has a strong interest in working with us to halt the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and missiles that can deliver them. The proliferation of danger will undermine the benign security environment and healthy international economy that China needs for its development.

China-US Relations Solves Extinction/Nuclear War

US-China relations solve multiple extinction senarios

Adhariri 1 [Eschan, Armed Forces Staff College national security professor, August 1]

Looking ahead, a continued deterioration of Sino-US ties does not bode well for the regional stability of the very large and equally important Asia Pacific. Yet this regional stability might be negatively affected for a long time if Washington and Beijing fail to bounce back from this fiasco and assiduously work to improve their strategic relations. In the meantime, the issue of immediate concern for the USA is nuclear non-proliferation. Immediate work has to be done by both sides to minimize damages on this issue. The PRC, armed with the knowledge of America's premier nuclear programs, is likely to be a much more sought after sources for nuclear proliferation than it has ever been in the past by those countries keenly interested in enhancing the sophistication of their extant nuclear programs and by those who have not yet developed indigenous nuclear know-how but desire to purchase it. China, along with Russia, has an established record proliferating nuclear technology. This reality is not likely to change in the foreseeable future, much to the continued consternation of now-nuclear India. The increased nuclear sophistication on the troubled subcontinent carries with it the risk of a potential nuclear holocaust. The Kashmir issue still remains unresolved and very explosive given the continued intransigence of both India and Pakistan to amicably resolve it.

China-US Relations Solves Terrorism/Prolif

U.S.-Sino Cooperation Solves Terror and weapons proliferation

Wang 1[Hui President of First China Capital, Inc. and a consultant at RAND U.S.-CHINA: BONDS AND TENSIONS Page 265 David Lee]

The United States and China also share an interest in limiting the spread of Islamic fundamentalism. For many years, the United States has been combating Islamic fundamentalist terrorists, whose anti- U.S. activities range from kidnapping to embassy bombing. Recently having suffered bombings on city buses and in busy shopping areas in cities of Xingjian and other areas. Some of these terrorists have been trained in traditionally anti-U.S. and anti-West terrorist camps in central and southwest Asia. Although China has traditionally had good relations with Muslim countries, it has become more alarmed by the destructive activities of Islamic fundamentalists. When U.S.-China relations are stable, the United States may find China more willing to cooperate in limiting the spread of Islamic fundamentalism, given China’s recent terrorist experiences.

China-US Relations Solve Environment

US-Sino Cooperation Solves World Environment

Wang 1[Hui President of First China Capital, Inc. and a consultant at RAND U.S.-CHINA: BONDS AND TENSIONS Page 265 David Lee]

China is a major partner with the United States in the global effort to protect the environment. Although China’s per-capita production is very low, with one-fifth of the world’s population, China should expect to cooperate more on and contribute more than it has in the past to pollution control and environmental protection. Currently, China is the world’s number one producer of steel, coal, cement, fertilizer, and similar products. And two-decade’s economic growth, which has lifted millions out of poverty, has caused serious environmental damage that will be felt for many years to come. Some of this damage is already devastating. A survey in 1997 shows more than one-third of monitored urban river sections are seriously polluted and that they do not even meet the lowest standards necessary for irrigation water, not to mention drinking water. In many major cities, such as Hangzhou and Yibin, over 70 percent of rainfall is acid rain. The frequency of acid rainfall in some cities, such as Changsha and Zhuengyi, reaches 90 percent. Although China has taken many measures to prevent environmental damage, it will likely see its environment get worse before it gets before. The United States and China are both among the top polluting countries in the world. The principal pollutants include carbon monoxide, lead, nitrogen oxide, and sulfur oxide. China is the world’s second largest greenhouse gas producer, trailing behind only the United States. Although it has a long way to go, China has voluntarily devoted substantial financial and human resources, in addition to regulation efforts, to clean air and water and to preserving the ecological system. China’s increasing market orientation requires a strategy for future environmental protection that goes beyond the measures of the past. Achieving environmental protection goals will require sacrifices in the near term and experience to make the battle more effective. The United States and China, together with other countries, need to cooperatively work out incentive programs for China and other less developed countries to shorten the process of cutting down emission rates to the level of more-developed countries. China remains a poor country, with half the population subsisting on under $2 a day. As Mark Hertsgaard observed, although being a big source of pollutant emissions, “China emits a far smaller amount of greenhouse gases per capita than the rich nations whose earlier industrialization has already condemned the world to climate change.” The fact is that the per-capita income of China is still well below the world average, and the Chinese in most of the inland areas have basic and urgent needs still to be met. Given this, future benefits and costs are subject to a higher discount rate in calculations and decision making. Controlling pollution and improving the environment may involve near-term sacrifices and disproportional allocations of the benefits. Environmental protection could be an extra or unfair burden for certain generations. On top of that, it requires understanding, cooperation, investment, and conscious action from all of the people. Although determined, China is facing an uphill battle in this ambitious environmental war—to reduce emissions in 2020 below today’s levels, improve air and water quality, and lower pollution-related health costs by 75 percent—while at the same time China will again quadruple its output. As for the United States, it needs to work with China on the environment. Absent a radical shift in world policies, the greenhouse effect, for example, and other environmental damage will accelerate global climate change, melting polar ice caps, and causing more and nastier hurricanes, droughts, and blizzards. The United States, China, and the rest of the world will suffer from such changes. The United States also has the resources and experience to assist China. This is a potential a major bond for the United States and China. Although China has realized the benefits of preserving the earth and protecting the environment, China undoubtedly has its own agenda, which may be far from that of the United States on this score. Given the huge differences in social and economic development, both the United States and China can see a clear common interest in working closely on accelerating China’s environmental efforts.

China-US Relations Turn Other Relations

**Cracks US-China relations spill over to other areas of cooperation**

**Gladkyy 3** [Oleksandr SMS International Affairs Fellow, June 23, World Affairs, http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m2393/is\_1\_166/ai\_106560179 ]

In the previous sections, which were mainly based on government documents, I discussed newly changed official U.S. policies toward Russia and China and the resulting change in U.S.- Russia and U.S.-China relations. Although the documents have demonstrated beneficial changes in the official policies of the states toward one another after 11 September, they do not reflect the whole situation. In reality, it is still too early to state that U.S.-Russia and U.S.-China relations have become entirely cooperative and strategically stable and that the changes are long term. The actions of one nation, if they do not correspond with the interests and expectations of another country, become constraints on the foreign policy of the latter toward the former. Such restraints are obstacles to further improvement of U.S.-Russia and U.S.-China relations and prevent successful relations in one area from spilling over to another. Moreover, current barriers are dangerous because those issues have the most potential to become serious problems, preventing the further improvement of relations and even hindering already established cooperation.

China-Russia Relations Solves Terrorism

China-Russia relations solve terrorism

Menon and Motyl 7 [Rajan, Monroe J. Rathbone Professor of International Relations at Lehigh University Alexander J, American historian, American Interest, April, http://www.the-american-interest.com/article.cfm?piece=258]

Things are little better in Russia’s east. Moscow and Beijing are strategic partners for now, given their mutual antipathy for a U.S.-dominated unipolar world and anger at American harangues about human rights. But the partnership will wither if predictions of China’s becoming the next superpower prove accurate. Russia, which has a long border with China and fewer than seven million people in its vast and resource-rich Far Eastern region, will then have to live under China’s shadow, implicitly relying on America, Japan and India as counterweights. China has already become a pivotal power in Central Asia, where its cooperation with Russia is symbolized by the Shanghai Cooperation Organization. Although it is a Moscow-Beijing-led organization devoted to balancing the American presence and combating terrorism and radical Islam, it has effectively codified, institutionalized and legitimized China’s growing influence in a region historically dominated by Russia. Once the common interest in balancing the United States evaporates and China becomes a front-line power, Chinese clout in Central Asia could surpass Russia’s.

\*\*\*RUSSIA\*\*\*

Russian Instability Turns Asian Economy

Russian instability causes Asian economic collapse

Financial Post 98 [August 25, Lexis]

Russian instability triggered renewed selling on Asian markets yesterday, and the gloom deepened as Malaysia warned the turmoil gripping the region's economies could last longer than expected. Traders said the weekend dismissal by Russian President Boris Yeltsin of his government combined with weakness in other emerging markets to push Tokyo stocks below the psychologically important 15,000 level. The edginess drove Singapore and Taiwan to new depths, while Malaysia's benchmark share index reached a 10-year low. Hong Kong bucked the trend and staged a powerful rally, but brokers put the move down to more government intervention.

Russian Instability Turns Global Economy

Russian instability collapses global economy

Courier Mail 93 [March 24, Lexis]

Mr Russell said pessimistic views on the political situation in Russia contributed to the downturn. Russian President Boris Yeltsin continued his push to rule by presidential decree. The Russian instability had caused overseas markets to fall overnight, with London's FTSE-100 index down 36.2 points to 2863.9 and the Dow Jones index losing 8.1 to 3463.48. Mr Russell said the international uncertainty resulted in a stronger gold sector, as investors turned to ""safe" stocks in times of unrest.

Russian instability harms the global economy

Ferguson 98 [Rob, Fund Manager September 1, Toronto Star, Lexis]

Nor do dim economic prospects for Asia, which accounts for one-third of the world economy. And Russia's economic troubles could force the country to default on its debts and sell off commodities dirt cheap. It all comes at a bad time for Canadians, who have never had a greater stake in the markets. Mutual fund holdings alone have risen ten-fold in the past few years to $330 billion. Ordinary investors can't help but worry about the market decline that began in May and has shaved more than 31 per cent off the value of the benchmark TSE 300 index, which was proudly notching a series of all-time highs as recently as April. When the Bank of Canada raised its trend-setting interest rate one percentage point to 6 per cent in a bid to shore up the sagging loonie on Thursday, the TSE 300 lost 6 per cent, the fifth-largest one-day drop in the market's history. The decline was also fuelled by concerns about Russia. One mutual fund manager called last week's drastic stock sell-off the reverse of the "irrational exuberance" U.S. Federal Reserve Board Chairman Alan Greenspan used to describe the once-soaring stock market a year or so ago.

Russian Instability Turns Russian Economy

Russian instability deters investment which is key to the Russian economy

Kennedy 4 [Mark, Staff Writer, October 5, The Gazette, Lexis]

Prime Minister Paul Martin, during a meeting next week in Moscow with Russian President Vladimir Putin, will express Canada's concerns about the declining stability for foreign investment in that country. The complaint will come in the wake of a troubling incident Aug. 13: A Canadian company part owner of a luxury Moscow hotel - the 343-room Aerostar - was unceremoniously kicked out of the building over a legal dispute with its co-owner, a shadowy Russian firm many believe is a front for the Russian mob. A squad of 30 private security guards hired by the Russian co-owner, Aviacity, marched into the hotel and ordered the Canadian managers to leave within minutes, or in the words of one witness, "be carried out." About 150 guests in the hotel were given 48 hours to leave. The eviction was conducted after a local court ruling in the business dispute appeared to favour Aviacity, but the Canadians say their ouster was illegally carried out and Moscow's lead prosecutor has launched a criminal investigation. The bizarre incident prompted a letter of complaint from the Canadian embassy, and it has become a symbolic test case to measure whether the rough-and-tumble business environment in Russia - in which organized crime appears to be growing stronger - has become too unpredictable for foreign investors. On Friday, Martin departs on an eight-day foreign trip to St. Petersburg, Moscow, Paris and Budapest. During his Oct. 11-13 visit to Moscow, he will meet with Putin. Senior business people from the Halifax-based company that co-owns the Aerostar are counting on him to help achieve redress for how they say their hotel was illegally stolen from them. "This is a watershed," Kenneth Rowe, chief executive officer of IMP Group International said. "It's a litmus test as to whether we and possibly other foreign investors wish to take the risk of investing in Russia in future."

Russian Instability Turns Asia/Europe Economy

Russian instability collapses Asian and European markets

Prague Post 98 [September 2, Lexis]

Prague stock prices tumbled on the news of Russia's financial crisis. The fall generated fears that the situation is scaring investors away from most Central and Eastern European markets. The implosion of the Russian ruble, brought on by the fall of the Russian government, a disastrous devaluation plan and fears that Russian reforms will stop altogether, caused a panicky flight from the Russian market and has had a global ripple effect.The collapse's direct impact on Prague stocks was sharp. The Prague Stock Exchange's 50-issue index lost 13 percent of its value Aug. 27, reaching its lowest level since October 1993. Share prices for the bank Ceska sporitelna fell 35.7 percent on the news that it will probably not recover much of the 5.4 billion Kc (dollar 163.6 million) debt it holds in Russia. Komercni banka shares lost 15-20 percent of their value on the same day.The Czech Republic only sends 3/4 percent of its exports to Russia. However, analysts say, the fear of Russian instability is causing many foreign investors to take their money out of the country and other Central and Eastern European securities, without waiting to find out whether the securities were connected to Russia. Markets in Hungary and Poland also saw a sharp decline.So far, the crisis has only had a light effect on the Czech crown, which dipped slightly against the German mark.Observers say the strength of Central European markets will largely depend on whether investors regain some sort of calm and assess the real impact of the Russian setbacks before selling off their stakes here.

Russian Instability Turns Middle East Stability

Russian instability causes continued Middle East Instability

Widlanski 93 [Michael, Staff Writer, The Jerusalem Post, November 17, Lexis]

ARMS transfers to the Middle East would not seem to be a major concern during a period of rapid diplomatic entente, but the actual situation is far more complex, according to a gathering of arms-control experts at the BESA Center for Strategic Studies at Bar-Ilan University. Dr. Yitzhak Klein, a lecturer in political science at Bar-Ilan who specializes in Russia, delivered a long paper on the Russian policy of arms transfers to the Middle East. Although Russia's traditional clients - Syria, Libya and Iraq - are constrained by financial problems or sanctions and embargoes, Russia is actively trying to re-stimulate an arms trade to the region that had been hurt by internal chaos and international change, Klein "At present, Russia's potential to serve as one of the leading suppliers of arms to the region is limited," asserted Klein, citing the desire of local arms purchasers to use more advanced Western systems weapons. But this could change as the Russians try to upgrade their own weapons and as sources of tension increase with the West. He explained this threat in the following interview:

Russian Instability Turns Baltic Stability

Russian instability causes Baltic stability

Irish Times 99 [March 13, Lexis]

These criticisms are no longer heard so loudly in Washington and other NATO capitals. But they are implicit in the logic of NATO enlargement beyond these three states, as nine others continue to press their case to join the alliance. Romania, Bulgaria and Slovenia are considered the most likely candidates; they would certainly be easier to accommodate than any former members of the USSR, such as Ukraine, Estonia, Latvia or Lithuania, which border directly on Russia. But it must be remembered that the enlargement demand is popular within all these states precisely because of fears for their security arising from Russian instability - despite worries about having foreign troops on their soil and the costs involved in modernising and re-equipping their armed forces when other socio-economic priorities compete.

Russian Instability Turns Asian Stability

Russian instability causes Asian instability

Evangelista and Reppy 2 [Matthew, professor of government and director of the Cornell Peace Studies Program Judith, Professor of Science and Technology Studies, May, Peace Studies Program, Cornell University, http://www.ciaonet.org/wps/evm01/evm01.pdf]

Recent statements by Russian President Vladimir Putin have emphasized the importance Russia places on its relationships in Asia. The motive is both geopolitical and domestic: Moscow and Beijing are increasingly cooperating to bolster the positions of both nations in international organizations, while the future in terms of economy and security for the 75 percent of Russia that lies in Asia is strongly influenced by the mutual relationships of these two vast regions.1 To date, Russia has only been able fully to engage China in security and economic issues, and in this effort the center exercises only partial control. Russia has also made attempts to engage Japan, South Korea, or North Korea, but these have foundered at both the national and subnational levels. While the region may not need Russia to serve as a stabilizer, it would certainly be harmed by Russian instability. In order to decrease the likelihood that Russia might play a negative role, it is in the interest of the international community to respond to Russian overtures, involving Russia in more bilateral relationships and multilateral efforts in the region. Russia’s security doctrine, by promoting the country as a major power mediating international disputes, implies that it acts as a stabilizer in Asia. Yet that same doctrine requires the maintenance of fairly high levels of power projection capability in the region. Should the military be unable to maintain these levels, instability could well result. Russian military enterprises are often ordered to fulfill central defense orders even when Moscow does not finance them, further endangering the factories’ positions, and forcing them to find other ways to make money.2

Russian Instability Turns Korean Stability

Russian stability key to Korean stability

DPJ 99 [Democratic Party of Japan, June, http://www.dpj.or.jp/english/policy/security.html]

Russia, a former superpower, is currently faced with domestic economic difficulties. Russia's involvement in the Asia-Pacific region is therefore likely to remain limited in the meantime. If the Russian domestic situation deteriorates any further, it could even become a cause of instability in the international community. However, Russia is obviously an important actor in regard to the Korean Peninsula issue. Despite the Northern Territories Issue, Japan should contribute to increased Russian stability through further economic and private sector exchange.

Russian Instability Turns Chinese Stability

Russian stability precludes Chinese nuclear capacity that nuclear attack on the US

DeLay 99 [Tom, US Representative, The Washington Times, February 4, Lexis ]

Chinese nuclear capability is growing in size, range and sophistication and Russian instability is a worsening danger. China increased the number of long-range missiles it has aimed at the United States by 44 percent last year while Russia still has over 6,000 operational warheads. Have those opposed to national missile defense forgotten about the real danger facing America today? In 1995, Russia almost launched an accidental strike against the United States and a high level Chinese military official threatened in 1996 to hit Los Angeles. The bipartisan Rumsfeld Commission has also determined that our intelligence services may have little or no warning before other nations realize nuclear capability. The best way to win a nuclear war is to make sure it never happens. A strong message is sent by American missile defense policy. The system itself will protect the nation from unexpected attack and propound to other nations that their missile programs are a waste of resources. Adequate funding and technological commitment by the United States make comparably meager programs by our enemies ineffectual.

Russian Instability Turns Racism

Russian instability spawns racism and xenophobia

Menon and Motyl 7 [Rajan, Monroe J. Rathbone Professor of International Relations at Lehigh University Alexander J, American historian, American Interest, April, http://www.the-american-interest.com/article.cfm?piece=258]

Russia’s recovery is undeniable, but far less substantial than prevailing wisdom avers. What has changed is that Putin looks strong and energy prices have increased, thereby providing Russian elites with money and the confidence to talk tough. Having dismantled democracy, Putin needs another form of popular appeal. He has found it in the language of Great Russian power, which resonates in Russia these days, not least because of the strong undertow of chauvinism and xenophobia. Putin has played on great-power and imperial nostalgia, nationalism and patriotism, vowing to rebuild a strong and glorious Russia. Russian elites of various political persuasions have either adopted Putin’s great-power talk or sympathize with it. But such rhetoric—what Dibb calls “Russia’s will to power”—has not made Russia strong. Indeed, history shows that “talking loudly while carrying a small stick” can push states to overreach, producing upheaval at home and abroad.

Russian Instability Turns Famine

Russian economic instability leads to famine- North Korean proves

Korea Herald 8 [October 6, Lexis]

Events and structural forces, however, have affected and changed the nature of the North Korean system since 1991. The sudden discontinuation of the supply of petroleum and natural resources from Russia in the early 1990s, the failure of the centrally-planned economy, and the subsequent massive famine in the mid-1990s left North Korea's leaders no alternative but to tolerate informal market activities. Nowadays, every North Korean seems to like money and know its value.

Russian Instability Turns Heg

Russian instability hurts US hegemony

Menon and Motyl 7 [Rajan, Monroe J. Rathbone Professor of International Relations at Lehigh University Alexander J, American historian, American Interest, April, http://www.the-american-interest.com/article.cfm?piece=258]

For its part, the West will have to live with a Russian petro-state that is weak, loud and potentially unstable. The appropriate policy for America is to build cooperation in areas where its interests intersect with Russia’s, be clear about areas where its interest do not intersect, and do what is feasible to minimize the external consequences of Russian instability—especially in Russia’s neighbors. The challenge for the United States will not be that Russia is too strong to handle, but that it is too weak to make a reliable partner.

Russian Instability Turns Terrorism – Central Asia

Russian instability empowers violent extremism, damning human rights

Irish Times 2/15 [2010, Lexis]

Only last spring Russian officials were declaring an end to anti-terrorist operations in Chechnya, scene of two brutal wars since 1994. Full-scale war may be over in Chechnya, but it has spawned a regional insurgency with a strong Islamist element that is arguably a greater threat to Russian stability than Chechnya s independence- minded fighters ever were. Emma Gilligan s book chronicles Moscow s brutal response to the republic s demand for freedom, an onslaught that has shattered Chechen society, fuelled armed resistance across the Caucasus and bred a new generation of violent extremists. She focuses on the second Chechen war, started by Boris Yeltsin in autumn 1999 and pursued by Vladimir Putin when he stepped up from the prime minister s post to the Kremlin in 2000.

Russian Instability Turns Democracy

Russian instability fuels authoritarianism, hinders democracy and promotes communism

Blank 94 [Stephen, July 22, Strategic Studies Institute, http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub101.pdf]

Russia's instability also feeds Asian communist hopes that a more undemocratic Russia might yet emerge. Reports from Hong Kong allege that China's government and Party privately supported the anti-Yeltsin forces in October 1993. In addition, there are solid grounds for suspecting prior Chinese collusion with, or prior knowledge of, the coup in August 1991, especially among the military.27 In closed speeches, mass media, and propaganda publications for party officials in civilian and military institutions, an anti-Yeltsin line emerged.28 China's President and General Secretary of the Communist Party, Jiang Zemin, reportedly described Russia's experience as gun barrel determinism and depicted the October 1993 confrontation as a merepower struggle. His point is that when any state is threatened the armed forces determine the outcome. In effect, he made an apologia for the Tiananmen Square massacre in 1989.29 Party Secretary and Politburo member Ding Guangen went still further. He, too, saw events as merely a power struggle and concluded that Russia will become still more unstable in the future. The bloody military conflict which was an outcome of the power struggle, will have a negative impact on the future political stability in Russia and will cause more obstacles to the economic and political reforms. The army played a decisive role in this round of power struggle and, in the future, it will have a bigger role in deciding the government and the core leadership level, playing a guiding function.30 Given the closeness and authoritarian and ideological congruence of the two militaries, the political autonomy of the Russian military, and the extent of Russo-Chinese arms transfers where the two military systems interact, these observations could become profoundly important and disturbing in the not too distant future.

Russian instability precludes global democracy

Lomeiko 93 [Vladimir, Russian Ambassador, March 26, International Herald Tribune, Lexis]

If this is true, we should not be surprised with the strange temporizing policy of many Western decision-makers on how to assist the reform cause in Russia. For them to insist on Russian instability and "lack of investment guarantees" does not help; such temporization only worsens the problems. A sense of bitter disappointment is growing among Russian intellectuals. It is as if an experienced mountain climber had urged a beginner to scale a mountain, then deserted him at its base. No one seriously expected billions of dollars to pour in from the West, but assistance with meaningful projects to teach democracy and free enterprise would seem to be an important business not only for Russia but for a stable, democratic world order. Most people in Russia back democratic change and economic reform. But quite a few would hamper it, and those who temporize in the West help them. Millions of young people enter Russia's social and political life each year. There are ways - some as simple as board games - to teach them democratic values, notions of democratic governance, and the achievements of European civilization. Once again, to temporize is to miss opportunities.

Russian Instability Turns Terrorism

Instability in Russia prompts state sponsored terrorism.

Schorr 4(Daniel senior news analyst at National Public Radio, “Loose nukes, Russian instability” September 10)AQB

One thing that hasn't changed much in Russia since Soviet days is the tendency of high officials to cover up when disaster strikes. So it was with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and the Chernobyl nuclear accident in 1986. So it was with President Vladimir Putin and the loss of the submarine Kursk in 2000. So it was in the first days after the schoolhouse massacre in southern Russia. While Russian television was told to go easy on the grim footage from Beslan, officials were understating the death toll and overstating the effectiveness of the special forces deployed to end the confrontation. When President Putin finally came out of his shell on Saturday to deal with rapidly growing popular anger, he went on television to say, "This crime of the terrorists, inhuman, unprecedented in terms of its cruelty" represents the "direct intervention of international terrorism against Russia." He did not acknowledge that the hostage-takers had demanded an end to the war in Chechnya. It was clearly in Putin's interest to represent the assault as connected with international terrorism rather than a homegrown liberation movement.

Russian Instability Turns Prolif

Russian instability destabilizes it’s nuclear force, risks accidents.

Schorr 4(Daniel senior news analyst at National Public Radio, “Loose nukes, Russian instability” September 10)AQB

With his regime as close to destabilization as it has been in his five years in office, Putin was reaching out to the West, and especially the United States, for support in his crisis. In his television speech, Putin alluded to fears abroad of a Russian nuclear threat that "must be removed." he US has reason to worry about an unstable Russia. According to Harvard professor Graham Allison in a new book, "Nuclear Terrorism: The Ultimate Preventable Catastrophe," 90 percent of all fissile material outside the US is stored in the former Soviet Union. And, because of its huge supplies, its shaky safeguards, and its extensive corruption, Russia poses the greatest threat of loose nukes. The Nunn-Lugar program designed to help finance the removal of Russian nuclear weapons has not been faring well under the Bush administration. But Bush officials might want to have another look at the danger of Russia's loose nukes in an unstable country.

\*\*\*SOUTH KOREA\*\*\*

South Korea Solves Regional Stability (Nuke War)

South Korea is the center stone of trilateral agreement that is providing stability in Asia

People Daily 10 ( People Daily is the official paper of china, 5.30.10, http://english.peopledaily.com.cn/90001/90776/90883/7004712.html ) ET

At an annual trilateral summit held in South Korea's southern resort of Jeju, Premier Wen, South Korean President Lee Myung-bak and Japanese Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama unveiled a blueprint for trilateral cooperation in economy, security, environmental protection, cultural exchange and other areas in the next decade. The leaders agreed that after making clear the detailed objectives and long-term goals within the next decade, all sides need to concentrate efforts on boosting trilateral cooperation to a new height, so as to further consolidate partnership, achieve more in mutually beneficial cooperation in all aspects and enhance friendship between the peoples of the three countries. They also agreed to set up a more cooperative mechanism to increase strategic mutual trust, which involves setting up a trilateral cooperation secretariat in South Korea in 2011 to jointly tackle natural disasters, discuss the possibility of a mechanism of trilateral defense dialogue to enhance security contacts, strengthen political dialogue and cooperation in police affairs, and boost government exchanges at local levels among the three nations. On developing sustainable economic cooperation and common prosperity, the leaders pledged efforts to finish by 2012 a joint feasibility study of trilateral free trade agreement, which was launched in May 2010, and to expand trade volume ahead of 2020 for the benefit of regional economic growth and integration. The leaders said the three countries will complete negotiations on investment agreement and provide a favorable investment environment to facilitate the operation of enterprises in the region. They also reiterated the importance of customs cooperation, and vowed to further cooperation in finance, science and technology, innovation, as well as policy cooperation and negotiations in such areas as energy efficiency and resources. "An open, fair and liberalized multilateral trade system is not only conducive to China, Japan and South Korea, but also important for the world. We must oppose protectionism of any form to safeguard and consolidate the system," said the document.

Asian instability most likely stage of nuclear war- Japan, Russia, and Koreas scenarios ensure

CIRINCIONE 2k (Joseph, *Carnegie Middle East Center*, http://carnegie-mec.org/publications/?fa=76 Vol 3 No. 3, mar. 2, 2k) ET

Asia is the region most likely to see the combat use of nuclear weapons. India and Pakistan - two nuclear-armed nations sharing a common border and a history of aggression - are developing new missiles and crafting nuclear-deployment doctrines. The disputed Kashmir region, the cause of two past wars between these nations, remains a frightening flash point. But it is Japan that may well be the critical element in this chain. In 1998, the Japanese were caught by surprise when the Indian-Pakistani tit-for-tat nuclear tests suddenly doubled the number of Asian nuclear-weapon states. Many Japanese were disturbed by how quickly the world accepted India and Pakistan's de facto status as new nuclear powers. This was not the bargain Japan had agreed to when - after a lengthy internal debate - it joined the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in 1976. North Korea's launch of a long-range Taepo Dong missile in August 1998 further agitated Japanese policymakers, stirring new debates over security policies. Then-Vice Defense Minister Shingo Nishimura argued that Japan "ought to have aircraft carriers, long-range missiles, long-range bombers. We should even have the atomic bomb." Mr. Nishimura was forced to resign over his comments, but if nuclear-weapon deployments increase in Asia, Japan may well conclude that its security is best served by building its own nuclear arsenal. And Japanese withdrawal from the NPT would almost certainly trigger the collapse of the treaty. Finally, there are two new emerging risks in Asia: Russia faces the prospect of fragmentation into separate, nuclear-armed states, while the possible unification of Korea - although solving one set of problems - could create a single country with nuclear ambitions and capabilities. If these new nations find themselves in a world with an increasing number of nuclear-weapon states, they may well opt to join the club.

South Korea Stability Solves Famine

South Korean economic stability solves North Korean famine

Kim 5 [Choong Nam, Professor of Political Science, Korean Military Academy and Institute of Foreign Affairs, August, East West Center, No.11, http://www.eastwestcenter.org/fileadmin/stored/pdfs/PSwp011.pdf]

Second, the engagement policy includes substantial economic assistance to an economically bankrupt North Korea. If South Korea’s economy were strong and expanding, South Koreans would likely support at least humanitarian aid to suffering Northern brethren. However, if the southern economy was in trouble, this might become a further obstacle to the policy. Unfortunately, since late 1997, the South Korean economy has been struggling with its own financial crisis that resulted in millions of unemployment. Despite South Korea’s serious economic difficulties after 1997-1998 financial crisis and Pyongyang’s reluctant response to the Seoul’s overtures, the Kim Dae Jung administration pushed the sunshine policy, and , as a result, weekend the fragile national consensus for the policy.

South Korea Instability Turns Global Economy

South Korean economy linchpin of global economy- Instability destroys

Pesek 9 [William, April 14, The Age Business Day http://www.theage.com.au/business/signs-of-gloom-lifting-in-south-korean-economy-20090413-a4ur.html]KLS

IF YOU'RE looking for signs the world economy is bottoming out, South Korea could be the place. It's entirely possible things will get worse globally. Recessions may deepen, asset prices may slide further and credit markets may remain locked up. Doomsayers such as Nouriel Roubini still make plausible arguments that things will just get nastier. Amid such risks, hints that the Bank of Korea's most aggressive round of interest rate cuts in a decade is coming to an end are a rare ray of sunlight. Among developed economies, Korea's was arguably the first sent into freefall by the global crisis. Iceland got more headlines, but as the world's 13th-largest economy, South Korea is one that really matters.

South Korea instability disrupts global economy

Shin And Ciccantell 9 [Kyoung-ho, Professor of Psychology at Northwest Missouri State University, Paul S. Professor of Sociology at Western Michigan University, July 9, American Sociological Association, http://jwsr.ucr.edu/archive/vol15/Shin\_Ciccantell-vol15n2.pdf Volume XV] KLS

The South Korean economy has grown remarkably since World War II, becoming a major player in the global economy by the 1990s. In 2003, the value of South Korean exports and imports totaled US$198.3 billion (2.6% of the world) and US$178.8 billion (2.3%) respectively. In the same year, South Korea produced 3.2 million automobiles, 5.2% of total global production and ranking 6th in the world. Electronics production totaled US$69.8 billion, trailing only the U.S.and Japan. Steel production was 46.3 million tons in 2003, 4.8% of world production (5th in the world) and the shipbuilding industry built 7,265,000 CG/T of ships, 32.4% of world production (ranked 1st in the world) (National Statistics Office 2004). South Korean ascent in the global economy prompted a number of analyses of the role of the Korean state and its policies of exportoriented industrialization, labor control, and state-business relationships (Amsden 1989; Deyo 1987; Kim 1997; Kohli 2004). The South Korean government has been flexible in shifting development policies from light industry (e.g., manufacturing of apparel and shoes) to heavy and high value-added industries such as automobiles and electronics, demonstrating its high capacity to adopt timely strategies and mobilize new technologies in response to the dynamically changing global market (Amsden 1989; D’Costa 1994).

South Korea-US Relations Solves Economy

US/ South Korean alliance is key to both america’s economic opportunity in Asia and to maintaining a stable region

Hwang 5 (Balbina, P.H.D in international law, Foreign Policy analyst, 5.18.5, *The Heritage Foundation*, http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2005/05/Beyond-the-US-South-Korea-Alliance-Reinvigorating-Economic-Relations ) ET

Enthusiasm for a U.S.-ROK FTA has grown steadily in recent years, particularly in South Korea, while American interest has been more cau tious. In principle, the Bush Administration has been a strong proponent of bilateral trade agree ments because they are an integral part of U.S. trade strategy to promote competitive liberaliza tion, both at home and abroadComprehensive agreements benefit both partners by injecting new competition into their domestic economies, lowering consumer prices, and shifting factors of production to more efficient uses, leveling the playing field for exporters. While free trade is certainly best pursued globally to minimize barriers and distortions in trade, the slow pace of negotia tions in the World Trade Organization (WTO) has led many nations to pursue free trade through bilat eral and regional agreements, allowing countries to customize agreements that meet the needs and con cerns of individual countries. For the United States, an FTA with South Korea makes immense sense considering the existing areas of economic convergence and complementa rities and the potential for even greater future gains. As one of America's top trading partners, with bilat eral trade exceeding $70 billion in 2004, South Korea currently enjoys relatively free access to the U.S. market while American exporters still face hurdles in South Korea. One of the greatest benefits of an FTA for the United States would be increased opportunity to export to South Korea. A 2001 U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC) report predicted that a U.S.-ROK FTA would increase annual American exports to South Korea by nearly $20 billon, while South Korean exports to the United States would rise by $10 billion.[8]The ITC study concluded that the largest gains in American exports would be in agricultural products such as dairy and meat prod ucts. South Korea, which imports over $2 billion in U.S. farm products annually, is America's fifth larg est export market for agricultural goods. An FTA would provide greater access to agricultural goods by eliminating many of the strict non-tariff barriers. Official and private studies on the likely economic impact of an FTA conclude that it would benefit pro­ducers and consumers in both countries. For South Korea, increasing participation in trade agreements is not just beneficial, but may be necessary in order to achieve its stated goal of raising annual per capita income to $20,000 by 2010. Partially due to its scar city of natural resources and the economy's heavy reliance on external trade, which accounts for nearly 70 percent of GDP, South Korea will not realize this goal unless exports grow by 12 percent annually.[9] Significantly, the benefits of a U.S.-ROK FTA would go beyond promoting free trade, increasing economic benefits, and bolstering the broader bilateral relationship. Agreement and cooperation on economic issues provide a strong basis from which to reinforce collaboration in the political and security arenas. An FTA would undoubtedly rein vigorate and strengthen the dynamic and compre hensive U.S.-ROK alliance, which has been the cornerstone of peace and stability in Northeast Asia for more than 50 years.In addition, a U.S.-ROK agreement would pro vide the United States with a strong economic pres ence in Northeast Asia and allow South Korea to reduce its economic dependence on China. U.S. Ambassador to the ROK Christopher Hill alluded to this strengthening of America's strategic presence in Northeast Asia when he stated that "South Korea can solidify a role as America's economic bridge in the Northeast Asian region"[10] through an FTA.

US and asia are the most economically interdependent in the world- economic risks increase security risks- conflict multiplier

Wu 5 (Rong I, Taiwan Institute of Economic Research, Feb 19-21-05, *Economic Interdependence and Security*

*in the Asia Pacific*) ET

In the case of Asia Pacific, as economic liberalization and globalization advance, the extent of economic interdependence in the region is almost unprecedented today. Nonetheless, many traditional security issues in the region, including the China-Taiwan rivalry, North-South Korean conflict, South China Sea dispute, Chinese military buildup, and arms race problem, remain uncertain. More importantly, the increase of economic interdependence instead seems to extend the impacts of such new security threats as international terrorism, infectious diseases, and weapons of mass destruction (WMD), and thus even makes national and international security increasingly sensitive and vulnerable in the Asia Pacific. In this context, whether the increase of economic interdependence really enhances or improves overall security in the Asia Pacific becomes a very compelling question we have to explore and understand.

South Korea-US Relations Solve North Korea/Heg

SK-US relations key to checking NK prolif, nuclear testing and regional stability

Baltimore Sun 9 (Council of Foreign Relations, June 16, <http://www.cfr.org/publication/19635/new_chapter_for_ussouth_korea_alliance.html>) LL

While all eyes have been trained on North Korea's belligerent and aggressive actions in recent weeks, it is important to note that the U.S.-South Korea alliance has emerged as a linchpin in the Obama administration's efforts to successfully manage an overcrowded global agenda, and a pivotal tool for safeguarding U.S. long-term interests in Asia. When South Korea's President Lee Myung-bak meets with President Barack Obama at the White House Tuesday, the two leaders must effectively address three main areas: policy coordination to address North Korea's nuclear threat, the development of a global security agenda that extends beyond the peninsula, and collaboration to address the global financial crisis as South Korea takes a lead on the G-20 process. By conducting a second nuclear test in May, followed by a number of missile launches, North Korea has forced its way onto the Obama administration's agenda. First and foremost, effective U.S.-South Korea alliance coordination is critical to managing both the global effects of North Korea's nuclear threat on the nonproliferation regime and the regional security challenges posed by potential regime actions that lead to further crisis in the region. North Korea's internal focus on its leadership succession, and the apparent naming of North Korean leader Kim Jong-il's little-known and inexperienced youngest son as his successor, make the task of responding to North Korea's aggressive and destabilizing actions all the more challenging. Both deterrence and negotiation must be pursued on the basis of close consultations. Presidents Obama and Lee must also develop coordinated contingency plans in the event of internal instability in North Korea. Through effective U.S.-South Korea alliance coordination, it should be possible to forge a combined strategy capable of managing the nuclear, proliferation, and regional security dimensions of North Korea's threat. A coordinated position would also strengthen the administration's hand in its efforts to persuade China to put pressure on North Korea.

US-ROK alliance key to check NK

Hwang 4 (Balbina, Policy Analyst for Northeast Asia in the Asian Studies Center at The Heritage Foundation, Dec 21, <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2004/12/Minding-the-Gap-Improving-US-ROK-Relations>) LL

The U.S.-ROK alliance has been a crucial corner stone of stability and security in Northeast Asia for the past half century and will continue to play this critical role in the future-but only if both countries can narrow the gap between American and South Korean mindsets. Reaffirming this important and successful alliance will be essential to resolving the North Korean nuclear issue and achieving a permanent peace on the Korean peninsula.

And North Korea uncontained triggers NE Asian wars, destroying both Koreas, Japan, and US heg

Glosserman 3(Brad, executive director of the Pacific Forum CSIS in Honolulu, Hawaii, *global communications pathway*, http://www.glocom.org/debates/20031104\_gloss\_us/ , 11.4.3) ET

Failure to reach a negotiated solution could trigger a war in Northeast Asia, bringing untold devastation to both North and South Korea, and possibly Japan. War, or even the fear of war, could unleash waves of refugees. The economies of South Korea and Japan would be hard hit, and the ripples would spread through China as well, destroying the stability that is the prerequisite for economic development. Failure to cap the North Korean nuclear threat would oblige Japan to look hard at the utility of its alliance with the United States. While a nuclear-armed North Korea should not in itself be enough to challenge the credibility of the US commitment to defend Japan, it could raise questions about US leadership and Washington's ability to manage regional security problems. Similarly, a North Korean nuclear weapon should not oblige South Korea to rethink its military posture, but, it might also be forced to reassess its views of American leadership.

**South Korea-US Relations Solves East Asia/Afghanistan**

SK-US relations key to East Asia stability and success in Afghanistan

Baltimore Sun 9 (Council of Foreign Relations, June 16, <http://www.cfr.org/publication/19635/new_chapter_for_ussouth_korea_alliance.html>) LL

While all eyes have been trained on North Korea's belligerent and aggressive actions in recent weeks, it is important to note that the U.S.-South Korea alliance has emerged as a linchpin in the Obama administration's efforts to successfully manage an overcrowded global agenda, and a pivotal tool for safeguarding U.S. long-term interests in Asia. When South Korea's President Lee Myung-bak meets with President Barack Obama at the White House Tuesday, the two leaders must effectively address three main areas: policy coordination to address North Korea's nuclear threat, the development of a global security agenda that extends beyond the peninsula, and collaboration to address the global financial crisis as South Korea takes a lead on the G-20 process. By conducting a second nuclear test in May, followed by a number of missile launches, North Korea has forced its way onto the Obama administration's agenda. First and foremost, effective U.S.-South Korea alliance coordination is critical to managing both the global effects of North Korea's nuclear threat on the nonproliferation regime and the regional security challenges posed by potential regime actions that lead to further crisis in the region. North Korea's internal focus on its leadership succession, and the apparent naming of North Korean leader Kim Jong-il's little-known and inexperienced youngest son as his successor, make the task of responding to North Korea's aggressive and destabilizing actions all the more challenging. Both deterrence and negotiation must be pursued on the basis of close consultations. Presidents Obama and Lee must also develop coordinated contingency plans in the event of internal instability in North Korea. Through effective U.S.-South Korea alliance coordination, it should be possible to forge a combined strategy capable of managing the nuclear, proliferation, and regional security dimensions of North Korea's threat. A coordinated position would also strengthen the administration's hand in its efforts to persuade China to put pressure on North Korea. Both countries also face hostage crises involving citizens detained in North Korea. The recent conviction of two U.S. journalists heightens the stakes for the United States, although the administration has tried to decouple their plight from Pyongyang's missile tests. Second, Presidents Obama and Lee should set the stage for a reinvigorated vision of a broader role for the U.S.-South Korea alliance as an important component of a broader U.S. strategy toward East Asia. A critical aspect of this vision is a mutual commitment to jointly address sources of global and functional instability beyond the peninsula. Lee Myung-bak has offered a vision of a global Korea that features an expanded commitment to peacekeeping and development assistance that is in greater proportion to South Korea's economic clout as the world's 13th largest economy. As the third-largest contributor of troops to Iraq, South Korea has also demonstrated its capacity to make valuable contributions to post-conflict stabilization. The U.S.-South Korea alliance can serve as a platform by which South Korea can make such contributions in many other areas, including Afghanistan. South Korea has already made commitments to send engineers and medical personnel to Afghanistan. It is poised now to expand its contributions, in line with its broadening scope of interest in contributing to global stability and its economic prowess.

South Korea-US Relations Solves North Korea

SK-US relations key to checking NK prolif, nuclear testing and regional stability

Baltimore Sun 9 (Council of Foreign Relations, June 16, <http://www.cfr.org/publication/19635/new_chapter_for_ussouth_korea_alliance.html>) LL

While all eyes have been trained on North Korea's belligerent and aggressive actions in recent weeks, it is important to note that the U.S.-South Korea alliance has emerged as a linchpin in the Obama administration's efforts to successfully manage an overcrowded global agenda, and a pivotal tool for safeguarding U.S. long-term interests in Asia. When South Korea's President Lee Myung-bak meets with President Barack Obama at the White House Tuesday, the two leaders must effectively address three main areas: policy coordination to address North Korea's nuclear threat, the development of a global security agenda that extends beyond the peninsula, and collaboration to address the global financial crisis as South Korea takes a lead on the G-20 process. By conducting a second nuclear test in May, followed by a number of missile launches, North Korea has forced its way onto the Obama administration's agenda. First and foremost, effective U.S.-South Korea alliance coordination is critical to managing both the global effects of North Korea's nuclear threat on the nonproliferation regime and the regional security challenges posed by potential regime actions that lead to further crisis in the region. North Korea's internal focus on its leadership succession, and the apparent naming of North Korean leader Kim Jong-il's little-known and inexperienced youngest son as his successor, make the task of responding to North Korea's aggressive and destabilizing actions all the more challenging. Both deterrence and negotiation must be pursued on the basis of close consultations. Presidents Obama and Lee must also develop coordinated contingency plans in the event of internal instability in North Korea. Through effective U.S.-South Korea alliance coordination, it should be possible to forge a combined strategy capable of managing the nuclear, proliferation, and regional security dimensions of North Korea's threat. A coordinated position would also strengthen the administration's hand in its efforts to persuade China to put pressure on North Korea.

US-ROK alliance key to check NK

Hwang 4 (Balbina, Policy Analyst for Northeast Asia in the Asian Studies Center at The Heritage Foundation, Dec 21, <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2004/12/Minding-the-Gap-Improving-US-ROK-Relations>) LL

The U.S.-ROK alliance has been a crucial corner stone of stability and security in Northeast Asia for the past half century and will continue to play this critical role in the future-but only if both countries can narrow the gap between American and South Korean mindsets. Reaffirming this important and successful alliance will be essential to resolving the North Korean nuclear issue and achieving a permanent peace on the Korean peninsula.

South Korea-US Relations Solves East Asia/Afghanistan

SK-US relations key to East Asia stability and success in Afghanistan

Baltimore Sun 9 (Council of Foreign Relations, June 16, <http://www.cfr.org/publication/19635/new_chapter_for_ussouth_korea_alliance.html>) LL

While all eyes have been trained on North Korea's belligerent and aggressive actions in recent weeks, it is important to note that the U.S.-South Korea alliance has emerged as a linchpin in the Obama administration's efforts to successfully manage an overcrowded global agenda, and a pivotal tool for safeguarding U.S. long-term interests in Asia. When South Korea's President Lee Myung-bak meets with President Barack Obama at the White House Tuesday, the two leaders must effectively address three main areas: policy coordination to address North Korea's nuclear threat, the development of a global security agenda that extends beyond the peninsula, and collaboration to address the global financial crisis as South Korea takes a lead on the G-20 process. By conducting a second nuclear test in May, followed by a number of missile launches, North Korea has forced its way onto the Obama administration's agenda. First and foremost, effective U.S.-South Korea alliance coordination is critical to managing both the global effects of North Korea's nuclear threat on the nonproliferation regime and the regional security challenges posed by potential regime actions that lead to further crisis in the region. North Korea's internal focus on its leadership succession, and the apparent naming of North Korean leader Kim Jong-il's little-known and inexperienced youngest son as his successor, make the task of responding to North Korea's aggressive and destabilizing actions all the more challenging. Both deterrence and negotiation must be pursued on the basis of close consultations. Presidents Obama and Lee must also develop coordinated contingency plans in the event of internal instability in North Korea. Through effective U.S.-South Korea alliance coordination, it should be possible to forge a combined strategy capable of managing the nuclear, proliferation, and regional security dimensions of North Korea's threat. A coordinated position would also strengthen the administration's hand in its efforts to persuade China to put pressure on North Korea. Both countries also face hostage crises involving citizens detained in North Korea. The recent conviction of two U.S. journalists heightens the stakes for the United States, although the administration has tried to decouple their plight from Pyongyang's missile tests. Second, Presidents Obama and Lee should set the stage for a reinvigorated vision of a broader role for the U.S.-South Korea alliance as an important component of a broader U.S. strategy toward East Asia. A critical aspect of this vision is a mutual commitment to jointly address sources of global and functional instability beyond the peninsula. Lee Myung-bak has offered a vision of a global Korea that features an expanded commitment to peacekeeping and development assistance that is in greater proportion to South Korea's economic clout as the world's 13th largest economy. As the third-largest contributor of troops to Iraq, South Korea has also demonstrated its capacity to make valuable contributions to post-conflict stabilization. The U.S.-South Korea alliance can serve as a platform by which South Korea can make such contributions in many other areas, including Afghanistan. South Korea has already made commitments to send engineers and medical personnel to Afghanistan. It is poised now to expand its contributions, in line with its broadening scope of interest in contributing to global stability and its economic prowess.

\*\*\*NORTH KOREA\*\*\*

North Korean Instability Turns Japan Stability

North Korean instability poses security threat to Japan

DPJ 99 [Democratic Party of Japan, June, http://www.dpj.or.jp/english/policy/security.html]

The situation on the Korean Peninsula is quite fairly serious. In particular, given North Korea's substantial technical capacity in the field of ballistic missiles, it would pose a major threat to Japan if North Korea were to arm itself with nuclear weapons. Recognizing North Korea's suspected nuclear capability and ballistic missile development as potential threats to Japan's own security, Japan needs to work more actively to resolve these problems. In April1999, the DPJ summed up its basic thinking on the handling of the North Korean issue. The report stressed the following five points:(1) strongly promote progress toward peaceful co-existence and North-South dialogue between the Republic of Korea and Democratic People's Republic of Korea; (2) emphasize "the comprehensive and integrated approach" through consultations with the United States, China, the ROK, and Russia; (3) move actively to normalize diplomatic relations between Japan and North Korea with close liaison with the countries directly concerned and with Japanese political parties, and build confidence between North Korea and the international community; (4) encourage the early resumption of governmental negotiations between Japan and North Korea; and (5) consider creating a Northeast Asian security framework centered around Japan, the United States, China, the ROK, the DPRK and Russia. The DPJ will deal actively with issues involving the Korean Peninsula based on this approach. Japan-South Korea Relations Solve Asian Instability.

North Korea War Turns China War

**Conflict over North Korea kills any stability in relations between China and the US.**

**Friedberg** **5** (Friedberg, Aaron L., Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University, International Security, Volume 30, Number 2, Fall 2005, pp. 44-45)

**The physical image of roughly balanced opposing forces suggests** a degree of **tension** and potential instability. In such circumstances **a change on one side or the other can yield dramatic**, discontinuous **shifts**. Such possibilities exist in the political world as well. With reference once again to the end of the U.S.- Soviet Cold War, **it is possible to imagine that a sudden breakthrough toward domestic political reform in China could open the way for radically improved relations with the United States**. At the same time, however, it is conceivable that **an unanticipated or mismanaged crisis (over** Taiwan, for example, or **North Korea**, or in South Asia) **could lead to the opposite result**. If the United States and China were somehow to lurch from constrained competition to direct confrontation, **their relationship would be transformed overnight. Trade and diplomacy would be disrupted; hostile images would harden; domestic political reform in China might be derailed; and the prospect of a genuine entente between the two** Pacific powers **could be put off** for a generation or even more.

**Second Korean War would drag in China as an enemy of the US.**

**Karlin** **10** (Anatoly Karlin, March 28, 2010 http://www.sublimeoblivion.com/2010/03/28/korean-war-2/)KM

**Crossing the DMZ** with the intention of toppling the DPRK and replacing it with a government allied with or integrated into South **Korea will put a whole set of new dynamics into play**. Though **China** has no intention of aiding North Korea in aggression, it **views the establishment of an American bridgehead on its Manchurian border with trepidation and may intervene** under extreme circumstances, such as an all-out American and South Korean drive for “regime change” in Pyongyang. **If this were to happen, all bets are off. China will probably be able to roll back the invasion forces** to the DMZ. After all, it managed to do this in the 1950′s, when it was much more militarily backwards relative to the US. Now, it will have a big preponderance over land, while its new “carrier-killing” ballistic missiles, submarines, cruise missiles, and Flanker fighters are now, at some level, able to deny the seas off China to the US Navy, while its anti-satellite tests and cyberwar prowess means that the American dominance in space and information ought not be taken for granted either. Now **I am not saying that the Chinese Army** (it ceased by the People’s Liberation Army recently) **comes anywhere close to matching the American military**; **however**, **it might** well already **have the ability to defeat it in a local war** on China’s borders. **If China is successful, it will re-establish North Korea** as its own protectorate, although under someone more rational and reliable than Kim Jong-il (though needless to say **this will also completely sever its economic relationship with the US** and cause a severe, but temporary, economic contraction due to the collapse of its export sector).

North Korea War Turns China War

**Empirically proven – war over Korea pits the US against China and creates hatred between the two countries.**

**Hanley** **10** (CHARLES J. HANLEY THE ASSOCIATED PRESS, June 20, 2010, http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5j7dD6NMKF5mQ3XJ68fo1EUIutP2wD9GEP4T82)KM

**It wasn't only America's place on the world stage that changed. "The Korean War thrust China onto the Cold War's front line**," said Shen Zhihua, a leading Chinese scholar of the war. "It encouraged Mao Tse-tung to lead Asia's and even the world's revolutions," and **it "entrenched the enmity and hatred between China and the U.S."** The two Koreas, meanwhile, rebuilt industrial economies from the war's devastation -- the north as an authoritarian one-party state obsessed with self-reliance, the south as a capitalist powerhouse under repressive military rule and, for the past two decades, a civilian democracy. Across the heavily mined armistice line, a 2.5-mile-wide demilitarized strip stretching 135 miles across the peninsula, almost 2 million troops face each other on ready alert for resumed war, some 27,000 of them U.S. military. **War scares have flared regularly**, from the 1968 North Korean seizure of the U.S. Navy spy ship Pueblo, to the long-running duel over North Korea's nuclear-weapons program, to this year's sinking of the South Korean warship Cheonan, allegedly by North Korea. **Why has this state of no war, no peace dragged on for 60 years?** South Korean scholar Hong Il-sik believes that **four great powers** -- the U.S. and Japan on one side, China and Russia on the other -- **like it this way. A unified Korea would align with one power or the other, upsetting the regional balance**, said the former Korea University president, a prominent conservative commentator. "By keeping Korea divided, they're in fact maintaining their own security," Hong said. . . . Korea as Cold War victim is a given of history: After the impromptu 1945 division, done for the convenience of the dual military occupation, the U.S.-Soviet superpower rivalry repeatedly foiled all efforts at reunification. But that Cold War ended a generation ago, and Korea's cold war goes on. Historian Park Myung-lim, a prolific chronicler of the war and author of a recent book on its consequences, said the North Korean leadership of the late Kim Il Sung and his son, Kim Jong Il, bears much of the blame because of its stark black-and-white worldview and bellicose "military first" policies. But it has been a U.S. failure, too, Park said. Despite normalizing relations with Moscow, Beijing and Vietnam, the U.S. "has chosen containment over engagement and peaceful coexistence with North Korea," he said. It's because "we've never known our enemy," said the University of Chicago's Bruce Cumings, author of the new book "The Korean War." American policymakers down the generations wrongly viewed Pyongyang as a puppet of the Kremlin and Beijing, he said. "When the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991, these deep suppositions about the nature of the regime led them to predict North Korea would collapse any day soon. Here we are 20 years later and North Korea is still standing," Cumings said. He added that **in light of the intense bombing of the north during the war, "you can understand how North Korea looks at us**." Some say the best opportunity for peace was a half-century ago -- that when China withdrew its troops from the north in 1958, U.S. troops should have withdrawn from the peninsula. Others say the abrupt change in tone between the presidencies of Bill Clinton and George W. Bush dashed hopes for progress. Still others say South Korea's decadelong "sunshine policy" of peaceful coexistence, economic relations and humanitarian aid for North Korea bolstered a regime that otherwise would have collapsed. And retired Maj. Gen. John K. Singlaub, a former U.S. chief of staff in Korea, sees blown opportunities in the war years themselves. "The armistice, in essence, rewarded North Korea for invading South Korea. We had the opportunity from a military standpoint. We should have pushed north" -- that is, pressed the offensive, he said. . . . Decades of crisis invite such an array of post-mortems and prescriptions for peace, just as the immediate consequences of the war itself remain uncertain in many ways. Did 2.5 million people die, or as many as 4 million? The United Nations concluded that Chinese military deaths alone reached almost 1 million. The official U.S. death toll stands at 36,516, and hundreds more died from 15 European and other allied nations that came to South Korea's defense. Tens of thousands were massacred in political executions on both sides. T**he physical devastation, both north and south, was almost complete**: factories and schools, railroads and ports, bridges and dams, and hundreds of thousands of homes destroyed. Some 10 million **South Koreans today are separated from family in the north**. For the 49 million South Koreans and 24 million North Koreans, **that psychic legacy of the unending war, another kind of damage, remains powerful**. "The Korean people never imagined they could be separated. That was the beginning of the tragedy," said Park, the historian. "**For North Koreans and South Koreans both, the thing now is to avoid a second Korean War at all costs. It would mean the death of all of us."**

North Korea War Turns Russia

The biggest risk to a Korean war is the involvement of Russia

Massa 9 (Alexander, http://www.projectshiningcity.org/fp371.php)KFC

The problem with this whole scenario lies not simply with North & South Korea and the United States. The forces of the US and ROK would be able to defeat the DPRK on the battlefield. That is not the problem. The problem is that China and/or Russia could intervene militarily on the side of the North, therefore causing, by definition, a world war. The real question here is this: will China and/or Russia intervene? Out of the two, China is more likely to intervene, as it props up Pyongyang, and, in essence, controls the DPRK as a puppet regime of Beijing. Russia no longer seems to have a stake in the survival of the Pyongyang regime, and therefore would probably not react directly against us militarily, but would probably deploy troops to their border with Korea, and around Vladivostok, in order to have a military presence in the area and ensure no violence spills over the border. Even China may not necessarily come to the aid of North Korea, which, over the past few years, has become more of a liability than an asset to Beijing.

Conflict on the Korean Peninsula would draw Russia to collapse the NPT and full war

Chufrin 5 (Gennady, Dir of the Institute of World Economy and In’t Relations, Jul 12, 2005, http://northkorea.ssrc.org/Chufrin/)KFC

Development of constructive and stable relations with both Korean states on a wide range of issues of common interest, including regional security, is a high priority in Russia’s policy in Northeast Asia. As the security situation in and around the Korean Peninsula remained unstable and tensions there started to escalate since the end of 2002, Russia has striven to make its own contribution to the resolution of the evolving crisis. It came forward with “a package proposal,” aimed at ensuring the non-nuclear status of the Korean Peninsula, strict observation of the NPT regime there and meeting North Korea’s legitimate economic (energy requirements in particular) and security concerns. At the same time, Russia expressed in no uncertain terms its negative reaction regarding the D.P.R.K.’s withdrawal from the NPT, stating that such action may only aggravate an already tense situation on the Korean peninsula and could greatly damage the existing legal instruments of maintaining regional and global security. The worst-case scenario from the Russian position would be a complete collapse of the nuclear non-proliferation regime not only on the Korean Peninsula, but also in the wider region of East Asia, provoking Japan and Taiwan to go nuclear. Russia, therefore, continued to urge Pyongyang to listen to the opinion of the international community, its neighbors and partners and to comply with the established norms and requirements of the non-proliferation regime.

North Korea Turns Iran Prolif

A Korean war would increase nuclear weapon sales to Iran

Aym 10 (Terrence, May 03, 2010, http://www.vheadline.com/readnews.asp?id=91333)KFC

During 2009, dictator Kim Jong-il announced that his country no longer would abide by the Armistice that was suggested by India and agreed to by the United Nations, US, Russia, China and NKorea in 1953. SKorea never signed the agreement. The NKorean leader then announced that his country considered itself fully at war with the US Immediately afterward the NKoreans ramped up their weapons sales -- including nuclear weapons technology and long range missile parts -- to Iran and Syria. They have since expanded that to include Venezuela, Cuba and possibly Nicaragua. Border incidents increased and gigantic tunnels running under the DMZ from NKorea into SKorean territory were discovered. And then the belligerent communist nation detonated its first atomic bomb. Although experts argued as to whether the detonation could be that of a nuclear weapon, none dismissed the second nuclear blast. The consensus was that Kim Jog-il's regime had developed 'the Bomb.'

North Korea War Turns Terror

The North Koreans will uses terror tactics in a war to defeat South Korea

Harden 9 (Blaine, Washington Post Foreign Service, October 9, 2009, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/10/08/AR2009100804018.html)KFC

"The North Koreans have done what they had to do to make sure their military is still a credible threat," said Bruce E. Bechtol Jr., a North Korea specialist who is a professor at the Marine Corps Command and Staff College in Quantico. "They can still inflict tens of thousands of civilian casualties in Seoul on the first day of combat." The havoc-raising potential of North Korea's special forces has grown as their numbers have increased and their training has shifted to terrorist tactics developed by insurgents in Iraq and Afghanistan, according to Gen. Walter Sharp, commander of U.S. forces in Korea. "The capability is really very large, and they will use these tactics," Sharp told reporters recently in Washington. In a conflict, tens of thousands of special forces members would try to infiltrate South Korea: by air in radar-evading biplanes, by ground through secret tunnels beneath the demilitarized zone (DMZ), and by sea aboard midget submarines and hovercraft, according to South Korean and U.S. military analysts. Disguised in the uniforms of South Korean police and military personnel, special forces are also expected to try to walk into Seoul. Dressed as civilians, they may also arrive aboard passenger flights from Beijing and other foreign capitals. "These are not your standard North Korean guys," Bechtol said. "They are the best-trained, best-fed and most indoctrinated soldiers in the North. They know how to fight, and if they are caught, they are trained to kill themselves."

A war in Korea would take needed troops away from the War on Terror – those are needed

Roberts 9 (Matt, April 13, 2009, http://www.associatedcontent.com/article/1624457/why\_we\_cant\_go\_to\_war\_with\_north\_korea.html?cat=9)KFC

It is this quote which scares me because a new global conflict or a potential World War III could occur, which would devastate the world and particularly, the US. North Korea knew that if they launched this rocket it would cause tension and "conflict" but they did it anyway. The US, because of North Korea's decision, is obligated to play the role of "world police" and try to fix everything and make ourselves seem tough. This is when things get out of hand. There are many reasons why we can't fight a World War III. Firstly, the US is currently in a recession, we need to get our country back online before we can deal with huge international affairs. This includes our credit cycles to be working again, housing crisis to be fix. As well as a solution to our new 8.5% unemployment (13 million people) problem. The banks need to be stabilized and lending again. Secondly, we are fighting a multi-front war against terrorism. Our military is already under pressure in the Middle East and isn't big enough to be fighting another "huge" war in the East. If "WW-III" is carried out, I believe the draft would have a high chance of being reinstated because we can't fight a major war with our declining recruiting rates, we just would not have a chance at success.

North Korea War Turns Econ

A war with North Korea would damage the US economy

Witt 10 (Ryan May 25, 2010, Political Buzz Examiner, http://www.examiner.com/x-5738-Political-Buzz-Examiner~y2010m5d25-What-a-war-with-North-Korea-would-mean)KFC

If a war did break out the U.S. and South Korea would likely be victorious in the end, but nearly everyone agrees that the costs would be tremendous. The Pentagon has played out a number of war games involving war with North. Most end with the U.S. "winning," but not without significant casualties along the way. Conservatives estimates have over 100,000 dying in the first few days of the conflict. The North Koreans have an army over 1,000,000 men and many armored divisions. The border between the two countries is littered with thousands of land mines. More importantly, they have significant stockpile of over 2,000 tons of chemical weapons and the means to deliver them into South Korea via ballistic missiles. If that prospect is not scary enough, the North also has some kind of nuclear weapon capabilities now, though it is unknown how they could deliver the weapon. Finally, any conflict would also risk a global escalation involving China, who has traditionally been an ally of the North Koreans. This would not be an Iraq or Afghanistan where the U.S. military is simply able to swoop in with "shock and awe" to overwhelm the enemy. Significant casualties would occur on both sides in this war. The picture is gets worse when you consider the economic side of the equation. The war would certainly take a toll on the South Korean economy when the North launches all their offensive weapons over the border. The South Korean economy is the 15th largest in the world with a GDP of $832 billion. Compare that number with the GDP of Greece ($330 billion) whose economic troubles nearly caused another global crisis. The U.S trades much more with South Korea as well. We sent approximately $2.48 billion worth of goods to Greece last year compared with $28.64 billion we sent to South Korea. A war on the Korean peninsula would greatly endanger what is already a very fragile economic recovery. Simply put, any sane person would want to avoid a war on the Korean peninsula if at all possible. Most believe the United States and South Korea are doing all they can to avoid an armed conflict. However, North Korean dictator Kim Jong Il has not always been known for rationality. We can only hope that he realizes the consequences of his actions in the coming days and weeks.

North Korea War Turns BCW’s

A US North Korea war would result in a transfer of chemical and nuclear weapons

Witt 10 (Ryan May 25, 2010, Political Buzz Examiner, http://www.examiner.com/x-5738-Political-Buzz-Examiner~y2010m5d25-What-a-war-with-North-Korea-would-mean)KFC

If a war did break out the U.S. and South Korea would likely be victorious in the end, but nearly everyone agrees that the costs would be tremendous. The Pentagon has played out a number of war games involving war with North. Most end with the U.S. "winning," but not without significant casualties along the way. Conservatives estimates have over 100,000 dying in the first few days of the conflict. The North Koreans have an army over 1,000,000 men and many armored divisions. The border between the two countries is littered with thousands of land mines. More importantly, they have significant stockpile of over 2,000 tons of chemical weapons and the means to deliver them into South Korea via ballistic missiles. If that prospect is not scary enough, the North also has some kind of nuclear weapon capabilities now, though it is unknown how they could deliver the weapon. Finally, any conflict would also risk a global escalation involving China, who has traditionally been an ally of the North Koreans. This would not be an Iraq or Afghanistan where the U.S. military is simply able to swoop in with "shock and awe" to overwhelm the enemy. Significant casualties would occur on both sides in this war. The picture is gets worse when you consider the economic side of the equation. The war would certainly take a toll on the South Korean economy when the North launches all their offensive weapons over the border. The South Korean economy is the 15th largest in the world with a GDP of $832 billion. Compare that number with the GDP of Greece ($330 billion) whose economic troubles nearly caused another global crisis. The U.S trades much more with South Korea as well. We sent approximately $2.48 billion worth of goods to Greece last year compared with $28.64 billion we sent to South Korea. A war on the Korean peninsula would greatly endanger what is already a very fragile economic recovery. Simply put, any sane person would want to avoid a war on the Korean peninsula if at all possible. Most believe the United States and South Korea are doing all they can to avoid an armed conflict. However, North Korean dictator Kim Jong Il has not always been known for rationality. We can only hope that he realizes the consequences of his actions in the coming days and weeks.

North Korea War Turns Heg

Bush’s calling North Korea part of the ‘axis of evil’ dooms any war to have the same fate as the Iraq war, a collapse of heg

Odom 7 (William E., Adjunct Professor of Political Science, Yale University, Proceedings Of The American Philosophical Society, 151(4), December 2007, http://www.amphilsoc.org/sites/default/files/1510403.pdf)KFC

Once the president announced the “axis of evil” thesis in his State of the Union address to Congress in January 2002, however, that support began to decline. NATO invoked Article 5 of the treaty for the first time in the history of the alliance, declaring that al Qaeda’s attack on the United States was also an attack on all other members. They signed up to fight al Qaeda. They were shocked to learn that the president was declaring war on Iraq, Iran, and North Korea without even consulting them. His so-called “global war on terrorism” was being stretched to justify invasions of countries anywhere, something that most allies understandably refused to accept. Failure to gain UN Security Council approval for the invasion of Iraq ensured that the financial costs of the war, not to mention the loss of life and moral standing in world opinion, would be huge, and that the quality of the coalition members would be poor. For example, the coalition in 1991 had French troops; in 2003 it had Ukrainian, Polish, and Honduran troops, and even a few from Mongolia! The costs of the war rise every day, well above $300 billion, and we can be sure that other countries will not share them with the American taxpayer. The president may have delighted many American voters by asserting U.S. sovereignty against the will of our allies in the UN Security Council— behavior we would normally expect of a French government, not of the government that built the post–World War II international order— but they will not be delighted with the impact of the action on their pocketbooks for years to come. As a spectacular example of how to squander American hegemony— fiscally, militarily, politically, and morally—the war in Iraq will probably turn out to be the greatest strategic mistake in American history. Can we still save the American empire? Or is it too late? We can, but we must act soon. The first step must be withdrawal from Iraq. That invasion was never in American interests. Rather, it advanced the interests of Iran by avenging Saddam’s invasion of that country. And it advanced al Qaeda’s interests by making Iraq open for its cadres. They are killing both Americans and Iraqis there in growing numbers, and taking their newly gained skills to other countries. Many reports suggest that al Qaeda was in desperate condition by spring 2002 and that only after the U.S. invasion of Iraq did its recruiting powers recover and its funding sources replenish its coffers. Apparently, President Bush came to Osama bin Laden’s rescue in his nadir. The irony would be comical if it were not so tragic.

North Korea War Turns Heg

A war with North Korea would expose the US hegemon’s lies that have been made, destroying it as a superpower

Lind 7 (Michael, New America Foundation, May/June 2007, The National Interest, http://www.newamerica.net/publications/articles/2007/beyond\_american\_hegemony\_5381)KFC

"Rogue state" is a term of emotional propaganda, not sober analysis. The rogue-state rationale is employed when American leaders wish to rally support for a policy whose actual purpose -- increasing or reinforcing American military hegemony in its European, Asian or Middle Eastern sphere of influence -- cannot be explained to the public. Instead, the American public is told that this or that rogue state -- North Korea, Iran or Iraq -- is a direct threat to the American people and the American homeland, as it will be able to lob missiles at the United States or to give terrorists nuclear bombs or other WMD for use on American soil. In the case of North Korea, for example, U.S. policy is motivated largely, although not solely, by the fear that if Japan loses confidence in America’s willingness to protect it, Japan may obtain its own nuclear deterrent and renationalize its foreign policy, emerging from the status of a semi-sovereign U.S. protectorate to that of an independent military great power once again. But no president can tell the American public that the United States must be willing to lose 50,000 or more American lives in a war with North Korea for fear that Japan will get nuclear weapons to defend itself. Therefore the public is told instead that North Korea might give nuclear weapons to non-state actors to use to destroy New York, Washington and other American cities, or that North Korean missiles can strike targets in North America. If Iran were to obtain nuclear weapons, its purpose almost certainly would be defensive -- to deter the United States, Israel or any other state from attacking it. The American public would not support a preventive war against Iran on the lunatic theory that it would cheaper to attack Iran before it gets nuclear weapons than to attack Iran after it gets them. Therefore, neoconservative hawks seek to persuade the public that Iran, like North Korea, might either bombard Kansas or give nuclear weapons to Islamist terrorists, or that Iran’s viciously anti-Semitic leadership might use nuclear weapons against Israel. (Annihilating Israeli Arabs and Palestinians alongside Israeli Jews would seem to be an odd way to promote the Palestinian cause -- but then, Iran’s leaders, like the leaders of any country that opposes the United States, are said to be "insane.") In the Balkans, a major strategic goal of the Kosovo war was reassuring Germany so it would not develop a defense policy independent of the U.S.-dominated NATO alliance. But Milosevic’s Yugoslavia could not be accused of developing WMD, so it had to be accused of something else if the American public were to support the war. In fact it was guilty of a war crime -- ethnic cleansing. But the Clinton Administration and supporters of intervention talked about "genocide", a much more serious charge. Needless to say, criminal as it is, ethnic cleansing -- using terror to frighten an ethnic group into leaving a country -- is the opposite of genocide, the extermination of an ethnic group, which requires that they be trapped, not expelled. When the Nazis settled on the Final Solution, they took measures to prevent Jews from escaping Europe. The point is not to argue that ethnic cleansing should not be discouraged and punished by the international community, or that proliferation is not a problem or that the regimes called rogue states are not threats to their neighbors and world order. The point is rather that these phenomena have been used as public rationales for recent wars and threatened wars whose real purpose was either the reassurance of regional allies like Germany and Japan or the dissuasion of potential enemies like Russia and China (Kosovo, North Korea), or the removal of regimes that threatened America’s military freedom of action as the post-Cold War hegemon of the Middle East (the Iraq War). The genocide in Rwanda was real, but the United States did not intervene because -- unlike America’s would-be permanent protectorates in Europe, Asia and the Middle East -- Africa contains no great powers or critical power resources, and therefore is marginal to the U.S. hegemony strategy. Pakistan fits the definition of a rogue state, but it is a U.S. ally -- and as long as it remains friendly to the United States, it can be permitted to retain nuclear weapons.

North Korea War Turns Soft Power

Mishandling a failed nation like North Korea during military times kills US soft power – Bush and the invasion of Iraq

Steinberg 8 (James B., dean of the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs ,The Washington Quarterly 31(2), http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/washington\_quarterly/v031/31.2steinberg.html)KFC

To understand what went wrong, it is important to recall how the United States got here in the first place. During the 2000 presidential campaign, Bush and his advisers offered conventional "realist" foreign policy bromides: focus on core national security interests and great powers and avoid overextending U.S. military forces or undertaking nation building.3 Yet, many of the officials who would come to play key roles in the Bush administration long harbored a more revolutionary agenda. By their assessment, U.S. power had eroded dramatically over the 1990s. The United States had failed to respond effectively to challenges from rogue states such as Iran, Iraq, and North Korea and the terrorists whom they supported. This weakness emboldened the United States' enemies to confront it directly.4 The United States could only be safe by forcefully taking on these dangerous states through militarily led regime change that would pave the way for pro-American, democratic governments. As the 1990s wore on, Iraq came to play an ever more central role as the leading "action item" in executing the new strategy. Removing Saddam Hussein not only offered an opportunity to demonstrate that the United States had returned from its holiday from history, but also seemed to be an attractive opening move in the project of democratic transformation. Iraq was the ideal candidate for three reasons. First, Saddam's continued defiance was the most visible symbol of U.S. weakness. Second, Iraq was seen as having a nascent secular, middle-class culture ready to take its place among the world's democracies once the obstacle of Saddam and the Ba'ath Party was swept away, a view urged by an articulate, well-connected Iraqi exile community. Third, the progressive deterioration of Iraq's military after a decade of sanctions made the Iraqi army a tempting target—a "cakewalk."5 When the terrorists attacked on September 11, 2001, the proponents of the new strategy thus had a ready-made U.S. response. For most of the world, "Iraq" was a startling non sequitur to "what shall we do now?" asked in response to an attack executed by al Qaeda from its sanctuary in Afghanistan. For Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz and his like-minded colleagues, however, it was the natural conclusion to their theory of how to restore U.S. leadership. The shock of 9/11 was an opportunity to liberate the United States from the shackles of alliance relations and international law to pursue a long-cherished strategy that, until that moment, had been stymied by a domestic political environment that was blind to the gathering dangers.6 [End Page 156] Alas, things did not work out in any of the ways that their strategy implied. Instead of intimidating North Korea, Kim Jong-il went on to test his long-range missiles and nuclear bomb. Instead of deterring Iran, the intervention dramatically shifted the power balance in the Persian Gulf by installing an Iran-friendly government in Baghdad and reinforcing the domestic strength of the hard-liners in Tehran while making it more difficult for Tehran's Sunni rivals to identify publicly with the United States.

North Korea War Solves Prolif

A war with North Korea would stop the proliferation of weapons by North Korea

Parker 3 (Randall, 2003 July 16, http://www.parapundit.com/archives/001489.html)KFC

Kaplan thinks that the North Koreans are ready to deal. More likely they are just stalling for time while they develop nuclear weapons. Once they have a lot of nukes Kim Jong-il probably figures he will be able to deter a US attack, extort a lot more aid from South Korea and Japan, and even earn a large amount of revenue by selling nuclear weapons to Middle Eastern governments and terrorist groups. From his standpoint becoming a nuclear power probably looks far more attractive than trying to strike a deal with the United States for aid in exchange for not developing nukes. Does Kaplan think that North Korea is going to hand over its processed plutonium, processed uranium, and uranium enrichment centrifuges? If they agreed to do so how would we know that they are not cheating? We'd probably find out that they cheated when an American city suddenly got vaporized. Short of air strikes or full scale war what else can the United States do about North Korea? I've previous posted (here and here) on the Proliferation Security Initiative. While the goal of that initiative might seem to be to stop the sale of WMD by North Korea by interception of WMD shipments it is unlikely to be able to accomplish that directly. A nuclear weapon or weapons grade bomb material would be so small that ways to smuggle it past ships and aircraft enforcing a partial blocakde would likely be found. However, that does not mean that the Proliferation Security Initiative has no value. If it has the effect of reducing illicit drug and missile sales then it will reduce the revenue that the regime receives. It will also demonstrate to the Chinese the seriousness with which the US treats the developing threat posed by North Korea. The other remaining option that gets far too little attention is to attempt to reach the North Korean people with news about the outside world and ideas that they know little about. I've posted an assortment of suggestions on how this might be accomplished. Also see this post for more on that idea. We will some day pay a high price to take out the North Korean regime. The big question is whether we will be willing to pay that price before an American city is nuked.

North Korea War Solves Heg

A war between the US and North Korea would reentrance US heg

Galtung 98 (Johan, dr hc mult, Professor of Peace Studies Dir., October 13, 1998, http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/New\_World\_Order/US\_Hegemony.html)KFC

 The exceptions were wars of self-defense or miliary obligations from the League Covenant, the Monroe doctrine or alliance obligations - similar to the UN Charter Article 2(4), with exceptions. Both valid international law, with holes. The three dictatorships were above the law and the League. They brushed all resolutions aside, lifted by their visions of a New Order: Neuordnung/Nuovo Ordine/dai-to-a. Their propaganda was as massive as the NATO propaganda with its insulting "apologies" for "collateral damage" that so obviously was intended by those on top from the very beginning. (The world did not have Internet at the time, that helps today). But the power was on the side of those "above the law" because of a criterion of their own choice - although there was probably more popular will behind what those dictatorships did than for the sneaky action by the "democracies"). The dictatorships followed up what they started: the Second world war. The USA, using NATO-AMPO-TIAP, is probably tempted to do the same, starting with North Korea and Colombia(?), to implement their New World Order. Unfortunately, this kind of politics is accompanied by a general attitude of self-righteousness and self-appointment. To the present President, William Jefferson Clinton, America has become the world's "indispensable nation". Since JCS has been drawn upon to show the political/military tradition enacted, it is worth pointing out that to one recent Chairman of the JCS, Colin Powell, "America was created by divine providence to bring order to the world", and to his successor, John Shalikashvili, the USA is nothing less than a "global nation with global interests". To such a nation world hegemony is not a right. It is a duty to be "international police force", whether others agree or not.

\*\*\*JAPAN\*\*\*

Japan-South Korea Relations Solve Asian Instability

Strong Japan- South Korea relations ensure Asian stability

DPJ 99 [Democratic Party of Japan, June, http://www.dpj.or.jp/english/policy/security.html]

Relations with the Republic of Korea are becoming closer, particularly in the economic field. While President Kim Dae Jung's visit to Japan in 1998 saw progress in Japan-ROK relations, sincere efforts need to be made to strengthen these ties further, building deeper relations of trust. Economic interdependence between the two countries should be deepened, while we should also accelerate cultural and regional exchange. It will be also important that both Japan and the ROK promote mutual exchange and dialogue on security issues. Such topics, the shape of security in Northeast Asia once the Korean Peninsula has stabilized should be discussed. In order to resolve the territorial issues between the two countries so that these do not flare up into major problems in the future, consideration should be given to the creation of some kind of consultative framework that includes third-party international institutions.

Japan-US Relations Solve Asian Instability

Japan-US relations solve Asian instability

DPJ 99 [Democratic Party of Japan, June, http://www.dpj.or.jp/english/policy/security.html]

The Japan-U.S. Security Arrangements have a major role in ensuring the peace and stability of the Asia-Pacific region. Close diplomatic and security tie between the two good economic super powers based on the Japan-U.S. Security Arrangements act as a stabilizing factor in the region. In Asia where no collective security framework such as NATO exists, the U.S. military presence in the Asia-Pacific region plays an important role for the peace and stability of the region. And the U.S. forces in Japan function as the focus of all U.S. forces in the region. Its objective being stated literally as peace and stability in the Far East, however, the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty does not explicitly legitimize the role of U.S. forces stationed in Japan in the Asia-Pacific region as a whole. In any case, the DPJ believes that more effective Japan-U.S. Security Arrangements would provide an important foundation for regional peace and stability. What is crucial for Japan is to build a relationship of trust with the alliance partner. Through frank consultations with the United States, Japan should try to make sure that U.S. behavior should be balanced with the benefit of the region as a whole, rather than being solely concentrated too narrowly on national interest.

Japan-US Relations Solve Prolif

US- Japan relations are the only thing keeping Japan from proliferating

Satoh 9 (Yukio, *Policy Forum Online*, http://www.nautilus.org/publications/essays/napsnet/policy-forums-online/security2009-2010/09018Satoh.html , may 5,9) ET

Yet, strategically, Japan's adherence to the Three Non-Nuclear Principles depends largely, if not solely, upon the credibility of the Japan-US Security Treaty, or more specifically, that of the United States' commitment to defend Japan from any offensive action, including nuclear threats. In response, the US government has been steadfastly assuring the Japanese in an increasingly clear manner of American commitment to provide deterrence for Japan by all means, including nuclear. Against this backdrop, the argument made by the aforementioned four eminent strategists in the tone-setting joint article published in The Wall Street Journal of January 4, 2007, that "the end of the Cold War made the doctrine of mutual Soviet-American deterrence obsolete", was received with mixed reactions in Japan: welcome for the sake of nuclear disarmament and caution from the perspectives of security and defense. As depending upon the US' extended nuclear deterrence will continue to be Japan's only strategic option to neutralize potential or conceivable nuclear and other strategic threats, the Japanese are sensitive to any sign of increased uncertainties with regard to extended deterrence. A unique feature of the Japan-US security arrangements is that there have been no consultations on how American extended deterrence should function, nor even any mechanism put in place for such consultations. This has been largely due to Japan's reluctance to date to be involved in American nuclear strategy. The Japanese government had gone even further in promising the people that it would strictly apply the Non-Nuclear Principles to the entry of US vessels and aircraft even at a time when tactical nuclear weapons were reportedly aboard some of them. In recent years, though, the Japanese have been more concerned about the credibility of the American commitment. Exposed to a series of threatening actions by Pyongyang, particularly its test-shooting of missiles over Japan (1998) and its nuclear testing (2006), the Japanese have come to realize anew how indispensable American deterrence is to their security. The abduction of Japanese citizens by Pyongyang's agents, which became public knowledge in 2002, had added to Japanese security concerns about North Korea, so that the Bush administration's decision to rescind (prematurely in Japanese eyes) the designation of the DPRK as a State Sponsor of Terrorism raised voices in Japan questioning Washington's sense of solidarity with an ally. It is indeed difficult to judge whether and how the concept of nuclear deterrence would work vis-a-vis North Korea, whose unpredictability makes it difficult to exclude the possibility that Pyongyang might use nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction out of desperation. Japan has therefore been engaged in the development of ballistic missile defense (BMD) systems in cooperation with the United States. Although BMD systems need to be much improved before they can be considered reliable, they are designed to eventually function, at least conceptually, as a supplementary means for defending the country against North Korea's missiles if and when deterrence were to fail. In addition, their purely defensive characteristics are stabilizing, rather than destabilizing, regional strategic balance. In the meantime, Japanese concern about the credibility of American extended deterrence could increase if the US government would unilaterally move to redefine the concept of nuclear deterrence and to reduce dependence upon nuclear weapons in providing deterrence. The time has come for the governments of Japan and the United States to articulate better the shared concept of extended deterrence, nuclear or otherwise, in order to assure the Japanese that deterrence will continue to function under changing strategic circumstances and with technological developments.

Japanese rearm causes nuclear conflict in Asia

Matthews 03 (Eugene, sr fellow @ council on Foreign Rel, *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 82, # 6, pg. 74-90, nov/dec 3) ET

Having said that, Washington must persuade Tokyo not to acquire nuclear weapons. A nuclear Japan would makes Asia a more dangerous place, starting an arms race unlike any the region has ever seen. China would increase its nuclear stockpile and seek more military resources, particularly nuclear submarines. Asia would suddenly have five nuclear powers--China, India, Japan, Pakistan, and North Korea--and South Korea would quickly follow, raising the potential for disastrous conflict.

Japan-US Relations Solves Prolif

A strong US - Japan alliance is necessary to prevent proliferation in Asia which would lead to miscalculation, preemption, and retaliatory war.

Friedberg 94 (Aaron L., Associate Prof. of Politics and Internat’l Affairs at Princeton and Director of Research Program in International Security at Princeton’s Center of International Studies, *International Security*, Vol. 18, No. 3, Winter, p. 5-33, ) ET

If the prospective costs of war appear unduly high and the benefits sufficiently low, the nations of Asia could remain at peace, regardless of the differences in their domestic structures and the weakness of some of the linkages between them. In Asia, however, even these elemental forces for caution and restraint may prove to be insufficient. To begin with, while nuclear weapons already serve to dampen the dangers of war between Russia and China or China and India, they are not yet evenly distributed across the region. Not all the states that feel themselves threatened by hostile nuclear forces have thus far been either able or willing to acquire matching capabilities of their own. In several cases this is not for any lack of trying; after many years of arduous effort Pakistan and North Korea may soon have operational nuclear forces. For the time being, Japan and South Korea have chosen to continue their Cold War policies of taking shelter beneath the U.S. nuclear umbrella, although their willingness to continue doing so will depend on the intensity of the threats they perceive and their faith in American security guarantees. In the foreseeable future Taiwan could also have both the means and the motivation to acquire nuclear weapons. Assuming for the moment that an Asia with more nuclear powers would be more stable than one with fewer, there would still be serious difficulties involved in negotiating the transition to such a world. As in other regions, small, nascent nuclear forces will be especially vulnerable to preemption. In Japan the prevailing "nuclear allergy" could lead first to delays in acquiring deterrent forces and then to a desperate and dangerous scramble for nuclear weapons.68 In Asia the prospects for a peaceful transition may be further complicated by the fact that the present and potential nuclear powers are both numerous and strategically intertwined. The nuclearization of Korea (North, South or, whether through reunification or competitive arms programs, both together) could lead to a similar development in Japan, which might cause China to accelerate and expand its nuclear programs, which could then have an impact on the defense policies of Taiwan, India (and through it, Pakistan) and Russia (which would also be affected by events in Japan and Korea). All of this would influence the behavior of the United States. Similar shockwaves could also travel through the system in different directions (for example, from India to China to Japan to Korea). A rapid, multifaceted expansion in nuclear capabilities could increase the dangers of misperception, miscalculation, and war. Even a successful transition to a many-sided nuclear balance would not necessarily guarantee peace. As during the Cold War, nuclear armed states would, of course, remain free to use force against lesser opponents, although by doing so they might run the risk of colliding with one another. As to the possibility of war among the nuclear powers, it is not obvious that nuclear multipolarity will necessarily be as stable as nuclear bipolarity. Forces adequate for deterring a single opponent (by appearing capable of absorbing its first strike and then hitting back against it with overwhelming destructive power) might not be sufficient to deter two or more opponents acting together. The members of such a nuclear alliance might be more inclined to believe that, if they teamed up to attack their common enemy, they could diminish its forces to the point where each could afford to absorb a fraction of the resulting retaliatory blow. These calculations could prove to be mistaken, with disastrous consequences all around but, as Stanley Hoffmann pointed out almost thirty years ago: "The more nuclear powers there are, the more uneven . . . their stage of nuclear development, the more complicated calculations will be [and] the more dangerous yet likely misperceptions will become. "69.

Japan-US Relations Solves Heg

JASA collapse would destroy U.S. hegemony

Kazuhisa 99 (Ogawa, analyst of international politics, *Japan quarterly*, p. 22) ET

No country in the littorals of the Pacific and Indian Oceans even begins to approach Japan in meeting conditions for a power-projection platform. One year after Japan notifies the United States of its intention to terminate the alliance, the United States would lose leverage and with it, most of its capability to project military power over half the world. Short of power-projection capability, the United States would be hard-pressed to remain the world’s sole superpower. Despite its colossal economy, diversified nuclear arsenal and qualitative advantage in conventional forces, the United States would be just one among several great powers, America’s power differential with respect to China, Russia, and other major powers would be much smaller. This has been generally acknowledged by U.S. governmental policy advisers in semi-official meetings. Then, by the way of reports, I convinced the Japanese government leaders of the significance of the American’s agreement.

US-Japan alliance is critical to sustaining US hegemony

Green 03 ( Prof @ Penn State, “Japans’ Reluctant Realism”,p. 9-10) ET

At the same time, however, this study also suggests that U.S. policymakers can no longer assume Japan's automatic compliance with U.S. diplomacy—and certainly cannot assume Japanese passivity. In order to sustain its own position in Asia, the United States will have to do more to demonstrate reciprocal support for Japanese diplomatic initiatives. The United States will have to frame its policy toward East Asia and multilateral organizations in terms that give Japan responsibilities at all stages of diplomacy—from conceptualization, to funding, to implementation on the ground. And at each stage, the United States will have to raise the bar of expectations on Japan—giving more responsibility, but insisting on more sharing of the risk. The United States will have to establish agreement with Japan on strategy and allow for divergence in tactics. In short, the United States will have to sustain a focus on Japan when its help is not required for U.S. diplomacy, so that Japan is more forthcoming when its help becomes essential. If U.S.-Japan diplomatic cooperation breaks down or drifts, Japan may not go the way of Gaullism, but U.S. leadership in the world will be less effective. The United States will lose leverage in its bilateral relationships with other Asian countries and in multilateral institutions as Japan joins in ad hoc coalitions with Europe, or even Russia and China, to constrain U.S. unilateralism; or as Tokyo refuses to fund U.S. initiatives. Tokyo's confidence in the U.S. commitment to Japanese security will wane, leading to more hedging strategies, redundant indigenous military capabilities, and exacerbated tensions throughout Asia. Concern about U.S. unilateralism will lead to more legal and political constraints on the use of U.S. forces based in Japan. Frustration with the asymmetrical aspects of the alliance could mount to the point that U.S. forward presence becomes at risk. Diplomatic leadership sharing, in short, is a critical complement to the core military aspect of the U.S.-Japan security relationship.

Japan Instability Turns Asia Stability

Japanese instability bad- pivotal post for US asian presence, key to US military, and collapse risks global instability

Kapila 6/7 (Subhash, international relations and strategic affairs analyst, *South Asia Analysis Group*, http://www.southasiaanalysis.org//papers39/paper3848.html paper no. 3848) ET

Japan is no ordinary nation in Asia. It has a unique historical past in strategic terms. It also has a unique strategic future both in terms of the US-Japan Mutual Security Treaty and also should it adopt an independent strategic posture based on its innate national strengths. In terms of the US-Japan Mutual Security Treaty (50th Anniversary this year). Japan is the pivot of the United States security architecture in East Asia even now despite significant changes in US-China relations and the overall power-balance in North-East Asia more specifically. In global terms, Japan counts more politically and economically than strategically. Its global significance arises from the fact that it is ‘global funder’ of many economic and social reconstruction projects. Here also Japan figures significantly in the United States calculus as additionally Japan virtually underwrites the United States forward military presence in East-Asia and contributes financially to United States military operations to offset her Constitutional limitations of not contributing troops e.g. Afghanistan, Iraq, Indian Ocean maritime security etc. With such strategic, political and economic salience, when political instability hits Japan, the strategic impact of such instability becomes a matter of serious concern both in regional and global terms. It should be a graver concern for the United States. Early this month, Japan witnessed the installation of the fifth Japanese Prime Minister in four years. Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama who assumed office on 16 September 2009 after leading the Democratic Party to victory in General Elections had to step down on 4 June 2010. The major reason was his inability to honor his election pledge on the relocation of the US Marine Aviation Base at Futema on Okinawa Island. Naato Kan has taken over as the new Prime Minister, He was the Deputy Prime Minister and more importantly the Finance Minister in the outgoing Cabinet. Noted as pragmatic, straight-talking and a decisive politician. Unlike his predecessors, Prime Minister Kan is the first Japanese Prime Minister who does not belong to any of Japan’s political dynasties or the elitist bureaucracy. As a civil activist he has risen from the grassroots and has been the founder-member of the Democratic Party. Prime Minister Kan inherits all the security and economic challenges that the previous Prime Minister had faced and in particular the resolution of the US-Japan security related debate over Futema Marine Air Base. Japan therefore, is in for challenging times and moreso against the backdrop of the changing strategic landscape in North East Asia. Japan is emerging more like the Italy of East Asia with frequent changes in Prime Ministers. While Japan is fortunate that its powerful civilian bureaucracy ensures a continuity in policies the political instability if it persists calls for strategic assessment of its impact.

Japan Rearm Turns NPT

Japanese rearm would cause worldwide prolif and collapses NPT

Shimbun 02 (Asahi, 7/9/2) ET

If Japan becomes a nuclear power despite its history as a victim of nuclear attack, the NPT will effectively collapse. It would certainly not be in the nation's interest, nor would it win world support, to lead the way in turning the world into a nuclear jungle.

NPT collapse leads to extinction

Akiba 03 (Tadatoshi, Mayor of Hiroshima, *Mayors Speeche @ MPI Strat meeting*, Apr 25, 3 http://www.city.hiroshima.jp/shimin/heiwa/mpi-speech.html) ET

And yet, the NPT has long been the only brake limiting the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Its collapse would destroy any chance of nuclear disarmament or abolition, leading in all likelihood to the actual use of a nuclear weapon. One use of such a weapon could, in turn, escalate to a nuclear war and, perhaps, the extinction of the entire human species.

Japanese proliferation will collapse the NPT

Halperin 99 (Morton, Sr fellow @ council on Foreign rel, Nautilus Institute, 7.20.99,

<http://www.nautilus.org/nukepolicy/Halperin/index.html>) ET

Moreover, Japan's development of nuclear weapons would certainly signal and accelerate the collapse of the NPT process. No one should take for granted the Japanese commitment over the long run to refrain from developing nuclear weapons.

Japan Rearm Turns India/Pakistan War

Japanese rearm leads to india pakistan arms race

Business Week 03 (*Business Week,* acclaimed new source, 1.20.3) ET

If Japan could get beyond the hurdles, it likely wouldn't need long to develop a bomb. It has five tons of plutonium stored in the nuclear research center of Tokai-mura, north of Tokyo, and its scientists know how to convert it to weapons-grade material. Hideyuki Ban, director of the nonprofit Citizens' Nuclear Information Center, says Japan could build a nuclear bomb within months. And its civilian rocket and satellite launching system could easily be converted to military use. Japan also has superbly equipped land, sea, and air forces that could deliver medium-range nukes to North Korea. But if Japan decides to build its own nukes, get ready for an Asian arms race. China would likely want to boost its arsenal, which would prompt India to develop more nuclear weapons, which would spur Pakistan to do the same -- and on and on into an ever more perilous future.

India/Pakistan arms race leads to nuclear war

Dallas Morning News 4 (*Dallas Morning News,* works with Fox News, acclaimed news source, 11.8.4) ET]

Yet Indians aren't disadvantaged at the ballot, and they showed it by tossing out Vajpayee's Bharatiya Janata Party. The new administration probably will be a coalition dominated by the Congress Party, led by Sonia Gandhi of the Gandhi political dynasty.The new administration should retain the best of the old \_ detente with Pakistan and China, openness to trade and investment, and cooperation in the war against Islamist terrorism. The detente is important to avoid a dangerous and debilitating nuclear arms race, which easily could deteriorate into nuclear war. The free-market strategy is necessary to create jobs for India's deep ranks of unemployed. And the defense cooperation is essential to defeat the Islamists, who have both India and the United States in their sights.

Most dangerous route to extinction

Washington Times 1(*Washington times,* 7.8.1) ET

The most dangerous place on the planet is Kashmir, a disputed territory convulsed and illegally occupied for more than 53 years and sandwiched between nuclear-capable India and Pakistan.It has ignited two wars between the estranged South Asian rivals in 1948 and 1965, and a third could trigger nuclear volleys and a nuclear winter threatening the entire globe. The United States would enjoy no sanctuary.

Japan Rearm Turns US/China War

Japanese rearming would cause Asian instability that would lead to the destruction of American hegemony and cause China – US war

Johnson 05 (chalmers, Pres of Jap Policy Institute, *Tom Dispatch* , http://www.tomdispatch.com/post/2259/chalmers\_johnson\_coming\_to\_terms\_with\_china)ET

I recall forty years ago, when I was a new professor working in the field of Chinese and Japanese international relations, that Edwin O. Reischauer once commented, "The great payoff from our victory of 1945 was a permanently disarmed Japan." Born in Japan and a Japanese historian at Harvard, Reischauer served as American ambassador to Tokyo in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. Strange to say, since the end of the Cold War in 1991 and particularly under the administration of George W. Bush, the United States has been doing everything in its power to encourage and even accelerate Japanese rearmament. Such a development promotes hostility between China and Japan, the two superpowers of East Asia, sabotages possible peaceful solutions in those two problem areas, Taiwan and North Korea, left over from the Chinese and Korean civil wars, and lays the foundation for a possible future Sino-American conflict that the United States would almost surely lose. It is unclear whether the ideologues and war lovers of Washington understand what they are unleashing -- a possible confrontation between the world's fastest growing industrial economy, China, and the world's second most productive, albeit declining, economy, Japan; a confrontation which the United States would have both caused and in which it might well be consumed. Let me make clear that in East Asia we are not talking about a little regime-change war of the sort that Bush and Cheney advocate. After all, the most salient characteristic of international relations during the last century was the inability of the rich, established powers -- Great Britain and the United States -- to adjust peacefully to the emergence of new centers of power in Germany, Japan, and Russia. The result was two exceedingly bloody world wars, a forty-five-year-long Cold War between Russia and the "West," and innumerable wars of national liberation (such as the quarter-century long one in Vietnam) against the arrogance and racism of European, American, and Japanese imperialism and colonialism.

US – China war would escalate into nuclear extinction

Straits Times 2k ( *Strait Times*, main asian news source, 5.25.2k) ET

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.

Japan Rearm Turns China War

A nuclear Japan will push China to a buildup its arsenals

Hughes 7 (Llewelyn, poli sci PHD @ MIT, *International Security* vol 31 no 4, 7) ET

This article reassesses the state of the evidence on the nuclearization of Japan. There are at least three reasons for doing so. First, changes in the regionaland international security environment add credenceto arguments that Japanese nuclearization will occur sooner rather than later. Most notably, the emergence of North Korea as a nuclear weapons state increases the threat to Japan, while the salience of the two central components of its strategy to defend against nuclear threats—multilateral regimes and the United States' extension of its nuclear deterrent to Japan—have been undermined.3 **[End Page 67]** Second, a decision by Japan to pursue an independent nuclear deterrent would undermine the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty(NPT) regime, which is already viewed by some as "teetering on the brink of irrelevancy."4 Such a decision would also worsenregional security relations, possibly leading China to bolster its nuclear weapons forceand South Korea to reconsider its nuclear weapons policy.

Japanese rearmament would provoke China

China Post 5 (*China Post*, 9.19.5, Newspaper that’s popular in China) ET

One other thing Koizumi is planning to do is to revise the MacArthur Constitution of 1946. General Douglas A. MacArthur, supreme commander of the Allied Forces in Japan, gave the country the pacifist constitution, which in its Article 9 abolishes war as an instrument of national policy. He has already made an exception to that article to send Japanese troops to Iraq for peacekeeping, and its removal to make Japan a "normal country" is expected to antagonize the People's Republic of China and to a lesser extent South Korea. They are afraid of a resurgence of ultranationalistic militarism, which goaded Japan to expand its empire after the Manchurian Incident of September 18, 1931.

Japanese rearmament could lead to war with China

Plate 5 (Tom, Prof @ UCLA, “Koizumi's success hinges on transparency” ,12.5.5) ET

Japan should become a model nation in openness. Otherwise, people will suspect the worst. As Taniguchi writes, "Japan's qualitative defense buildup is not a consequence of the nation's becoming a more rightwing or freelance power." It is the result of the natural political and global evolution of one of the world's largest economies. As the diplomat puts it, "The more information the nation discloses, the less room will there be for its neighbors to misunderstand its intentions." He goes further: "The Japanese government must invite Chinese defense planners to Tokyo regularly so they can scrutinize Japan's defense buildups and developments. This attempted transparency should be unwavering and unilateral, with or without reciprocal action from the Chinese side, in order for Japan to achieve the moral high ground." Japan is not looking to develop a new way of invading its neighbors. What Japan is looking to do is to carve out a role on the world stage that's commensurate with its achievements. Bumping and pushing against China is inevitable, but all-out war is not. Tokyo believes that its military buildup will deter this from happening. Let's hope so. But bad public diplomacy by Japan could raise tensions throughout the region. No one could say for sure what this might lead to.

Japan Rearm Turns Asia Nukes

Japan’s proliferation would trigger a Northeast Asia nuclear crisis.

Oros 3 (Andrew, ass prof of poli sci & internat’l studies @ WA College, *Stimson Center*, Dec 3) ET

Japan should dare follow the brinksmanship strategy of North Korea. Even the proponents of Japan’s nuclear armament acknowledge that Japan would not be able to develop nuclear weapons without US approval and cooperation. From a strategic perspective, the Japanese government in the past has quietly re-examined the nuclear option at times of fundamental strategic shifts in the international system.34 The results of these strategic calculations are noteworthy. All such examinations have reached the same conclusion: Japan’s possession of its own nuclear arsenal had little, if any strategic merit. The key points in the calculations that led to this conclusion are as follows: 1) Japan’s possession of nuclear weapons would undermine Japan’s national security by triggering an arms race in Northeast Asia, prompting the two Koreas and Taiwan to accelerate their nuclear development programs or to go nuclear as well—ultimately undermining regional and global security 2) Nuclear armament would not be appropriate for Japan because this country is inherently vulnerable to a nuclear attack, considering the fact that it is an island country where a large part of its population lives in a limited number of densely populated areas and thus lacks strategic depth 3) Japan is surrounded by seas and does not have sufficient ground for the use of tactical nuclear weapons 4) The threat of Russian and Chinese nuclear weapons can be deterred by US extended deterrence as long as it remains effective 5) Japan would never allow North Korea’s possession of nuclear weapons, and therefore, the North’s nuclear weapons do not, and will not, constitute the basis for calculating Japan’s future national security strategy 6) Japan’s nuclear option could motivate a number of other countries to pursue nuclear proliferation while only bringing minimal military benefit to Japan.

Japan Rearm Turns Asian Arms Race

Japanese rearmament would trigger an Asian arms race and widespread prolif

US News & World Report 3 (1.27.3, *US News & World Report*, p. 33) ET

Faced with a nuclear breakout by a hostile regime, Japan reconsiders its antinuclear taboos, fields a larger missile force of its own, and plunges into developing a shield against incoming missiles with the United States. South Korea, with one eye on the North and the other on Japan, follows suit. China reacts with more nukes and missiles of its own. Taiwan, outgunned, opts for more missiles and, perhaps, nuclear bombs. A nervous Russia shifts nuclear and conventional forces for defense against its old rivals, China and Japan. India, a foe of China, expands its nuclear forces, a step that causes Pakistan to do likewise. An Asian arms race snaps into high gear. No wonder that one former U.S. official who helped guide North Korea policy warns of a new "domino effect" in Asia.

Proliferation in Asia quickly escalates to global nuclear war

Cirincione 2k (*Foreign Policy*, 3.22.2) ET

The blocks would fall quickest and hardest in Asia, where proliferation pressures are already building more quickly than anywhere else in the world. If a nuclear breakout takes place in Asia**,** then the international arms controlagreements that have been painstakingly negotiated over the past 40 years will crumble. Moreover, the United States could find itself embroiled inits fourth waron the Asian continent in six decades--a costly rebuke to those who seek the safety of Fortress America by hiding behind national missile defenses. Consider what is already happening: North Korea continues to play guessing games with its nuclear and missile programs; South Korea wants its own missiles to match Pyongyang's; India and Pakistan shoot across borders while running a slow-motion nuclear arms race; China modernizes its nuclear arsenal amid tensions with Taiwan and the United States; Japan's vice defense minister is forced to resign after extolling the benefits of nuclear weapons; and Russia--whose Far East nuclear deployments alone make it the largest Asian nuclear power--struggles to maintain territorial coherence. Five of these states have nuclear weapons; the others are capable of constructing them. Like neutrons firing from a split atom, one nation's actions can trigger reactions throughout the region, which in turn, stimulate additional actions. These nations form an interlocking Asian nuclear reaction chain that vibrates dangerously with each new development.If the frequency and intensity of this reaction cycle increase**, critical decisions taken by any one of these governments could cascade into the** **second great wave of nuclear-weapon proliferation, bringing regional and global economic** **and political instability and, perhaps, the first combat use of a nuclear weapon since 1945.**

\*\*\*DEMOCRACY\*\*\*

Democracy Solves Economy

Democracy exponentially increases economic capabilities

Davis and Trebilcock 8 [Kevin E, Michael J, Fall, The American Journal of Comparative Law , 56 Am. J. Comp. L. 895, Lexis]

The effects of improved governance on income in the long run are found to be very large, with an estimated 400 percent improvement in per capita income associated with an improvement in governance by one standard deviation, and similar improvements in reducing child mortality and illiteracy. To illustrate, an improvement in the rule of law by one standard deviation from the current levels in Ukraine to those "middling levels prevailing in South Africa would lead to a fourfold increase in per capita income in the long run. A larger increase in the quality of the rule of law (by two standard deviations) in Ukraine (or in other countries in the former Soviet Union), to the much higher level in Slovenia or Spain, would further multiply this income per capita increase. Similar results emerge from other governance dimensions: a mere one standard deviation improvement in voice and accountability from the low level of Venezuela to that of South Korea, or in control of corruption from the low level of Indonesia to the middling level of Mexico, or from the level of Mexico to that of Costa Rica, would also be associated with an estimated fourfold increase in per capita incomes, as well as similar improvements in reducing child mortality by 75 percent and major gains in literacy. [n180](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.uhd.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1278694993019&returnToKey=20_T9714873117&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.163434.3444688221" \l "n180)

Democracy Solves War

Democratization decreases war

Ward and Gleditsch 98 [Michael D., Professor of Political Science, University of Washington, and Kristian S, graduate research trainee in the Globalization and Democratization Program, at University of Colorado, Boulder, March 1998, The American Political Science Review, Lexis]

As Figure 1 details, democratization-whether in mild or strong degrees-is accompanied by reduction, not increase, in the risk of war. Though we do not present graphs of the converse, changes toward autocracy and reversals of democratization are accompanied by increased risks of war involvement. These risks are proportionally greater than the decline or benefits of further democratization. Thus, there is strong evidence that democratization has a monadic effect: It reduces the probability that a country will be involved in a war. Although the probability of war involvement does not decrease linearly, it does decrease monotonically, so that over the entire range of democracy minus autocracy values, there is a reduction of about 50%. During the democratic transition, at every point along the way as well as at the end points, there is an attendant reduction in the probability of a polity being at war. We also find that reversals toward greater levels of autocracy (not shown) not only increase the probability of war involvement. Apparently, it is more dangerous to be at a given level of democracy if that represents an increase in the level of authoritarianism than it is to be at the same level of democracy if that represents a decrease in the authoritarian character of the regime. Stated differently, reversals are riskier than progress.ll It has been argued that institutional constraints are theoretically important in translating the effect of democracy into foreign policy (Bueno de Mesquita, Siverson, and Woller 1992; Siverson 1995). If the idea of democracy is separated into its major components, then the degree of executive constraints empirically dominates the democracy and autocracy scales (Gleditsch and Ward 1997). Accordingly, we demonstrate that moving toward stronger executive constraints also yields a visible reduction in the risk of war.

Democracy prevents war- models prove

Ward and Gleditsch 98 [Michael D., Professor of Political Science, University of Washington, and Kristian S, graduate research trainee in the Globalization and Democratization Program, at University of Colorado, Boulder, March 1998, The American Political Science Review, Lexis]

Our results show that the process of democratization is accompanied by a decrease in the probability of a country being involved in a war, either as a target or as an initiator. These results were obtained with a more current (and corrected) database than was used in earlier work, and our analyses also focus more clearly on the process of transition. In comparison to studies that look only at the existence of change in authority characteristics, we examine the direction, magnitude, and smoothness of the transition process.

Democratization decreases the chance of war

Ward and Gleditsch 98 [Michael D., Professor of Political Science, University of Washington, and Kristian S, graduate research trainee in the Globalization and Democratization Program, at University of Colorado, Boulder, March 1998, The American Political Science Review, Lexis]

The argument that democratization can bring about war is a powerful critique suggesting limits to the linkage between democracy and peace. This research examines this claim. Our findings demonstrate that democratizing polities are substantially less war prone than previously argued. By focusing on the characteristics of the transition process, we show that as contemporary polities become more democratic they reduce their overall chances of being involved in war by approximately half. We also find that rocky or especially rapid transitions or reversals are associated with a countervailing effect; namely, they increase the risk of being involved in warfare. Both in the long term and while societies undergo democratic change, the risks of war are reduced by democratization and exacerbated by reversals in the democratization process. To reach these conclusions, we developed and applied a logit model linking authority characteristics and war involvement using Polity III and Correlates of War databases.

Democracy Solves Human Rights

Democratization is essential to the advance of human rights

Sharansky 4 [Nathan, Israel’s Minister for Jerusalem and Diaspora Affairs and former Soviet dissident, 2004, The Case for Democracy, p. 205, Google Books]

In the post 9/11world, many democratic governments now have a better appreciation of how difficult it can be to find the appropriate balance between providing maximum secu­rity to your citizens and protecting human rights. In debat­ing issues like the Patriot Act or the rights granted to prisoners at Guantanamo Bay, Americans are confronting a dilemma that Israel has faced since the day it was estab­lished. Human rights violations can and do take place in demo­cratic societies. But one of the things that sets democracies apart from fear societies is the way they *respond* to those violations. A fear society does not openly debate human rights issues. Its people do not protest. Its regime does not investigate. Its press does not expose. Its courts do not pro­tect. In contrast, democratic societies are always engaged in self-examination. For example, look at how the United States dealt with the abuse and humiliation of Iraqi prisoners by American soldiers in Abu Ghraib prison. Even before the abuse became publicly known, the army had suspended those involved and was conducting a full investigation. And as soon as the disturbing pictures of the abuse were published, America’s democracy was shocked into action. The Con­gress, determined to find the culprits, immediately convened public hearings, and demanded a full account of what led to the abuse. Politicians and opinion makers insisted that the people responsible for the abuse be held accountable, including those at the very top of the chain of command. The media mulled over the details, pursuing every allega­tion, tracking down every lead. The American people openly discussed what the abuse said about their own country’s val­ues, its image in the world, and how that image would affect the broader War on Terror. The U.S. president, for his part, apologized to the families of the victims and said that those responsible would be punished. But let’s not forget that the treatment of prisoners at Abu Ghraib under Saddam was far worse than anything America was accused of. Yet were pictures distributed of Saddam’s soldiers murdering, raping, and torturing Iraqis? If they had been distributed, would Iraq’s parliament have conducted public hearings? Would the Iraqi media have reported it? Would anyone have publicly called for the resignation of Saddam’s defense minister, let alone Saddam himself? Would Saddam have denounced the brutality and apologized to the victims and their families? Far from showing that all societies are the same, the human rights abuses that sometimes occur in democracies often help illustrate the tremendous moral divide that sepa­rates free and fear societies. While I have not always agreed with the decisions made by my government on issues related to human rights, my experience has made me confi­dent that these issues are thoroughly discussed and debated and that the need to protect human rights is never ignored. I suspect that in most other free societies the situation is much the same. Every democratic state will choose its own balance between protecting security and protecting human rights, but concern for human rights will always be part of the decisionmaking process. The free world is not perfect, but the way it responds to its imperfections is only further proof that human rights can only be protected in demo­cratic societies.

Democracy Solves Hunger/Famine

Democracy prevents famine

Sen **1** [Amartya, Nobel Prize winner, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge and Lamont University Professor Emeritus at Harvard University , The Global Divergence of Democracies, p. 7-8, Google Books]

I have discussed elsewhere the remarkable fact that, in the terrible history of famines in the world, no substantial famine has ever occurred in any independent and democratic country with a relatively free press. We cannot find exceptions’ to this rule, no matter where we look: the recent famines of Ethiopia, Somalia, or other dictatorial regimes; famines in the Soviet Union in the 1930s; China’s 1958—61 famine with the failure of the Great Leap Forward; or earlier still, the famines in Ireland or India under alien rule. China, although it was in many ways doing much better economically than India, still managed (unlike India) to have a famine, indeed the largest recorded famine in world history: Nearly 30 million people died in the famine of 1958—61, while faulty governmental policies remained uncorrected for three full years. The policies went uncriticized because there were no opposition parties in parliament, no free press, and no multiparty elections. Indeed, it is precisely this lack of challenge that allowed the deeply defective policies to continue even though they were killing millions each year. The same can be said about the world’s two contemporary famines, which are occurring in North Korea and Sudan. Famines are often associated with what look like natural disasters, and commentators often settle for the simplicity of explaining famines by pointing to these events: the floods in China during the failed Great Leap Forward, the droughts in Ethiopia, or crop failures in North Korea. Nevertheless, many countries with similar natural problems, or even worse ones, manage perfectly well, because a responsive govern­ment intervenes to help alleviate hunger. Since the primary victims of a famine are the indigent, deaths can be prevented by recreating incomes (for example, through employment programs), which makes food accessible to potential famine victims. Even the poorest democratic countries that have faced terrible droughts or floods or other natural disasters (such as India in 1973, or Zimbabwe and Botswana in the early 1 980s) have been able to feed their people without experiencing a famine. Famines are easy to prevent if there is a serious effort to do so, and a democratic government, facing elections and criticisms from opposi­tion parties and independent newspapers, cannot help but make such an effort. Not surprisingly, while India continued to have famines under British rule right up to independence (the last famine, which I wit­nessed as a child, was in 1943, four years before independence), they disappeared suddenly with the establishment of a multiparty democracy and a free press.

Famine leads to war

**Cohen** **and** **Pinstrup-Andersen** **99** [Marc J., Special Assistant to the Director General, International Food Policy Research Institute Per is Director General of the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), Spring, Social Research, http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m2267/is\_1\_66/ai\_54668884/pg\_10]

Hunger and conflict usually have roots in colonial legacies and contemporary policies of racial or religious exclusion and political-economic discrimination (Heggenhoughen, 1995); and in struggles over control of strategic resources, such as land, water, trade routes, and petroleum. Sources of discontent include skewed land distribution and discriminatory economic policies that preclude decent standards of living. Unequal access to education and nutrition services and unequal treatment before the law inflame perceptions of unfairness. Human rights abuse based on race, religion, ethnicity, geographic location, political ideology, or occupation rouse animosities. In Central America, civil wars followed protracted food crises and human rights abuses, with demands for land, social justice, and democracy key to the conflicts (MacDonald, 1988; Barraclough, 1989). Tensions ripen into violent conflict especially where economic conditions deteriorate and people face subsistence crises. Hunger causes conflict when people feel they have nothing more to lose and so are willing to fight for resources, political power, and cultural respect. A recent econometric study found that slow growth of food production per capita is a source of violent conflict and refugee flows (Nafziger and Auvinen, 1997). In Ethiopia, Rwanda, and Sudan, governments were finally toppled when they inadequately responded to famine situations they had helped create. Unfortunately, none of these wars immediately improved subsistence conditions; instead, all magnified suffering and food shortages. Hunger spurs conflict in both rural and urban areas. Wolf (1969), Scott (1976), and others have shown the key role of subsistence crises in "peasant wars of the twentieth century" in such places as Mexico, Cuba, Vietnam, and Central America.

Democracy Solves Environment

Democracy solves environment – accountability, information flow and markets

Li and Reuveny 7 [Quan, Prof of poli sci at Penn State Rafael, prof of public and environmental affairs @ Indiana University http://cmp.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/24/3/219]

Moving to the view that democracy reduces the level of environmental degradation, one set of considerations focuses on the institutional qualities of democracy. The responsiveness argument is that democracies are more responsive to the environmental needs of the public than are autocracies due to their very nature of taking public interests into account (Kotov and Nikitina, 1995). It is also argued that democracies comply with environmental agreements well, since they respect, and respond to, the rule of law (Weiss and Jacobsen, 1999). The freedom of information channel is offered by Schultz and Crockett (1990) and Payne (1995). They theorize that political rights and greater freedom for information ﬂows help2 to promote the cause of environmental groups, raise public awareness of problems and potential solutions, and encourage environmental legislation to curtail environmental degradation. Democracies also tend to have market economies, which further promotes the ﬂow of information as economic efﬁciency and proﬁts requires full information. Hence, unlike the above argument, this channel expects that proﬁt-maximizing markets will promote environmental quality (Berger, 1994).

Democracy solves environment – less war, famines and more repsonsiblity.

Li and Reuveny 7 [Quan, Prof of poli sci at Penn State Rafael, prof of public and environmental affairs @ Indiana University http://cmp.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/24/3/219]

A second set of considerations on the positive role of democracy on environmental quality focuses on the effects of democracy on human life and crisis situations. The famines argument (Sen, 1994) observes that famines tend to promote environmental degradation because they divert attention away from longer-term environmental concerns. Since famines typically do not occur in democracies, argues Sen, environmental quality is expected to be higher in democracies than in autocracies. The human life argument (Gleditsch & Sverdlop, 2003) suggests that since democracies respect human life more than autocracies, they are more responsive to life-threatening environmental degradation. A related argument, the war channel, reasons that to the extent that democracies engage in fewer wars, they should also have a higher level of environmental quality (Gleditsch & Sverdlop, 2003), since war often destroys the environment of the warring parties (Lietzmann & Vest, 1999).

Democracy Solves Trade

Democracies increase trade – confidence with rule of law.

Li and Reuveny 7 [Quan, Prof of poli sci at Penn State Rafael, prof of public and environmental affairs @ Indiana University http://cmp.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/24/3/219]

If trade can be used as a tool of power, who will trade with whom? Grieco (1988), Gowa (1994), and Gowa and Mansﬁeld (1993), among others, expect that states will avoid trade with states they consider to be their actual or potential adversaries. In such situations, the concern for relative gains—who gains more from trade—may reduce trade ﬂows to trickles, as the side that gains less will worry that the side that gains more may translate the gain to military power. During the Cold War, for example, the U.S. regulated its trade with the Soviet bloc based on this logic. Since democracies are expected not to engage in wars against each other, they feel more secure in their bilateral trade and may be content with trade regardless of who gains more. Democracy, then, should promote trade (e.g., Russett & Oneal, 2001; Morrow, 1997; Snidal, 1991). Moreover, since democracy is associated with the rule of law and respect for property rights, agents will feel more secure to trade as the level of democracy rises, as it is more likely they will be able to enjoy the fruits of their investments (e.g., Olson, 1993; Clauge et al., 1996).

Democracy key to free trade

Milner 2 [Helen, Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University, Summer, International Organization, http://homepages.nyu.edu/~bpr1/papers/mmr2io.pdf]

We have argued that the regime type of states can strongly affect their propensity to cooperate on economic issues. Leaders in democracies have a greater incentive to pursue international cooperation in trade than do their nondemocratic counterparts. We developed this argument using a formal model of trade policymaking emphasizing the electoral constraints faced by political leaders. Although there are many reasons why countries choose to cooperate, our analysis emphasizes how a country’s regime type creates domestic political incentives for leaders that influence this choice. Our model assumes that both democratic and autocratic leaders would like to maximize the rents stemming from trade barriers, but that both may lose office if their rent seeking becomes excessive. The problem faced by voters and leaders, however, is that voters have incomplete information about their leaders. behavior: they do not know exactly what trade policy their leaders have chosen at any point in time. And domestic executives cannot credibly commit to accurately divulge this information. Hence, when exogenous shocks adversely influence the economy, an incumbent executive may be voted out of office not because the executive was too extractive, but rather because voters mistakenly assume that the executive was engaged in protectionist predation. The prospect of losing elections due to factors beyond the incumbent executive’s control provides a strong incentive to find ways of reassuring voters that the government is not being too extractive. Trade agree- ments are one such means. Commercial agreements can mitigate the executive’s informational problem. The monitors of these agreements.either countries that are party to them or the international trade institutions themselves.can credibly signal to voters whether their leader is cheating or abiding by the agreement. Accusations of cheating against one.s government by foreign countries or an international institution are newsworthy events that can alert (at least some) voters to the government’s behavior. Because of this signal, executives can improve their chances of re-election. In democracies, however, voters have a greater impact on the tenure of leaders than in autocracies, since the democratic electorate can more easily turn incumbents out of office. Since autocratic leaders face fewer worries about re-election, they have fewer incentives to relinquish policy autonomy and sign trade agreements, making them less likely than more democratic leaders to seek commercial cooperation. The greater accountability of leaders to voters in democracies makes a difference. Surprisingly, this result is obtained even though democratic executives discount the future more heavily than their autocratic counterparts. In our model, international agreements serve a domestic purpose. They allow executives to commit themselves credibly to actions that voters would otherwise find incredible. Unilateral trade barrier reductions are less credible to voters and more easily repealed than are mutually agreed-upon international reductions. Others have argued that international institutions promote cooperation by providing infor- mation, but they have been less specific about how this mechanism actually induces leaders to choose cooperation.60 Here, we identify one mechanism by which cooperative agreements can convey information to voters about the behavior of their leaders, thus allowing voters to better judge their leaders. Other mechanisms might serve this purpose as well, but our claim is that trade agreements do so especially well. The information provided by trade agreements benefits all of the players in our analysis voters and governments alike. Existing studies rarely acknowledge that international institutions can serve this function. The tendency for such institutions to be created with monitoring and dispute settlement mechanisms suggests their importance in disseminating information domestically as well as internationally. International cooperation can thus generate domestic political benefits for leaders, making them more likely to seek cooperative agreements in the first place. Our empirical findings strongly support the two central hypotheses stemming from the formal model. Since World War II, more democratic countries have displayed a greater likelihood of concluding trade agreement than other countries, even when holding constant various political and economic influences. Equally, pairs of democratic countries are about twice as likely to form a PTA as are pairs composed of a democracy and an autocracy and roughly four times as likely to form such cooperative agreements as are autocratic pairs. In sum, holding constant Cold War influences, economic variables, and various other factors, we find considerable evidence that democracy promotes commercial cooperation. Clearly, democracy is not alone in promoting such agreements, but our findings indicate that it is a potent impetus to cooperation.

\*\*\*HEGEMONY\*\*\*

Hegemony Solves Middle East Instability

Hegemony solves Middle East instability

Liu 3 [Henry C K, chairman of the New York-based Liu Investment Group. November 20, Asian Times, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle\_East/EK20Ak05.html]

US hegemony, for Lewis, offers the hope of rescuing the fallen Arab people from their state of degradation. Not only will the US promote values of freedom and democracy, it promises salvation as the one power that can stand against the inexorable historical trajectory that is pulling the Middle East downward. George W Bush articulated this historical mission. For Lewis and Bush, ever since Ottoman vitality petered out four centuries ago, the West has provided the ideas, inspiration and means to move the Middle East into the modern world - never mind that the ideas came in the form of cultural imperialism, the inspiration in the form of Calvinist capitalism and the means in the form of military invasion. Left to their own devices, Arabs are destined to remain in the misery they have chosen for themselves.

Heg Solves Asian War

American hegemony prevents Asian war

Khalilzad 95 [Zalmay Defense Analyst at RAND, The Washington Quarterly, RETHINKING GRAND STRATEGY; Vol. 18, No. 2; Pg. 84,]

Third, the United States should seek to strengthen its own relative capabilities and those of its friends in East Asia to deter possible Chinese aggression and deal effectively with a more powerful, potentially hostile China. China's military leaders are considering the possibility of a conflict with the United States. They recognize the overall superiority of the U.S. military but believe there are weaknesses that could be exploited while preventing the United States from bringing its full power to bear in case of a conflict over Taiwan. According to the Chinese, U.S. weaknesses include vulnerability of U.S. bases to missile attacks, heavy U.S. reliance on space, America's need to rapidly reinforce the region in times of conflict, susceptibility of U.S. cities to being held hostage, and America's sensitivity to casualties. According to the emerging Chinese doctrine, the local balance of power in the region will be decisive because in this new era wars are short and intense. In a possible Taiwan conflict China would seek to create a fait accompli, forcing the United States to risk major escalation and high levels of violence to reinstate the status quo ante. China might gamble that these risks would constrain the U.S. response. Such an approach by China would be extremely risky and could lead to a major war. Dealing with such possible challenges from China both in the near and long term requires many steps. Burden-sharing and enhanced ties with states in East and Southeast Asia will be important. New formal alliance relationships--which would be the central element of a containment strategy--are neither necessary nor practical at this time, but it would be prudent to take some preparatory steps to facilitate the formation of a new alliance or the establishment of new military bases should that become necessary. They would signal to China that any attempt on their part to seek regional hegemony would be costly. The steps we should take now in the region must include enhancing military-to-military relations between Japan and South Korea, encouraging increased political- military cooperation among the ASEAN states and resolving overlapping claims to the Spratly Islands and the South China Sea; fostering a Japanese-Russian rapprochement, including a settlement of the dispute over the "northern territories;" and enhancing military-to-military cooperation between the United States and the ASEAN states. These steps are important in themselves for deterrence and regional stability but they can also assist in shifting to a much tougher policy toward China should that become necessary. Because of the potential for conflict between the United States and China over issues such as Taiwan, the U.S. military posture in general should take this possibility into account. Measures should be taken to correct the Chinese belief that they can confront the world with a fait accompli in Taiwan. The United States needs expanded joint exercises with states in the region. Ensuring access to key facilities in countries such as the Philippines, pre-positioning stocks in the region, and increasing Taiwan's ability to defend itself would also be prudent. The large distances of the East Asian region also suggest that a future U.S. force-mix must emphasize longer-range systems and stand-off weapons. The United States must develop increased capabilities to protect friendly countries and U.S. forces in the region against possible missile attacks

Heg Solves Proliferation

**Heg solves proliferation- Asia proves**

Tellis 00 [Ashley J. Senior Associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace April and May http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/3492121.html]

I believe that the commitment to U.S. regional preeminence remains the best solution to our multiple national security interests in Asia. The relative merits of pursuing the maintenance of preeminence as a grand strategy — as opposed to settling for a local multipolar balance of power or slowly disengaging from the region — can be best demonstrated by testing the consequences of each of these alternatives against the multiple goals pursued by the United States in Asia. The United States has, arguably, several critical interests in Asia. The list here is in decreasing order of importance: The first critical interest consists of preventing, deterring, and reducing the threat of attack on the continental United States and its extended territorial possessions. In the simplest sense, this interest has two components. The first and most important involves preserving the continental United States (conus) and its possessions from threats posed by weapons of mass destruction in Asia. These weapons are important because of the extensive damage they can inflict in relatively compressed time frames. Equally important, as Bracken points out, are the challenges posed by sophisticated delivery systems, like ballistic and cruise missiles and advanced attack aircraft, currently deployed by the wmd-capable states as well as prospective delivery systems that may be acquired by other Asian states over time. This includes both spin-off technologies emerging from space and commercial aviation programs as well as other kinds of non-traditional, covert delivery systems. The other component of this national objective involves protecting the conus and its possessions from conventional attack. Because of the vast distances involved in the Asia-Pacific region, the critical variables here are battlespace denial and power-projection capabilities — both sea- and air-based — that may be acquired by one or more Asian states. Given the changes in technology, these capabilities must be expanded to include other, newer, approaches to conventional war-fighting like strategic information warfare and the technologies and operational practices associated with the "revolution in military affairs." In all instances, U.S. interests suggest the following preference ordering: preventing potential adversaries from acquiring such capabilities; if prevention is impossible, deterring their use becomes the next logical objective; and, if even deterrence is unsuccessful, attenuating their worst effects through either extended counterforce options or effective defensive measures finally becomes necessary.

U.S. hegemony key to preventing proliferation and global nuclear war.

Khalilzad 95 [Zalmay Defense Analyst at RAND, The Washington Quarterly, RETHINKING GRAND STRATEGY; Vol. 18, No. 2; Pg. 84,]

Under the third option, the United States would seek to retain global leadership and to preclude the rise of a global rival or a return to multipolarity for the indefinite future. On balance, this is the best long-term guiding principle and vision. Such a vision is desirable not as an end in itself, but because a world in which the United States exercises leadership would have tremendous advantages. First, the global environment would be more open and more receptive to American values -- democracy, free markets, and the rule of law. Second, such a world would have a better chance of dealing cooperatively with the world's major problems, such as nuclear proliferation, threats of regional hegemony by renegade states, and low-level conflicts. Finally, U.S. leadership would help preclude the rise of another hostile global rival, enabling the United States and the world to avoid another global cold or hot war and all the attendant dangers, including a global nuclear exchange. U.S. leadership would therefore be more conducive to global stability than a bipolar or a multipolar balance of power system.

Heg Solves Proliferation

Hegemony solves proliferation

The Boston Globe 8 [July 24, Lexis]

AS BARACK OBAMA travels abroad this week, he is finding a world that still wants America to be engaged, but no longer necessarily waits for America to take the lead. The challenge for the next president is to understand how much has changed and how America can best pursue its national interests in such a different international environment. It isn't just the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan that have changed the world, nor other aspects of the Bush legacy that have weakened America's power and position. The world itself has changed. Ours is the era of global interconnectedness. The fate of the average American is increasingly connected to the fate of people around the world creating unparalleled opportunities but also great dangers from which no nation can be immune. Ours is also an era of increasingly diffuse power, as more powers rise to demand influence and a say over global affairs and more actors of many different kinds affect the course of global politics. Such a world requires a new kind of leadership - one that is clear on how, when, and with whom America leads. Call it strategic leadership. A leadership that understands that while much of the world still believes that international peace and prosperity are most likely to be achieved if Washington plays a significant and constructive role, key actors no longer simply defer to or automatically prefer what America wants. A leadership that focuses on effective action rather than who is in the lead. A leadership that relies on clear judgment as much as demonstrating resolve. A leadership that grasps that however great our power, America cannot meet today's challenges all on its own. Strategic leadership requires a commitment to statecraft as both an alternative and a complement to military force. Although diplomacy has its limitations, US strategic interests are often best served by leveraging its potential for enhancing security, reducing tensions, resolving conflicts, achieving peace, and transforming adversarial relationships. With regard to nuclear proliferation, for instance, the best hope lies not in striking possible proliferators, but in working with countries around the world to renew the essential bargain at the core of the nuclear nonproliferation regime. On this issue, **America will have to lead**, by reducing reliance on nuclear weapons and committing to seeking a world free of nuclear weapons. Only then can it convince others to do likewise and gain the benefits of nuclear power without risking wider proliferation of nuclear weapons and capabilities. Strategic leadership demands a strong military, but also the wisdom to know when and how to employ it. For example, US withdrawal of combat troops from Iraq cannot be a military withdrawal from the region. A regional military posture that deters adversaries and reassures allies must remain in place. The conflict in Afghanistan must get greater priority. But so too must diplomatic initiatives. Militarily and diplomatically, the United States needs regional and European partners to do their part. America should take the lead where it can play the most constructive role and support others when their roles are most promising.

Heg Solves Terrorism

**US Intervention is key to prevent another terrorist attack**

Korb 3 [Lawrence Project Director of Council Policy Initiative, Sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations, http://www.cfr.org/content/publications/attachments/National\_Security\_CPI.pdf]

For centuries, international law has accepted that a state need not suffer an attack before it can lawfully take action to repel an imminent danger. Legal scholars condition the first use of force on the presence of an imminent threat.We need to adapt this imminence requirement to today’s realities.The terrorists and tyrants that inhabit the globe will not use conventional means, such as armies, navies, and air forces, to attack us. They plan to rely on “asymmetric warfare”—the use of terror tactics and perhaps even weapons of mass destruction,weapons that will be carefully concealed ,secretly delivered, and employed without warning.In this new threat environment, the inherent right to self-defense enshrined in Article 51 of the UN Charter includes the right—I would say the legal and moral obligation—to act to protect American interests.To conclude otherwise would be to turn the charter into a suicide pact. In a perfect world, preventive action would be unnecessary. But in the admittedly flawed world of today, it is not enough to act only in response to past aggression. Even a number of “just war” theorists understand that such a reactive strategy plays into the hands of Osama bin Laden and his sympathizers. I agree with many of our religious and moral leaders who say that war should be fought only as a last resort, but preventive action is plainly defensive when it is motivated by a reasonable belief that a serial aggressor, such as Saddam Hussein’s Iraq, is equipping itself with the means to carry out further aggression.

U.S. hegemony prevents terrorist use of WMDs

Schmitt 6 [Gary, Resident scholar and director of the Program on Advanced Strategic Studies at the American Interprise Institute, [ The Weekly Standard, Vol. 11 No. 22, February, Lexis]

The core argument itself is not new: The United States and the West face a new threat--weapons of mass destruction in the hands of terrorists--and, whether we like it or not, no power other than the United States has the capacity, or can provide the decisive leadership, required to handle this and other critical global security issues. Certainly not the United Nations or, anytime soon, the European Union. In the absence of American primacy, the international order would quickly return to disorder. Indeed, whatever legitimate concerns people may have about the fact of America's primacy, the downsides of not asserting that primacy are, according to The American Era, potentially far more serious. The critics "tend to dwell disproportionately on problems in the exercise of [American] power rather than on the dire consequences of retreat from an activist foreign policy," Lieber writes. They forget "what can happen in the absence of such power."

Heg Solves Global Stability

U.S. hegemony through military presence maintains order

Mandelbaum 6 [Michael, professor of American foreign Foreign Policy Magazine, Jan/Feb, http://www.sais-jhu.edu/insider/pdf/2006\_articles/mandelbaum\_fp\_010506.pdf]

For instance, U.S. military power helps to keep order in the world. The American military presence in Europe and East Asia, which now includes approximately 185,000 personnel, reassures the governments of these regions that their neighbors cannot threaten them, helping to allay suspicions, forestall arms races, and make the chances of armed conflict remote. U.S. forces in Europe, for instance, reassure Western Europeans that they do not have to increase their own troop strength to protect themselves against the possibility of a resurgent Russia, while at the same time reassuring Russia that its great adversary of the last century, Germany, will not adopt aggressive policies. Similarly, the U.S.- Japan Security Treaty, which protects Japan, simultaneously reassures Japan’s neighbors that it will remain peaceful. This reassurance is vital yet invisible, and it is all but taken for granted.

U.S. policies ensure peace.

Mandelbaum 6 [Michael, professor of American foreign Foreign Policy Magazine, Jan/Feb, http://www.sais-jhu.edu/insider/pdf/2006\_articles/mandelbaum\_fp\_010506.pdf]

To be sure, the United States did not deliberately set out to become the world’s government. The services it provides originated during the Cold War as part of its struggle with the Soviet Union, and America has continued, adapted, and in some cases expanded them in the post-Cold War era. Nor do Americans think of their country as the world’s government. Rather, it conducts, in their view, a series of policies designed to further American interests. In this respect they are correct, but these policies serve the interests of others as well. The alternative to the role the United States plays in the world is not better global governance, but less of it—and that would make the world a far more dangerous and less prosperous place. Never in human history has one country done so much for so many others, and received so little appreciation for its efforts.

Heg Solves Democracy

**US hegemony is essential to support democracies**

Diamond 96 [Larry Senior researcher fellow at Hoover Institution, Orbis, “Beyond the Unipolar Moment: Why the United States Must Remain Engaged”, p. 405-413]

In the past, global power has been an important reason why certain countries have become models for emulation by others. The global power of the United States, and of its Western democratic allies, has been a factor in the diffusion of democracy around the world, and certainly is crucial to our ability to help popular, legitimate democratic forces deter armed threats to their overthrow, or to return to power (as in Haiti) when they have been overthrown. Given the linkages among democracy, peace, and human rights-as well as the recent finding of Professor Adam Przeworski (New York University) that democracy is more likely to survive in a country when it is more widely present in the region-we should not surrender our capacity to diffuse and defend democracy. It is not only intrinsic to our ideals but important to our national security that we remain globally powerful and engaged-and that a dictatorship does not rise to hegemonic power within any major region.

Heg key to democracy spread

McFaul and Bings 5 [Michael McFaul, Helen and Peter Bing Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution, Winter 2004-2005, The Washington Quarterly, p. 158. Google Books]

There is a genuine correlation between the advance of democracy as well as democratic norms worldwide and the growth of U.S. power. No country has done more to strengthen the norms and practices of democracy around the world than the United States. If Adolf Hitler had prevailed in World War II, democratic values would have survived, but few democratic regimes would have remained. Similarly, if the Cold War had ended with U.S. disintegration, rather than Soviet dissolution, command economies run by one-party dictatorships would be the norm and democracy the exception. Thus, even good ideas need powerful actors to defend and advance them.

Heg Solves Economy

**Heg is key to sustaining the economy – trade, oil, and investments**

Khalilzad 95 [Zalmay Defense Analyst at RAND, The Washington Quarterly, RETHINKING GRAND STRATEGY; Vol. 18, No. 2; Pg. 84,]

The extension of instability, conflict, and hostile hegemony in East Asia, Europe, and the Persian Gulf would harm the economy of the United States even in the unlikely event that it was able to avoid involvement in major wars and conflicts. Higher oil prices would reduce the U.S. standard of living. Turmoil in Asia and Europe would force major economic readjustment in the United States, perhaps reducing U.S. exports and imports and jeopardizing U.S. investments in these regions. Given that total imports and exports are equal to a quarter of U.S. gross domestic product, the cost of necessary adjustments might be high

Hegemony solves Iranian instability

Washington Times 5 **[October 13, Lexis]**

What does it take to attract qualified people to the U.S. military? The Pentagon's release of final fiscal year 2005 recruiting and retention data confirms that this billion-dollar question needs to be revisited again. The recruiting catastrophe many feared after poor spring results never came to pass, but the numbers in the Army, the Army Reserves and National Guard are all bad omens. The Army's 6,627-recruit shortfall was its biggest in 26 years. No wonder Iran is taunting the United States over its apparently reduced capabilities in the Persian Gulf region. The news isn't all bad: As expected, the Marine Corps, Navy and Air Force each exceeded their annual recruiting goals. Those services traditionally fill the ranks more easily than the Army and its reserve components, and that hasn't changed. Equally encouraging, it appears that the Pentagon's efforts to keep our existing soldiers, even in the most manpower-troubled places, are working. All the services except the Navy exceeded their annual retention goals. There were losses in the reserve components, but these were within the Pentagon's "acceptable limits." This suggests that even if the war in Iraq is driving away new recruits the way some critics of the Bush administration contend, at least it isn't driving away the people already fighting. But existing soldiers aren't the problem; new ones are. The Army and its reserve components are still struggling to attract recruits. Although the Army rebounded nicely from the spring by signing 105 percent of the recruits it sought for July through September, this still left it at 92 percent of its 2005 goal of 80,000 new recruits. Things were even worse in the National Guard and the Army Reserves. The Guard reached only 80 percent of its annual goal and the Army Reserve 84 percent. No doubt the increased likelihood of being sent overseas accounts for much of the recruiting problem - an effect that will lessen as the Pentagon rotates more guardsmen and reservists home but one that is unlikely to go away completely as long as the war on terror continues. For a sense of why the problem matters, consider what our enemies say about it. "There will not be a war ahead of us. The situation in America does not allow them to create new fronts," Iranian nuclear negotiator Ali Larijani told an Iranian news agency last week. That suggests the United States is not striking fear into the mullahs' hearts the way it should be.

Heg Turns Terrorism/Economy/Resource Wars/Democracy

Failure to reassert US hegemony risks terrorism, resource scarcity, global economic collapse and democratic consolidation

Goodspeed 9 [Peter, award winning reporter with the National Post, November 26, Lexis]

U.S. economic and political clout will decline over the next 15 years; the world will become a more dangerous place; food, water and energy shortages could spark regional conflicts and, while the appeal of terrorism might decline, terrorists themselves will become more deadly and dangerous thanks to new technology, the report says. "The international system -- as constructed following the Second World War -- will be almost unrecognizable by 2025," the study predicted. New powers, especially China and India, will grow in influence and the world will be transformed by a globalizing economy and a historic transfer of wealth and economic power from West to East. The report identified a great "arc of instability" stretching from sub-Saharan Africa through North Africa into the Middle East, the Balkans, the Caucasus, South and Central Asia and parts of Southeast Asia. The power of non-state actors -- businesses, tribes, religious organizations and criminal networks -- will also increase. By 2025, droughts, food shortages and scarce water resources, related to climate change, could plague large areas of the globe, from China to the Horn of Africa, triggering mass migrations and political upheavals. The influence of the United Nations, the World Bank and a host of other international organizations that have maintained political and economic stability since the Second World War will also plummet. The world will enter an increasingly unstable and unpredictable period in which the advance of Western-style democracy is no longer assured, the study said. "The United States will remain the single most powerful country but will be less dominant," the report said. "Shrinking economic and military capabilities may force the U.S. into a difficult set of trade-offs between domestic versus foreign policy priorities." In the wake of the then just erupting 2008 global financial crisis, "the better economic performance of many authoritarian governments could sow doubts among some about democracy as the best form of government," the report predicted.

Heg Turns Terrorism/Economy/Resource Wars/Democracy

Failure to reassert US hegemony risks super terrorism, world economic collapse, democratic consolidation

Goodspeed 9 [Peter, award winning reporter with the National Post, November 26, Lexis]

U.S. economic and political clout will decline over the next 15 years; the world will become a more dangerous place; food, water and energy shortages could spark regional conflicts and, while the appeal of terrorism might decline, terrorists themselves will become more deadly and dangerous thanks to new technology, the report says. "The international system -- as constructed following the Second World War -- will be almost unrecognizable by 2025," the study predicted. New powers, especially China and India, will grow in influence and the world will be transformed by a globalizing economy and a historic transfer of wealth and economic power from West to East. The report identified a great "arc of instability" stretching from sub-Saharan Africa through North Africa into the Middle East, the Balkans, the Caucasus, South and Central Asia and parts of Southeast Asia. The power of non-state actors -- businesses, tribes, religious organizations and criminal networks -- will also increase. By 2025, droughts, food shortages and scarce water resources, related to climate change, could plague large areas of the globe, from China to the Horn of Africa, triggering mass migrations and political upheavals. The influence of the United Nations, the World Bank and a host of other international organizations that have maintained political and economic stability since the Second World War will also plummet. The world will enter an increasingly unstable and unpredictable period in which the advance of Western-style democracy is no longer assured, the study said. "The United States will remain the single most powerful country but will be less dominant," the report said. "Shrinking economic and military capabilities may force the U.S. into a difficult set of trade-offs between domestic versus foreign policy priorities." In the wake of the then just erupting 2008 global financial crisis, "the better economic performance of many authoritarian governments could sow doubts among some about democracy as the best form of government," the report predicted.

\*\*\*SOFT POWER\*\*\*

Soft Power Solves Heg

Soft power key to American hegemony- foundation of military alliance

CSIS 9 [April, Volume 9-No. 2, Pacific Forum, http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/issuesinsights\_v09n02.pdf]

Young Leaders conclude that it is in America’s interest to deepen engagement with Asian allies in all fields. Although nontraditional security issues are the center of discussion, Young Leaders recognize that military engagement is a building block of our alliances and thus do not imply that the current emphasis on military relations needs to be decreased. However, without broadening the alliance structure to include more soft power tools, including Track II cooperative efforts, strictly military-based alliances will not be a sufficient tool to face evolving nontraditional security threats. Thus, the U.S. needs to build upon these military alliance structures to ensure they are always relevant to the challenges and threats of the 21st century.

Soft Power Solves Democracy

Soft power is key to democracy promotion

Page 4 [James, Demos researcher, December 13, New Stateman, http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m0FQP/is\_4718\_133/ai\_n8694156/pg\_2]

The optimist's approach is deeply myopic. Its singular focus on delivering democracy causes it to ignore the attitudes and beliefs of the intended recipients. This is a critical oversight, because even in its most minimal, Schumpeterian sense, democracy requires the active support of those who are being governed. Mahatma Gandhi once said that "the spirit of democracy cannot be imposed from without. It must come from within", and without the democratic spirit its formal structures alone are like castles of sand. From Germany in the 1930s to Pakistan in 1999, this has been proven time and again. This is vital now because the democratic spirit--or "hearts and minds", as it has been rebranded in the lexicon of the war on terror--is suddenly proving elusive. The problem lies with the unparalleled concentration of what Joseph Nye calls "hard power" (military and economic), which is proving extremely difficult to reconcile with the promotion of "soft" democratic values. This is not just to repeat the oft-quoted and benign point that imposing freedom is an oxymoron. That has always been so and has proven less problematic in practice than in principle. Rather, it is that, in the new world order, the US is suffering a chronic deficit of legitimacy in the eyes of those it claims to be seeking to help. Its power has become an albatross around the neck of the US and its allies. The reasons are not hard to find, nor, in principle, are the solutions. At the most basic level, hard power is unavoidably threatening, arousing suspicion and fear. Realpolitik, the canon of thought founded on Thucydides, Macchiavelli and Hobbes, may be overly cynical for some, but the suspicion that power, ultimately, will always be used for self-interest still resonates strongly. As Thucydides put it: "Right ... is only in question between equals in power, while the strong do what they can and the weak suffer what they must."

Soft Power Solves China

China is taking advantage of low US soft power to remove US primacy in its region.

Shuja 8 (Sharif, Monash U Global Terrorism Research Unit Honorary Research Associate, “Why America Can Not Ignore Soft Power”, 3/22, p. 21)

With its declining soft power capabilities America is losing its persuasive power. In its attempt to persuade North Korea to give up its weapons of mass destruction, the US has had to let China play a major role. As its economy has rapidly grown over the last decade, China has sought to develop its soft power capabilities. It has sought to influence other countries using regional aid, pub- lic diplomacy, interaction with multilateral institutions and the embracing of free trade. Its appeal threatens to outstrip that of the United States and cast it as the primary regional power, presenting a potential danger to US influence and interests in the region. China is actually copying Nye's soft power concept: building authority through persuasion rather than coercion. China's Office of the Chinese Lan- guage Council International has opened 135 Confucius Institutes worldwide, aiming to teach Chinese. The Office is, actually, part of a broad campaign involving investment and diplomacy as well as cultural outreach, all aimed at hastening China's progress toward great-power status. The campaign, com- bined with China's economic growth and military modernisation, forms a challenge that some US politicians, including Democratic presidential candi- date John Edwards, are taking note of. 'China is capitalizing on the United States' current unpopularity to project its own soft power In the coming years, China's influence and importance will only continue to grow', he wrote in the September/October issue of Foreign Affairs

Soft Power Solves Terrorism

Soft power is key to solve terrorism - hard power is insufficient

Nye 4 (Joseph S, “Soft Power and American Foreign Policy”, Harvard IR prof., vol. 119, no. 2, p. 257)

Look again at Afghanistan. Precision bombing and Special Forces defeated the Taliban government, but U.S. forces in Afghanistan wrapped up less than a quarter of al Qaeda, a transnational network with cells in sixty countries. The United States cannot bomb al Qaeda cells in Hamburg, Kuala Lumpur, or De- troit. Success against them depends on close civilian cooperation, whether shar- ing intelligence, coordinating police work across borders, or tracing global fi- nancial flows. America's partners cooperate partly out of self-interest, but the inherent attractiveness of U.S. pohcies can and does influence the degree of co- operation. Equally important, the current struggle against Islamist terrorism is not a clash of civilizations but a contest whose outcome is closely tied to a civil war between moderates and extremists within Islamic civilization. The United States and other advanced democracies will win only if moderate Muslims win, and the ability to attract the moderates is critical to victory. We need to adopt policies that appeal to moderates and to use public diplomacy more effectively to explain our common interests. We need a better strategy for wielding our soft power. We will have to learn better how to combine hard and soft power if we wish to meet the new challenges.

Soft power is key to solve terrorism.

Cristo 5 (Danna A, Pace U, American Economist, http://www.allbusiness.com/accounting/1086331-1.html]

Although worthwhile, the strategy assessment of the US's use of soft power is not a new or novel idea. The management and psychology literature has long touted the benefits of using referent power (soft power) over coercive power (hard power). In their classic article, "The Bases of Social Power," Raven and French (1959), describe the five bases of power: reward, coercive, legitimate, referent, and expert. Referent power is based on identification and attraction, and yields the greatest influence in relation to the other bases along as this strong attraction exists. The authors point out that referent power has the broadest range of power. The most negative power is coercion, which decreases attraction, and thus referent power. In relation to the rest of the world, there are some and individuals that are attracted to the US and its culture and others that are not. This is especially true of Islamic fundamentalists who believe that the US's secular culture is evil and corrupt. Moreover, many European countries have long shared feelings that their cultures are far superior to that of the US. The major failure of the Bush administration in gaining broad support for the war against Iraq may in fact be a failure in assessing the strength of the referent power of the US, which had been eroding for many years prior to the administration. Although it would have been best to move ahead with broad support using soft power, the US could not use what they did not have. The fault of the Bush administration could lie in their immediate use of coercive power without the exploration of the other bases of power before declaring war. But it is important to note that France, Germany, and Russia had their own self-interest in mind when they opposed the war against Iraq. These countries had a long history of trying to weaken the containment of Iraq to ensure that they could have good trading relations with it.

Soft power is critical to solve terrorism.

Shuja 8 (Sharif, Monash U Global Terrorism Research Unit Honorary Research Associate, “Why America Can Not Ignore Soft Power”, 3/22, p. 19)

It is argued that both hard and soft power are important in US foreign policy and in the fight against terrorism. The suppression of terrorism, and the achievement of a variety of other objectives including efforts to promote democracy overseas, require the willing assistance of other nations and peo- ples. There are places where the US cannot go in search of terrorist leaders. It needs broad cooperation for intelligence gathering and the restriction of ter- rorist finances. The hard power of military and economic strength is, of course, essential, but the use of 'carrot and stick' alone cannot achieve these objectives. America's neglect of soft power is undermining its ability to persuade and influence others.

Soft Power Solves Heg

Soft power is key to sustain hegemony due to alliances and information sharing.

Nye 4 (Joseph S, “Soft Power and American Foreign Policy”, Harvard IR prof., vol. 119, no. 2, p. 261)

In the global information age, the attractiveness of the United States will be crucial to our ability to achieve the outcomes we want. Rather than having to put together pick-up coalitions of the willing for each new game, we will benefit if we are able to attract others into institutional alliances and eschew weak- ening those we have already created. NATO, for example, not only aggregates the capabilities of advanced nations, but its interminable committees, procedures, and exercises also allow these nations to train together and quickly be- come interoperable when a crisis occurs. As for alliances, if the United States is an attractive source of security and reassurance, other countries will set their expectations in directions that are conducive to our interests. Initially, for ex- ample, the U.S.-Japan security treaty was not very popular in Japan, but polls show that over the decades, it became more attractive to the Japanese public. Once that happened, Japanese politicians began to build it into their approaches to foreign policy. The United States benefits when it is regarded as a constant and trusted source of attraction so that other countries are not obliged continually to re-examine their options in an atmosphere of uncertain coalitions. In the Japan case, broad acceptance of the United States by the Japanese public "contributed to the maintenance of US hegemony" and "served as politi cal constraints compelling the ruling elites to continue cooperation with the United States.'"^ Popularity can contribute to stability. Finally, as the RAND Corporation's John Arquila and David Ronfeldt ar- gue, power in an information age will come not only from strong defenses but also from strong sharing. A traditional realpolitik mind-set makes it difficult to share with others. But in an information age, such sharing not only enhances the ability of others to cooperate with us but also increases their inclination to do so.'' As we share intelligence and capabilities with others, we develop common outlooks and approaches that improve our ability to deal with the new challenges. Power fiows from that attraction. Dismissing the importance of at- traction as merely ephemeral popularity ignores key insights from new theories of leadership as well as the new realities of the information age. We cannot afford that.

Soft power is key to hegemony – avoids backlash and provides staying power.

Nye 4 (Joseph S, “Soft Power and American Foreign Policy”, Harvard IR prof., vol. 119, no. 2, p. 261)

Ironically, however, the only way to achieve the type of transformation that the neoconservatives seek is by working with others and avoiding the backlash that arises when the United States appears on the world stage as an imperial power acting unilaterally. What is more, because democracy cannot be imposed by force and requires a considerable time to take root, the most likely way to obtain staying power from the American public is through developing interna- tional legitimacy and burden sharing with allies and institutions. For Jacksoni- ans like Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld, this may not matter. They would pre- fer to punish the dictator and come home rather than engage in tedious nation building. For example, in September 2003, Rumsfeld said of Iraq, "I don't be- heve it's our job to reconstruct the country."^' But for serious neoconservatives, like Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz, their impatience with institutions and allies may undercut their own objectives. They understand the importance of soft power but fail to appreciate all its dimensions and dynamics.

Soft Power Solves Proliferation

Soft power solves proliferation

Hassan 6 [Jawhar, Staff Writer, October 8, New Straits Times, Lexis]

These strategies have only served to compound the problem, not resolve it. They have helped militarise the situation further and forced North Korea down the nuclear path. Threats and sanctions have not worked. They have impoverished the people further, and forced greater diversion of scarce sources to the overwhelming imperative of maintaining and strengthening defence. Fifty years of relentless harassment and pressure have, not surprisingly, led to extreme paranoia. They have helped prop up a brutal totalitarian system, not weakened it. The failed strategies have left the US and the international community with few viable options to stop North Korea from going nuclear and inducing responses that could spiral out of control. What then, can be done? Put in a nutshell, the US should abandon its extreme posture and adopt the South Korean, Chinese and Russian approach to the problem. It should soften its hard line, eschew name-calling and desist from its demonisation of North Korea. It should cease talk of regime change and stop demanding economic and political reform. They will come eventually. In the absence of an external threat, the regime must either change or die. No rulers of a society where 37 per cent of its children are stunted, 23 per cent underweight, and seven per cent "wasted" (as the World Food Programme puts it), can survive for long without dramatically improving matters, unless they are propped up by an external threat. Instead, the US should go into direct negotiations, either independently or within the framework of the six-party talks. All parties should work without pre-conditions which have hitherto frozen progress. The package should contain generous economic and other inducements to North Korea to abandon its nuclear programme. They should not be viewed as appeasement, capitulation or "rewards" to North Korea for "bad behaviour". They should be viewed as pragmatic options to induce North Korea to abandon its nuclear programme. Above all, North Korea must be assured of its security. It will not abandon the quest for nuclear weapons unless it is given a firm assurance. This the US can easily provide through a bilateral or multilateral peace pact that includes countries like Japan, South Korea, China and Russia, to replace the 1953 armistice agreement. The peace pact must contain solemn undertakings for respect of sovereignty, non-interference, non- use of force or threat of force, and mutual non-aggression. In return, North Korea must abandon its nuclear weapons programme, re-join the non-proliferation regime and open itself to International Atomic Energy Agency inspections. If a peace pact can be successfully inked, the US and its allies can terminate their annual military exercises off the Korean peninsula. As confidence returns and the environment for peace solidifies, there will also be less need for the US to station as many forces in the region. All this requires a radical, even revolutionary, transformation in American strategic culture and mindset. It can begin by the leaders shedding some of their self-perception of moral elitism because it breeds arrogance and intolerance. Though there is much to admire in some of America's values, its double standards abroad disqualify such notions. The US will also need to employ less coercion and more persuasion. There must be less militarism in foreign policy, and its postures be driven less by intolerant and extreme ideology and more by tolerant pragmatism. It must be less inflexible and more accommodating. It must engage more and retain lines of communication with foes, not sever them. Respect for international law and recourse to global institutions should be a norm rather than an option only when convenient. Such a radical change is not impossible. It may be unthinkable for the neo-conservatives and the Cheneys, Rumsfelds and Boltons, but not impossible for some of the State Department-types and the likes of Madeleine Albright and Colin Powell. The impending change in administration provides an opportunity for change. If the US is able to transform its strategies for peace, not only on the Korean peninsula but also in West Asia, South America and elsewhere, then it can regain some of its moral lustre, replenish its depleted soft power, and become a more humane and benevolent force for global good. A gentler, more even-handed and pragmatic America will be able to promote its national interest more effectively this way.

Soft Power Solves Proliferation

Hard power fails to stop proliferation- North Korea proves

Hassan 6 [Jawhar, Staff Writer, October 8, New Straits Times, Lexis]

Every nuclear weapon state cites deterrence as a justification for possessing nuclear weapons. Nuclear deterrence is a central defence doctrine of countries like the US. If nuclear deterrence is legitimate and respectable for them, then North Korea and any other country facing a threat can lay claim to the same. Indeed, in the case of North Korea, the nuclear threat to it was actual and credible, and the US continues to threaten the country with regime change and sanctions that undermine its vital economic interests. How serious was North Korea with its test announcement last week? Is it soon to become the world's eighth declared nuclear weapon state, if it is not already one? Nobody knows. Periodic brinkmanship is a tactic Pyongyang employs to extract concessions and deter pressure. North Korea's statement appears to be designed to leave the door open for negotiations. It merely talks of a test "in the future". It cites the "US extreme threat of a nuclear war and sanctions and pressure". North Korea's funds abroad, vital for its survival, are being increasingly squeezed by the US. Since September last year, the US is reported to have persuaded 24 banks in several countries, including China, Mongolia, Vietnam and Singapore, to shut down North Korean accounts. But, still, nobody knows whether it is merely a negotiating ploy or North Korea means what it says, and will go ahead and test. The US and some other countries are not taking chances and have issued stern warnings of dire consequences if North Korea proceeds.

Only soft power solves proliferation- alternatives provoke continued weapons production

Hayes 9 [Peter, Professor of International Relations, RMIT University The Asia-Pacific Journal, December 14, http://www.japanfocus.org/-Peter-Hayes/3268]

A completely non-nuclear strategy to deter and defend against DPRK threat of attack is militarily feasible. Indeed, although the United States has kept a target list for nuclear attack in North Korea and allocated warheads and delivery systems to implement the nuclear war plan at all times, the non-nuclear defeat of the DPRK has been the primary basis for military war planning in the Korean Peninsula since the withdrawal of American nuclear weapons in 1992 (and some would argue in the US Army, for decades before 1992). Making a solely non-nuclear strategy explicit would devalue the DPRK’s nuclear weapons far more effectively than reliance upon END. Reasserting US nuclear threat via reinforced END simply validates the DPRK’s nuclear breakout in their own and third party eyes and provides de facto recognition that the DPRK is an actual nuclear weapon state requiring a deterrent response. The North Koreans themselves have pointed this out: Ultimately, the stipulation of the "extended deterrence" in writing does nothing but add more legitimacy to our possession of nuclear deterrence and will only result in bringing on themselves a tragic situation that will bring the fiery shower of our nuclear retaliation over South Korea in an "emergency.

Soft Power Solves Terrorism

**Soft power stops terrorism - hedges against provocation**

**Nye and Owens 96** [Joseph S. , Jr. dean of the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University William A. former admiral in the United States Navy, Institute of Communication Studies, March/April http://ics.leeds.ac.uk/papers/vp01.cfm?outfit=pmt&requesttimeout=500&folder=49&paper=155]

The premature end of what Time magazine founder Henry Luce termed the American century has been declared more than once by disciples of decline. In truth, the 21st century, not the twentieth, will turn out to be the period of America's greatest preeminence. Information is the new coin of the international realm, and the United States is better positioned than any other country to multiply the potency of its hard and soft power resources through information. **This does not mean that the United States can act unilaterally, much less coercively, to achieve its international goals. The** beauty of information as a power resource is that, while it can enhance the effectiveness of raw military power, it ineluctably democratizes societies. The communist and authoritarian regimes that hoped to maintain their centralized authority while still reaping the economic and military benefits of information technologies discovered they had signed a Faustian bargain. The United States **can increase the effectiveness of its military forces and make the world safe for soft power, America's inherent comparative advantage.** Yet, a strategy based on America's information advantage and soft power has some prerequisites. The necessary defense technologies and programs, ISR, C4I, and precision force, must be adequately funded.... Global Warmning Turns Middle East Stability

Soft Power Sovles Russian Instability

Alliances promote Russian Stability

Moisi 8 [Dominique, Staff Writer, July 2, The Japan Times, Lexis]

If it is to remain a "Western Alliance" in a "globalized" world, must it define a much clearer relationship with Russia without giving the Kremlin a veto in the Alliance? Or will NATO eventually become an "alliance for stability" that includes all the new powers - China, India, and Brazil, not to mention Russia - of the emerging "multipolar world"? One thing is certain; a "shrinking West," as long as it retains some influence, must create the best institutions it can during the time it still has.

Soft Power Solves Bioterrorism

Soft power solves biological terrorism

DPJ 99 [Democratic Party of Japan, June, http://www.dpj.or.jp/english/policy/security.html]

On the other hand, the end of this era of ideological confrontation has removed the pressing weight of the superpowers, and brought about frequent regional conflicts. They are based on ethnic, religious and resource-related issues and economic difficulties. The nature of conflict has also diversified from clashes between nations to terrorism and guerilla activities in which the main agents are religious and ethnic groups, for example, rather than states. New threats are emerging, such as the improved performance and proliferation of missiles, computer-hacking and attacks on information systems and the localized use of biological and chemical weapons away from the battlefield. The world needs to develop diverse military and non-military responses to these new threats.

Soft Power Solves Deterrence

**Soft power key to deterrence- hard power alone can’t solve**

**Douthat 7** [Ross, senior editor, The Atlantic, July 13, http://rossdouthat.theatlantic.com/archives/2007/07/the\_case\_for\_deterrence.php]

In almost all real-world situations, 'the bomb' is not "the ultimate guardian of our safety". Our ability to solve conflict by non-military means is the ultimate guardian of our safety. By the time we use the nuclear bombs, our safety has already been compromised, yes? Therefore, our national security really, really does rest with our capacity to understand people(s), use soft power, influence events away from the development of dangerous red lines, incent collective action (even more so as a hegemon), and do much else besides ensuring that everyone is sufficiently frightened to compliance. (I know the love-your-bomb and I'll-put-my-faith-in-weaponry folks will hate that, but that doesn't make it untrue.)

Soft Power Solves Warming/Disease/Terrorism

Soft power is key to solve warming, disease, terrorism, and organized crime.

Nye 4 (Joseph S, “Soft Power and American Foreign Policy”, Harvard IR prof., vol. 119, no. 2, p. 264)

Because of its leading edge in the information revolution and its past investment in military power, the United States will likely remain the world's single most powerful country well into the twenty-first century. French dreams of a multipolar mihtary world are unlikely to be realized anytime soon, and the German Foreign Minister, Joschka Fischer, has explicitly eschewed such a goal.^^ But not all the important types of power come out of the barrel of a gun. Hard power is relevant to getting the outcomes we want on all three chessboards, but many of the transnational issues, such as climate change, the spread of infec- tious diseases, international crime, and terrorism, cannot be resolved by mili- tary force alone. Representing the dark side of globalization, these issues are inherently multilateral and require cooperation for their solution. Soft power is particularly important in dealing with the issues that arise from the bottom chessboard of transnational relations. To describe such a world as an American empire fails to capture the real nature of the foreign policy tasks that we face.

Soft Power Solves Warming/Terrorism

Soft power is key to solve climate change and terrorism.

**Khanna 8** (Director of the Global Governance Initiative and Senior Research Fellow in the American Strategy Program at the New America Foundation. Council on Foreign Relations: “The United States and Shifting Global Power Dynamics”) online: http://www.cfr.org/publication/16002/united\_states\_and\_shifting\_global\_power\_dynamics.html

To the extent that our grand strategy will involve elements of promoting good governance and democracy, we will have to become far more irresistible as a political partner, offering incentives greater than those of other powers who do not attach any strings to their relationships. Even if you are agnostic on this issue, we are all aware that this is a perennial plank of American diplomacy and if we want to be even remotely effective at it, we have to up our ante in this arena of rising powers. This I believe is part of what you would call “non-military spending on national security,” a course of action I strongly advocate for the Middle East and Central Asia.

An equally important component of grand strategy will have to be a realistic division of labor with these rising powers, something both of us clearly emphasize. Whether the issue is climate change, public health, poverty reduction, post-conflict reconstruction, or counterterrorism, we do not have the capacity to solve these problems alone—nor can any other power. I argue that we need serious issue-based summit diplomacy among concerned powers (and other actors such as corporations and NGOs) to get moving quickly on these questions rather than (or in parallel to) allowing things to drag through their course in cumbersome multilateral fora. This last point is crucial: the missing ingredient to a globalized grand strategy is the U.S. foreign policy community cleverly leveraging the strengths, activities, and global footprint of the U.S. private sector and NGO communities into what I call a diplomatic-industrial complex. It is in changing our foreign policy process, as much as some of the goals, that our success lies.

Soft Power Solves Heg/Terrorism

Soft power is key to sustain hegemony and solve terrorism.

Nye 4 (Joseph S, “Soft Power and American Foreign Policy”, Harvard IR prof., vol. 119, no. 2, p. 257)

But it would be a mistake to dismiss the recent decline in our attractiveness so lightly. It is true that the United States has recovered from unpopular poli- cies in the past, but that was against the backdrop of the Cold War, in which other countries still feared the Soviet Union as the greater evil. Moreover, while America's size and association with disruptive modernity are real and un- avoidable, wise policies can soften the sharp edges of that reality and reduce the resentments that they engender. That is what the United States did after World War II. We used our soft power resources and co-opted others into a set of alliances and institutions that lasted for sixty years. We won the Cold War against the Soviet Union with a strategy of containment that used our soft power as well as our hard power. It is true that the new threat of transnational terrorism increased American vulnerability, and some of our unilateralism after September 11 was driven by fear. But the United States cannot meet the new threat identified in the national security strategy without the cooperation of other countries. They will cooper- ate, up to a point, out of mere self-interest, but their degree of cooperation is also affected by the attractiveness of the United States. Take Pakistan for ex- ample. President Pervez Musharraf faces a complex game of cooperating with the United States on terrorism while managing a large anti-American constitu- ency at home. He winds up balancing concessions and retractions. If the United States were more attractive to the Pakistani populace, we would see more con- cessions in the mix. It is not smart to discount soft power as just a question of image, public re- lations, and ephemeral popularity. As I argued earlier, it is a form of power—a means of obtaining desired outcomes. When we discount the importance of our attractiveness to other countries, we pay a price. Most important, if the United States is so unpopular in a country that being pro-American is a kiss of death in their domestic politics, political leaders are unlikely to make concessions to help us. Turkey, Mexico, and Chile were prime examples in the run-up to the Iraq war in March 2003. When American policies lose their legitimacy and credibility in the eyes of others, attitudes of distrust tend to fester and further reduce our leverage. For example, after September 11, there was an outpouring of sympathy from Germans for the United States, and Germany joined a mili- tary campaign against the al Qaeda network. But as the United States geared up for the unpopular Iraq war, Germans expressed widespread disbelief about the reasons the United States gave for going to war, such as the alleged connec- tion of Iraq to al Qaeda and the imminence of the threat of weapons of mass destruction. German suspicions were reinforced by what they saw as biased American media coverage during the war and by the failure to find weapons or prove the connection to al Qaeda right after the war. The combination fos- tered a climate in which conspiracy theories flourished. By July 2003, one-third of Germans under the age of thirty said that they thought the American govern- ment might even have staged the original September 11 attacks."

Soft Power Solves North Korean Instability

US soft power solves North Korean aggression

Koh 3[Harold Hongju, Professor of International Law at Yale Law School, 55 Stan. L. Rev. 1479, 2003 p. Lexis]

America's "hard power" alternative - disarming North Korea militarily - raises such a threat to the people of South Korea and the 100,000 U.S. troops stationed there as to be effectively unusable.Yet the passive alternative initially chosen by the Bush Administration would have let North Korea go nuclear, while seeking to isolate and contain it in hopes of bringing about the eventual collapse of the North Korean regime. Yet an isolationist approach seems most unlikely to affect what is already the most isolated country on earth. Under intense pressure from Seoul and Tokyo, the administration has now finally shifted back to a diplomatic alternative: to reinitiate talks onthe condition - rejected by the North - that the North first abandon its effort to develop a highly enriched uranium program. Meanwhile, Kim Dae Jung has retired, having made little headway with his Sunshine Policy during the last years of his presidency. Our diplomatic ties with South Korea and its new president, Roh Moo Hyun, have been strained. The North Koreans continue to build nuclear weapons and could have six or seven in a year or two, enough to test, sell, and target Seoul and Tokyo, while still holding three or more weapons in reserve as bargaining chips in case serious talks ever do begin. n47 And President Bush has found himself in precisely the same position as his father in 1989 and President Clinton in 1993, concluding reluctantly that America has no real option but to reengage diplomatically, with soft power, having lost both critical time and valuable ground.

\*\*\*PROLIFERATION\*\*\*

Proliferation Turns Middle East Stability

Middle East prolif results in an arms race, war and nuclear shootouts

Rosen 6[Beton Michael Kaneb, Professor of National Security and Military Affairs and Director of the John M. Olin Institute for Strategic Studies at Harvard University Foreign Affairs. Sep. CIAO]

During the Cold War, the United States and the Soviet Union engaged in an intense arms race and built up vast nuclear arsenals. Other binary nuclear competitions, however, such as that between India and Pakistan, have been free of such behavior. Those states' arsenals have remained fairly small and relatively unsophisticated. Nuclear-armed countries in the Middle East would be unlikely to display such restraint. Iran and Iraq would be much too suspicious of each other, as would Saudi Arabia and Iran, Turkey and Iraq, and so forth. And then there is Israel. Wariness would create the classic conditions for a multipolar arms race, with Israel arming against all possible enemies and the Islamic states arming against Israel and one another.   Historical evidence suggests that arms races sometimes precipitate wars because governments come to see conflict as preferable to financial exhaustion or believe they can gain a temporary military advantage through war. Arguably, a nuclear war would be so destructive that its prospect might well dissuade states from escalating conflicts. But energetic arms races would still produce larger arsenals, making it harder to prevent the accidental or unauthorized use of nuclear weapons.

Proliferation Turns Asian Stability

Proliferation will spillover to Asia – results in an arms race

Rosen 6 [Beton Michael Kaneb, Professor of National Security and Military Affairs and Director of the John M. Olin Institute for Strategic Studies at Harvard University Foreign Affairs. Sep. CIAO]

Nuclear arms races might emerge in regions other than the Middle East as well. Asia features many countries with major territorial or political disputes, including five with nuclear weapons (China, India, North Korea, Pakistan, and Russia). Japan and Taiwan could join the list. Most of these countries would have the resources to increase the size and quality of their nuclear arsenals indefinitely if they so chose. They also seem to be nationalist in a way that western European countries no longer are: they are particularly mindful of their sovereignty, relatively uninterested in international organizations, sensitive to slights, and wary about changes in the regional balance of military power. Were the United States to stop serving as guarantor of the current order, Asia might well be, in the words of the Princeton political science professor Aaron Friedberg, "ripe for rivalry" -- including nuclear rivalry. In that case, the region would raise problems similar to those that would be posed by a nuclear Middle East.

Japanese proliferation causes Asian instability and encourages proliferation

Japan Times 5/22 [2010, Lexis]

Japan has more than 47 tons of plutonium stockpiled from spent nuclear waste. Ten tons are being stored in Japan, and the remainder in Europe, where it was sent for reprocessing into plutonium-uranium mixed oxide (MOX) fuel, the letter said. It is supposed to be returned to Japan for possible use in Monju and other nuclear power plants. "Civil plutonium stockpiles create serious instabilities in the NPT regime. The April 13, 2010, communique of the Nuclear Security Summit held in Washington recognized that 'highly enriched uranium and separated plutonium require special precautions.' Both of these materials can be used to produce nuclear weapons," the letter said. "In addition to the direct proliferation risks associated with Japan's program to separate and reuse plutonium, the example set by Japan encourages other countries to pursue plutonium-based nuclear power programs. The restart of Monju undermines Japan's claim to leadership in nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation," the letter concludes.

Proliferation Turns Asian Stability/US-Japan Relations

Japanese proliferation results in regional instability, kills US-Japanese relations and accelerates North Korean and Taiwanese nuclearization

Kamiya 2 [Matake. associate professor of international relations at the National. Defense Academy of Japan Washington Quarterly. 26:1 pg. 63–75. CIAO]

First, Japan’s decision to go nuclear would surely undermine the stability of the international environment in which the country lives. As a resourcepoor island country, friendly international relations are Japan’s only hope to maintain its security and prosperity. The country imports nearly 80 percent of its total energy requirements and almost 100 percent of its petroleum requirements. 15 In fiscal 2000, Japan was self-sufficient for only 40 percent of its calories and 28 percent of its cereal grains.16 As an island nation, Japan depends on sea-lanes for imports and exports. Thus, the Japanese are not merely speaking rhetorically when they say that world and regional peace is inseparable from the country’s security and prosperity, as the government’s Diplomatic Bluebook recently emphasized.17 Since the end of World War II, Japan has used every opportunity to show the international community and especially its East Asian neighbors that it has been reborn as a nation of peace. Japan’s postwar, exclusively defenseoriented policy has played a particularly large role in restoring the trust of other East Asian countries by providing clear evidence of Japan’s resolve not to become militaristic again. In abiding by this policy, Japan has voluntarily limited the resources and application of its Self-Defense Forces to the absolute minimum necessary to maintain national self-defense. It has refrained from acquiring offensive weapons such as intercontinental ballistic missiles, long-range strategic bombers, and offensive aircraft carriers and imposed strict conditions on when and how the Self-Defense Forces can lawfully mobilize. According to these conditions, Japan can employ military force only if an armed attack has already been initiated against it and if dealing with the situation without using military force is impossible, but only within the limit of what is minimally necessary. Were Japan to go nuclear, more than a half-century of abiding by such conditions would immediately go up in smoke. Foreign Minster Yohei Kono’s comments in August 1994, when tensions about the North Korean nuclear development program were at a peak, demonstrated a clear understanding of the stakes involved. Asked about Japan’s nuclear option, Kono declared flatly that it “would not benefit Japan at all” because Japan’s development of a nuclear arsenal would increase tensions with its neighbors, the United States, and presumably other countries as well.18 Second, contrary to what most foreign observers believe, nuclearization would actually threaten Japan’s military security. A decision to go nuclear might trigger an arms race in Northeast Asia—in a worst-case scenario, prompting the two Koreas and Taiwan to accelerate their nuclear development or go nuclear as well—ultimately reducing regional and global security. Japan’s Defense Agency soberly recognizes this reality. An unofficial study conducted in 1994 by Defense Agency officials and Self-Defense Forces officers at the behest of Administrative Vice-Minister Shigeru Hatakeyama concluded that Japan’s possession of its own nuclear arsenal had little if any strategic merit.19 In a 1996 presentation, Lt. Gen. Noboru Yamaguchi of the Japanese Ground Self-Defense Forces—reportedly a participant in the 1994 study group—asserted that, even without the protection of a U.S. nuclear umbrella, Japan would be worse off with its own nuclear arsenal.20 He emphasized that, because Japan is an island country with a large part of its population of more than 120 million living in a small number of densely populated cities, nuclear armament would not suit Japan because of its inherent vulnerability to nuclear attack. As a result, Japan is better off in a world where just a few states possess nuclear weapons capability. Consequently, going nuclear would only endanger Japan because, while bringing only minimal military benefits to the country, such a move would motivate numerous other currently nonnuclear states to pursue proliferation. Third, Japan’s decision to develop nuclear weapons would inevitably have a detrimental effect on the country’s relationship with the United States— Japan’s most important bilateral relationship. U.S. leaders do not want to see Japan become a major military power, much less a nuclear power. In March 1990, Maj. Gen. Henry Stackpole, commander of the U.S. Marine Corps bases in Japan, expressed the U.S. position quite clearly: “No one wants a rearmed, resurgent Japan. … So we are a cap in the bottle, if you will.”21 This sentiment has been echoed by many U.S. politicians and security experts on numerous occasions, and the Japanese are well aware of it. Fourth, and again contrary to the views of many foreign observers, the decision to go nuclear would only weaken Japan’s political power internationally. In fact, Japan has won the respect of other nations for its decision not to go nuclear despite its latent nuclear capability. For example, many of the countries that have expressed their support for Japan’s bid for a permanent seat on the United Nations (UN) Security Council have listed Japan’s nonnuclear status as one of the reasons for their support. For example, in August 1994, Brazilian foreign minister Celso Luiz Nunes Amorim told Japanese foreign minister Yohei Kono that limiting the permanent membership of the Security Council to nuclear weapons states would not be appropriate and that Japan should be included in the rank of permanent members.22 Thus, nuclearization would only undermine Japan’s international position and the reputation it has built for itself thus far. As the second largest economic power in the world, Japan, unlike India, does not need to acquire nuclear weapons to assert its power and prestige in the world.

Proliferation Turns Taiwan Stability

Taiwanese proliferation would lead to a shootout in a desperate attempt to draw in superpowers

Rosen 6[Beton Michael Kaneb, Professor of National Security and Military Affairs and Director of the John M. Olin Institute for Strategic Studies at Harvard University Foreign Affairs. Sep. CIAO]

What kind of state might attempt such a thing? If history is any guide, a state that openly rejects the existing international order, considers its opponents to be less than fully human, and seeks to intimidate others. Alternatively, internal conflicts could create hatreds so powerful that actors might resort to using nuclear weapons; consider, for example, how Moscow might respond if another Chechen attack killed hundreds of Russian children. Some states might also be tempted to use nuclear weapons in other ways. For example, before it started to abandon its nuclear weapons program, South Africa had planned to use its bombs if it was ever approaching military defeat, as a last-ditch effort to draw the superpowers into the conflict. If it were to cross the nuclear threshold, Taiwan might embrace a similar strategy.

Proliferation Turns Escalation

Prolif snowballs – as long as one country has weapons, the rest will follow

Sethi 1[Manpreet. Senior Fellow at the Center for Strategic and International Studies Strategic Analysis:A Monthly Journal of the IDSA. February 2001 Vol. XXVI No. 11. CIAO]

The most palpable danger that nuclear weapons pose arises from the insecurity that they generate in the minds of others so that the adversary too is compelled to acquire a similar capability in order to guard against nuclear blackmail, coercion, or annihilation. The dictate of putting a sort of deterrence in place then has the potential to trigger off a chain of proliferation.   Despite the best US efforts to withhold nuclear know how and expertise in the late 1940s, it could not prevent the USSR from going nuclear. Within one year of the use of the two nuclear weapons in Japan, Russia had realised the threat that the monopolist possession of the bomb posed. Stalin had then said on September 24, 1946 that the "monopolist possession of the bomb cannot last long". The USSR conducted its first nuclear tests in 1949. Thereafter, as and when a country has felt it imperative for its security, nuclear weapons have gone on proliferating. Nuclear proliferation is a real danger that exists as long as nuclear weapons exist with even one country. And this danger is only likely to grow in the future owing to the following factors:-  An increasing salience of nuclear weapons in the national security strategies of the nuclear weapons states (NWS). Disturbing indications are available in the way all the NWS are increasing their reliance on their nuclear arsenals. US and NATO have reaffirmed that nuclear weapons constitute the cornerstone of their national security policies; 1 Russia's new national security concept envisages the right to use "all available means and forces, including nuclear weapons, in case of the need to repel an armed aggression when all other means of settling the crisis situation have been exhausted", 2 China's modernisation of its nuclear and missile weaponry continues; an arms race spiral could be created by the US decision to deploy a national missile defence; 3 and NATO intervention in Kosovo without the approval of the United Nations and its implications on state intervention, are all issues that have a bearing on nuclear proliferation.  A corollary of the above is the growing perception among the non nuclear weapon states (NNWS) that there is a lack of seriousness and urgency on the part of the NWS to honour their commitment towards nuclear disarmament and as embodied in Article VI of the NPT. The NPT Preparatory Committee meetings in 1997, 1998 and 1999, as also the Review Conference earlier this year found the two categories of states polarised over the issue of nuclear disarmament. 4 The Conference on Disarmament, the multilateral grouping of 66 countries, that identifies and negotiates steps towards disarmament has also remained deadlocked over the past two years on two issues. One of these pertains to the insistence by the NNWS on the creation of an ad hoc committee within the CD to negotiate nuclear disarmament. 5  Easy accessibility to more and more sophisticated technology, fissile material, weapons components and even ready-made weapons after the collapse of centralised Soviet control. This aspect is dealt with in greater detail in the section on nuclear smuggling. Apart from this, there is the aspect of the international system going through a phase of technology push in which more and more sophisticated technology is available from an increasing number of suppliers. In such an emergent scenario, commercial considerations could outweigh security concerns even as import-export restrictions become less effective over the years.  Likelihood of an increase in Third World dependence on commercial nuclear power. A rise in scientific and technological sophistication of infrastructures would carry the seed of militarily exploiting the dual use technology. In fact, with improvements in technologies relating to commercial nuclear power, the size of key facilities is getting smaller, as is the number of technicians involved and the amount of electrical power consumed or the time taken for each step of development. Earlier, all these could be taken as tell tale signs of a country's nuclear weapons programme. But given the present trend, proliferation could not only increase for a variety of reasons, but also become less easy to detect.

Proliferation Turns Hegemony

Proliferation leads to accidental shootout, collapse of hegemony and attack on the homeland

Gray 99 [Colin. strategic thinker and professor of International Relations and Strategic Studies at the University of Reading, The Second Nuclear Age. CIAO]

Unfortunately, balanced political and strategic judgment is apt to be the first victim of the retreat into technicity and a world of presumptive nuclear peril that often is the dense thicket of expert scholarship on proliferation. Proliferation experts have a way of being expert on almost everything except what the subject of their expertise means politically and strategically. To be fair, the whole realm of strategic and security studies is awash with such niche cases of genuine, but bounded, expertise. Theorists of seapower, airpower, spacepower, and now cyberpower vie for our respect. But are they offering a whole theory of sufficient strategic effect for success in statecraft? Or, is the plat du jour but one course in what needs to be approached as a balanced meal overall?  Lest I should be misunderstood, proliferation could matter to the point where vital or even survival levels of intensity of interest are engaged because of the following considerations:  Nuclear proliferation renders some regional neighborhoods far more dangerous than they were previously.   Nuclear-armed regional polities, or other actors similarly equipped, might inflict mass destruction upon U.S. and U.S.-allied forces forward deployed, upon local friends and allies, or even upon the homeland of the United States.   Successful use of WMD as a diplomatic counterdeterrent would undermine fundamentally the basis of the current regional/international order, which frequently amounts in practice to a (single) superpower protection system—in other words, a hegemonic system. 4   In some statistical perspective, the emergence of more (declared or undeclared) nuclear powers means a rise in the possibility of nuclear “events,” purposeful or accidental. The psychological, political, and hence probably strategic consequences of a, or some, “small” nuclear event(s) are not easily analyzed by mind-sets that resist nonlinear, chaotic possibilities. Again to quote Freedman, “The concept of a small nuclear war has yet to be developed. Any nuclear use still moves us into the area of unimaginable catastrophe.” 5 His hyperbole is appropriate.

Proliferation Turns Hegemony

Proliferation collapses hegemony – weaker states can counterbalance

Gray 99 [Colin. professor of International Relations and Strategic Studies at the University of Reading The Second Nuclear Age. CIAO]

Of course, there is a problem for the United States with the proliferation of WMD, and especially of nuclear weapons. But as we shall see, that problem is both generally manageable in and of itself and of modest significance when compared with the nuclear dimension to the defining (bipolar antagonistic) political characteristic of the first, and eventually probably third (and beyond), nuclear age. WMD in the hands of “lawbreakers” carry the threat to neutralize the power and authority of the sheriff for order—that is, the practical authority of a hegemonic United States. Lawrence Freedman is right when he notes that “rather than reinforce power politics as usual, nuclear weapons in fact confirm a tendency towards the fragmentation of the international system in which the erstwhile great powers play a reduced role.” 3 By raising the risks for all concerned, or all of those contemplating concern, nuclear proliferation encourages a self-regarding autarky in security practice. This means, in principle, that notwithstanding its “unipolar moment” in this second nuclear age, the United States is going to be ever more reluctant to play regional “balancer,” let alone global cop, when such roles carry the risk of exposure of forces, allies, and just possibly the U.S. homeland to counterdeterrent (or retaliatory) action by WMD.

Prolif causes counterbalancing that collapses US Heg.

Gray, 99 (Colin professor of International Relations and Strategic Studies at the University of Reading, “Beyond the Fuel Cycle: Strategy and the Proliferation Puzzle.” The Second Nuclear Age. CIAO)AQB

Of course, there is a problem for the United States with the proliferation of WMD, and especially of nuclear weapons. But as we shall see, that problem is both generally manageable in and of itself and of modest significance when compared with the nuclear dimension to the defining (bipolar antagonistic) political characteristic of the first, and eventually probably third (and beyond), nuclear age. WMD in the hands of “lawbreakers” carry the threat to neutralize the power and authority of the sheriff for order—that is, the practical authority of a hegemonic United States. Lawrence Freedman is right when he notes that “rather than reinforce power politics as usual, nuclear weapons in fact confirm a tendency towards the fragmentation of the international system in which the erstwhile great powers play a reduced role.” 3 By raising the risks for all concerned, or all of those contemplating concern, nuclear proliferation encourages a self-regarding autarky in security practice. This means, in principle, that notwithstanding its “unipolar moment” in this second nuclear age, the United States is going to be ever more reluctant to play regional “balancer,” let alone global cop, when such roles carry the risk of exposure of forces, allies, and just possibly the U.S. homeland to counterdeterrent (or retaliatory) action by WMD.

Proliferation Turns Hegemony

Proliferation kills US hegemony- DPRK

Hayes 9 [Peter, Professor of International Relations, RMIT University The Asia-Pacific Journal, December 14, http://www.japanfocus.org/-Peter-Hayes/3268]

Since 2008, US nuclear hegemony based on END in East Asia has begun to unravel due to the havoc wrought by the North Korean nuclear breakout on the NPT-IAEA system as a whole, by its rejection of the authority of the UNSC as enforcer of the NPT-IAEA system, as a spoiler state for cooperative security institution building in the region, and by its direct challenge to US hegemony in its alliance relationships. Of course, all the nuclear weapons states are responsible for the parlous state of the NPT-IAEA system. But in the case of the DPRK, the United States as a direct antagonist and primary player in the Peninsula is by far the state held most accountable for these dismal outcomes.

Global Warming causes imperialism

Lee 9 [James R, Director, Mandala Projects School of International Service American University, January 4, Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/01/02/AR2009010202280.html]

But sometimes the displacement happens with shocking speed: Just think of the deadly hurricanes Katrina and Rita, which together drove millions of people to suddenly leave Louisiana, Mississippi and Texas. As global warming and population growth increase, we could see far deadlier storms than Katrina. In 1991, a cyclone in Bangladesh displaced 2 million people and killed 138,000. All this can lead to warfare when it's time for the displaced to find a new home. For most of human history, they could at least theoretically do so in unclaimed lands -- a sort of territorial pressure valve whose existence tamped down conflict. But today, this reservoir of vacant turf no longer exists, except in the least hospitable parts of the planet. So when the displaced start eyeing currently inhabited areas, expect trouble -- and the bigger the displacement, the bigger the fight. The second cause of the coming climate wars is the flip side of scarcity: the problems of an increase in abundance. Suppose that global warming makes a precious resource easier to get at -- say, rising temperatures in northern Canada, Alaska and Siberia make it easier to get at oil and gas resources in regions that had previously been too bone-chilling to tap. (A few degrees of change in temperature can transform a previously inhospitable climate.) But what happens if some tempting new field pops up in international waters contested by two great powers? Or if smaller countries with murky borders start arguing over newly arable land? Finally, we should also worry about new conflicts over issues of sovereignty that we didn't need to deal with in our older, colder world. Consider the Northwest Passage, which is turning into an ice-free corridor from Europe to Asia during the summer months. Canada claims some portions of the route as its own sovereign waters, while the United States argues that these sections lie within international waters. Admittedly, it'd take a lot of tension for this to turn into a military conflict, but anyone convinced that the United States and Canada could never come to blows has forgotten the War of 1812. And not all this sort of resource conflict will occur between friendly countries. Other kinds of territorial quarrels will arise, too. Some remote islands -- particularly such Pacific islands as Tuvalu, Kiribati, Tonga, the Maldives and many others -- may be partially or entirely submerged beneath rising ocean waters. Do they lose their sovereignty if their territory disappears? After all, governments in exile have maintained sovereign rights in the past over land they didn't control (think of France and Poland in World War II). Nor are these new questions far away in the future. The first democratically elected president of the Maldives, Mohamed Nasheed, is already planning to use tourism revenue to buy land abroad -- perhaps in India, Sri Lanka or Australia -- to house his citizens. "We do not want to leave the Maldives, but we also do not want to be climate refugees living in tents for decades," he told Britain's Guardian newspaper.

Proliferation Turns China/Space/Cyber War

Proliferation leads to cyber war, space war and conflict with China

Blank 2 [Stephen Research Professor of National Security Affairs;. CIAO]

China launched missile attacks on Taiwan (which it declares to be part of China) in 1995-1996 and has continued proliferating to Pakistan and Iran despite membership in the Missile Technology Control Regime. 59 Furthermore China is evidently moving towards a new nuclear doctrine that actually contemplates use of those weapons, not only to deter, but also as warfighting weapons. 60  China, aided by Russia, is undoubtedly modernizing its missiles and missile defense capability to gain the capacity to threaten the continental United States, diversify and expand its arsenal, and counter foreign missile attacks. 61 This buildup is only part of a much larger comprehensive modernization of military technologies across the board. It aims to give China the means to fight for informational and strategic superiority by striking the enemy’s most critical targets first, even preemptively. 62 This strategy and target set could easily mandate space war and/or nuclear attacks. 63  Thus we are witnessing the return of limited (and possibly even unlimited) nuclear war as a viable operational mission. And this is not a question of one or two states. Proliferators and established nuclear power see new justification for their use as threats change and as warfare becomes multi-dimensional to the degree that cyberwar is a reality as is the potentiality for weapons to strike from underwater, the earth, the sea, the air, and space at targets in any one of the other dimensions. And they are abetted by the trend whereby proliferating states then become salesmen of WMD systems to other proliferators, as China and North Korea have done.

Proliferation Turns Terrorism

Prolif causes terrorism through corruption.

Sethi, 1 (Manpreet Senior Fellow at the Center for Strategic and International Studies “Dangers From Weapons of Mass Destruction: Any Different in South Asia.” Strategic Analysis:A Monthly Journal of the IDSA. February 2001 Vol. XXVI No. 11. CIAO)AQB

Even though illegal nuclear commerce has long existed and proof of this is evident in the state of advancement of the clandestine nuclear programmes of Pakistan, Iraq, and North Korea yet, it is only after the break up of the USSR that the problem has assumed menacing proportions. This may be attributed to three main factors. Firstly, the fact the Soviet Union possessed the largest nuclear arsenal and related nuclear infrastructure that got split with the break up of the empire into 15 republics. With physical control of nuclear weapons, installations and stockpiles of fissile material slipping into many hands, the exact accounting of nuclear materials came to pose a problem. Given the magnitude of the material, errors in accounting could easily be exploited by those wishing to indulge in their trade. Such a possibility is further heightened by the socio-economic crises and political instability that continues to afflict most of the new states. A rise in corruption has not only raised the specter of technological mercenaries but also the fear of nuclear commerce being conducted to raise easy money. The problem is further aggravated by the degradation in the standards of physical protection of nuclear materials and weapons. 7 Since 1990, incidences of smuggling of nuclear fissile material have registered a perceptible increase. Attempts to smuggle radioactive material from Eastern Europe had more than doubled from 56 cases in the early 1990s to 124 in 1995. Of these, 77 cases involved weapons grade material. 8 Proliferation of such material or weapons made thereof, increase the risk of their coming into use, if not as a weapon of war fighting, then as one of terror to facilitate nuclear coercion or blackmail.

Proliferation Turns Asian Stability

Proliferation causes Asian instability- North Korea proves

Gavin 10 [ Francis J, professor of international affairs University of Texas at Austin, March 9, Los Angeles Times, Lexis]

Iran's announcement last month that it will begin enriching uranium for use in a medical reactor sparked a rare bipartisan consensus in Washington. Politicians on both sides of the aisle treated the news as the latest evidence we are moving closer to a nuclear crisis. There is cause for concern, with Iran unwilling to bend to global pressure, terrorists eager to acquire an atomic device, an erratic North Korea threatening stability in East Asia and an international nuclear nonproliferation regime that appears to be getting weaker by the minute.

\*\*\*DETERRENCE\*\*\*

Deterrence Turns Hegemony

**Reassessing deterrence key to American hegemony**

**Thayer 7** [Bradley, American legal Writer, International Studies Association 48th Annual Convention, Februrary 28, http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p\_mla\_apa\_research\_citation/1/7/9/2/6/p179261\_index.html]

This analysis explores the relationship between nuclear deterrence and changes in the international system. The central argument of this chapter is that the effectiveness of the United States? nuclear deterrent depends on the distribution of power in international politics. That is, whether the international system is bipolar, as it was during the Cold War, or is hegemonic, as it is today, with a significant imbalance of power between the United States and the rest of the world. Deterrence was relatively straightforward during the Cold War due to the political context of a bipolar international system. However, the political context of the post-Cold War period contains important differences that the United States did not confront previously. Some of these are negative?the rise of Islamic fundamentalist terrorist groups who seek to use nuclear weapons against the United States; and some are positive?the United States has escalation dominance against likely adversaries.This issue is important to analyze precisely because deterrence worked in Cold War. Why it did so is critical to understand. Equally, even in the era of its hegemony, the United States cannot assume that the causes of successful deterrence during the Cold War will obtain in the post-Cold War period. The changing political circumstances between the Cold War and post-Cold War world create new dangers and risks that can lead to deterrence failure if the United States is not cognizant of them. Likewise, there are new opportunities for the United States to use its strategic capabilities to advance its interests, and these must be explored as well.

Inability to provide extended nuclear deterrence to allies threatens US hegemony

Hayes 9 [Peter, Professor of International Relations, RMIT University The Asia-Pacific Journal, December 14, http://www.japanfocus.org/-Peter-Hayes/3268]

This essay examines the role that nuclear weapons have played in Northeast Asia in creating a system of inter-state relations based in part on nuclear threat and the impact of North Korea on that system. The US-led alliances that rest on extended nuclear deterrence have been characterized as hegemonic in the forty years of Cold War in the Gramscian sense of hegemonic, that is, allied elites accepted US leadership based on its legitimating ideology of extended nuclear deterrence, institutional integration, and unique American nuclear forces that underpinned the alliances.2 A crucial aspect of American nuclear hegemony in Asia was the guarantee that the hegemon would ensure that no adversary could break out of the system after China's 1964 successful nuclear test, as expressed by the Non Proliferation Treaty and IAEA safeguard system. The failure of the United States to stop and now reverse the DPRK nuclear over the previous two decades threatens its hegemonic leadership in Northeast Asia, and is linked to the decreasing ability of American power to shape events in other proliferation-prone regions such as South and West Asia.

Nuclear deterrence imposes a direct correlation to US hegemony

Hayes 9 [Peter, Professor of International Relations, RMIT University The Asia-Pacific Journal, December 14, http://www.japanfocus.org/-Peter-Hayes/3268]

The DPRK thereby called the American bluff in the most serious challenge to American nuclear hegemony in the entire post Cold War period. The inability and unwillingness of the United States to halt or reverse North Korean nuclear breakout to the point where the DPRK can at least partly neutralize the United States’ “unique” nuclear weapons capacities are obvious to the leadership of all states in the region.12 Recent discussions of the need to “shore up” extended deterrence in the US-Japan security alliance,13 thereby reinforcing extended nuclear deterrence to Japan and Korea14 and even reintroducing nuclear weapons into Korea itself,15 reveal the effects of North Korean nuclearization and the lack of an American vision for regional order based on Global Abolition—the new doctrinal framework introduced by President Obama for international relations without depending on nuclear threat.

Deterrence Turns Morality

Deterrence ensures the least harm to the least number of people

Yin 3 [Tung, Associate Professor, University of Iowa College of Law; Alabama Law Review, 55 Ala. L. Rev. 111, Fall, Lexis]

Perhaps the French and British would argue that their nuclear forces are intended to be used in more limited ways than all-out retaliation. In the Cold War, when the greatest threat to those countries came from the Soviet Union, either European nuclear power theoretically could have achieved deterrence by threatening just Moscow with retaliatory nuclear strikes rather than the entire Soviet nation. [n152](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.uhd.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1278554751073&returnToKey=20_T9701349985&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.753999.5073583418" \l "n152) This was the theory, in essence, of "minimum deterrence" and was grounded on the idea that no rational country would risk one or two major cities in a campaign of aggression. [n153](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.uhd.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1278554751073&returnToKey=20_T9701349985&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.753999.5073583418" \l "n153)

Deterrence Solves Proliferation

Deterrence solves proliferation

**Record 4 [Jeffrey,** Bio and Research with the Strategic Studies Institute, CATO Institute, July 7, http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa519.pdf]

During the Cold War, the principal function of nuclear weapons was to deter nuclear attack. Nuclear deterrence was not considered a tool of nonproliferation. The primary mechanisms for halting the proliferation of nuclear weapons were the nonproliferation regime established by the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) of 1968 and the U.S. extension of nuclear deterrence to states that might otherwise have sought security through the acquisition of nuclear weapons. Since the end of the Cold War, and especially in the wake of the September 11, 2001, al Qaeda terrorist attacks on the United States, the U.S. government has reexamined the utility of both nuclear deterrence and nonproliferation. The discovery in the wake of the 1991 Gulf War that Iraq, an NPT signatory, had secretly embarked on a huge nuclear weapons program prompted the United States to embrace counterproliferation, which consists of a series of nonwar initiatives designed to prevent hostile states from acquiring nuclear weapons and, in the event of crisis or war, to destroy such weapons and their supporting infrastructure. The 9/11 attacks a decade later spawned proclamation of a new use-of-force doctrine calling for preventive military action against so-called “rogue states” seeking to acquire nuclear weapons. The doctrine reflected a loss of confidence in traditional nuclear deterrence; rogue states, it was believed, were irrational and might launch attacks on the United States or transfer weapons of mass destruction to terrorist organizations. Thus the global war on terrorism, highlighted by the preventive war against Iraq, became as much a war of counterproliferation as it was a war on terrorism. The wisdom and necessity of preventive war as a substitute for nuclear deterrence are, however, highly questionable. The evidence strongly suggests that credible nuclear deterrence remains effective against rogue state use of WMD, if not against attacks by fanatical terrorist organizations; unlike terrorist groups, rogue states have critical assets that can be held hostage to the threat of devastating retaliation, and no rogue state has ever used WMD against an enemy capable of such retaliation. Additionally, preventive war is not only contrary to the traditions of American statecraft that have served U.S. security interests so well but also anathema to many longstanding friends and allies.

**Deterrence prevents proliferation**

**Record 4 [Jeffrey,** Bio and Research with the Strategic Studies Institute, CATO Institute, July 7, http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa519.pdf]

In the final analysis, it is not the mere presence of WMD in hostile hands—but rather their use—that kills and destroys. Accordingly, if their use can be deterred—and the evidence suggests that deterrence does work against rogue states if not terrorist organizations, then deterrence of their use is manifestly a much more attractive policy option than war to prevent their acquisition.

Deterrence Solves Proliferation/Stability

Deterrence solves proliferation and ensures stability

BBC News 5 [September 1, Lexis]

On the one hand, as an integral part of the global security order, the international arms control, disarmament and nonproliferation regime is still playing an important role in safeguarding world peace and stability. Since the 1990s, fresh achievements have been scored in arms control, disarmament and nonproliferation. A number of important treaties have been concluded in such areas as the prohibition of chemical weapons and nuclear tests. The international consensus has been constantly strengthened on preventing the proliferation of WMD. The UN Security Council has unanimously adopted Resolution 1540 on nonproliferation. Political and diplomatic efforts have been continuously pursued to settle proliferation issues through dialogue and cooperation. Initiatives on strengthening the nonproliferation regime have been introduced. Security dialogues have been intensified among countries and regional security cooperation has been expanded. The aforementioned progress has enhanced mutual trust among countries, boosted the relaxation of the security situation and maintained international strategic stability. On the other hand, there is still a long way to go in multilateral arms control and disarmament. The process of nuclear disarmament has been long and arduous. The nuclear deterrence strategy based on the first use of nuclear weapons has yet to be abandoned. The trend towards lowering the threshold for the use of nuclear weapons and developing new nuclear weapons is worrisome. There has been greater danger of weaponization of and an arms race in outer space. The universality of international treaties on arms control is still inadequate and negative examples of scrapping important arms control treaties occur from time to time. The multilateral arms control and disarmament regime is faced with difficulty. As the single multilateral disarmament negotiating body, the Conference on Disarmament (CD) in Geneva has for years been unable to carry out substantive work. The international nonproliferation process is facing challenges. The prospect for settling regional nuclear issues is still blurry and the risks of terrorist organizations and other non-state entities acquiring WMD are growing. Currently, the international process of arms control, disarmament and nonproliferation is at a crucial crossroad. It is an absolute necessity for the maintenance of international peace, security and stability to seize fresh opportunities, meet new challenges and consolidate and constantly strengthen the existing international regime on arms control, disarmament and nonproliferation. This also conforms to the people's will. The international community is in favour of maintaining multilateralism, pushing forward the international process of arms control and disarmament, constantly improving the international nonproliferation regime, stepping up international cooperation and coping with security challenges.

Deterrence Solves Soft Power

**Extended deterrence garners the US soft power**

**Nye and Owens 96** [Joseph S. , Jr. dean of the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University William A. former admiral in the United States Navy, Institute of Communication Studies, March/April http://ics.leeds.ac.uk/papers/vp01.cfm?outfit=pmt&requesttimeout=500&folder=49&paper=155]

In this setting, the emerging U.S. capabilities suggest leverage with friends similar to what extended nuclear deterrence once offered. The nuclear umbrella provided a cooperative structure, linking the United States in a mutually beneficial way to a wide range of friends, allies, and neutral nations. It was a logical response to the central issue of international relations -- the threat of Soviet aggression. Now the central issue is ambiguity about the type and degree of threats, and the basis for cooperation is the capacity to clarify and cut through that ambiguity.

Deterrence Solves Russian Instability

Deterrence promotes Russian stability

Japan Times 8 [March 24, Lexis]

Nuclear dynamics contribute to the uncertainty. In the Cold War, the U.S. accepted mutual vulnerability with the Soviet Union to create strategic stability. Both superpowers knew that in a crisis each could inflict unacceptable damage on the other; that provided the foundation for stability through mutual deterrence.

Deterrence Solves Asian Stability

Nuclear deterrence promotes Asian stability

CIR 6 [Committee On International Relations, September 14, http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/congress/2006\_hr/060914-transcript.pdf]

 I think we are going to have a special obligation in the United States as this problem gets harder—and it will get harder—to demonstrate very clearly that we stand with Japan, that an attack on Japan is a threat to the United States. And attack on the U.S., that our extended nuclear deterrence is resolute. The same with Republic of Korea, despite some of the flack in the relationship right now. It is one reason I am a little concerned that if we were to overfocus on the history issue, for example, we would be sending the wrong messages to Japan at this time and to the region. I have a slightly different take on China’s view of North Korea than my good friend, Kurt Campbell. In an odd way, I think the Chinese are afraid the North Koreans. The Chinese have several million ethnic Koreans of their own right across the border. Instability in North Korea would threaten regime stability inside China. They just don’t want to rock the boat. And we have to make it clear to China that if they don’t rock the boat a little more North Korea is going to start doing it on its own. So there may be some ancillary benefit in terms of tweaking the Japanese side, but I think for the most part the Chinese are most confounded of all about what to do about North Korea because they are basically kind of scared of them. Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Rohrabacher, I would agree with Mike. I think—actually, that is what I thought I was saying. I thought that was the case. And the thing that might surprise you is that I think if you ask yourself among a pretty hostile group of folks in northeast Asia, there is a lot of trade and interaction but underneath a lot of suspicion and anxiety. I would say near the top of the hits chart is suspicion and concern between North Korea and China. I think behind the scenes there is a lot of tension and a lot of uncertainty. I wouldn’t be at all surprised if a few of those nuclear weapons in North Korea are aimed not just at Japan and United States and South Korea. Maybe a few of them are aimed at China.

Deterrence Solves North Korean Instability

Nuclear deterrence promotes North Korean stability- plan B against regime collapse

Sung-ki 9 [Jung, Staff Writer, Korea Times, December 24, Lexis]

North Korean insistence on retaining its nuclear weapons and being designated a nuclear power makes the ROK-US alliance ever more critical for the security of South Korea and the region, he said. "As a result, I found the ROK-US Joint Vision of the Alliance statement to be a key development. I was especially struck by the US commitment to extended deterrence, including its nuclear umbrella," said the analyst. Bennett said North Korean leader Kim Jong-il's illness early in the year implied that succession could come soon, and the failure of Kim Jong-il to clearly designate a successor suggests that a third-generation Kim family succession could fail. This view was reinforced by North Korea's provocations - its missile launches and nuclear test - in the first half of the year, which apparently stemmed from Kim Jong-Il's deteriorating health and the need to demonstrate his power, he analyzed. "If anyone in the ROK was feeling safe from North Korean nuclear weapons, they should have developed a different perspective after May 25 (the nuclear test), and worried about how the ROK government was going to protect them," the analyst said. "While most experts have focused on Kim Jong-Il's efforts to appear peaceful and cooperative in the second half of this year, I think there have been clear signs even in this period of the need for our alliance, given North Korean instability," he said.

Deterrence Solves India-Pakistan Instability

Deterrence ensures India- Pakistan stability

Grier 2 [Peter, Staff writer, January 4, The Christian Science Monitor, Lexis]

"Both sides now show great cognizance that there are nuclear dangers and that they have to be extremely careful," says George Perkovich, author of a study of India's nuclear program and fellow at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. If not for the knowledge of the nuclear dangers, Indian forces on the border might have already crossed into Pakistani-controlled Kashmir, judge other experts. Thus, for Pakistan, nuclear deterrence has worked, at least for the short term. Whether that continues, and what happens if it does not, remains to be seen. "I know it goes against all nonproliferation theory, but I believe the presence of nuclear weapons [in the region] has actually made things better, for now," says Sumit Ganguly, a South Asia expert at the University of Texas at Austin. The possibility of an uncontrolled India-Pakistan war over Kashmir has long been a nightmare scenario for Western non-proliferation experts. It represents the most likely set of circumstances they can think of that could lead to the use of a nuclear weapon in anger. The human toll of such an attack would be unthinkable. India has more than 1 billion people, and Pakistan nearly 150 million. Just one weapon detonated over Bombay could cause 850,000 casualties, according to a recent study.

Deterrence Solves Middle East War

**Nuclear deterrence checks threats of Middle East escalation - Tehran proves**

**Cooper** **and** **Brackman 9 [Rabbi Abraham** is associate dean of the Simon Wiesenthal Center. **Harold**, a historian, is a consultant to the Wiesenthal Center, US News, May 27, http://politics.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2009/05/27/iran-missile-test-shows-israels-nuclear-deterrent-is-essential\_print.html]

Policy makers who want a successful two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict should think twice before they revise U.S. nonproliferation policy of calculated silence about Israel's undeclared nuclear deterrent. Against the backdrop of Tehran's genocidal threats to Israel, its lengthening missile reach, and its destabilizing campaign against Egypt, the U.S. and its European allies should be counting on Israel's nuclear deterrence, not seeking ways to degrade it. Far from stabilizing the region, any change in U.S. policy could unleash the nuclear dominos in the world's most dangerous neighborhood. Tehran's missile launch sent an unmistakable challenge to Mr. Obama. The president's response should leave no ambiguities about Israel's continued right to maintain her nuclear deterrence.

Deterrence Solves Terrorism

Deterrence solves terrorism- coalitions

Biden 4/17 [Joe, Vice President of the United States, Los Angeles Times, Lexis]

When I joined the Senate in 1973, crafting nuclear policy meant mastering arcane issues like nuclear stability and deterrence theory. With the end of the Cold War and a new relationship between our country and Russia, thankfully these subjects no longer dominate public discourse. Today, the danger of deliberate, global nuclear war has all but disappeared, but the nuclear threats we face from terrorists and non-nuclear states seeking to acquire such weapons are graver than ever. On Tuesday, President Obama took an important step toward addressing these threats by releasing a plan that will reduce the role of nuclear weapons in our national security strategy while ensuring that our nuclear arsenal remains safe, secure and effective for as long as it is needed. The Nuclear Posture Review outlines a strategy, supported unanimously by the national security cabinet, for greater security from nuclear dangers and implements the agenda that President Obama first outlined in Prague just over a year ago to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and to pursue the peace and security of a world without them. This new strategy, a sharp departure from previous Nuclear Posture Reviews released in 2001 and 1994, leaves Cold War thinking behind. It recognizes that the greatest threat to U.S. and global security is no longer a nuclear exchange between nations, but nuclear terrorism by extremists and the spread of nuclear weapons to an increasing number of states. From now on, decisions about the number of weapons we have and how they are deployed will take nonproliferation and counter-terrorism into account, rather than being solely based on the objective of stable deterrence.

\*\*\*WAR\*\*\*

War Turns Oil Dependence

War increases our dependence of Fossil Fuels

Herizons 8 [January 1, Herizon’s Newspaper, http://www.accessmylibrary.com/coms2/summary\_0286-33712860\_ITM]

The U.S. women's anti-war group CODEPINK has spun off a green campaign that makes a link between the Iraq war and global warming. Its slogan: No War. No Warming. According to CODEPINK's website: "The war is a direct result of our addiction to oil, and the continued U.S. occupation of Iraq is further perpetuating our need for it." The U.S. military is the single largest single consumer of petroleum in the world. "As our military grows, so does our dependence on oil. While chaos and death tolls in Iraq heighten, temperatures continue to rise," the group notes. The U.S. military uses 100 million barrels of oil a year for its aircraft, ships, ground vehicles and facilities. One hundred million barrels of petroleum is enough fuel 7.6 million cars to drive 15,000 miles each year. Jet fuel constitutes nearly 70 percent of the military's petroleum use. "It is necessary that we end our addiction to oil and stop the war, as it would enable us to better use our resources to develop a green economy," concludes CODEPINK.

War Turns Rights/Liberties

**War restricts freedoms, paving the way for authortarianism**

Hoeffler 3 [Anke, Centre for the Study of African Economies and St Antony’s College, University of Oxford, Marta Reynal-Querol, The World Bank, March, http://www.patrir.ro/london/september/Costs%20of%20Conflict%20Mapping/2003\_Hoeffler\_Reynal.pdf, accessed 7/18]

For civil war to have some redeeming features, the most hopeful areas would be policies, political institutions, and human rights. The impact of civil war on each of these can, to an extent, be measured. With respect to policy we use a measure adopted by the World Bank – the Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA). The CPIA is an assessment on a five-point scale of economic policy in four areas – macro, structural, social, and public sector management. While what constitutes ‘good’ policies can be controversial; there is a wider consensus on the recognition of bad policies, and unfortunately, civil war countries tend to be at this end of the spectrum. Those low- income countries that are neither at war nor in the first decade of post-war peace have on average a CPIA score of 2.75. Post-conflict countries, averaged over the first decade of peace, have a CPIA score of only 2.52. Although the numbers are close together, they actually reflect quite a substantial difference in policies. All four policy areas are worse in post-conflict societies – the macro-economy is less stable, structural policies such as trade and infrastructure are less conducive to growth, social policies are less inclusive, and the public sector is less well-managed. Civil war is thus not normally a catalyst for policy improvement but rather for policy deterioration. With respect the extent to which political institutions are democratic, we use the standard political science index – ‘Polity IV’9. This is a ten-point scale; as with the CPIA the bottom end of the range is probably more clear-cut than the top. The typical low-income country that is neither at war nor in post-war peace has a score of 2.11. Countries in the first decade of post-war peace average a score of only 1.49. Hence, again on average civil war leads to a deterioration rather than an improvement in political institutions. A related measure is an index of political freedoms compiled by Freedom House10. This is a seven-point scale in which, unlike the other indices, a low score is better than a high score. The comparable numbers are 4.79 and 5.66. Hence, again civil war leaves a legacy of reduced freedom rather than increased freedom.

War Turns Social Exclusion

**War causes dehumanization and legitimizes social exclusion**

**Maiese, 03** [Michelle, research staff at the Conflict Research Consortium, July, The Beyond Intractability Project: Guy Burgess and Heidi Burgess” http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/dehumanization/]

Dehumanization is a psychological process whereby opponents view each other as less than human and thus not deserving of moral consideration. Jews in the eyes of Nazis and Tutsis in the eyes of Hutus (in the Rwandan genocide) are but two examples. Protracted conflict strains relationships and makes it difficult for parties to recognize that they are part of a shared human community. Such conditions often lead to feelings of intense hatred and alienation among conflicting parties. The more severe the conflict, the more the psychological distance between groups will widen. Eventually, this can result in moral exclusion. Those excluded are typically viewed as inferior, evil, or criminal.[1] We typically think that all people have some basic human rights that should not be violated. Innocent people should not be murdered, raped, or tortured. Rather, international law suggests that they should be treated justly and fairly, with dignity and respect. They deserve to have their basic needs met, and to have some freedom to make autonomous decisions. In times of war, parties must take care to protect the lives of innocent civilians on the opposing side. Even those guilty of breaking the law should receive a fair trial, and should not be subject to any sort of cruel or unusual punishment. However, for individuals viewed as outside the scope of morality and justice, "the concepts of deserving basic needs and fair treatment do not apply and can seem irrelevant."[2] Any harm that befalls such individuals seems warranted, and perhaps even morally justified. Those excluded from the scope of morality are typically perceived as psychologically distant, expendable, and deserving of treatment that would not be acceptable for those included in one's moral community. Common criteria for exclusion include ideology, skin color, and cognitive capacity. We typically dehumanize those whom we perceive as a threat to our well-being or values.[3] Psychologically, it is necessary to categorize one's enemy as sub-human in order to legitimize increased violence or justify the violation of basic human rights. Moral exclusion reduces restraints against harming or exploiting certain groups of people. In severe cases, dehumanization makes the violation of generally accepted norms of behavior regarding one's fellow man seem reasonable, or even necessary

War Turns Human Rights, Sexual Violence

War leads to human rights violations and sexual violence

Amnesty International 9 [Amnesty International, May 28, http://www.africafocus.org/docs09/hr0906b.php, accessed 7/13]

Armed conflict and insecurity in several African countries forced hundreds of thousands of people to flee from their homes, trying to find international protection across borders or some form of security within their own country. In some of the worst armed conflicts still affecting the region, government forces and armed groups completely disregarded the dignity and physical integrity of the population. The civilian population was routinely the object of attacks by parties to the conflict; rape and other forms of sexual violence remained widespread; children were often recruited to take part in hostilities; and humanitarian workers were targeted. Those responsible for crimes under international law, committed in the context of these armed conflicts, were hardly ever held to account. The role of UN and regional peacekeeping missions in Africa increased during 2008, but failed to make a significant impact in terms of protecting the civilian population. This was partly, but not entirely, the result of inadequate resources. The UN and regional bodies, such as the African Union, made little progress in resolving the armed conflicts in Sudan (Darfur), Chad, Somalia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (North Kivu). The proliferation of small arms remained a significant contributing factor to the continuation of armed conflicts and to widespread human rights abuses. UN arms embargoes have not been effective. The international community mobilized unprecedented resources to combat piracy off the coast of Somalia and to protect its commercial interests. It made no such efforts, however, to halt the flow of arms to Somalia - despite a UN embargo. Nor did it act effectively to stop the widespread violations of international humanitarian law by all parties to the conflict; nor to hold those responsible for crimes under international law accountable. Hundreds of thousands of people were also newly displaced as a result of the conflict in Somalia. Fighting in and around the capital Mogadishu has led to 16,000 deaths, and undocumented numbers of wounded, among the civilian population since January 2007. The Transitional Federal Government was not able to establish its authority across south central Somalia and lost ground to armed opposition groups. Humanitarian organizations had only limited access to provide emergency assistance to an estimated 3.2 million people in need. Aid workers, as well as journalists and human rights defenders, were often targeted for political and criminal reasons. The armed conflict in the eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo escalated again during the second half of 2008. Numerous human rights abuses were committed by all the parties to the conflict, including killings and abductions of civilians, rape and other forms of sexual violence, and the recruitment and use of children as armed fighters. Hundreds of thousands of people fled the fighting.

War Turns Rape

War increases patriarchy and sexual violence- rape used as a weapon

Robson 93 [Angela, London-based freelance journalist specializing in human-rights issues, June 1993, New Internationalist, Rape: weapon of war, http://www.newint.org/issue244/rape.htm, accessed 7/13]

The sexual abuse of women in war is nothing new. Rape has long been tolerated as one of the spoils of war, an inevitable feature of military conflict like pillage and looting. What is new about the situation in Bosnia is the attention it is receiving – and the recognition that it is being used as a deliberate military tactic to speed up the process of ‘ethnic cleansing’. According to a recent report by European Community investigators, rapes are being committed in ‘particularly sadistic ways to inflict maximum humiliation on victims, their families, and on the whole community’.1 In many cases the intention is ‘deliberately to make women pregnant and to detain them until pregnancy is far enough advanced to make termination impossible’. Women and girls aged anything between 6 and 70 are being held in camps throughout the country and raped repeatedly by gangs of soldiers. Often brothers or fathers of these women are forced to rape them as well. If they refuse, they are killed.

Rape is justified by government in times of war

Robson ’93 [Angela, London-based freelance journalist specializing in human-rights issues, June 1993, New Internationalist, Rape: weapon of war, http://www.newint.org/issue244/rape.htm, accessed 7/13]

To Zainab Jama, the Somali writer and former BBC broadcaster, the silence surrounding such violence is a measure of its effectiveness. Her research on her own country indicates that acts of unspeakable brutality are being carried out against women in the civil war raging there. ‘Who knows how many victims of rape there are in Somalia? No-one can estimate the number though one can speak in terms of many thousands. All we do know is that the victims of war rape are being ignored in Somalia. The West simply does not wish to know what is happening there.’ Rape is unlawful in both international conflicts and civil war. But, according to Amnesty International, many governments do not uphold these norms and are often complacent in the face of such abuses. On a visit to Peru’s Ayacucho department in 1986, for example, Amnesty was told by legal officers that rape by government troops conducting counter-insurgency operations ‘was to be expected’ and that prosecutions for such assaults were unlikely to happen. Women raped by soldiers in emergency zones were warned not to report it lest they suffer reprisals. What can be done to protect women from such violations? According to Françoise Hampson, lecturer in international law at the UK’s Essex University, what is lacking is the will to prosecute. ‘The act, rape, must be punished. Nothing should be allowed to jeopardize the prosecution of those alleged to have committed rape.’

The culture of war allows men to rape as a means of asserting dominance

Goldstein 1 [Joshua S., Professor of Women’s Studies at Emeritus, School of International Service, American University, “War and Gender”, 2001, Google Books]

Rape in wartime may arise from different motivations than in peacetime. Among other reasons, a male soldier rapes because “war…has awakened his aggressiveness, and he directs it at those who play a subordinate role in the world of war.” Wartime also offers different opportunities. One US soldier in Vietnam said: “They are in an all-male environment….. There are women available. Those women are of another culture, another colour, another society… You’ve got an M-16. What do you need to pay a lady for? You go down to the village and take what you want. “ Some said that having sex and then killing the woman made the soldier a “double veteran. In one view, raping by soldiers in wartime results from the weakening of social norms—parallel with increased sex, swearing, looting, cruelty, and other such behaviors. Some see a “return to nature” in war. The US Infantry Journal in 1943 referred to soldiers as “a society of men, frequently unwashed, who have been dedicated to the rugged task of killing other men, and whose training has emphasized that a certain reversion to the primitive is not undesirable.” Romantic or forced sexual conquests reflect “the rapist in every man.” “Copulation under such circumstances is an act of aggression; the girl is the victim and her conquests the victor’s triumph. Preliminary resistance on her part always increases his satisfaction.”

War Turns Patriarchy

Emphasis on “male” deaths ignores the inordinate number of female victims of war- reveals patriarchy of war

Chew 5 [Huibin Amee, Joint Degree in Social Studies and Women from Harvard University, “Why the War is Sexist (And Why We Can’t Ignore Gender Anymore)”http://www.insurgentamerican.net/analysis/why-the-war-is-sexist/ ]

In the 20th century, 90 percent of all war deaths have been of unarmed women, children, and men. 1 As the occupation wears on, more and more Iraqi women and girls are killed – reported as “collateral damage.” Bombs and modern war weapons murder and maim noncombatant women in approximately equal numbers to noncombatant men – even if from the U.S. perspective, men make up the vast majority of our war dead. Soldiers are not those primarily losing their lives in this occupation. At the same time, note that U.S. imperialism benefits from certain strategies that maximize “collateral damage” (such as using long-distance, high tech weapons rather than infantry), because these also minimize our own soldiers’ deaths and the potential public relations blowup. The tendency to devalue the enemies’ lives is reinforced by not only racist but also sexist ideologies – history is made by “our boys,” and enemy females’ deaths are not even acknowledged. Putting U.S. soldiers’ deaths abroad in the context of other wartime deaths occurring at home causes another shift in perspective. For example, during World War II, U.S. industrial workers were more likely than U.S. soldiers to die or be injured. Historian Catherine Lutz observes, “The female civilians who worked on bases or in war industries can be seen as no less guardians or risk-takers than people in uniform.” 2 This is not to downplay the amount of suffering and exploitation soldiers are forced to endure, but to widen our scope of who we recognize as affected in war.

**War amplifies female suffering- economically**

Chew 5 [Huibin Amee, Joint Degree in Social Studies and Women from Harvard University, “Why the War is Sexist (And Why We Can’t Ignore Gender Anymore)”http://www.insurgentamerican.net/analysis/why-the-war-is-sexist/ ]

With the destruction of Iraq’s economy, women and girls have suffered especially from deprivations. In the article, “Occupation is Not (Women’s) Liberation: Confronting ‘Imperial Feminism’ and Building a Feminist Anti-War Movement,” I discuss in detail some gendered ways Iraqi women and girls disproportionately bear effects of the country’s economic collapse – from unemployment to the dramatic drop in female literacy. In the U.S., poor women bear the brunt of public service cuts. In Massachusetts, for example, most Medicaid recipients, graduates of state and community colleges, welfare and subsidized childcare recipients, are women – and all these programs have faced budget slashes. Most families living in poverty are headed by single mothers.

War Turns Food Scarcity

War causes food scarcity- inhibits cultivation

Adley and Grant 3/13 [Jessica, Andrea, Sierra Club Representatives, Sierra Club http://www.sierraclub.ca/national/postings/war-and-environment.html]

Water shortages can also lead to inadequate irrigation of cropland. Agricultural production may also be impaired by intensive bombing and heavy military vehicles traveling over farm soil.[9] The presence of landmines can also render vast areas of productive land unusable.[10]

War Turns Environmental Degradation (General)

War leads to environmental degradation- destroyed crop land, water contamination

Adley and Grant 3/13 [Jessica, Andrea, Sierra Club Representatives, Sierra Club http://www.sierraclub.ca/national/postings/war-and-environment.html]

Throughout history, war has invariably resulted in environmental destruction. However, advancements in military technology used by combatants have resulted in increasingly severe environmental impacts. This is well illustrated by the devastation to forests and biodiversity caused by modern warfare. Military machinery and explosives have caused unprecedented levels of deforestation and habitat destruction. This has resulted in a serious disruption of ecosystem services, including erosion control, water quality, and food production. A telling example is the destruction of 35% of Cambodia’s intact forests due to two decades of civil conflict. In Vietnam, bombs alone destroyed over 2 million acres of land.[13] These environmental catastrophes are aggravated by the fact that ecological protection and restoration become a low priority during and after war.

War necessitates chemical use that contaminates water supplies, poisons crop land causing disease

Adley and Grant 3/13 [Jessica, Andrea, Sierra Club Representatives, Sierra Club http://www.sierraclub.ca/national/postings/war-and-environment.html]

One of the most striking examples of military disregard for environmental and human health is the use of chemical and biological agents in warfare. The American military’s use of Agent Orange during the Vietnam War is one of the most widely known examples of using environmental destruction as a military tactic. Agent Orange is a herbicide that was sprayed in millions of liters over approximately 10% of Vietnam between 1962 and 1971. It was used to defoliate tropical forests to expose combatants, and destroy crops to deprive peasants of their food supply.[16] [17] The environmental and health effects were devastating. The spraying destroyed 14% of South Vietnam’s forests, including 50% of the mangrove forests. Few, if any, have recovered to their natural state. [18] A key ingredient of Agent Orange is dioxin, the most potent carcinogen ever tested.[19] It is therefore not surprising that Agent Orange has been linked to an array of health problems in Vietnam including birth defects, spontaneous abortions, chloracne, skin and lung cancers, lower IQ and emotional problems for children (Forgotten Victims).[20]

War Turns Biodiversity

War causes species loss- Rwandan gorillas prove

Adley and Grant 3/13 [Jessica, Andrea, Sierra Club Representatives, Sierra Club http://www.sierraclub.ca/national/postings/war-and-environment.html]

The threat to biodiversity from combat can also be illustrated by the Rwanda genocide of 1994. The risk to the already endangered population of mountain gorillas from the violence was of minimal concern to combatants and victims during the 90-day massacre.[14] The threat to the gorillas increased after the war as thousands of refugees, some displaced for decades, returned to the already overpopulated country. Faced with no space to live, they had little option but to inhabit the forest reserves, home to the gorilla population. As a result of this human crisis, conservation attempts were impeded. Currently, the International Gorilla Programme Group is working with authorities to protect the gorillas and their habitats. This has proven to be a challenging task, given the complexities Rwandan leaders face, including security, education, disease, epidemics, and famine.[15]

War Turns Water Scarcity

War cause water scarcity- contamination

Adley and Grant 3/13 [Jessica, Andrea, Sierra Club Representatives, Sierra Club http://www.sierraclub.ca/national/postings/war-and-environment.html]

The degradation of infrastructure and basic services brought on by war can wreak havoc on the local environment and public health. Countries’ water supply systems, for example, can be contaminated or shut down by bomb blasts or bullet damage to pipes.[7] In Afghanistan, destruction to water infrastructure combined with weakened public service during the war resulted in bacterial contamination, water loss through leaks and illegal use.[8] The consequence was an overall decline in safe drinking water throughout the country. Water shortages can also lead to inadequate irrigation of cropland. Agricultural production may also be impaired by intensive bombing and heavy military vehicles traveling over farm soil.[9] The presence of landmines can also render vast areas of productive land unusable.[10] Additional war-related problems which compound degradation of the natural and human environment include shortages in cooking fuel and waste mismanagement during and after military conflicts. During the most recent warfare in Iraq, individuals were forced to cut down city trees to use as cooking fuel.[11] In Afghanistan, the creation of poorly located, leaky landfill sites resulted in contaminated rivers and groundwater.[12]

War Turns Racism

War fuels racism

Blank 94 [Stephen, July 22, Strategic Studies Institute, http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub101.pdf]

Kasatonov's insubordination and his arrogant disdain for civilian authority showed a blunt disregard for the broader implications of his actions for national interests. Unfortunately they continued the tradition of casting Russia's Far East interests in essentially military terms. Traditionally, the military view has been that the region is constantly threatened by enemies, particularly by the United States, Japan, and China. In addition, the military has adopted a visibly racist attitude toward Japan and China. Today Japanese concerns are regarded with a combination of fear and (visibly) arrogant disdain, while the Far Eastern region is seen basically through the prism of potential military scenarios.

\*\*\*NUCLEAR WAR\*\*\*

Nuclear War Turns Racism

Nuclear war exacerbates racism – evacuations force choices on which groups to save

Katz and Osdoby 82 [Arthur M. Katz and Sima R. Osdoby, author of Life After Nuclear War and graduate student at Johns Hopkins respectively, Cato Institute, http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa009.html]

If evacuation were to result in a prolonged relocation, divisive social conflicts, as well as economic and social dislocation, would be likely. Under much more favorable conditions in Great Britain during World War II, relationships between evacuees and their hosts degenerated quickly under the influence of prolonged stress, uncertainty, substantial class and urban-rural differences, and inadequate social service resources. This experience was not unique. Japan and Germany in World War II, and even the Netherlands in peacetime, experienced these type of conflicts. Under a limited war scenario in the United States, to absorb the evacuated population the number of people living in a single house or apartment in the host areas would have to increase six times (from three people to eighteen). It is not hard to imagine the conflict and stress that type for crowding would create.[7] Thus these problems are likely to be much more intractable under the "limited" war scenarios because of insufficient social services and the massive numbers of people involved. In threatened but unaffected metropolitan areas, decisions about who will be evacuated and when could become politically explosive -- fraught with fears of one group or another becoming the expendable victims. This is not to mention the problem of deciding when and how to evacuate special populations -- prisoners, patients in acute and chronic care facilities, etc.

Nuclear War Turns Stigmatization

Nuclear war’s effects target the unemployed -- anxiety and economic reactions

Kiraly 86 [S. J. Kiraly psychiatrist and authorCan. Fam. Physician, January 1986, http://ukpmc.ac.uk/articlerender.cgi?artid=1433613]

Kimmel examined the role of anxiety in criminal behavior and identified the threat of nuclear war as a source of stress and anxiety for adults in correctional setting before and after the release into society. HE considered crimes such as forgery, embezzlement, sexual crimes, violence and family abandonment in non-psychopaths. As preventative treatment, he recommended that counseling be available to the former subgroups to enable them to deal with these anxiety-laden issues both in and out of prison. Matterman described the chain reaction of health breakdown which was set in motion when man’s basic needs were threatened. He blamed the arms race for economic hardship causing unemployment and a deterioration in group morale and individual and national self esteem, correlating psychiatric morbidity with work deprivation, as did Brenner who reported that a 1% rise in unemployment was associated with a 5. 7% rise in crime rate, 3.4% more hospital admissions and 4.1% increase in suicides.

Nuclear War Turns Hunger

Nuclear war increases starvation – jacks the agriculture industry

ACDA 96[US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, “Worldwide effects of nuclear war”, October 1996, Project Gutenberg, http://www.scribd.com/doc/13364069/Worldwide-Effects-of-Nuclear-War]

Finally, at least brief mention should be made of the global effects resulting from disruption of economic activities and communications. Since 1970, an increasing fraction of the human race has been losing the battle for self-sufficiency in food, and must rely on heavy imports. A major disruption of agriculture and transportation in the grain-exporting and manufacturing countries could thus prove disastrous to countries importing food, farm machinery, and fertilizers—especially those which are already struggling with the threat of widespread starvation. Moreover, virtually every economic area, from food and medicines to fuel and growth engendering industries, the less-developed countries would find they could not rely on the “undamaged” remainder of the developed world for trade essentials: in the wake of nuclear war the industrial powers directly involved would themselves have to compete for resources with those countries that today are described as “less-developed”.

Nuclear War Turns Warming

Nuclear war destroys the ozone layer

Martin 82

[Brian Martin professor of social sciences at the University of Wollongong Journal of Peace Research, 1982, http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/pubs/82jpr.html]

 (b) Ozone. Nuclear war would cause an increase in ultraviolet light from the sun which reaches the earth's surface, due to reductions in stratospheric ozone caused by its catalytic destruction by nitrogen oxides produced in nuclear explosions. This would increase the incidence of skin cancer (which is mostly non-lethal) and possibly alter agricultural productivity, but would be most unlikely to cause widespread death.[7]

Nuclear War Turns Heg

A survivable nuclear attack would create an endless war that kills US influence.

Katz 82[ Arthur M, PHD in Chemistry from University of Rochester and MS in Meteorology from MIT, Cambridge Massachusetts, PP 66-7)

Of particular concern in this regard is that in the counterforce scenario no one is defeated in a conventional military or political sense. Thus, the ability of the U.S. or Soviet political leaders to find a formula that implies an acceptable stalemate may require protracted internal as well as external negotiations. This protracted period of indecision leads to the disturbing possibility of what Fred Ikle described in the late 1950s as the “broken back" or unterminated war. His scenario was a nuclear exchange inflicting great damage but with sufficient surviving infrastructure so that a military stalemate with continued fighting resulted. Limited war strategy ensures a variation of this stalemated situation because a portion of the ICBM -SAC structure remains intact under the terms of the DOD scenarios along with a substantial undamaged Submarine Launched Ballistic Missile (SLBM) force. Under these circumstances, what would be the impact of this type of interminated war dragging on for weeks and months-And what are the implications for resolving this counterforce conflict? A pertinent example is the eventual Japanese public reaction against their war leadership during World War II. The public rejected the leadership's claims of omnipotence, power. And courage when damage to the society became evident… Toward their other leaders from the prime minister down, the attitude of the people greatly changed. At first, the people were proud of and greatly trusted their leaders, but as cabinet changes took place, the confidence of the people in their leadership was rudely shaken and finally utterly shattered… the people themselves were not fully united in the latter part of their war. Resentment toward national leadership, especially in bombed areas, was true of other damaged nations such as Germany, and even Britain. The important point to be made is that while the traumatic effects of counterforce by itself would be severe, the prolonged terror of an unresolved nuclear conflict would have a corrosive impact on the credibility of national leadership.

Nuclear War Outweighs Global Warming

Nuclear war outweighs global warming. Time frame, makes warming inevitable, and magnitude.

Guardian Unlimited 6 [http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2006/dec/12/nuclearindustry.climatechange]

The scientists said a sudden change to the Earth's ecosystem because of nuclear blasts would be worse than any of the effects predicted by global warming due to greenhouse gases. "Global warming is a problem and we certainly should address it but in 20 years, the temperature might go up by a few tenths of a degree and it will be gradual," said Prof Robock. "We'll be able to adapt from some of it. But the climate change from even the small nuclear war we postulated would be **instantaneous** and such a shock to the system"

Nuclear War Turns Fear

Nuclear war creates massive fear that makes any recovery impossible.

Katz 82[ Arthur M, PHD in Chemistry from University of Rochester and MS in Meteorology from MIT, Cambridge Massachusetts, PP 195)

In nuclear war, the situation will be quite different. The impulse is to flee, not to enter, the area, because of the terrible destruction and the fear of contamination by radioactivity. The mass convergence of external resources would be far less likely to occur in this type of disaster. It is questionable, given the scope of nuclear war, whether significant outside resources would be available under any circumstances. In addition, destruction could also overwhelm the indigenous resources and leadership that survive, as in Hiroshima. This loss would severely limit any ability to reconstruct leadership and organizational roles\_ As a German Jesuit witness to the Hiroshima disaster, Father Siemes, reported: "Among the passersby, there are many who are uninjured. In a purposeless, insensate manner, distraught by the magnitude of the disaster, most of them rush by and none conceives the thought of organizing help on his own initiative. They are concerned only with the welfare of their own families." Other personal accounts of Hiroshima and Nagasaki suggest that the main pattern of behavior was to help family members and sometimes neighbors and then to escape from the city of ruins and fires into the countryside, ignoring the plight of strangers. Everywhere the victims needing help outnumbered the potential helpers and rescuers. Moreover, the physical condition of great numbers of victims was too serious for nonprofessionals-or even professionals lacking equipment and supplies-to cope with successfully. The emotionally overwhelming nature of this experience appears to have prevented spontaneous organization of rescue and relief groups. Further exacerbating these problems was the fear of renewed bombing.

Nuclear War Turns Extinction

Nuclear winter is causes extinction

The Columbia Missourian 9 [June 11, http://www.columbiamissourian.com/stories/2009/06/11/steven-starr-nuclear-expert/]

 Nuclear winter is a term used to describe the dramatic global climate change that could follow a nuclear war. According to Starr’s Web site, a hypothetical nuclear war between India and Pakistan fought with 100 Hiroshima-sized nuclear weapons would throw 5 million tons of smoke into the stratosphere, enough to block 10 percent of the sun's rays from reaching the northern hemisphere — shortening growing seasons and causing the lowest temperatures in 1,000 years. After 10 years, 40 percent of that smoke would still be in the stratosphere. The average nuclear warhead today is between eight and 50 times more powerful than the 15 kiloton bomb dropped on Hiroshima.

“Nuclear war is essentially suicide for humanity,” Starr said.

Nuclear War Turns Economy

Nuclear war derails the economy – banking and social services

Katz and Osdoby 82 [Arthur M. Katz and Sima R. Osdoby, author of Life After Nuclear War and graduate student at Johns Hopkins respectively, Cato Institute, http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa009.html]

Casualties, evacuation, and land denial would create severe national and local economic dislocations. Approximately one-third of the U.S.'s manufacturing capacity lies within the geographic areas most affected by fallout.[5] A major evacuation would leave the regional economy in a shambles. Because of economic interdependence, the problem of "bottlenecking" -- serious disruption of the national economy -- would be likely. Bottlenecking is the disruptive effect that losses in a key industry (e.g., steel) have on other dependent economic activities (automobiles and machine tool production). Even modest reductions in capacity of basic, pivotal industries can have severe, widespread effects on the economy. Despite the possibility of product substitution (e.g., plastics for steel) or high inventories of selected products, the short- and mid-term ramifications of a disruption of even 25 to 50% of the affected region's manufacturing activities (equivalent to 8 to 15% of national economic activities) would be a serious blow to the national economy. This disruption could easily last several months, and in a post-attack stalemate with the possibility of future attack requiring prolonged urban evacuation, it would become worse. There are other likely consequences that are less obvious. The banking system would face a particularly severe burden, for example -- potential bankruptcies; defaults on basic time payments, such as mortgages and major appliances; and major shifts of monies by individuals during evacuation. In contaminated areas individuals or businesses would be unable to gain access to money, especially in local banks, for long periods. In general, it would be virtually impossible for banks, either regionally or nationally, to pursue "normal" lending and borrowing policies. Payments such as rents and salaries to businesses or individuals would also have to be deferred. Business insurance would certainly not cover this type of catastrophe. On a scale unknown in U.S. experience, there would probably be a massive outcry for the federal government to provide regional disaster loans to prevent bankruptcy and help resettle workers and their families from severely contaminated areas. The injured and evacuated population would create enormous social service demands (medical care, welfare, emergency housing, etc.) requiring huge sums of money to be spent rapidly. Unprecedented government intervention would probably be demanded to save industries from bankruptcies, allocate goods, and determine industrial priorities. Since individual, industrial, and even regional economic stability would depend on which industries and plants were decontaminated and/or received needed financial support first, implementing these governmental policies would be politically explosive.

Nuclear War Turns Disease

Nuclear war increases disease spread and frequency

Katz 82[ Arthur M, PHD in Chemistry from University of Rochester and MS in Meteorology from MIT, Cambridge Massachusetts, PP 172)

In the initial post attack period, severe medical care problems will occur on a nationwide scale because of the massive increase in the number of people who will require medical care for burns, radiation sickness, blast effects, shock, and other injuries; and the absence of necessary medical services and supplies due to the wholesale destruction of hospital facilities, widespread deaths and injuries among medical personnel, and the almost total destruction of the drug industry. Other serious health problems are likely to appear later. For example, while epidemics are unlikely to occur during the early post attack period because the large reservoirs of disease carriers will be absent, nevertheless, prolonged contact in crowded conditions necessitated by extended shelter life or fuel and housing conservation measures would increase the long-term probability of epidemics.29 In addition, the appearance of diseases not normally seen in the United States, such as plague, typhus, cholera, and so forth, may generate fear (magnified by the post attack atmosphere) that will cause spontaneous or planned isolation of specific areas, and diminish the effectiveness of post attack recovery programs.

Nuclear War Turns Democracy

Nuclear war makes democracies vulnerable – perception of threats

Krebs 9, [Ronald R. professor of political science at the U of Minnesota Cambridge University Press, journals.cambridge.org]

The relationship between democracy and war has been much studied in international relations. Yet, while the democratic peace continues to be reﬁned and revised, the reverse—the effects of war on democracy—has received less systematic attention. Students of international political economy have devoted substantial attention to the “second-image reversed,” but they have had fewer counterparts in international security. The most plausible explanation for this relative neglect is that international relations emerged in the shadow of mass industrialized war fare and the prospect of nuclear war, and the ﬁeld’s overriding concern was how to prevent a catastrophe in which millions would perish. This understandable focus on the causes of war came at the expense of research into its consequences. Moreover, assumptions about both the nature of war (an event) and the purpose of social science (to explain regularities) combined to make the study of war ’s consequences seem fruitless. But war, this article has suggested, is a process, embedded in and potentially transforming social life. War is more than war fare: it entails the emergence and perception of threat as well as the mobilization of societal resources, and these are distinct political phenomena with distinct ramiﬁcations for democratic politics. International conﬂict, especially when unpacked in this fashion, is a recurring feature of global politics, not an outlier. Large-scale war fare may be obsolete among developed nations, but conﬂict, mobilization, and the use of force are not. Understanding war’s consequences for democratic politics is important for its own sake, but it will also lead to better-speciﬁed models of war initiation and termination. Further research may, by clarifying the costs of crisis and war time measures, help civilize an often-strident public debate. Hand observed that the “spirit of liberty” may determine the survival of democracy. But, during rough times, the fate of regimes may rest precisely on the margins. It is there that the difference may lie between a democracy that limps along, compromised yet intact, and one that abandons its heritage

Nuclear war erodes democracy – deterrence

Falk 82 [Richard Falk, professor of international relations at Princeton Central and Eastern Europe Online Library, ceeol.com]

In this essay, my concern is with the structural relevance of nuclear weaponry and strategy to the future of democracy. The central contention is that the existence of nuclear weapons, even without any occurrence of nuclear war, interferes with democratic governance in fundamental ways. In other words, we don’t have to wait for Armageddon to begin paying the price, as measured by the quality of democracy, for a system of international security constructed around the central imagery of nuclear deterrence. To presume this relevance of nuclear armaments and doctrines to democracy is itself somewhat unusual. For instance, one searches in vain the pages of the Trilateral Commission’s notorious study, The Crisis of Democracy, for any reference to the erosion of democratic governance as a consequence of “the nuclear revolution”; the Trilateralists’ idea of “crisis” is based on the alleged erosion of authority and stability through the undisciplined tactics of social movements demanding reform that surfaced in the late 1960s, a phenomenon described elsewhere in positive terms as the beginnings of a participatory model of democratic revitalization. In the background, of course, is a concern about the preconditions for capitalist efficiency under contemporary conditions, including a fear that the work ethic, achievement syndrome, and greed impulse are being drained away by cultural developments, including a substantially alienated intelligentsia in so-called mature capitalist countries.4

Nuclear War Turns Dehumanization

Nuclear Attack crushes the emotions of the survivors and encompasses an emotional guilt because of inability to help which dominates the rest of their lives

Katz 82[ Arthur M, PHD in Chemistry from University of Rochester and MS in Meteorology from MIT, Cambridge Massachusetts, PP 200]

Robert Lifton's evaluation of the psychological effects of the atomic bombing of Japan, Death in Life, concludes that the reality of such an event overpowers the normal human capacity to absorb and integrate an experience in a useful way. The imagery of a totally shattered human environment created by such catastrophe further magnifies the emotional impact. Lifton found that the experience stripped away normal psychological protection. Even protective mechanisms such as psychic numbing and denial (refusal to accept the existence of a threatening and frightening occurrence) were so distorted that this experience eventually became the basis for pathological behavior. Effects of this kind are potentially the foundation for apathy, antisocial behavior, and psychological disorganization seen in other post disaster situations. Judging from the studies of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki survivors, the image produced by a nuclear attack in the mind of a survivor is one of annihilation, loss of continuity, and a total break with previous reality. The extent and scale of the destruction creates an atmosphere of overpowering involvement: "A sudden and absolute shift from normal existence to an overwhelming encounter with death." 3 All the normal connections with everyday experience and human continuity are broken: reality is radically transformed into a terrifying and all encompassing image of the death of human life and even of nature. There is "the replacement of the natural order of living and dying with an unnatural order of death-dominated life."4 For the Hiroshima survivors, nuclear attack, in Lifton's terms, amounted to a "death immersion" followed by an escape from death's grasp. Escape for some represented personal failure or impotence and resulted in what was termed subsequently "death guilt." According to Lifton, this guilt was derived from a combination of factors, all related to the magnitude and overwhelming terror of the atomic tragedy. Thus, while the instinct for survival will remain the primary human response to a nuclear attack, survival may be purchased at an emotional price. For some, this price could be very high, the result of abnormal or aberrant personal behavior patterns during the initial confrontation with the catastrophe. At Hiroshima, personally unacceptable behavior took the form of running away. Later, the survivors had to confront this behavior; shame and guilt were often the legacy of this confrontation. The sense of failure arose from the inability and, at times, the unwillingness of many survivors to extend adequate assistance to family, friends, or strangers in need during the initial terrifying minutes and hours after the explosion 5 This gave rise to "survivor's guilt," a common reaction stemming from the survivor's inability to fulfill basic human responsibilities and, to some extent, from the conflict of feeling joy in surviving when they believed they should have died. Those who died, some survivors believed, had made it possible for the survivors to live. Even those who tried to remain and help were unable to cope, physically and psychologically, with the magnitude of the destruction and the number of casualties. They, too, experienced guilt related to feelings of helplessness, impotence and shame. All survivors eventually had to attempt to confront and integrate into their lives this fear and guilt. Unfortunately, these emotions were tied to an annihilating experience that was so psychologically overwhelming that it left many of them fixated on this small portion of their lives For some, a substantial portion of their productive energy was thereafter devoted to coming to terms with their terrifying experience. While these reactions are likely to occur to some degree in other types of disaster, the confrontation with death would have a well-defined terminal point in most cases, and the survivors would be freer to renew their lives. The process of living and experiencing, then, helps to mitigate the power of these tragic events and to permit survivors to find some way of coming to terms on a personal level with their experiences.

Nuclear War Turns Structural Violence

Nuclear War amplifies social tensions and creates violence- evacuation

Katz 82[ Arthur M, PHD in Chemistry from University of Rochester and MS in Meteorology from MIT, Cambridge Massachusetts, Pg 73]

Ikte recognized the potential for conflict between rural and suburban populations and urban evacuees. He believed that despite rural resistance, the overwhelming numbers of evacuees would force a grudging sharing of goods. However, this may not be the case. Limited nuclear war is strongly biased by its very nature to create the potential for these conflicts. Moreover, the problem is likely to be exaggerated in the United States. If the central city population is evacuated to the suburban and rural areas, the racial composition of the population will change. Almost 25 percent of the population in the central cities of the 157 SMSAs discussed above is nonwhite, while only 6 percent of the suburban and rural population is nonwhite. Moreover, the income distribution is very different, with the inner cities generally being poorer. Thus a combination of class and racial conf1ict may exacerbate the social tensions that existed in a situation similar to England in World War II. This will be particularly true if the war remains unterminated for any substantial period of time. This type of emerging racial conflict arose in Japan at the end of World War II: "The Koreans, who have been imported for labor, are feared and suspected of plotting against the Japanese .... Rumors and recrimination regarding a scapegoat minority such as the Koreans rose especially sharply. Given the changing but still unstable state of relations between white and nonwhite, and rich and poor groups in the United States, a dangerous conflict-laden situation might emerge under the conditions of terror and stress. Add to this the normal urban-suburban rural lifestyle dichotomies, and there is the potential of extreme disruption, perhaps even more long-lasting and threatening to societal stability than the physical damage.

\*\*\*ECONOMY\*\*\*

Economy Solves Chinese Freedom of Speech

Economic growth solves freedom of speech in China

Blankenhorn 6 [Dana, business journalist, June 23, http://www.danablankenhorn.com/2006/06/this\_weeks\_clue\_3.html]

There's irony in the fact that I'm saying sharing is the key to defeating what we have long thought of as Communist China. But their economy is entirely built on an industrial, proprietary model. We have to grasp the future in order to win. And here's the bonus. By competing economically, by using open source and the Internet, by forcing economic and technology change, there are no losers. The pressure of our growth will force China to open up its society. Without that pressure, as we've seen the last few years, there is no such pressure. The only way to free China is to beat China, so that China will be forced to free itself.

Economy Turns Disease

Economic decline leads to disease spread

Alexander 9 [Brian, Staff Writer, www.msnbc.msn.com/id/29599786]

To most Americans, diseases with names like dengue fever, chikungunya, malaria, Chagas and leishmaniasis might sound like something out of a Victorian explorer’s tales of hacking through African jungles. Yet ongoing epidemics of these diseases are killing millions of people around the world. Now, disease experts are increasingly concerned these and other infections may become as familiar in the United States as West Nile or Lyme disease. Few believe Americans face a killer epidemic from tropical diseases. But scientists who specialize in emerging infectious diseases say such illnesses may become more common here as the economic downturn batters an already weakened public health system, creating environmental conditions conducive to infectious diseases spread by insects or other animals. At the same time, such vector-borne diseases are capable of spreading around the world much more rapidly due to massive south-to-north immigration, rapid transportation, and global trade.

Economic decline causes disease spread

Robertson 9 [Dr Andrew, Physician, June 12th, <http://www.physorg.com/news163993567.html>]

There are concerns that the financial crisis has already hit tuberculosis control, which has global ramifications, says Robertson.“There are already indications that funding for TB diagnosis and management is decreasing in [developing countries](http://www.physorg.com/tags/developing%2Bcountries/) and a surge of new cases there may flow onto the US and other countries,” he says.Healthcare in developed countries will also suffer if budgets are cut and incomes fall. Fewer people are accessing private health services in the USA, which will increase the burden on public health services.Resources for disease surveillance are often cut back during difficult economic times, jeopardising the systems we rely on to identify and deal with emerging diseases - including the current swine flu epidemics.The 1995 economic crisis in Mexico led to 27,000 excess deaths in that country alone - but the effect of this far greater, global downturn is currently “impossible to quantify,” according to Robertson.

Economy Turns Democracy

Economic decline causes multiple hotposts of state failure and democratic backsliding

Ferguson 9 [Niall, Professor of History @ Harvard, Harvard Business Review; Jul/Aug2009, Vol. 87 Issue 7/8, p44-53]

Will this financial crisis make the world more dangerous as well as poorer? The answer is almost certainly yes. Apart from the usual trouble spots -- Afghanistan, Congo, Gaza, Iraq, Lebanon, Pakistan, Somalia, and Sudan -- expect new outbreaks of instability in countries we thought had made it to democracy. In Asia, Thailand may be the most vulnerable. At the end of 2007 it reverted to democracy after a spell of military rule that was supposed to crack down on corruption. Within a year's time the country was in chaos, with protesters blocking Bangkok's streets and the state banning the People's Power Party. In April 2009 the capital descended into anarchy as rival yellow-shirted and red-shirted political factions battled with the military. Expect similar scenes in other emerging markets. Trouble has already begun in Georgia and Moldova. Then there's Ukraine, where economic collapse threatens to trigger political disintegration. While President Viktor Yushchenko leans toward Europe, his ally-turned-rival Prime Minister Yulia Tymoshenko favors a Russian orientation. Their differences reflect a widening gap between the country's predominantly Ukrainian west and predominantly Russian east. Meanwhile, in Moscow, Putin talks menacingly of "ridding the Ukrainian people of all sorts of swindlers and bribe-takers." The Crimean peninsula, with its ethnic Russian majority, is the part of the "Near Abroad" (the former Soviet Union) that Putin most covets. January's wrangle over gas supplies to Western Europe may have been the first phase of a Russian bid to destabilize, if not to break up, Ukraine. The world's increasing instability makes the United States seem more attractive not only as a safe haven but also as a global policeman. Many people spent the years from 2001 to 2008 complaining about U.S. interventions overseas. But if the financial crisis turns up the heat in old hot spots and creates new ones at either end of Eurasia, the world may spend the next eight years wishing for more, not fewer, U.S. interventions.

Economic decline collapses democracy

Halperin 5 [Morton, Senior Vice President of the Center for American Progress and Director of the Open Society Policy Center, 2005, The Democracy Advantage, p. 90, Google Books]

This chapter has made the case that economic stagnation is a threat to de­mocratization. Over 70 percent of democratic backtrackers experienced economic stagnation in the years preceding their political contraction. Moreover, democratizers with more prolonged recessions had a greater tendency to revert to authoritarianism. Backtracking under economic duress has been primarily concentrated in parts of Latin America, Africa, and the former Soviet Union. Nonetheless, democracy has amazing staying power. In more than 95 percent of the cases of sustained economic con­traction, democratizing states did not backtrack. Furthermore, even for those that eventually did backtrack, 60 percent regained their democratic course after a several-year interval.

Economic Collapse tanks democracy

Petrou 9 [Michael, PhD in History from Oxford, Maclean’s, March 9, Proquest]

History suggests the results will be damaging. Political freedom rarely advances during a worldwide recession. "The current downturn, if it continues for some period of time, is likely to be very unhelpful for hope that democracy will spread around the world," says Benjamin M. Friedman, a Harvard University economist and the author of The Moral Consequences of Economic Growth, in an interview with Maclean's. Friedman argues that political freedom expands during prolonged periods of prosperity, and contracts during regression or stagnation. It's a thesis echoed by Freedom House's Puddington. "Democracy moves ahead when diings are flush," he says. "The history of democracy in times of real economic pain and crisis- it's not very good. I'm certainly hopeful that we're not going to end up like we did in the late 1920s and 1930s. That was a terrible time for world politics."

Economy Turns Environment

On the brink of total environmental catastrophe – change in growth patterns allows the environmental movement to take root and solve extinction

Shekhar 9 [Manisha, January 30, Professor in the Research Department of Electronics and Communications @ Centre for Strategic Analysis & Research Dept, http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/articles/12807\_environment\_does\_not\_allow\_further\_economic\_growth\_in\_the\_world]

The world is currently facing an unprecedented [health](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/health) and environmental [Crisis](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/crisis). Despite progress in both the health and the environment fields, the situation is approaching the brink of global disaster. So extensive and far-reaching are the [problems](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/problems) that the future wellbeing of humanity, together with that of many other life forms on the planet, is in jeopardy. On one level, individuals and communities—especially those who are poorest, most marginalized and suffering the most discrimination are facing the direct consequences of local environmental destruction, which often result from exploitative [business](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/business) practices and destructive development projects. Those who are worst off pay with their health for the destruction of their local environment. On another level, people all over the world are beginning to be affected by regional and global environmental [changes](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/changes). These drastic environmental problems, e.g. the changing climate and the depletion of the ozone layer, are mainly the result of unsustainable lifestyles, over consumption and unhealthy patterns of development. Also these environmental problems are likely to hit the poor and marginalized first—and with the most drastic consequences—but will sooner or later also affect the privileged. Unless curbed (through wide ranging, structural changes) these global environmental trends threaten to cause havoc to whole ecosystems and essential life-supporting systems. This may in turn lead to an immense, unprecedented crisis for the whole of humanity. It is thus of utmost relevance for everyone involved in the People’s Health Assembly to understand the links and interconnections between health, the environment as well as underlying factors such as social, political and economic structures which determine the current patterns of development. Ultimately, the health and environment crisis relates to issues of social justice. Analyzing health in an ecological and environmental framework calls for a broad, intersect oral, holistic understanding of health. It shows how many of the pressing health and environmental problems of today [share](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/share) the same root causes and the same barriers to being effectively tackled and solved. It encourages a long-term perspective on health and its future challenges. And it provides, through the experiences of the environmental movement, exciting examples of how people—or ‘civil society’—can successfully influence current thinking and policies. To achieve environmentally sustainable societies will require drastic changes in the current world order and the formulation of alternative ways of thinking. Within the environmental movement there is a huge wealth of ideas, experience and visions of what an alternative—just, environmentally sustainable and people-oriented—society would look like. The health movement can draw on this experience while, on the other hand, influencing the environmental movement to incorporate human health into their analyses and actions. A closer integration of the health and environmental movements is essential to counter the [present](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/present) environmentally destructive and exploitative course of development. In order to solve the current crisis, both humans and the environment must be taken into full [account](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/account).

Economy Turns Hegemony

US dollar collapse would end US hegemony

Champion 3 [Scott Share International Staff Writer, June (http://64.233.167.104/search? q=cache:c7OliQOGgIEJ:shareno.net/dollarcollapse.htm+economic+collapse+and+hegemony&hl=en]

The problem with this approach for the Bush administration is that there are great risks to a weak dollar policy. The world economy is awash in dollars, and when there is too much of something the price or value usually drops, sometimes precipitously. If confidence in the dollar or dollar assets, such as Treasury bonds, declines, the world may, at some point, reconsider its involvement with US assets. The results of such a reappraisal could be anything from mildly damaging to catastrophic. Seventy-five per cent of the world’s central-bank assets are held in US dollars (as Treasury bonds). These bankers do not want their primary asset to suffer a significant decline. Many nations, like Japan, recycle their trade surpluses into US dollars by purchasing and holding US Treasury bonds. They do this out of self-interest. In the case of Japan, it helps to weaken the yen relative to the dollar. It is hard to imagine the Japanese reversing this policy, as it would harm their own corporations. However Japan, together with the rest of the world, holds nearly a third of total US Treasury debt. If these countries were to stop buying Treasuries, let alone start selling the ones they already own, the US would be in serious trouble. What should concern the US authorities about a weak dollar policy is that the decline could spin out of control. When the global stock-market crash predicted in this magazine occurs, international support for the dollar will likely evaporate as countries sell dollar assets to shore up their own ailing economies. If this happens, the US will have great difficulty funding its historically large budget and trade deficits. At a most inopportune time, the US may be forced to raise interest rates sharply to attract the capital to meet its obligations. This would be a further blow to an ailing economy. A collapsing US stock market would almost certainly usher in a period of deflation for the American economy. Recent statements by Federal Reserve chairman Alan Greenspan and New York ‘Fed’ governor Bernacke make clear that the Fed is concerned about deflation and stands ready to print an unlimited supply of dollars to fight this eventuality. These statements are unprecedented in the 90-year history of the US Federal Reserve Bank and are tantamount to a declaration that they stand willing to destroy the value of the dollar in the event of a serious crisis. Today, many forces are coming together that could lead to a collapse of the US dollar. Among these are its oversupply, low interest rates, the need to fight deflation, continuing stock-market declines, and a potential derivatives meltdown [see Share International May 1990] It is highly likely that in the not-too-distant future all of these factors will come into play simultaneously. In addition, many of the world’s financiers, central bankers, and government officials cannot be pleased with the economic and foreign policies of the Bush administration. They well know that the continued recycling of capital into US assets serves, at least in part, to allow the US to dominate the world. If the people who control the world’s capital were to decide, for whatever reason, to cease buying Treasury securities and to liquidate those they own, the dollar would collapse and the US would experience an unprecedented economic shock. Were this to happen, the world would witness the end of American hegemony.

Economy Turns Racism

Poor economic conditions cause racism

Progressive 92 (January, p. 7)

That racist and anti-Semitic appeals are more popular during times of economic decline is nothing new; Such demagoguery is an old and dishonorable tradition in Europe as well as in America. When people are desperate, they will seek out any politician offering a scapegoat.

Economic decline cause hate crimes

Kim 93 [Marlene, Prof of Labor Studies at Rutgers University, 1993 p. viii]

In addition, anti-immigration sentiment, like hate crimes, ignites when economic times are tough. During the Great Depression of 1930s, lynchings of African Americans increased and 300,000 Mexican Americans were forcibly bussed back across the border. Over a hundred years ago, the US prohibited Chinese and later all Asians from immigrating, sanctions that were not lifted until the 1940s

Economic decline turns racism

New York Times 90 [October 24, Section A; Page 24; Column 4; Editorial Desk]

The emancipation of the slaves did not lead directly to segregation, as it should have if American society was primarily and fundamentally racist. Rather, segregation arose in response to a threatening biracial political challenge from black and white farmers in the 1890's to the white elite -- which capitulated to racism after paternalism failed. Segregation collapsed in the face of a civil rights movement sustained by post-World War II prosperity, while racism is now resurgent in an era of economic decline. This oversimplified summary is meant to document the assertion that racism has been and continues to be fostered by competition for limited resources, that is, it is primarily a class issue. It can best be fought by policies for economic and, hence, social justice.

Economy Turns Proliferation

Economic growth is the surest way to stop proliferation

Burrows & Windram 94 [William & Robert, Critical Mass, p. 491-2]

Economics is in many respects proliferation’s catalyst. As we have noted, economic desperation drives Russia and some of the former Warsaw Pact nations to peddle weapons and technology. The possibility of considerable profits or at least balanced international payments also prompts Third World countries like China, Brazil, and Israel to do the same. Economics, as well as such related issues as overpopulation, drive proliferation just as surely as do purely political motives. Unfortunately, that subject is beyond the scope of this book. Suffice it to say that, all things being equal, well-of, relatively secure societies like today’s Japan are less likely to buy or sell superweapon technology than those that are insecure, needy, or desperate. Ultimately, solving economic problems, especially as they are driven by population pressure, is the surest way to defuse proliferation and enhance true national security.

Economic affluence deters proliferation tendencies- North Korea proves

Japan Times 8 [October 23, Lexis]

South Korea, which is enjoying unprecedented prosperity, is becoming increasingly uncomfortable with North Koreans' economic despair. Probably no two neighboring countries have such a huge economic gap, let alone countries that share the same ethnic and historical background. The danger is that such a discrepancy can become a source of instability and conflict. To overcome its economic deficiencies and attain social stability, the North has no choice but to abandon its nuclear weapons program and move toward reform and greater openness. South Korea is trying to persuade the North to make this strategic decision. We are more than willing to help the North achieve economic growth, which is almost always the source of peace and security. As such, North Korea's economic recovery is vital for an enduring peace on the Korean Peninsula.

Economy Turns Global Warming

Economic growth key to solve warming

Anderson 4 [Terry L. professor of economics at Montana State University, Ph.D. in economics http://www.perc.org/articles/article446.php]

Hansen's essay concludes on an optimistic note, saying "the main elements [new technologies] required to halt climate change have come into being with remarkable rapidity."This statement would not have surprised economist Julian Simon. He saw the "ultimate resource" to be the human mind and believed it to be best motivated by market forces. Because of a combination of market forces and technological innovations, we are not running out of natural resources. As a resource becomes more scarce, prices increase, thus encouraging development of cheaper alternatives and technological innovations. Just as fossil fuel replaced scarce whale oil, its use will be reduced by new technology and alternative fuel sources. Market forces also cause economic growth, which in turn leads to environmental improvements. Put simply, poor people are willing to sacrifice clean water and air, healthy forests, and wildlife habitat for economic growth. But as their incomes rise above subsistence, "economic growth helps to undo the damage done in earlier years," says economist Bruce Yandle. "If economic growth is good for the environment, policies that stimulate growth ought to be good for the environment."

Economy Turns Poverty

Global economic causes food crisis, economic hardships, and increases poverty

Klare 9 [Michael T. Author and Professor of Peace and World-Security Studies at Hampshire College, March 19, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/michael-t-klare/the-second-shockwave_b_176358.html>]

While the economic contraction is apparently slowing in the advanced industrial countries and may reach bottom in the not-too-distant future, it's only beginning to gain momentum in the developing world, which was spared the earliest effects of the global meltdown. Because the crisis was largely precipitated by a collapse of the housing market in the United States and the resulting disintegration of financial products derived from the "securitization" of questionable mortgages, most developing nations were unaffected by the early stages of the meltdown, for the simple reason that they possessed few such assets. But now, as the wealthier nations cease investing in the developing world or acquiring its exports, the crisis is hitting them with a vengeance. On top of this, conditions are deteriorating at a time when severe drought is affecting many key food-producing regions and poor farmers lack the wherewithal to buy seeds, fertilizers, and fuel. The likely result: A looming food crisis in many areas hit hardest by the global economic meltdown. Until now, concern over the human impact of the global crisis has largely been focused -- understandably so -- on unemployment and economic hardship in the United States, Europe, and former Soviet Union. Many stories have appeared on the devastating impact of plant closings, bankruptcies, and home foreclosures on families and communities in these parts of the world. Much less coverage has been devoted to the meltdown's impact on people in the developing world. As the crisis spreads to the poorer countries, however, it's likely that people in these areas will experience hardships every bit as severe as those in the wealthier countries -- and, in many cases, far worse. The greatest worry is that most of the gains achieved in eradicating poverty over the last decade or so will be wiped out, forcing tens or hundreds of millions of people from the working class and the lower rungs of the middle class back into the penury from which they escaped. Equally worrisome is the risk of food scarcity in these areas, resulting in widespread malnutrition, hunger, and starvation. All this is sure to produce vast human misery, sickness, and death, but could also result in social and political unrest of various sorts, including riot, rebellion, and ethnic strife. The president, Congress, or the mainstream media are not, for the most part, discussing these perils. As before, public interest remains focused on the ways in which the crisis is affecting the United States and the other major industrial powers. But the World Bank, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and U.S. intelligence officials, in three recent reports, are paying increased attention to the prospect of a second economic shockwave, this time affecting the developing world.Sinking Back Into Penury In late February, the World Bank staff prepared [a background paper](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/NEWS/Resources/swimmingagainstthetide-march2009.pdf) for the Group of 20 (G-20) finance ministers meeting held near London on March 13 and 14. Entitled "Swimming Against the Tide: How Developing Countries Are Coping with the Global Crisis," it provides a preliminary assessment of the meltdown's impact on low-income countries (LICs). The picture, though still hazy, is one of deepening gloom. Most LICs were shielded from the initial impact of the sudden blockage in private capital flows because they have such limited access to such markets. "But while slower to emerge," the report notes, "the impact of the crisis on LICs has been no less significant as the effects have spread through other channels." For example, "many LIC governments rely on disproportionately on revenue from commodity exports, the prices of which have declined sharply along with global demand." Likewise, foreign direct investment is falling, particularly in the natural resource sectors. On top of this, remittances from immigrants in the wealthier countries to their families back home have dropped, erasing an important source of income to poor communities. Add all this up, and it's likely that "the slowdown in growth will likely deepen the deprivation of the existing poor." In many LICs, moreover, "large numbers of people are clustered just above the poverty line and are therefore particularly vulnerable to economic volatility and temporary slowdowns." As the intensity of the crisis grows, more and more of these people will lose their jobs or their other sources of income (such as those all-important remittances) and so be pushed from *above* the poverty line to *beneath* it. The resulting outcome: "The economic crisis is projected to increase poverty by around 46 million people in 2009."

Growth solves poverty – US imports, credit, and commodity prices

Haass 8 [Richard. President of the Council on Foreign Relations. November 8, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122611110847810599.html]

The recession is sure to strengthen trade protectionism. This is a big setback, as trade offers the ideal noninflationary stimulus. It is also a boon to developing countries, and one way to link countries in a web of dependencies that restrains nationalist impulses. The combination of recession and no global trade accord will reduce U.S. imports, which in turn will slow growth around the world, increasing poverty and straining political stability in many countries. Many countries are already suffering from slower growth, much lower stock values, scarce credit and reduced exports. Others are reeling from lower commodity prices. We should not be surprised when governments fail and societies suffer from violence.

Economy Turns South Korea Stability

US economic instability massively affects South Korea’s economy

BBC 8 [September 17, Lexis]

Seoul, Sept. 17 (Yonhap) - South Korea's top central banker said Wednesday the bank will make efforts to provide liquidity at an appropriate time following the collapse of Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc. On Monday, Lehman Brothers, once America's fourth-largest investment bank, filed for bankruptcy protection after amassing debts worth $60US billion caused by soured real estate holdings. The demise of Lehman sent shockwaves across global markets, with South Korea's key stock index tumbling 6.1 per cent to an 18-month low on Tuesday. On the same day, the local currency also plunged to a 49-month low against the US dollar on deepening woes over economic instability following the collapse of Lehman. "The central bank will spare no effort to supply liquidity at the right time by buying government bonds directly from the market if needed," Bank of Korea (BOK) Gov. Lee Seong-tae told the National Assembly. His remarks came one day after the BOK said it would inject dollars into the domestic won-dollar swap market if necessary, in a potential move to calm market turmoil. South Korea's financial watchdog said earlier in the day that local financial markets "overreacted" to the collapse of Lehman Brothers on Tuesday, adding that South Korean firms have enough capacity to cope with overseas instability. "US financial market jitters could affect the South Korean market temporarily. But local financial firms have enough capacity to cope with overseas instability, and the impact (of the Lehman demise) should be limited in the local market," Kim Yong-hwan, standing commissioner of the Financial Services Commission (FSC), told a radio programme.

Economy Turns Political Stability

Economic instability disrupts political stability

Davis and Trebilcock 8 [Kevin E, Michael J, Fall, The American Journal of Comparative Law , 56 Am. J. Comp. L. 895, Lexis]

More dynamic theories of how political conditions are related to legal change focus less on whether political power is exercised in a predatory or a benevolent fashion and more on the extent of competition for and conflict over political power. The resources lost to this kind of competition could presumably be channeled into the improvement of legal institutions. Moreover, chronic political conflict and competition prompted by deep social divisions may lead to political  [\*927]  instability. For instance, Alesina and Perotti argue that extreme income inequality fuels social discontent and so exacerbates political instability. [n131](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.uhd.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1278694993019&returnToKey=20_T9714873117&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.163434.3444688221" \l "n131) Similarly, Amy Chua argues that socio-political instability is likely to result when economic inequalities track ethnic divisions so that wealth is concentrated in the hands of ethnic minorities. According to Chua, in many cases this phenomenon tends to persist or even be exacerbated by the operation of free market forces and tends to foment inter-ethnic envy and hatred. As a result, certain types of societies, specifically, societies that simultaneously attempt to endorse free markets and democracy, are inherently unstable. [n132](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.uhd.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1278694993019&returnToKey=20_T9714873117&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.163434.3444688221" \l "n132) Political instability may in turn lead to legal instability which, as we have already observed, is widely viewed as being incompatible with the rule of law. [n133](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.uhd.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1278694993019&returnToKey=20_T9714873117&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.163434.3444688221" \l "n133)

Economy Turns Hunger/Terrorism/Nuke War

Economic collapse exacerbates food scarcity, terrorism and nuclear engagement

Japan Times 8 [October 16, Lexis]

Rising geopolitical risks have been underscored by today's multiple global crises - from a severe global credit crunch and financial tumult to serious energy and food challenges. Add to that the international failure to stem the spreading scourge of terrorism and the specter of a renewed Cold War arising from the deterioration in relations between the West and Russia since Moscow's August retaliatory military intervention in Georgia and subsequent recognition of the breakaway regions of South Ossetia and Abkhazia - actions that some portray as the 21st century's first forcible changing of borders. The world clearly is at a turning point, underscored by the ongoing tectonic shifts in political and economic power.

Economy Turns Biodiversity

Economic decline leads to loss of Biodiversity

 [Alier](http://www.eoearth.org/contributor/Joan.alier) and [Farley](http://www.eoearth.org/contributor/Joshua.farley) 9 [Joan, Martinez Joshua June 1 The Encyclopedia Earth, <http://www.eoearth.org/article/Herman_Daly_Festschrift~_Socially_Sustainable_Economic_Degrowth>]

In National Income Accounting one could introduce valuations of ecosystem and biodiversity losses either in satellite accounts (physical and monetary) or in adjusted GDP accounts (“Green Accounts”). The economic valuation of losses might be low compared to the economic gains of projects that destroy biodiversity. However, which groups of people suffer most by such losses?  In their project “Green Accounting for India”, Sukhdev, Gundimeda and Kumar found that the most significant direct beneficiaries of forest biodiversity and ecosystem services are the poor, and the predominant impact of a loss or denial of these inputs is on the well-being of the poor. The poverty of the beneficiaries makes these losses more acute as a proportion of their “livelihood incomes” than is the case for the people of India at large. Hence the notion of "the GDP of the Poor": for instance, when water in the local river or aquifer is polluted because of mining, they cannot afford to buy water in plastic bottles. Therefore, when poor people see that their chances of livelihood are threatened because of mining projects, dams, tree plantations, or large industrial areas, they complain not because they are professional environmentalists but because they need the services of the environment for their immediate survival. This is the “environmentalism of the poor”.

\*\*\*TERRORISM\*\*\*

Terrorism Turns Hunger/Biodiversity

A terrorist attack would target animals kills the agriculture industry and devastates biodiversity

Baker 1 [Chris, Washington Times reporter, “Farms targets for terror?; Livestock illness seen as weapon”, lexis]

A germ warfare attack on farm animals instead of humans is a rapidly emerging threat**,** and recent livestock epidemics like foot-and-mouth disease show just how fast and far "agro-terrorism" could spread.Instead of using anthrax to make people sick, terrorists might try to infect animals with diseases like the foot-and-mouth virus**,** which has devastated Britain's farming industry**,** said Mark Urlaub, director of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's biosecurity program. Agro-terrorism would have "instantaneous effects on the economy," Mr. Urlaub told a conference on terrorism preparedness in Salt Lake City last week. "We are talking about enormous values in commodities lost . . . . It can destroy trade relations between countries**,**" he said. Animal diseases have become a big concern for the $55 billion-a-year livestock industry in the United States. Investigators are taking another look at the 1989 "medfly" outbreak in California, he said. The Mediterranian fruit fly, which attacks more than 250 species of fruits and berries, is regarded as the biggest agricultural threat in California**,** home to a $25 billion-a-year farming industry. The "bizarre" pattern of the 1989 outbreak combined with at least one fringe group claiming responsibility left terrorism experts wondering, Mr. Urlaub said. "It could well have been an intentional introduction," he said. The United States has not had a confirmed case of foot-and-mouth disease, sometimes called hoof-and-mouth disease, since 1929. But the virus would cost the country $5 billion in cattle and pork exports if it were to spread here, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Mad cow disease, or bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE), has never been reported in this country, although similar diseases in elk and sheep have been confirmed. Foot-and-mouth and BSE have swept Europe in recent years. Britain alone has confirmed 1,541 cases of foot-and-mouth disease and 180,000 cases of BSE-infected cattle. A swine epidemic, thought to be unintentional, killed 4 million animals in Taiwanbefore it was brought under control, Mr. Urlaub said. "The virus blew across the island in six weeks," he said. Foot-and-mouth disease - which does not harm humans - can be carried by the wind, clothing, shoes and farm equipment. Researchers believe the brain-destroying BSE disease spreads when cattle eat the ground remains of other cattle. The human version of BSE is spread when people eat infected beef, researchers believe. The federal government has tried to keep the diseases from surfacing in the United States here through stronger restrictions on travelers from overseas and tight controls on animal feed and meat imports. The Department of Agriculture said Wednesday it will add canine-sniffing dogs and extra security at the Salt Lake City International Airport in February when that city hosts the 2002 Winter Olympic Games. But it is almost impossible to prevent terrorists from bringing diseases like foot-and-mouth to the United States**,** according to Niall Finnegan, director of governmental relations for the American Veterinary Medicine Association. He said the foot-and-mouth virus - which causes lesions in the mouths of cloven-hooved animals - could be introduced in the United States with "relative ease."A terrorist could swipe the tongue of an infected animal in Europe, place the sample in a vial and then travel to an American farm or feed lot and release it into the mouth of a healthy animal, Mr. Finnegan said. "It's that simple. . . . It would be hard for any country to stop that," he said. The Federal Emergency Management Agency, which would work with the Department of Agriculture and other groups to contain an animal-disease outbreak, said the FBI is responsible for tracking the threat of agro-terrorism in the United States. FBI spokesman Steven Barry said he could not comment on whether the agency has investigated threats of agro-terrorism in the United States. But he said it is "an investigative priority" for the agency and "will remain so." The 40,000-member National Cattlemen's Beef Association said it would be "extremely difficult" for a terrorist to bring a disease like foot-and-mouth into the United States, according to spokeswoman Carole duBois. For example, research indicates heat and light cankill the foot-and-mouth virus, which makes it hard for it to be smuggled across U.S. borders, she said. The association has warned its members to not let strangers onto their farms and feedlots, she said. Association leaders also speak daily with government officials to receive updates on disease monitoring. "We are dedicating a lot of resources to ensure these animal diseases stay out of the United States," she said. Domestic terrorists already have shown that agricultural stations are tempting targets. Groups like Reclaim the Seeds and Earth Liberation Front, which oppose genetically modified plants, have broken into laboratories in California to destroy research plants. Other groups have fire-bombed facilities. "Lack of human casualties has been a matter of luck," Mr. Urlaub told the Salt Lake City terrorism-preparedness conference.

Terrorism Turns Disease

Terrorist attacks would include the use of diseases---increases the risk of spread

Dunn et al. 05 [Mark, Kate Jones, Shaun Phillips, Herald Sun, Lexis]

COUNTER-terror authorities have drawn up plans to defend Australia against terrorists spreading avian influenza.The National Counter Terrorism Committee has included the use of bird flu strain H5N1 as a weapon in possible terrorism attack scenarios**,** Attorney-General Philip Ruddock's office confirmed. "It certainly is factored into the counter-terrorism plan," Mr Ruddock's spokeswoman said. Australia joins the US and Canada in treating bird flu as a possible "agri-terrorism" weapon against the West. The H5N1 strain -- the most virulent type of bird flu -- has so far claimed more than 60 lives in Asia.If the strain mutates into a human-to-human virus, the World Health Organisation has warned millions could die. A quarantine official said flights from countries that had detected H5N1 were closely monitored. Thermal scanners for detecting passengers with a fever are on stand-by at Australian airports in the event of a pandemic. As bird flu fears spread around the world, the Herald Sun can reveal Melbourne Commonwealth Games organisers have taken out insurance worth hundreds of millions of dollars in case the Games are cancelled. Under the national pandemic response plan, mass gatherings can be cancelled. Health Minister Tony Abbott's office confirmed Victorian authorities were aware of the potential impact of bird flu. "It would have to be at a stage in the pandemic where big public assemblies would be very dangerous in terms of spread of infection," spokeswoman Kay McNiece said. Scientists fear the disease has spread from Asia to poultry in Europe and South America. In developments yesterday: TURKEY reported bird flu at a farm where 1800 birds died last week. HUNDREDS of chickens in Colombia were quarantined after health authorities found the first suspected cases of bird flu. BULGARIAN authorities tested three dead birds for the virus. SURVEILLANCE in Papua New Guinea has been increased as the wild bird migratory season towards Australia begins. Sources said the threat of terrorists using bird flu should not be overstated, but counter-terror agencies around the world have factored it into their scenarios.Al-Qaida is known to have considered agricultural and biological terrorism, including a plot to infect tons of cocaine with a poison and then sell the drug in the US. Six of al-Qaida's September 11 hijackers had some form of agricultural training and had learned to fly crop-duster aircraft. Canada's intelligence service, the J2 Directorate, has also warned of the potential for terrorists to use bird flu. While scientific opinion differs on how easy it may be to use it as a weapon, J2 analysts found the development of a man-made strain capable of triggering a human flu pandemic was possible.

Terrorism Turns Economy

A terrorist attack would cause a global recession---collapses the economy

Crutsinger 01 [Martin, AP Economics writer, lexis]

 The International Monetary Fund warned Wednesday that severe fallout from the terrorist attacks in the United States could trigger a growth recession worldwide. But the 183-nation lending agency insisted that this outcome could still be avoided by aggressive government policy actions to stimulate growth. IMF chief economist Kenneth Rogoff called a recession in the United States a "done deal." However, later in his briefing he sought to soften that comment by saying it was still too early to tell whether the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks would push the already weak U.S. economy into a full blown recession. Rogoff said the real question was whether the United States had entered a sustained recession or would bounce back quickly. Rogoff said there was "every reason" to believe the U.S. economy would enjoy a quick rebound next year, noting that the Federal Reserve has been cutting interest rates aggressively all year and Congress has approved billions of dollars in increased funding for reconstruction and to help cushion the economic fallout at U.S. airlines. The global economy was already flirting with recession because of a longer-than-expected slowdown in the United States and spreading weakness around the world, the IMF said in its latest "World Economic Outlook" forecast. Even before the Sept. 11 attacks, the IMF had slashed its global growth forecast to just 2.6 percent for this year. That would be the poorest showing since 1993 and down 0.6 percentage point from a May forecast of 3.2 percent growth for 2001. In the view of economists, global growth below 2.5 percent constitutes a growth recession because economic activity at that pace is not strong enough to keep unemployment from rising substantially in parts of the world with high population growth. The IMF said even its reduced figure of 2.6 percent may not be realized depending on the severity of the fallout from the terrorist attack which Rogoff said was having "a negative effect on activity now in many regions of the globe." Rogoff, however, said that there are reasons to be optimistic that a global recession can be avoided. He cited the sizable government stimulus that has been injected through interest rate cuts in the United States and many other countries and large increases in U.S. spending for reconstruction and increased security. For that reason, Rogoff said, the IMF would not be changing its reduced 2.6 percent growth forecast for this year or its projection of 3.5 percent growth for 2002. However, he conceded that actual growth in 2002 is likely to be rather lower than 3.5 percent. The IMF compared the attacks to the costliest natural disaster in modern history, the 1995 earthquake in Kobe, Japan. That quake caused over 6,400 deaths, 35,000 injuries and property damage of $120 billion, or about 2.5 percent of Japan's gross domestic product. The direct impact of the Kobe quake on the Japanese economy was larger than that of the attacks on the American economy,the IMF said. However, the total effect of the terrorist attacks on the U.S. economy could be more far-reaching, particularly if shaken consumer confidence does not rebound, it said. "Since the terrorist attack was a deliberate action with long-term security implications, the effects on consumer psychology may well not be comparable," the IMF said. The IMF's latest "World Economic Outlook" described unusually large uncertainties and risks facing industrialized countries and the developing world. "There is now no major region providing support to global activity," the IMF said. "This has increased the vulnerability of the global economy to shocks and heightened the risk of a self-reinforcing downturn whose consequences could prove difficult to predict." For the United States, the IMF projected the GDP would grow a weak 1.3 percent this year, 0.2 percentage point lower than its May forecast. For 2002, the IMF forecast U.S. growth would rebound slightly to 2.2 percent. The U.S. economy grew 4.1 percent in 2000. The IMF's outlook for Japan, the world's second-largest economy, was even gloomier. Japan is probably already in its fourth recession of the decade, the IMF said in projecting Japan's GDP would shrink by 0.5 percent this year and manage only a tiny 0.2 percent gain in 2002. For Germany, the largest economy in Europe, the IMF put growth this year at 0.8 percent, 1.1 percentage point below its May projection. It forecast Germany would grow by 1.8 percent next year. The 12 European nations that have adopted the euro as a joint currency will see growth of 1.8 percent this year and 2.2 percent in 2002, the IMF estimated. In one of its few upward revisions, the IMF said it expected China's economy would grow by 7.5 percent this year, up by 0.5 percentage point from the May forecast, and by 7.1 percent in 2002. Growth in developing countries was expected to be 4.3 percent this year and 5.3 percent in 2002. Last year, the developing world managed growth of 5.8 percent.

Terrorism Turns Japan Economy

A terrorist attack would devastate Japan’s economy

Xinhua News 01 [Xinhua General News Service, lexis]

The terrorist attacks in the United States and the ongoing U.S.-led military operations have increased uncertainty in the already ailing Japanese economy**,** making its outlook gloom and the planned structural reforms even harder. The Bank of Japan (BOJ) has already downgraded its outlook for the Japanese economy earlier this month while BOJ and Japanese government officials have been talking economic contraction as inevitable. On Thursday, Japanese Finance Minister Masajuro Shiokawa said: "I cannot guarantee that the economy will not contract", hinting that Japan may sink into deeper economic doldrums. Japanese Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi later put it that a temporary economic contraction is "inevitable" in fiscal 2001**.** The terrorist attacks and the risk of a prolonged U.S.-led military strikes inflicted a heavy blow to the economy**,** making the promised reforms more difficult**,** analysts said.The attacks and the ongoing strikes threaten to bring on a global recession and worsen the troubles in Japan Japanese exports, which rely heavily on sales in North America and Europe, have been undercut by the aftermath of terrorist attacks.Several big Japanese companies have planned job-cutting.Major exporting companies from Sony to Matsushita Electric Industrial to NEC have lowered their financial forecasts.Travel and tourism, which help drive the Japanese economy, are affected even worse. Japan Air Lines has scrapped about one-quarter of its trans- Pacific flights amid dwindling passengers while travel agencies are facing severe difficulties after large scale cancellations.Negative effects such as the sudden worsening of business is beginning to surface. Corporate failures rose 4.4 percent, they noted. in September from a year earlier, mostly due to the current economic slowdown. As a result, employment and consumer confidence are badly hurt while corporate profits are being eroded. Meanwhile, the BOJ has little room to do with monetary policy to promote growth with short-term interest rates already effectively at zero. Japan's economic growth is likely to be slowed by 1.8 percentage points in fiscal 2002 if the current U.S.-led attacks on Afghanistan drag on, the economic research arm of Sanwa Bank said Tuesday.

Terrorism Turns Fear

Terrorism causes physiological trauma- dirty bombs

Hecker 6 [Siegfried is a visiting professor at the Center for International Security and Cooperation (CISAC) at Stanford University The Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science, September, Lexis]

Terrorists have also not yet crossed the radiological dispersal bomb (dirty bomb) threshold. A dirty bomb will disperse radioactive materials but not cause a nuclear detonation and mushroom cloud. Materials for dirty bombs include roughly a dozen radioisotopes that are ubiquitous in international use as radiation sources for medicine, industry, and agriculture--and readily available to determined terrorists. A dirty bomb would not kill many people, but it would cause enormous psychological trauma and economic disruption (Ferguson et al. 2004). Regardless of whether or not terrorists are just about to cross the nuclear bomb threshold, we must assume that some of them eventually will. The best preventive measure is to keep the weapons-usable material out of their hands.

Terrorism Turns Hunger/Food Production/Resource Wars

Terrorism would destroy food supplies---wrecks the global economy and farming industry

MacPherson 01 (Robert, Staff Writer Agence France Press, Lexis)

While the world's attention is riveted by the spread of anthrax by mail, EU experts are tackling an even more sinister scenario -- a terrorist strike on the foods that Europeans eat.Meetings this week of specialist committees better known for tackling mad cow and foot-and-mouth disease will be delving into the risks that bio-terrorism could pose to Europe's crops and livestock."The intention is to begin a process for the urgent review of our present defense systems against any potential bio-terrorism attack in the areas of animal and food production," EU Health and Consumer Protection Commissioner David Byrne has said. Speaking to EU farm ministers in Luxembourg on Tuesday, Byrne raised the specter of herds being infected with contagious viruses, or crops being sprayed with harmful chemicals. While insisting that he did not want to be alarmist, Byrne said he has already pursued "this very sensitive dossier" with US Agriculture Secretary Ann Veneman and with health ministers in most of the 15 EU member states. "This is all part of the process of reviewing the level of preparedness in the EU against such threats, both at the level of the member states and at the community level," he said. Discussing the risks this week is the Standing Veterinary Committee, a blue-ribbon panel of top vets from each of the EU member states whose scientific advice is closely listened to by EU farm ministers. It played a key role in Europe's reponse to the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Britain earlier this year, and with the threat of bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE) -- mad cow disease -- to human health. The lesser-known Standing Committee on Foodstuffs is also reviewing the bio-terrorism question this week, Byrne said. **"**The experience of recent years with foot and mouth disease and classical swine fever highlights the huge damage which can result from the introduction of viruses against which our animal population is vulnerable," Byrne said. "Food production and distribution systems have also shown their potential vulnerability,"he said. "We cannot ignore these warning signs." Simon Whitby, a research fellow at Bradford University's peace studies department who has written about bioterrorism and agriculture, said an attack on farms was unlikely to go unnoticed for very long. Industrialized economies, he said in a telephone interview Wednesday, already have sophisticated procedures in place to constantly monitor the quality of produce going into the food chain. "But in terms of economic impact, it would be devastating" if just a small-scale attack took place, as it would rattle public confidence in the food supply and wreak havoc in the farming industry**,** Whitby said."It's most certainly a serious concern for governments," he said. Last week in Washington, Veneman announced that the Bush administration was asking Congress for 45.2 million dollars for "biosecurity" programs in the wake of the September 22 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.

Terrorism Turns Racism

**Terrorism justifies racism**

Mahoney and Kirk 2 (Honor, Editor and Lisbeth, Staff writer, EU Observer, Lexis)

HIGHLIGHT: Since the September 11 terrorist attacks in America Muslims often "have to justify that they are not terrorists", said Beate Winkler, director of the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC). She was speaking in Brussels on Thursday to mark the publication of a report on Islamophobia in the EU after September 11. The report outlined ways to combat islamophobia, which rose sharply in the EU and called on an "early warning system for racism." Since the September 11 terrorist attacks in America Muslims often "have to justify that they are not terrorists", said Beate Winkler, director of the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC). She was speaking in Brussels on Thursday to mark the publication of a report on Islamophobia in the EU after September 11. Significant rise in attacks since September 11 The report, which is based on the EUMC's network of national focal points in each member state, monitored racist behaviour towards Muslims in the period directly after the terrorist attacks until the end of 2001. According to Bob Purkiss, the chairman of EUMC, there was "a very significant rise in attacks since September 11" which acted as a "detonator" for racist sentiment. He also pointed out that the rise of religious intolerance led to a manifestation of racism in the EU. Racist graffiti and offensive websites In the UK, Denmark, Ireland and the Netherlands the country reports showed a significant rise in islamophobic behaviour, which ranged from verbal and physical attacks to racist graffiti and offensive websites. The people most affected were women and children, towards whom the highest percentage of racist behaviour was directed. Overt signs of the Muslim religion, such as the hijab, which is worn by Muslim women, were "identifiable targets for verbal abuse." A number of EU member states, including Sweden, Denmark and Greece, showed an increase in physical attacks on Muslims. Austria, Finland and Luxembourg had the least reported incidences of islamophobia. However, the tools for monitoring racism in the member states vary greatly and one of the next important tasks for the EMUC will be to ensure than the monitoring methods are standardised.

Terrorism Turns Racism

Terrorism causes racist sentiments.

Sallot 01 (Jeff, The Globe and Mail, “Spectre of racist backlash worries many in Canada”)AQB

A strong majority of Canadians worry that members of Arab and Muslim minorities will become victims of racism in the aftermath of terrorist attacks in the United States, a national poll suggests. The poll also indicates that only a small minority have become more suspicious of Arabs and Muslims after the attacks Sept. 11 in New York and Washington, which are believed by U.S. officials to be the work of Islamic extremists. Fears of an ugly racial backlash in Canada and the United States have prompted Prime Minister Jean Chrétien and President George W. Bush to reach out to the Arab and Muslim communities in their countries and to urge their citizens to show tolerance. Appearing at an Ottawa mosque last Friday, Mr. Chrétien said he was ashamed of recent racial slurs and attacks on Canadian Muslims, including an assault six days earlier in Ottawa on a teenaged boy of Arab descent. The poll indicates that 82 per cent of Canadians share Mr. Chrétien's fears of a backlash. The Globe and Mail-CTV Ipsos-Reid poll of 1,000 adults was taken between Sept. 17 and 20. The margin of error is plus or minus 3.1 per cent 19 times out of 20 with a sample this size. Eighty-two per cent of the respondents said they somewhat or strongly agreed that they are worried that people of Arab descent or Muslims may become the target of unwarranted racism or personal attacks. Seventeen per cent somewhat or strongly disagreed with the statement. Fears of a backlash were lowest in Quebec, where 66 per cent said they worried about attacks on Muslims and Arabs. On a separate question, 27 per cent of the respondents said they somewhat or strongly agreed with the statement that they have personally become more suspicious of Muslims or people of Arab descent since the terrorist attacks. Seventy-three per cent said they somewhat or strongly disagreed that they have become more suspicious. In Halifax, police have decided that the smashing of a window at the Halifax Islamic Centre was not a hate crime. On Saturday evening, a passenger in a taxi became enraged by the fare he was charged and chased the cab driver into the centre. A large window at the mosque was broken. Police spokeswoman Brenda Zima said the destruction of the window does not fit the Criminal Code definition of a hate crime because it wasn't done willfully to incite hatred. Some Islamic leaders in the city insisted that a 28-year-old man arrested by police should not be charged with a hate crime and they asked to meet with him. He is charged with damaging property. William Sweet, a philosophy professor at St. Francis Xavier University, said the complexity of the terrorist issue and the appeals by political and religious leaders that the Islamic people not be harassed have helped prevent a widespread backlash. He said Canadians are having trouble figuring out how they should respond to the terrorist attacks. "Can we do anything about it? Does it make any sense to go to war because it's not obvious how we would win such a war? I think moral paralysis is a real problem right now," said Dr. Sweet, whose research centres on human rights and social ethics. Canadian racism? A Sept. 17-20 poll of 1,000 adult Canadians revealed their feelings toward Arabs and Muslims. STATEMENT: "I am worried that people of Arab descent or Muslims in Canada may become the target of unwarranted racism or personal attacks because of last week's terrorist attacks."

Terrorism Turns Racism

Terrorism used as a justification for racism

Mahoney and Kirk 02 (Honor and Lisbeth, EU Observer, “Rise of 'Islamophobia' in EU after September 11”)AQB

HIGHLIGHT: Since the September 11 terrorist attacks in America Muslims often "have to justify that they are not terrorists", said Beate Winkler, director of the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC). She was speaking in Brussels on Thursday to mark the publication of a report on Islamophobia in the EU after September 11. The report outlined ways to combat islamophobia, which rose sharply in the EU and called on an "early warning system for racism." Since the September 11 terrorist attacks in America Muslims often "have to justify that they are not terrorists", said Beate Winkler, director of the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC). She was speaking in Brussels on Thursday to mark the publication of a report on Islamophobia in the EU after September 11. Significant rise in attacks since September 11 The report, which is based on the EUMC's network of national focal points in each member state, monitored racist behaviour towards Muslims in the period directly after the terrorist attacks until the end of 2001. According to Bob Purkiss, the chairman of EUMC, there was "a very significant rise in attacks since September 11" which acted as a "detonator" for racist sentiment. He also pointed out that the rise of religious intolerance led to a manifestation of racism in the EU. Racist graffiti and offensive websites In the UK, Denmark, Ireland and the Netherlands the country reports showed a significant rise in islamophobic behaviour, which ranged from verbal and physical attacks to racist graffiti and offensive websites. The people most affected were women and children, towards whom the highest percentage of racist behaviour was directed. Overt signs of the Muslim religion, such as the hijab, which is worn by Muslim women, were "identifiable targets for verbal abuse." A number of EU member states, including Sweden, Denmark and Greece, showed an increase in physical attacks on Muslims. Austria, Finland and Luxembourg had the least reported incidences of islamophobia. However, the tools for monitoring racism in the member states vary greatly and one of the next important tasks for the EMUC will be to ensure than the monitoring methods are standardised.

\*\*\*GLOBAL WARMING\*\*\*

Global Warming Turns Proliferation

Global warming causes global resource wars and proliferation

Klare 6 [Michael.professor of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College, 2006 March 10. http://www.alternet.org/environment/33243]

It's official: the era of resource wars is upon us. In a major London address, British Defense Secretary John Reid warned that global climate change and dwindling natural resources are combining to increase the likelihood of violent conflict over land, water and energy. Climate change, he indicated, "will make scarce resources, clean water, viable agricultural land even scarcer" -- and this will "make the emergence of violent conflict more rather than less likely." Although not unprecedented, Reid's prediction of an upsurge in resource conflict is significant both because of his senior rank and the vehemence of his remarks. "The blunt truth is that the lack of water and agricultural land is a significant contributory factor to the tragic conflict we see unfolding in Darfur," he declared. "We should see this as a warning sign." Resource conflicts of this type are most likely to arise in the developing world, Reid indicated, but the more advanced and affluent countries are not likely to be spared the damaging and destabilizing effects of global climate change. With sea levels rising, water and energy becoming increasingly scarce and prime agricultural lands turning into deserts, internecine warfare over access to vital resources will become a global phenomenon. Reid's speech, delivered at the prestigious Chatham House in London (Britain's equivalent of the Council on Foreign Relations), is but the most recent expression of a growing trend in strategic circles to view environmental and resource effects -- rather than political orientation and ideology -- as the most potent source of armed conflict in the decades to come. With the world population rising, global consumption rates soaring, energy supplies rapidly disappearing and climate change eradicating valuable farmland, the stage is being set for persistent and worldwide struggles over vital resources. Religious and political strife will not disappear in this scenario, but rather will be channeled into contests over valuable sources of water, food and energy. Prior to Reid's address, the most significant expression of this outlook was a report prepared for the U.S. Department of Defense by a California-based consulting firm in October 2003. Entitled "An Abrupt Climate Change Scenario and Its Implications for United States National Security," the report warned that global climate change is more likely to result in sudden, cataclysmic environmental events than a gradual (and therefore manageable) rise in average temperatures. Such events could include a substantial increase in global sea levels, intense storms and hurricanes and continent-wide "dust bowl" effects. This would trigger pitched battles between the survivors of these effects for access to food, water, habitable land and energy supplies.

Global Warming Turns Exclusion

Global warming fuels societal exclusion- depleted resources

Klare 6 [Michael.professor of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College, 2006 March 10. http://www.alternet.org/environment/33243]

"Violence and disruption stemming from the stresses created by abrupt changes in the climate pose a different type of threat to national security than we are accustomed to today," the 2003 report noted. "Military confrontation may be triggered by a desperate need for natural resources such as energy, food and water rather than by conflicts over ideology, religion or national honor." Until now, this mode of analysis has failed to command the attention of top American and British policymakers. For the most part, they insist that ideological and religious differences -- notably, the clash between values of tolerance and democracy on one hand and extremist forms of Islam on the other -- remain the main drivers of international conflict. But Reid's speech at Chatham House suggests that a major shift in strategic thinking may be under way. Environmental perils may soon dominate the world security agenda. This shift is due in part to the growing weight of evidence pointing to a significant human role in altering the planet's basic climate systems. Recent studies showing the rapid shrinkage of the polar ice caps, the accelerated melting of North American glaciers, the increased frequency of severe hurricanes and a number of other such effects all suggest that dramatic and potentially harmful changes to the global climate have begun to occur. More importantly, they conclude that human behavior -- most importantly, the burning of fossil fuels in factories, power plants, and motor vehicles -- is the most likely cause of these changes. This assessment may not have yet penetrated the White House and other bastions of head-in-the-sand thinking, but it is clearly gaining ground among scientists and thoughtful analysts around the world. For the most part, public discussion of global climate change has tended to describe its effects as an environmental problem -- as a threat to safe water, arable soil, temperate forests, certain species and so on. And, of course, climate change is a potent threat to the environment; in fact, the greatest threat imaginable. But viewing climate change as an environmental problem fails to do justice to the magnitude of the peril it poses. As Reid's speech and the 2003 Pentagon study make clear, the greatest danger posed by global climate change is not the degradation of ecosystems per se, but rather the disintegration of entire human societies, producing wholesale starvation, mass migrations and recurring conflict over resources. "As famine, disease, and weather-related disasters strike due to abrupt climate change," the Pentagon report notes, "many countries' needs will exceed their carrying capacity" -- that is, their ability to provide the minimum requirements for human survival. This "will create a sense of desperation, which is likely to lead to offensive aggression" against countries with a greater stock of vital resources. "Imagine eastern European countries, struggling to feed their populations with a falling supply of food, water, and energy, eyeing Russia, whose population is already in decline, for access to its grain, minerals, and energy supply." Similar scenarios will be replicated all across the planet, as those without the means to survival invade or migrate to those with greater abundance -- producing endless struggles between resource "haves" and "have-nots." It is this prospect, more than anything, that worries John Reid. In particular, he expressed concern over the inadequate capacity of poor and unstable countries to cope with the effects of climate change, and the resulting risk of state collapse, civil war and mass migration. "More than 300 million people in Africa currently lack access to safe water," he observed, and "climate change will worsen this dire situation" -- provoking more wars like Darfur. And even if these social disasters will occur primarily in the developing world, the wealthier countries will also be caught up in them, whether by participating in peacekeeping and humanitarian aid operations, by fending off unwanted migrants or by fighting for access to overseas supplies of food, oil, and minerals. When reading of these nightmarish scenarios, it is easy to conjure up images of desperate, starving people killing one another with knives, staves and clubs -- as was certainly often the case in the past, and could easily prove to be so again. But these scenarios also envision the use of more deadly weapons. "In this world of warring states," the 2003 Pentagon report predicted, "nuclear arms proliferation is inevitable." As oil and natural gas disappears, more and more countries will rely on nuclear power to meet their energy needs -- and this "will accelerate nuclear proliferation as countries develop enrichment and reprocessing capabilities to ensure their national security." Although speculative, these reports make one thing clear: when thinking about the calamitous effects of global climate change, we must emphasize its social and political consequences as much as its purely environmental effects. Drought, flooding and storms can kill us, and surely will -- but so will wars among the survivors of these catastrophes over what remains of food, water and shelter. As Reid's comments indicate, no society, however affluent, will escape involvement in these forms of conflict.

Global Warming Turns Terrorism

Global warming causes failed states and terrorism

Dallas Morning News 8 [June 26 http://www.dallasnews.com/sharedcontent/dws/news/healthscience/stories/DN-warming\_26nat.ART.State.Edition2.4e1b40a.html ]

Global warming is likely to have a series of destabilizing effects around the world, causing humanitarian crises as well as surges in ethnic violence and illegal immigration, according to a U.S. intelligence assessment debated Wednesday. "Logic suggests the conditions exacerbated [by climate change] would increase the pool of potential recruits for terrorism," said Tom Fingar, deputy director of national intelligence, who testified Wednesday before a joint hearing of two House committees. Climate change alone would not topple governments, but it could worsen problems such as poverty, disease, migration and hunger that could destabilize already vulnerable areas, Mr. Fingar said. But he warned that efforts to reduce global warming by changing energy policies "may affect U.S. national security interests even more than the physical impacts of climate change itself. "The operative word there is 'may.' We don't know," he said. The national intelligence assessment on the national security implications of global climate change through 2030 was requested by Congress last year. It represents the consensus judgment of top analysts at all 16 U.S. spy agencies. The report is classified but was given to senior lawmakers on the two committees. Rep. Edward Markey, D-Mass., chairs the House Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming. On Tuesday night, he accused the White House of trying to "bury the future security realities of global warming" in Mr. Fingar's prepared statement. But on Wednesday, he said the report itself is "first-class" and its findings are "a clarion call to action from the heart of our nation's security establishment." The report was criticized by skeptics of global warming and opponents of using U.S. intelligence resources to track something as amorphous as the environment. "I think it was a pathetic use of intelligence resources," said Rep. Peter Hoekstra, R-Mich., the ranking Republican on the House Intelligence Committee. Mr. Hoekstra complained that the report did little to expand government officials' understanding of global warming and its consequences. The document, he said in an interview, "didn't add anything I didn't already know." The assessment relied on climate calculations and projections made by the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. In April 2007, the Center for Naval Analyses issued a similar report, written by 11 top retired military leaders, that drew a direct correlation between global warming and the conditions that lead to failed states becoming the breeding grounds for extremism and terrorism. "Weakened and failing governments, with an already thin margin for survival, foster the conditions for internal conflicts, extremism and movement toward increased authoritarianism and radical ideologies," the 2007 report said. "The U.S. will be drawn more frequently into these situations."

Global Warming Turns Food Production

**Warming decreases global food production, causing widespread starvation.**

IPCC 07 [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, December 12-17, p. 26]

At lower latitudes, especially in seasonally dry and tropical regions, crop productivity is projected to decrease for even small local temperature increases (1 to 2°C), which would increase the risk of hunger (medium confidence). {WGII 5.4, SPM} \_ Globally, the potential for food production is projected to increase with increases in local average temperature over a range of 1 to 3°C, but above this it is projected to decrease (medium confidence).

Global Warming Turns Disease

**Warming will strain the health care industry while increasing infectious disease spread.**

IPCC 07 [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, December 12-17, p. 26]

The health status of millions of people is projected to be affected through, for example, increases in malnutrition; increased deaths, diseases and injury due to extreme weather events; increased burden of diarrhoeal diseases; increased frequency of cardio-respiratory diseases due to higher concentrations of ground-level ozone in urban areas related to climate change; and the altered spatial distribution of some infectious diseases. {WGI 7.4, Box 7.4; WGII 8.ES, 8.2, 8.4, SPM} Climate change is projected to bring some benefits in temperate areas, such as fewer deaths from cold exposure, and some mixed effects such as changes in range and transmission potential of malaria in Africa. Overall it is expected that benefits will be outweighed by the negative health effects of rising temperatures, especially in developing countries.

Global Warming Turns Ethnic Conflict

**Climate change can trigger ethnic conflict. Darfur proves.**

Kolmannskog 8 [Vikram Odedra, April, Norweigan Refugee Council, http://www.nrc.no/arch/\_img/9268480.pdf]

Darfur is often used to illustrate how climate change can interact with other factors to trigger violent conflict. When Darfur first made headlines, the most common explanation of the violent conflict emphasised the ethnic differences between Arabs and Africans. More recently, prominent officials such as UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon have argued that “the Darfur conflict began as an ecological crisis, arising at least in part from climate change (“A Climate Culprit in Darfur,” in *The Washington Post*, 16.06.2007).” UNEP’s post-conflict environmental assessment (*Sudan: Post-Conflict Environmental Assessment*, UNEP, 2007) indicates that there is a very strong link between land degradation, desertification and conflict in Darfur. The boundary between desert and semi-desert is shifting southwards partly due to declining precipitation. Several authors attribute this to climate change, while others maintain that the semi-arid Sahel with strong climate variability is not a good case for illustrating or proving climate change. The 20-year drought, regardless of cause, played an important role by reducing the land available for farming and herding, but as the UNEP assessment also recognises, climate (and/or environmental) change alone does not offer the full explanation for the outbreak or the extent of the violent conflict. All countries in the Sahel have felt the impact of global warming, but so far only Sudan has experienced such devastating conflict. The ethnic dimension does not offer a full explanation either: Political and military alliances frequently shifted depending on pragmatic rather than ethnic considerations. Furthermore, some tribes practice both herding and crop cultivation so there is not always clear tribal distinctions between farmers and herders. When the north-south civil war broke out again in the mid-1980s, however, the central government used Arab militias as a means of keeping the southern rebels at bay in Darfur. Raising an army is expensive so the Khartoum regime used a strategy often employed in warfare: they armed others to do the work of the army. A balance was upset, and ethnic identity became more politicised. This fed into the escalation of conflicts over land issues. The conflict itself has taken a further toll on already scarce resources. Militias in Darfur intentionally destroyed forests and the natural livelihood base of people, resulting in further displacement. The massive scale of displacement also has serious consequences for the environment. Around the camps for displaced people, the collection of shelter materials and firewood can cause serious deforestation and soil erosion. UNEP’s assessment indicates that some international aid programmes may also cause significant harm to the environment, and there may be vicious circles of (particularly food) aid dependence, agricultural underdevelopment and environmental degradation. This is detrimental to Darfur’s existing problems of drought, desertification and disputes over land-use – factors that contributed to the conflict in the first place.

Global Warming Turns Asian Stability

Climate change threatens Asian stability- India-Bangladesh tension

Chowdury 2007 [Afsan December 28, The International Institute for Strategic Studies, http://www.iiss.org/whats-new/iiss-in-the-press/press-coverage-2007/december-2007/climate-change-brings-threats-of-war/]

Global climate change presents a serious national security threat that could affect Americans at home, impact U.S. military operations, and heighten global tensions, finds a study released recently by a blue-ribbon panel of 11 of the most senior retired U.S. admirals and generals as stated by the panel known as the Military Advisory Board. "We will pay for this one way or another," said retired U.S. Marine Corps General Anthony Zinni, former commander of U.S. forces in the Middle East. "We will pay to reduce greenhouse gas emissions today, and we'll have to take an economic hit of some kind. Or, we will pay the price later in military terms. And that will involve human lives. There will be a human toll." "The U.S. should commit to a stronger national and international role to help stabilize climate changes at levels that will avoid significant disruption to global security and stability," the Military Advisory Board recommends. The study, "National Security and the Threat of Climate Change," says that climate change acts as a "threat multiplier" in already fragile regions of the world, creating the breeding grounds for extremism and terrorism. The CNA Corporation, a nonprofit research and analysis organization, brought together the 11 retired four-star and three-star admirals and generals as a Military Advisory Board to provide advice, expertise and perspective on the impact of climate change on national security. CNA writers and researchers compiled the report under the board's direction and review. Meanwhile closer at home the threat is taking its early shapes. India is already putting fences on its border with Bangladesh, one of the longest borders between any two countries, to stop Bangladeshis from crossing. It claims millions of Bangladeshis have crossed over to India after 1972. That figure may look small if one-third of Bangladesh drowns and millions try to enter India, seeking safety. Two dangerous components of possible conflicts arouse great fear. One, the spark of communalism-related conflict which both countries are subjected to and two, terrorism-related opportunities inherent in a region where it appears already firmly planted. Should India aggressively stop fleeing refugees from entering, repercussions are obvious. Such measures may lead to communal interpretation of these actions. India may quickly be painted as stopping Muslims from reaching safety. On the other hand, stopping Hindu refugees from Bangladesh will be cause problem within India. So whatever be the scenario, communalism may rise to conflict level in both countries and there are many forces in both countries ready to take advantage.

Global Warming Turns Central Asian Stability

Global warming causes Central Asian stability- economy, agricultural cultivation

TR 9 [Technical Reform, International Green Week, January 16, http://www.irthebest.com/globalwarming\_climate\_change\_in\_central\_asia.html]

Agriculture is one of the most vulnerable sectors to the impacts of climate change not only in Central Asia but worldwide. Despite the enormous progress of scientific knowledge and technological developments in recent decades, weather is still the major factor in agricultural productivity. It is acknowledged that the impacts of climate change are highly location specific. In Central Asia, water and agricultural sectors are likely to be the most sensitive to the negative effects of global warming. The major factors related to climate change affecting agricultural productivity in Central Asia: increasing temperature, and carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, changes of precipitation, surface water access and extreme weather conditions. Temperature will rise in average- even if Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions are stabilized at current levels - and the water coverage as well as surface runoff will also alter in the region. However rising concentration of carbon in the atmosphere could benefit certain crop yields (e.g. maize and sorghum), it can not compensate the negative impacts of more intense droughts and floods. Central Asia significantly contributes to global warming by generating large volume of GHG emissions, and agricultural sector is among the major contributors. Agriculture is a significant sector of the economy in the Central Asian countries, with around 60% of the population living in rural areas, occupying more than 40% of the total labor force, and agriculture accounting for approximately 25% of GDP on average. Kazakhstan is the only exception with agriculture accounting for only 8% of GDP (but still around 33% of total employment). Currently the two most significant crops in Central Asia are cotton and wheat. It is foreseen that due to global warming, agricultural productivity in Central Asia might suffer severe losses because of high temperature, severe drought, flood conditions, and soil degradation, which may endanger food security and agriculturally-based livelihood systems in the region. Climate change poses serious threats to the region’s rural population, which can lead to accelerated rural-urban migration, increased urban unemployment and consequently, social and political tensions.

Global Warming Turns South Asian Stability

**Conflict is escalating in South Asia due to increased climate change.**

Sappenfield 7 [Mark, Staff writer of the Christian Science Monitor, December 6 <http://www.csmonitor.com/2007/1206/p13s02-wogi.htm>]

The reason he gives is one heard throughout this corner of India, where Himalayan peaks give way to fertile flood plains: Immigrants from Bangladesh are taking over. It is a visceral fear in India's Northeast, where people say they feel under siege – their culture, politics, and security threatened by a tide of Bangladeshis who are here illegally. "On the surface there is peace," says Mr. Das, who says he was forced out of his village through intimidation and murders by immigrants. "But this migration is a tragedy for us." For now, there is relative calm. But security analysts worry that unrest could flare up again because of a new threat: global warming. As negotiators gather in Bali, Indonesia, this week to begin work on an agreement to fight climate change worldwide, concern is mounting that altered weather patterns will stoke conflict in various parts of the globe. And this area of South Asia sits atop most experts' watch lists. Bangladesh is not only one of the countries most vulnerable to climate change, it is also chronically unstable. It is in the midst of a political crisis and showing signs of nascent Islamist fundamentalism. The effects of global warming could amplify the forces of instability, experts say. That remains an extreme view. The clearest threat, most agree, is a mass migration that sparks renewed conflict in the Indian Northeast – an independent­-minded area of mountains and jungles fiercely proud of its distinct heritage and already fretted by a dozen insurgencies. "It is the No. 1 conflict zone for climate change," says Peter Schwartz, chairman of the Monitor Group, a research firm in San Francisco that recently released a study on the security risks presented by climate change. That field of study is relatively new, but analysts are beginning to lay the map of forecasted climate change over the map of political weakness to see where changes in weather could lead to volatility. No one argues that climate change alone will lead to war. But analysts suggest that it could be a pivotal factor that tips vulnerable regions toward conflicts. "Climate change is a threat multiplier," says Geoff Dabelko, director of the Environmental Change and Security Program at the Woodrow Wilson Institute in Washington. "It's not that it creates a whole new set of problems, it's that it will make things that are already a problem worse." For that reason, few expect climate change to throw Europe or North America into chaos. Both have the political stability and economic resources to cope. Areas that lack these advantages – such as sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and South Asia – are most at risk, experts say. History suggests that climate can help breed political instability. One recent study charted climate changes, wars, and several other variables back to the 1400s. It found that significantly cooler periods were characterized by large-scale crop loss, starvation, and conflict.

Global Warming Turns Middle East Stability

Global warming will cause Middle East Water War

Duchene 8 [Lisa. Research assistance at Penn State. http://www.physorg.com/news131901803.html]

 With rapid population growth, wasteful practices, and impending climate change, the situation is likely to get worse. Water resources in semi-arid regions are expected to be especially hard-hit, warned the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change in its 2007 summary report. By some estimates, two-thirds of the world's population will be water-stressed by 2025. During a year when many states across the U.S. are suffering some of the worst droughts ever, water is a topic on people's minds. Will the prospect of a diminishing water supply result in serious geopolitical conflict? "Freshwater resources are unevenly distributed around the globe," says Robert B. Packer, lecturer in political science at Penn State, who studies international political economy and the causes of war. "While freshwater is relatively abundant in Europe and much of North America, other regions of the globe, such as the Middle East, Central Asia, and parts of West and Eastern Africa, face increasingly severe shortages." According to the BBC, the number of 'water-scarce' countries in the Middle East grew from three in 1955 to eight in 1990, with another seven expected to be added within 20 years. "Of particular concern," said Packer, "are certain riparian basins that could explode into conflict as sources of freshwater diminish. Conflict is more likely to occur where water can be seized and controlled in addition to being scarce." Among Middle East countries, where every major river crosses at least one international border, up to 50 percent of water needs of any specific state finds its source in another state, Packer noted. "Hydro-politics already play a central role among states in riparian basins, such as the Tigris-Euphrates, the Nile, the Jordan, as well as those sharing the underground aquifers of the West Bank." Conflicts are likely to emerge as competition intensifies to control river waters for hydroelectricity, agricultural use, and human consumption, he added. "Farms and cities downstream are vulnerable to the actions and decisions of upstream countries that they have little control over. This is exemplified in the tensions over the Tigris-Euphrates, where Turkey commenced construction of a system of hydroelectric dams. Iraq and Syria have protested, citing the project would reduce the rivers' flow downstream. Turkey's response to the Arab states has been 'we don't control their oil, they don't control our water.'" To the west, the Nile has been the lifeline for Egyptian civilization dating back to antiquity. Nearly all of Egypt's 80 million people live on the three percent of Egyptian territory that is the river's valley and delta. "For Egypt the Nile is life, and its government has voiced to upstream countries that any reduction of Nile waters would be taken as national security threat that could trigger a military response," says Packer. "Nearly all freshwater in the Israeli-occupied West Bank comes from underground aquifers," he added. "Water access has become a major issue between Israelis and Palestinians." "Perhaps the greatest of all modern Middle East conflicts, the Six Day War of 1967, began as a dispute over water access," Packer noted. Israel built a National Water Carrier to transport freshwater from the Jordan and the Sea of Galilee to the country's farming and urban centers. (The Carrier now supplies half the drinking water in Israel.) In 1965, Israeli forces attacked a Syrian water diversion project that would have cut the Carrier's supply, and prolonged violence led to war. "For Israelis, control of the Golan Heights is important strategically in terms of controlling the headwaters of the Jordan River," Packer noted. The effects of global warming and desertification also have impacted hydro-politics around the world. In West Africa, rainfall has declined 30 percent over the last four decades and the Sahara is advancing more than one mile per year. Senegal and Mauritania engaged in militarized conflict in 1989 across the Senegal River that divides them, in part over changing access to arable land.

Global Warming Turns Middle East Stability

Global warming causes Middle East instability

Guttman 7 [Nathan, Washington correspondent for the Israeli daily newspaper, June 13, The Jewish Daily, http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:aeqtpb1fQoQJ:www.forward.com/articles/10954/+&cd=38&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us]

“Israel is an insignificant player in contributing to global warming, but it suffers from it in a nonproportional rate,” Bar-Or said. The main changes, the Israeli experts predicted, would be a drop in the water supply — already a scarce commodity in the Middle East — and an expected rise in temperature that will make it even more difficult to replenish water sources. According to the information presented this week, if action is not taken, then Israel might be facing a loss of up to 100 millimeters of rain a year — almost 20% of the country’s annual rainfall. For Israel, water shortages could influence not only its population but also the future of its relations with neighboring countries. Israel is already facing difficulties fulfilling its agreement — as part of its 1994 peace treaty with Jordan — to transfer water to the Hashemite kingdom, and will face great problems when trying to work out water arrangements with Palestinians in a final status agreement. The Jordanian monarchy, which is based on support of the agricultural communities, might be in danger. The same is true for the Palestinian leadership, which might encounter an uprising of extremists who will feed on the poverty and despair caused by the collapse of agriculture due to lack of water.

Global Warming Turns Economy

Global warming makes huge weather problems- collapses economy

Brown 8 (Lester R., founder of the Worldwatch InstituteEarth Policy Institute , Earth Policy Institute, p. 64) ET

As the climate changes, more extreme weather events are expected. Andrew Dlugolecki, a consultant on climate change and its effects on financial institutions, notes that damage from atmospherically related events has increased by roughly 10 percent a year. “If such an increase were to continue indefinitely,” he notes, “by 2065 storm damage would exceed the gross world product. The world obviously would face bankruptcy long before then.” Few double-digit annual growth trends continue for several decades, but Dlugolecki’s basic point is that climate change can be destructive, disruptive, and very costly.69

Global Warming Turns Heg

**Failure to act on global warming undermines US hegemony**

Pachauri 8 [Rajenda, IPCC Chairman, January 23, http://www.ipcc.ch/graphics/speeches.htm]

Some of the impacts of climate change are already translating into monetary flows and expenditure as brought out by payments made by the insurance industry. For instance, economic losses attributed to natural disasters have increased from US$75.5 billion in the 1960s to US$659.9 billion in the 1990s. Losses to insurers from natural disasters nearly doubled in 2007 to just below $30 billion globally according to risk records. From 1980 through 2004, the global economic costs of weather-related events totaled $1.4 trillion (inflation- corrected), of which $340 billion was insured. Far more important than the aggregate impacts of climate change on global economic activity are the consequences for some of the most vulnerable communities across the globe. In Africa, between 75 and 250 million people are projected to be exposed to increased water stress due to climate change by 2020. In the same year, in some countries yields from rainfed agriculture could be reduced by upto 50%. Agricultural production, including access to food, in many African countries would be severely compromised. This would further adversely affect food security and exacerbate malnutrition. Worldwide the health status of millions of people is projected to be affected through, for example, increases in malnutrition; increased deaths, diseases and injury due to extreme weather events; increased burden of diarrhoeal diseases; increased frequency of cardio-respiratory diseases; and other impacts. The inertia in the climate system is such that even if we were to stabilize the concentration of greenhouse gases (GHGs) in the atmosphere today, climate change would continue for decades. Hence, measures for adapting to the impacts of climate change are urgent and inevitable. However, it is only through appropriate mitigation measures that many impacts can be avoided, reduced or delayed. The IPCC has found that the costs of even stringent mitigation measures would be modest. For achieving a scenario of stabilized temperature increase of 2.0 to 2.4 0 C, the cost to the global economy would be around 0.12 % per annum, amounting to a loss of less than 3.0 % of the GDP by 2030 and less than 5.5% by 2050. Comparing the costs of mitigation with avoided damages would require the reconciliation of welfare impacts on people living in different places and at different points of time into a global aggregate measure of well-being. What other forum would be more suitable for exercising its wisdom, knowledge and enlightenment than this one for defining a strategy for global society to act in response to projected climate change? Such a strategy must be based on stringent mitigation of emissions of GHGs, through policy measures that lead to development and dissemination of low carbon technologies across the board, paramount among which would be an appropriate price on carbon. The benefits from this go beyond the field of climate change, with substantial benefits in the form of higher levels of energy security, lower pollution at the local level and attendant health benefits. At the same time, the global community has to provide adequate resources for creating capacity and infrastructure for adapting to the impacts of climate change in some of the poorest and most vulnerable communities. Business and industry will, therefore, need to work with governments, civil society and knowledge organizations at an unprecedented level in creating actions and opportunities for themselves and society as a whole. Economic activities will consequently move rapidly towards a low carbon future. Those companies and entities that establish a lead in this endeavour would meet with success in both a business and a societal context. Those that lag behind would suffer the risk of losses in the marketplace and loss of prestige and reputation. The same observation can be applied to nations and governments. There would be dramatic loss of political power and influence for nations that stand unmoved by the growing global consensus for “deep cuts” in emissions of GHGs with a sense of urgency.

Global Warming Turns Violence/War

Global warming escalates violence- resources, migration, arable land

Lee 9 [James R, Director, Mandala Projects School of International Service American University, January 4, Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/01/02/AR2009010202280.html]

We're used to thinking of climate change as an environmental problem, not a military one, but it's long past time to alter that mindset. Climate change may mean changes in Western lifestyles, but in some parts of the world, it will mean far more. Living in Washington, I may respond to global warming by buying a Prius, planting a tree or lowering my thermostat. But elsewhere, people will respond to climate change by building bomb shelters and buying guns. "There is every reason to believe that as the 21st century unfolds, the security story will be bound together with climate change," warns John Ashton, a veteran diplomat who is now the United Kingdom's first special envoy on climate change. "The last time the world faced a challenge this complex was during the Cold War. Yet the stakes this time are even higher because the enemy now is ourselves, the choices we make." Defense experts have also started to see the link between climate change and conflict. A 2007 CNA Corp. report, supervised by a dozen retired admirals and generals, warned that climate change could lead to political unrest in numerous badly hit countries, then perhaps to outright bloodshed and battle. One key factor that could stoke these tensions is massive migration as people flee increasingly uninhabitable areas, which would lead to border tensions, greater demands for rescue and evacuation services and disputes over essential resources. With these threats looming, the U.N. Security Council held a precedent-setting debate on climate change in April 2007 -- explicitly casting global warming as a national security issue. Global warming could lead to warfare in three different ways. The first is conflict arising from scarcity. As the world gets hotter and drier, glaciers will melt, and the amount of arable land will shrink. In turn, fresh water, plants, crops and cattle and other domestic animals will be harder to come by, thereby spurring competition and conflict over what's left. In extreme examples, a truly desiccated ecosystem could mean a complete evacuation of a hard-hit region. And the more people move, the more they will jostle with their new neighbors. Such displacement can arise either suddenly or slowly. The growth of the Sahara, for instance, took many millenniums; many thousands of years ago, people were slowly nudged out of the inland region of northern Africa and into such great river valleys as the Nile and the Niger. Over time, incremental but prolonged rises in sea levels will also gradually uproot hundreds of millions of people.

Global Warming Turns War

**Warming leads to widespread warfare that risks a major nuclear exchange.**

Pauchari 07 [R.K., IPCC chairman, December 10, p. 4, http://www.ipcc.ch/]

Neglect in protecting our heritage of natural resources could prove extremely harmful for the human race and for all species that share common space on planet earth. Indeed, there are many lessons in human history which provide adequate warning about the chaos and destruction that could take place if we remain guilty of myopic indifference to the progressive erosion and decline of nature’s resources. Much has been written, for instance, about the Maya civilization, which flourished during 250–950 AD, but collapsed largely as a result of serious and prolonged drought. Even earlier, some 4000 years ago a number of well-known Bronze Age cultures also crumbled extending from the Mediterranean to the Indus Valley, including the civilizations, which had blossomed in Mesopotamia. More recent examples of societies that collapsed or faced chaos on account of depletion or degradation of natural resources include the Khmer Empire in South East Asia, Eastern Island, and several others. Changes in climate have historically determined periods of peace as well as conflict. The recent work of David Zhang has, in fact, highlighted the link between temperature fluctuations, reduced agricultural production, and the frequency of warfare in Eastern China over the last millennium. Further, in recent years several groups have studied the link between climate and security. These have raised the threat of dramatic population migration, conflict, and war over water and other resources as well as a realignment of power among nations. Some also highlight the possibility of rising tensions between rich and poor nations, health problems caused particularly by water shortages, and crop failures as well as concerns over nuclear proliferation.

**Climate change causes war – 5 reasons.**

Pauchari 07 [R.K., IPCC chairman, December 10, p. 4, http://www.ipcc.ch/]

Peace can be defined as security and the secure access to resources that are essential for living. A disruption in such access could prove disruptive of peace. In this regard, climate change will have several implications, as numerous adverse impacts are expected for some populations in terms of: - access to clean water, - access to sufficient food, - stable health conditions, - ecosystem resources, - security of settlements.

\*\*\*OIL DEPENDENCE\*\*\*

Oil Dependence Turns Poverty

Oil Dependence increases poverty- aid given to subsidize oil industries instead

BIC 6 [November 13, Bank International Center, http://www.bicusa.org/en/Article.3014.aspx]

"Oil Aid" is the government’s practice of diverting taxpayer money, intended for poverty alleviation, to instead subsidize the international oil industry. According to the just-released Stern Report, climate change is “the greatest and widest-ranging market failure ever seen,” and it will have massive costs for the global economy. A major underlying reasons for this market failure is the perverse incentives and signals created by subsidies to the oil industry. Yet, as world leaders continue to search for solutions to the global problem of climate change this week in Nairobi, our public funds continue to flow into the pockets of the oil industry. Since 1992, the publicly-backed World Bank has provided more than $5 billion in subsidies to the oil industry, while devoting only five percent of its energy budget to clean, renewable energy sources. The U.S. government has spent even more money subsidizing Big Oil internationally. America’s misguided policies have fueled global warming, encouraged oil dependence, led to increased conflict, and increased poverty and debt. In addition, soaring oil prices are undermining the benefits of limited debt cancellation in many of the world’s most impoverished countries, particularly those that are oil importers. For example, the estimated cost of Tanzania’s oil imports rose from $190 million in 2002 to $480 million this year – for the same amount of oil. In comparison, debt cancellation is expected to only free up about $140 million for Tanzania in 2006. Furthermore, this cancellation doesn’t even touch on the debt held by large private banks in London, Paris and New York. At the same time, oil companies are raking in record profits, with ExxonMobil reporting profits of $4.7 million an hour in July 2006. Publicly-supported international institutions routinely protect the interests of private investors, whether they are oil companies or Wall Street banks that profit from their activities. In Chad, the World Bank provided critical assistance to a project led by ExxonMobil that has only exacerbated conflict and poverty. As oil started flowing, Chad’s authoritarian president increased military spending and ripped up an agreement with the World Bank that was supposed to ensure that oil revenues were used to fight poverty. At first the Bank objected, but it backed down as soon as the president threatened to cut off the oil if his terms were not accepted. In Ecuador, when the government wanted to use oil revenues to alleviate poverty, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank withheld promised new lending in protest, pushing the country to instead pay its debt to the IMF, World Bank and other creditors.

Oil Dependence Turns Asian/Middle East Stability

Oil dependence damns Asian, Middle East stability- bankrupts their economies

Richardson 7 [Michael, former Asia editor of the International Herald Tribune, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, http://www.iseas.edu.sg/tr12007.pdf]

An average of about 17 million barrels of crude oil transited the Hormuz strait each day in 2004, approximately 20% of the world’s daily consumption of oil.22 In 2004, this consumption amounted to 81.4 million barrels per day.23 But a significant amount was used in the countries that produced it and was not exported. However, the Persian Gulf is a huge energy export hub. Oil flows through the Hormuz strait account for about 40% of all the crude oil traded in the world each day.24 While some of this oil could be diverted into overland export pipelines, any interruption to the supply from the Persian Gulf by sea would panic markets, making prices soar. It would jolt the world economy which struggled for much of 2006 to absorb the impact of oil costing over $US60 a barrel.25 However, the repercussions would be most severe in Asia. The US gets about 22% of its oil imports from the Gulf. This meets about 12% of America’s total oil demand. Europe buys 30% of its imported oil from the Gulf.26 But most of the rest of the oil goes to Asia. Japan, for example, imports all its oil and 89% comes from the Middle East, defined as the Gulf oil exporters plus Oman and Yemen. Asia’s two emerging economic giants, China and India, are also heavily reliant on the Middle East for their oil, India for about 70% of its imports and China for around 46%. South Korea, Singapore, Taiwan, Thailand and the Philippines each depend on the Gulf for over 70% of their oil imports. Overall, the Middle East supplies nearly 75% of Asia’s import needs, making the region by far the most important customer. This relationship is expected to strengthen even further as Asian oil production plateaus and demand rises.27

Oil Dependence Turns Democracy/Terrorism

Oil dependence prevents democracy promotion and encourages terrorism

Luft 5 [Gal, Executive Director, Institute for The Analysis of Global Security, October 20, Congressional Testimony, http://foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/LuftTestimony051020.pdf]

Four years after September 11 it is essential that we view our geopolitical situation in the context of our oil dependence and realize that it will be extremely difficult to win the war on terror and spread democracy around the world as long as we continue to send petrodollars to those who do not share our vision and values. As long as the U.S. remains dependent on oil to the degree that its does today, its dependence on the Middle East will grow. The U.S. can no longer afford to postpone urgent action to strengthen its energy security and it must begin a bold process toward reducing its demand for oil.

Oil Dependence Turns Equality/Human Rights/Poverty/Patriarchy

Oil dependence increases societal inequity, human rights abuse, patriarchy and poverty

Luft 5 [Gal, Executive Director, Institute for The Analysis of Global Security, October 20, Congressional Testimony, http://foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/LuftTestimony051020.pdf]

It is a sad fact of life that most of the world's leading oil producing countries are either politically unstable and/or at serious odds with the U.S. With the exception of Canada and Norway, all major oil-exporting countries suffer from severe social illnesses due to their failure to absorb the shock of an oil jackpot and distribute the wealth on an equitable basis. This is not an accident. Countries rich in easily extracted and highly lucrative natural resources do not have to invest in education, productivity, or economic diversification. In addition, the government does not feel obligated to be accountable or transparent to its people and it denies them representation. They also have no imperative to educate women and grant them equal rights. While their oil wealth allows them to be the strategic pivot of world politics and economy, these “trust fund states’” record on human rights, political stability and compliance with international law is abysmal. Only three of the world's ten largest oil producers are democracies and only 9 percent of the world's proven oil reserves are in the hands of countries ranked free by Freedom House.

Oil Dependence Turns Democracy/Human Right/Prolif

Oil dependence hinders democracy, prolif, and human rights progress

Luft 5 [Gal, Executive Director, Institute for The Analysis of Global Security, October 20, Congressional Testimony, http://foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/LuftTestimony051020.pdf]

The Uzbek case is a harbinger of things to come. Unlike the U.S. which bars companies from doing business with some unsavory regimes China’s state-owned companies turn a blind eye to the way petrodollars are used by the local governments. In the global contest for oil the U.S. loses ground as a result of its pressure for government reform. Dictators who view democracy with suspicion don’t like to be pressured to reform especially when U.S. pressure can bring an end to their regimes. They much more prefer selling their oil to countries which turn a blind eye to the way petrodollars are used and who are willing to pay top dollars for oil and not lecture to them on democracy and human rights. The growing economic power of OPEC producers enables them to resist U.S. pressure on a variety of issues from human rights to nuclear proliferation. As the second largest oil producer and holder of 10 percent of the world’s proven oil reserves Iran is fully aware of the power of its oil. Its supreme leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei warned in 2002: “If the west did not receive oil, their factories would grind to a halt. This will shake the world!" The Iranians also know that oil is their insurance policy and that the best way to forestall U.S. efforts in the UN is by bedding themselves with energy hungry powers such as Japan and the two fastest growing energy consumers—China and India. After securing the support of a third of humanity the Iranians are unfazed by the pressure coming from the U.S. and the EU. Last month Iran’s President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad warned that Iran could wield the oil weapon if Tehran's case was sent to the Security Council for possible sanctions.

Oil Dependence Turns Transparency/Human Rights

Oil dependence fuels authoritarianism and corruption

Drezner 8 [Daniel W, professor of international politics at the Fletcher School at Tufts University, October 30, National Interest, http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=20096]

As the price of oil and other natural resources has risen over the past decade, Russia has become more dysfunctional, corrupt, dictatorial and assertive. And oil wealth everywhere—from Venezuela to Iran to Russia—breeds independence from and indifference to international norms, markets and rules.

Oil Dependence Turns Economy

Oil dependence causes US economic collapse

Duncan 7 [Garry Senior Executive for Accenture Finance and Performance Management, Business Times, November 12, http://business.timesonline.co.uk/tol/business/columnists/article2852863.ece]

We have all been pretty lucky so far. Over the past four years oil prices have soared ever higher, yet the world economy has just kept on motoring – literally and metaphorically. While the twin oil shocks of the Seventies brought global growth to a juddering halt and plunged the West into prolonged and painful recessions, things have been very different this time around – so far, at least. As oil prices have risen from a quite-hard-to-recall $30 a barrel as recently as the end of 2003 to $50 in 2004, $60 in 2005, $70 in 2006 and, in recent weeks, more than $90 a barrel, the global economy has cruised on almost regardless. The past few years have, in fact, marked the strongest sustained worldwide economic boom since the Seventies. Yet with analysts now sounding warnings that the cost of crude will almost inevitably breach $100 a barrel within days, the question is: can the world’s luck last? Are we, finally, reaching a tipping point where the relentless bad news from the black stuff will at last exact a real economic toll? Worryingly, it seems likely that we are, indeed, approaching just such a threshold. To understand why, we need to consider the key factors that have insulated the West’s oil-consuming nations from the impact of surging energy costs and whether we can continue to rely on these to shield our economies as crude prices climb into triple digits. The West can at least continue to draw considerable comfort from the knowledge that, essential to our economies though oil may be, our dependence on it has vastly diminished since the Seventies. What economists call the “oil intensity” of GDP – the amount of oil needed for each pound of national output we produce – has dropped to just 15 per cent of its level in 1970. Even gas-guzzling America needs only 13 per cent of the oil that it required in the Seventies for each dollar of output. And Europe’s “oil intensity” is a tenth of what it was back then. While this reduced reliance on crude is reassuring, two further vital factors that have helped the developed world to escape any serious economic fallout from dearer energy now fail to offer the protection that they have up to this point. First, the dynamic behind spiralling oil prices has shifted. Over the past few years, the driving force propelling the cost of crude to ever-greater highs has been the potent demand for energy created by a very robust global economy. Now, however, oil prices are continuing to climb even as prospects for world growth next year are deteriorating sharply. It is true that demand for oil continues to be reinforced by China’s burgeoning appetite for energy, with rising Chinese consumption taking up three quarters or more of any extra crude production. Yet it still seems apparent that, on top of this, significant concerns over supply and a very substantial speculative element are giving added impetus to prices. ING, the investment bank, notes that speculative long positions in the crude market, betting on oil reaching prices well in excess of $100, and as high as $200, are at extreme levels not seen for years. More serious than this changed dynamic behind oil’s rise, however, is that the surge in crude comes at a time when the US economy is dangerously vulnerable. The world economy’s resilience to oil’s rapid rise during this decade has owed a great deal to the ability of a robust American expansion to absorb shocks of all sorts. This time, though, this first line of defence for global growth looks very weak indeed. The US economy is already reeling from the impact of a brutal housing slump and the severe credit squeeze sparked by the resulting shake out in the sub-prime mortgage market. Now, America faces a further “double whammy” as the record cost of crude undermines growth while at the same time triggering a leap in US inflation that will seriously impede the Federal Reserve’s ability to respond with lower interest rates. As Capital Economics suggests in a timely report today, the malign combination of badly faltering growth with rising inflationary pressures now confronting the United States raises the spectre of another Seventies economic terror – stagflation. The risks to US growth are all too clear. The knock-on effects of oil prices could see the cost of gasoline for US motorists rise by as much as 50 per cent over the next couple of months. On top of that, the average American’s home heating bill is set to double this winter. Combined with the continued toll from the housing market’s downturn and the credit squeeze, it is far from implausible that these blows will see the US economy shrink in the final quarter of this year. Yet at the same time, the Fed is likely to have to grapple with a probable jump in inflation. Capital Economics forecasts that the effects of sharply increased energy costs could push headline US inflation to nearly 5 per cent, levels not seen for 16 years, by December. With the plunge in the dollar also stoking inflationary pressures in America, the almost inevitable consequence of this for the Fed will be that it will take longer to deliver the cuts in interest rates that will ultimately be necessary to shore up economic activity. In turn, that points to a more painful outcome, not just for America, but for the rest of the world.

Oil Prices Turn Democracy

High oil prices erodes stability in developing democracies- Putin, Chavez prove

Sandalow 7 [David, Staff Writer, Brookings Institute, January 22, ttp://www.brookings.edu/views/papers/fellows/sandalow20070122.pdf]

Oil wealth also corrodes democratic institutions. This dynamic is not inevitable, but it is widespread. A growing body of scholarly work explores this topic, concluding that oil wealth is strongly associated with corruption and authoritarian rule.7 A few examples underscore this trend. Bahrain, the Persian Gulf country with the smallest oil reserves, was also the first to hold free elections.8 As oil prices climbed in recent years, both Vladmir Putin and Hugo Chavez moved away from democratic institutions and toward more authoritarian rule. In Nigeria, oil abundance contributes to widespread corruption.

Oil Prices Turn Terrorism

Higher Oil Prices Fuel Terrorism

Biondo, 10 [Gabriella, St. Louis Globe, April 4, “http://www.globe-democrat.com/news/2010/mar/04/vets-launch-ad-tying-foreign-oil-money-terrorists/]

Operation Free, a coalition of veterans against using foreign oil, launched a new ad campaign in St. Louis Thursday tying U.S. foreign oil dependence to terrorist funding and attacks on U.S. soldiers. Operation Free representatives said they'll commit over $93,000 in Missouri as part of the nearly million dollar ad campaign – which ties Iran’s ability to create new and powerful weapons used against our troops to our addiction to oil. The Missouri ad calls on U.S. Sen. Claire McCaskill to pass comprehensive clean energy legislation that proponents say will stop funding of U.S. enemies. The ad is paid for by VoteVets.org Action Fund in coordination with Operation Free. The ad features Iraq War and U.S. Army Veteran Christopher Miller, who earned a Purple Heart as the result of an explosion from an Improvised Explosive Device (IED). Miller then highlights the destructive potential of a newer and more powerful explosive device, the Explosively Formed Projectile (EFP), which the coalition says was brought to Iraq from Iran and then used against U.S. troops. In the ad, Miller says every time the price of a barrel of oil increases $1, Iran makes another $1.5 billion, enhancing their ability to create weapons to be used against our troops. The world oil market depends greatly upon Iranian supply and the United States, as the top consumer of oil in the world, significantly drives up oil prices. The ad urges people to contact their congressional representatives seeking their support for energy independence legislation. The Missouri add ends with the message: “Tell Senator McCaskill: It's Time To Lead. Pass Clean Energy and Climate Legislation.” A coalition spokesperson says they're calling on McCaskill because she has been tentatively supportive of Clean Energy Climate legislation for a while and now. There is no current law, but the coalition said lawmakers in Washington are now drafting legislation and "McCaskill's voice is an important one to have a the table during the drafting and negotiation of the legislation." Laura Myron, spokesperson for U.S. Senator Claire McCaskill said, “Senator McCaskill has long said that our country’s dependence on foreign oil is a serious problem that, among other things, creates a national security risk, especially for our brave troops abroad. As the Senate considers energy legislation, she will keep this important aspect of the issue in mind.” Operation Free organizers said members are veterans and national security organizations dedicated to securing America with clean energy. They said U. S. dependence on foreign oil is funding our enemies, making America vulnerable, and causing destabilizing climate change.

Oil Prices Turn Heg

**High oil prices collapse heg**

**EAC 4/15** [Energy and Capital, newsletter, 2010, http://seekingalpha.com/article/198870-u-s-military-issues-peak-oil-warning]

If you haven't heard the latest peak oil warning, you should definitely take a minute to catch up. A few days ago, the U.S. military cautioned that the oil production capacity could disappear within two years, with major shortages occurring in 2015. It was the last place I thought I'd hear a peak oil alarm sound. To be honest, I would have expected the Department of Energy to send this out, rather than our military. Then again, I'm not really surprised that the U.S. military is losing sleep over the upcoming peak oil crisis. Think about it, dear reader. Here's some sobering reminders that our military is shackled to its thirst for crude oil: Out of the $20 billion the U.S. military spent on energy in 2008, 82.5% was to purchase crude oil. That's pretty scary considering oil prices collapsed during the second half of the year. The U.S. military consumes well over 300,000 barrels of oil every day The U.S. Department of Defense is (and always will be, in my humble opinion) the single largest energy consumer in the world. In 2007, the average U.S. soldier used up 15 gallons of oil per day, making the American fighting men and women the most oil-consuming soldiers ever to stand on a battlefield. If you have ever wondered how our U.S. military's energy consumption breaks down, check this out: When we're sliding down the backside of peak oil, the truth is that the U.S. military stands to lose more than anyone else.

Oil Prices Turns Russia/Global Econ

High oil prices empowers Russia and destroying the global economy

Nyquist 9 [J.R., Regular geopolitical columnist for Financial Sense Online August 21, http://www.financialsense.com/stormwatch/geo/pastanalysis/2009/0821.html]

In this way Russia strengthens Iran while weakening the position of Israel and the United States. It goes without saying that Moscow envisions the destabilization of the Middle East and the disruption of its main centers of oil production and shipping. Should Iran unleash biochemical warheads against Israel, there would be a further escalation of violence with the result that oil prices would reach -- according to Filin -- $200-$300 per barrell. The consequences, of course, would be devastating for the oil-dependent Western economies, which are already suffering from widespread financial troubles. On the Russian side, however, high oil prices would empower the Russian state while stabilizing the Iranian clerical regime under a defiant nationalist banner. Moscow also envisions the closing of the Strait of Hormuz, a massive mobilization of terrorists, and a fresh violence in Iraq. According to Filin, "Upon learning of the Arctic Sea and its cargo, a major Western state that favors a strategic partnership with Ukraine, was prepared to intercept the ship. But fearing this would cause a serious international scandal that would disrupt the 'reboot' of its relations with the Putin regime, the [aforesaid] state decided to act informally, which it did."