# **\*\*GUAM AFF\*\***

## \*\*1AC\*\*

### 1AC – Inherency

**Status quo realignment has been hampered by delays, uncertainty, and cost overruns – infrastructure upgrades are a prerequisite to successful relocation**

Matthews 6-12-12 (Laura, International Business Times reporter, June 12, 2012, “Guam Faces Uncertain Future As U.S. Delays Shifting Marines From Okinawa,” <http://www.ibtimes.com/articles/351154/20120612/guam-military-buildup-relocation-marines-okinawa-real.htm>, YX)

**The talks began approximately 10 years ago:** The United States and Japan had a [road map](http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-11-459R) for reducing the number of American forces in Okinawa while at the same time maintaining the U.S. presence in the Pacific region. Somewhere along the line, figures started coming out. The deal was that 8,600 Marines and their approximately 9,000 dependents would relocate to Guam from the Japanese island, **by a projected date of 2014**. Moving other military forces and equipment was supposed to follow later. Had everything gone according to plan, the Guam-based Department of Defense population would more than double to about 39,000 in the year 2020 from 15,000 in 2007. Population figures like these meant that **Guam**, a small, unincorporated U.S. territory in the western Pacific Ocean, would see the **equivalent of 20 years of growth in just a quarter of that time. Things needed to happen**, and they needed to happen **fast.** Infrastructure upgrades were a must, and there were housing needs not only for the incoming military population, but for the tens of thousands of off-island workers who would also flock to Guam to augment the local workforce. But things have been progressing slowly. A worldwide recession and mounting federal deficit have dented the relocation plans. Only about 5,000 Marines are Guam-bound, and the others will scatter throughout parts of the Pacific. Fewer Marines meant lower funding for Guam, and the dramatic decline in proposed population growth has had a huge impact on the island, especially in the real estate sector: there's now a large number of vacant housing units and industrial spaces. "We are still in a period in which the ramifications are still working their way through the real estate market, and it has been negative," said Nick Captain, owner of Captain Real Estate Group. The military buildup was an event anticipated since around 2006, and when the Record of Decision was signed about two years ago giving the go signal to start the buildup, things were looking up. It seemed the investments made during the time were going to pay off. "We had this anticipation and expectation, which has been totally shelved as far as we can see right now," Captain said. "It is very difficult to plan real estate decisions when you have such dramatic unknowns." Boom Or Bust? Depends On The Military The facts are evident in the real estate decline. According to Captain, in 2007, there was $686 million worth of real estate transactions on the island. Last year, there was less than $400 million. "**The buildup tends to delay any real estate decision-making. People are waiting to see what the military does**," Captain added. "I anticipate things will get worse if the status quo continues, if it is on a hold and very little is spent." Should the military buildup get back on track, Captain said Guam's real estate market will stabilize and grow again. He said the future of Guam's economy and the real estate market is tied to any military activity. "Real estate market follows the local economy," Captain said. "Job counts have declined, construction jobs have declined, and those are the jobs that have declined dramatically. Market conditions are weak, and when you have a negative or a flat-line job count, you will see a weak economy**. For now, the buildup doesn't seem like it is going to happen to the extent it was before**." Core Tech International Inc. and Younex International Corp. are currently the two major builders of housing developments constructed in preparation for the Marines. Core Tech's housing projects were built with the intention to accommodate about 8,500 temporary workers. They spread across several villages on the 212-square mile island. Younex's project, known as the Ukudu Workforce Village, was built to house up to 18,000 temporary workers. Since completing its facilities, Core Tech has turned a majority of its structures into affordable homes. There's also a partnership between it and the Government of Guam to use one of its facility as a temporary campus for Untalan Middle School, which is currently being rehabilitated. The Ukudu Workforce Village is unused. Younex management is exploring the best ways to use its facilities, said Sen. Tina Muna-Barnes, chairwoman of the Committee on Municipal Affairs, Tourism, Housing and Recreation. "Both companies have had to adapt to a stalled buildup process," Muna-Barnes said. "Once more information is available to our people, we will be in a better position to address any future temporary housing needs." Muna-Barnes said there's a challenge for both the public and private sectors to provide temporary workforce housing or real estate rentals, because much is dependent on decisions made outside of Guam's local government. "Our island and community will continue to focus our collaborative efforts to meet the growing demand for housing based on our anticipated organic growth," she said. Guam's housing and real estate sector is presently anticipating a need for 6,000 additional units by the year 2020. This is based solely on the island's organic growth. By 2030, there will be a need for another 7,000 units. **However, with the absence of concrete facts and figures pertaining to the off-base housing needs, it remains a challenge for Guam to prepare accordingly**. Utility Upgrades Needed Guam needs to construct a new wastewater treatment and disposal facility in the near future. What is uncertain, however, is whether Guam will have to pay for the cost of these upgrades or if the military will assume the responsibility. Naval Base Guam maintains its own wastewater treatment facility. If the new base is constructed and connected to the Guam Waterworks Authority's wastewater treatment facilities, chances are the federal government will subsidize a portion of the cost. Simon Sanchez, chairman of the Consolidated Commission on Utilities, the umbrella house for GWA and its sister company the Guam Power Authority, said the utilities are presuming a smaller buildup with reduced impact. They, too, are waiting on details from the DOD about the revised buildup plan. "The much-reduced personnel transfer should result in less upgrades to serve the new buildup," Sanchez said. "Until DOD gives us more details, we cannot estimate what will be needed to support their move. Right now, it's just a waiting game until DOD issues the required report on the revised buildup to Congress, supposedly summer time." Last month, the [U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee](http://www.levin.senate.gov/newsroom/press/release/senate-committee-on-armed-services-completes-markup-of-national-defense-authorization-act-for-fiscal-year-2013) proposed eliminating $139.4 million for Guam socioeconomic projects, because there wasn't any "detailed justification" and they were "ahead of need." These [projects](http://comptroller.defense.gov/defbudget/fy2012/budget_justification/pdfs/01_Operation_and_Maintenance/O_M_VOL_1_PARTS/O_M_VOL_1_BASE_PARTS/OEA_OP-5_FY_2012.pdf) were proposed by President Barack Obama and approved by the House of Representatives. They include some $106 million for water and wastewater upgrades. The Senate is awaiting [three reports](http://www.guampdn.com/article/20120526/NEWS01/205260303/Senate-panel-halt-buildup-cash) from the commander of the Marine Corps and the secretary of the Navy **and** a buildup master plan from **the secretary of defense.** Congress, therefore, is prevented from authorizing spending on the Marine relocation, and, consequently, the military cannot use the more than $800 million in Japanese funding available today. "The utilities are key to the buildup," said Heidi Ballendorf, public affairs director for the CCU. "The challenge right now is that until money gets appropriated to the utilities we cannot be sure of the size of the build up or exactly when it will happen. " Ballendorf said even with regular growth, the upgrades still need to happen, and both Guam's northern and southern wastewater treatment plants must move up to secondary treatment. A total of seven wastewater plants and pump stations need $300 million upgrades. "Whether the military comes, this is work we still need to do," Ballendorf said. "This system is definitely an ailing system and needs a lot of work." Guam produces about 55 million gallons of water per day -- plenty to sustain the growth and its 41,000 existing customers. There is plenty of power too, as GPA produces 260 to 280 megawatts daily. Increased Population Means Economic Increase Despite the current uncertainties, there is no doubt that the military buildup will bring a bounty of economic opportunities for Guam. When a recent training exercise brought 700 troops to Guam and another 200 to its neighbor island Tinian, estimates were that more than $1.3 million dollars in hotel revenue and about $750,000 in additional spending resulted from it. Muna-Barnes believes that with the buildup, the island will see an increase in the income tax collected from nonresidents and others working on Guam. "So while the numbers of Marines have been reduced significantly, there are still many possibilities for our economy to gain financially," she said. "A population increase of 4,700 nonresident military personnel will mean a substantial addition in revenue for our tourism economy" Though some lawmakers remain optimistic about such potential growth from the buildup, some hesitation remains as to whether Congress realizes that for the buildup to work, Guam must build its utility capacity, as mentioned, as well as other necessary infrastructure, such as roads. Guam Gov. Eddie Calvo expressed that hesitation when he met with Japanese officials last month. "Now that the number of Marines coming to Guam has been reduced and the financial commitments of both countries have been adjusted, what was once certain has now become uncertain and ambiguous," Calvo said. "We on Guam are left wondering whether anyone, even our own sovereign, will give Guam the practical financial offsets it needs to absorb the impact of the coming troops. "While the government of Japan is offering you assistance with your economy as you seek to reduce the U.S. presence of troops in Okinawa, we have to petition our federal government to do the same as it seeks to increase the U.S. presence of troops on Guam." Still, Calvo said these hiccups don't stop Guam from being patriotic. One third of the island is owned and occupied by the U.S. military. Guam also has one of the highest enlistment rates in the U.S. But for those in the real estate market, the Marine force reduction is difficult to swallow after many preparations were made. "We learned not to make real estate decisions on what the military says," Captain said. "You have to wait and see what they actually do."

### 1AC – Alliance (wars)

#### **Relations are at a watershed moment – negotiations have forced Japan to foot the bill – that undermines relations**

Japan Times 3/25/12 (“Japan asked to shell out extra $1 billion over marines' transfer to Guam”, [http://www.japantimes.co.jp/text/nn20120325b2.html //](http://www.japantimes.co.jp/text/nn20120325b2.html%20//) Veevz)

Washington is pushing Tokyo to pay an additional $1 billion over the transfer of U.S. Marines from Okinawa to Guam, reneging on an earlier pledge to shoulder the costs itself, sources close to bilateral relations said Saturday. Specifically, Japan has been asked to cover the equivalent of ¥82 billion in extra costs to construct American military facilities on the U.S. territory, despite a bilateral agreement to share the financial burden, the sources said. The request was initially made during a recent review of the realignment of American forces in Japan, and comes as the U.S. Congress cranks up the pressure on President Barack Obama to cut federal expenditures. On Friday, U.S. officials repeated the request during negotiations with Japanese government representatives in San Francisco, but Tokyo has been reluctant to agree so far. Japan instead is arguing that its share of the costs should be reduced because the United States announced earlier this month that 3,300 fewer marines will be transferred to Guam, following the realignment review, the sources said. Under a deal reached by the two sides over the marines' relocation, Japan will fund the construction of living facilities for their families, including schools, as well as buildings to house the U.S. military's command center on the Pacific island. The United States, meanwhile, will cover the costs of building military-related facilities, such as those used for training purposes. Japan's financial contribution over the marines' redeployment to Guam is effectively capped at $2.8 billion (about ¥230 billion), but this amount would be exceeded if it accepts the United States' latest request. On the other hand, Washington's expenses, capped at $4.2 billion (around ¥346 billion), probably would be reduced. In 2006, the two countries agreed to transfer 8,000 marines stationed in Okinawa Prefecture, which hosts the majority of U.S. military facilities in Japan, to Guam. However, the realignment review proposed that this figure be slashed to just 4,700 marines.

Realignment is key to resetting the bilateral alliance with Japan

Delgado 6/30/12 (Nick Delgado, KUAN – Guam’s News Network, “Guam briefing held on Capitol Hill”, <http://www.kuam.com/story/18921168/2012/06/30/guam-briefing-held-on-capitol-hill> // Veevz)

Guam – The House Foreign Affairs subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, and the National Bureau of Asian Research hosted a briefing titled, "Guam and U.S. Strategy in the Asia-Pacific" on Capitol Hill. Congresswoman Madeleine Bordallo gave brief remarks stating Guam plays pivotal roles in the United States' re-focus in our region. Bordallo spoke on the military realignment from Okinawa to Guam, and how the time to realign our forces has come. She adds, "Unfortunately, I believe those that are holding back on allowing the Department of Defense to spend Government of Japan and U.S. military construction funds are simply unconvinced that realignments in the region are necessary." The Guam Delegate says once we can get on with the realignment and begin to reduce the burden in Okinawa, then we can begin to shift our attention to other security matters in our region. She states if the realignment does not move forward, then we risk a more serious impact to our critical bilateral relations with the Japan government.

#### **Two internal links**

#### **A. Uncertainty**

Talmadge 10 (Eric Talmadge, Tokyo bureau chief of the Associated Press, 6/23/2010, “ US-Japan security pact turns 50, faces new strains”, [http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5islkPj\_84APsquFWNdqr2kuTwDQwD9GG68080 //](http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5islkPj_84APsquFWNdqr2kuTwDQwD9GG68080%20//) Veevz)

Uncertainty over a Marine base and plans to move thousands of U.S. troops to Guam are straining a post-World War II security alliance Japan and the United States set 50 years ago, but Tokyo's new leader said Tuesday he stands behind the pact. Prime Minister Naoto Kan said he sees the arrangement as a crucial means of maintaining the balance of power in Asia, where the economic and military rise of China is looming large, and vowed to stand behind it despite recent disputes with Washington. "Keeping our alliance with the United States contributes to peace in the region," Kan said in a televised question-and-answer session with other party leaders. "Stability helps the U.S.-Japan relationship, and that between China and Japan and, in turn, China and the United States."

#### **B. Japanese politics**

Ogoura 10 (Kazuo, political science professor at Aoyama Gakuin University,“Japan-U.S. relations cry out for new management, dialogue”, 6/13/10, [http://search.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/eo20100613ko.html //](http://search.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/eo20100613ko.html%20//) Veevz)

Ripples, frictions, uneasiness, concern and even dismay — these are the words by which most of the Japanese mass-media commentaries characterize present Japan-U.S. relations. Behind this phenomenon lies the impact from several issues. The problem of bases in Okinawa, particularly the so-called Futenma air base issue, is one. In this case there are two aspects of friction. The first was the change in the position of a new Japanese government divorced from an "agreement" that had been reached between the former LDP government of Japan and the Bush administration. The second aspect appears to be related to the series of "changes" in the position of the Japanese authorities, which has wavered between consideration for international strategy and and the strong resistance of the people in Okinawa. Somewhat related to the base issue is a question as to how to deal with the mitsuyaku (secret deals or agreements) between Japanese and American authorities over the Okinawa reversion. Though, in substance, the contents of the secret agreement, even if proved to be true, does not directly jeopardize Japan-U.S. strategic relations, the underlying political implication is rather serious. The existence of a secret agreement between the conservative government of Japan and the American administration is regarded by many Japanese as a typical example of insincerity toward and neglect of the people's wishes at the expense of military or strategic dealings between the two governments. In other words, popular support and more transparent decision-making are now required in dealing with politico-military issues between Japan and the U.S. Then comes former Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama's emphasis on the formation of an East Asia Community coupled with the concept of yuai or fraternity. Although neither the idea of an East Asian Community nor yuai should necessarily give rise to concern in the American mind, these concepts have been viewed by some observers on both sides of the Pacific as signs of the new Japanese administration's "inclination" toward less attachment to strategic considerations in international relations. Finally, there is on the side of Japan a vague feeling of being "bullied" by America (such as on the issue of the recall of Toyota cars in the U.S.) or of being increasingly marginalized or neglected in the wake of the rising Chinese power and the increasingly visible U.S.-China strategic partnership.

#### **Maintaining a strong U.S.-Japan alliance is key to deterring Chinese aggression and regional destabilization**

Tkacick 04 (John, Jr., Senior Research Fellow, July 13, 2004, Heritage Foundation, “China's New Challenge to the U.S.-Japan Alliance” <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2004/07/Chinas-New-Challenge-to-the-US-Japan-Alliance>, )

As Chinese warships and naval survey vessels ply Japanese waters hoping to stake their claim to potentially gas-rich seabeds, the United States is sending mixed signals to Japan on the U.S.-Japan alliance. Ambiguity in Washington may undermine Japanese confidence in the alliance-in itself, a major strategic goal for Beijing. Washington must now publicly support Japan, our most important ally in Asia, if it hopes to deter China from further adventurism in Japan's Exclusive Economic Zone. On Tuesday, July 6, Japanese antisubmarine aircraft spotted a Chinese naval survey vessel, the *Nandiao 411*, well within Japan's Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ). The Chinese foreign ministry declined to comment on the incursion, saying it had not received any report of naval survey activities. On July 13, Japanese coast guard cutters discovered a Chinese civilian research vessel, the *Xiangyanghong 9,* within the EEZ and engaged in survey operations for which it had not sought, much less obtained, Japanese government permission-a possible violation of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS).[[1]](http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2004/07/Chinas-New-Challenge-to-the-US-Japan-Alliance%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn1) Japanese aircraft ordered the vessel to leave the area, but the Chinese ship refused to respond. Even more ominously, on July 14, a Chinese naval vessel overtook a Japanese resource exploration ship inside the EEZ, forcing it to alter its route to avoid a collision.[[2]](http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2004/07/Chinas-New-Challenge-to-the-US-Japan-Alliance%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn2) The Chinese navy has made a habit of traversing Japanese waters for the past two years, and Chinese ships and submarines have been particularly assertive in the past year. In January, the Japanese government declassified a report that Chinese naval vessels had entered the EEZ six times during 2003 "to survey subsea routes for Chinese submarines to enter the Pacific." These incursions include two violations of Japan's territorial waters by Ming class submarines in the vicinity of Kagoshima at the southern tip of Kyushu. So far this year, Japan's Self Defense Forces have documented at least twelve violations of the EEZ, including three separate incursions northwest of the Senkaku Islands in May alone.Alarmed by China's presence in Japanese waters, Tokyo will soon dispatch a civilian survey vessel-looking for natural gas-to the area near the Senkaku Islands (which China calls "Diaoyutai") to assert its own EEZ rights. Beijing's foreign ministry protested this news, claiming that the EEZ is "disputed." It warned Tokyo not to take "any action that may imperil China's interest and complicate the current situation." The Chinese navy's sudden assertiveness-indeed aggressiveness-in Japanese waters is a test of the U.S.-Japan alliance. Washington must be careful not to confront this challenge with its traditional studied ambiguity. Ambiguous support for an ally against China's increasingly provocative territorial encroachments will encourage China to become more aggressive not just in Japanese waters, but also in the South China Sea and, of course, the Taiwan Strait.The status of the Senkakus is clear. Japan first claimed the uninhabited and unclaimed islets in question in 1895 to use their rocky outcroppings for maritime navigation aids. From that time through the end of World War II, they were administered as part of Japan's Okinawa prefecture. Upon the Japanese surrender, the United States administered the islets under a military occupation authority. In 1972, when the United States returned Okinawa to Japanese administration, the Senkakus were included in the reversion. There is, accordingly, no doubt that the United States has always regarded the islands as Japanese.China and Taiwan have expressed interest in the islands since only 1968, when a United Nations Economic Commission for Asia report suggested there may be petroleum deposits in the seabed near the islets. (No petroleum or gas deposits have since been detected in the area.) On June 11, 1971, the Republic of China on Taiwan formally claimed the islands. After the United States returned the islands to Japan in the 1972 Okinawa Reversion Agreement, China lodged a formal protest with the U.S. government. Eager not to alienate Beijing just as President Nixon was beginning his opening to China, the U.S. State Department announced that the Reversion Agreement "did not affect the sovereignty" over disputed islands. As recently as March 2004, the State Department accepted China's claims over the Senkakus as being equally valid as Japan's title. Still, in a stance known affectionately in Japan as the "Armitage Doctrine," U.S. officials have said that the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty covers "all territories under the administration of Japan" and there is no question that, as a matter of law-under the Reversion Agreement, the alliance treaty, and the terms of the U.S. military occupation of the Ryukyu island chain-that the Senkakus are indeed "under the administration of Japan." As such, any hostile activities against the islands would trigger the treaty.In this context, China's forays into the Senkakus seem designed to probe where the bedrock of the U.S.-Japan alliance begins-or if it is there at all. Of course, Chinese survey vessels are also mapping the ocean bottom for the benefit of the country's rapidly expanding submarine fleet.

**Failure to cement the alliance results in Korean, Taiwan, and Indo-Pak war – that goes nuclear**

Armitage et al., 2k (Richard L. Armitage et al., 2000 Kurt M.Campbell, Michael J. Green, Joseph S. Nye et al. fmr. Dep. Secretary of State, CSIS, CFR, JFK School of Government at Harvard (also contributed to by James A. Kelly, Pacific Forum, Center for Strategic and International Studies; Edward J. Lincoln, Brookings Institution; Robert A. Manning, Council on Foreign Relations; Kevin G. Nealer, Scowcroft Group; James J. Przystup, Institute for National Strategic Studies, National Defense University; “The United States and Japan: Advancing Toward a Mature Partnership”, Institute for National Strategic Studies Special Report, October, http://www.ndu.edu/inss/strforum/SR\_01/SR\_Japan.htm)

Asia, in the throes of historic change, should carry major weight in the calculus of American political, security, economic, and other interests. Accounting for 53 percent of the world’s population, 25 percent of the global economy, and nearly $600 billion annually in two-way trade with the United States, Asia is vital to American prosperity. Politically, from Japan and Australia, to the Philippines, South Korea, Taiwan, and Indonesia, countries across the region are demonstrating the universal appeal of democratic values. China is facing momentous social and economic changes, the consequences of which are not yet clear. Major war in Europe is inconceivable for at least a generation, but the prospects for conflict in Asia are far from remote. The region features some of the world’s largest and most modern armies, nuclear-armed major powers, and several nuclear-capable states. Hostilities that could directly involve the United States in a major conflict could occur at a moment’s notice on the Korean peninsula and in the Taiwan Strait. The Indian subcontinent is a major flashpoint. In each area, war has the potential of nuclear escalation. In addition, lingering turmoil in Indonesia, the world’s fourth-largest nation, threatens stability in Southeast Asia. The United States is tied to the region by a series of bilateral security alliances that remain the region’s de facto security architecture. In this promising but also potentially dangerous setting, the U.S.-Japan bilateral relationship is more important than ever. With the world’s second-largest economy and a well- equipped and competent military, and as our democratic ally, Japan remains the keystone of the U.S. involvement in Asia. The U.S.-Japan alliance is central to America’s global security strategy.

They all escalate to extinction –

A) China

Cheong 2k (Ching, Senior Writer at the Strait Times, “No one gains in a war over Taiwan,” June 25th, Lexis)

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 civilization.

#### **B) North Korea**

Hayes and Green, 10 - \*Victoria University AND \*\*Executive Director of the Nautilus Institute (Peter and Michael, “-“The Path Not Taken, the Way Still Open: Denuclearizing the Korean Peninsula and Northeast Asia”, 1/5, http://www.nautilus.org/fora/security/10001HayesHamalGreen.pdf)

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

#### **C) India-Pakistan**

GSN, 3-16-2010 [Global Security Newswire, “Regional Nuclear War Could Devastate World Population, Report Warns,” http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\_20100315\_4193.php]

Computer modeling suggests a nuclear exchange between India and Pakistan would block out the sun with large amounts of airborne debris, disrupting global agriculture and leading to the starvation of around 1 billion people, *Scientific American* reported in its January issue (see *GSN*, March 4). The nuclear winter scenario assumes that cities and industrial zones in each nation would be hit by 50 bombs the size of the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima, Japan, in World War II. Although some analysts have suggested a nuclear exchange would involve fewer weapons, researchers who created the computer models contended that the panic from an initial nuclear exchange could cause a conflict to quickly escalate. Pakistan, especially, might attempt to fire all of its nuclear weapons in case India's conventional forces overtake the country's military sites, according to Peter Lavoy, an analyst with the Naval Postgraduate School. The nuclear blasts and subsequent blazes and radiation could kill more than 20 million people in India and Pakistan, according to the article. Assuming that each of the 100 bombs would burn an area equivalent to that seen at Hiroshima, U.S. researchers determined that the weapons used against Pakistan would generate 3 million metric tons of smoke and the bombs dropped on India would produce 4 million metric tons of smoke. Winds would blow the material around the world, covering the atmosphere over all continents within two weeks. The reduction in sunlight would cause temperatures to drop by 2.3 degrees Fahrenheit for several years and precipitation to drop by one-tenth. The climate changes and other environmental effects of the nuclear war would have a devastating affect on crop yields unless farmers prepared for such an occurrence in advance. The observed effects of volcano eruptions, smoke from forest fires and other events support the findings of the computer modeling, the researchers said. "A nuclear war could trigger declines in yield nearly everywhere at once, and a worldwide panic could bring the global agricultural trading system to a halt, with severe shortages in many places. Around 1 billion people worldwide who now live on marginal food supplies would be directly threatened with starvation by a nuclear war between India and Pakistan or between other regional nuclear powers," wrote Alan Robock, a climatology professor at Rutgers University in New Jersey, and Owen Brian Toon, head of the Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences Department at the University of Colorado at Boulder.

### 1AC – Guam Economy (trade)

#### **Guam’s economy is stagnating**

**Guam Economic Development Authority ‘11** (Guam Economic Development Authority Bureau of Statistics and Plans, University of Guam, Pacific Center for Economic Initiatives, “Guam Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy,”

<http://www.bsp.guam.gov/Guam%202011%20Comprehensive%20Economic%20Development%20Strategy.pdf>, YX)

**Guam has seen a precipitous drop in revenues from three major sectors of the economy (tourism, military/federal, other**). As a result of this drop, total government revenues have dropped 49% from $660 million in the mid-1990’s to an estimated $340 million in 2010. This condition has led to very serious shortcomings in the delivery of basic public services and raises major concerns in public safety, health, education, and employment. Other economic indicators paint an equally dismal picture. Reduction in government expenditures has not kept pace with the island’s shrinking economy. The estimates for Guam show that real GDP -- GDP adjusted to remove price changes -- increased 1.7% to $3.9 billion in 2009 after increasing 0.5% in 2008.

#### Timely realignment is key to jumpstart growth – three reasons

* Military spending is a quarter of Guam’s GDP
* Relocation increases population by 20%
* We control uniqueness – foreign investor pullout, businesses shrinking, tourism stagnating now

AFP 2-29-12 (Agence France-Presse, February 29, 2012, “Economy Suffers as Guam Waits for [US Marines](http://www.thejakartaglobe.com/),” <http://www.thejakartaglobe.com/business/economy-suffers-as-guam-waits-for-us-marines/501418>, YX)

Hagatna, Guam. Row upon row of dormitories lie empty at the Ukudu housing complex in northern Guam amid uncertainty over US plans to relocate thousands of Marines from Japan to the Pacific island nation. Work on the project began two years ago, in anticipation of an economic boom in Guam following a 2006 agreement between Washington and Tokyo to transfer 8,000 Marines and 9,000 dependents from the Japanese island of Okinawa. Designed to accommodate up to 18,000 temporary workers needed to service the US military’s increased presence, the $200-million complex includes space for an on-site fire station, medical clinic, transport hub and police station. The vast majority of its buildings stand empty, however, a symbol of the lengthy delays and constant changes to the Marine transfer plan that have cast a pall of uncertainty over Guam’s economy. Ukudu’s developer, South Korean-owned Younex International Enterprises, said it had adjusted its [business plan](http://www.thejakartaglobe.com/) and was now leasing what space it could in the vast complex to workers who were not linked to the military build-up. “There are existing construction projects that are already in progress. These projects may not be related to the military build-up but they require care (accommodation) for workers,” Younex vice-president David Tydingco said. Guam, a US territory, already houses US Navy and Air Forces bases, with [US military](http://www.thejakartaglobe.com/) spending accounting for about a quarter of its gross domestic product in 2010, according to the US Department of Interior (DOI). The DOI predicted last year that the military build-up would boost Guam’s 180,000-strong population by 20 percent and usher in “robust expansion” for the economy. But deadlines for the transfer have continually changed in recent years and the latest agreement between the US and Japan will reportedly involve only 4,700 Marines moving to Guam. The scale-down of the Marines’ Guam transfer comes against the backdrop of a drastic reduction in the US defense budget and protracted talks between Washington and Tokyo over how the cost of the move from Okinawa will be split. Real estate analyst Nicholas Captain said the prospect of the Marines’ presence being slashed was a massive shock to a market already weakened by years of “it’s off, it’s on” speculation about the military’s intentions. “Many recent investments designed to capitalize on the build-up, especially worker housing and industrial property, have suffered from weak demand,” he said, adding that real estate sales in Guam “tanked” late last year. Some foreign investors have pulled out of projects and Guam Chamber of Commerce president David Leddy said [local businesses](http://www.thejakartaglobe.com/) were tightening their belts as they assessed the situation. “When confronted with change, businesses must reinvent themselves in order to remain competitive and keep their doors open,” he said. “This may entail a [business](http://www.thejakartaglobe.com/) tightening up to live within its means or adjusting its strategic goals to coincide with a more realistic timeline.” **Leddy said businesses needed to concentrate on Guam’s other major economic driver, tourism, rather than waiting for a windfall from the military’s plans. But Guam’s tourism market relies on Japan for 70 percent of its visitors and has slowed in the wake of the earthquake and tsunami disasters last March, despite attempts to attract more Chinese and Russian tourists**. Guam Contractors Association president James Martinez said businesses “knew the risks” surrounding the ever-changing military plan but was hopeful investment would pick up once the Marines finally began arriving. “Companies that were here mainly to avail themselves of the military build-up may have pulled out of Guam with the intent to return once they see that military construction is back on track,” he said.

#### **Infrastructure is a unique economic engine**

PIR 12 (Pacific Islands Report, 5/28/12, “U.S. Secretary Of Transportation Visits Guam Port”,http://pidp.org/pireport/2012/May/05-28-04.htm // Veevz )

U.S. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood yesterday visited the Jose D. Leon Guerrero Commercial Port, the island's only seaport point of entry for civilian goods.¶ LaHood's trip, which primarily is to speak at today's University of Guam graduation, allowed the local government to show him a seaport that awaits tens of millions of dollars in funding to renovate its old facilities and keep its wharf from collapsing because of structural problems from previous earthquakes.¶ LaHood agrees the Port Authority's facilities need an upgrade.¶ "It is an antiquated port and it needs to get into the 21st century for the island to continue to grow," LaHood said.¶ The Port Authority has identified close to $200 million in projects to modernize the port, but the local government has not firmed up how to fund all of the projects. The Maritime Administration, which is under the U.S. Transportation Department, is overseeing about $50 million in Defense Department funding for the Port to be ready for an expected increase in incoming goods for the military buildup.¶ Gov. Eddie Calvo said it was an honor to have LaHood on Guam because it's "not every day" a high-ranking government official visits Guam.¶ Calvo said he hopes LaHood will be able to speak to his colleagues in Washington, D.C., about Guam's transportation infrastructure funding needs.¶ LaHood said his department has invested in 19 ports throughout the states as part of President Barack Obama's National Export Initiative, an effort to double U.S. exports by the end of 2014 and support millions of American jobs.¶ After touring the island's seaport, LaHood said the Department of Transportation would become a good partner as the Port Authority modernizes its facilities.¶ "We support the port. It is an economic engine for the community. Investing in the port will create jobs and only be a good thing for Guam," LaHood said.

#### **Growth boosts trade relations**

**Calvo et. al. ‘8** (Calvo, Fisher, and Jacob, law firm that specializes in civil litigation, international law, finance, real estate, land use and development, communications, business licensing, bank regulation and licensing, and government regulation, May 28, 2008, “U.S. Military Buildup and Rising Asian Economy Converge to Reshape Guam,” <http://calvofisher.com/news/20080528-military-buildup>)

ECONOMIC BOOM TIMES IN THE PACIFIC As Guam prepares to assume its new role as the military’s principal operational platform in the Western Pacific, it at the same time anticipates a significant uptick in both direct [investment](http://calvofisher.com/news/20080528-military-buildup) and commercial activity arising out of its trade relationships with the rest of East Asia. Since the mid 1970s, Guam’s economic fortunes have moved in close tandem with the Japanese economy and the resultant inflow of Japanese tourists and investment money. After slumping into a prolonged recession following the collapse of its real estate market in the early 1990s, Japan appears to have finally regained its feet. In Guam, this is manifest in the steady increase in Japanese visitors to the island, which in 2008 will likely exceed the high water mark of 1.1 million set in 1997. Japan has also reemerged as a major investor on Guam, principally in the hotel and resort sector. In fact, Tokyo-based Ken Corp.and its affiliates, which began investing in Guam in 2005, now own some of the finest oceanfront [hotels](http://calvofisher.com/news/20080528-military-buildup) on Guam, including luxury resorts such as the Hilton Guam Resort and Spa, the Hyatt Regency Guam, and the Sheraton Laguna Guam Resort. Attorneys at Calvo & Clark handled all of these transactions. But unlike the boom which spurred much of the island’s new growth in the late 1980s, investment in Guam this time out will be supported by more than Japan alone. In addition to mature economies such as Korea and Taiwan, the rapid growth of China, the Philippines and Vietnam, all within a four-hour flight to Guam, should contribute greatly along with Japan toward boosting Guam’s trade, tourism and investment sectors. A U.S. JURISDICTION IN THE HEART OF ASIA Guam’s attraction to foreign investment is further enhanced by the fact that, as a U.S. jurisdiction, it is governed by a well developed body of statutory and common law. Investors and creditors that put their assets in play in Guam know that their contract rights will be fairly and expeditiously enforced. In addition to its court system, Guam is unique among emerging East Asian economies, in that it does not restrict the sale of land to native or indigenous persons or businesses.

#### **The link is reverse causal – failure to realign wrecks Guam’s economy**

**Guam Economic Development Authority ‘11** (Guam Economic Development Authority Bureau of Statistics and Plans, University of Guam, Pacific Center for Economic Initiatives, “Guam Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy,”

<http://www.bsp.guam.gov/Guam%202011%20Comprehensive%20Economic%20Development%20Strategy.pdf>, YX)

The U.S. Department of Defense has maintained bases on Guam since the turn of the century. After the end of World War II, Guam became the site for major naval and air force facilities in support of the U.S. defense commitments in the Asia-Pacific region. In Fiscal 1993, military expenditures in Guam amounted to $748 million, making the defense sector second to only tourism in terms of expenditures and employment. In that year, there were 10,600 active military personnel and 11,400 dependents living on the island. Since 1993, however, Guam has experienced a significant decrease in military activity beginning with the Base Realignment and Closure Commission’s (BRACC) recommendations in 1995. BRACC '95 recommended closure of the Naval Air Station (NAS), the Naval Ship Repair Facility (SRF), the realignment (downsizing) of the Naval Activities Guam, the "disestablishment" of the Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, and the reassignment of naval air units, formerly slated to be transferred from NAS to Andersen AFB, to locations outside of Guam. The economic impact of these base closures, unit transfers, and scaled-back activities has resulted in direct job losses of approximately 4,800 jobs (i.e. 3,500 federal civilian jobs and 1,300 military positions). In terms of lost income, cumulative current dollar losses to the Gross Island Product for the period 1996-1999 has been estimated at $942 million. In terms of the rapidity of job loss, more than 60 % of the jobs were lost within two years, with the balance being lost in the following two years. Considering indirect job losses related to BRACC actions (i.e., those jobs lost to the multiplier effect of direct job income losses), it is estimated that another 2,011 jobs were lost, bringing the total decline in local jobs to 6,800. The loss of 6,800 direct and indirect jobs is very significant, 29 especially when considering that many of these jobs were high-paying, skilled, professional, and managerial positions. Furthermore, the cumulative number of jobs lost is equivalent to approximately 10 % of Guam's total workforce. While the impact on the economy in the short-term has been grim, particularly to those losing jobs and to the Government of Guam managers faced with major revenue losses. It had been anticipated that in the long- run, military downsizing might result in the kinds of concrete local actions needed to further stimulate private sector development (e.g., income tax reform, privatization of selected government operations, increased public sector fiscal discipline coupled with the upgrading of labor productivity while limiting the growth of payrolls and number of public hires). While actions to stimulate private sector development did occur, it has become increasingly apparent that a continued military presence is a significant component of Guam’s economy.

**This bolsters Asian-Pacific trade**
**Calvo ‘11** (Eddie, Governor of Guam, quoted and paraphrased by Kevin Kerrigan, writer for the Guam News, 9-27-11, “[Governor's Weekly Address: A Case for Guam's Economic as Well as Strategic Importance](http://mail.pacificnewscenter.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=17402:governors-weekly-address&catid=45:guam-news&Itemid=156),”

An Open Message to Members of Congress To Support the Agreed Implementation Plan By Eddie Baza Calvo, Governor of Guam Dear Members of Congress, As you go about restructuring the finances of the United States government, I ask that you place due consideration to a well-researched, well-justified national security strategy that involves, at its center, a realignment of armed forces to Guam. As it has been planned for the past decade, it is central to United States and global security for the next century. The outcome of this strategy will sustain our security well beyond the effects of the current budget malaise in Washington. I appreciate what you and the President are doing. You are trying to make very hard decisions that will keep the people’s federal government solvent for generations to come. The question we, as Americans, ask is this: “Is our security priceless?” There’s a simple answer to this. “Of course not.” Otherwise, cutting the security budget wouldn’t be a debate in Congress. What then lingers is, ‘how much is Congress willing to invest to keep the American people [safe](http://mail.pacificnewscenter.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=17402:governors-weekly-address&catid=45:guam-news&Itemid=156)? How much will Congress invest so that future generations won’t be burdened with expensive mistakes made today?’ The funding constraints should not be limited to what is happening now. It should anticipate how the decisions made today will affect spending in the future. I know Guam is far out of sight and out of mind for many Americans, and perhaps for many Congressmen and Senators. But I think it’s important you know why Guam has always been important to the country. Yes, we contribute. Yes, we are loyal and proud Americans, grateful for our citizenship and our inclusion into the Union, albeit through an unincorporated territorial status. But from the conquest of Guam in 1898 from Spain, it’s been clear that Guam is critical to American interests because of its location. Guam may be 12 flight hours from Los Angeles, but in our backyard is the fastest-growing region in the world. This includes some of the greatest threats to American security, some with missiles that clearly can reach our island and the host of American allies in Asia. No American community is closer to all of this than Guam. Our location hasn’t changed. What has changed is the world around our piece of American Pacific paradise. Guam is no longer important just for national security. The countries around us will no longer be considered third-world trouble spots as they’ve been known through the Cold War and after. No. Not in the coming century or the foreseeable future. You see, nations once ruled by autocratic leaders have since paved the way for democratic rule. For decades, Japan, South Korea, China, Taiwan, Singapore, India, the Philippines, Malaysia and Indonesia have been investing heavily in their infrastructure and in education. After some time, they have successfully crafted emerging economies built by the ingenuity of their unique systems of government interacting with the private sector. They created human resources that are on the cutting edge of technology, diplomacy and, soon enough, military emergence. The emerging economic powers of the world are right in our backyard. And because of the huge U.S. trade deficit, they are holding mountains of U.S. money. Our country imports Asian goods faster than we export to them. That trend can continue, or, we can start reversing it by breaking the link in that chain. We can begin to send more Asian capital to America through the center of its Pacific connection – Guam. From our shores, we can export tourism, fiber-optic connectivity, transshipment of Asian goods and much more. The spending of Asian capital through our island will mean one thing for the country: offset of the trade imbalance that means more job opportunities for the American people who will benefit from the industries involved. Guam may be far away, but it is linked as closely to the federal banking system as Dallas, Jackson, Seattle or any other U.S. city is. We are America in Asia. Think of Guam as America’s gateway to Asia, and Asia’s gateway to our country. This is what we can do for our country if the military realignment is allowed to continue. The crafters of this strategy I’m sure did not develop it in the vacuum of Defense posture for the generation of yesterday and today. The need for stronger military presence in Asia, on American soil, runs the gamut of United States military, economic, political and diplomatic interests for generations to come. This isn’t just about the building of a base. This is about the future of U.S. strength in the fastest-growing part of the world. We are prepared to do our part for the country… for the future of the American people in what should be another American century of prosperity. All you have to do is make the investment. I respectfully ask the Congress to give due consideration to the U.S. Departments of State and Defense as this realignment moves forward. Please make the investment into the Agreed Implementation Plan. Your decisions will span the prosperity of American generations who have yet to be born. [Thank](http://mail.pacificnewscenter.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=17402:governors-weekly-address&catid=45:guam-news&Itemid=156) you and God bless the United States of America.

#### **Solves global economic collapse, resource wars, the environment, genocides, biological and nuclear terrorism, global war and extinction**

**Panzner ‘9** (Michael Panzner, Prof. at the New York Institute of Finance, 25-year veteran of the global stock, bond, and currency markets who has worked in New York and London for HSBC, Soros Funds, ABN Amro, Dresdner Bank, and JPMorgan Chase, Financial Armageddon: Protect Your Future from Economic Collapse, 2009, p. 136-138)

Continuing calls for curbs on the flow of finance and trade will inspire the United States and other nations to spew forth protectionist legislation like the notorious Smoot-Hawley bill. Introduced at the start of the Great Depression, it triggered a series of tit-for-tat economic responses, which many commentators believe helped turn a serious economic downturn into a prolonged and devastating global disaster. But if history is any guide, those lessons will have been long forgotten during the next collapse. Eventually, fed by a mood of desperation and growing public anger, restrictions on trade, finance, investment, and immigration will almost certainly intensify. Authorities and ordinary citizens will likely scrutinize the cross-border movement of Americans and outsiders alike, and lawmakers may even call for a general crackdown on nonessential travel. Meanwhile, many nations will make transporting or sending funds to other countries exceedingly difficult. As desperate officials try to limit the fallout from decades of ill-conceived, corrupt, and reckless policies, they will introduce controls on foreign exchange. Foreign individuals and companies seeking to acquire certain American infrastructure assets, or trying to buy property and other assets on the cheap thanks to a rapidly depreciating dollar, will be stymied by limits on investment by noncitizens. Those efforts will cause spasms to ripple across economies and markets, disrupting global payment, settlement, and clearing mechanisms. All of this will, of course, continue to undermine business confidence and consumer spending. In a world of lockouts and lockdowns, any link that transmits systemic financial pressures across markets through arbitrage or portfolio-based risk management, or that allows diseases to be easily spread from one country to the next by tourists and wildlife, or that otherwise facilitates unwelcome exchanges of any kind will be viewed with suspicion and dealt with accordingly. **The rise in isolationism and protectionism will bring about ever more heated arguments and dangerous confrontations over shared sources of oil, gas, and other key commodities** as well as factors of production that must, out of necessity, be acquired from less-than-friendly nations. Whether involving raw materials used in strategic industries or basic necessities such as food, water, and energy, efforts to secure adequate supplies will take increasing precedence in a world where demand seems constantly out of kilter with supply. **Disputes over the misuse, overuse, and pollution of the environment and natural resources will become more commonplace**. **Around the world, such tensions will give rise to full-scale military encounters, often with minimal provocation**. In some instances, **economic conditions will serve as a convenient pretext for conflicts that stem from cultural and religious differences**. Alternatively, nations may look to divert attention away from domestic problems by channeling frustration and populist sentiment toward other countries and cultures. **Enabled by cheap technology and the waning threat of American retribution, terrorist groups will likely boost the frequency and scale of their horrifying attacks, bringing the threat of random violence to a whole new level**. **Turbulent conditions will encourage aggressive saber rattling and interdictions by rogue nations running amok**. Age-old clashes will also take on a new, more heated sense of urgency. **China will likely assume an increasingly belligerent posture toward Taiwan, while Iran may embark on overt colonization of its neighbors in the Mideast**. Israel, for its part, may look to draw a dwindling list of allies from around the world into a growing number of conflicts. Some observers, like John Mearsheimer, a political scientist at the University of Chicago, have even speculated that an “intense confrontation” between the United States and China is “inevitable” at some point. **More than a few disputes will turn out to be almost wholly ideological**. **Growing cultural and religious differences will be transformed from wars of words to battles soaked in blood**. **Long-simmering resentments could also degenerate quickly, spurring the basest of human instincts and triggering genocidal acts**. **Terrorists employing biological or nuclear weapons will vie with conventional forces using jets, cruise missiles, and bunker-busting bombs to cause widespread destruction**. Many will interpret stepped-up conflicts between Muslims and Western societies as **the beginnings of a new world war**.

#### **Independently, economic interdependence makes war structurally impossible**

**Brooks 2K** (Jason Brooks, Department of Journalism at Carleton University, May 1, 2000, Garvey Contest Essay, “Make Trade, Not War,” http://www.independent.org/students/garvey/essay.asp?id=1456)

Free trade is, in one sense, like a nuclear weapon. Which seems strange to say because trade is associated with peace and prosperity, while nuclear weapons are synonymous with apocalypse and terror. But here is how they are alike: they both prevent war by making it more costly. A strong argument exists that the only reason the Cold War never got “hot” between the United States and the Soviet Union was that nuclear weapons made outright conflict unthinkable. **Trade**, in a similar way, **binds** the fortunes of **people** in the world **together. It is the best assurance of peace**. By forging bonds between customers and suppliers around the world, **trade gives citizens a vested interest in the wellbeing of people in other countries—war becomes a matter of mutual assured destruction**, if you will. **With trade, a war abroad will have fallout at home**. But while trade has the deterrent effects of powerful weapons, is far preferable because of its other advantages. Where weapons are expensive, free trade brings prosperity and freedom. Where weapons bring terror, **free trade fosters harmony and encourages people to resolve disputes without violence**. Richard Cobden, a nineteenth century British industrialist and politician, often argued in favor of trade over armaments to discourage war. His recipe for peace remains as true today as it was more than 150 years ago: “The more any nation traffics abroad upon free and honest principles, the less it will be in danger of wars.” Free trade is indeed the wellspring of peace.

### 1AC – Force Posture (Asian war)

#### Infrastructure upgrades are critical to our deterrence posture

DOD 10 (Department of Defense Report --- Department of the Navy, Department of Defense Department of the Army, Department of Defense. “RECORD OF DECISION for Guam and CNMI Military Relocation including Relocating Marines from Okinawa Transient Nuclear Aircraft Carrier Berth Air and Missile Defense Task Force”, September 10, <http://www.guampdn.com/assets/pdf/M0164364922.PDF> // Veevz)

As a result of efforts to redefine the United States (U.S.) defense posture in the Pacific region and the U.S. alliance with Japan, a portion of U.S. Marine Corps forces currently located in Okinawa, Japan will be relocated to Guam. The overarching purpose of the proposed actions is to locate U.S. military forces to meet international agreement and treaty requirements and to fulfill U.S. national security policy requirements to provide mutual defense, deter aggression, and dissuade coercion in the Western Pacific Region. The proposed actions will meet the following criteria based on U.S. policy, international agreements, and treaties: • Position U.S. forces to defend the homeland including the U.S. Pacific territories • Locate U.S. forces within a timely response range • Maintain regional stability, peace and security • Maintain flexibility to respond to regional threats • Provide a powerful U.S. presence in the Pacific region • Increase aircraft carrier presence in the Western Pacific • Defend U.S., Japan, and other allies’ interests • Provide capabilities that enhance mobility to meet contingencies around the world • Have a strong local command and control structure • Protect the territory of Guam and the U.S. forces and allies on Guam from all classes and ranges of air and ballistic missile threats. From a global strategic perspective, the U.S. maintains military capabilities in the Western Pacific to support U.S. and regional security, economic and political interests, and to fulfill treaty and alliance agreements. The Guam and CNMI Military Relocation program proposes distinct, yet related actions to support this position. The actions are the relocation of Marine Corps forces from Okinawa to Guam, Marine Corps training activities on Tinian, construction and operation of a Navy transient nuclear aircraft carrier wharf in Guam, and establishment and operation of an AMDTF on Guam. In addition, roadway and utility improvements are necessary to support the previously listed actions. Each component has an independent purpose and an independent utility. Likewise, the decisions on each component are independent of the others.

#### Guam deterrence solves every war

Kamiya 12 (Matake Kamiya is Professor of International Relations at the National Defense Academy of Japan. He was a main author of the report Strategic Implications of an Ongoing Buildup of the US Bases in Guam for Japan, which the Research Institute for Peace and Security published in 2007, 6/20/12, “The Relocation of US Marines from Okinawa to Guam: Strategic Implications for Japan”, [http://www.asianz.org.nz/our-work/track-2/opinions-essays/matake-kamiya //](http://www.asianz.org.nz/our-work/track-2/opinions-essays/matake-kamiya%20//) Veevz)

How should we assess the impact of the relocation on Japan's security? The planned relocation is part of both the ongoing build up of US bases in Guam and the realignment of US forces in Japan. Japan's financial support for the relocation (about $6 billion) will cover almost 40% of the entire estimated cost of the planned build up of the US' Guam bases (about $15 billion). It is not appropriate to assess the impact on Japan's security of the relocation alone. It is necessary to evaluate the strategic implications for Japan of the entire scheme of the build up, the realignment, and the relocation. To make a long story short, this entire scheme could do more than maintain the level of deterrence. It represents a singular opportunity for Japan to enhance its security. While the strengthened Guam bases and the relocated Marines there will enhance the capability of the US military to intervene in the vast area from the West Pacific to the Middle East and the east coast of Africa, they could serve as a particularly useful tool to support stability in the Asia-Pacific region. Guam is located close enough to the "hot spots" in Asia, including the Korean Peninsula and the Taiwan Strait, to be vital to any conceivable conflicts, but far enough from mainland Asia to preclude attacks from other countries in the region (except for attacks by ballistic missiles). The bases there could also be useful to the United States and its allies in preparing for China's build up of its navy's blue-water capability. As for the US capability to provide defence support for Japan, too, the overall impact of the ongoing scheme on it could be positive. According to the USFJ realignment plan, the command functions as well as the military capabilities of the USFJ (such as missile defence) will be strengthened. In Okinawa, the Marine units on high combat readiness will remain after the relocation. The USFJ will maintain its capability to support Japan in the event of a military clash between Japan and China over the Senkaku Islands or in the East China Sea. At the same time, the USFJ realignment plan includes various ways to alleviate base-related issues in local communities in Japan, including but not limited to the relocation of the Marines in Okinawa to Guam. Such measures will enhance the Japanese people's support of the alliance with the United States.

#### **African stability causes nuclear war**

**Glick 7**

 Caroline Glick 7, deputy managing editor of The Jerusalem Post, Senior Fellow for Middle East Affairs of the Center for Security Policy, “Condi's African holiday”, December 11, [http://www.rightsidenews.com/20071211309/editorial/us-opinion-and-editorial/our-world-condis-african-holiday.html](http://www.rightsidenews.com/20071211309/editorial/us-opinion-and-editorial/our-world-condis-african-holiday.html%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank)

**The Horn of Africa is a dangerous and strategically vital** place. **Small wars,** which rage continuously, can easily **escalate into big** wars. Local conflicts have regional and global aspects. All of the **conflicts in this tinderbox**, which controls shipping lanes from the Indian Ocean into the Red Sea, **can potentially give rise to regional, and indeed global conflagrations between competing regional actors and global powers.**

#### Middle East wars cause extinction

Steinbach, 02 (DC Iraq Coalition, 3/2/02 “Israeli Weapons of Mass Destruction: a Threat to Peace” Center for Research on Globalisation. [http://wagingpeace.org/articles /0203/0331steinbachisraeli.htm](http://wagingpeace.org/articles%20/0203/0331steinbachisraeli.htm))

Meanwhile, the existence of an arsenal of mass destruction in such an unstable region in turn has serious implications for future arms control and disarmament negotiations, and even the threat of nuclear war. Seymour Hersh warns, "Should war break out in the Middle East again,... or should any Arab nation fire missiles against Israel, as the Iraqis did, a nuclear escalation, once unthinkable except as a last resort, would now be a strong probability."(41) and Ezar Weissman, Israel's current President said "The nuclear issue is gaining momentum(and the) next war will not be conventional."(42) Russia and before it the Soviet Union has long been a major(if not the major) target of Israeli nukes. It is widely reported that the principal purpose of Jonathan Pollard's spying for Israel was to furnish satellite images of Soviet targets and other super sensitive data relating to U.S. nuclear targeting strategy. (43) (Since launching its own satellite in 1988, Israel no longer needs U.S. spy secrets.) Israeli nukes aimed at the Russian heartland seriously complicate disarmament and arms control negotiations and, at the very least, the unilateral possession of nuclear weapons by Israel is enormously destabilizing, and dramatically lowers the threshold for their actual use, if not for all out nuclear war. In the words of Mark Gaffney, "... if the familar pattern(Israel refining its weapons of mass destruction with U.S. complicity) is not reversed soon- for whatever reason- the deepening Middle East conflict could trigger a world conflagration."

#### Chinese invasion of Taiwan escalates and causes nuclear holocaust

Hsiung, 01- Professor of Politics and International Law at NYU (James, 21st Century World Order and the Asia Pacific, p. 359-360)

Admittedly, it is harmless for an analyst like Lind to be so oblivious of lessons from the past and of the reasons behind both the dogs barking and not barking. But decision-makers cannot afford such luxury. Lee Kuan Yew, Singapore’s Senior Minister, issued a grave warning presumably directed at all government leaders, including the United States, that the Taiwan powder keg could ignite a conflagration that will engulf the entire region. It might even embroil the United States in a nuclear holocaust that nobody wants. Oftentimes, well-meaning analysts raise the question whether China, with its present military capability and modest defense expenditures (about U.S. $15 billion annually), can or cannot take Taiwan by force. But this is the wrong question to pose. As the late patriarch Deng Xiapoing put it, “We’d rather have it proven that we tried but failed [to stop it] even by force, than be accused [by our disgruntled compatriots and posterity] of not trying to stop Taiwan from going independent.” Earlier, I raised the issue of stability within the U.S.-China-Japan triad, precisely with the U.S.-Japan alliance in view. Apparently, many in Japan have apprehensions about the stability. Japanese Nobel laureate (for literature) Ohe Kenzaburo, for instance, once told a pen pal that he was fearful of the outcome of a conflict between the United States and China over the question of Taiwan. Because of its alliance relationship, Japan would be embroiled in a conflict that it did not choose and that might escalate into a nuclear holocaust. From the ashes of such a nuclear conflict, he figured, some form of life may still be found in the combatant nuclear giants, China and the United States. But, Kenaburo rued, there would be absolutely nothing left in Japan or Taiwan in the conflict’s wake. By now, I hope it is clear why stability in the U.S.- China-Japan triadic relationship is a sine qua non for geopolitical peace in the Asia Pacific region.

#### Korean war causes extinction

Africa News, 99 [10-25, Lexis]

If there is one place today where the much-dreaded Third World War could easily erupt and probably reduce earth to a huge smoldering cinder it is the Korean Peninsula in Far East Asia. Ever since the end of the savage three-year Korean war in the early 1950s, military tension between the hard-line communist north and the American backed South Korea has remained dangerously high. In fact the Koreas are technically still at war. A foreign visitor to either Pyongyong in the North or Seoul in South Korea will quickly notice that the divided country is always on maximum alert for any eventuality. North Korea or the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) has never forgiven the US for coming to the aid of South Korea during the Korean war. She still regards the US as an occupation force in South Korea and wholly to blame for the non-reunification of the country. North Korean media constantly churns out a tirade of attacks on "imperialist" America and its "running dog" South Korea. The DPRK is one of the most secretive countries in the world where a visitor is given the impression that the people's hatred for the US is absolute while the love for their government is total. Whether this is really so, it is extremely difficult to conclude. In the DPRK, a visitor is never given a chance to speak to ordinary Koreans about the politics of their country. No visitor moves around alone without government escort. The American government argues that its presence in South Korea was because of the constant danger of an invasion from the north. America has vast economic interests in South Korea. She points out that the north has dug numerous tunnels along the demilitarised zone as part of the invasion plans. She also accuses the north of violating South Korean territorial waters. Early this year, a small North Korean submarine was caught in South Korean waters after getting entangled in fishing nets. Both the Americans and South Koreans claim the submarine was on a military spying mission. However, the intension of the alleged intrusion will probably never be known because the craft's crew were all found with fatal gunshot wounds to their heads in what has been described as suicide pact to hide the truth of the mission. The US mistrust of the north's intentions is so deep that it is no secret that today Washington has the largest concentration of soldiers and weaponry of all descriptions in south Korea than anywhere else in the World, apart from America itself. Some of the armada that was deployed in the recent bombing of Iraq and in Operation Desert Storm against the same country following its invasion of Kuwait was from the fleet permanently stationed on the Korean Peninsula. It is true too that at the moment the North/South Korean border is the most fortified in the world. The border line is littered with anti-tank and anti-personnel landmines, surface-to-surface and surface-to-air missiles and is constantly patrolled by warplanes from both sides. It is common knowledge that America also keeps an eye on any military movement or build-up in the north through spy satellites. The DPRK is said to have an estimated one million soldiers and a huge arsenal of various weapons. Although the DPRK regards herself as a developing country, she can however be classified as a super-power in terms of military might. The DPRK is capable of producing medium and long-range missiles. Last year, for example, she test-fired a medium range missile over Japan, an action that greatly shook and alarmed the US, Japan and South Korea. The DPRK says the projectile was a satellite. There have also been fears that she was planning to test another ballistic missile capable of reaching North America. Naturally, the world is anxious that military tension on the Korean Peninsula must be defused to avoid an apocalypse on earth. It is therefore significant that the American government announced a few days ago that it was moving towards normalizing relations with North Korea.

**Failure to relocate eviscerates readiness**

**Meyer 2k9**

(Carlton, a former Marine Corps officer who participated in military operations around the world. He had written dozens of articles for military magazines, pg online @ <http://www.g2mil.com/Japan-bases.htm> //ghs-ef)

**Keeping military families, aircraft, and ships permanently based in Japan is not only extremely expensive, it is strategically unwise. The USA maintained dozens of aircraft at Clark Field in the Philippines in 1941 to deter a Japanese attack. They provided an easy target for a surprise attack and all aircraft were destroyed on the ground. The defense of the Philippines was poorly organized as a key concern for American officers was the evacuation of military families. The same problem exists today in the unlikely event that war erupts with North Korea, China, or Russia. Dozens of American aircraft and thousands of American lives may be lost to surprise missile, bomber, or commando attacks, while officers are distracted with family concerns. While American servicemen are brave, many would abandon their post after an attack to ensure the welfare of their family. An attack on Japan may cause panic, and Admirals would face problems of sailors refusing to abandon their family to set sail. The Navy would be anxious to move its ships out of port to slip past lurking enemy submarines to the safety of bases in the central Pacific. From a military standpoint, it is far better to base ships, aircraft, and families far from the Asian mainland.**

#### **Military readiness is key to heg**

Perry 06

(William J. “The US Military: Under Strain and at Risk”, January, <http://globalsecurity.org/military/library/report/2006/us-military_nsag-report_01252006.htm>)

**In the meantime, the United States has only limited ground force capability ready to respond to other contingencies. The absence of a credible strategic reserve in our ground forces increases the risk that potential adversaries will be tempted to challenge the United States. Since the end of World War II, a core element of U.S. strategy has been maintaining a military capable of deterring and, if necessary, defeating aggression in more than one theater at a time. As a global power with global interests, the United States must be able to deal with challenges to its interests in multiple regions of the world simultaneously. Today, however, the United States has only limited ground force capability ready to respond outside the Afghan and Iraqi theaters of operations. If the Army were ordered to send significant forces to another crisis today, its only option would be to deploy units at readiness levels far below what operational plans would require – increasing the risk to the men and women being sent into harm’s way and to the success of the mission. As stated rather blandly in one DoD presentation, the Army “continues to accept risk” in its ability to respond to crises on the Korean Peninsula and elsewhere. Although the United States can still deploy air, naval, and other more specialized assets to deter or respond to aggression, the visible overextension of our ground forces has the potential to significantly weaken our ability to deter and respond to some contingencies.**

**Heg solves great power war**

**Thayer 2006** [Bradley A., Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Minnesota, Duluth, The National Interest, November -December, “In Defense of Primacy”, lexis]

A remarkable fact about international politics today--in a world where American primacy is clearly and unambiguously on display--is that countries want to align themselves with the United States. Of course, this is not out of any sense of altruism, in most cases, but because doing so allows them to use the power of the United States for their own purposes--their own protection, or to gain greater influence. Of 192 countries, 84 are allied with America--their security is tied to the United States through treaties and other informal arrangements--and they include almost all of the major economic and military powers. That is a ratio of almost 17 to one (85 to five), and a big change from the Cold War when the ratio was about 1.8 to one of states aligned with the United States versus the Soviet Union. Never before in its history has this country, or any country, had so many allies. U.S. primacy--and the bandwagoning effect--has also given us extensive influence in international politics, allowing the United States to shape the behavior of states and international institutions. Such influence comes in many forms, one of which is America's ability to create coalitions of like-minded states to free Kosovo, stabilize Afghanistan, invade Iraq or to stop proliferation through the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI). Doing so allows the United States to operate with allies outside of the UN, where it can be stymied by opponents. American-led wars in Kosovo, Afghanistan and Iraq stand in contrast to the UN's inability to save the people of Darfur or even to conduct any military campaign to realize the goals of its charter. The quiet effectiveness of the PSI in dismantling Libya's WMD programs and unraveling the A. Q. Khan proliferation network are in sharp relief to the typically toothless attempts by the UN to halt proliferation. You can count with one hand countries opposed to the United States. They are the "Gang of Five": China, Cuba, Iran, North Korea and Venezuela. Of course, countries like India, for example, do not agree with all policy choices made by the United States, such as toward Iran, but New Delhi is friendly to Washington. Only the "Gang of Five" may be expected to consistently resist the agenda and actions of the United States. China is clearly the most important of these states because it is a rising great power. But even Beijing is intimidated by the United States and refrains from openly challenging U.S. power. China proclaims that it will, if necessary, resort to other mechanisms of challenging the United States, including asymmetric strategies such as targeting communication and intelligence satellites upon which the United States depends. But China may not be confident those strategies would work, and so it is likely to refrain from testing the United States directly for the foreseeable future because China's power benefits, as we shall see, from the international order U.S. primacy creates.

The other states are far weaker than China. For three of the "Gang of Five" cases--Venezuela, Iran, Cuba--it is an anti-U.S. regime that is the source of the problem; the country itself is not intrinsically anti-American. Indeed, a change of regime in Caracas, Tehran or Havana could very well reorient relations.

THROUGHOUT HISTORY, peace and stability have been great benefits of an era where there was a dominant power--Rome, Britain or the United States today. Scholars and statesmen have long recognized the irenic effect of power on the anarchic world of international politics. Everything we think of when we consider the current international order--free trade, a robust monetary regime, increasing respect for human rights, growing democratization--is directly linked to U.S. power. Retrenchment proponents seem to think that the current system can be maintained without the current amount of U.S. power behind it. In that they are dead wrong and need to be reminded of one of history's most significant lessons: Appalling things happen when international orders collapse. The Dark Ages followed Rome's collapse. Hitler succeeded the order established at Versailles. Without U.S. power, the liberal order created by the United States will end just as assuredly. As country and western great Ral Donner sang: "You don't know what you've got (until you lose it)." Consequently, it is important to note what those good things are. In addition to ensuring the security of the United States and its allies, American primacy within the international system causes many positive outcomes for Washington and the world. The first has been a more peaceful world. During the Cold War, U.S. leadership reduced friction among many states that were historical antagonists, most notably France and West Germany. Today, American primacy helps keep a number of complicated relationships aligned--between Greece and Turkey, Israel and Egypt, South Korea and Japan, India and Pakistan, Indonesia and Australia. This is not to say it fulfills Woodrow Wilson's vision of ending all war. Wars still occur where Washington's interests are not seriously threatened, such as in Darfur, but a Pax Americana does reduce war's likelihood, particularly war's worst form: great power wars. Second, American power gives the United States the ability to spread democracy and other elements of its ideology of liberalism. Doing so is a source of much good for the countries concerned as well as the United States because, as John Owen noted on these pages in the Spring 2006 issue, liberal democracies are more likely to align with the United States and be sympathetic to the American worldview.3 So, spreading democracy helps maintain U.S. primacy. In addition, once states are governed democratically, the likelihood of any type of conflict is significantly reduced. This is not because democracies do not have clashing interests. Indeed they do. Rather, it is because they are more open, more transparent and more likely to want to resolve things amicably in concurrence with U.S. leadership. And so, in general, democratic states are good for their citizens as well as for advancing the interests of the United States. Critics have faulted the Bush Administration for attempting to spread democracy in the Middle East, labeling such an effort a modern form of tilting at windmills. It is the obligation of Bush's critics to explain why democracy is good enough for Western states but not for the rest, and, one gathers from the argument, should not even be attempted.

Of course, whether democracy in the Middle East will have a peaceful or stabilizing influence on America's interests in the short run is open to question. Perhaps democratic Arab states would be more opposed to Israel, but nonetheless, their people would be better off. The United States has brought democracy to Afghanistan, where 8.5 million Afghans, 40 percent of them women, voted in a critical October 2004 election, even though remnant Taliban forces threatened them. The first free elections were held in Iraq in January 2005. It was the military power of the United States that put Iraq on the path to democracy. Washington fostered democratic governments in Europe, Latin America, Asia and the Caucasus. Now even the Middle East is increasingly democratic. They may not yet look like Western-style democracies, but democratic progress has been made in Algeria, Morocco, Lebanon, Iraq, Kuwait, the Palestinian Authority and Egypt. By all accounts, the march of democracy has been impressive. Third, along with the growth in the number of democratic states around the world has been the growth of the global economy. With its allies, the United States has labored to create an economically liberal worldwide network characterized by free trade and commerce, respect for international property rights, and mobility of capital and labor markets. The economic stability and prosperity that stems from this economic order is a global public good from which all states benefit, particularly the poorest states in the Third World. The United States created this network not out of altruism but for the benefit and the economic well-being of America. This economic order forces American industries to be competitive, maximizes efficiencies and growth, and benefits defense as well because the size of the economy makes the defense burden manageable. Economic spin-offs foster the development of military technology, helping to ensure military prowess.

Perhaps the greatest testament to the benefits of the economic network comes from Deepak Lal, a former Indian foreign service diplomat and researcher at the World Bank, who started his career confident in the socialist ideology of post-independence India. Abandoning the positions of his youth, Lal now recognizes that the only way to bring relief to desperately poor countries of the Third World is through the adoption of free market economic policies and globalization, which are facilitated through American primacy.4 As a witness to the failed alternative economic systems, Lal is one of the strongest academic proponents of American primacy due to the economic prosperity it provides. Fourth and finally, the United States, in seeking primacy, has been willing to use its power not only to advance its interests but to promote the welfare of people all over the globe. The United States is the earth's leading source of positive externalities for the world. The U.S. military has participated in over fifty operations since the end of the Cold War--and most of those missions have been humanitarian in nature. Indeed, the U.S. military is the earth's "911 force"--it serves, de facto, as the world's police, the global paramedic and the planet's fire department. Whenever there is a natural disaster, earthquake, flood, drought, volcanic eruption, typhoon or tsunami, the United States assists the countries in need. On the day after Christmas in 2004, a tremendous earthquake and tsunami occurred in the Indian Ocean near Sumatra, killing some 300,000 people. The United States was the first to respond with aid. Washington followed up with a large contribution of aid and deployed the U.S. military to South and Southeast Asia for many months to help with the aftermath of the disaster. About 20,000 U.S. soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines responded by providing water, food, medical aid, disease treatment and prevention as well as forensic assistance to help identify the bodies of those killed. Only the U.S. military could have accomplished this Herculean effort. No other force possesses the communications capabilities or global logistical reach of the U.S. military. In fact, UN peacekeeping operations depend on the United States to supply UN forces. American generosity has done more to help the United States fight the War on Terror than almost any other measure. Before the tsunami, 80 percent of Indonesian public opinion was opposed to the United States; after it, 80 percent had a favorable opinion of America. Two years after the disaster, and in poll after poll, Indonesians still have overwhelmingly positive views of the United States. In October 2005, an enormous earthquake struck Kashmir, killing about 74,000 people and leaving three million homeless. The U.S. military responded immediately, diverting helicopters fighting the War on Terror in nearby Afghanistan to bring relief as soon as possible. To help those in need, the United States also provided financial aid to Pakistan; and, as one might expect from those witnessing the munificence of the United States, it left a lasting impression about America. For the first time since 9/11, polls of Pakistani opinion have found that more people are favorable toward the United States than unfavorable, while support for Al-Qaeda dropped to its lowest level. Whether in Indonesia or Kashmir, the money was well-spent because it helped people in the wake of disasters, but it also had a real impact on the War on Terror. When people in the Muslim world witness the U.S. military conducting a humanitarian mission, there is a clearly positive impact on Muslim opinion of the United States. As the War on Terror is a war of ideas and opinion as much as military action, for the United States humanitarian missions are the equivalent of a blitzkrieg. THERE IS no other state, group of states or international organization that can provide these global benefits. None even comes close. The United Nations cannot because it is riven with conflicts and major cleavages that divide the international body time and again on matters great and trivial. Thus it lacks the ability to speak with one voice on salient issues and to act as a unified force once a decision is reached. The EU has similar problems. Does anyone expect Russia or China to take up these responsibilities? They may have the desire, but they do not have the capabilities. Let's face it: for the time being, American primacy remains humanity's only practical hope of solving the world's ills.

### **1AC – Plan text**

**The United States federal government should substantially increase its transportation infrastructure investment in Guam.**

## \*\*ADD-ONS\*\*

### 2AC – Alliance (warming)

#### Alliance key to innovation to solve warming

Calder 10(Kent E, Director, Reischauer Center for East Asian Studies SAIS/Johns Hopkins University, “U.S. CLIMATE POLICY AND PROSPECTS FOR U.S.‐JAPAN COOPERATION,” <http://www.us-jpri.org/en/reports/s1_calder.pdf>)

Active U.S.‐Japan cooperation on energy and environmental issues has a powerful, unprecedented logic today, given prevailing political configurations in Tokyo and Washington, D.C. Both the Obama and Hatoyama Administrations place emphasis on these issue areas, and their general approaches are broadly similar. The Obama energy policy approach, for example, emphasizes downstream energy efficiency rather than upstream energy resource development, and also systematic long‐term reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. The Hatoyama priorities appear to be broadly congruent. Both administrations are also interested in broad, systemic approaches to energy and environmental problems, integrating technological innovation and masstransportation policy into solutions for energy and environmental questions. Both administrations also find multilateral cooperation congenial. U.S. and Japanese capacities in addressing energy and environmental issues are also complementary in many important respects. The U.S. has historically proven adept at technological innovation, and was a pioneer in nuclear and resource‐exploitation technology, such as off‐shore drilling. Japan is a global leader in promoting energy efficiency—through technical innovation, as well as systems and product engineering, and in devising effective industrial standards. Given the pressing nature of global energy and environmental problems, the general congruence of underlying U.S. and Japanese approaches to these issues, and the strategic importance of strengthening the U.S.‐Japan alliance, the two countries could productively initiate a bilateral energy and environmental dialogue. The US currently engages in such bilateral dialogues with both China and South Korea, and the logic is strong for an analogous dialogue with Japan. The two countries can also, of course, productively cooperate in broader international fora, as they have in the COP‐15 process. Among the concrete topics on which the U.S. and Japan can productively consider energy and environmental cooperation are the following: (1) Demonstration projects, such as energy‐efficient buildings, that illustrate novel methods for reducing resource use, and thereby reducing global emissions; (2) Clean coal technology, where their capabilities are well‐matched, in an area of fateful long‐term importance for large‐scale energy consumers such as China and India; (3) carbon capture and storage (CCS) technology; (4) mass‐transit approaches, including high‐speed rail, which reduce use of resources; (5) product standards that promote energy efficiency; (6) civilian nuclear issues, including safety and storage questions, the closed fuel cycle, and the improvement and strengthening of multilateral non‐proliferation regimes; and (7) water use. Both countries can learn substantially from the other, thereby strengthening and broadening their vital bilateral relationship. Cooperation on energy and environmental matters, however, cannot easily serve as a substitute for cooperation in areas of hard security, such as host‐nation support, however, for both strategic reasons and do to the configuration of embedded political interests in both countries.

**And- Cooperation Spills to get all major emitters onboard**

Patel, 7 **(Nirav, Bacevich fellow at the Center for a New American Security, “The U.S.-Japan Alliance Should Evolve to Encompass Environmental Cooperation,”**[**http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/1420/the-u-s-japan-alliance-should-evolve-to-encompass-environmental-cooperation**](http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/1420/the-u-s-japan-alliance-should-evolve-to-encompass-environmental-cooperation)**)**

Historically, U.S.-Japan relations have benefited from multiple layers of bilateral cooperation. As the U.S.-Japan bilateral relationship evolves, traditional military and economic cooperation will prove insufficient to guard against malignant stresses in the alliance. The recent meeting in Washington of Japanese Prime Minister Yasuo Fukuda and President Bush provided the foundation for a new pillar of bilateral cooperation: one that is guided by mitigating nontraditional threats like global climate change. Environmental cooperation has the potential to transcend traditional foundations of bilateral cooperation and guard against future schisms in America's most important Asian relationship. Unfortunately, policymakers remain myopic in their understanding of global climate change as a security threat. Focus on "traditional" security issues -- the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, interstate warfare, and conventional arms races -- however necessary and justified, is undermining our capability to deal with the existential nightmares associated with global climate change. Asia has the most to gain from countering the threats associated with global climate change. As dramatic economic growth and industrialization continue to sweep through Asia, policymakers must devise creative and pragmatic climate change mitigation policies that are palatable to nations seeking to become more prosperous and industrialized. The promise of bringing billions of people out of poverty will continue to drive Asian nations to push for rapid industrialization, often at the expense of environmentally conscious policies. This is evidenced by the fact that 16 of the 20 most polluted cities in the world are located in China, and all 20 are in Asia. Generating cooperative agreements to deal with the threat of rogue industrialization will continue to prove difficult as nations prioritize a future of prosperity over ecological sustainability. Recent reports from the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) project that if global warming continues at its current rate, the thinning of polar ice caps may increase sea levels by as much as or more than 1 meter. This could displace over 1 billion people in China, Japan, Indonesia, Malaysia, and elsewhere in Southeast Asia, forcing them to relocate inland. The stress of mass relocation in the region has the potential to spark resource-based conflicts, and undermine international stability and regional security. This would exacerbate a contentious Asia-Pacific security environment, which already risks conflict on a scale not seen since World War II. Asian environmental problems require Asian input and solutions. However, divergent interests mean consensus within Asia will be difficult to reach. Therefore, countries with extensive expertise on global climate change must lead. Japan can be such a leader, helping to create consensus and providing valuable expertise. The benefits of greater U.S.-Japanese environmental collaboration would be significant. In particular, Japan's current leadership role on global climate change would be more effective if it had greater support from the United States. Furthermore, greater U.S.-Japanese cooperation on environmental issues has the potential to increase America's influence in the region by showcasing its desire to assist in the responsible development and integration of Asian economies into the international order. This would go a long way in countering many of China's "soft power" gains in recent years. U.S.-Japanese environmental cooperation also would strengthen the U.S.-Japan alliance by illustrating new benefits that result from it, such as an enhanced ability to meet future security challenges in the region. If not adequately dealt with, global climate change has the potential, especially in Asia, to undermine international peace, stability and security.

### 2AC – Guam Economy (telecom)

#### **Guam key to Pacific telecommunications**

**Guam Economic Development Authority ‘11** (Guam Economic Development Authority Bureau of Statistics and Plans, University of Guam, Pacific Center for Economic Initiatives, “Guam Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy,”

<http://www.bsp.guam.gov/Guam%202011%20Comprehensive%20Economic%20Development%20Strategy.pdf>, YX)

With the many hurdles facing Guam’s tourism industry, businesses are challenged to focus on recapitalizing the island’s tourism plant. Efforts are underway to restore and upgrade the island’s deteriorated cultural and historic assets in order to validate and sustain Guam’s differentiated brand identity, continue to be a competitive destination, and ensure the long-term viability of Guam’s tourism industry. Shopping on Guam is one of the main attractions for tourists and is a significant contributor to the local economy. Retail spending accounts for an estimated 43% of all tourism spending. Furthermore, the military and other temporary residents (i.e., contract labor from Asia or the United States) contribute substantially to Guam’s retail sales by making a significant portion of their lifetime purchases on durables while on the island. As an economic sector, which complements the tourist industry and responds quickly to a generally rising standard of living, this sector is expected to play an important role in Guam in the coming years. Because of its supportive and reactive nature, however, it cannot be relied upon as a major income generator. Guam’s unique position in the Asia-Pacific region highlights potential roles that the island can play as a commercial trade hub and a major telecommunications hub. In regards to commercial trade, the U.S. exports farther across the Pacific than across the Atlantic. Asian countries, in turn, have benefited greatly from selling to the American market. Guam has an opportunity to play a 9 greater role in the midst of this vast Asian-Pacific trading zone. In this regard, Guam has several key advantages that can be considered for economic development opportunities. Furthermore, Guam possesses the most advanced telecommunications infrastructure and systems in the Western Pacific region. The island sits at the nexus of the Pacific’s underwater fiber optics cabling network with more terminating cable connections than anywhere else in the world and making Guam a telecommunications hub for numerous international providers.

#### **Military presence is the lynchpin of Guam’s status as a telecom hub**

**Starosielski ’11** (Nicole, Assistant Professor in the Department of Media, Culture, and Communication at New York University, conducting research for a book project, "Media under Water: Friction, Flow, and the Cultural Geographies of Undersea Cables,” which traces the social and cultural dimensions of undersea communications cables and their relationships with other infrastructures in the Pacific Rim, “Critical Nodes, Cultural Networks: Re-mapping Guam’s Cable Infrastructure,” Amerasia Journal 37:3, 18-27, <http://nyu.academia.edu/NicoleStarosielski/Papers/1396927/Critical_Nodes_Cultural_Networks_Re-mapping_Guams_Cable_Infrastructure>)

Undersea communication cables are durable and cost-effective infrastructures supporting the interconnection of America, Asia, and Australia. Many of these cables, which carry almost all transpacific Internet traffic, are routed through the island of Guam. Historically, more cables have landed on Guam than in either Hawai‘i or California, two other major hubs for signal exchange. The cartographic representation of undersea cables, however, often abstracts them as mere lines of interconnection, rarely ascribing significance to the geographies they intersect (see Figure 1). This representational strategy makes it difficult for viewers to connect cables on the ocean floor to the cultural landscapes above them; it implies that information flows effortlessly, without political force or resistance, across the oceans. From this vantage point, the concentration of cables on Guam appears to be an anomaly, a site that should have been bypassed once cables began to extend directly across the Pacific. These images, like the narratives that stereo -typically portray islands as tourist paradises, obscure the actual spatial conditions of cultural production in the Pacific. 2 This essay delineates the cultural history of Guam’s under-sea cables. It traces how broader social forces interested in locating Guam at the center of transpacific traffic have kept the island a crucial node in the cable network. These forces include the U.S. military’s establishment of Guam as a strategic space; pri -vate telecommunications companies’ [investment](http://nyu.academia.edu/NicoleStarosielski/Papers/1396927/Critical_Nodes_Cultural_Networks_Re-mapping_Guams_Cable_Infrastructure) in Guam as an Asian hub; and the expansion of infrastructures that depend on and generate traffic for cables, including networks of sea trans -port, air transport, and migration. As the location where inter-connection occurs, Guam has become a place of power in transpacific networks, and this power resides in part in the island’s physical geography. Guam’s cable networks, like its military bases, are material sites which solidify and reinforce the spaceof empire. 3 Due to the geographic concentration of communi-cations resources, however, Guam might also be described as a pressure point in the network. Here, local actions and environ -mental forces have disproportionate consequences for network operation, and must be continually negotiated in order to sustain the ow of electrical and political power. Guam has continued to be a stable communications hub, due in part to companies’ success in sheltering these cables from resistance generated by local environments. Describing these cultural geographies, I suggestthat, rather than an anomaly, Guam should be considered as a critical node of transpacific systems; it is a geographic location critical to the system’s operation (and to U.S. national security),as well as a place from which a critique of the virtual nature ofcommunication systems is possible—it is a point from which wecan best perceive the material investments in the interconnection of America, Asia, and the Pacic. 4 Over the past one hundred years, the coordination of military investment with private interests has established Guam as a cable hub in the Pacific. The first cable to the island, in July 1903, was driven in part by entrepreneur John Mackay’s quest to establish cheaper transpacific communication. 5 Cable systems in this era were often privately financed; the United States refused to build a state-sponsored or subsidized transpacific cable. Histories of the system, however, less often note that the offer to lay the cable “without subsidies or landing licenses [was made] on the grounds that the Pacific Ocean was a ‘navigable water of the United States’,” 6 or the fact that the cable landing on Guam, and its extension on to the Philippines, was made possible by the U.S. Navy’s conquests in the Spanish-American War only ve years prior. The land for the cable station was leased from the Naval Station, which at the time administered the entire island. Though it was operated by a private company, the establishment of the Commercial Pacific Cable was intertwined with the geopolitical imagination and extension of a United States Pacific Empire that conceptualized the islands as “stepping stones on the way to Asia.” 7 In the early days of its operation, the Navy played a large role in supporting the cable station. The 1904 Governor’s Report noted the Navy’s “desire to assist the [cable] company in every practicable way in all of its undertakings.” 8 In return, it was by the “courtesy” of the superintendent of the cable company ythat the naval station be informed of the state of war between Japan and Korea as well as the confiict’s progress. 9 Because it was not a military system, other private companies were allowed to interconnect at Guam: in 1905 the German-Netherlands Tele -graph Company connected Guam to Yap and Shanghai, and in the following year, Guam was connected to Japan. As the Na vy’s control over the island became increasingly rm, however, communications development was made more clearly subject toNavy oversight—for instance, the Navy censored the cable sev-eral times during World War I. 10 In 1915, after Japan’s seizureof German Micronesia in the war, Governor William J. Maxwellset forth a rm denition of the cable company’s subservience to the Navy, determining that the military character of the islandallowed the U.S. to take control of any part of the cable business at any time. He also specied that all persons connected with the station had to be U.S. citizens so that they would not develop conicting interests during time of war; the governmentwould nd suitable employees if the company could not. 11 The cable was used to facilitate important nancial transactions for the military, 12 and later on, the cable company served as a de-fense contractor. 13 While their relationship was initially situatedin terms of the military’s assistance to the cable station, during the rst half of the twentieth century, the military came to gain increasing control over communications networks. In the 1950s, the cable was taken out of service due to deepwater leaks and Guam no longer had commercial communication. The Navy invited Radio Corporation of America (RCA) to set up commercial radio telegraph and telephone service for theisland. After a little over a decade without any submarine cables, the rst telephone cable, TPC-1, between Hawai‘i, Midway, and Guam, was landed. From Guam, it then branched off to the Philippines and Japan, establishing the island as a critical switching point. Shortly after, other systems began to interconnect at the island. The SEACOM system, designed to unite the Common wealth countries, was landed on Guam in 1967; it extended on to Singapore and to Sydney, locating Guam as the hub for interconnection of South Pacic, East Asian, and American networks. These systems were privately operated, yet, like the telegraph systems, beneted the military, which used many of the circuitsto provide secure and redundant transpacic routes. In order to build cable stations on U.S. territory, private companies were also subject to military building specications, including the es -tablishment of thick concrete walls, nuclear fallout shelters, andsurplus provisioning to protect the cable (and its labor force) inthe case of attack. Despite the shift in the 1970s to satellite communication, ca - bles continued to be laid and operated throughout this period,in part because they offered secure alternatives to wireless transmission. It was not until ber-optic cables were developed thatGuam’s cable infrastructure signicantly advanced. In 1987, TPC-3, the rst transpacic ber-optic cable, was landed; subsequent ly, GPT (1990), PacRim West (1995), GP (1999), China-US (2001),Australia-Japan (2001), Asia-America Gateway (2009), and PPC-1(2009) were initiated. By this point, the majority of the trafc was commercially supported and was not defense-related. Though themilitary did not depend on the cables as extensively as in the tele-graph era, they continued to retain oversight and control. Cables were termed “critical infrastructure,” which signied their key role in U.S. national security. As in the telegraph period, the man-agers of cable stations must be U.S. citizens, with the assumptionthat they will support the country in time of war. The Department of Homeland Security regularly inspects some Pacic cable sta tions and offers suggestions for how to increase security measures; they also reserve the right to come into the station at any point and to intercept or censor trafc on the cables. In 2010, the military laid a cable from the Marshall Islands to Guam to facilitate remote defense operations. This cable signied a shift from the early era when cable companies relied on infrastructural support from theNavy. Now the interconnection of military communications de-pends on private infrastructure development. This brief history illustrates that cable laying in Guam has never been either an entirely military or private affair, but has been supported both by the military’s development of the island as a strategic hub and telecommunications companies’ interest in establishing a point of interconnection. Military owned and operated systems, such as Guam’s early Navy radio stations and the Johnston Atoll cable system, did not develop as hubs in part due to their lack of commercial traffic. At the same time, it is probable that Guam would not have become a hub had there not been extensive support and traffic generated by the military. The difficulties encountered by Pacific islands that switched almost entirely to commercial traffic, such as Fiji, reveal the significance of defense in justifying and sustaining cable systems. Without the coordination of strategic interests in establishing redundant communication lines with private interests in interconnecting various systems, it is unlikely that Guam would have maintained its prominence in transpacific cable networks. Guam’s cable networks have been coordinated with otherkinds of transport and communications systems, a process thathas helped to solidify the island as a site of interconnection. Theselection of Guam as a cable landing was made probable by its historical role as a landing for ships involved in East-West trade; the Spanish used Guam as a site to gather provisions for ships on transpacic journeys from the 1500s onward. The presence of the telegraph cable also made the location attractive as a stop for the Pan Am Clipper and the building of a Pan Am Hotel. The Navy later recognized the cable’s potential role in supporting the 24 development of Guam’s port, 14 though it was not until the 1950s, when Guam became a stop for two major airlines and two ma- jor shipping lanes, that it began to develop as an infrastructurehub. 15 Undersea cables were also used to leverage the develop-ment of air transport networks. 16 Cable infrastructure therefore generated a kind of gravity that drew in other ows via both air and sea. Guam became more than the sum of these individual trafc routes. It constituted a critical node of interconnection, a place where companies could layer networks over existing struc-tures, where blocked outward transmissions could be re-routed, yet inward trafc was less easily diverted, and where economic surpluses were more easily generated. The power channeledthrough Guam extended beyond the grasp of the transnationalforces that initially built these infrastructures. It was rooted inthe very contours of the island’s physical geography, which in turn provided signicant challenges to the maintenance of com -munications networks. Due to the relative immobility of this infrastructural geography, Guam forms a pressure point where environmental friction arises between cable infrastructure and the local environment, as well as those who are invested in it. This friction must be continually negotiated in order to sustain the low of power through the system. 17 The natural environment in Guam is a force that must be overcome; the successful development of the island as a transit hub is predicated on extensive environmental protection against the jungle and storms. The early telegraph operators had extensive difficulties with tropical insects, with water infrastructure (water had to be carted in from another town), and in obtaining food (at first the station employees were not allowed to purchase fresh meat or ice from government stores, causing many to fall ill). Due to the frequency of natural disasters on the island, they attempted to design the station so that it would be completely self-contained with its own water, sewer, cold storage, and power systems, as well as to be re, earthquake, and typhoon proof. 18 Over the years, protection of communications installations continued to intensify as natural disasters and typhoons struck the island. When Typhoon Karen hit the island in 1962 with over 200-mile-per-hour gusts, more than ninety percent of structures were destroyed, including the radio telephone operation stations. John Driver, the manager of RCA, had to temporarily run the stations out of shipping containers (see Figure 2). Over the last fifty years, stations have been increasingly fortified to the point that communications technicians have at times taken shelter inside; cable infrastructures are now built to sustain such storms with numerous backup generators and battery systems. The aforementioned strategies of military security and the efforts made to resist environmental friction formed a united front protecting the island’s communications infrastructure and ensuring that Guam remained a secure landing point. While the resistance provided by the environment itself has been negotiated for as long as cables have landed, cable companies are now confronted with resistance from those who have territorial claims on the environments through which cables run (see Figure 3). In some locations, this includes fishermen’s contestation of ocean space or local communities’ claims on the shoreline. On Guam, resistance has been more often generated by conservation-ists on behalf of the environment. If a cable company runs generators in the case of a storm, they may be ned and held accountable for the pollution that it causes. Cable operators must also hire divers to check and conrm that cables have not moved on the seabed each year. In one instance, a cable company had to remove and relocate coral that existed near a cable route. 19 The level of trafc passing through infrastructure hubs has led to increasingly recic. Environmental friction, rather than overt attacks or contesta -tion, will be the more likely challenge to infrastructure develop-ment, especially as the space on Guam becomes compacted withthe relocation of a marine base from Okinawa. This process will bring tens of thousands of military personnel, their dependents, and associated labor forces, along with a drastic reconfiguration of the material environment. 20 The island’s militarization, the interests of private telecommunications companies, and general infrastructure development have all contributed to the establishment of Guam as a critical node for transpacific circulations and exchanges. If the island’s networks were disconnected, it would not only disrupt military operations and transpacific Internet traffic, but also the operation of the island’s port, the lights that land on Guam on their way from Japan to Micronesia, and the weather reporting for much of the region. At the same time, the connections of this infrastructure to the island’s physical geography means that this node’s power cannot be completely extracted from the locality of Guam. It not only makes Guam a critical point for the maintenance of transpacific flows, but also makes the signals carried through it locally vulnerable. Guam forms a pressure point where environmental friction, whether it be from the environment itself or from human actors, can affect transnational systems. Observing the latter process, Guam comes into relief as “critical” in a second sense: it is a point where transpacific information exchange, often seen as virtual lines of connection between major cities on the edges of the Pacific, can be instead viewed as a material, geo -graphic, and environmental process constituted and negotiated at the nodes in between America and Asia.

### 2AC – Guam Economy (corals)

#### **Growth is key to protection**

NOAA 10 (national oceanic and atmospheric administration, 2010, “GUAM’S CORAL REEF MANAGEMENT PRIORITIES”, http://coralreef.noaa.gov/aboutcrcp/strategy/reprioritization/managementpriorities/resources/guam\_mngmnt.pdf // Veevz)

Education and Outreach goals cut across all areas of management and conservation. Because of its geography, the culture and economy of the island are irrevocably intertwined with the condition of the coral reef ecosystem. The reefs are a tourism draw and a fishery, and they protect the island from the full impact of strong storm systems. Guam’s Coral Reef Management Priorities Page 25 The status of the ecosystem is dependant upon sustainable users. Education and outreach programs are vital to public and visitor understanding of human impact and sustainable use.

#### **Extinction**

Philippine Daily Inquirer ‘2 [“REEFS UNDER STRESS”, 12-10, L/N]

The artificial replacement of corals is a good start. Coral reefs are the marine equivalent of rainforests that are also being destroyed at an alarming rate not only in the Philippines but all over the world. The World Conservation Union says reefs are one of the "essential life support systems" necessary for human surviva**l**, homes to huge numbers of animals and plants. Dr. Helen T. Yap of the Marine Science Institute of the University of the Philippines said that the country's coral reefs, together with those of Indonesia and Papua New Guinea, contain the biggest number of species of plants and animals. "They lie at the center of biodiversity in our planet," she said.

### 2AC – Guam Economy (Senkaku)

#### Results in broader Asian Market stability

**Calvo et. al. ‘8** (Calvo, Fisher, and Jacob, law firm that specializes in civil litigation, international law, finance, real estate, land use and development, communications, business licensing, bank regulation and licensing, and government regulation, May 28, 2008, “U.S. Military Buildup and Rising Asian Economy Converge to Reshape Guam,” <http://calvofisher.com/news/20080528-military-buildup>)

ECONOMIC BOOM TIMES IN THE PACIFIC As Guam prepares to assume its new role as the military’s principal operational platform in the Western Pacific, it at the same time anticipates a significant uptick in both direct [investment](http://calvofisher.com/news/20080528-military-buildup) and commercial activity arising out of its trade relationships with the rest of East Asia. Since the mid 1970s, Guam’s economic fortunes have moved in close tandem with the Japanese economy and the resultant inflow of Japanese tourists and investment money. After slumping into a prolonged recession following the collapse of its real estate market in the early 1990s, Japan appears to have finally regained its feet. In Guam, this is manifest in the steady increase in Japanese visitors to the island, which in 2008 will likely exceed the high water mark of 1.1 million set in 1997. Japan has also reemerged as a major investor on Guam, principally in the hotel and resort sector. In fact, Tokyo-based Ken Corp.and its affiliates, which began investing in Guam in 2005, now own some of the finest oceanfront [hotels](http://calvofisher.com/news/20080528-military-buildup) on Guam, including luxury resorts such as the Hilton Guam Resort and Spa, the Hyatt Regency Guam, and the Sheraton Laguna Guam Resort. Attorneys at Calvo & Clark handled all of these transactions. But unlike the boom which spurred much of the island’s new growth in the late 1980s, investment in Guam this time out will be supported by more than Japan alone. In addition to mature economies such as Korea and Taiwan, the rapid growth of China, the Philippines and Vietnam, all within a four-hour flight to Guam, should contribute greatly along with Japan toward boosting Guam’s trade, tourism and investment sectors. A U.S. JURISDICTION IN THE HEART OF ASIA Guam’s attraction to foreign investment is further enhanced by the fact that, as a U.S. jurisdiction, it is governed by a well developed body of statutory and common law. Investors and creditors that put their assets in play in Guam know that their contract rights will be fairly and expeditiously enforced. In addition to its court system, Guam is unique among emerging East Asian economies, in that it does not restrict the sale of land to native or indigenous persons or businesses.

#### That’s necessary to stopping the Senkakku dispute between China and Japan

Mackinnon 10 (Mark, staff writer – the Globe and the Mail, “China-Japan trade war looms”, <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/china-japan-trade-war-looms/article1214030/> // Veevz)

A simmering dispute between China and Japan - until now a war only of words and gestures - is threatening to take on serious economic consequences as rumours spread about a Chinese ban on exports of a key resource to Japan.¶ The Asian giants - ancient rivals as well as the world's second- and third-largest economies - have been butting heads since a Sept. 7 incident when Japan detained the captain of a Chinese fishing trawler after his ship collided with two Japanese coast guard vessels near a chain of disputed islands between Okinawa and Taiwan. Infuriated, China has since escalated its diplomatic response on a near-daily basis, demanding that the captain be immediately returned and that he not face charges in a Japanese court.¶ Concern rippled through markets Thursday after The New York Times reported that China had slapped a ban on the export to Japan of rare earth minerals - elements crucial to the production of everything from solar panels and guided missiles to iPhones and Toyota's hybrid Prius automobile.¶ The Chinese government later denied the report, but an executive at one Japanese company that produces high-tech factory equipment told The Globe and Mail that Toyota Inc., one of its main customers, had contacted his firm several days ago out of concern that supplies of rare earth minerals from China were being restricted.¶ In fact, China, which controls some 95 per cent of the world's supply of these minerals, had begun to restrict its exports to all countries as far back as July, after nearing an annual quota. But the panic over what China might do to retaliate against its neighbour - following a suggestion in a newspaper affiliated with the ruling Communist Party that China should seek and strike "the Achilles heel of Japan" - illustrated just how high the stakes are in this seemingly trivial dispute over an uninhabited atoll.¶ Beijing has already started trying to inflict economic pain on its neighbour, advising state-run tourist agencies not to advertise Japan as a destination. However, broader bilateral trade - worth a whopping $147-billion (U.S.) through the first six months of this year - has otherwise not been affected so far.¶ China has severed high-level contacts between the two governments and refused a Japanese suggestion that Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao and Japanese Prime Minister Naoto Kan meet in New York on the sidelines of the United Nations General Assembly to resolve the quarrel, insisting that the fishing captain, 41-year-old Zhan Qixiong, first be released.¶ "The Diaoyu Islands are sacred Chinese territory and if Japan clings obstinately to its mistake, China will take further actions. The Japanese side shall bear all the consequences that arise," Mr. Wen said on his arrival in New York, using the Chinese name for the disputed atoll, which Japan calls Senkaku. The islands are also claimed by Taiwan.¶ The Japanese government, which last week returned the ship and the rest of the 14-member crew to China, has thus far refused to release Mr. Zhan, insisting it has the right to try him under domestic laws for "obstructing officers on duty." A Japanese court recently extended his pretrial detention until Sept. 29.¶ Anti-Japanese sentiment is already high in China, resulting in small, closely supervised street demonstrations in Beijing and other cities. Now, Japanese public opinion also seems to be hardening about the case.¶ "Due to the nature of the incident, it makes perfect sense for Japan, a country of laws, to stick to its guns in calmly dealing with the issue in accordance with domestic law," the Asahi Shimbun newspaper wrote in an editorial published Thursday.¶ In the eyes of many observers, the quarrel is less about the fate of Mr. Zhan than it is an effort by China to assert itself as the new power in East Asia by forcing declining Japan to back down in a very public spat.¶ "If [the Japanese]don't back down, I have no idea what [China's leadership]is going to do. I think it's a really dangerous situation," said Gordon Chang, a U.S.-based critic of the Chinese government. He said the standoff is more dangerous because China's military has gained substantial new influence in Beijing under President Hu Jintao.¶ On Thursday, U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton waded into the dispute, urging the two sides to resolve the dispute through dialogue. The United States is a close military and political ally of Japan.¶ The islands at the centre of the current argument were awarded to Japan by the United States following the Second World War. The dispute over their ownership became far more heated following a 1969 geological survey that indicated that the waters around the islands could be home to as much as seven trillion cubic feet of natural gas and upward of 100 billion barrels of oil.¶

#### Escalation is inevitable – America gets drawn in

Spitzer 12 (Krik, Time, 5/24/12, “Clock Ticks On China-Japan Islands Dispute”, <http://battleland.blogs.time.com/2012/05/24/clock-ticks-on-china-japan-islands-dispute/> // Veevz)

TOKYO – Japan has one year, maybe two, to resolve the ownership dispute over a tiny group of islands or risk an honest-to-goodness shooting war with China. Unfortunately, neither Japan’s diplomats nor public seem to realize the danger, says a leading expert on the territorial disputes plaguing America’s closest Asian ally.¶ “We have drifted to a place where we don’t want to be and we are running out of time,” says Kazuhiko Togo, director of the Institute for World Affairs at Kyoto Sangyo University. “We need to prepare ourselves militarily, and at the same time make every diplomatic effort to bridge the gap between Tokyo and Beijing. This really is becoming a casus belli.”¶ China this week cancelled a visit to Japan of its top uniformed military leader, and snubbed Prime Minister Yoshihiko Noda at a summit meeting in Beijing earlier month. Both actions were intended, at least in part, to express China’s displeasure with the dispute over the Senkaku Islands, known as Diaoyu in China, a group of five or so islets near Taiwan. The islands are administered by Japan, but are claimed by both China and Taiwan.¶ In recent weeks, Chinese officials have begun to refer to the Senkakus as a “core interest.” That’s the diplomatic equivalent of baring one’s teeth and emitting a low growl.¶ China has been aggressively modernizing its military and pressing territorial claims throughout the region. A monthlong standoff between China and Philippines patrol ships in an area called the Scarborough Shoals shows little sign of letup.¶ The Senkaku Islands dispute nearly came to blows in 2010, when Japan detained a Chinese fishing trawler for ramming an armed patrol ship. Japan eventually released the fishing boat and crew under diplomatic pressure, trade sanctions and a wave of anti-Japanese demonstrations in major Chinese cities.¶ Tokyo’s hard-line governor, Shintaro Ishihara, re-ignited the dispute last month when he announced plans to purchase three of the islands from private owners. A serial China-baiter, Ishihara says his aim is to prevent Beijing from acting on its claim in the Senkakus, although it’s whether he would have the legal authority to do this. He says he’s already raised more than $3 million from private donors for the purchase.¶ The Noda administration, meanwhile, responded by assigning formal names to dozens of previously un-christened islets and rock outcroppings in the region (China has done the same), and says it may or may not try to buy the three Senkaku islands before Ishihara does.¶ Togo faults Tokyo for fumbling the Senkaku dispute and allowing it to become an emotional issue for both sides. Long-standing grievances have crystallized and left little room for compromise or face-saving, he says. Where China sees an unrepentant Japan clinging to a legacy of colonial expansion, Japan sees an arrogant and erratic China once again bullying its smaller neighbors.¶ “Senkaku started out as a territorial issue for Japan and China, but it is in very serious danger of becoming an entirely historical-memory issue for both countries. If that happens, I don’t see a way out,” says Togo, a former senior Foreign Ministry official and author ofJapan’s Territorial Problem: The Northern Territories, Takeshima, and the Senkaku Islands.¶ Yang Yi, former director of the Institute for Strategic Studies at the National Defense University in Beijing, worries that the dispute could trigger an arms escalation, if not an outright shooting war. China’s air and sea forces have increasingly encroached on territory around Japan’s southwestern islands, while Japan has begun reinforcing those islands and building more mobile and flexible air and ground forces.¶ “We have much more urgent things to do. Let’s not back each other into a corner,” says Yang.¶ Japan has administered the Senkakus since 1895. China claimed ownership in 1971, shortly after oil was discovered, but both sides agreed to let “the next generation” resolve the issue. The islands are located about 200 miles from Taiwan, at the tip of Japan’s southwest island chain.¶ Emotions are playing role in Japan’s other two territorial disputes. A visit by South Korea’s defense minister, scheduled for the end of this month, was called off, and the signing of the first-ever defense pact between Japan and South Korea has been delayed indefinitely because of the dispute over ownership of Takeshima Island, known reverently among South Koreans as Dokdo.¶ Although South Korean police and military have occupied the island since the 1950s, officials in a neighboring prefecture of Japan began observing an annual “Takeshima Day” in 2005 to express their displeasure with a failed fishing treaty and pressure Tokyo. The result has been to infuriate the Koreans.¶ Similarly, Japan’s insistence on the return of all four islands of its Northern Territories – seized by the Soviet Union in the waning days of World War II – has hampered negotiations for decades. Russian President Vladimir Putin, who took office this month, has signaled a willingness to resume negotiations over two of the islands this year, but could turn to South Korea or other regional rivals to help develop the islands if Japan balks.¶ Whether a shooting war with China over the Senkaku Islands would inevitably involve Americans is unclear. Article 5 of the US-Japan Security Treaty commits the US to Japan’s defense, even if the territory under attack is merely under Japan’s ‘administrative control,’ as is the case of the Senkakus.¶ But says Togo, “If our diplomacy is so stupid as to incite China to attack Japan, could we then approach the United States and say, ‘Hey, we have a war’?”¶ Read more:

Escalates to nuclear war with China

UK Defence Forum, 2003 (UK Defence Forum, Regional Studies 8: “Conflict In The South China Sea,” Jan 20, 2003 <http://www.ukdf.org.uk/regional/rs8.htm>)

The oil rich and strategically important Spratly Islands archipelago is one of the world's most important flash points. There is a strong risk that the states of South- east Asia could be drawn into a war with China, destabilising the whole region and upsetting economic growth in one of Britain's most important markets. The shipping lanes passing close to the Spratlys carry 25% of the world's oil trade to Japan and America, the South China Sea is one of the most important trade routes in the world. Because of the importance of the sea lanes and oil associated with the Spratlys and the fact that Britain is a signatory to a defence pact that includes Malaysia, one of the disputing states, British naval forces could be called in to the South China Sea. The end of the cold war altered the balance of power in the South China Sea. The United States has withdrawn from Subic Bay in the Philippines and the former Soviet Union has withdrawn from Camranh Bay, Vietnam. China is in the best position to take advantage of the resulting power vacuum. It claims most of the area, and argues that the South China Sea, an area of approximately 800,000 square kilometres, has been encroached upon by other regional powers. The focus of this conflict are the Spratly Islands; claimed by China, Taiwan and, Malaysia, Brunei, Vietnam and the Philippines. The conflict indirectly involves all the states of South-east Asia. The UK is party to the Five Power Defence Arrangements which also involve Malaysia, Singapore, Australia, and New Zealand. This defence pact is not an alliance, but should hostilities break out in the South China Sea, Britain would be obliged to help Malaysia and has an interest in keeping the sea lanes free for trade. The Spratly Islands dispute has the potential to become a major international conflict.¶ <CONTINUES>¶ The profound changes brought on the region by the withdrawl of the US and USSR have created a climate of instability. In this climate there is a risk that China may attempt to impose her will on the region by attacking her opponents forces on the Spratlys and non-Chinese merchant vessles on the high seas. It is unlikley that China would attempt to take all the islands in one bite. It would be much easier to get away with a slow period of limited aggression. Britain, along with Malaysia, Singapore, Australia and New Zealand is a signatory of the Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA). This defence pact is not an alliance, however if Malaysian ships or troops were attacked then Britain would be under an obligation to assist. In addition Britain has strong trade links with ASEAN and a profound interest in keeping sea lanes open. Britain does not have to capability to intervene on her own. However she might send a naval force in collaboration with Australia and the USA. The most likely form of intervaetion would be similar to the Armilla patrol that operated in the Persian Gulf during the Iran-Iraq war. Neutral ships would be protected by warships and the sea lanes kept open without a formal declaration of war against China. For the first time, Britain, and the US, risk becoming involved in military hostilities with another nuclear power. Despite the very small chance that nuclear weapons would be used such a prospect has frightening prospects for our security in the next century. The international community will have to find a better way of relating to China if we are to avoid a conflict in the near future. One first step might be to stop turning a blind eye to human rights abuses. While this policy would cause a souring of relationships in the short term, China would be given the message that some actions are unacceptable. It could not interpret silence as a weakness and reluctance to become involved in Asian politics that could be exploited. The West should learn the lesson of Iraq, that if reasons of expediency allow the international community to give a free hand to a despotic leadership, those leaders will attack their neighbours because they think they can get away with it.

#### And- even limited china exchange causes extinction

**Takai, 2009** (Mitsuo, Ret. Colonel and Researcher at the Staff College for Japan’s Ground Self-Defense Force, “U.S.-China Nuclear Strikes Would Spell Doomsday”, October 7, http://www.upiasia.com/Security/2009/10/07/us-china\_nuclear\_strikes\_would\_spell\_doomsday/7213/)

What would happen if China launched its 20 Dongfeng-5 (ICBMs) intercontinental ballistic missiles, each with a 5-megaton warhead, at 20 major U.S. cities? Prevailing opinion in Washington D.C. until not so long ago was that the raids would cause over 40 million casualties, annihilating much of the United States. In order to avoid such a doomsday scenario, consensus was that the United States would have to eliminate this potential threat at its source with preemptive strikes on China. But cool heads at institutions such as the Federation of American Scientists and the National Resource Defense Council examined the facts and produced their own analyses in 2006, which differed from the hard-line views of their contemporaries. The FAS and NRDC developed several scenarios involving nuclear strikes over ICBM sites deep in the Luoning Mountains in China’s western province of Henan, and analyzed their implications. One of the scenarios involved direct strikes on 60 locations – including 20 main missile silos and decoy silos – hitting each with one W76-class, 100-kiloton multiple independently targetable reentry vehicle carried on a submarine-launched ballistic missile. In order to destroy the hardened silos, the strikes would aim for maximum impact by causing ground bursts near the silos' entrances. Using air bursts similar to the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki would not be as effective, as the blasts and the heat would dissipate extensively. In this scenario, the 6 megatons of ground burst caused by the 60 attacks would create enormous mushroom clouds over 12 kilometers high, composed of radioactive dirt and debris. Within 24 hours following the explosions, deadly fallout would spread from the mushroom clouds, driven by westerly winds toward Nanjing and Shanghai. They would contaminate the cities' residents, water, foodstuff and crops, causing irreversible damage. The impact of a 6-megaton nuclear explosion would be 360 times more powerful than the Hiroshima bomb, killing not less than 4 million people. Such massive casualties among non-combatants would far exceed the military purpose of destroying the enemy's military power. This would cause political harm and damage the United States’ ability to achieve its war aims, as it would lose international support. On the other hand, China could retaliate against U.S. troops in East Asia, employing intermediate-range ballistic missiles including its DF-3, DF-4 and DF-21 missiles, based in Liaoning and Shandong provinces, which would still be intact. If the United States wanted to destroy China's entire nuclear retaliatory capability, U.S. forces would have to employ almost all their nuclear weapons, causing catastrophic environmental hazards that could lead to the annihilation of [human] mankind. Accordingly, the FAS and NRDC conclusively advised U.S. leaders to get out of the vicious cycle of nuclear competition, which costs staggering sums, and to promote nuclear disarmament talks with China. Such advice is worth heeding by nuclear hard-liners.

Diner 94

#### Extinction

Diner, ‘94 Judge Advocate General’s Corps 94 [Major David N., United States Army Military Law Review Winter, p. lexis]

By causing widespread extinctions, humans have artificially simplified many ecosystems. As biologic simplicity increases, so does the risk of ecosystem failure. The spreading Sahara Desert in Africa, and the dustbowl conditions of the 1930s in the United States are relatively mild examples of what might be expected if this trend continues. Theoretically, each new animal or plant extinction, with all its dimly perceived and intertwined affects, could cause total ecosystem collapse and human extinction. Each new extinction increases the risk of disaster. Like a mechanic removing, one by one, the rivets from an aircraft's wings, n80 mankind may be edging closer to the abyss.

Senkaku war escalaties

#### Results in broader east Asian conflict

Selden 10 (Tanaka Saka, Asia Pacific Journal -- Kyoko Selden is the author of a number of articles, translations and edited volumes. She is the co-translator of Kayano Shigeru’s Our Land Was a Forest (Westview, 1994), translator of Honda Katsuichi’s Harukor: Ainu Woman’s Tale (University of California Press, 2000), The Atomic Bomb: Voices From Hiroshima and Nagasaki (M.E. Sharpe, 1997), and most recently, More Stories By Japanese Women Writers, An Anthology. She is an Asia-Pacific Journal associate. Kyoko Selden taught Japanese language-literature at Cornell University until 2008., “Rekindling China-Japan Conflict: The Senkaku/Diaoyutai Islands Clash”, <http://www.japanfocus.org/-Kyoko-Selden> // Veevz)

After the incident, the Chinese authorities decided to dispatch fishery patrol boats which are under quasi-military authority in order to protect Chinese fishermen who operate around the Senkaku islands. For the first time, a situation has arisen in which Japan (the Coast Guard) and China (a quasi-military fishing patrol boat under the Department of Agriculture) confront each other at sea. This is a situation in which a battle could take place between China and Japan. A situation that did not exist for sixty-five years since the Asia-Pacific War, one in which Japan could again go to war, now looms. (Instead of the catch phrase “US-British demons” used during World War II, the threat of China will become the target of Japanese propaganda.) The Senkaku Islands, along with the Nansha Islands and the Yellow Sea, has been upgraded to a world-level maritime dispute in which China and countries around it, with US support, confront one another.

### 2AC – Force Posture (South China Sea)

#### Marines in Guam key to Deterrence

Freedberg 7/27

(Sydney J. Freedberg Jr. "Pentagon, Congress Must Break 'Logjam' Over Japan, Guam Bases: CSIS,"7/27 pg online @ defense.aol.com/2012/07/27/pentagon-congress-must-break-logjam-over-japan-guam-bases-c//arjun)

"These plans are at the center of a logjam between DoD [the Department of Defense], which would like to implement them, and the Congress, which is reluctant to authorize funding absent better details about cost and long-term master plans." The report argues that decades-long commitments to Japan and Korea have resulted in a Pacific posture that puts too many forces in the north of the region and not enough in the south, where China has become increasingly aggressive towards its maritime neighbors in the South China Sea, especially the Philippines. Shifting forces from Okinawa to Guam would help correct that imbalance, and China, our allies, and neutral parties are all watching for signs of US clarity and resolve: "The current impasse between DoD and the Congress is not cost-free in terms of US strategic influence in the region," the report warns. As a way out of that impasse, CSIS would prioritize military construction to build up the bases on Guam and in the Mariana Islands, even at the price of moving fewer Marines off Okinawa. But Panetta took exception to that trade-off in his comments, saying that a force of less than 5,000 Marines on Guam would not be "operationally viable."

#### Tensions Increasing in the South Sea Now

Freedberg 12

(Sydney J. Freedberg, "Don't Push China: Vice-Chief of Joint Staff Says "We Can All Get Along"," 2012 pg online @ defense.aol.com/2012/04/12/dont-push-china-vice-chief-of-joint-staff-says-we-can-all-get//arjun)

ASHINGTON, DC: "Don't push China." Even as the Chinese and America's Philippine allies engage in their latest standoff at sea over the disputed Scarborough Shoal, the message from an array of elder statesmen is that the U.S. needs to avoid any kind of confrontation with China -- and the Obama Administration seems to be listening. "We are often accused of this so-called pivot to the Pacific being all about China," said the Vice-Chief of the Joint Staff, Adm. James Winnefeld on Wednesday morning, addressing the annual conference of the relentlessly centrist Center for Strategic and International Studies. But the US has many other interests in the region -- most notably at the moment North Korea, but also the reform process in Myanmar (aka Burma) -- where it and China have common ground. "It should be viewed not as containing China, it should be viewed as balancing China," Winnefeld said of the new strategy. "I don't think China should view this as a threat....We can all get along out there." That's music to Singaporean ears, but the Filipinos aren't so sure. "We all want to settle this dispute peacefully, but the question I have is how would this be settled peacefully if China refuses to abide by international law, which is the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea?" asked the Philippine ambassador to Washington, Jose Cuisia, rising from the audience at a CSIS forum later in the day on the oil-rich and much-disputed South China Sea. (Ironically, China has signed the Law of the Sea treaty, but the US has not). In the current confrontation, the Philippine Navy flagship Gregorio del Pilar (pictured) has attempted to arrest Chinese fisherman operating in the disputed waters of the Scarborough Shoal, only to be blocked by Chinese maritime surveillance vessels. While fishing rights are at stake today -- themselves big business in the world's most populous region -- literally underneath that issue there lie oil reserves estimated to match those of Alaska and natural gas deposits possibly exceeding the Gulf of Mexico's. The Philippines have even begun to auction lots in to energy companies for exploration, much to China's ire. The waters in contention are much closer to the Philippine home islands -- and for that matter to Vietnam, Malaysia, and Brunei, all of which have staked competing claims -- than they are to the Chinese mainland, but Beijing claims the area's barely habitable islets as Chinese soil and argues on that basis that almost the entire South China Sea is legally its exclusive offshore waters. Asked Amb. Cuisia, "How can you come to a peaceful resolution when you can't even agree on a basis?" The assembled experts urged the Filipinos to be patient. "[To] bring it to a resolution is very difficult," answered Joseph Prueher, a retired admiral who has served both as chief of the Pentagon's Pacific Command and the US ambassador to Beijing. Chinese leader Hu Jintao has recently reemphasized that for the PRC, "economic development trumps everything else," Prueher said. "The 'everything else' gets in what I would describe as the kick-the-can category. [Let's] not force them to a head, [but rather] manage them. So they don't get resolved, but they get put in a box of something you can live with for a while....That probably is not very satisfactory," he summed up.

#### A conflict in the South China Sea escalates and goes nuclear

Waldron 97

[Arthur, professor of Strategy and Policy at the Naval War College Commentary, [http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.7442,filter.all/pub\_detail.asp](http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.7442%2Cfilter.all/pub_detail.asp), accessed on 7/19/12, Kfo]

Then there is Southeast Asia, which, having weathered the Vietnam War and a variety of domestic insurgencies, and having moved onto the track of prosperity, shows no desire to complicate matters with political headaches. Fault lines nevertheless remain, and not least between the numerous and disproportionately successful ethnic Chinese and other inhabitants. And here again China is a looming worry. Beijing's claim of "unquestionable sovereignty" over the Spratly Islands in the South China Sea and its recent seizure of one of them, Mischief Reef, also claimed by the Philippines, have alarmed Vietnam, the Philippines, Malaysia, and Brunei, and rattled Indonesia, which asserts its right to gas fields nearby. India and South Asia, long preoccupied with their own internal rivalries and content with their rates of growth, now look with envy and some concern as East Asia opens an ever-increasing lead in economics, military power, and general global clout. Indian and Chinese forces still face each other in the high mountains of their disputed border, as they have done since their war in 1962. Pakistan to the west is a key Chinese ally, and beyond, in the Middle East, China is reportedly supplying arms to Syria, Iraq, and Iran. To the north, Tibet (whose government-in-exile has been based in India since 1959) is currently the object of a vicious Chinese crackdown. And a new issue between India and China is Beijing's alliance with Rangoon and its reported military or intelligence-gathering presence on offshore Burmese territories near the Indian naval base in the Andaman Islands. Finally there is Russia, which has key interests in Asia. Sidelined by domestic problems, but only temporarily, Moscow has repeatedly faced China in this century, both in the northeast and along the Mongolian border. The break-up of the Soviet Union has added a potentially volatile factor in the newly independent states of Central Asia and Chinese-controlled Xinjiang (Sinkiang), where Beijing is currently fighting a low-level counterinsurgency. An Arms Race in Asia Making these flash-points all the more volatile has been a dramatic increase in the quantity and quality of China's weapons acquisitions. An Asian arms race of sorts was already gathering steam in the post-cold-war era, driven by national rivalries and the understandable desire of newly rich nation-states to upgrade their capacities; but the Chinese build-up has intensified it. In part a payoff to the military for its role at Tiananmen Square in 1989, China's current build-up is part and parcel of the regime's major shift since that time away from domestic liberalization and international openness toward repression and irredentism. Today China buys weapons from European states and Israel, but most importantly from Russia. The latest multibillion-dollar deal includes two Sovremenny-class destroyers equipped with the much-feared SS-N-22 cruise missile, capable of defeating the Aegis anti-missile defenses of the U.S. Navy and thus sinking American aircraft carriers. This is in addition to the Su-27 fighter aircraft, quiet Kilo-class submarines, and other force-projection and deterrent technologies. In turn, the Asian states are buying or developing their own advanced aircraft, missiles, and submarines--and considering nuclear options. The sort of unintended escalation which started two world wars could arise from any of the conflicts around China's periphery. It nearly did so in March 1996, when China, in a blatant act of intimidation, fired ballistic missiles in the Taiwan Straits. It could arise from a Chinese-Vietnamese confrontation, particularly if the Vietnamese should score some unexpected military successes against the Chinese, as they did in 1979, and if the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), of which they are now a member, should tip in the direction of Hanoi. It could flare up from the smoldering insurgencies among Tibetans, Muslims, or Mongolians living inside China. Chains of alliance or interest, perhaps not clearly understood until the moment of crisis itself, could easily draw in neighboring states--Russia, or India, or Japan--or the United States.

### 2AC – Force Posture (Senkaku)

**Deterrence solves Senkaku conflict**

**Washington Times 10**

[The Washington Times, 9/27/10, Lexus]

Nothing should make the rest of the world so nervous as conflict between the two East Asian behemoths, China and Japan. Their long history of incestuous, bitterly conflicted relations dominates the political and economic landscape in their part of the world. That is why even a minor clash between a Chinese fishing boat and small Japanese coastal security craft has turned into a major flash point, exciting not only their two capitals, but Washington as well. We may never know the exact details of the episode. But in early September, a Chinese fishing craft bumped two Japanese coast guard speedboats. The episode took place in rich tuna grounds among rocky uninhabited islands, which stretch southward in the East China Sea from the Japanese main home islands through the Ryuku chain (including Okinawa, heavily loaded with U.S. bases) and on to Taiwan. These islands, called the Senkakus by the Japanese, Diaoyu by the Chinese, are claimed by both.The islands have taken on new importance because of speculation there may be oil and gas deposits beneath them. The argument is an expression of China's growing economic and military power, reflected in recent estimates that the Chinese gross national product has surpassed that of Japan as the world's No. 2 economy behind the United States. The "normal" routine in such encounters is that the Japanese take the fishing boats into custody, eventually returning them either to the Chinese mainland or, often, to their Taiwanese home ports. But this time, apparently, the fishing boat captain attempted to make a run for it before being captured. Tokyo almost immediately released the crew and the ship, but held on to the commander to be tried locally under Japanese law. Beijing howled. Its government-controlled media repeated recent highly chauvinistic claims, as it had recently done for other contested islets in the South China Sea. Stock Chinese communist phrases placed the incident on a par with challenges to Beijing's sovereignty over troubled internal provinces, such as Tibet and Xinjiang. A newly installed government in Tokyo stood its ground at first, but quickly caved in to Beijing's demands. A local magistrate released the ship's captain, ruling that the collisions were "deliberate, but not premeditated." Tokyo at first had argued that the two "bumps" occurred at different intervals, indicating the unlikelihood that they were accidental. And the question hanging in the air was whether the ship's captain was acting on instructions or whether he was a rogue mariner who had taken it upon himself to try to intimidate the smaller Japanese craft. Whatever the sequence of events, behind the scenes a complex political and diplomatic scramble was under way. Washington, which in some Japanese circles had been seen as less than responsive to Tokyo's concerns in recent international issues, especially on the North Korean threat, seemed to shift its position. Just weeks earlier, Washington had made a point of removing these disputed islands from the umbrella of the U.S.-Japan Mutual Defense Treaty. But Vice President Joseph R. Biden Jr. in a public address ranked U.S.-China relations as subsidiary to the concerns of the U.S.-Japanese alliance. A State Department spokesman used diplomatese to explain that Washington made a distinction between areas under Japanese control and sovereignty - but did reaffirm the application of the bilateral defense treaty in any defense of Japanese territory against aggression, presumably including from China. Washington's response bucked up the Japanese, not the least the new foreign minister, Seiji Maehara, a power in the heterogeneous ruling Democratic Party of Japan. Unlike many of his former socialist and pacifist party colleagues, Mr. Maehara, who arrived at the post largely because of internal DPJ politics, is seen as a hawk on China and one of the most stalwart supporters of the American alliance. But some Japanese explained Tokyo's capitulation in the clash as having been "advised" by Washington.

### 2AC – Force Posture (Marines)

**The Marines are critical to stability in Asia—but staying in Futenma destroys their effectiveness**

**Harden 10**

(Washington Post Foreign Service Correspondent, interviewing LT. General Robling US Marine Commander on Okinawa, “Future of Okinawa base strains U.S.-Japanese alliance”, [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/01/23/AR2010012302392.html//greenhill-chris](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/01/23/AR2010012302392.html/greenhill-chris))

**The people of Okinawa and the U.S. Marine Corps agree on at least one thing: The Futenma Marine air station is a noisy dinosaur that needs to move elsewhere -- and soon. Smack in the middle of this densely packed city of 92,000 and taking up about a quarter of its land, the air base torments its neighbors with the howl of combat helicopters and the shudder of C-130 transport planes. "The noise is unbearable," said Harumi Chinen, principal of Futenma No. 2 Elementary School, where about 780 children study in buildings next to the airfield. "A school should be very comforting and safe. That is not the case here." Where can the Marines and their earsplitting machines go? That question has triggered the most serious quarrel in the history of the traditionally harmonious U.S.-Japanese alliance, which last week marked its 50th anniversary. The** [**relocation question**](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/11/16/AR2009111600428.html?nav=emailpage) **has exasperated the Obama administration and strained its dealings with a country that the United States is treaty-bound to protect in case of attack. Hanging in the balance is the future of a** [**$26 billion deal**](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/10/21/AR2009102100746.html?nav=emailpage) **between** [**Japan**](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/world/countries/japan.html?nav=el) **and the United States to transfer 8,000 Marines from Okinawa to Guam and turn over several valuable tracts of urban land to the people of the island. Worry, too, has spread across East Asia, as officials from** [**South Korea**](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/world/countries/korea.html?nav=el) **to Australia have expressed concern about the future of the U.S. security role in the region. The 14,200 Marines who train with aircraft from Futenma are the only mobile U.S. ground forces based in East Asia, said Lt. Gen. Keith J. Stalder, commander of Marine forces in the Pacific. "They bring a lot of stability and security that allows the Asia Pacific region to be a relatively peaceful place," he said. Yet even from a Marine point of view, staying at Futenma is not desirable. Decades of citizen complaints -- and the 2004 crash of a Marine helicopter into a nearby college campus, which miraculously killed no one -- have triggered flight restrictions that degrade the tactical utility of the Futenma base, especially in training Marines for night combat. "These restrictions reduce the number of aircraft we can put up through a 24-hour day," said Lt. Gen. Terry G. Robling, Marine commander on this tropical island, which has a strategic perch between Taiwan and the Korean Peninsula. "It is not a showstopper, but it is a factor."**

**Marines can’t train effectively in Okinawa—Its too small and forces them to split up their forces**

GAO ‘2 (Government Accountability Office, “Military Training: Limitations Exist Overseas but Are Not Reflected in Readiness Reporting,” Report to the Chairman, Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d02525.pdf>)

**In Japan, local training areas on Okinawa are too small to support the Marine Corps’ maneuver-training requirements. Only small-unit elements can maneuver together. Large force elements that would normally be in close proximity to each other and maneuver together must break into small groups, disperse among the island’s training areas, and maneuver independently. Further, maneuver training that ideally would be conducted in a continuous, uninterrupted manner must be started and stopped as units move from one non-contiguous training area to another. Training constraints have further increased as a result of the 1996 Special Action Committee on Okinawa agreement4, which returned the Yomitan Auxiliary Airfield—the site previously used to conduct parachute drop training—to Japan and terminated nearly all artillery training on the island. Most battalion exercises and parachute drops, which require troops to conduct maneuver exercises after being dropped, have been relocated off Okinawa. Marine Corps officials told us that it is becoming increasingly difficult to obtain maneuver training on Okinawa. Figure 11 in appendix II is a map showing the locations of major units and training facilities in Japan.**

**Training restrictions and reductions kill readiness and combat capabilities**

Montalvo ‘2, of the Temple Environmental Law & Technology Journal (Eric, “Operational Encroachment: Woodpeckers and their Congressman,” Temple Environmental Law & Technology Journal, Spring, 20 Temp. Envtl. L. & Tech. J. 219)

**The judicial granting of injunctive relief for an administrative error resulting in temporary or permanent cease of military operations is of no small consequence. The harshness of a choice between environmental concerns and the deprivation of essential training from the men and women of the Armed Forces cannot be what Congress intended by the incorporation of injunctive relief in the citizen suit provisions of the various environmental statutes. In his testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee on encroachment issues and their impact on military readiness n23, Admiral Amerault described the deprivation of training "impact" as follows: When our vital ranges are not available for training because they are encumbered by encroachments, our state of readiness is at risk. This is complicated by the fact that encroachment issues are complex, varied, and involve multiple federal, state, and local agencies, the Congress, non-governmental organizations and the public. In dealing with its effects, we have borne a significant increase in administrative and human costs (time away from home, flight hour costs, travel expenses etc.) to achieve an acceptable level of readiness. In some instances, we have been unable to achieve the desired level. Encroachment negatively affects readiness by reducing the number of available training days; reducing training realism as tactics are modified (altitudes, airspeeds, profiles) ... causing a loss of range access altogether (either temporary or permanent); decreasing scheduling flexibility and complexity ... and increasing time away from home during training prior to deployment. Encroachment is often gradual and can go unnoticed, but its impacts cumulatively erode our ability to deploy combat ready Sailors and Marines. Knowledge of these domestic pressures by our allies may influence them to deny use of their ranges by our forces ... This loss of training opportunities will reduce fleet combat readiness proportionately. n24**

Staying in Japan eviscerates their combat effectiveness—it destroys readiness and makes them an easy target in the event of conflict

Meyer 2k9

(Carlton, a former Marine Corps officer who participated in military operations around the world. He had written dozens of articles for military magazines, pg online @ <http://www.g2mil.com/Japan-bases.htm> //ghs-ef)

**Keeping military families, aircraft, and ships permanently based in Japan is not only extremely expensive, it is strategically unwise. The USA maintained dozens of aircraft at Clark Field in the Philippines in 1941 to deter a Japanese attack. They provided an easy target for a surprise attack and all aircraft were destroyed on the ground. The defense of the Philippines was poorly organized as a key concern for American officers was the evacuation of military families. The same problem exists today in the unlikely event that war erupts with North Korea, China, or Russia. Dozens of American aircraft and thousands of American lives may be lost to surprise missile, bomber, or commando attacks, while officers are distracted with family concerns. While American servicemen are brave, many would abandon their post after an attack to ensure the welfare of their family. An attack on Japan may cause panic, and Admirals would face problems of sailors refusing to abandon their family to set sail. The Navy would be anxious to move its ships out of port to slip past lurking enemy submarines to the safety of bases in the central Pacific. From a military standpoint, it is far better to base ships, aircraft, and families far from the Asian mainland.**

**Lack of effective training will eviscerate Marine effectiveness and retention efforts—**

**Eaglen 11**

(Mackenzie, “Assessing the Strategic Readiness of the U.S. Armed Forces”,

[http://www.heritage.org/Research/Testimony/2011/03/Assessing-the-Strategic-Readiness-of-the-US-Armed-Forces//greenhilll-chris](http://www.heritage.org/Research/Testimony/2011/03/Assessing-the-Strategic-Readiness-of-the-US-Armed-Forces/greenhilll-chris))

**A significant component to maintaining readiness is training. Training does not just include preparing forces about to deploy to Iraq or Afghanistan --such as more time in depot for maintenance on equipment used at five or six times the peacetime rate and more in counterinsurgency operations, but also conventional warfare training in non-desert terrains, for example. Military service members do not have the luxury of preparing for or focusing on only one type of conflict. They must be trained on all weapons systems and platforms for all types of contingencies—even while major combat operations are underway. Senior military commanders in Iraq repeatedly noted that soldiers and Marines lacked training for major combat operations using their entire range of weapons. For example, artillerymen have not been practicing firing heavy guns but are instead doing counterinsurgency work as military police. General Robert Magnus, Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps, has said the Marine Corps’ ability to train for potential conflicts has been “significantly degraded.” General Michael Moseley, former Chief of Staff of the Air Force, was concerned that airmen—particularly those in the Guard and Reserves—were spending too much time training outside their mission specialties. In one of his notes to airmen, he described this phenomenon as “ancillary training creep” that jeopardizes mission accomplishment with the potential to overshadow combat focus. The potential consequences of reduced readiness levels across the U.S. military range from the practicalmechanics required to keep older planes, ships, and vehicles running--to the dire, such as an unforeseen crisis requiring aid from the U.S. military. Restoring readiness is critical because the nation does not have the residual capacity in many units, particularly the Army, to respond to domestic emergencies should they arise. Beyond potentially misspent time, there are secondary and tertiary effects of reduced training in a servicemember’s core competency. These negative possibilities may include an altered career path where professional military education, specialty certifications, or other development and education suffers, thereby affecting the performance reviews that, in part, help determine promotion and pay increases. In addition to a reduced ability to respond quickly to crises here in the United States, there are many second-tier effects of low readiness levels in the military. Regional combatant commanders beyond Central Command have seen their personnel and equipment diverted to Iraq and Afghanistan over the past several years. Admiral Timothy Keating, former Commander of the U.S. Pacific Command, said that mission demands hindered his ability to respond to an unforeseen crisis in the military’s largest geographical command region because 30,000 ground forces that are typically under his control were in the Middle East instead. Strategic engagement has also suffered as exercises with foreign militaries and allied partners have been curtailed over the last several years. These demands have also hamstrung Pacific Command’s ability to conduct exercises and build alliances that could one day prove decisive particularly in reducing the potential for future conflict. Large and small exercises with foreign militaries provide an effective display of capabilities, acting as a deterrent to would-be aggressors--and are important methods for enhancing military readiness. An effort to increase these exercises would be especially useful in the Asia-Pacific and in places like the Horn of Africa and the Strait of Hormuz, where increased coordination is required to stem the threat posed by both pirates and terrorists. Similarly, since 9/11 the U.S. has worked diligently to train and equip foreign militaries in counterterrorism as well as other security and stability operations. The U.S. military participates in the Trans-Sahara Counterterrorism Partnership, the Regional Strategic Initiative, the DoD Counterterrorism Fellowship Program, and the Building Global Partnerships Train and Equip program. Both U.S. Southern Command and U.S. Africa Command have made building partnerships and enhancing strategic cooperation central pillars of their missions. In addition to the benefits offered by training foreign militaries, these initiatives also serve to strengthen respect for the civil-military relationship and should not be bill payers for readiness. These marginal investments can reap savings for taxpayers in the event they help avoid conflict and the expenditure of greater resources. Further consequences of continued low readiness levels include recruitment and retention difficulties and the overall decline in the condition of the nation’s all-volunteer force. While all the services have done tremendous work in meeting high recruiting and retention goals since 2001, there are palpable signs of strain. The QDR Independent Panel “stress tested” America’s all-volunteer force and found there is reason to doubt the military can attract and maintain the requisite high quality numbers of personnel as the economy improves. The report noted that even if endstrength numbers remain steady, the quality of the force may decline due to emerging challenges and the loss of institutional memory. There is also some evidence to suggest that the average length of service is getting shorter.**

**Relocating the Marines to Guam will improve global deterrence and allow for better responses to every Asian hotspot**

**RIPS 7**

(Research Institute for Peace and Security, “Summary of the Report:
Strategic Implications for Japan of the Buildup of U.S. Bases in Guam September 2007”, [http://www.rips.or.jp/english/seminars/guam.html//greenhill-chris](http://www.rips.or.jp/english/seminars/guam.html/greenhill-chris))

**The ongoing buildup of U.S. bases in Guam, including the relocation of the Third Marine Expeditionary Force from Okinawa to Guam, could strengthen Japan's security in the following eight ways (see section III): The U.S. military's capability to intervene in the vast area from the Western Pacific to the Middle East will be enhanced. The relocated U.S. Marines will be positioned closer to Southeast Asia and the "Arc of Instability" than they currently are. Guam has the geographic advantage of being located close enough to the "hot spots" (places of potential instability) in Asia to be vital to any conceivable conflict, but far enough from mainland Asia to preclude attacks from other countries in the region. The bases in Guam will be useful to the United States and its allies in preparing for China's buildup of its navy's blue-water capability. The probability of a military conflict on the Korean peninsula comparable in magnitude to the Korean War is low. However, if such a conflict were to occur, the remaining U.S. Marine units in Okinawa, which will maintain high combat readiness, would be sufficient to handle the situation. In case of a military conflict between China and Taiwan, the United States presumably would come to the aid of Taiwan. Likewise, although the marines stationed in Okinawa have not been considered essential to its response, those remaining would be sufficient to take care of any contingency. The United States also will maintain its capability to support Japan in the event of a military conflict between Japan and China over the Senkaku Islands or in the East China Sea, since U.S. Marine units on high combat readiness will remain in Okinawa. The question here is the United States' willingness to actually provide such military support to Japan in such a situation. To resolve the U.S. base issue in Okinawa and to maintain a stable U.S. presence in the Western Pacific, this mutually agreed-on plan-in which the number of U.S. troops in Okinawa will be reduced to the extent possible without creating any strategic problems and will be moved to the U.S. territory of Guam-is rational. Even though the bases in Guam belong to the United States, to make sure that they will be operated in a way that reflects Japan's interests, the Japanese and U.S. governments should agree on the following four points (see section III): That the great distance between Okinawa and Guam will not negatively affect Japan's security; That the United States' commitment to the security of Japan will not be weakened by the relocation; That the strategic advantages of the U.S. bases on Guam will actually be used for Japan's security; and That Japan, in turn, will use the strengthened Guam bases to enhance its security. Despite the smaller number of U.S. Marines in Okinawa, the realignment of U.S. forces in Japan is expected to better equip the U.S. military to defend Japan, for the following five reasons (see section IV): After the marines leave, enough U.S. troops to provide the necessary defense support for Japan are scheduled to remain in the country. The command function of the U.S. forces in Japan will be strengthened. Along with the realignment of U.S. troops, the military power of the U.S. forces in Japan, such as the U.S. missile defense, will be reinforced. Since the U.S. forces in Guam will be located where they are invulnerable to attacks by other countries in the region, they can launch a counterattack (e.g., in response to a military attack on Japan) without the fear of preemptive attacks or retaliation. The mutually agreed-on plan for the realignment of U.S. forces in Japan considers various resolutions to problems related to the bases there-which include but are not limited to the relocation of the U.S. Marines in Okinawa-that will enhance the Japanese people's support of the Japan-U.S. alliance.**

**Moving to Guam maintains deterrence and allows the US to perform critical cooperative security missions in South East Asia**

**Japan Times 5**

(“U.S. general calls Guam better base for dealing with Islamist radicals”, U.S. general calls Guam better base for dealing with Islamist radicals, <http://search.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/nn20051109a4.html> //greenhill-chris)

**A top U.S. Marine Corps general said Monday the United States decided to transfer some marines stationed in Okinawa to Guam because it will better position them to deal with Islamic radicals in Asia, especially Southeast Asia.Speaking at a National Press Club luncheon, Marine Commandant Gen. Michael Hagee also said the development of high-speed transport vessels will enable the marines to deploy rapidly and maintain deterrence in Northeast Asia, even if some forces are moved from Okinawa to Guam. Hagee made the comments when asked about the Oct. 29 agreement with Japan to relocate 7,000 marines out of Okinawa -- 6,000 to Guam and 1,000 elsewhere in Japan. While the agreement is an effort to reduce the burden in Okinawa as part of the realignment of the U.S. military presence in Japan, Hagee stressed that the United States decided on the relocation as part of its global military transformation to deal with future contingencies. At issue is whether the marines are "properly positioned to respond to contingencies or to (provide) cooperative security" in the future, Hagee said. "Why are the marines on Okinawa?" Hagee asked, "Because we ended up there after World War II and we stayed after the Korean War, and that's why we're there. "Now we're providing deterrence up there in Northeast Asia, and that is quite important," he said. "But if you look at the Asia-Pacific region, and if you believe that this global war on terror is also about fighting against this small element of radical fundamentalism in the Islamic religion, and where are the largest Islamic countries that we probably want to work with, do cooperative security with? They are not in the Gulf," Hagee said. Naming Indonesia, Malaysia, Bangladesh and India, he said they are "all democratic countries that I would argue that we want to cooperate with and we want to work with." As for maintaining deterrence, especially against North Korea and cross-strait tensions between China and Taiwan, Hagee said high-speed vessels will be available in a few years to transport marines significant distances at low cost. Hagee said, "Just as an example, going from Okinawa to Korea, we can move a battalion, with all its equipment, in just about 24 hours." "It takes a week if we use strategic airlift to do that, and it costs a great deal more," he said.**

**Al Qaeda is making inroads into South Asia—its become a key safe haven to launch attacks from**

**Chanlet-Avery et al 9**

(“Terrorism in Southeast Asia”, [http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/terror/RL34194.pdf//greenhill-chris](http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/terror/RL34194.pdf/greenhill-chris))

**Beginning in the early-to-mid 1990s the Al Qaeda terrorist network made significant inroads into the Southeast Asia region. Al Qaeda’s Southeast Asian operatives—who have been primarily of Middle Eastern origin—appear to have performed three primary tasks. First, they set up local cells, predominantly headed by Arab members of Al Qaeda, that served as regional offices supporting the network’s global operations. These cells have exploited the region’s generally loose border controls to hold meetings in Southeast Asia to plan attacks against Western targets, host operatives transiting through Southeast Asia, and provide safe haven for other operatives fleeing U.S. intelligence services. Al Qaeda’s Manila cell, which was founded in the early 1990s by a brother-in-law of Osama bin Laden, was particularly active in the early-mid-1990s. Under the leadership of Ramzi Yousef, who fled to Manila after coordinating the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center in New York, the cell plotted to blow up 11 airliners in a two-day period (what was known as the “Bojinka” plot), crash a hijacked airliner into the Central Intelligence Agency’s headquarters, and assassinate the Pope during his visit to the Philippines in early 1995. Yousef was assisted in Manila for a time by his uncle, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the alleged mastermind of the September 11, 2001 attacks. 3 In the late 1990s, the locus of Al Qaeda’s Southeast Asia activity appears to have moved to Malaysia, Singapore, and—most recently— Indonesia. In 1999 and 2000, Kuala Lumpur and Bangkok were the sites for important strategy meetings among some of the September 11 plotters. 4 Al Qaeda’s leadership also has taken advantage of Southeast Asia’s generally loose financial controls to use various countries in the region as places to raise, transmit, and launder the network’s funds. By 2002, according to expert opinion on Al Qaeda, roughly one-fifth of Al Qaeda’s organizational strength was centered in Southeast Asia.**

**Failure to crush South Asian terrorists causes full scale Indo-Pak war**

GSN 10

(Global Security Newswire, “Al-Qaeda Seeks to Heighten South Asian Tensions, Gates Warns”, [http://gsn.nti.org/gsn/nw\_20100120\_4750.php//greenhill-chris](http://gsn.nti.org/gsn/nw_20100120_4750.php/greenhill-chris))

**An al-Qaeda-linked terrorist strike in South Asia could lead to another military conflict between nuclear-armed rivals India and Pakistan, U.S. Defense Secretary Robert Gates warned today (see [GSN](http://gsn.nti.org/gsn/nw_20091217_8715.php%22%20%5Ct%20%22blank), Dec. 17, 2009). A handful of organizations within a regional al-Qaeda "syndicate" aim "to destabilize not just Afghanistan, not just Pakistan, but potentially the whole region by provoking a conflict perhaps between India and Pakistan through some provocative act," Gates told reporters in New Delhi, according to Agence France-Presse. "It's important to recognize the magnitude of the threat that the entire region faces," he added, saying the al-Qaeda "umbrella" included the Taliban groups in Pakistan and Afghanistan was well as the Pakistani-based extremist organization Lashkar-e-Taiba, which is believed to have masterminded the 2008 terror attack on the Indian city of Mumbai (Agence France-Presse/[Sydney Morning Herald](http://news.smh.com.au/breaking-news-world/alqaeda-could-provoke-new-indiapakistan-war-gates-20100120-mlle.html%22%20%5Ct%20%22blank), Jan. 20). "It's dangerous to single out any one of these groups and say, 'If we can beat that group, that will solve the problem,' because they are in effect a syndicate of terrorist operators intended to destabilize this entire region," Gates said. He argued that "a victory for one" of the organizations "is a victory for all," the Associated Press reported. New Delhi and Islamabad have already gone to war three times. While they successfully avoided additional violence following the Mumbai strike, another such incident could stretch New Delhi's tolerance over militant groups based in Pakistan, Gates cautioned: "It is not unreasonable to assume that Indian patience would be limited were there another attack." Gates' stop in New Delhi included talks with Prime Minister Manmohan Singh and other senior leaders (see[GSN](http://gsn.nti.org/gsn/nw_20091210_6052.php%22%20%5Ct%20%22blank), Dec. 10, 2009; Anne Gearan, Associated Press/[Yahoo!News](http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20100120/ap_on_re_as/as_gates%22%20%5Ct%20%22blank), Jan. 20). Washington is "pretty confident of our intelligence-sharing relationship," one high-level U.S. official told theWashington Post, adding it was going to take a collective effort to dismantle and defeat" the terrorist groups (Craig Whitlock, [Washington Post](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/01/19/AR2010011900278.html%22%20%5Ct%20%22blank), Jan. 19).**

### 2AC – Force Posture (China war)

#### Plan key to Deter China

Kan 12

(Shirley A. Kan, 2012 "Guam: US Defense Deployments," pg online @ www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS22570.pdf//arjun)

Building Guam as a strategic hub has played a critical role in balancing U.S. security interests in responding to and cooperating with China as well as in shaping China’s perceptions and conduct. The Obama Administration’s strategy has sought to shape China’s rise as a power that is peaceful, responsible, and respectful of international rules and laws. However, China’s civilian and military commentators commonly have suspected the U.S. defense buildup on Guam as partly aimed at China, as part of the U.S.-led “encirclement” or “containment” of China. Some critics have questioned whether there is a coherent strategy for addressing China’s security challenges, while other critics worry that U.S. actions and statements would raise tensions with China. Washington and Beijing have long differed over China’s threats to use the People’s Liberation Army (PLA) against Taiwan. U.S. policy on helping Taiwan’s self-defense is governed not by a defense treaty but by the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA), P.L. 96-8. Moreover, some concerns about the PLA’s accelerated modernization since the Taiwan Strait Crisis of 1995-1996 have expanded beyond Taiwan to include PLA preparations for possible conflicts with the United States, Japan, and others. In Southeast Asia, China claims much of the South China Sea as well as the disputed Spratly and Paracel Islands in that sea as its “sovereign territory.” The PLA has raised attention to Guam and has been building up its submarine force (both nuclear-powered and diesel-electric). In November 2004, the PLA Navy sent a Han-class nuclear attack submarine to waters off Guam before intruding into Japan’s territorial water. 44 Further, the PLA’s rising power has implications beyond Asia. The National Military Strategy of 2011 stated concerns about China’s assertiveness in space, cyberspace, the Yellow Sea, East China Sea, and South China Sea. By early 2012, the Director of National Intelligence (DNI) testified to Congress that: “Many of Beijing’s military capability goals have now been realized, resulting in impressive military might. Other goals remain longer term, but the PLA is receiving the funding and political support to transform the PLA into a fully modern force, capable of sustained operations in Asia and beyond.” 45 In 2007, PACOM Commander Admiral Timothy Keating visited Guam and acknowledged that its defense buildup was partly due to concerns about tension over Taiwan and North Korea. At the same time, he stressed U.S. transparency, saying the buildup was not “under the cover of darkness.” In answer to Senator Webb about the PLA’s expanding activities at a hearing in March 2008, Keating testified that during his first visit to China (in May 2007), the PLA Navy proposed—in seriousness or in jest—that as it acquires aircraft carriers, it would take the Pacific west of Hawaii while the U.S. Navy would cover east of Hawaii. 46 Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for East Asia Michael Schiffer testified to Congress in March 2010 that the implementation of the 2006 Realignment Roadmap would help meet shared security challenges, including the threat posed by North Korea as well as uncertainty posed by the PLA’s “rapid” modernization. In the same month in answer to Senator Daniel Akaka, PACOM’s Commander, Admiral Willard, cited the PLA Air Force’s fighters and air defense systems for U.S. deployment of F-22 fighters in the Pacific, including at Guam’s Andersen Air Force Base. 47 The Commander of Pacific Air Forces, General Gary North, acknowledged in October 2011 that U.S. forces needed to watch China’s “expansive claims” in the South China Sea. He added that the three Global Hawk reconnaissance drones based at Guam can stay airborne for over 30 hours. 48 However, the impasse with Japan that started in 2009 over the realignment to Guam raised increased concerns about PRC misperceptions of weakened U.S. alliances that could affect stability. Also, with the planned move of significant numbers of marines from Japan to Guam, the PRC could misperceive pushing a U.S. retreat from the “first island chain” to the “second island chain.” In Congress, Senator James Webb said in a speech in Tokyo in February 2011 that Northeast Asia is the only place in the world where the interests of the United States, Russia, China, and Japan intersect. He noted that the U.S.-Japan relationship resulted in regional stability. Concerning China, Senator Webb said that when the Soviet Union collapsed, the United States became “overexposed and unprepared” for the way that China has expanded. While affecting the U.S. economy, China’s rise also has incrementally affected regional stability. He urged careful handling of the realignment of bases to avoid giving the wrong signals for strategic stability. 49

**Stable presence in Guam is critical to deter a Chinese attack on Taiwan**

**Caryl, 7**

(Washington Chief Editor for Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty. He is a Contributing Editor at Foreign Policy and a Senior Fellow of the Center for International Studies at MIT, [http://www.newsweek.com/2007/02/25/america-s-unsinkable-fleet.html](http://www.newsweek.com/2007/02/25/america-s-unsinkable-fleet.html%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank))

**So why all the fuss over a tropical island just 30 miles long, known mainly for its white-sand beaches and glorious sunsets? The answer: the Pentagon has begun a major redeployment of U.S. forces in the region, pulling troops and equipment out of sometimes unreliable allies and beefing up its presence in more-congenial locales. First on its list isGuam, a U.S. territory since 1898 that is fast becoming the linchpin of Washington's new Asia strategy. Current U.S. forces on the island number just a few thousand but within a decade will total well over 20,000—about the same size as the Bush administration's planned surge in Iraq. By comparison, there are some 29,000 U.S. troops left in South Korea, yet despite the dangers of a nuclear-armed North, that number is expected to drop significantly. At a time when most of the world's attention is focused on the United States' misadventures in Iraq and Afghanistan,Pentagon planners are quietly working on ways to fortify the U.S. presence in East Asia. And they're looking to do so in ways that will give them a free hand in a wide range of contingencies—including fighting regional terrorists and a possible showdown with China. Guam offers the U.S. military both proximity to potential hot spots and the advantages of operating off U.S. soil. The transfer of forces to the island also reflects the Pentagon's determination to give regional allies such as South Korea and Japan more responsibility for their own security. Guam, a sleepy but diverse place that looks like a cross between Micronesia and Middle America, has long served as a U.S. air base and way station for troops traveling through the Pacific. At the end of the cold war, the Pentagon began shutting down some facilities on the island. But then came September 11, and a dramatic reassessment of America's global forces. Former secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld began to advocate the lily-pad strategy: rather than relying on large, static bases in Germany and South Korea, the Pentagon should create a global network of jumping-off points for quick responses to unpredictable attacks. Guam is an ideal lily pad, since the United States can act there without seeking permission from allies, says Honolulu-based defense analyst Richard Halloran. Declares Carl Peterson of the Guam Chamber of Commerce: "This is the U.S. in Asia. This is the tip of the spear." The island has already become a convenient base for fighting Washington's "Global War on Terror" in Indonesia and the Philippines. Small wonder that Brig. Gen. Douglas H. Owens, the commanding officer of Guam's Andersen Air Force Base, describes the island as "an unsinkable aircraft carrier." It's also well positioned for possible trouble to come. As Rear Adm. Charles Leidig, U.S. Navy commander on Guam, points out, if you take a map and draw a circle with Guam at the center and a radius of 1,500 nautical miles—equivalent to three hours' flying time or two to three days by ship—you come close to the main islands of Japan, Okinawa, Indonesia and the Philippines. China and the Korean Peninsula are only a bit farther off. So are several of the world's most important sea lanes, such as the Strait of Malacca, through which some 50 percent of the world's oil passes each year. The Pentagon, however, may be building up its forces on Guam with even bigger game in mind. "The larger strategic rationale [for the shift] can be summed up in one word, and that's 'China'," says Halloran. "They [the Bush administration] don't want to contain China, and they couldn't. What they are trying to do is to deter the Chinese. That's what the buildup on Guam is all about." The nature of the U.S. reorganization reinforces this point. Washington and Tokyo have agreed to move 8,000 Marines to Guam from Okinawa by 2014, at a cost of $10 billion (60 percent of which will be paid for by the Japanese government). But this is only the most public part of a broader buildup that has largely escaped notice. If all the pieces come together, it could mean billions more in Defense Department funds and a total increase in Guam's population (which is currently just 170,000) of 35,000. Guam is already home to a major U.S. Navy port and one of the biggest bases in the U.S. Air Force, featuring twin two-mile-long runways. Not long after September 11, flights of massive B-52 bombers began returning to Andersen to carry out regular training missions. Now the Air Force has begun to prepare for the deployment of tanker aircraft and up to 48 fighter planes, including the state-of-the-art F-22 Raptor. Andersen has also already started construction of a $52.8 million project that will house up to 10 Global Hawks--large unmanned spy planes that, according to Pacific Command Air Force Gen. Paul Hester, could end up replacing aging U-2 spy planes now based in South Korea. Meanwhile, the Navy has turned its port at Guam's Apra Harbor into a home for two Los Angeles-class nuclear-powered attack submarines, with a third to come later this year. It also plans to refurbish wharves to accommodate aircraft carriers and to transform Guam into a base for its new Littoral Combat Ship (a shallow-draft stealth ship designed to operate close to shore) and Trident submarines. The Tridents, immense cold-war-era craft converted to fire Tomahawk cruise missiles, can also be used by Navy Special Operations Forces, who can set off on missions in mini-submarines launched through the Tridents' missile ports. Guam is already home to an undisclosed number of Navy SEALs, many of whom have seen duty in the war on terror, and their number will likely grow. Guam's new capabilities, however, are designed for more than just low-intensity conflicts. The attack submarines that will soon be based there, for example, probably wouldn't be much use in a conflict with North Korea or Qaeda-allied terrorists in the Philippines; the presence of the subs, experts say, is clearly aimed at the possibility of a naval confrontation with China over the Taiwan Strait. Similarly, analysts argue, the stationing of F-22s and tanker planes on Guam points to the Pentagon's desire to ensure dominance in the air should it have to fight the Chinese. China's media often worry about just this scenario, but not everyone agrees that China is the main target of the Guam buildup. Evan Medeiros of the RAND Corporation says "the initial impetus and primary driver" were to restructure the U.S. military for the wide range of operations it now faces, from fighting the war on terror to chasing pirates and conducting humanitarian missions. In the complicated post-9/11 world, the United States believes it must be able to respond to various threats as flexibly as possible. This means keeping its forces close to the action. In the past that's required basing them in other countries' territories. But Guam offers an almost unique combination of a good location, excellent facilities (including a topnotch harbor, vast warehouses and massive airfields) and a lack of political restraints. As Kurt Campbell, a former White House staffer and Defense Department official now at the Center for a New American Security, says, "[Guam is] a point from which you can do a variety of things. And it's a place to remind people that you're still focused on the region." Campbell points out that these secondary missions, such as protecting sea lanes, countering weapons proliferation and conducting relief missions, remain important; the U.S. military's humanitarian efforts after the tsunami of December 2005 gave a huge boost to the country's reputation in Asia. Brad Glosserman, executive director of Pacific Forum CSIS, a Hawaii-based think tank, agrees. The Asia-Pacific region, he says, "is a jigsaw puzzle where all the pieces are changing shape and size all the time. China's the big story--but there are also changes going in on Japan, India, South Korea, Taiwan." One such development driving the move to Guam has been the steady withdrawal of the United States from South Korea in recent years (more than 9,000 troops have left in the last three years)--a result, in part, of rising anti-Americanism there and Rumsfeld's reluctance to keep troops in politically sensitive places. Some Air Force units that have pulled out of South Korea have already arrived on Guam; others may be yet to come. That, along with the planned removal of the Marines from Okinawa, has led some commentators to characterize the Guam expansion as evidence of a virtual U.S. retreat from East Asia. But Campbell and others disagree: "I would see this not as a retrenchment but as a diversification." Indeed, after years of maintaining an even balance between its Atlantic and Pacific fleets, the U.S. Navy is now clearly emphasizing its force in Asia.**

#### Solves China war

Erickson and Mikolay 05 (Andrew – Strategic Studies at U.S. Naval War college. Justin -- USS San Juan, “Anchoring America’s Asian Assets: Why Washington Must Strengthen Guam”, <http://www.hawaii.edu/hivandaids/Anchoring_America_s_Asian_Assets__Why_Washington_Must_Strengthen_Guam.pdf> // Veevz)

The recent agreement to split up the package on realigning U.S. forces in Japan is part of a wider move by Washington to strengthen security ties in response to China’s growing military might. Specifically, the Japan agreement will transfer some U.S. Marines now based in Okinawa Prefecture to Guam even before any progress is made on the relocation of the U.S. Marine Corps Air Station Futenma in the prefecture. The transfer to Guam comes while the United States has also strengthened its relationship in recent months with such allies as Australia and the Philippines. The joint statement issued on Feb. 8 about the new agreement only said the Marine transfer to Guam would be for "the maintenance of peace and security in the Asia-Pacific region." However, in discussions that started in early January between officials of Japan and the United States, the Americans made clear their concerns about the future effects on U.S. national security due to moves made by China. Sources said the U.S. officials pointed to the Philippines, Singapore and Australia within the bigger picture of realigning the U.S. military in the Asia-Pacific region. A central role in the U.S. strategy will be played by the U.S. territory of Guam. Even as China makes efforts to improve the capability of its ballistic and cruise missiles, Guam is sufficiently distant from China, but close enough so that airborne troops can be transported within about three hours to such key locations as Tokyo, Okinawa, Taipei and Manila. The Marines who would be moved from Okinawa to Guam would mainly be those working in command functions. Plans call for constructing a new command headquarters on Guam to have the island serve as the brain of the Marine deployment, while bases in Okinawa and other allies would serve as the arms and legs. However, the U.S. Congress rejected all expenditures for the Marine transfer to Guam in the federal budget for the fiscal year running from October 2011 until September 2012. A major reason was the lack of progress on the Futenma relocation issue. Following the 2006 agreement between Japan and the United States on the realignment of the U.S. military in Japan, U.S. officials insisted on a package deal that would have the Marines transferred to Guam only if progress was made on the Futenma relocation. The latest decision to break up that package reflects the urgency of U.S. officials to create a cornerstone of their strategy in Guam as a means of dealing with China.

#### **And- even limited China exchange causes extinction**

**Takai, 2009** (Mitsuo, Ret. Colonel and Researcher at the Staff College for Japan’s Ground Self-Defense Force, “U.S.-China Nuclear Strikes Would Spell Doomsday”, October 7, http://www.upiasia.com/Security/2009/10/07/us-china\_nuclear\_strikes\_would\_spell\_doomsday/7213/)

What would happen if China launched its 20 Dongfeng-5 (ICBMs) intercontinental ballistic missiles, each with a 5-megaton warhead, at 20 major U.S. cities? Prevailing opinion in Washington D.C. until not so long ago was that the raids would cause over 40 million casualties, annihilating much of the United States. In order to avoid such a doomsday scenario, consensus was that the United States would have to eliminate this potential threat at its source with preemptive strikes on China. But cool heads at institutions such as the Federation of American Scientists and the National Resource Defense Council examined the facts and produced their own analyses in 2006, which differed from the hard-line views of their contemporaries. The FAS and NRDC developed several scenarios involving nuclear strikes over ICBM sites deep in the Luoning Mountains in China’s western province of Henan, and analyzed their implications. One of the scenarios involved direct strikes on 60 locations – including 20 main missile silos and decoy silos – hitting each with one W76-class, 100-kiloton multiple independently targetable reentry vehicle carried on a submarine-launched ballistic missile. In order to destroy the hardened silos, the strikes would aim for maximum impact by causing ground bursts near the silos' entrances. Using air bursts similar to the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki would not be as effective, as the blasts and the heat would dissipate extensively. In this scenario, the 6 megatons of ground burst caused by the 60 attacks would create enormous mushroom clouds over 12 kilometers high, composed of radioactive dirt and debris. Within 24 hours following the explosions, deadly fallout would spread from the mushroom clouds, driven by westerly winds toward Nanjing and Shanghai. They would contaminate the cities' residents, water, foodstuff and crops, causing irreversible damage. The impact of a 6-megaton nuclear explosion would be 360 times more powerful than the Hiroshima bomb, killing not less than 4 million people. Such massive casualties among non-combatants would far exceed the military purpose of destroying the enemy's military power. This would cause political harm and damage the United States’ ability to achieve its war aims, as it would lose international support. On the other hand, China could retaliate against U.S. troops in East Asia, employing intermediate-range ballistic missiles including its DF-3, DF-4 and DF-21 missiles, based in Liaoning and Shandong provinces, which would still be intact. If the United States wanted to destroy China's entire nuclear retaliatory capability, U.S. forces would have to employ almost all their nuclear weapons, causing catastrophic environmental hazards that could lead to the annihilation of [human] mankind. Accordingly, the FAS and NRDC conclusively advised U.S. leaders to get out of the vicious cycle of nuclear competition, which costs staggering sums, and to promote nuclear disarmament talks with China. Such advice is worth heeding by nuclear hard-liners.

### 2AC – Force Posture (Filipino terror)

#### Plan k2 solve Indonesian and Filipino terrorism

Erickson and Mikolay 05 (Andrew – Strategic Studies at U.S. Naval War college. Justin -- USS San Juan, “Anchoring America’s Asian Assets: Why Washington Must Strengthen Guam”, <http://www.hawaii.edu/hivandaids/Anchoring_America_s_Asian_Assets__Why_Washington_Must_Strengthen_Guam.pdf> // Veevz)

The October 12, 2002 terrorist attack that killed 168 civilians in Bali, Indonesia, awakened American observers to the danger of terror cells in Southeast Asia. As yet, explains the Brookings Institution’s Michael O’Hanlon, “terrorists based in the Philippines and Indonesia have not demonstrated global capabilities.” 26 But this regional focus does not discount the importance of establishing a center to more closely monitor such groups as Jemaah Islamiah in Indonesia and Abu Sayyaf in the southern provinces of the Philippines. Hundreds of special operations soldiers already pursuing terrorists in the Philippines need reinforcement to render terrorist organizations inoperative. The struggle against terrorism will be a long war of attrition. Prevailing with minimum loss of American life and interests requires simultaneously treating both the symptoms and the condition. Terrorism can be overcome in the long term only by addressing the larger economic, political, and religious factors that cause it; otherwise when one cell is destroyed another will emerge, like a Hydra’s head. But in the meantime, reducing the devastation that could harm Americans and reduce international support for the larger effort means targeting local violence. The U.S. Navy has an important role to play here, from special operations to construction battalions. 27 U.S. Special Operations forces are currently helping to coordinate attacks on Abu Sayyaf in the Philippines. Construction battalions can be used in strategic, joint goodwill operations, such as helping the Philippine Air Force build a small airstrip in Mindanao. 28 The continued emphasis on joint operations in the form of Joint Mission Essential Task Lists (JMETLs) has forced commanders to consider consolidating forces in Guam. JMETLs derive from orders considered vital to foreseeable missions and are normally delegated to regional commands. 29 Guam is therefore well suited to host joint military exercises in support of such JMETLs. Guam has already been used in the 1990s as the premier training ground for the 31 st Marine Expeditionary Unit exercise True (Training in an Urban Environment). 30 Of central signiﬁcance to the economic interests of America and its East Asian allies is the security of mega-hubs, deep-water ports that can accommodate the 60-foot drafts of the largest container ships. As of yet, however, safeguarding the world’s megahubs has not received the attention it deserves. According to Lieutenant Colonel Scott Lindsey, U.S. Marine Corps, “Guam puts [American forces] closer to the four mega-hubs in Southeast Asia (out of the global 14 that run east-west and ‘feed’ small ports). And 76% of the planet’s computer components come through that neighborhood.” 31

#### Terrorism causes state collapse and global conflicts

Alexander 02, Professor at George Washington, (Yonah, FDCH Testimony before the Immigration and Claims subcommittee, 2/28, http://judiciary.house.gov/legacy/alexander022802.htm)

Scores of countries have experienced sporadic and relentless subnational and government-sponsored terrorism in the post-World War II period. Epitomizing the state of anarchy of contemporary life and increasingly becoming a universal nightmare, terrorism includes: kidnapping of businesspeople, assassination of political leaders, bombing of embassies, and hijacking of aircraft. Modern terrorism, in contrast to its older features, has introduced a new breed of warfare in terms of threats, technology, victimization, and responses. Perhaps the most significant dangers that evolve from modern day terrorism are those relating to the safety, welfare, and rights of ordinary people; stability of the state system; health of economic development; expansion of democracy; and possibly survival of civilization itself. And yet, on September 11, 2001, Americans were stunned to witness the unprecedented drama of terrorists striking a devastating blow at the center of the nation’s commercial and military powers. Thus, despite the end of the Cold War and the evolving era of the New World Order, terrorism remains as threatening as ever. Undoubtedly, conflicts emerging from ideological, religious, and national animosities will continue to make terrorism a global problem well into the twenty-first century. The vulnerability of modern society and its infrastructure, coupled with the opportunities for the utilization of sophisticated high-leverage conventional and unconventional weaponry, requires states, both unilaterally and in concert, to develop credible responses and capabilities to minimize future threats. Ensuring the safety and interests of its citizens at home and abroad will therefore continue to be every government’s paramount responsibility in the coming months and years. Understanding the methods of operation employed by terrorists, identifying the threats and specific targets, both present and future, and knowing the damage and consequences that may result from acts of terror violence will assist governments, with the help of private industry, in responding to the reality of terrorism.

### 2AC – Force Posture (North Korea)

#### Redeployment to Guam protects against N. Korea.

Erickson and Mikolay 05 (Andrew – Strategic Studies at U.S. Naval War college. Justin -- USS San Juan, “Anchoring America’s Asian Assets: Why Washington Must Strengthen Guam”, <http://www.hawaii.edu/hivandaids/Anchoring_America_s_Asian_Assets__Why_Washington_Must_Strengthen_Guam.pdf> // Veevz)

U.S. military force planners now work in the framework of a broad new national security strategy calling for proactive responses to unpredictable threats. Dismantling WMD being among the highest priorities for national defense, the announcement of an ongoing nuclear weapons program in North Korea has drawn the concerted attention of American policy makers to Northeast Asia. Now that Saddam Hussein has been captured and his regime dismantled, decision makers would do well to ask, “Should North Korea be the next target of U.S. pressure?” and plan accordingly.32 Current U.S. priorities in the Middle East make it unwise to provoke North Korea now, but in the future building a more credible American threat that does not hinge on Japanese or South Korean participation may be essential in attempting to pressure Pyongyang. North Korean aggression remains a possibility (albeit remote) should détente with the South fail. Of course, a Korean Peninsula conflict would not be as lopsided as America’s Iraq campaign, for reasons that go beyond comparative military capabilities. The apparent military ease of Operation Iraqi Freedom should not be allowed to obscure key differences. First, in Iraq a slow diplomatic buildup allowed for massive troop prepositioning. This would not happen in the Koreas. The North, in a time of rising tensions, could preempt major troop deployments, threatening Seoul with artillery or Japan with missiles. Second, the coalition in Iraq had bases in neighboring Kuwait from which to launch an attack, with no restrictions on their use; public opinion in South Korea might not permit similar use of U.S. bases there. Third, North Korea has a far greater potential to inflict a “sea of fire”—unacceptable, even mass casualties among American troops and allied civilians—than Iraq ever did, greatly constraining U.S. options for applying pressure. Moreover, South Korean civilians would probably not embrace even a defensive American military buildup on the peninsula. Another place or base—such as Guam—is necessary to overcome this dilemma. With further investment, Guam could bring to life the current doctrinal focus on RSOI (reception, staging, onward movement, and integration). The concept of RSOI is to rapidly transport troops into a crisis theater or area of operations and unite them with their equipment. First, in-theater ships would deploy equipment at sea or in Japan, or stage the equipment in Guam. The process of arranging combat organizations in-theater depends on further transportation developments, mainly the transport of heavy (e.g., mechanized tanks) and light (such as mechanized infantry) equipment. It makes sense to preposition stocks in Guam and marry these stocks with troops using the RSOI process, rather than a costly yet less dependable prestaged maritime option. All U.S. military services already preposition equipment; it is simply preferable to consolidate and then fly troops in to meet the vessels carrying the equipment.33 A large conventional conflict on the Korean Peninsula is a high-cost, low-probability prospect. For decades the need for America to respond to a full-scale invasion kept a permanent land force near the demilitarized zone. But the Pentagon is now backing away from this “tripwire” approach, since U.S. forces stationed within range of North Korean artillery undermine the American threat of preemptive strike. Moreover, the more likely contingency of heightened tensions—as opposed to immediate, full-scale war—suggests a rapid-response force. Here, as in much of East Asia, the bulk of U.S. influence lies not on land but at sea.

#### North Korean war causes extinction

Hayes and Green, 10 - \*Victoria University AND \*\*Executive Director of the Nautilus Institute (Peter and Michael, “-“The Path Not Taken, the Way Still Open: Denuclearizing the Korean Peninsula and Northeast Asia”, 1/5, http://www.nautilus.org/fora/security/10001HayesHamalGreen.pdf)

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

### 2AC – Force Posture (China/Taiwan war)

#### Arms sales kill Chinese relations now

**Cole 4/1/11** (CITING A report co-authored by a former commander-in-chief of the US Pacific Command is calling  Staff writer, Taipei Times, US arms sales creating ‘vicious circle’, [http://www.taipeitimes.com/News/taiwan/archives/2011/04/01/2003499637 //](http://www.taipeitimes.com/News/taiwan/archives/2011/04/01/2003499637%20//) Veevz )

“Today, the changing and evolving US/China relationship demands a practical strategy,” the introductory letter by center director Gerald Baliles says. “There must be careful consideration of what both nations seek to gain from this relationship, and of how the relationship itself affects the balance of nations worldwide.” Part of that practical strategy, the report says, involves rethinking longstanding US security commitments to Taiwan under the Taiwan Relations Act. “The United States takes a somewhat protectionist stance with Taiwan historically,” the report says. “However, Taiwan is now an economically successful democratic institution that is slowly tending towards greater alignment with the Mainland [China]. Our involvement with Taiwan is a frequent point of contention with the Chinese, particularly in respect to arms sales, and one that should be re-examined. The complex relationship is political and should be re-examined outside of a military context.”

Plan Trades off with arms sales – individually solves Taiwan Conflict

Erickson and Mikolay 05 (Andrew – Strategic Studies at U.S. Naval War college. Justin -- USS San Juan, “Anchoring America’s Asian Assets: Why Washington Must Strengthen Guam”, <http://www.hawaii.edu/hivandaids/Anchoring_America_s_Asian_Assets__Why_Washington_Must_Strengthen_Guam.pdf> // Veevz)

Tension in the Taiwan Strait deserves separate consideration here, because it will drive American basing strategy in the middle term. Taiwan is a democratic stronghold, a key trade partner, and a potential technology sieve, which could be forced to capitulate to the mainland. 35 At present, U.S. military assistance is geographically far removed from Taiwan; rapidity of response depends on what forces happen to be nearby at the time. The transit time for a carrier strike group stationed on the West Coast is roughly two weeks, a week from the Indian Ocean, and approximately the same from Hawaii. If an additional carrier were forward deployed to Yokosuka, Japan; or if a CVN were on station in the Paciﬁc, or in port at Guam the transit time would be much reduced. America’s ability to respond to a Taiwan Strait crisis is also constrained by political forces in the region. Although many U.S. analysts believe Taiwan could defend itself in a military engagement against China, calamitous economic damage to the island would be a virtual certainty; if the United States failed to respond effectively and early, Taipei might therefore sue for peace. The most likely course of Chinese action against Taiwan would produce a series of ambiguous indicators that would need to be evaluated up close and early, on the basis of previous assessments of Chinese naval operations at peace and during crises. Such monitoring would be greatly facilitated by a stronger American presence in the region. Deploying additional U.S. forces to Guam would also generally support growing U.S. interests in Asia and would most likely be far less provocative than selling additional armaments to Taiwan. A stronger American presence might also persuade Beijing to reduce the chance of crises by signing a more effective Military Maritime Agreement specifying appropriate conduct for encounters in or near territorial waters or airspace. 36

#### And – The impact is extinction and causes indo pak and Russian war

Cheong 2k (Ching, Senior Writer at the Strait Times, “No one gains in a war over Taiwan,” June 25th, Lexis)

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 civilization.

**That triggers multiple scenarios for planetary destruction and warming**

**Cohen, 9** (William S. Cohen is chairman and CEO of The Cohen Group, a strategic business consulting firm based in Washington, D.C. Secretary Cohen served as U.S. secretary of defense, Maurice R. Greenberg is chairman and CEO of C.V. Starr & Co., Inc. Mr. Greenberg retired four years ago as chairman and CEO of American International Group (AIG) after more than 40 years of leadership, creating the largest insurance company in history, “Smart Power in U.S.-China Relations,” pg online @ http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/090309\_mcgiffert\_uschinasmartpower\_web.pdf)

The evolution of Sino-U.S. relations over the next months, years, and decades has the potential to have a greater impact on global security and prosperity than any other bilateral or multilateral arrangement. In this sense, many analysts consider the US.-China diplomatic relationship to be the most influential in the world. Without question, strong and stable U.S. alliances provide the foundation for the protection and promotion of U.S. and global interests. Yet within that broad framework, the trajectory of U.S.-China relations will determine the success, or failure, of efforts to address the toughest global challenges: global financial stability, energy security and climate change, nonproliferation, and terrorism, among other pressing issues. Shepherding that trajectory in the most constructive direction possible must therefore be a priority for Washington and Beijing. Virtually **no major global challenge can be met without U.S.-China cooperation**. The uncertainty of that future trajectory and the "strategic mistrust" between leaders in Washington and Beijing necessarily concerns many experts and policymakers in both countries. Although some U.S. analysts see China as a strategic competitor—deliberately vying with the United States for energy resources, military superiority, and international political influence alike— analysis by the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) has generally found that China uses its soft power to pursue its own, largely economic, international agenda primarily to achieve its domestic objectives of economic growth and social stability.1 Although Beijing certainly has an eye on Washington, not all of its actions are undertaken as a counterpoint to the United States. In addition, CSIS research suggests that growing Chinese soft power in developing countries may have influenced recent U.S. decisions to engage more actively and reinvest in soft-power tools that have atrophied during the past decade. To the extent that there exists a competition between the United States and China, therefore, it may be mobilizing both countries to strengthen their ability to solve global problems. To be sure, U.S. and Chinese policy decisions toward the respective other power will be determined in large part by the choices that leaders make about their own nations interests at home and overseas, which in turn are shaped by their respective domestic contexts. Both parties must recognize—and accept—that the other will pursue a foreign policy approach that is in its own national interest. Yet, in a globalized world, challenges are increasingly transnational, and so too must be their solutions. As demonstrated by the rapid spread of SARS from China in 2003, pandemic flu can be spread rapidly through air and via international travel. Dust particulates from Asia settle in Lake Tahoe. An **economic downturn in one** country can and **does trigger an economic** **slowdown** in another. These challenges can no longer be addressed by either containment or isolation. What constitutes the national interest today necessarily encompasses a broader and more complex set of considerations than it did in the past As a general principle, the United States seeks to promote its national interest while it simultaneously pursues what the CSIS Commission on Smart Power called in its November 2007 report the "global good."3 This approach is not always practical or achievable, of course. But neither is it pure benevolence. Instead, a strategic pursuit of the global good accrues concrete benefits for the United States (and others) in the form of building confidence, legitimacy, and political influence in key countries and regions around the world in ways that enable the United States to better confront global and transnational challenges. In short, the global good comprises those things that all people and governments want but have traditionally not been able to attain in the absence of U.S. leadership. Despite historical, cultural, and political differences between the United States and China, Beijing's newfound ability, owing to its recent economic successes, to contribute to the global good is a matter for common ground between the two countries. Today there is increasing recognition that no major global challenge can be addressed effectively, much less resolved, without the active engagement of—and cooperation between—the United States and China. The United States and China—the worlds first- and third-largest economies—are inextricably linked, a fact made ever more evident in the midst of the current global financial crisis. Weak demand in both the United States and China, previously the twin engines of global growth, has contributed to the global economic downturn and threatens to ignite simmering trade tensions between the two countries. Nowhere is the interconnectedness of the United States and China more clear than in international finance. China has $2 trillion worth of largely U.S. dollar-denominated foreign exchange reserves and is the world's largest holder—by far—of U.S. government debt. Former treasury secretary Henry M. Paulson and others have suggested that the structural imbalances created by this dynamic fueled the current economic crisis. Yet. China will almost certainly be called on to purchase the lion's share of new U.S. debt instruments issued in connection with the U.S. stimulus and recovery package. Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton's February 23.2009, reassurance to Beijing that U.S. markets remain safe and her call for continued Chinese investment in the U.S. bond market as a means to help both countries, and the world, emerge from global recession underscored the shared interest—and central role—that both countries have in turning around the global economy quickly. Although China's considerable holdings of U.S. debt have been seen as a troubling problem, they are now being perceived as a necessary part of a global solution. Similarly, as the world’s two largest emitters of greenhouse gases, China and the United States share not only the collateral damage of energy-inefficient economic growth, b­­ut **a primary responsibility to shape** any ultimate **global** **solutions to climate change**. To date, cooperation has been elusive, owing as much to Washington's reluctance as to Beijing's intransigence. Painting China as the environmental bogeyman as an excuse for foot-dragging in policymaking is no longer an option; for its part, China, as the world's top polluter, must cease playing the developing-economy card. Yet energy security and climate change remain an area of genuine opportunity for joint achievement. Indeed, U.S.-China cooperation in this field is a sine qua non of any response to the energy and climate challenges. The sheer size of the Chinese economy means that collaboration with the United States could set the de facto global standards for etficiency and emissions in key economic sectors such as industry and transportation. Climate change also provides an area for cooperation in previously uncharted policy waters, as in emerging Arctic navigational and energy exploration opportunities. Washington and Beijing also share a deep and urgent interest in international peace and stability. The resumption of U.S.-China military contacts is a positive development. As two nuclear powers with worldwide economic and strategic interests, both countries want to minimize instability and enhance maritime security, as seen by parallel antipiracy missions in the waters otT Somalia. Joint efforts in support of United Nations peacekeeping, nonproliferation, and counterterrorism offer critical areas for bilateral and multilateral cooperation. Certainly, regional and global security institutions such as the Six-Party Talks concerning North Korea or the UN Security Council require the active engagement of both Washington and Beijing. Even more broadly, crisis management in geographic regions of mutual strategic interest like the Korean peninsula, Iran, or Burma require much more Sino-U.S. communication if the two countries are to avoid miscalculation and maximize opportunities to minimize human sutfering. Increasing the number of mid-level military-to-military exchanges would help in this regard. The United States and China could do more to cooperate on law enforcement to combat drug trafficking and organized crime in Western China. Afghanistan is competing with Burma as the main provider of narcotics to China; Washington could use its influence with the International Security Assistance Force in Kabul to develop a joint antinarcotics program. This could potentially build networks and joint capabilities that might be useful for U.S.-China cooperation on the issue of Pakistan. In addition, Washington should also encourage NATO-China cooperation along the Afghan border. Collaborating under the auspices of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) might provide an additional framework for Beijing and Washington to address Central Asian security issues in a cooperative manner. 1he SCO, which includes Pakistan as an observer and will convene a multinational conference on Afghanistan in March 2009, has long made curbing narcoterrorism in Afghanistan a priority. In addition, the VS. Drug Enforcement Agency and the Chinese Anti-Narcotics Bureau should expand cooperation on interdiction and prosecution of heroin and meth traffickers. To be sure, there are a number of areas of serious divergence between Washington and Beijing. This should surprise no one. The United States has disagreements with even its allies. Two large powers with vastly dilferent histories, cultures, and political systems are bound to have challenges. History has shown, however, that the most effective way of addressing issues is for the U.S. and Chinese governments to engage in quiet diplomacy rather than public recrimination. In the U.S.-China context, there is often little to be gained—and much to be lost in terms of trust and respect—by a polarizing debate. Any differences, moreover, must not necessarily impede Sino-U.S. cooperation when both sides share strong mutual interests. I;. Scott Fitzgerald wrote that "the test of a first-rate intelligence is the ability to hold two opposed ideas in the mind at the same time, and still retain the ability to function."3 Effective policy toward China by the United States, and vice versa, will require this kind of dual-minded intelligence. Moreover, working together on areas of mutual and global interest will help promote strategic trust between China and the United States, facilitating possible cooperation in other areas. Even limited cooperation on specific areas will help construct additional mechanisms for bilateral communication on issues of irreconcilable disagreement. In fact, many of the toughest challenges in U.S.-China relations in recent years have been the result of unforeseen events, such as the accidental bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade in May 1999 and the EP-3 reconnaissance plane collision in April 2001. Building trust and finding workable solutions to tough problems is the premise behind the Obama administrations foreign policy of smart power, as articulated by Secretary of State Clinton. Smart power is based on, as Secretary Clinton outlined in her confirmation hearing, the fundamental belief that 'We must use... the full range of tools at our disposal—diplomatic, economic, military, political and cultural—picking the right tool, or combination of tools, for each situation."' As the CS1S Commission on Smart Power noted in November 2007, "Smart Power is neither hard nor soft—it is the skillful combination of bothIt is an approach that underscores the necessity of a strong military, but also invests heavily in alliances, partnerships and institutions at all levels... .°5 As such, smart power necessarily mandates a major investment in a U.S.-China partnership on key issues. 'The concept enjoys broad support among the Chinese and American people and, by promoting the global good, it reaps concrete results around the world. There should be no expectation that Washington and Beijing will or should agree on all, or even most, questions. But the American and Chinese people should expect their leaders to come together on those vital issues that require their cooperation. U.S.-China partnership, though not inevitable, is indispensable.

**Extinction**

**Tickell, 8** (Oliver, Climate Researcher, The Guardian, 8-11, “On a planet 4C hotter, all we can prepare for is extinction”, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/11/climatechange)

We need to get prepared for four degrees of global warming, Bob Watson told the Guardian last week. At first sight this looks like wise counsel from the climate science adviser to Defra. But the idea that we could adapt to a 4C rise is absurd and dangerous. Global warming on this scale would be a catastrophe that would mean, in the immortal words that Chief Seattle probably never spoke, "the end of living and the beginning of survival" for humankind. Or perhaps the beginning of our extinction. The collapse of the polar ice caps would become inevitable, bringing long-term sea level rises of 70-80 metres. All the world's coastal plains would be lost, complete with ports, cities, transport and industrial infrastructure, and much of the world's most productive farmland. The world's geography would be transformed much as it was at the end of the last ice age, when sea levels rose by about 120 metres to create the Channel, the North Sea and Cardigan Bay out of dry land. Weather would become extreme and unpredictable, with more frequent and severe droughts, floods and hurricanes. The Earth's carrying capacity would be hugely reduced. **Billions** **would undoubtedly die**. Watson's call was supported by the government's former chief scientific adviser, Sir David King, who warned that "if we get to a four-degree rise it is quite possible that we would begin to see a runaway increase". This is a remarkable understatement. The climate system is already experiencing significant feedbacks, notably the summer melting of the Arctic sea ice. The more the ice melts, the more sunshine is absorbed by the sea, and the more the Arctic warms. And as the Arctic warms, the release of billions of tonnes of methane – a greenhouse gas 70 times stronger than carbon dioxide over 20 years – captured under melting permafrost is already under way. To see how far this process could go, look 55.5m years to the Palaeocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum, when a global temperature increase of 6C coincided with the release of about 5,000 gigatonnes of carbon into the atmosphere, both as CO2 and as methane from bogs and seabed sediments. Lush subtropical forests grew in polar regions, and sea levels rose to 100m higher than today. It appears that an initial warming pulse triggered other warming processes. Many scientists warn that this historical event may be analogous to the present: the warming caused by human emissions could propel us towards a similar hothouse Earth.

### 2AC – Force Posture (Afghani army)

**Effective Okinawan Marine training is key to the war in Afghanistan—**

**Okubo 10**

(Grant, Stars and Stripes, “Marines hone skills at Fuji ahead of deployment”, [http://www.stripes.com/news/pacific/okinawa/marines-hone-skills-at-fuji-ahead-of-deployment-1.122585//greenhill-chris](http://www.stripes.com/news/pacific/okinawa/marines-hone-skills-at-fuji-ahead-of-deployment-1.122585/greenhill-chris))

**With an Afghanistan deployment in their sights, Okinawa Marines are hitting the training grounds of the Combined Arms Training Center here to sharpen their skills. For the next couple of weeks Marines from Charlie Company, 3rd Reconnaissance Battalion, based at Camp Schwab, are conducting raids and room-clearing drills, as well as honing their skills in combat marksmanship, sniper training and basic infantry. Charlie Company is spending a lot of time conducting urban terrain training in town settings similar to what they would encounter in the war zone. “We don’t have these facilities in Okinawa,” Capt. Colin Boynton, 1st Platoon commander, said Wednesday. “Training here is vital to the current fight in Afghanistan.” The pre-deployment training is particularly important for the new Marines in the battalion, according to Sgt. Ivan Cherry. “The guys see how difficult the situation is – how tight the spaces are – and how challenging it is to patch up their buddies,” he said.**

**They’re also key to training the Afghan army**

**Valdespino  8**

(Luis P, Combined Security Transition Command
 “Okinawa Marines help build Afghan National Army”, [http://replay.web.archive.org/20080501162550/http://www.okinawa.usmc.mil/Public%20Affairs%20Info/Archive%20News%20Pages/2008/080118-afghan.html//greenhill-chris](http://replay.web.archive.org/20080501162550/http%3A/www.okinawa.usmc.mil/Public%20Affairs%20Info/Archive%20News%20Pages/2008/080118-afghan.html/greenhill-chris))

**Okinawa Marines help build Afghan National ArmyRoughing it with their local counterparts and operating independently, Okinawa-based Marines are training and fighting alongside Afghan National Army soldiers in the eastern region of the country. Sgt. Seth E. Lewis and Lance Cpl. Michael J. Subu, from 3rd Marine Division, are serving as embedded training team members with ETT 7-2. Most of the ETT Marines deployed to Afghanistan July 5, and are mentoring 3rd and 5th Kandaks (Afghan battalions), 3rd Brigade, 201st ANA Corps. ETT members, who work in groups of two or three Marines, have been involved in operations throughout eastern Afghanistan with 3rd Kandak (Armored). Their missions call for leadership, initiative and, in Lewis and Subu's case, a lot of mountain climbing. The two-man team is mentoring an ANA platoon at a border checkpoint near Bari Kot village in eastern Konar Province. The checkpoint is an Afghan Border Police post with an ANA observation post about 500 meters up a mountain, just across the Konar River from Pakistan. Lewis estimates that, since arriving at the checkpoint early in the fall, he has climbed the mountain at least 50 times. Most of the ANA soldiers the Marines mentor work and sleep at the observation post atop the mountain. Lewis and Subu are housed in a hut at the base with more ANA soldiers, a U.S. Army platoon and some Afghan Border Police. The Marines say they appreciate their responsibilities and the experience they are getting. 1st Sgt. Matthew S. Seamans, the ETT's senior enlisted mentor, said the ETT mission requires Marines to "step up" and be strong leaders. The expectation during training for the mission was that NCOs would mentor NCOs, staff NCOs would mentor staff NCOs, and officers would mentor officers, but as the ANA has grown, so have ETT mentor responsibilities. "I was actually pretty happy ... because I would be able to prove my worth as a sergeant," said the 29-year-old Lewis. He added that working with the ANA has helped him grow as a leader, and he has seen the results of his efforts. "I see leaps and bounds with the ANA at certain points," Lewis said. During a recent visit from the Kandak commander and ETT leaders, Lewis led ETT mentors up the mountain to the observation post with ANA soldiers. Seamans and ETT Chief Lt. Col. James F. Werth commented that the structures at the top had been improved substantially since their last visit. The sergeant had coordinated the hiring of local labor to move supplies to the ANA soldiers to improve the post. Aside from coordinating logistical support, Lewis said he focuses much of his efforts on trying to help ANA soldiers see leadership as the Marine Corps uses it, with NCOs, staff NCOs and officers having specific leadership roles and responsibilities. And with consideration for the ETT goals, he encourages the ANA to accomplish tasks on their own. "I try to push that if they want something simple done, to do it themselves (instead of hiring laborers)," Lewis said. "What are they gonna do when the (American) money goes away?" Lewis said the goal is for ANA soldiers to learn to operate without assistance from American mentors and deal with challenges and projects on their own. "The ultimate goal is for the ANA to function without ETTs," he said, adding that he believes his tour will be worth his efforts when he is done. ANA leaders said they have benefited from the relationship with Lewis, Subu, and other ETT mentors. "We have the best relations with the ETTs," said ANA Lt. Col. Mohammad Naseem, 3rd Kandak commander. Naseem added that the ETTs have worked closely with the ANA soldiers, providing much logistical and operational support and proving ready for any tactical missions that have come up.**

### 2AC – Marines (rape)

**Okinawan marines commit rapes**

**CNN Wire Staff,’10**

(5/4/10, Cable News Network, “ Japan PM: Moving U.S. base ‘difficult’ ” , [http://www.cnn.com/2010/WORLD/asiapcf/05/04/japan.okinawa.base.protest/index.html?iref=allsearch](http://www.cnn.com/2010/WORLD/asiapcf/05/04/japan.okinawa.base.protest/index.html?iref=allsearch" \t "_blank))

Okinawans say the U.S. military has been responsible for a number of blights in the city, from serious crimes like rape and drunken driving, to environmental and noise pollution. Nearly 100,000 residents protested last week demanding that the base be moved off the island. And a recent poll said two out of three Japanese say they disapprove of the prime minister's performance and 59 percent said Hatoyama should resign if he can't resolve the fight over the future of the Futenma Air Base in Okinawa. One of the issues that sparked a backlash against the U.S. base recently was the 2008 charges against a Marine for the rape of a 14-year-old Japanese girl in Okinawa. The case revived simmering anger in the local community, some of whom remembered the 2006 case of the sailor who was convicted of fatally beating a 56-year-old Japanese woman and the 1995 case of three American servicemen who were found guilty of kidnapping and raping a 12-year-old Okinawan schoolgirl.

**Rape is dehumanizing.**

**Halley, 08**

(Janet is Royall Professor of Law, Harvard Law School. Fall 2008. “ARTICLE: RAPE AT ROME: FEMINIST INTERVENTIONS IN THE CRIMINALIZATION OF SEX-RELATED VIOLENCE IN POSITIVE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL LAW”  Michigan Journal of International Law. 30 Mich. J. Int'l L. 1)

Emphasis on the gender dimension of rape in war is critical not only to surfacing women as full subjects of sexual violence in war, but also to recognizing the atrocity of rape in the time called peace ... .From a feminist human rights perspective, gender violence has escaped sanction because it has not been viewed as violence and because the public/private dichotomy has shielded such violence in its most common forms. The recognition of rape as a war crime is thus a critical step toward understanding rape as violence. The next is to recognize that rape that acquires the  [\*64]  imprimatur of the state is not necessarily more brutal, relentless, or dehumanizing than the private rapes of everyday life ... .Every rape is a grave violation of physical and mental integrity. Every rape has the potential to profoundly debilitate ... Every rape is an expression of male domination and misogyny, a vehicle of terrorizing and subordinating women

**Dehumanization outweighs and causes all other impacts.**

**Berube, 97**

 [David M., Professor of Communication Studies and Associate Director of NanoScience and Technology Studies at University of South Carolina, “NANOTECHNOLOGICAL PROLONGEVITY: The Down Side,” [http://www.cas.sc.edu/engl/faculty/berube/prolong.htm](http://www.cas.sc.edu/engl/faculty/berube/prolong.htm%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank)]

We don’t endorse gendered language.

This means-ends dispute is at the core of Montagu and Matson's treatise on the dehumanization of humanity. They warn[s]: "its destructive toll is already greater than that of any war, plague, famine, or natural calamity on record -- and its potential danger to the quality of life and the fabric of civilized society is beyond calculation. For that reason this sickness of the soul might well be called the Fifth Horseman of the Apocalypse.... Behind the genocide of the holocaust lay a dehumanized thought; beneath the menticide of deviants and dissidents... in the cuckoo's next of America, lies a dehumanized image of man... (Montagu & Matson, 1983, p. xi-xii). While it may never be possible to quantify the impact dehumanizing ethics may have had on humanity, it is safe to conclude the foundations of humanness offer great opportunities which would be foregone. When we calculate the actual losses and the virtual benefits, we approach a nearly inestimable value greater than any tools which we can currently use to measure it. Dehumanization is nuclear war, environmental apocalypse, and international genocide. When people become things, they become dispensable. When people are dispensable, any and every atrocity can be justified. Once justified, they seem to be inevitable for every epoch has evil and dehumanization is evil's most powerful weapon.

### 2AC China Relations

#### Guam Relocation Solves China Relations

Kan 12

(Shirley A. Kan, 2012 "Guam: US Defense Deployments," pg online @ www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS22570.pdf//arjun)

Cooperation in Converging Interests. Still, the policy challenge has been to avoid conflict with China and deter aggression by China as well as to assure it that the U.S. goal is expanded cooperation with this rising power as a responsible, stabilizing, and rules-based country. Indeed, China has benefitted from U.S. preservation of peace and prosperity in the region. The PRC leadership acknowledged to President Obama in November 2009, in the first U.S.-PRC Joint Statement in 12 years, that “China welcomes the United States as an Asia-Pacific nation that contributes to peace, stability, and prosperity in the region.” The Administration has sought to build “strategic trust” and a “positive, cooperative, and comprehensive” relationship with Beijing. In Guam’s buildup, the Commander of Pacific Air Forces said in 2005 that the PLA’s modernization gave him “pause for interest” but did not make a difference in significant force redeployment. 52 Also, in 2006, Guam became a focal point for improving the military-to-military relationship with China. To blunt charges that Guam’s buildup targeted China, PACOM’s Commander, Admiral Fallon, invited PLA observers to the U.S. “Valiant Shield” exercise that brought three aircraft carriers to waters off Guam in June 2006. The PLA Navy sent a Deputy Chief of Staff and specialist in submarine operations to lead the observers, who also boarded an aircraft carrier and visited Guam’s air and naval bases. In May 2008, two C-17 transport aircraft flew supplies from Guam to China for earthquake relief. Also in 2008, Deputy PACOM Commander, Lt. Gen. Dan Leaf (USAF), addressed the question of whether China posed a threat and if China could see Guam as a threat, and he said that while the United States had concerns about China’s military buildup, “that’s not why we’re basing forces in Guam.” He noted that the forces were already based and standing ready in the Pacific, with new adjustments in U.S. posture. 53 While in Australia in late 2010 to discuss the alliance, Defense Secretary Gates stated that moves to strengthen the U.S. military presence in the region were more about relationships with the rest of Asia than about China. 54 The Chief of Naval Operations (CNO), Admiral Jonathan Greenert, clarified in early 2012 that the new strategy’s greater focus on the Asian-Pacific region would not mean a large increase in the naval presence in the Western Pacific. Greenert said, “it’s not a big naval buildup in the Far East. We’re there. We have been there. We will be there.” He said that the U.S. Navy will engage closer with the PLA and cooperate more with allies and partners to promote a rules-based order and maintain freedom of navigation. 55 In answer to Senator Daniel Akaka at a hearing in February, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Martin Dempsey, testified that the rebalancing (not a pivot) in the strategy actually offers the opportunity to expand engagement with the PLA. At another hearing, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta answered Representative Hank Johnson about the risk of an increasingly adversarial military competition by testifying that the U.S. military needs to engage with the PLA from a position of strength and with preservation of the presence in the Pacific. 56 When President Obama met with Hu Jintao and other leaders at the Nuclear Security Summit in Seoul, NSC staff said at a news conference on March 27, 2012, that the strategy of rebalancing priorities is not aimed at China. Indeed, President Obama stressed increasing military-to-military cooperation with China as well as with other countries. x

#### [Insert Impact from China Relations Good – This is in the Elections Addendum file and is the impact for China Bashing – there are a bunch – you can choose whichever one is most strategic]

### 2AC Readiness

#### New Infrastructure is key to Military Readiness in the Entire Pacific Region

CSIS 7/27

(CSIS, Center for Strategic and International Studies, David J. Berteau and Michael J. Green, "U.S. Force Posture Strategy in the Asia Pacific Region:An Independent Assessment," 7/27/12 pg online @ www.pacificnewscenter.com/images/pdf/csisreport.pdf//arjun)

Of significance to military readiness and potential military operations in the PACOM AOR are the training ranges on the nearby Mariana islands, including Tinian, Saipan, Farallon de Medinilla, and Pagan, and the very sizable ordnance storage facilities on Guam. In recent years, three Valiant Shield joint exercises based at Guam have boosted U.S. military readiness in the Asia Pacific region, 141 and in May 2012, nearly 1,000 U.S. Air Force and Marines from Iwakuni, Japan conducted exercises on Guam and Tinian, in an exercise named Geiger Fury. Without such facilities, maintaining the readiness of forward stationed military personnel would be significantly more difficult. Guam offers additional port capacity. For air operations, Andersen Air Force Base (AFB) is the western most U.S. sovereign base, ensuring U.S. control over ability to operate and train from the island and surrounding U.S. held territories. Construction of new facilities on Guam is challenging. Basic infrastructure on the island is outdated, and the multiplier to construct facilities is a factor greater than two. Additionally, the process of commissioning an environmental impact assessment, receiving public comment before proceeding has historically been long and drawn out. And, until training ranges are built or better utilized, stationing ground troops on Guam will mean their readiness and needed skill sets will be diminished.

### 2AC Air Power

#### Infrastructure is key to Airpower in the Asia Pacific Region

CSIS 7/27

(CSIS, Center for Strategic and International Studies, David J. Berteau and Michael J. Green, "U.S. Force Posture Strategy in the Asia Pacific Region:An Independent Assessment," 7/27/12 pg online @ www.pacificnewscenter.com/images/pdf/csisreport.pdf//arjun)

A critical component of U.S. force posture in the Asia Pacific region is airpower. A rebalancing of focus and forces necessitates relook at both assets and locations from which they base and fight. While the U.S. Air Force had already bolstered its presence and forces over the past decade by adding rotational bomber and tanker forces on Guam and additional strategic airlift assets based in Hawaii and Alaska, this option explores additional forces.  Permanently base a bomber squadron in Guam Current stationing of assets in Guam consists of rotational bomber units coming from and returning to CONUS bases. This action would permanently relocate an entire B-52 squadron forward to the PACOM AOR. A full squadron consisting of twelve aircraft would more than double existing capability which is currently four B-52s or two B-2s. While Andersen Air Base, Guam has excess capacity to house such a unit move, it would require some new construction for support facilities and upgrades to housing.  Add airborne Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) assets, both manned and unmanned, to Australia or Guam Existing ISR assets in the region are focused on Northeast Asia. This action would expand the ISR coverage to include stationing of manned and unmanned air assets more broadly in the region, specifically in Guam or Australia. CONUS or Japan-based assets limit time on station and intelligence gathering. Assets would include Global Hawk Unmanned Aerial Systems and MC-12W Liberty aircraft. While the Global Hawk does require specialized facilities, this action assumes locations that would require minimal new construction.  Add bomber and tanker dispersal locations across Southeast Asia This action would identify and certify dispersal locations across Southeast Asia. There are nearly 50 locations currently under consideration for such dispersal, and these locations will likely require minimal construction. Key actions include acquiring access agreements, conducting training to validate locations, and construction to meet U.S. needs. The purpose is not for permanent stationing of aircraft but rather to be able to disperse aircraft in the event of a contingency operation.

#### Air superiority deters conflicts in the South China Sea and India-Pakistan

Tellis 98

[Ashley, Ashley J., Senior Political Scientist at RAND specializing in South Asian Security, Chung Min Lee, James Mulvenon, Courtney Purrington, and Michael D. Swaine, <http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph_reports/MR897/MR897.chap3.pdf>, accessed on 7/19/12, Kfo]

REGIONAL CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE This subsection attempts to synthesize some of the key operational implications distilled from the analyses relating to the rise of Asia and the potential for conflict in each of its constituent regions. The first key implication derived from the analysis of trends in Asia suggests that American air and space power will continue to remain critical for conventional and unconventional deterrence in Asia. This argument is justified by the fact that several subregions of the continent still harbor the potential for full-scale conventional war. This potential is most conspicuous on the Korean peninsula and, to a lesser degree, in South Asia, the Persian Gulf, and the South China Sea. In some of these areas, such as Korea and the Persian Gulf, the United States has clear treaty obligations and, therefore, has preplanned the use of air power should contingencies arise. U.S. Air Force assets could also be called upon for operations in some of these other areas. In almost all these cases, U.S. air power would be at the forefront of an American politico-military response because (a) of the vast distances on the Asian continent; (b) the diverse range of operational platforms available to the U.S. Air Force, a capability unmatched by any other country or service; (c) the possible unavailability of naval assets in close proximity, particularly in the context of surprise contingencies; and (d) the heavy payload that can be carried by U.S. Air Force platforms. These platforms can exploit speed, reach, and high operating tempos to sustain continual operations until the political objectives are secured. The entire range of warfighting capability—fighters, bombers, electronic warfare (EW), suppression of enemy air defense (SEAD), combat support platforms such as AWACS and J-STARS, and tankers—are relevant in the Asia-Pacific region, because many of the regional contingencies will involve armed operations against large, fairly modern, conventional forces, most of which are built around large land armies, as is the case in Korea, China-Taiwan, India-Pakistan, and the Persian Gulf. In addition to conventional combat, the demands of unconventional deterrence will increasingly confront the U.S. Air Force in Asia. The Korean peninsula, China, and the Indian subcontinent are already arenas of WMD proliferation. While emergent nuclear capabilities continue to receive the most public attention, chemical and biological warfare threats will progressively become future problems. The delivery systems in the region are increasing in range and diversity. China already targets the continental United States with ballistic missiles. North Korea can threaten northeast Asia with existing Scud-class theater ballistic missiles. India will acquire the capability to produce ICBM-class delivery vehicles, and both China and India will acquire long-range cruise missiles during the time frames examined in this report. The second key implication derived from the analysis of trends in Asia suggests that air and space power will function as a vital rapid reaction force in a breaking crisis. Current guidance tasks the Air Force to prepare for two major regional conflicts that could break out in the Persian Gulf and on the Korean peninsula. In other areas of Asia, however, such as the Indian subcontinent, the South China Sea, Southeast Asia, and Myanmar, the United States has no treaty obligations requiring it to commit the use of its military forces. But as past experience has shown, American policymakers have regularly displayed the disconcerting habit of discovering strategic interests in parts of the world previously neglected after conflicts have already broken out. Mindful of this trend, it would behoove U.S. Air Force planners to prudently plan for regional contingencies in nontraditional areas of interest, because naval and air power will of necessity be the primary instruments constituting the American response. Such responses would be necessitated by three general classes of contingencies. The first involves the politico-military collapse of a key regional actor, as might occur in the case of North Korea, Myanmar, Indonesia, or Pakistan. The second involves acute politicalmilitary crises that have a potential for rapid escalation, as may occur in the Taiwan Strait, the Spratlys, the Indian subcontinent, or on the Korean peninsula. The third involves cases of prolonged domestic instability that may have either spillover or contagion effects, as in China, Indonesia, Myanmar, or North Korea. In each of these cases, U.S. responses may vary from simply being a concerned onlooker to prosecuting the whole range of military operations to providing post-conflict assistance in a permissive environment. Depending on the political choices made, Air Force contributions would obviously vary. If the first response is selected, contributions would consist predominantly of vital, specialized, airbreathing platforms such as AWACS, JSTARS, and Rivet Joint—in tandem with controlled space assets—that would be necessary for assessment of political crises erupting in the region. The second response, in contrast, would burden the entire range of U.S. Air Force capabilities, in the manner witnessed in Operation Desert Storm. The third response, like the first, would call for specialized capabilities, mostly in the areas of strategic lift and airborne tanker support. The third key implication derived from the analysis of trends in Asia suggests that despite increasing regional air capabilities, U.S. Air Force assets will be required to fill gaps in critical warfighting areas. The capabilities of the Asian states, including those of U.S. allies and neutral states, have been steadily increasing in the last two decades. These increases have occurred largely through the acquisition of late-generation, advanced combat aircraft such as the MiG-29, and the F-15, F-16, and F/A-18 together with short-range infrared and medium-range semi-active air-to-air missiles. Despite such acquisitions, however, the states that possess these aircraft have not become truly effective users of air power, in part because acquiring advanced combat aircraft and their associated technologies is a small part of ensuring overall proficiency in the exploitation of air power. The latter includes incorporating effective training regimes, maintaining large and diverse logistics networks, developing an indigenous industrial infrastructure capable of supporting the variegated air assets, and integrating specific subspecialties such as air-to-air refueling, electronic warfare, suppression of enemy air defenses, airspace surveillance and battle management capabilities in a hostile environment, and night and adverse weather operations. Most of the Asian air forces lack full air-power capabilities of the sort described above. The Japanese and South Korean air forces are, as a rule, optimized mostly for air defense operations. Both air forces are generally proficient in all-weather defensive counterair operations, and they possess relatively modest day ground-attack capabilities as well. Because of their specific operating environments, however, the Japanese air force is particularly proficient in maritime air operations, whereas the South Korean air force has some close air support (CAS) experience as well. The Chinese air force (People’s Liberation Army Air Force, [PLAAF]) is still a predominantly daylight defensive counterair force with limited daylight attack capabilities, as are most of the Southeast Asian air forces, but the PLAAF has recently demonstrated an impressive ability to integrate its new weapon systems (e.g., the Su-27) much faster than most observers expected. The air forces of the Indian subcontinent have somewhat greater capabilities. Most squadrons of the Indian and Pakistani air forces are capable of daylight defensive counterair, a few are capable of all-weather defensive counterair, and several Indian units are capable of battlefield air interdiction and deep penetration-interdiction strike. None of these air forces, however, is particularly proficient at night and all-weather ground attack, especially at operational ranges. They lack advanced munitions, especially in the air-to-surface regime. With the exception of Japan and Singapore, they lack battle management command, control and communications (BMC3) platforms as well as the logistics and training levels required for successful, extended, high-tempo operations. The brittle quality of Asian air forces implies that U.S. Air Force assets will be required to fill critical gaps in allied air capabilities as well as to counter both the growing capabilities of potential adversaries such as China and the new nontraditional threats emerging in the form of ballistic and cruise missiles, information warfare, WMD, and possibly even the revolution in military affairs.

## \*\*INHERENCY\*\*

### 2AC – XT: no infrastructure now

#### Funding for infrastructure projects in Guam just got cut – this perception undermines commitment to Asian security

#### State News Service '12

(5/23/12, "Statement on the Senate Cuts to Military Construction Projects on Guam", Lexis//Aspomer)

The following information was released by the office of Guam Rep. Madeleine Bordallo: Congresswoman Madeleine Z. Bordallo today issued the following statement on the Senate Appropriations and Armed Services Committees decision to eliminate fiscal year 2013 funding for military construction projects directly tied to the military build-up and critical improvements to current military capabilities on Guam. The Senate Appropriations Committee removed $93.4 million in funding for projects on Guam, including phase 2 of north ramp parking and the upgraded fuel pipeline from Andersen Air Force Base to Navy Base Guam, during its mark-up of the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs and related agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2013. However, $8.5 million in funding for the Guam National Guard Joint Force Headquarters project remains intact. The bill must be considered by the full Senate. Additionally, the Senate Armed Services Committee is expected to report its version of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 by the end of the week. The bill will also likely remove funding for military construction projects and will not fund civilian infrastructure projects. The House of Representatives, however, includes that funding in H.R. 4310, the House version of the FY13 NDAA, which was passed by the House last week as well as the House Defense Appropriations Act which was recently favorably reported out of Committee. Generally, appropriations for military construction projects cannot be obligated without specific authorization from the NDAA. I am deeply disappointed that the Senate Appropriations Committee has chosen to eliminate funding for military construction projects directly tied to the military build-up on Guam. Although the cut to the Navy project at Andersen Air Force Base comes as no surprise, it is clear that opposition from Senators Carl Levin, Jim Webb and John McCain has had a significant impact on the Senates overall concerns about the relocation of Marines from Okinawa to Guam, said Congresswoman Bordallo. The Senates actions remain inconsistent with Obama Administrations support for the build-up, and the recent 2+2 meeting and the revised roadmap demonstrates that the U.S. and Japan are actively working to get this realignment back on track. At a time when the Administration is working to move this realignment forward to address emerging threats in the region. The removal of these funds in Senate legislation sends the wrong signal to our allies in the Asia-Pacific region and will further delay the Department of Defenses ability to begin spending build-up funds on Guam. Further, the full inclusion of these military construction funds for Guam is critical to ensuring that our island is adequately prepared for the arrival of the Marines. I know that Senator Inouye remains a supporter of the overall goals of the realignment of forces in the Pacific, and I look forward to working with him in the future to erode the obstructive requirements of section 2207 of the FY12 NDAA. The Senates actions also are a reminder that the Department of Defense must do more to satisfy the information requests of Congress including the requirements of section 2207.

#### Relocation is contingent on improved infrastructure

#### Japan Economic Newswire '10

(12/17/10, "U.S. Congress to cut budget for Marines' transfer from Okinawa to Guam", Lexis//Aspomer)

The U.S. Congress has reached an agreement to sharply slash the fiscal 2011 budget for transferring the Marine Corps' troops from Okinawa, Japan, to Guam, congressional sources said Thursday. The administration of President Barack Obama had proposed about $452 million (38 billion yen) in transfer costs for that fiscal year starting on Oct. 1, 2010. Congress has agreed to cut the amount by about 70 percent to some $132 million due to a delay in work to develop infrastructure on Guam, the sources said. The Defense Department has already acknowledged that the transfer of the Marines from Okinawa to Guam could be delayed beyond the current target of 2014 because of a shortage of water, sewage and electric power facilities on Guam, a U.S. territory in the Pacific. One of the sources said that Congress has come to the conclusion that the budget for the transfer of the Marines could not be enforced due to a delay in infrastructure development work on Guam even if the legislature approved the administration's budget proposal. The Marines' planned move to Guam is deeply linked with the relocation of the Marines' Futenma air station from a densely populated quarter in Ginowan, Okinawa Prefecture, to a less populated coastal area in Nago, also Okinawa. In Japan, the Futenma base's relocation has hit a snag due to strong opposition from local residents and governments in Okinawa. Congress will cut the administration's budget requests for construction work at Andersen air force base and at related facilities in the Finegayan district. It will only accept $132 million for several other works and for planning and designing costs.

#### New infrastructure key to Marine relocation

#### Association of Defense Communities '12

(5/23/12, "Guam Needs Guarantee for Infrastructure Funding, Governor Says", [www.defensecommunities.org/headlines/guam-needs-guarantee-for-infrastructure-funding-governor-says/#](http://www.defensecommunities.org/headlines/guam-needs-guarantee-for-infrastructure-funding-governor-says/)//Aspomer)

Despite a reduction in the number of Marines relocating to Guam, the island still needs funding from the United States or Japan to pay for badly needed upgrades to its environmental infrastructure, Gov. Eddie Calvo told Japanese reporters during a visit to Okinawa. The original buildup plan between the United States and Japan earmarked $700 million for Guam’s water and wastewater systems, but the revised agreement leaves the issue murky. “Now that the number of Marines coming to Guam has been reduced, and the financial commitments of both countries have been adjusted, what was once certain has become uncertain and ambiguous,” Calvo said, reported the Pacific Daily News. Guam will not be able to accommodate an influx of Marines until new infrastructure is built, he emphasized. “The sooner Congress realizes the absolute need to fund these things, the sooner the buildup can happen and the sooner the troops can move from Okinawa to Guam,” he said. Meanwhile, the fiscal 2013 military construction and veterans affairs spending bill approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee Tuesday stripped funding for the Marine Corps realignment to Guam due to DOD’s failure to meet several mandates in last year’s defense authorization bill, reported kuam.com.

#### Even delays kill perception of commitment to alliances

#### Brown '11

(Adam Brown, "President Obama Warns Senate Against Betraying Allies' Trust With Proposed Cuts To Guam Military Buildup", 7/15/11, guambuildupnews.com/Buildup-News-Politics/President-Obama-Warns-Senate-Against-Betraying-Allies-Trust-With-Proposed-Cuts-to-Guam-Military-Buildup.html//Aspomer)

GUAM – Weeks after high-level talks between the U.S. and Japan on the Guam military buildup, President Obama warned the Senate that delaying related construction projects would betray the trust of international allies. "Deferring or eliminating these projects could signal that the U.S. does not stand by its allies or its agreements such as the realignment of forces from Okinawa to Guam," Obama said in a letter, responding to a Senate Appropriations Committee vote weeks ago to cut $155 million from buildup spending plans. The reductions would affect Marine buildup related projects, including an upgrade to North Ramp utilities at Andersen Air Force Base and new water utilities at the location of the planned Marine base at Finegayan in Dededo. The cuts would also require incremental funding for an Air Force fuel systems maintenance hangar for the Guam Strike program. Obama said his administration is "concerned about the reduction in funding for military construction projects" in the Senate committee and said a proposal for incremental funding of various military construction projects, including the planned Guam-based global air intelligence hub Guam Strike, "runs counter to sound budgeting principles and fiscal discipline." The Department of Defense aims to transfer at least 8,600 U.S. Marines and their families and support staff from Okinawa to Guam in coming years as part of a plan to redistribute 30,000 troops currently based in Japan throughout Asia Pacific under the Defense Policy Review Initiative. The Guam buildup portion, plus associated programs such as the Air Force expansion on the island, could cost more than $23.9 billion over the next 10 years, according to a study by the Government Accountability Office. The government of Japan has agreed to finance about $6 billion of the move. Funds appropriated for the buildup since 2008 -- not including fiscal year 2011 funds from Japan – total $1.32 billion. Early delays and an effort to pace construction to avoid overwhelming the island's infrastructure have left a large portion of program appropriations unspent. With fiscal year 2012 approaching, only $264.3 million for 12 major design-build task orders, not all related to the Marine transfer, have so far been awarded.

#### Funding is already appropriated – spending on NEW infrastructure key to signal commitment and prevent lengthy delays

#### Calvo '12

(Eddie Baza Calvo, Governor of Guam, "News: Calvo Fights for Federal Action on Guam So Buildup Can Start", 5/23/12, governor.guam.gov/2012/05/23/news-calvo-fights-federal-action-guam-buildup-start//Aspomer)

In a triangulated effort to raise awareness in Washington and Tokyo about the practical and direct impact of the buildup, Governor Calvo spoke in front of a dozen Japanese news agencies in Okinawa and delivered a stirring policy speech. Japanese media are now carrying the message. The Governor and his remarks in English, with Japanese translation, are being broadcast in Okinawa. The Governor’s main point – it’s important for leaders in Washington and Tokyo to recognize the practical and inescapable need to build infrastructure on Guam to support the buildup of forces. “These things need to happen for a successful buildup,” Governor Calvo said. “And the sooner it happens, the sooner Congress realizes the absolute need to fund these things, the sooner the buildup can happen and the sooner the troops can move from Okinawa to Guam. And the sooner this happens, the sooner the United States can keep its commitments to Japan.” This message resonated well with Okinawa. The main topic of concern by the Japanese reporters was whether the lack of funding or effort would cause a delay in the movement of U.S. troops. The Governor responded frankly that with the massive migration to Guam over the past 25 years from the U.S. treaty with the freely associated states, the infrastructure is already maxed out, so how could the island accept another migration without increasing the infrastructure capacity first. It is a very practical consideration that Congress must understand. The buildup is the result of a strengthened Security Treaty between Japan and the U.S. In the past few decades, Okinawa absorbed 75 percent of the impact of U.S. forces in Japan. The Governor noted that the Japanese national government is now recognizing that impact and taking practical steps to absorb some of that direct impact on its air services, roads, and other infrastructure. The Security Treaty now shifts its focus to Guam, which Governor Calvo lauded and supports. He said Guamanians are a patriotic people and welcome the Marines. The Governor told Japanese reporters and the Governor of Okinawa that he is concerned there are some in Congress who do not yet understand that for the buildup to work effectively for the military, practical considerations like the building of capacity for water and wastewater services, roads, and other directly-impacted programs, must be addressed. The Governor expressed hesitation to believe Congress will meet this practical obligation considering Congress’ annual failure for a quarter of a century now to offset the impact of a previous treaty it has entered elsewhere that affects Guam directly – the Compacts of Free Association. This is further exacerbated by the holdback of a promised $33 million in direct impact funding for Guam in last year’s federal budget. It was appropriated, but the federal government won’t allow the Department of Defense to spend it without further authorization. The Governor wrote this concern to the House Armed Services Committee, noting that this first appropriation would have sent a strong signal to Guam and Tokyo that the U.S. government is serious about this commitment.

#### No Guam Shift – Infra Costs

Marchesseault 10 (Jeff, anchor for Guam News Watch, “U.S. Asks Japan to Pay More for the Military Buildup on Guam”. Guam News Watch. http://guamnewswatch.com/201007062437/Local-News/U.S.-Asks-Japan-to-Pay-More-for-the-Military-Buildup-on-Guam.html // Veevz)

 Japan will need to pay more for the military buildup on Guam and the Pentagon's reconsidering the mix of troops to be sent here. That's the word from independent news sources in Japan. Kyodo News reports that US Secretary of Defense Robert Gates is asking Tokyo to shoulder up to hundreds of millions of dollars more for the transfer of marines from Okinawa to Guam because the U.S. reportedly claims infrastructure costs on Guam are higher than expected. Japanese paper Yomiuri Shimbun reports a new proposal would change the makeup of Marines assigned from Okinawa to Guam. The alternate plan would keep some of the 8,000 members of the third marine expeditionary force on Okinawa, while certain combat troops would be relocated instead.

#### No infra Now

Pincus 09 (Walter, Washington Post, 4/12/09, “GAO Says Military Expansion Will Tax Guam’s Infrastructure”, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/04/11/AR2009041101849.html?hpid=topnews> // Veevz)

The infrastructure and social services on Guam in the next five years will not meet the needs of the more than 8,000 Marines and their 9,000 dependents expected to relocate there, even as other U.S. military facilities on the Pacific island are expanding, according to the Government Accountability Office. Under a 2005 agreement with Japan, the Marines will transfer from Okinawa to Guam by 2014. At the same time, a $13 billion expansion is planned for Air Force bases and Navy port facilities on the island. Together, the changes will increase Guam's population by almost 15 percent and "substantially" tax the island's infrastructure, the GAO said in a report sent to Congress on Friday. Guam's water and wastewater systems "are near capacity and demand may increase by 25 percent," the GAO said. The island's solid-waste facilities have "reached the end of their projected useful life," and the military construction demands "will exceed local capacity and the availability of workers on Guam," the GAO added. As a result, outside workers will need to move to the island, the report said. Also citing what could be an inadequate electric grid capacity and an overload for Guam's only two major highways, the GAO called on Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates to urge that other government agencies make the island's problems a higher priority in their budgets. Although the Defense Department is expected to pay for infrastructure projects directly related to the military buildup and contribute toward utilities and roads, the Guam government "is largely responsible for obtaining funding for civilian requirements related to the buildup," the GAO said. At a May Senate hearing, Gov. Felix P. Camacho (R) said Guam would need $6.1 billion for fiscal 2010 to support the military buildup. Guam's revenue for fiscal 2010 is projected at $532 million.

#### The deterrence Advantage is impossible without infrastructure

GAO 08 (Government Accounatability Office, “DEFENSE ¶ INFRASTRUCTURE ¶ Planning Efforts for the ¶ Proposed Military Buildup ¶ on Guam Are in Their Initial ¶ Stages, with Many ¶ Challenges Yet to Be ¶ Addressed” [http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a481050.pdf //](http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a481050.pdf%20//) Veevz)

In addition, DOD and government of Guam officials recognize that the island’s infrastructure is inadequate to meet the increased demand due to the military buildup. For example:• Guam’s commercial port has capacity constraints with pier berthing space, crane operations, and container storage locations. The military buildup requires a port with double the current capacity, and military cargo is expected to increase sixfold during construction of facilities required for the buildup. Guam’s two major highways are in poor condition and, when ordnance (ammunition and explosives) is unloaded from ships for Andersen Air Force Base now and for the Marine Corps in the future, the ordnance must be transported on one of these major roads that run through highly populated areas. The current highway system also experiences slippery surfaces, potholes, and occasional flooding. Traffic between military installations and commercial, business, and residential areas is anticipated to increase significantly with the military buildup.

#### Infrastructure Key to Relocation

Kan 12

(Shirley A. Kan, 2012 "Guam: US Defense Deployments," pg online @ www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS22570.pdf//arjun)

Infrastructure. As U.S. forces relocate to Guam, the state of its infrastructure has been of concern to some policymakers. Also, Guam’s political leaders have expressed concerns about the impact of additional deployments on its civilian infrastructure, including utilities, roads, and water supplies. Guam’s location in the Western Pacific also requires construction of protection for U.S. forces and assets against typhoons. In the fall of 2006, PACOM officials briefed Guam on some aspects of an undisclosed draft plan for military expansion, the Integrated Military Development Plan, with possible military projects worth a total of about $15 billion. 19 In addition, Guam’s size, remoteness, and conditions raised more questions about hosting and educating military dependents; training on Guam and with other units in Asia, Hawaii, or the west coast; and costs and time for extended logistical support and travel. Addressing another concern, a former commander of Marine Forces Pacific urged in 2007 that Guam’s buildup include more than infrastructure to develop also human capital, communities, and the environment.’’

#### Roads key to Marines Moving

CSIS 7/27

(CSIS, Center for Strategic and International Studies, David J. Berteau and Michael J. Green, "U.S. Force Posture Strategy in the Asia Pacific Region:An Independent Assessment," 7/27/12 pg online @ www.pacificnewscenter.com/images/pdf/csisreport.pdf//arjun)

Prioritize improvements on Guam, focusing on roads and infrastructure improvements such as pipeline protection that would be mission essential even if fewer Marines move to Guam from Okinawa. These improvements will necessarily include some limited MILCON funding outside of the wire of DoD facilities.

### 2AC – XT: relocation unique

#### We leave Futenma in place – but it will inevitably be resolved

#### Bloomberg '12

(2/8/12, Sachiko Sakamaki and Takashi Hirokawa, "U.S. Troop Shift To Guam May Ease Tensions With Japan Over Okinawa Bases", [www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-02-08/u-s-japan-to-announce-troop-relocation-plan.html//Aspomer](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-02-08/u-s-japan-to-announce-troop-relocation-plan.html/Aspomer%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank))

The U.S. and Japan agreed to move thousands of Marines to Guam from Okinawa in a cost-cutting move that circumvents a disputed base relocation agreement that has frayed bilateral relations. “We are committed to reducing the burden on Okinawa,” Foreign Minister Koichiro Gemba said at a press conference today in Tokyo in announcing the agreement. “This marks a major step forward in deepening the Japan-U.S. alliance.” Enlarge image Japanese Foreign Minister Koichiro Gemba said at a press conference today, “We are committed to reducing the burden on Okinawa.” Photographer: Yoshikazu Tsuno/AFP/Getty Images The realignment separates the troop shift from an agreement to relocate the Marine Corps Air Station Futenma on Okinawa to another part of the island that has stalled over local objections. Okinawans have repeatedly called for the facility to be moved elsewhere, citing crime and pollution, and the issue led to the 2010 resignation of Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama after he submitted to U.S. pressure to confirm the deal. While Gemba gave no details of troop numbers, President Barack Obama will send about 4,500 Marines stationed in Japan to Guam as he curtails a plan costing as much as $21.1 billion to expand the military’s presence on the island, according to people familiar with the matter who spoke on condition of anonymity. The U.S. will rotate an additional 4,000 troops through Australia, the Philippines and Hawaii, the people said. “Futenma is virtually impossible to move, and the U.S. must evolve its military posture without waiting for Japan,” said Kunihiko Miyake, a former Japanese diplomat and now director of research at the Canon Institute for Global Studies in Tokyo. Camp Schwab Today’s statement reaffirmed the intention of both governments to move the air station to a new facility at Camp Schwab, near the Okinawan town of Henoko. “Under no circumstances does this mean that the Futenma air base will remain in place for good,” Gemba said.The U.S. and Japan have “agreed to delink the movement of Marines to Guam” from progress on replacing Futenma, George Little, a Pentagon spokesman, said today in an e-mailed statement. Both countries are continuing discussions on the next steps and ways to “mitigate the impact of the Marine presence on the Okinawan people,” Little wrote. “It’s premature to discuss troop numbers or specific locations associated with the relocation of Marines from Okinawa,” until the negotiations between U.S. and Japan are complete, he said. Guamwill continue to be developed as a “strategic hub with an operational Marine Corps presence,”

**Realignment is inevitable, but certainty and infrastructure upgrades are critical to success**

Senate Report '12

[Senate Report 112-029, Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 2012, "Global Challenges", pg. online @ thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/cpquery/?&sid=cp112BIGAR&r\_n=sr029.112&dbname=cp112&&sel=TOC\_17673&// bprp]

**Japan/Okinawa/Guam- In mainland Japan, Okinawa and Guam, DOD and the Government of Japan are moving forward with a complex troop realignment initiative that includes repositioning and consolidating United States forces among a number of bases within Okinawa and Japan, and relocating approximately 8,600 Marines and 9,000 dependents from Okinawa to Guam. The Marine relocation is one piece of a larger DOD effort to build up the United States military presence on Guam. Other elements of the plan include Air Force intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance assets; a new Navy pier and hospital, and, potentially, an Army missile defense component. The Committee is concerned that although DOD has requested more than $1,000,000,000 in funding since fiscal year 2010 for military construction projects to implement elements of the Marine Corps buildup in Guam, the Department has yet to produce a comprehensive master plan, realistic cost estimate, or construction timeline encompassing all elements of the plan. Moreover, several land use issues--including the availability of land on Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands for essential training range support for the Marines--remains unresolved. And the proposed United States military construction program does not begin to address the requisite civilian infrastructure improvements on Guam--including transportation, water, sewer and electrical upgrades--that will be needed to accommodate the projected population increase.**

#### **Status quo relocation deviates from 2006 agreements**

**Guam Economic Development Authority ‘11** (Guam Economic Development Authority Bureau of Statistics and Plans, University of Guam, Pacific Center for Economic Initiatives, “Guam Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy,”

<http://www.bsp.guam.gov/Guam%202011%20Comprehensive%20Economic%20Development%20Strategy.pdf>, YX)

Guam has a large U.S. military presence, which includes Navy and Air Force bases that encompasses nearly 27% of the island’s land mass. The Department of Defense (DoD) plans to relocate 8,600 Marines and approximately 9,000 dependents from Okinawa to Guam with an initial estimated cost of $10.27 billion. The current Guam population is 180,000. It is estimated that up to 20,000 temporary workers may be needed to complete the required construction. At the completion of the relocation, approximately 6,000 civilian workers will be added to the island’s population. The government of Guam is concerned that this rapid population increase will place an unsustainable burden on its infrastructure. Major funding for the buildup effort is being contributed by DoD, US Department of Agriculture (USDA), and the Government of Japan. Defense spending on Guam is about $700-800 million a year, with 6,500 active duty personnel and approximately 7,000 dependents. There were 3,600 Federal civilian employees and Federal taxes returned to Guam were $45 million. Since 2006, the proposed military buildup has been expected to have a major economic impact on the local economy. What is in common among these factors is that they tend to be largely outside of the control of local economic planners and policymakers and leave the local economy exposed to instability they create. Partly related to the recent devastation in Japan as well as new developments from the U.S. Congress, the terms, magnitude, and timing of the military buildup on Guam might deviate from those spelled out in the 2006 U.S.-Japan Agreement. Much depends on the fiscal health of both the U.S. federal government and the Government of Japan, who initially agreed to share the cost of the military buildup on a 60-40 basis (approximately). To effectively counteract this situation, Guam has developed the 2011 Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) to guide its future economic development policies and efforts. The purpose of the strategy is to develop a specific action plan to assist the island in guiding future economic development by focusing limited community and outside resources on Guam’s targeted economic sectors (e.g., tourism, marine resources, aquaculture, commerce, manufacturing and service) and to achieve the specific socio-economic objectives (full employment, improved employment opportunities, higher wages and salaries, etc.) outlined in the broader planning efforts of the Calvo-Tenorio Administration whose economic platform “Blueprint 2020” provides details on how to begin the operations of the six Pacific Tiger goals into objectives.

### 2AC – XT: ports unique

#### Ports key to relocation

#### Tendersinfo News '10

(10/24/10, "Guam : USDA and DOD Announce Support for Infrastructure Improvements at the Port Authority of Guam", Lexis//Aspomer)

Modernization to the Port of Guam is not only critical for the military relocation, but also to support the long-term needs of the people of Guam. The Department of Defense is committed to executing the realignment in a manner which can benefit the Guam community and this funding contribution is one step in its efforts to do so. "USDA is proud to contribute to this important joint undertaking with the U.S. Department of Defense, Vilsack said."Guam is vital to America's security, and a modern port facility will improve our ability to rapidly deploy supplies and equipment to the area." Located near Piti, Guam, the Port Authority of Guam, also known as the Jose D. Leon Guerrero Commercial Port, handles more than 90 percent of the goods consumed by residents of Guam and the Western Pacific islands. A planned military build-up of 8,000 Marines and their dependents has led to a re-examination of the existing infrastructure. Several key facilities are being updated and expanded in preparation for the increased activity, traffic and construction that will follow. Since the seaport is the main entry point for material goods, its increased capacity is essential for subsequent expansions and new construction. Funding from USDA and the Department of Defense is expected to help save or create more than 800 jobs. The Maritime Administration (MARAD) will help administer DOD and USDA's funding for this project.

#### Ports k2 Guam’s economy – no funding now

PIR 12 (Pacific Islands Report, 5/28/12, “U.S. Secretary Of Transportation Visits Guam Port”,http://pidp.org/pireport/2012/May/05-28-04.htm // Veevz )

U.S. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood yesterday visited the Jose D. Leon Guerrero Commercial Port, the island's only seaport point of entry for civilian goods. LaHood's trip, which primarily is to speak at today's University of Guam graduation, allowed the local government to show him a seaport that awaits tens of millions of dollars in funding to renovate its old facilities and keep its wharf from collapsing because of structural problems from previous earthquakes. LaHood agrees the Port Authority's facilities need an upgrade. "It is an antiquated port and it needs to get into the 21st century for the island to continue to grow," LaHood said. The Port Authority has identified close to $200 million in projects to modernize the port, but the local government has not firmed up how to fund all of the projects. The Maritime Administration, which is under the U.S. Transportation Department, is overseeing about $50 million in Defense Department funding for the Port to be ready for an expected increase in incoming goods for the military buildup. Gov. Eddie Calvo said it was an honor to have LaHood on Guam because it's "not every day" a high-ranking government official visits Guam. Calvo said he hopes LaHood will be able to speak to his colleagues in Washington, D.C., about Guam's transportation infrastructure funding needs. LaHood said his department has invested in 19 ports throughout the states as part of President Barack Obama's National Export Initiative, an effort to double U.S. exports by the end of 2014 and support millions of American jobs. After touring the island's seaport, LaHood said the Department of Transportation would become a good partner as the Port Authority modernizes its facilities. "We support the port. It is an economic engine for the community. Investing in the port will create jobs and only be a good thing for Guam," LaHood said.

#### Port upgrade is critical

DOD 12 (Feb 8th 2012, “Report on the Program and Contract Infrastructure Technical Requirements Development for the Guam Realignment Program”, <http://www.dodig.mil/Inspections/PDFs/DODIG-2012-052.pdf> // Veevz)

Commercial Port of Guam The Port of Guam’s cargo handling capacity must be upgraded to achieve the required throughput for the military realignment to the territory of Guam. All port improvements, as stated in the 2008 Memorandum of Understanding between the Government of Guam; the Port Authority of Guam; and the U.S. Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration (USDOT, MARAD), must be implemented within the 2007 Port Master Plan framework ranked in order of priority and should enable the Port of Guam to achieve the required throughput in support of the military realignment. ii Finding. Given the fact that the Guam commercial port bulkhead is at significant risk of major structural failure, the Department of Defense, Office of Inspector General (DOD IG) issued a memorandum of condition to USDOT, MARAD addressing the serious condition of the bulkhead. The memorandum advocated that MARAD work with the Port Authority of Guam to implement the first priority of the Memorandum of Understanding between MARAD and the Port Authority of Guam, signed November 2008, that stated, “Correct the deteriorated structural, utility and infrastructural facility deficiencies and upgrade said facilities to modern safe standard.

## \*\*SOLVENCY\*\*

### 2AC – ports mech

#### **Ports key to relocation**

#### **Tendersinfo News '10**

(10/24/10, "Guam : USDA and DOD Announce Support for Infrastructure Improvements at the Port Authority of Guam", Lexis//Aspomer)

Modernization to the Port of Guam is not only critical for the military relocation, but also to support the long-term needs of the people of Guam. The Department of Defense is committed to executing the realignment in a manner which can benefit the Guam community and this funding contribution is one step in its efforts to do so. "USDA is proud to contribute to this important joint undertaking with the U.S. Department of Defense, Vilsack said."Guam is vital to America's security, and a modern port facility will improve our ability to rapidly deploy supplies and equipment to the area." Located near Piti, Guam, the Port Authority of Guam, also known as the Jose D. Leon Guerrero Commercial Port, handles more than 90 percent of the goods consumed by residents of Guam and the Western Pacific islands. A planned military build-up of 8,000 Marines and their dependents has led to a re-examination of the existing infrastructure. Several key facilities are being updated and expanded in preparation for the increased activity, traffic and construction that will follow. Since the seaport is the main entry point for material goods, its increased capacity is essential for subsequent expansions and new construction. Funding from USDA and the Department of Defense is expected to help save or create more than 800 jobs. The Maritime Administration (MARAD) will help administer DOD and USDA's funding for this project.

#### **Ports key to the buildup**

Jowers 08 (Karen, Air Force Times, 5/10/08, “Military Buildup Threatens to Overwhelm Guam,” <http://www.airforcetimes.com/news/2008/05/airforce_guam_051008p/> // Veevz)

If Guam doesn’t get money soon from the federal government to help prepare for the massive military buildup coming to the island in the next few years, it could affect not only the island’s permanent residents but also the quality of life for the service members and families who will move there, the island’s governor told lawmakers. “No American community can shoulder the challenges of a 30 percent increase in population” in such a short time, Guam Gov. Felix Camacho said. Guam’s population of about 171,000 includes about 14,000 people connected to the Defense Department, but that is expected to triple, to more than 40,000, in a five-year period, said David Bice, executive director of the Joint Guam Program Office for the Navy’s assistant secretary for installations and environment. That includes 8,000 Marines and their 9,000 family members relocating from Okinawa to Guam by 2014, as well as the addition of about 1,000 airmen at Andersen Air Force Base. Including active-duty airmen, reservists and dependents, the population of Andersen will swell from about 8,500 to nearly 12,000 by early in the next decade. The people of Guam expect the federal government to underwrite the costs directly related to the military buildup, Camacho told the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee on May 1. Guamanians are worried about the potential strains on their port, roads, electrical system, health care system, wastewater system and social programs. Camacho noted that military personnel and their families “will travel the same roads, use the same resources and live in the same community we all share today. ... We want to be ready so we can continue to provide America’s front lines with a home away from home, without jeopardizing the basic services the government of Guam provides to the local community.” Although Guam’s government has been working to improve roads, schools and other infrastructure, it is unfair to expect any community to take on such exponential growth in such a short timeline, he said. Because of its strategic location in the western Pacific and its status as U.S. soil, Air Force leaders envision Guam becoming a major staging ground from which to project air power throughout Asia. Buildup has already begun The ramp-up is already underway. Andersen has hosted continuous long-range bomber deployments since 2004, and the base began construction in 2006 on a $242 million Expeditionary Combat Support Training campus. The campus will host the 554th Red Horse Squadron and a combat communications squadron, both relocating from South Korea. Andersen also expects to gain a permanent tanker presence as soon as fiscal 2009, and the base is slated to receive the first of seven Global Hawk surveillance drones in 2009 or 2010. The Navy plans to build a transient nuclear aircraft carrier-capable pier at Apra Harbor and beef up its submarine presence, and the Army plans to put a ballistic missile defense task force on the island. The most pressing concern, Camacho said, is Guam’s only civilian seaport, which expects to see six times the number of containers it now handles to support the construction boom. The port will bear the brunt of incoming military cargo and will be a critical chokepoint to support the buildup, he said. Expanding the port will cost an estimated $195 million, Guam officials said. Local officials have been taking steps on their own to prepare, he said. For example, the master plan for expansion of the port is before the Guam legislature. But officials have received little Defense Department guidance, and uncertainties about the buildup contribute to the difficulty of crafting a fully formed plan, said Brian Lepore, the Government Accountability Office’s director of defense capabilities and management. Commitments between the U.S. and the government of Japan, Camacho said, were made “without consideration of our capacity.”

### 2AC – misc. solvency

**Timely infrastructure expansion is critical to accommodate Marine transfer**

Geiger '11

[Julianne Geiger, freelance writer and editor based in the US., 5/11/2011, "Futenma, Guam Building Challenges, Changes Just Parts of Massive U.S. Defense Policy Review Initiative; Timelines, Price Tag Always Evolving While Strategy Stays", pg. online @ guambuildupnews.com/Buildup-News-Politics/Futenma-Guam-Buildup-Challenges-Changes-Just-Parts-of-Massive-U.S.-Defense-Policy-Review-Initiative-Timelines-Price-Tag-Always-Evolving-While-Strategy-Stays.html// bprp]

**GUAM - The Defense Policy Review Initiative (DPRI), a massive program launched in 2002 to update the U.S.-Japan security alliance, laid the framework for the future structure of U.S. forces in Japan and the U.S. Marine Corps realignment to Guam -- one of the largest movements of military assets in decades. The realignment is part of the 2006 Realignment Roadmap Agreement between the U.S. and Japan, which was renewed in 2009 in response to the broader U.S. Defense Posture Review Initiative. The agreement is expected to help to maintain a robust forward deployed military presence in the Asia-Pacific region, but has experienced significant delays over the establishment of a new Marine base on Okinawa and concerns that the transfer of Marines to Guam must be deliberately paced to avoid overwhelming the island's already stressed infrastructure. However delayed, work to upgrade Guam's infrastructure and expand military facilities is moving forward, and already in April the Navy has begun to release up to $1.2 billion in new construction task orders for 2011. The Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific has said that preliminary digging and boring work can now move ahead to allow builders to draft construction designs. Construction costs for facility and infrastructure development to prepare Guam for the realignment was originally pegged at $10.27 billion in 2006. To support a U.S. military presence in Asia, Japan has pledged to spend more than $6 billion for Guam buildup costs alone, of which already $833.8 million has been conveyed from previous years, with Parliament working to finance another $420 million as appropriated in its FY 2011 national budget. Japan has also promised to fund realignment costs associated with a new replacement facility in Okinawa for the current Marine Corps Air Station Futenma, and for a buildup at Marine Corps Air Station Iwakuni on the Japanese mainland. Although the realignment of the Marines to Guam is of great significance, it is only a portion of the broader DPRI. Over 30,000 troops will be involved in the realignment, including the III Marine Expeditionary Force, most of which is currently based in Okinawa. Under the DPRI, the III MEF would be distributed throughout Guam, Okinawa, Iwakuni in Japan and potentially also Hawaii. Major components of this larger DPRI include the Futenma Replacement Facility on Okinawa, the Iwakuni Master Plan, the Okinawan Consolidation Plan, as well as the Guam Joint Military Master Plan. The Futenma Replacement Facility The Futenma Replacement Facility or so-called FRF in Nago, a city in northern Okinawa, has an anticipated completion date of 2021. However this date will likely slide, according to a March 24 "pre-decisional" presentation on the Pacific Realignment by U.S. Marine Corps Pacific Division policy director Bryan Wood. Delays reflect the tension between the local Okinawan and Tokyo governments—both of which feel pressure to relieve Okinawa's basing burden, but also realize the critical value of Marines support, given serious contingencies in the region such as the threat of aggression by China and North Korea and the March 11 Japan earthquake-tsunami disaster. Delays will likely be seen during landfill permitting, which is expected to take between one and two years. Construction issues may also contribute to delays, which are set to include the demolition of up to 94 percent of existing structures in Nago's Henoko Bay area. The timing of the FRF is intertwined with the Guam Master Plan, as III MEF personnel will be redistributed from the current Okinawan facility to Guam as well as to the FRF. Guam Joint Military Master Plan The Guam Joint Military Master Plan will relocate the majority of the Marines currently based in Okinawa to northern Guam in the Finegayan area, where new family housing and quality of life facilities will be built. A main training complex at Andersen Air Force Base South along Route 15 in the Pagat area of northern Guam, as well as additional training at Naval Magazine in southern Guam and Andersen's Northwest Field are also part of the plan. The Marine transfer will also require force beddown and associated facilities at AAFB North Ramp for the Marine Corps Air Combat Element, a new North Gate and access road at AAFB, new air embarkation facilities at AAFB South Ramp and various wharf refurbishments and utilities upgrades to support the Marines' waterfront functions at Naval Base Guam. To accommodate the influx of additional military personnel and their families, the master plan will require infrastructure expansion and improvements of an unprecedented scale. While March 24 document says that the current "Approved Implementation Plan" calls for the transfer of over 8,900 Marines and their dependants and support staff to Guam, the Secretary of Defense plans on seeking approval from the U.S.-Japan Security Consultative Committee for a new "Preferred Laydown" that would increase this number to 9,700 Marines. Current impediments to the Guam Master Plan include the litigation over the proposed training range in Pagat and the slow progress made at the FRF. The Navy also still faces land acquisition challenges as the Marine Corps requires two full contiguous land parcels in vicinity of Route 15 in order to meet minimum live fire weapons qualification and sustainment requirements.**

#### Squo won’t relocate because guam sucks.

Potter 10 **(**Matthew, served in the U.S. Navy, worked as a defense contractor in Washington D.C. specializing in program management and budget development and execution, 1/13/2010, U.S Military's Move From Japan To Guam Underway<http://industry.bnet.com/government/10004825/us-militarys-move-from-japan-to-guam-underway/> // Veevz )

The United States has based troops on Okinawa and in Japan since the end of World War II. The 3rd U.S. Marine Division and large amounts of air assets are based on the island seized in a bloody battle in April through June of 1945. The U.S. and Japanese governments have been negotiating for years to close the air base at Futenma and moving most of the troops off of the island. A new airbase will be built on Okinawa in a less built up area. In 2006 it was decided that the U.S. Territory of Guam would be the site chosen. Japan has long desired the removal of U.S. troops and proper integration of the island back into it. This is one of the largest changes to the U.S. military’s facilities and basing as part of the last round of Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC). Guam is already providing heavy support to U.S. operations in Afghanistan and Iraq by supporting fixed wing Air Force assets as well as transport flights. The plan is to expand the base to allow the 3rd Marines to be stationed their as well as increased support assets including a pier for aircraft carriers. Along with Marine and Navy assets an Army air defense organization will also be moved. All this will require new bases and facilities paid for by both the U.S. and Japanese governments. The building boom will be a big plus to the island’s economy although there are many in the Territory who are worried about the massive influx of new U.S. forces and their dependents. The new more liberal Government of Japan is also having second thoughts wanting further negotiations despite the U.S. holding firm on their commitment to the 2006 deal. They want perhaps a complete move of the air assets without building a new base. Many in Okinawa and Guam see massive environmental disruption and damage from the construction and moves no matter what the boon to the economy of the territory will be. The U.S. Navy announced this week despite the controversies that the first construction contracts using Japanese money were to be awarded. The $50 million contract with AHL Setiadi Gushiken Joint Venture LLC of Honolulu is for engineering support and architecture services that will begin the process of laying out and building the new facilities. Two actual projects were also executed with the Japanese funding to build a headquarters and fire station. The total amount expected to be contributed by Japan is over $6 billion with almost $3 billion in cash. There have been other arguments about the size of the population growth, lack of infrastructure and how the contracts will be divided up. Many of the companies will be from off island and utilize non-U.S. workers. There have also been disputes about the wages involved and whether they will be U.S. minimum, lower or union level. Obviously the higher the wages the greater the cost to the U.S. military but at the same time the workers must be treated fairly. This is one of the largest facility expansion in modern U.S. history. Only the construction of the permanent facilities in Iraq, Vietnam and Afghanistan in the last forty years come close. A total of almost 20,000 new residents will eventually be transferred to the island over several years. As Guam builds up Okinawa will wind down with a negative effect on that islands’ economy. This is a difficult process that politics only makes harder but to answer the wishes of Japan Guam will receive the good and bad of having a large U.S. military base built on it.

#### You may be asking yourself - -- what does the aff do? – well this is it!

Leonard 11 (Barry, Editor and Publisher of the Environmental Impact Statement of the military move from Okinawa to Guam commissioned by -- Joint Guam Program Office c/o Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific, “Final Environmental Impact Statement GUAM AND CNMI MILITARY RELOCATION Relocating Marines from Okinawa, Visiting Aircraft Carrier Berthing, and Army Air and Missile Defense Task Force”, [http://www.guambuildupeis.us/documents/final/volume\_7/Volume\_7\_Proposed\_Mitigation\_Measures\_Preferred\_Alternatives\_Impacts\_and\_Cumulative\_Impacts.pdf //](http://www.guambuildupeis.us/documents/final/volume_7/Volume_7_Proposed_Mitigation_Measures_Preferred_Alternatives_Impacts_and_Cumulative_Impacts.pdf%20//) Veevz)

The proposed actions consist of: 1) constructing facilities and infrastructure to support the relocation of approximately 8,600 Marines and their dependents from Okinawa (Japan) to Guam, 2) constructing a Navy deep-draft wharf with shoreside infrastructure improvements for transient aircraft carriers, and 3) constructing facilities and infrastructure on Guam to support relocation of approximately 600 military personnel and their dependents in order to establish and operate an Army AMDTF. In summary, implementation of the proposed actions would include the following major components: • Temporary increase in population associated with the construction-related workforce. • Permanent increase in the number of military and civilian personnel and dependents on Guam with a transient presence during training on Tinian. • Increase in number and types of major equipment to support military personnel and operations (e.g., aircraft, ships, amphibious watercraft). • Increase in number and types of training activities. • Construction of new facilities and improvements to existing facilities (main cantonment, training, waterfront, airfield, family housing, community support). • Improvements to existing and construction of new infrastructure (including roads, utilities, etc.). • Acquisition or long-term leasing of additional land.

#### Solvency Advocate for the GRN

Leonard 11 (Barry, Editor and Publisher of the Environmental Impact Statement of the military move from Okinawa to Guam commissioned by -- Joint Guam Program Office c/o Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific, “Final Environmental Impact Statement GUAM AND CNMI MILITARY RELOCATION Relocating Marines from Okinawa, Visiting Aircraft Carrier Berthing, and Army Air and Missile Defense Task Force”, [http://www.guambuildupeis.us/documents/final/volume\_7/Volume\_7\_Proposed\_Mitigation\_Measures\_Preferred\_Alternatives\_Impacts\_and\_Cumulative\_Impacts.pdf //](http://www.guambuildupeis.us/documents/final/volume_7/Volume_7_Proposed_Mitigation_Measures_Preferred_Alternatives_Impacts_and_Cumulative_Impacts.pdf%20//) Veevz )

The roadway improvements sections have been prepared jointly by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) as a federal cooperating agency, the Navy's Joint Guam Program Office as the federal lead agency for the Guam and CNMI military relocation, and the Guam Department of Public Works as a participating agency. The purpose of the proposed construction of the Guam Road Network (GRN) is to improve the existing network through the Defense Access Road Program and provide mission-critical transportation infrastructure as part of the planned military relocation. The improvements proposed for the GRN would result in strengthened roadways, bridge replacement, increased roadway capacity roadway realignment (Route I5), new access, and enhanced roadway safety on Guam as a response to construction for military relocation and growth. The off base roadway projects may be funded through the DAR program and annual allocations through the U.S. Department of Transportation FHWA and/or other DoD/FHWA special funding allotments. The Defense Access Road Program provides the means for DoD to pay a fair share for public highway improvements required as a result of a sudden or unusual defense-generated traffic impact or unique defense-related public highway requirement. Individual projects have been identified from recent transportation and traffic studies on the island of Guam. These consist of 43 GRN (off-base) prokects and 15 intersection improvement projects at military access points (MAPS) (i.e.. gates). The 43 GRN (of f-base) projects are composed of six types of roadway improvements: Intersection improvement projects Bridge replacement projects (involving eight bridges) Pavement strengthening (combined with roadway widening at some locations) Roadway relocation (Route |5) Roadway widening Construction of a new road (Finegayan Connection)

#### More solvency MORE!

GDPW No date (Guam Department of Public Works, “GUAM ROAD NETWORK”, [http://www.guamtransportationprogram.com/guam-transportation-plan-2030/guam-road-network //](http://www.guamtransportationprogram.com/guam-transportation-plan-2030/guam-road-network%20//) Veevz )

The United States 3rd Marine Corps Expeditionary forces Air Combat Element, Command element, Ground Combat Element, and Command Service Element will relocate from Okinawa, Japan to Guam with a projected schedule of completing the relocation by 2015. Additionally, the US Army Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) Task Force is also being located to the Guam. The build-up includes accommodating additional logistics capabilities for military training and operations, and improving pier/waterfront infrastructure for transient U.S. Navy nuclear aircraft carrier berthing at Naval Base Guam. The concept of a "Haul Road Network" grew from identifying the routes most likely to be used by the military connecting known origins and destinations. In this fashion, routes used by the military would be pre-determined, impacts localized to those roadways, restricting the haul road related improvements to the identified network. The Haul Road Network, when fully improved, will have the traffic capacity and structural integrity to withstand the movement of military and civilian traffic as well as cargo truck traffic during the build-up period. The key component of the HRN is a strengthened bypass on the Route 8/Route 16 corridor on the easterly side of the Guam International Air Terminal. This by-pass route would provide a good alternative for moving cargo across the island rather than the normally congested Route 1 corridor through Tamuning. The primary truck route between the Port of Guam, NCTS Finegayan and Anderson Air Force Base would consist of Route 1 from the Port to Route 8, Route 8 to Route 16, Route 16 to Route 27, Route 27 back to Route 1, Route 1 to Route 3 and Route 3 to Finegayan. Other major truck routes include Route 3 north of NCTS Finegayan and Route 9 which provide access to Northwest Field and Andersen Air Force Base. Another key connection is along Route 15 and Chalan Lujuna which will connect the Rock Quarry to the military construction sites. Based on detailed analyses of the existing roads and projections of future needs as discussed above, required improvements were identified and generally fall into one of the following categories: Pavement strengthening Roadway widening Intersection improvements Bridge replacements

### 2AC – A2 alt causes (Triten)

#### Squo solves alt causes but they’re not building roads or ports – plan key

Triten 12 (Travis, Stars and Stripes, “Guam not ready for Okinawa's Marines, officials say”, 2/28/12, [http://www.stripes.com/news/pacific/okinawa/guam-not-ready-for-okinawa-s-marines-officials-say-1.170092 //](http://www.stripes.com/news/pacific/okinawa/guam-not-ready-for-okinawa-s-marines-officials-say-1.170092%20//) Veevz )

Meanwhile, most of the preparatory construction work planned for Guam is on hold, including about $700 million in funding from Japan for upgrading wastewater treatment and other utilities in advance of the Marines arriving, according to Cuff. Congress froze funding for military build-up projects on the island until the U.S. military’s realignment plans can be further studied, the Department of Defense provides a master realignment plan and the Marine Corps weighs in on its ideal force structure in the region. The Senate has said it plans to order an independent review this year of the plans to shift Marines off Okinawa, but it remains unclear when the other congressional requirements may be met. With congressional requirements and bilateral negotiations looming, the length of time needed for Guam to get prepared to host Marines remains undecided, Cuff said. “Putting any type of timeline or an expected date would just be inappropriate at this point,” he said. Guam Sen. Judi Guthertz, chairwoman of the island legislature’s military build-up committee, said she believes the island could build the training facilities and upgrade the utilities within three years. “I don’t think that would be very difficult to achieve,” Guthertz said. In the past, the training ranges had caused controversy on the territory, but the decision to consider land on or around the existing naval magazine could avoid widespread public opposition and delays for the project, she said. However, the Navy is also considering parcels of land on the eastern coast that are earmarked for return to Chamorro residents, who are the original inhabitants of Guam, Guthertz said.

## \*\*ALLIANCE\*\*

### 2AC – XT: plan solves relations

#### **Plan solves relations**

US Embassy 06 (U.S. Department of State, United States, “Japan Reaffirm Commitment on Security Cooperation <http://wfile.ait.org.tw/wf-archive/2006/060501/epf105.htm> // Veevz)

Following up on an October 2005 SCC initiative, the ministers approved an implementation plan for realignment of U.S. military forces based in Japan. "The measures to be implemented demonstrate the resolve of both parties to strengthen their commitments under the U.S.-Japan Security treaty, and at the same time, to reduce the burden on local communities, including those on Okinawa, thereby providing the basis for enhanced public support for the security alliance," according to the statement. Details of the implementation plan have been laid out in a report, "United States-Japan Road Map for Realignment Implementation," according to the officials. Speaking with reporters following the SCC meeting, Rumsfeld said the two sides had agreed to relocate two U.S. air bases from urban to rural areas, and are planning to develop a larger role for the island of Guam in the U.S.-Japan alliance and the security architecture of the Asia-Pacific region.

#### **Prefer reverse-causal evidence**

Feffer 10 (John , co-director of Foreign Policy in Focus at the Institute for Policy Studies, “Okinawa and the new domino effect”, 3-5, <http://inthesenewtimes.com/2010/03/05/okinawa-and-the-new-domino-effect/> // Veevz)

Under the circumstances, the new government of Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama proposed something modest indeed – putting the US-Japan alliance on, in the phrase of the moment, a “more equal” footing. It inaugurated this new approach in a largely symbolic way by ending Japan’s resupply mission in the Indian Ocean (though Tokyo typically sweetened the pill by offering a five-year package of $5 billion in development assistance to the Afghan government). More substantively, the Yukio Hatoyama government also signaled that it wanted to reduce its base-support payments. Japan’s proposed belt-tightening comes at an inopportune moment for the Obama administration, as it tries to pay for two wars, its “overseas contingency operations”, and a worldwide network of more than 700 military bases. The burdens of US overseas operations are increasing, and fewer countries are proving willing to share the costs. Of dugongs and democracy The immediate source of tension in the US-Japanese relationship has been Tokyo’s desire to renegotiate that 2006 agreement to close Futenma, transfer those 8,000 Marines to Guam, and build a new base in Nago, a less densely populated area of the island. It’s a deal that threatens to make an already strapped government pay big. Back in 2006, Tokyo promised to shell out more than $6 billion just to help relocate the Marines to Guam.

#### **Squo negotiations force Japan to pay extra money in guam – kills the bilateral agreement – shatters relations**

Japan Times 3/25/12 (“Japan asked to shell out extra $1 billion over marines' transfer to Guam”, [http://www.japantimes.co.jp/text/nn20120325b2.html //](http://www.japantimes.co.jp/text/nn20120325b2.html%20//) Veevz)

Washington is pushing Tokyo to pay an additional $1 billion over the transfer of U.S. Marines from Okinawa to Guam, reneging on an earlier pledge to shoulder the costs itself, sources close to bilateral relations said Saturday. Specifically, Japan has been asked to cover the equivalent of ¥82 billion in extra costs to construct American military facilities on the U.S. territory, despite a bilateral agreement to share the financial burden, the sources said. The request was initially made during a recent review of the realignment of American forces in Japan, and comes as the U.S. Congress cranks up the pressure on President Barack Obama to cut federal expenditures. On Friday, U.S. officials repeated the request during negotiations with Japanese government representatives in San Francisco, but Tokyo has been reluctant to agree so far. Japan instead is arguing that its share of the costs should be reduced because the United States announced earlier this month that 3,300 fewer marines will be transferred to Guam, following the realignment review, the sources said. Under a deal reached by the two sides over the marines' relocation, Japan will fund the construction of living facilities for their families, including schools, as well as buildings to house the U.S. military's command center on the Pacific island. The United States, meanwhile, will cover the costs of building military-related facilities, such as those used for training purposes. Japan's financial contribution over the marines' redeployment to Guam is effectively capped at $2.8 billion (about ¥230 billion), but this amount would be exceeded if it accepts the United States' latest request. On the other hand, Washington's expenses, capped at $4.2 billion (around ¥346 billion), probably would be reduced. In 2006, the two countries agreed to transfer 8,000 marines stationed in Okinawa Prefecture, which hosts the majority of U.S. military facilities in Japan, to Guam. However, the realignment review proposed that this figure be slashed to just 4,700 marines.

#### **Relocation is key to bilat relations**

Ryoko Shimpo 12 (Japenese Newspaper, 2/12/12, “New realignment plan for moving U.S. Marine to Guam will not be tolerated – the situation must not go from bad to worse”, <http://english.ryukyushimpo.jp/2012/02/10/5523/> // Veevz)

We want to eliminate the risks posed by Futenma Air Station – which U.S. officials have described as “the most dangerous air base in the world” – as soon as possible. To avoid accidents, we want to reject the deployment of the MV-22 Osprey vertical takeoff and landing transport aircraft in Okinawa because it has been described as having inherent defects. These standpoints represent the views held by the vast majority of the Okinawan public. If the governments of Japan and the United States place a high priority on human rights or human life, and would like to normalize relations between Japan and United States supported by the trust of the Okinawan people, the best course of action would be the unconditional return of Futenma Air Station to the Okinawan people or to relocate those facilities either outside the prefecture or abroad.

### 2AC – XT: alliance solves wars

#### **Relocation revitalizes East Asian security alliances**

**Ennis ’11** (Peter, Pacific Forum CSIS, writes and publishes Dispatch Japan and the private newsletter The Bottom Line, covering US national and foreign policies of importance to US-Japan relations, 5-25-11, “Pressure Builds for US Shift on Okinawa,” <http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/Digital-Library/ISN-Insights/Detail/?lng=en&id=129533&contextid734=129533&contextid735=129531&tabid=129531129533>, YX)

Asia policy shift **A resolution of the Futenma issue could have implications far beyond Okinawa and US-Japan relations. Evidence continues to grow that** President **Obama would like to see a major US strategic shift toward greater emphasis on Asia**. The White House has tapped Obama confidante Mark Lippert to replace Gregson; one of the president’s closest advisors should soon be overseeing Asia policy for the Pentagon, assuming a few lingering qualms about Lippert’s readiness are resolved. Obama’s focus on Asia’s growing strategic importance should be particularly evident when he hosts the APEC summit in Hawaii next November. It’s notable that in a recent New Yorker analysis of Obama’s foreign policy, NSC director Tom Donilon, deputy director Ben Rhodes (Obama’s long-time chief foreign policy speechwriter), and Assistant Secretary of State for East Asia Kurt Campbell were all quoted outlining just such a strategic “rebalancing” of American foreign policy. The Pentagon’s top policy chief, Michelle Flournoy, outlined a similar policy in a recent talk at Johns Hopkins. **The administration is looking to energize America’s role in East Asia by fomenting a system of open and transparent economic and security cooperation in the region**, defining the terms of engagement to which China has to respond. **The economic component, for now, is the Trans-Pacific Partnership regional trade initiative. And the security component involves building on America’s traditional bilateral security alliances in the region to include a network of overlapping bilateral, trilateral, and multilateral security relationships** from India, through Vietnam and Indonesia, to Australia, and up to Korea and Japan. Japan is already cultivating security ties with India and Vietnam, and deepening ties with South Korea, including discussion of formal military agreements involving information sharing and the exchange of military goods and services. China and South Korea both provided relief assistance to Japan after March 11, opening the door to expansion of the existing “Plus Three” dialogue between Tokyo, Seoul, and Beijing. Washington is supportive of these steps by Japan, as they indirectly extend the influence of the US-Japan alliance, while providing Tokyo a far greater degree of self-determination than possible through the exclusively bilateral US-Japan security alliance. The Futenma dilemma **The problem Washington faces is that continued focus on the Futenma dispute threatens to distract the US and Japan from this broader strategic goal, allowing a relatively minor base dispute to disrupt the whole alliance**. Excess focus on Futenma also detracts from the absolutely critical role played by the naval facility at Yokosuka, where the US home ports the USS George Washington carrier group, and the role of the huge Kadena Air Base on Okinawa. Together, Kadena and Yokosuka allow the US to project enormous power throughout East Asia, and are the principle means to deter North Korean aggression, and to balance China’s rising military role in the region. Tokyo insists Japan fully backs the plan for a new facility at Henoko, fearful that admitting the plan is dead will cause tension with Washington. And **Washington continues to back the Henoko plan, because no political decision has been made to abandon the bureaucratic status quo**. With no decision yet made to abandon the Henoko project, none of the necessary talks about a new plan can proceed. That leaves the US-Japan alliance dangerously vulnerable to a crisis in the event of a helicopter crash at the Futenma facility, which is surrounded by civilian communities. Congressional intrigue **Into this bureaucratic quagmire have stepped three senior and very influential US senators**: Carl Levin, chairman of the Armed Services Committee; John McCain, ranking Republican on Armed Services; and, Jim Webb, chairman of the Asia subcommittee of Senate Foreign Relations. On May 13, the three senators issued a joint statement calling for the Defense Department to “re-examine plans to restructure U.S. military forces in East Asia.” **The senators said the US “strongly supports a continuous and vigorous US presence in the region,” but** emphasized that **they “believe the current DoD realignment plans are unrealistic, unworkable, and unaffordable.**” While the statement was “joint,” Levin seemed to emphasize the need for restraint, and cost-effectiveness, in defense spending, especially in the construction of new overseas facilities. McCain tended to emphasize strategy, saying: “The Asia-Pacific region’s growing role in the global distribution of power requires us to consistently view and update plans for the U.S. military’s role in the region.” And Webb forcefully challenged the Marine Corps claims that construction of a new facility in Henoko Bay to replace the Futenma air station is indispensable to the Marine presence in, and thus the stability of, East Asia. With Webb taking the lead, the three senators proposed a dramatic overhaul of the US Marine presence in East Asia. The key elements would include: a) “abandonment” of the Henoko project at Camp Schwab as a replacement for the Futenma facility; b) integration of the Marine Corps assets at Futenma into Kadena Air Base, while dispersing some Air Force assets now at Kadena to other areas of the Pacific; c) home-basing in Hawaii or at Camp Pendleton the 8,000 Marines now scheduled to redeploy to Guam, and deploy those Marines on a rotating basis throughout the Pacific. Most intriguing is that retired Marine Corps Gen. Jim Jones, who was President Obama’s national security advisor until last October, played an important role in helping Webb craft these proposals. It will be difficult for the current Marine Corps leadership to argue to legendary Marine veterans Jones and Webb that their proposals would be harmful to the Marine Corps, and are otherwise operationally unrealistic. The skeptical view Some **sources** very close to the situation **are skeptical that the Obama administration will shift Okinawa policy any time soon**. According to this view, it makes sense that the administration would seek to kick the Futenma-Henoko issue down the road a while longer. Pushing back the 2014 deadline would amount to acknowledging the obvious, and acknowledging the difficulties to proceed so soon after the March 11 natural disasters would also buy more time to find a permanent solution. But Webb is proposing a wholesale rethinking of US strategy and force structure in the Western Pacific, and only the Secretary of Defense and/or the president himself can make those kinds of decisions. **Without that heavy push from the White House, according to this view, it would not be possible to shake the bureaucracy out of its policy rut.** From a strategy standpoint, opponents of a shift in Okinawa policy will argue that it would signal a US retreat from Asia, and reduce the US deterrence of China. **The White House continues signal that it is serious about a shift in strategy toward Asia. A restructured US force posture would not be seen as retreat, but rather a region-wide “hedge” in the event China tries to throw its growing weight**. Sources close to Kurt Campbell say that he is convinced that continued US and Japanese wrangling over Futenma will threaten the whole “shift” strategy, because **it can’t work without a vibrant US-Japan alliance**. Campbell is prepared to work with Webb and others in Congress on a new basing arrangement for the Marines in the Pacific. Once Panetta takes over as defense secretary, and assuming Lippert becomes his top deputy for Asia, the White House would have in place an administration-wide team to pursue an expanded role in the region.

**U.S. commitment to Japan is vital to overall East Asian stability**

Goh 08 (Evelyn, Lecturer in International Relations in the Department of Politics and International Relations at the Univ of Oxford International Relations of the Asia-Pacific,“Hierarchy and the role of the United States in the East Asian security order,” 2008 8(3):353-377, Oxford Journals Database)

The centrality of these mutual processes of assurance and deference means that the stability of a hierarchical order is fundamentally related to a collective sense of certainty about the leadership and order of the hierarchy. This certainty is rooted in a combination of material calculations – smaller states' assurance that the expected costs of the dominant state conquering them would be higher than the benefits – and ideational convictions – the sense of legitimacy, derived from shared values and norms that accompanies the super-ordinate state's authority in the social order. The empirical analysis in the next section shows that regional stability in East Asia in the post-Second World War years can be correlated to the degree of collective certainty about the US-led regional hierarchy. East Asian stability and instability has been determined by U.S. assurances, self-confidence, and commitment to maintaining its primary position in the regional hierarchy; the perceptions and confidence of regional states about US commitment; and the reactions of subordinate states in the region to the varied challengers to the regional hierarchical order. 4. Hierarchy and the East Asian security order Currently, the regional hierarchy in East Asia is still dominated by the United States. Since the 1970s, China has increasingly claimed the position of second-ranked great power, a claim that is today legitimized by the hierarchical deference shown by smaller subordinate powers such as South Korea and Southeast Asia. Japan and South Korea can, by virtue of their alliance with the United States, be seen to occupy positions in a third layer of regional major powers, while India is ranked next on the strength of its new strategic relationship with Washington. North Korea sits outside the hierarchic order but affects it due to its military prowess and nuclear weapons capability. Apart from making greater sense of recent history, conceiving of the US' role in East Asia as the dominant state in the regional hierarchy helps to clarify three critical puzzles in the contemporary international and East Asian security landscape. First, it contributes to explaining the lack of sustained challenges to American global preponderance after the end of the Cold War. Three of the key potential global challengers to US unipolarity originate in Asia (China, India, and Japan), and their support for or acquiescence to, US dominance have helped to stabilize its global leadership. Through its dominance of the Asian regional hierarchy, the United States has been able to neutralize the potential threats to its position from Japan via an alliance, from India by gradually identifying and pursuing mutual commercial and strategic interests, and from China by encircling and deterring it with allied and friendly states that support American preponderance. Secondly, recognizing US hierarchical preponderance further explains contemporary under-balancing in Asia, both against a rising China, and against incumbent American power. I have argued that one defining characteristic of a hierarchical system is voluntary subordination of lesser states to the dominant state, and that this goes beyond rationalistic bandwagoning because it is manifested in a social contract that comprises the related processes of hierarchical assurance and hierarchical deference. Critically, successful and sustainable hierarchical assurance and deference helps to explain why Japan is not yet a ‘normal’ country. Japan has experienced significant impetus to revise and expand the remit of its security forces in the last 15 years. Yet, these pressures continue to be insufficient to prompt a wholesale revision of its constitution and its remilitarization. The reason is that the United States extends its security umbrella over Japan through their alliance, which has led Tokyo not only to perceive no threat from US dominance, but has in fact helped to forge a security community between them (Nau, 2003). Adjustments in burden sharing in this alliance since the 1990s have arisen not from greater independent Japanese strategic activism, but rather from periods of strategic uncertainty and crises for Japan when it appeared that American hierarchical assurance, along with US' position at the top of the regional hierarchy, was in question. Thus, the Japanese priority in taking on more responsibility for regional security has been to improve its ability to facilitate the US' central position, rather than to challenge it.13 In the face of the security threats from North Korea and China, Tokyo's continued reliance on the security pact with the United States is rational. While there remains debate about Japan's re-militarization and the growing clout of nationalist ‘hawks’ in Tokyo, for regional and domestic political reasons, a sustained ‘normalization’ process cannot take place outside of the restraining framework of the United States–Japan alliance (Samuels, 2007; Pyle, 2007). Abandoning the alliance will entail Japan making a conscience choice not only to remove itself from the US-led hierarchy, but also to challenge the United States dominance directly. The United States–ROK alliance may be understood in a similar way, although South Korea faces different sets of constraints because of its strategic priorities related to North Korea. As J.J. Suh argues, in spite of diminishing North Korean capabilities, which render the US security umbrella less critical, the alliance endures because of mutual identification – in South Korea, the image of the US as ‘the only conceivable protector against aggression from the North,’ and in the United States, an image of itself as protector of an allied nation now vulnerable to an ‘evil’ state suspected of transferring weapons of mass destruction to terrorist networks (Suh, 2004). Kang, in contrast, emphasizes how South Korea has become less enthusiastic about its ties with the United States – as indicated by domestic protests and the rejection of TMD – and points out that Seoul is not arming against a potential land invasion from China but rather maritime threats (Kang, 2003, pp.79–80). These observations are valid, but they can be explained by hierarchical deference toward the United States, rather than China. The ROK's military orientation reflects its identification with and dependence on the United States and its adoption of US' strategic aims. In spite of its primary concern with the North Korean threat, Seoul's formal strategic orientation is toward maritime threats, in line with Washington's regional strategy. Furthermore, recent South Korean Defense White Papers habitually cited a remilitarized Japan as a key threat. The best means of coping with such a threat would be continued reliance on the US security umbrella and on Washington's ability to restrain Japanese remilitarization (Eberstadt et al., 2007). Thus, while the United States–ROK bilateral relationship is not always easy, its durability is based on South Korea's fundamental acceptance of the United States as the region's primary state and reliance on it to defend and keep regional order. It also does not rule out Seoul and other US allies conducting business and engaging diplomatically with China. India has increasingly adopted a similar strategy vis-à-vis China in recent years. Given its history of territorial and political disputes with China and its contemporary economic resurgence, India is seen as the key potential power balancer to a growing China. Yet, India has sought to negotiate settlements about border disputes with China, and has moved significantly toward developing closer strategic relations with the United States. Apart from invigorated defense cooperation in the form of military exchange programs and joint exercises, the key breakthrough was the agreement signed in July 2005 which facilitates renewed bilateral civilian nuclear cooperation (Mohan, 2007 ). Once again, this is a key regional power that could have balanced more directly and independently against China, but has rather chosen to align itself or bandwagon with the primary power, the United States, partly because of significant bilateral gains, but fundamentally in order to support the latter's regional order-managing function. Recognizing a regional hierarchy and seeing that the lower layers of this hierarchy have become more active since the mid-1970s also allows us to understand why there has been no outright balancing of China by regional states since the 1990s. On the one hand, the US position at the top of the hierarchy has been revived since the mid-1990s, meaning that deterrence against potential Chinese aggression is reliable and in place.14 On the other hand, the aim of regional states is to try to consolidate China's inclusion in the regional hierarchy at the level below that of the United States, not to keep it down or to exclude it. East Asian states recognize that they cannot, without great cost to themselves, contain Chinese growth. But they hope to socialize China by enmeshing it in peaceful regional norms and economic and security institutions. They also know that they can also help to ensure that the capabilities gap between China and the United States remains wide enough to deter a power transition. Because this strategy requires persuading China about the appropriateness of its position in the hierarchy and of the legitimacy of the US position, all East Asian states engage significantly with China, with the small Southeast Asian states refusing openly to ‘choose sides’ between the United States and China. Yet, hierarchical deference continues to explain why regional institutions such as the ASEAN Regional Forum, ASEAN + 3, and East Asian Summit have made limited progress. While the United State has made room for regional multilateral institutions after the end of the Cold War, its hierarchical preponderance also constitutes the regional order to the extent that it cannot comfortably be excluded from any substantive strategic developments. On the part of some lesser states (particularly Japan and Singapore), hierarchical deference is manifested in inclusionary impulses (or at least impulses not to exclude the United States or US proxies) in regional institutions, such as the East Asia Summit in December 2005. Disagreement on this issue with others, including China and Malaysia, has stymied potential progress in these regional institutions (Malik, 2006). Finally, conceiving of a US-led East Asian hierarchy amplifies our understanding of how and why the United States–China relationship is now the key to regional order. The vital nature of the Sino-American relationship stems from these two states' structural positions. As discussed earlier, China is the primary second-tier power in the regional hierarchy. However, as Chinese power grows and Chinese activism spreads beyond Asia, the United States is less and less able to see China as merely a regional power – witness the growing concerns about Chinese investment and aid in certain African countries. This causes a disjuncture between US global interests and US regional interests. Regional attempts to engage and socialize China are aimed at mediating its intentions. This process, however, cannot stem Chinese growth, which forms the material basis of US threat perceptions. Apprehensions about the growth of China's power culminates in US fears about the region being ‘lost’ to China, echoing Cold War concerns that transcribed regional defeats into systemic setbacks.15 On the other hand, the US security strategy post-Cold War and post-9/11 have regional manifestations that disadvantage China. The strengthening of US alliances with Japan and Australia; and the deployment of US troops to Central, South, and Southeast Asia all cause China to fear a consolidation of US global hegemony that will first threaten Chinese national security in the regional context and then stymie China's global reach. Thus, the key determinants of the East Asian security order relate to two core questions: (i) Can the US be persuaded that China can act as a reliable ‘regional stakeholder’ that will help to buttress regional stability and US global security aims;16 and (ii) can China be convinced that the United States has neither territorial ambitions in Asia nor the desire to encircle China, but will help to promote Chinese development and stability as part of its global security strategy? (Wang, 2005). But, these questions cannot be asked in the abstract, outside the context of negotiation about their relative positions in the regional and global hierarchies. One urgent question for further investigation is how the process of assurance and deference operate at the topmost levels of a hierarchy? When we have two great powers of unequal strength but contesting claims and a closing capabilities gap in the same regional hierarchy, how much scope for negotiation is there, before a reversion to balancing dynamics? This is the main structural dilemma: as long as the United States does not give up its primary position in the Asian regional hierarchy, China is very unlikely to act in a way that will provide comforting answers to the two questions. Yet, the East Asian regional order has been and still is constituted by US hegemony, and to change that could be extremely disruptive and may lead to regional actors acting in highly destabilizing ways. Rapid Japanese remilitarization, armed conflict across the Taiwan Straits, Indian nuclear brinksmanship directed toward Pakistan, or a highly destabilized Korean peninsula are all illustrative of potential regional disruptions. 5. Conclusion To construct a coherent account of East Asia's evolving security order, I have suggested that the United States is the central force in constituting regional stability and order. The major patterns of equilibrium and turbulence in the region since 1945 can be explained by the relative stability of the US position at the top of the regional hierarchy, with periods of greatest insecurity being correlated with greatest uncertainty over the American commitment to managing regional order. Furthermore, relationships of hierarchical assurance and hierarchical deference explain the unusual character of regional order in the post-Cold War era. However, the greatest contemporary challenge to East Asian order is the potential conflict between China and the United States over rank ordering in the regional hierarchy, a contest made more potent because of the inter-twining of regional and global security concerns. Ultimately, though, investigating such questions of positionality requires conceptual lenses that go beyond basic material factors because it entails social and normative questions. How can China be brought more into a leadership position, while being persuaded to buy into shared strategic interests and constrain its own in ways that its vision of regional and global security may eventually be reconciled with that of the United States and other regional players? How can Washington be persuaded that its central position in the hierarchy must be ultimately shared in ways yet to be determined? The future of the East Asian security order is tightly bound up with the durability of the United States' global leadership and regional domination. At the regional level, the main scenarios of disruption are an outright Chinese challenge to US leadership, or the defection of key US allies, particularly Japan. Recent history suggests, and the preceding analysis has shown, that challenges to or defections from US leadership will come at junctures where it appears that the US commitment to the region is in doubt, which in turn destabilizes the hierarchical order. At the global level, American geopolitical over-extension will be the key cause of change. This is the one factor that could lead to both greater regional and global turbulence, if only by the attendant strategic uncertainly triggering off regional challenges or defections. However, it is notoriously difficult to gauge thresholds of over-extension. More positively, East Asia is a region that has adjusted to previous periods of uncertainty about US primacy. Arguably, the regional consensus over the United States as primary state in a system of benign hierarchy could accommodate a shifting of the strategic burden to US allies like Japan and Australia as a means of systemic preservation. The alternatives that could surface as a result of not doing so would appear to be much worse.

## \*\*GUAM ECON\*\*

### 2AC – XT: plan solves econ

**That presents a unique opportunity for Guam to build a self-sustaining economy**

**Castillo ’11** (Geraldine, writer for the Marianas Variety quoting University of Guam Economics Professor Dr. RoseanneJones, guest speaker during the Association of Government Accountants Guam Chapter's monthly [membership](http://mvguam.com/index.php) meeting, 9-22-11 [‘Guam must develop a self-sustaining economy’](http://mvguam.com/local/news/19999-guam-must-develop-a-self-sustaining-economy.html), <http://mvguam.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=19999:guam-must-develop-a-self-sustaining-economy&catid=1:guam-local-news&Itemid=61>, YX)

**WITH the impending military buildup and the downturn in countries that have sustained Guam's economy, an economics expert points out this can be the chance for the island to develop its own self-sustaining economy. University of Guam Economics Professor** Dr. Roseanne Jones was the guest speaker during the Association of Government Accountants Guam Chapter's monthly [membership](http://mvguam.com/index.php) meeting at the Outrigger Guam Resort, presenting her lecture on “Guam Economic Development: Trade and Demographic Indicators.” Jones spoke about the physical manifestations of an improvement of trade and the importance of Guam, citing the developments being made at the A.B. Won Pat International Airport and the Port Authority of Guam. “There's a new cement company that's coming to the Port area,” said Jones. “You can say, 'Well why is it that we get so excited about cement?' [But] these are the very key fundamental ingredients of economic development. The building going on, the capacity to build – that's what excites me ... regional trade.” Jones also spoke about the downturn in Japan and the United States. “Certainly [these are] difficult times for both of those nations, and it is a difficult time for Guam. It’s unprecedented that we have had both major nations that have been trading partners or countries that we've relied on for the two major sectors of our economy – tourism and federal investments in military – both not in the position to be spreading to the West like they used to,” Jones stated. Opportunity Despite that downturn, it presents an opportunity for Guam to look within itself to develop the economy instead of relying on the other countries to sustain us. “For the first time, we may have this door opening where we can really begin to think about how we sustain ourselves,” said Jones. “We've got the beginnings of domestic demand, we've got the beginnings of a solid infrastructure … but we have a momentum building and we have an opportunity to look to ourselves and say, 'Hey, what do we have and how can we make the most of what we have?’” Jones pointed out the many things Guam already has in order to develop its self-sustaining economy, from the foundations of infrastructure and the growing educated population to the beginning of a hub of regional trade with island neighbors. “We know that Japan and the United States will always be there,” said Jones. “But not with the same level and intensity that they once were.”

### 2AC – XT: Guam solves trade

**Guam key to Asian-Pacific trade**
**Calvo ‘11** (Eddie, Governor of Guam, quoted and paraphrased by Kevin Kerrigan, writer for the Guam News, 9-27-11, “[Governor's Weekly Address: A Case for Guam's Economic as Well as Strategic Importance](http://mail.pacificnewscenter.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=17402:governors-weekly-address&catid=45:guam-news&Itemid=156),”

The Address is a reading of a letter he has sent to every member of Congress appealing for their support of the Guam military buildup. But he also argues that Guam can play an important economic role as well. As Congress debates cuts in the federal budget, the Governor asks its members "to give due consideration to the U.S. Departments of State and Defense" and "make the [investment](http://mail.pacificnewscenter.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=17402:governors-weekly-address&catid=45:guam-news&Itemid=156) into the Agreed Implementation Plan." He reminds the Congress that Guam has been critical to [national security](http://mail.pacificnewscenter.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=17402:governors-weekly-address&catid=45:guam-news&Itemid=156) because of its location, but today, he argues, the island's importance goes beyond its strategic value. He points out that many of the Asian countries around us were once considered third world trouble spots but they are now economic power houses. Guam, says the Governor, can play a role as the gateway to America for those Asian economies. "From our shores," he states "we can export tourism, fiber-optic connectivity, transshipment of Asian goods and much more." And, the Governor maintains, the spending of Asian capital through Guam will help the U.S. economy off set its trade deficit.

#### **Guam key to Pacific trade and telecommunications**

**Guam Economic Development Authority ‘11** (Guam Economic Development Authority Bureau of Statistics and Plans, University of Guam, Pacific Center for Economic Initiatives, “Guam Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy,”

<http://www.bsp.guam.gov/Guam%202011%20Comprehensive%20Economic%20Development%20Strategy.pdf>, YX)

With the many hurdles facing Guam’s tourism industry, businesses are challenged to focus on recapitalizing the island’s tourism plant. Efforts are underway to restore and upgrade the island’s deteriorated cultural and historic assets in order to validate and sustain Guam’s differentiated brand identity, continue to be a competitive destination, and ensure the long-term viability of Guam’s tourism industry. Shopping on Guam is one of the main attractions for tourists and is a significant contributor to the local economy. Retail spending accounts for an estimated 43% of all tourism spending. Furthermore, the military and other temporary residents (i.e., contract labor from Asia or the United States) contribute substantially to Guam’s retail sales by making a significant portion of their lifetime purchases on durables while on the island. As an economic sector, which complements the tourist industry and responds quickly to a generally rising standard of living, this sector is expected to play an important role in Guam in the coming years. Because of its supportive and reactive nature, however, it cannot be relied upon as a major income generator. Guam’s unique position in the Asia-Pacific region highlights potential roles that the island can play as a commercial trade hub and a major telecommunications hub. In regards to commercial trade, the U.S. exports farther across the Pacific than across the Atlantic. Asian countries, in turn, have benefited greatly from selling to the American market. Guam has an opportunity to play a 9 greater role in the midst of this vast Asian-Pacific trading zone. In this regard, Guam has several key advantages that can be considered for economic development opportunities. Furthermore, Guam possesses the most advanced telecommunications infrastructure and systems in the Western Pacific region. The island sits at the nexus of the Pacific’s underwater fiber optics cabling network with more terminating cable connections than anywhere else in the world and making Guam a telecommunications hub for numerous international providers.

#### **Guam key to Asian markets**

**Guam Economic Development Authority ‘11** (Guam Economic Development Authority Bureau of Statistics and Plans, University of Guam, Pacific Center for Economic Initiatives, “Guam Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy,”

<http://www.bsp.guam.gov/Guam%202011%20Comprehensive%20Economic%20Development%20Strategy.pdf>, YX)

F. STRATEGIC LOCATION IN ASIA-PACIFIC Guam’s location in the Asia-Pacific region has been described to be strategic, thus making it an attractive site for military operations. In fact, the 2006 military forces agreement between the U.S. and Japan is motivated largely by Guam’s strategic location. This attractiveness to military operations brings with it both benefits and costs and hence requires a careful balance of these two effects. For example, the proposed military buildup on Guam has received numerous scrutiny from those in favor of it as well as those opposed to it that achieving the balance has called for a need for strategically pacing the resulting economic development (e.g., adaptive program management) in order to match up the required resources (infrastructure, human capital) with their availability. Evaluating the benefits and costs of the military buildup (as well as other proposals for economic changes) have brought to light the need for current, reliable and relevant socio-economic data and models that can be used to accurately estimate the benefits and costs of military (as well as non-military) proposals/projects and to serve as evidence for effective policymaking. Guam’s location puts it in close proximity to the dynamic Asian markets, with several of them within a 3-5 hour direct flight distance. These point to opportunities to enhance travel infrastructure, for example, to explore additional air routes between Guam and important regional markets, thus having the effect of increasing competition among air carriers and potentially making travel more affordable to local residents as well as to tourists. On the other hand, proximity to Asia brings with to Guam the challenge of competing with other tourist destinations in Asia. It also causes a leakage from the local economy as local residents travel to the neighboring Asian destination to shop at much lower prices and enjoy a wider variety of goods and services.

#### **Guam growth key to trade**

**Guam Economic Development Authority ‘11** (Guam Economic Development Authority Bureau of Statistics and Plans, University of Guam, Pacific Center for Economic Initiatives, “Guam Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy,”

<http://www.bsp.guam.gov/Guam%202011%20Comprehensive%20Economic%20Development%20Strategy.pdf>, YX)

Except for the estimate for Private Fixed Investment (4.21%), which is likely to be understated, all other estimates are as expected. Like many economies, including the U.S., Guam is driven by consumer spending (65%). Unlike the U.S., the share of government spending (47%) is much higher due to the greater investment spending by the public sector. Table 9 also confirms Guam’s reality as an island in that it is dependent on imports, which amounted to 35% of the Gross Island Product (GIP). As an economic strategy concern, one must look closely into whether all imports are necessary and to explore options at replacing some of them as a way to spur the local economy. Assuming a spending multiplier of 1.5, one is able to illustrate how significant the economic impact would be of shifting 10% of what is currently imported to a local source in terms of an increase in GIP by 25% (or $1 billion), an increase in the local government’s revenue in terms of Gross Receipts Tax by 4% of $1 billion (or $40 million), and an increase in local jobs by 23% (or 14,000 jobs). Guam’s economic performance is closely tied to overseas markets, especially to Japan and to a lesser extent Korea, with both markets affecting tourism and foreign investment. In addition, Guam’s economic performance is affected significantly by occurrences of natural and manmade disasters (e.g., typhoons, earthquakes, and airline crash). Since 2006, the proposed military buildup has been expected to have a major economic impact on the local economy. The factors affecting the impact are largely outside of the control of local economic planners and policymakers, leaving the local economy exposed to the subsequent instabilities.26 Source: Ruane, Maria Claret M. & Ning Li (2009). “Guam’s Income Distribution: 1981-2005”, Journal of International Business Research, vol. 8, no. 2, 2009, pp. 101-110. This reality has become quite clear in the aftermath of the earthquake and tsunami that devastated northeastern Japan in March 2011. Almost immediately, tourist arrivals on Guam declined significantly, which affected hotel occupancy rates along with occupancy taxes (11% of hotel receipts), as well as employment and income prospects sought by many island residents who are employed in tourist-related activities.

### 2AC – XT: Guam econ low

#### **Stagnation now – try or die**

**Guam Economic Development Authority ‘11** (Guam Economic Development Authority Bureau of Statistics and Plans, University of Guam, Pacific Center for Economic Initiatives, “Guam Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy,”

<http://www.bsp.guam.gov/Guam%202011%20Comprehensive%20Economic%20Development%20Strategy.pdf>, YX)

**Guam has seen a precipitous drop in revenues from three major sectors of the economy (tourism, military/federal, other**). As a result of this drop, total government revenues have dropped 49% from $660 million in the mid-1990’s to an estimated $340 million in 2010. This condition has led to very serious shortcomings in the delivery of basic public services and raises major concerns in public safety, health, education, and employment. Other economic indicators paint an equally dismal picture. Reduction in government expenditures has not kept pace with the island’s shrinking economy. The estimates for Guam show that real GDP -- GDP adjusted to remove price changes -- increased 1.7% to $3.9 billion in 2009 after increasing 0.5% in 2008.

#### **Tourism dipping – that wrecks growth**

**Guam Economic Development Authority ‘11** (Guam Economic Development Authority Bureau of Statistics and Plans, University of Guam, Pacific Center for Economic Initiatives, “Guam Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy,”

<http://www.bsp.guam.gov/Guam%202011%20Comprehensive%20Economic%20Development%20Strategy.pdf>, YX)

Guam’s tourism industry is the island’s single largest economic sector. The industry generates approximately 60% of Guam’s annual business revenue. By 2005, a Global Insight report revealed that tourism directly supported 10,412 full-time and part-time jobs. This economic activity generated $378 million in local wages. Visitor arrivals began to decline in 2001 and 2002 after years of continued growth. Tourist arrivals have struggled in the midst of a worldwide economic slump, compounded by the September 11, 2001 terrorist attack on the World Trade Towers, the invasion of Afghanistan by the United States and its allies, the war with Iraq, and the fury of Typhoon Chata'an and Supertyphoon Pongsona in 2002. Furthermore, the earthquake and tsunami events in Sendai, Japan in March 2011 have added to the struggles facing Guam’s major source market. 7 About 90% of all Guam visitors are from Asia, with the balance made up of visitors from the United States, neighboring Pacific islands, and other areas. Visitors from Japan comprise the largest share of Guam’s market mix with close to 80% of all arrivals to Guam. Guam’s market share in 2010 was 5.4 % of the Japanese tourist market, a total of 16.6 million outbound travelers. Guam Visitors Bureau’s purchasing power in source markets has been seriously impacted by the yen’s 27% rise in value against the U.S. dollar during the period of April 2008 to April 2011. This increase in the yen’s value has limited its advertising and public relations expenditures, especially in Japan. The global economic recession of 2008 also played no small part in diminishing international travel arrivals from major source markets to Guam.

## \*\*FORCE POSTURE\*\*

### 2AC – XT: force posture solves wars

#### Guam stability is crucial to resolve every Asian hotspot---basing operations in Guam are able to deter Chinese aggression without alienating them

#### Rivera, 2

(Col.-US Army, GUAM USA: America’s Forward Fortress in Asia Pacific, [http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA404522](http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA404522" \t "_blank))

**How do all these considerations relate to Guam being a major hub for U.S. military forward presence in Asia Pacific as they apply to China or any other major regional competitor? First, forward military presence can still be maintained through routine patrols of the area by U.S. Navy carrier battle groups and U.S Air Force aircraft permanently stationed in Guam, only 1500 miles away. The stationing of combat-ready U.S. Marine and possibly U.S. Army units on Guam can be readily deployed as a quick reaction force pending the arrival of augmentation forces from within PACOM or from other major commands. From Guam, the U.S. military can keep a watchful eye out for the region, should it be selected as its main hub for operations. One very important argument for building up Guam's bases is China's declared preference for U.S. power and influence to be reduced because it views our forward presence at this time to be excessive. China may try to limit U.S. military bases and access in East and Southeast Asia and to lessen U.S. ties to allies like Japan and South Korea or even a unified Korea. If we are forced to limit our access to some of our current allies through their denial of bases or forward operating locations (FOL's) for our use, then the argument for Guam's expansion is made stronger. China would be hard-pressed to criticize any massive buildup in Guam due to the fact that America has a fundamental right to increase any amount of military forces on its own soil. This would be significantly different from any buildup in countries closer to China. However, the question is how to engage China as we ponder its intentions. Second, we can engage China by reducing its concerns about the immediate presence of military bases in Asian countries. Luckily, as discussed above, China has given military expansion and modernization a priority three levels below its booming economy. Perhaps, this is due to its observation that although the U.S. is in the immediate area, the U.S. has shown no imperialistic ambitions nor taken any aggressive action towards China or its neighbors. But we cannot be certain that these are China's reasons for giving a low priority to its military. It is in the best interests of the U.S. to remove any excuse for China to modernize and enlarge its military. One way to do this is to decrease our military presence in Japan and to a smaller scale, in Korea, (pending reunification) and move them to Guam. As pointed out by the RAND study, the Philippines, Northwest Australia, Malaysia, Indonesia, Singapore, Vietnam and Thailand are all within comfortable range of proposed U.S. Air Force air assets. China, Taiwan and Japan are also within effective striking distance with long range, high-speed heavy bombers, capable of delivering sizable numbers of munitions.66 The U.S. Navy, with its continuously moving aircraft carrier task forces can also quickly move into any area in the Asia Pacific region. Third, another argument for expanding Guam as a hub is the fact that the Marianas have a valuable asset that Hawaii and the east and west coasts of the U.S. no longer have: an uninhabited island for naval gunnery and aircraft target practice. The Farallon de Mendinilla Island north of Saipan and Tinian is currently being used by both the U.S. Navy and Air Force and allies for target practice. Guam and the CNMI do not have radical protestors fighting the U.S. not to use the island. On the contrary, the islands promote its usage. Fourth, it is in the best interests of the U.S. to invest U.S. taxpayer dollars on U.S. soil for the benefit of Americans and U.S. servicemen living in Guam. Granted, the U.S. may have to invest several hundred million or several billion dollars to fortify Guam (and possibly some of the other Mariana islands) and accommodate the stationing of large units in the area, but such investments in our national security are not wasted on U.S. soil. U.S. military spending for infra structure development in the Philippines was lost when Filipino nationalism forced us out. And when we move from Korea and Japan, any expenditure of U.S. dollars there would be lost as well. But it can never be lost on U.S. soil. Even if decades from now, bases in Guam and the Northern Marianas should close down or be downsized, American citizens and not foreign nationals would benefit from them.Fifth, if Guam is properly used, it can be used as a launching pad for power projection into any Asian "hot spot" or crisismuch like in World War II against Japan. On the one hand, Guam is close enough to Asia to ensure U.S. military forward presence in the region to deter aggression against U.S. and allied interests on a timely basis. On the other hand, it is far enough away from China to reduce its concerns about immediate U.S. presence.**

#### Guam key to power projection in Asia

#### Ortiz, 9

(Chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee in the House Armed Services Committee

[http://thehill.com/special-reports/defense-july2009/51775-guam-and-the-security-of-our-nation](http://thehill.com/special-reports/defense-july2009/51775-guam-and-the-security-of-our-nation%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank))

**Guam, an island territory of the United States, is located 900 miles north of the equator in the Western Pacific. From four to eight miles in width and 32 miles long, Guam covers approximately 220 square miles. It is truly a tropical paradise. What many people do not realize is that it sits at the tip of the spear for the defense of our nation and iswoven into the strategic fabric of the Pacific Theater. Most importantly, it represents a territory in our nation that provides the military freedom of movement and undeterred military access unavailable in the western portion of the Pacific Theater. The United States Navy and Air Force have long recognized the importance of this strategic hub and the guaranteed access that it offers. United States forces have maintained a significant presence on the island and currently encumber almost 23 percent of the entire island and represent almost 14,000 military service members. The Air Force alone has two 11,000-foot runways and the Navy occupies a significant presence in the natural harbor. Guam’s strategic importance to the United States is obvious. In addition to the United States, Japan also recognized the importance of Guam in their strategic interests and has offered to provide financial contributions to better align United States forces in the Pacific Theater. Because of severe encroachment of the Marine Corps presence in Okinawa, the government of Japan has offered almost $6 billion in improvements on Guam to support new infrastructure that will relocate 8,000 Marines and 9,000 dependents from Okinawa to this strategic hub. Considering this significant contribution, the United States has also offered an additional $4 billion to support the movement of Marine Corps forces.These contributions will provide the foundation for a long-term, stable basing structure that ensures the viability of United States forces in this theater. Most importantly, Japan has long recognized the United States as a vital partner in the defense of its homeland and has offered tangible proof of its willingness to support United States forces within the context of the Japanese constitution The U.S. Congress has had the opportunity to endorse this strategic alliance and is preparing to provide funds in fiscal year 2010 to support the initial investments at Guam. The government of Japan has also provided its first installment of Guam infrastructure funds and it appears that our two nations are well on our way to a successful cooperative realignment. The House Armed Services Committee this year has addressed numerous issues related to this move, including the dependence of the Guam relocation to the overall realignment of forces in the Pacific, the importance of the Pacific Theater in the overall national security strategy of the United States, and the military’s overall training requirements in the Pacific Theater. The guiding mantra in this realignment is to ensure that we get this right and ensure that the United States enhances the overall strategic framework of our military. With the rising influence of our Pacific partners in today’s global economy, it is essential that we continue to support the world’s economy and guarantee the freedom of movement of commercial interests. The military provides an essential element in the protection of our commercial interests and Guam continues to provide support as one of the crown jewels in the defense of our nation.**

#### Guam is critical to our mission in Asia

#### Blowers, 9

(Mass Communication Specialist 2nd Class-Navy, [http://www.navy.mil/search/display.asp?story\_id=47864](http://www.navy.mil/search/display.asp?story_id=47864" \t "_blank)      )

SECNAV: Guam Strategically Vital to Navy's Mission

**GUAM (NNS) -- The secretary of the Navy (SECNAV) visited Guam and Saipan Aug. 23-24 to familiarize himself with Department of the Navy assets, talk with Sailors and Marines, the local business community and senior government and military leadership. Ray Mabus, SECNAV, met with Guam Gov. Felix P. Camacho and military leadership about issues concerning the region. He also took an aerial tour of Saipan before landing to meet with Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands Gov. Repeki Benigno Fitial. Mabus also met with the Island Knights of HSC-25 and reminded them of the strategic importance of Guam and that their work does not go unnoticed. "Thank you from a very grateful, appreciative nation for what you do every single day," Mabus said. We're doing a job that the people in the United States don't see very much. They don't understand the importance of your mission. Whether you're in the deserts of Afghanistan or Iraq, whether you are here in Guam, whether you are operating off of one of our ships at sea, you're doing one of the most vital, most important missions we have." The secretary emphasized the strategic importance of Guam in the Pacific and thanked them for their contributions to the Navy and the nation. "Guam has always been important strategically as a part of the United States. The people of Guam have always been among the most patriotic people in America. They enlist in the American armed forces at a higher per capita rate than any other state in our union. One of the things that Guam gives us is a lot more flexibility in terms of strategic deployment of our assets," Mabus said.**

#### Strong Guam presence de-escalates Asian hotspots and security challenges

#### Kan, 10

(Research Specialist in Asian Affairs-CRS, [http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS22570.pdf](http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS22570.pdf%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank))

**One rationale for the military build-up on Guam is its status as a U.S. territory. Thus, the United States is not required to negotiate with sovereign countries on force deployments or face the risks of losing bases or access. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld visited Guam in November 2003 and expressed support for building up Guam as he considered a new round of base closings.8 In contrast, the United States had to close Subic Bay Naval Base and Clark Air Force Base in the Philippines in 1992, and countries like South Korea could restrict the use of U.S. forces based there. U.S. forces based in Guam also do not have to contend with political sensitivities over nuclear powered vessels. Moreover, some countries, including allies, have raised doubts about their support for U.S. forces in a possible conflict between the United States and China. Another rationale is the expansion of options that Guam offers to the evolving U.S. force structure. As Commander of PACOM, Admiral William Fallon expressed his vision for Guam as a staging area from which ships, aircraft, and troops can “surge” to the Asian theater. He stressed “flexibility,” saying “we need to have forces ready to react,” and we must have built-in flexibility” to meet emergencies (including disaster relief).9 In 2004, the Navy held “Summer Pulse 04,” its first exercise to increase readiness to “surge” operations in response to a crisis or emergency. In June 2006, PACOM held the “Valiant Shield” exercise that brought three aircraft carriers to waters off Guam. A third rationale is the need to counter what commanders call the “tyranny of distance.” PACOM, headquartered in Honolulu, has an area of responsibility that encompasses almost 60% of the world’s population, over 50% of the earth’s surface, the Pacific and Indian Oceans, 16 time zones, and five of seven U.S. defense treaties. U.S. forces on Guam are much closer to East Asia, where the United States has alliances with Australia, Japan, South Korea, Thailand, and the Philippines. The United States also has concerns in Asia about threats to peace and stability in the East China Sea, South China Sea and over terrorist threats in Southeast Asia, humanitarian crises, and security for sea lines of communication (SLOCs), particularly through the Straits of Malacca. Combat aircraft on Guam can reach Taiwan, Japan, Philippines, or the Korean peninsula in two to five hours.10 Moreover, Table 1 presents the shorter sailing distance and time from Guam to Manila in East Asia, compared to that from Honolulu, Seattle, and San Diego.**

#### Guam critical to deter Asian conflicts---offers maximum flexibility

#### Erickson and Mikolay, 5

(Andrew, Justin, assist. Prof. of Strategic Studies at U.S. Naval War college, Prof. at USNA, Comparative Strategy, Anchoring America’s Asian Assets: Why Washington Must Strengthen Guam, p. 168)pl

**Several potential dangers could plausibly threaten American interests in East Asia; an effective response will require political and geographical diversification of the U.S. naval presence in the region**, with a chain of overlapping bases and access rights. **The linchpin can be a strengthened base in Guam. To maximize its ability to deter hostility, gather information, and overcome aggression, the U.S. Navy should continue to develop Guam as a forward logistics hub**.A **diversified and expanded American military presence on Guam will offer maximum flexibility in times of crisis and help ensure that future contingencies**—**such as the rise of a belligerent China, a change in Japanese foreign policy, or a reunification of the Koreas— does not create a “missing link” in the chain of U.S. capabilities**. Moving assets westward across the Pacific and maintaining a flexible and growing constellation of facilities and access rights in East Asia would keep that chain strong—and even the most determined enemies would not be able to dislodge its anchor, Guam.

#### Geographic proximity to Asian powers make Guam a critical base for US conflict mitigation strategy

#### NPR, 6

[http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=5534309](http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=5534309" \t "_blank)

**Unease over North Korea is just one of the reasons the United States is expanding its military presence in the Pacific. The U.S. is rebuilding bases on the tiny Pacific island of Guam. The military presence there grew in the Cold War, then shrank again. Now it's growing as a way to protect Taiwan and South Korea, and to keep a watchful eye on China. NPR Pentagon Correspondent John Hendren traveled to an outpost of American power more than 10,000 miles from Washington. JOHN HENDREN reporting: Like all residents of Guam, Tony Artero Sablam(ph) is inured to the sounds of military aircraft that drown out the street noise outside his urban home. He's a man of Polynesian proportions and a Micronesian pedigree: a generous-sized man in a land where big means something. His family has also been generous to the U.S. military. The pristine coastline on this Pacific island's north side that is now occupied by Andersen Air Force Base once belonged to his mother's family. But while he's a real estate investor who'd probably benefit from a growing U.S. buildup on Guam, Sablam says enough is enough. Guam is too small to accommodate more troops, ships, and planes, without losing its identity. Mr. TONY ARTERO SAMBLAM: The United States sees Guam as a military bastion, and it does not really care for the people who own the island of Guam. But, to me, this is home, and I've got no other place. We are being mesmerized with the idea that it's going to bring jobs. Does more mean better? Do we want to be an overpopulated little island in the Pacific? HENDREN: Guam has had a colonial complex ever since Spanish sailor Ferdinand Magellan arrived in 1521. He immediately burned down a village and killed several native Chamorros who'd stolen his skiff. Magellan's arrival later brought colonization by Spain, which lost Guam to the U.S. in the Spanish-American War in 1898. The Americans lost it to the Japanese in World War II, and won it back in one of the bloodiest battles of the Pacific war. The U.S. military now owns about a third of the island. Shaped like a footprint, the isle is just 30 miles long and five miles wide at the instep. But it's been too well placed for trade and defense for the superpowers of each era to ignore it. It's far closer to China, Japan, and Vietnam than the U.S. mainland, and its just 1,700 miles to Taiwan, which the United States is committed to defending from mainland China. Lt. General David Deptula, the Pacific Command's number two Air Force official, says those advantages hold true today. Lt. General DAVID DEPTULA (Vice Commander, Pacific Air Forces, Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii): Guam has an attraction principally because it is the western-most U.S. territory and it allows us to provide basing from which to more quickly react in times of need.**

### XT: Marines in Guam Key to Detterence

#### Marines in Guam key to Deterrence

Freedberg 7/27

(Sydney J. Freedberg Jr. "Pentagon, Congress Must Break 'Logjam' Over Japan, Guam Bases: CSIS,"7/27 pg online @ defense.aol.com/2012/07/27/pentagon-congress-must-break-logjam-over-japan-guam-bases-c//arjun)

"These plans are at the center of a logjam between DoD [the Department of Defense], which would like to implement them, and the Congress, which is reluctant to authorize funding absent better details about cost and long-term master plans." The report argues that decades-long commitments to Japan and Korea have resulted in a Pacific posture that puts too many forces in the north of the region and not enough in the south, where China has become increasingly aggressive towards its maritime neighbors in the South China Sea, especially the Philippines. Shifting forces from Okinawa to Guam would help correct that imbalance, and China, our allies, and neutral parties are all watching for signs of US clarity and resolve: "The current impasse between DoD and the Congress is not cost-free in terms of US strategic influence in the region," the report warns. As a way out of that impasse, CSIS would prioritize military construction to build up the bases on Guam and in the Mariana Islands, even at the price of moving fewer Marines off Okinawa. But Panetta took exception to that trade-off in his comments, saying that a force of less than 5,000 Marines on Guam would not be "operationally viable."

## \*\*A2 OFF-CASE\*\*

### 2AC – A2 Topicality – T/I

**We meet substantial transportation infrastructure investment**

**Brown ’11** (Adam, Guam Buildup News reporter, 2-25-11, “[Guam’s Aging Infrastructure Needs Unprecedented Growing Spurt For Buildup](http://guambuildupnews.com/Buildup-News-Politics/Guams-Aging-Infrastructure-Needs-Unprecedented-Growing-Spurt-for-Buildup.html),” <http://guambuildupnews.com/Buildup-News-Politics/Guams-Aging-Infrastructure-Needs-Unprecedented-Growing-Spurt-for-Buildup.html>)

GUAM – By the time the 8,500 Marines arrive with their 9,000 dependents and entourage, the Guam Water Authority says, water infrastructure must advance to levels now targeted in the Capital Improvement Plan for 2025. **Failure to overhaul infrastructure on time would delay the military buildup itself or pollute waterways, overflow sewers and overload the power grid. Guam must cram more than a decade's worth of infrastructure work into the next five to six years before the military buildup boosts demand** by tens of thousands of daily showers, hundreds of thousands of toilet flushes, and billions of dollars in electricity-sapping equipment, authorities say. Even with the use of population growth mitigation measures like the Department of Defense's (DoD) force flow reduction and Adaptive Program Management, the relocation of the Marines from Japan along with their dependents, support staff and construction workers will add an estimated 41,000 to 46,000 people at the peak of growth -- a boost of nearly a quarter to the population of 180,000. And the heavy-duty demand particular to the military makes the increase even more stressful to infrastructure than mere numbers indicate. The DoD on Guam will need water supply of 35 million gallons a day – almost double its current maximum demand, according to the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific. This will require adding more than 30 wells on military and civilian land, five new water treatment plants, five extra [water storage](http://guambuildupnews.com/Buildup-News-Politics/Guams-Aging-Infrastructure-Needs-Unprecedented-Growing-Spurt-for-Buildup.html)facilities and as much as 27 miles of additional distribution lines. The GWA says the island's 336 billion-gallon aquifer can sustain output of as much as 80 million gallons a day while demand at the peak of construction will reach 53 million gallons a day. The relocation will also dramatically increase military-related wastewater flow at the Northern District [Wastewater Treatment](http://guambuildupnews.com/Buildup-News-Politics/Guams-Aging-Infrastructure-Needs-Unprecedented-Growing-Spurt-for-Buildup.html)Plant, from 2 million gallons a day or less currently to as much as 5 million gallons a day. Without major upgrades, the GWA says, excess demand would prevent issuance of permits for much of the planned new housing, overflow the sewer line in Marine Drive, which is already operating near capacity, and strain the environment. While a single megawatt is enough to power 1,000 average US homes, the DoD already uses about 50 megawatts on Guam. That is projected to more than double to 115 megawatts. With the margin of reserve power that the DoD requires, it estimates a power shortfall of as much as 100 megawatts. The Guam Power Authority says these power demands can be comfortably met but only if [financing](http://guambuildupnews.com/Buildup-News-Politics/Guams-Aging-Infrastructure-Needs-Unprecedented-Growing-Spurt-for-Buildup.html) and construction comes on time. Current peak total demand is 272 megawatts out of a generation capacity of 552 megawatts. The DoD is also considering alternative power supply including wind power, geothermal energy and others that, it says, should account for 25 percent of its power use on the island. Japanese government funding for upgrades and expansion of utilities on Guam total $740 million, according to the Joint Guam Program Office. [Investment](http://guambuildupnews.com/Buildup-News-Politics/Guams-Aging-Infrastructure-Needs-Unprecedented-Growing-Spurt-for-Buildup.html) in wastewater infrastructure **is targeted at $421 million**, while water supply upgrades and expansion account for $159 million. Another $160 million will be invested in power supply. **The Department of Defense,** though**, says that infrastructure investment may need to rise to $1.3 billion.**

### 2AC – A2 Topicality – US

**We meet – the investment takes place in the U.S.**

**We meet – Guam is “in the United States”**

**It’s a U.S. territory**

**DOI ’12** (Department of the Interior profile of Guam, last updated 1-05-12, accessed 7/9/12, <http://www.doi.gov/archive/oia/Islandpages/gumpage.htm>, YX)

Political Status **Guam became a U.S. territory in** [**1898**](http://www.doi.gov/oia/Islandpages/treaty1898.html) **and placed under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Navy. The Guam Organic Act of 1950** conferred U.S. citizenship on Guamanians and established the territory’s government. The Act also **transferred Federal jurisdiction over Guam from the U.S. Navy to the Department of the Interior**. First elections were held in 1970.

**That counts**

**Cornell University Law School, no date** (Cornell University Law School’s Legal Information Institute citing US Code, <http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/18/2340>, accessed 7/9/12, YX)

18 USC § 2340 - DEFINITIONS

This preliminary release may be subject to further revision before it is released again as a final version. As with other online versions of the Code, the [U.S. Code Classification Tables](http://uscode.house.gov/classification/tables.shtml%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) should be consulted for the latest laws affecting the Code. Those using the USCPrelim should verify the text against the printed slip laws available from [GPO](http://www.gpo.gov/)(Government Printing Office), the laws as shown on [THOMAS](http://thomas.loc.gov/) (a legislative service of the Library of Congress), and the final version of the Code when it becomes available.

Current through Pub. L. [112-123](http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-112publ123/html/PLAW-112publ123.htm%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank%22%20%5Co%20%22Pub.%20L.%20112-123). (See [Public Laws for the current Congress](http://thomas.loc.gov/home/LegislativeData.php?n=PublicLaws).)

As used in this chapter—

(1) “torture” means an act committed by a person acting under the color of law specifically intended to inflict severe physical or mental pain or suffering (other than pain or suffering incidental to lawful sanctions) upon another person within his custody or physical control;

(2) “severe mental pain or suffering” means the prolonged mental harm caused by or resulting from—

(A) the intentional infliction or threatened infliction of severe physical pain or suffering;

(B) the administration or application, or threatened administration or application, of mind-altering substances or other procedures calculated to disrupt profoundly the senses or the personality;

(C) the threat of imminent death; or

(D) the threat that another person will imminently be subjected to death, severe physical pain or suffering, or the administration or application of mind-altering substances or other procedures calculated to disrupt profoundly the senses or personality; and

(3) “**United States” means the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the commonwealths, territories, and possessions of the United States.**

#### **Federal transportation laws apply – solves ground**

**Guam Economic Development Authority ‘11** (Guam Economic Development Authority Bureau of Statistics and Plans, University of Guam, Pacific Center for Economic Initiatives, “Guam Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy,”

<http://www.bsp.guam.gov/Guam%202011%20Comprehensive%20Economic%20Development%20Strategy.pdf>, YX)

Local Government Guam is an organized, unincorporated territory of the US, which means that in some cases federal laws do not automatically apply to the island. For example, U.S. import tariff laws do not apply, and Guam is considered to be a duty free port. On the other hand, federal banking and transportation laws and regulations apply to Guam, with some exemptions, to address the island’s unique political, geographical, and social circumstances.

### 2AC – A2 Agenda DA (Obama good)

#### **No link – Obama can circumvent the unpopular parts**

**Ennis ’11** (Peter, Pacific Forum CSIS, writes and publishes Dispatch Japan and the private newsletter The Bottom Line, covering US national and foreign policies of importance to US-Japan relations, 5-25-11, “Pressure Builds for US Shift on Okinawa,” <http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/Digital-Library/ISN-Insights/Detail/?lng=en&id=129533&contextid734=129533&contextid735=129531&tabid=129531129533>, YX)

When those meetings do occur, it won’t be possible to simply ignore Futenma and related Okinawa issues. **It is very possible Washington and Tokyo will** [**agree**](http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/Digital-Library/ISN-Insights/Detail/?lng=en&id=129533&contextid734=129533&contextid735=129531&tabid=129531129533) **to state the obvious: the 2014 deadline to complete the Okinawa and Guam force structure realignment will have to be pushed back. It is also possible the administration will accept a very low-key statement of continued support for the Henoko plan, rather than a high-profile emphasis**, so as **to avoid the issue returning as a major irritant at the top of the bilateral agenda. There are pockets of hope within the Obama administration that White House will force the Pentagon to accept a review of the whole base realignment plan** for Okinawa prior to the Obama-Kan summit, **but that seems very unlikely**.

#### **Plan solves the warrant for unpopularity – solidifies implementation plans**

**Montvel-Cohen 12** (Sharla Torre, Guam Buildup News writer, 1-1-12, “[President Obama Signs National Defense Authorization Act; Guam Military Buildup Officially On Pause For 2012](http://guambuildupnews.com/News-Analysis/President-Obama-Signs-National-Defense-Authorization-Act-Guam-Military-Buildup-Officially-on-Pause-for-2012.html),” <http://guambuildupnews.com/News-Analysis/President-Obama-Signs-National-Defense-Authorization-Act-Guam-Military-Buildup-Officially-on-Pause-for-2012.html>)

GUAM – **President Obama signed the annual U.S. defense policy bill into law** on Saturday while on [vacation in Hawaii](http://guambuildupnews.com/News-Analysis/President-Obama-Signs-National-Defense-Authorization-Act-Guam-Military-Buildup-Officially-on-Pause-for-2012.html). **The new law caps defense authorizations at $662 billion for the year and officially puts 2012 Guam military buildup projects on hold. The new law does not, however, affect previous authorizations for the military construction program meant to prepare Guam for the transfer of U.S. Marines from Okinawa.** Of the almost $2 billion in U.S.-Japan appropriations already authorized from previous fiscal years, less than $500 [million](http://guambuildupnews.com/News-Analysis/President-Obama-Signs-National-Defense-Authorization-Act-Guam-Military-Buildup-Officially-on-Pause-for-2012.html) is in procurement. Last week, Tokyo proposed cutting its new fiscal year funding for the Marine transfer to 7.38 billion yen from 51.86 billion yen. The Japanese government does, however, propose maintaining an additional 670 million yen for designing and planning so that a related project to relocate the U.S.'s Futenma air base to Okinawa's eastern coast can move forward quickly if the U.S. ends up restoring its funding for the troop realignment. **Programs that were cut from the Pentagon's spending this year include over $150 million in military construction projects on Guam**. **The U.S. Senate succeeded in its push to freeze Guam military buildup funding this year,** at least **until the Pentagon can deliver a more detailed implementation plan for the troop realignment. The Guam cuts** will directly affect a planned [upgrade](http://guambuildupnews.com/News-Analysis/President-Obama-Signs-National-Defense-Authorization-Act-Guam-Military-Buildup-Officially-on-Pause-for-2012.html) to North Ramp utilities at Andersen Air Force Base and new water utilities at the location of the planned Marine base at Finegayan in Dededo. It also **means that only incremental funding will be authorized for an Air Force fuel systems maintenance hangar for the Guam Strike –** a program that is transforming Andersen Air Force Base into a Pacific hub for global reconnaissance that includes new Global Hawk technology.

### 2AC – A2 Spending DA

#### No link – that’s an “m” not a “b” before the “illion”

DOD 12 (Feb 8th 2012, “Report on the Program and Contract Infrastructure Technical Requirements Development for the Guam Realignment Program”, <http://www.dodig.mil/Inspections/PDFs/DODIG-2012-052.pdf> // Veevz)

The final Guam road construction cost was estimated to be approximately $1.03 million per lane mile. In comparison, construction costs per lane mile are $1.0 million in Hawaii, $0.41 million in Maryland, and $0.33 million in California (see Figure 8).

### 2AC – A2 States CP

**The CP is illegal – Guam is a U.S. territory under federal jurisdiction**

**DOI ’12** (Department of the Interior profile of Guam, last updated 1-05-12, accessed 7/9/12, <http://www.doi.gov/archive/oia/Islandpages/gumpage.htm>, YX)

Political Status **Guam became a U.S. territory in** [**1898**](http://www.doi.gov/oia/Islandpages/treaty1898.html) **and placed under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Navy. The Guam Organic Act of 1950** conferred U.S. citizenship on Guamanians and established the territory’s government. The Act also **transferred Federal jurisdiction over Guam from the U.S. Navy to the Department of the Interior**. First elections were held in 1970.

#### **That ensures the CP links to politics**

Louis **Fisher** 19**72**, senior specialist in separation of powers with the Congressional Research Service of the

Library of Congress.. "Presidential Spending Discretion and Congressional Controls”. Law and Contemporary

Problems, Vol. 37, No. 1, Administrative Discretion (Winter, 1972), pp. 135-172. Published by Duke University of

Law. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1191125

**Legislative efforts to monitor reprogramming occasionally go beyond the review responsibilities of designated committees**. For instance, early in I97I Secretary Laird expressed interest in' obtaining funds to begin a fourth nuclear-powered carrier (CVAN-70). If it became necessary to submit a budget amendment or initiate a reprogramming request, he would be willing to give up $139.5 million that had been requested for an oil tanker and three salvage ships.99 Senators Case and Mondale were able to enlist the support of Senator Ellender, chairman' of the Appropriations Committee, and of Senator Stennis, chairman of Armed Services. The two chairmen agreed that reprogramming would be an improper technique for providing funds. **The Administration would have to follow normal budgetary procedures: a budget request from the President followed by Congressional authorization and appropriation**. The Administration decided to postpone making that request until a sub- sequent fiscal year.10 Thus, **in the case of controversial reprogramming requests, the review role extends beyond the designated committees to involve Congress as a whole**. To take another example, the Defense Department submitted a reprogramming request in I97I for an additional $61.2 million for the Cheyenne helicopter. That covered approx- imately $35 million to reimburse the contractor for services performed, $9.3 million to continue the development program during fiscal I972, and approximately $17 million to continue it during fiscal I973. Since the Cheyenne had been under attack by members of Congress in recent years, only the reimbursement portion of the reprogramming request was approved. The House Appropriations Committee denied the request for fiscal I973 development on the ground that "it did not seem proper to anticipate the will of Congress with respect to the Cheyenne program that far in advance."10l With regard to fiscal I972 development, $9.3 million was placed in the appropriation bill as a separate and identifiable item so that the full Congress could work its will on the request.102

Too expensive – fed key to cover cost – perm solves best

ADC 12 (Association of Defense Communities, 4/30/12, “DOD Could Support Municipal Services in Guam under Authorization Bill Provision”, [http://www.defensecommunities.org/headlines/dod-could-support-municipal-services-in-guam-under-authorization-bill-provision/#](http://www.defensecommunities.org/headlines/dod-could-support-municipal-services-in-guam-under-authorization-bill-provision/) // Veevz)

Guam would eligible for federal aid to cover the costs of providing increased municipal services and facilities stemming from the relocation of Marine Corps personnel, under a provision in the fiscal 2013 defense authorization bill approved by the House Armed Services’ Readiness Subcommittee Friday. DOD would be required to determine “that an unfair and excessive financial burden will be incurred by the government of Guam to provide the services and facilities in the absence of the Department of Defense assistance,” according to the provision. The department could take actions needed to mitigate the “significant impacts” identified in the environmental impact statement for the realignment on Guam. DOD could provide assistance through existing federal programs supporting the buildup, and the department would be allowed to help Guam cover cost share requirements. The bill language would allow DOD to transfer funds appropriated for operation and maintenance to another account or federal agency so they could be made available. The authority would expire Sept. 30, 2020. Another provision would repeal a requirement for DOD to complete a government-wide plan for supporting civilian infrastructure on Guam before carrying out the buildup there. A supplemental environmental impact statement the Navy is preparing would be “the correct forum” to consider the impacts of the realignment from the perspective of all federal agencies, according to the subcommittee. “Considering the timing of the Record of Decision, the committee believes that there are discrete elements of the overall realignment that have independent utility and should move forward,” the lawmakers added.

Certainty key – 1AC \_\_

### 2AC – A2 Process CP (generic)

#### **Fed key**

**Guam Economic Development Authority ‘11** (Guam Economic Development Authority Bureau of Statistics and Plans, University of Guam, Pacific Center for Economic Initiatives, “Guam Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy,”

<http://www.bsp.guam.gov/Guam%202011%20Comprehensive%20Economic%20Development%20Strategy.pdf>, YX)

The same source shows that the number of establishments increased from 1,706 in 1985 to 2,776 in Figure 1. Events That Affected Guam’s Economy27 2000 before declining to 2,677 in 2005 and 2,408 in March 2009. In the near future, the private sector will remain the primary source of economic growth and will need to be an active partner in developing and supporting the economic goals, objectives, and projects contained in this report. Of course, the public sector needs to provide the necessary physical, social, human, and institutional infrastructure and an overall business environment that will be conducive to local and off-island business start-ups and retention.C. PUBLIC SECTOR Federal Government The federal government plays a leading role in the economic affairs of Guam, making up almost 27% of Guam’s $4 billion economy in 2007 (U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis). It provided 6.36% of total employment in March 2011 (Guam Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics), which was significant but much lower than its 18% share of jobs in 1985 or 10-12% in the early 1990s. Between 1985 and 2009, federal employment expanded in 1985-1990, declined in 1990-2005 and expanded in 2005-2010. Table 10 shows that, since 2006, federal government spending on Guam ranged from $530.2 million in 2007 to $1.23 billion in 2010. Through May of this year (2011), the Federal government has spent $308.1 million on Guam. As expected, the largest share (approximately half) of federal government spending on Guam was related to the anticipated military presence, with the Department of Defense (and within it, the Department of the Navy) shown in Table 10 to rank first in terms of share of total Federal government spending. Ranking second is the Social Security Administration, followed by the Department of Health and Human Services. Table 10 also shows the remaining agencies that made major federal government expenditures.

#### **Certainty key**

**Guam Economic Development Authority ‘11** (Guam Economic Development Authority Bureau of Statistics and Plans, University of Guam, Pacific Center for Economic Initiatives, “Guam Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy,”

<http://www.bsp.guam.gov/Guam%202011%20Comprehensive%20Economic%20Development%20Strategy.pdf>, YX)

In support of a continuing military presence, government and civic leaders jointly submitted in March 2001, a white paper calling for a greater military presence on Guam. Entitled “Force Structure Redistribution in the Asia-Pacific Region: Guam’s Potential Role”, the purpose of the white paper, which was prepared by the Guam Chamber of Commerce, was to demonstrate Guam’s endorsement of a larger military presence. Also due to tensions in the region and Guam’s strategic location to serve as a staging base and operating location for mobilizing U.S. military forces and equipment within the Western Pacific, there is evidence of increased military activity on Guam. The signing of the “U.S.-Japan Alliance: Transformation and Realignment for the Future” agreement (ATARA) in October 2005 set into motion actions and expectations of a military buildup on Guam for the projected time period of 2010-2014. Although the component of the proposed military buildup on Guam with the largest dollar value and on-island population increase will come from the relocation of 8,000 Marines and 9,000 dependents from Okinawa to Guam, it will also include construction of a wharf in Apra Harbor to support a transient nuclear power aircraft carrier and construction of facilities and infrastructure to support 600 Army Missile Defense Task Force and their 900 dependents (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2009, page ES-1). As 2010 approached, many developments have given stakeholders a better sense of what to expect from this military buildup. The first set of specific information was contained the U.S. Department of Navy’s Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), which was released to the public in November 20, 2009. The public was given 90 days to comment on the DEIS, during which more than 10,000 comments were submitted. The final report was released at the end of July 2010, which introduced the “Adaptive Program Management” approach to the military buildup, which will pace of military construction and population increases according to the capacity of Guam’s infrastructure. A Record of Decision occurred as scheduled during September 2010. Since then, old and new issues have surfaced that continue to create uncertainty regarding the magnitude, timing and other details of the proposed military buildup. This includes continued interest in the military’s plan to use of Pagat, a historic burial site on Guam, as a firing range and training site, along with sluggish recovery in of the U.S. economy and the record-high federal government debt, leading to a downgrade of its credit rating; the devastation of northeast Japan from the earthquake and tsunami in March 11, 2011; delay in implementing a $1 billion multiple award construction contracts (MACC) whose funding would come from Japan’s almost 60% share; recent announcements by U.S. senators geared toward a reexamination of the 2006 Agreement; recent 30 leaked information regarding the “real” details of the military buildup, especially on the magnitude of the personnel relocation and project costs. These uncertainties clearly highlight the need for Guam’s economic planners to welcome the military’s contribution to the economy and, at the same time, develop other less uncertain sources of economic activities.

#### **Delay DA – cost**

**Geiger ’11**(Julianne, “[Guam Roads Under Construction: $56.4 Million In Upgrades Already Underway, Another 14 Projects In Design By Local Public Works](file:///C%3A/Users/xuyun/Desktop/Debate/2012-13/Hoya-Spartan/Assignments/Guam%20Roads%20Under%20Construction%3A%20%2456.4%20Million%20In%20Upgrades%20Already%20Underway%2C%20Another%2014%20Projects%20In%20Design%20By%20Local%20Public%20Works),” [http://guambuildupnews.com/Buildup-News-Politics/Guam-Roads-Under-Construction-$56.4-Million-in-Upgrades-Already-Underway-Another-14-Projects-In-Design-by-Local-Public-Works.html](http://guambuildupnews.com/Buildup-News-Politics/Guam-Roads-Under-Construction-%2456.4-Million-in-Upgrades-Already-Underway-Another-14-Projects-In-Design-by-Local-Public-Works.html))

GUAM - Between the U.S. Department of Defense and Guam's Department of Public Works, Guam's road system is set to undergo a massive overhaul to support transportation needs during and after the military buildup that will bring at least 8,600 U.S. Marines and their dependants and support staff from Okinawa no sooner than 2016. As military and contractor [trucks](http://guambuildupnews.com/Buildup-News-Politics/Guam-Roads-Under-Construction-%2456.4-Million-in-Upgrades-Already-Underway-Another-14-Projects-In-Design-by-Local-Public-Works.html) begin to lug building material and construction personnel between the Port Authority, Anderson Air Force Base, NCTS Finegayan and the Naval Base, Guam's system of roads, already overburdened and in disrepair, will be strained further—even before the population increase. Inaction is not an option as the cost would be a 44 percent increase in traffic congestion, according to the DPW.

#### **Delay DA – cost overruns and stagnation**

**Guam Economic Development Authority ‘11** (Guam Economic Development Authority Bureau of Statistics and Plans, University of Guam, Pacific Center for Economic Initiatives, “Guam Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy,”

<http://www.bsp.guam.gov/Guam%202011%20Comprehensive%20Economic%20Development%20Strategy.pdf>, YX)

Partly related to the devastation in Japan as well as new developments from the U.S. Congress, the terms, magnitude, and timing of the military buildup on Guam might deviate from those spelled out in the 2006 U.S.-Japan Agreement. Much depends on the fiscal health of both the U.S. federal government and the Government of Japan, who initially agreed to share the cost of the military buildup on a 40-60 basis (approximately). The delays may likely increase earlier cost estimates, worsening the fiscal situation. As such, these factors highlight the importance of local economic growth, propelling a sustainable and participatory development path. In addition to strengthening existing markets (tourism and military), additional economic activities need to be explored and developed to diversify Guam’s economic structure in order to create a stronger and more sustainable economic portfolio. In the past five to 10 years, the private sector has become a more significant contributor to the economy. The latest Guam Department of Labor's "Annual Census of Business Establishments" (March 2009) shows the following data: Annual growth rate of number of jobs over the five-year period.

#### **Any delay is bad**

**Guam Economic Development Authority ‘11** (Guam Economic Development Authority Bureau of Statistics and Plans, University of Guam, Pacific Center for Economic Initiatives, “Guam Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy,”

<http://www.bsp.guam.gov/Guam%202011%20Comprehensive%20Economic%20Development%20Strategy.pdf>, YX)

Military The military market is also significant in Guam. Expectedly, it claimed a larger share of the economy in the aftermath of World War II but has since decreased, although still notable. It usually reflects itself in construction and engineering services industries, although there are opportunities to get involved in military bases’ maintenance and operation. The concern here is that decisions affecting the military presence on Guam are made externally, in this case, by the U.S. Federal Government, in consultation with foreign government(s). For instance, the U.S. and Japan entered an agreement in 2006 to realign U.S. military forces in Asia. Of particular interest to Guam is the proposal to relocate 8,000 military personnel and their families from Okinawa, Japan to Guam. Such military buildup on Guam was originally valued in excess of $10 billion (2.5 times the size of the current Guam economy) and was originally planned to take place over a short four-year period, after which the military-related construction boom would be expected to decline. More recently, there has been uncertainty regarding the terms, magnitude and timing of this military buildup, in part due to the recent natural disasters in Japan as well as to new developments in the U.S. Congress. Much depends on the fiscal health of both the U.S. Federal Government and the Government of Japan, which initially agreed to share the cost of the military buildup on a 40-60 basis (approximately). Any delay of the military buildup will likely increase earlier estimates of costs.59

### 2AC – A2 Consult CP

#### **Perm do the CP – it’s normal means**

**Guam Economic Development Authority ‘11** (Guam Economic Development Authority Bureau of Statistics and Plans, University of Guam, Pacific Center for Economic Initiatives, “Guam Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy,”

<http://www.bsp.guam.gov/Guam%202011%20Comprehensive%20Economic%20Development%20Strategy.pdf>, YX)

Military The military market is also significant in Guam. Expectedly, it claimed a larger share of the economy in the aftermath of World War II but has since decreased, although still notable. It usually reflects itself in construction and engineering services industries, although there are opportunities to get involved in military bases’ maintenance and operation. The concern here is that decisions affecting the military presence on Guam are made externally, in this case, by the U.S. Federal Government, in consultation with foreign government(s). For instance, the U.S. and Japan entered an agreement in 2006 to realign U.S. military forces in Asia. Of particular interest to Guam is the proposal to relocate 8,000 military personnel and their families from Okinawa, Japan to Guam. Such military buildup on Guam was originally valued in excess of $10 billion (2.5 times the size of the current Guam economy) and was originally planned to take place over a short four-year period, after which the military-related construction boom would be expected to decline.

### 2AC – A2 EIS CP

#### **Perm do the CP – it’s normal means and redundant**

**SECNAVY ’11** (“Under SECNAV Releases Statement Following Visit To Guam,” Story Number: NNS110120-15, 1/20/2011, <http://www.navy.mil/submit/display.asp?story_id=58119>)

We hope these four pillars demonstrate our determination to [continue](http://www.navy.mil/submit/display.asp?story_id=58119) to listen to the government and people of Guam and to accommodate their concerns. **Our draft EIS was widely criticized by the government and people of Guam**. However, the final EIS is substantially different, having been shaped by the thousands of comments from the people of Guam and the hundreds of recommendations from our inter-agency partners. It resolves issues regarding the island's water and waste water resources, committing to more than $1 billion in improvements that will benefit all who live on the island. It slows down the planned buildup to reduce the influx of workers onto the island. It adopts a new adaptive management process that prevents the buildup from overwhelming the island's natural resources. It defers the final selection of the planned carrier pier pending further environmental studies. As a result of these changes, DoD issued the final EIS successfully resolving all objections from the White House Council on Environmental Quality, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Interior and the Fish and Wildfire Service, and forms the basis for further productive negotiations with the government of Guam.

#### **DoD oversight resolves energy and environmental concerns**

**SECNAVY ’11** (“Under SECNAV Releases Statement Following Visit To Guam,” Story Number: NNS110120-15, 1/20/2011, <http://www.navy.mil/submit/display.asp?story_id=58119>)

WASHINGTON (NNS) -- A delegation led by the under secretary of the Navy met with Guam's governor, lieutenant governor and with a majority of the Guam Legislature to discuss outstanding issues related to the planned relocation of Marines from Okinawa to Guam in Guam Jan. 20. The delegation who met with Gov. Eddie Calvo and Lt. Gov. Ray Tenorio included the Under Secretary of the Navy Robert Work, Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Energy, Installations and the Environment) Jackalyne Pfannenstiel, Assistant Deputy Commandant of the Marine Corps (Installations and Logistics) Brig. Gen. Robert Ruark and representing the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and the Environment) Pete Potochney. The following statement was released by Work upon completion of his visit to Guam Jan. 20: "Today, Jan. 20, my colleagues and I engaged in two frank, informative and fruitful discussions first with the governor and lieutenant governor and then with the Guam Legislature. These discussions centered on how the Department of Defense (DoD) and the government of Guam will work together to address remaining questions and concerns about the Guam build-up and to set the stage for future negotiations over issues that still separate DoD and the government of Guam. During these discussions, I outlined four pillars that will shape the strategy going forward. These four pillars were developed over the past year after listening carefully to the concerns of both the government and people of Guam. They are: - One Guam**.** DoD recognizes the added strain that additional Marines and their family members will place on Guam's infrastructure. We are committed to improving the quality of life for both the proud people who call Guam their home and the military personnel based on the island. Improvements in the quality of life will result from direct investments in projects to improve and upgrade Guam infrastructure. These projects will reflect a combination of requests by the government of Guam and those identified by the environmental impact [study](http://www.navy.mil/submit/display.asp?story_id=58119), performed by DoD to study the effects of the build-up. These projects include upgrades to the commercial port, roads and water, waste water and electric utilities; DoD advocacy of additional federal investment in Guam's socio-economic needs, including a world class cultural artificats depository, mental health clinic and school buses; and tax revenues generated by the billions of dollars in projects associated with the build-up. - Green Guam. DoD understands and supports the great emphasis the people of Guam place on protecting the island's environmental treasures. We have projects underway with the Guam Power Authority, Guam Waterworks Authority, University of Guam, Department of Energy and other federal agencies to bring public and private funds to Guam for sustainable projects. We will work with the University of Guam's Center for Island Sustainability to develop and[secure funding](http://www.navy.mil/submit/display.asp?story_id=58119) for green programs. In addition, DoD is committed to developing the most energy efficient infrastructure possible, with a goal of converting all DoD bases on Guam into "net zero" energy users over time, meaning the bases will contribute as much energy into the Guam energy grid as they consume. - Twenty-Four/Seven unimpeded [access](http://www.navy.mil/submit/display.asp?story_id=58119) to the Chamorro cultural and historical site at Pagat Village and Pagat Cave in the area below the cliff line to the east of Route 15. The conceptual plans contained in the final environmental impact statement (EIS) for the [training](http://www.navy.mil/submit/display.asp?story_id=58119) ranges in this area would have required DoD to gain a controlling interest over the area and to exclude both military and civilians from this area while some of the live fire ranges were being used. Over the past year, the people of Guam made it clear that our plan to provide access to the area only during times when the ranges were not active was unacceptable, and had to be changed, and that Pagat was not for sale under any circumstances. We therefore changed our plans and developed options so that access to Pagat Village and the cave site below the cliff line will remain as it is today accessible at all times.

### **2AC – A2 Guam CP**

#### **Guam can’t fund – only federal support shoulders the financial burden**

**Jowers ‘8** (Karen, writer for the Air Force Times, May 10, 2008, “Military buildup threatens to overwhelm Guam – governor pleads for immediate federal assistance,” <http://www.airforcetimes.com/news/2008/05/airforce_guam_051008p/>)

**If Guam doesn’t** get money soon from the federal government **to help prepare for the massive military buildup coming to the island in the next few years**, it could affect not only the island’s permanent residents but also the quality of life for the service members and families who will move there, the island’s governor told lawmakers. “No American community can shoulder the challenges of a 30 percent increase in population” in such a short time, Guam Gov. Felix Camacho said. Guam’s population of about 171,000 includes about 14,000 people connected to the Defense Department, but that is expected to triple, to more than 40,000, in a five-year period, said David Bice, executive director of the Joint Guam Program Office for the Navy’s assistant secretary for installations and environment. That includes 8,000 Marines and their 9,000 family members relocating from Okinawa to Guam by 2014, as well as the addition of about 1,000 airmen at Andersen Air Force Base. Including active-duty airmen, reservists and dependents, the population of Andersen will swell from about 8,500 to nearly 12,000 by early in the next decade. The people of Guam expect the federal government to underwrite the costs directly related to the military buildup, Camacho told the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee on May 1. Guamanians are worried about the potential strains on their port, roads, electrical system, [health care](http://www.airforcetimes.com/news/2008/05/airforce_guam_051008p/) system, wastewater system and social programs. Camacho noted that military personnel and their families “will travel the same roads, use the same resources and live in the same community we all share today. ... We want to be ready so we can [continue](http://www.airforcetimes.com/news/2008/05/airforce_guam_051008p/) to provide America’s front lines with a home away from home, without jeopardizing the basic services the government of Guam provides to the local community.” Although Guam’s government has been [working](http://www.airforcetimes.com/news/2008/05/airforce_guam_051008p/) to improve roads, schools and other infrastructure, it is unfair to expect any community to take on such exponential growth in such a short timeline, he said. Because of its strategic location in the western Pacific and its status as U.S. soil, Air Force leaders envision Guam becoming a major staging ground from which to project air power throughout Asia.

### 2AC – A2 Colonialism K

#### **No link – the plan was the result of communicative processes that responded directly to public concerns**

**SECNAVY ’11** (“Under SECNAV Releases Statement Following Visit To Guam,” Story Number: NNS110120-15, 1/20/2011, <http://www.navy.mil/submit/display.asp?story_id=58119>, YX)

- 'Net negative' or 'net minus' DoD footprint. Over the past year, another clear message we received is that the people of Guam do not want the footprint of land controlled by the federal government to be any larger after the military build-up is over. In direct response to their concerns, we now plan not only to limit further growth, but to better utilize the land we now control in order to return underutilized land to the government of Guam. By doing so, the overall goal of DoD is to have a smaller footprint than it is now. Our actions in this regard will require us to make additional investments to realign our operations from these underutilized areas. We hope these four pillars demonstrate our determination to [continue](http://www.navy.mil/submit/display.asp?story_id=58119) to listen to the government and people of Guam and to accommodate their concerns. **Our draft EIS was widely criticized by the government and people of Guam. However**, the final EIS is substantially different, having been shaped by the thousands of comments from the people of Guam and the hundreds of recommendations from our inter-agency partners. It resolves issues regarding the island's water and waste water resources, committing to more than $1 billion in improvements that will benefit all who live on the island. It slows down the planned buildup to reduce the influx of workers onto the island. It adopts a new adaptive management process that prevents the buildup from overwhelming the island's natural resources. It defers the final selection of the planned carrier pier pending further environmental studies. As a result of these changes, DoD issued the final EIS successfully resolving all objections from the White House Council on Environmental Quality, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Interior and the Fish and Wildfire Service, and forms the basis for further productive negotiations with the government of Guam. Similarly, in response to persistent calls for an organization, which can answer questions about the planned buildup once we move from planning to construction, we formed the Civil-Military Coordination Council (CMCC). The CMCC's first meeting was held in October 2010, where the government of Guam and DoD agreed on CMCC membership. The council is now drafting their operating charter, and will be ready to perform their duties once we shift to detailed project planning and building. I hope these actions, along with our commitment to ensuring 24/7 access to Pagat Village and to a smaller land footprint once the buildup is over, provide concrete evidence that DoD is indeed listening to the concerns of the government and people of Guam, and working hard to address them. As my discussions with the Guam Legislature made clear, we have not yet addressed every concern, but we hope to do so during the coming months. In closing, I would like to personally thank Gov. Calvo, Lt. Gov. Tenorio, Speaker Won Pat and the members of the Guam Legislature for their forthright and pointed comments today. I will take back what I heard and work even harder to resolve any remaining issues. We believe the buildup on Guam will benefit the island and its people, and are anxious to work with the government of Guam to define the next steps forward."

### 2AC – A2 Rationality K

#### **No link – the plan was the result of communicative processes that responded directly to public concerns**

**SECNAVY ’11** (“Under SECNAV Releases Statement Following Visit To Guam,” Story Number: NNS110120-15, 1/20/2011, <http://www.navy.mil/submit/display.asp?story_id=58119>, YX)

- 'Net negative' or 'net minus' DoD footprint. Over the past year, another clear message we received is that the people of Guam do not want the footprint of land controlled by the federal government to be any larger after the military build-up is over. In direct response to their concerns, we now plan not only to limit further growth, but to better utilize the land we now control in order to return underutilized land to the government of Guam. By doing so, the overall goal of DoD is to have a smaller footprint than it is now. Our actions in this regard will require us to make additional investments to realign our operations from these underutilized areas. We hope these four pillars demonstrate our determination to [continue](http://www.navy.mil/submit/display.asp?story_id=58119) to listen to the government and people of Guam and to accommodate their concerns. **Our draft EIS was widely criticized by the government and people of Guam. However**, the final EIS is substantially different, having been shaped by the thousands of comments from the people of Guam and the hundreds of recommendations from our inter-agency partners. It resolves issues regarding the island's water and waste water resources, committing to more than $1 billion in improvements that will benefit all who live on the island. It slows down the planned buildup to reduce the influx of workers onto the island. It adopts a new adaptive management process that prevents the buildup from overwhelming the island's natural resources. It defers the final selection of the planned carrier pier pending further environmental studies. As a result of these changes, DoD issued the final EIS successfully resolving all objections from the White House Council on Environmental Quality, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Interior and the Fish and Wildfire Service, and forms the basis for further productive negotiations with the government of Guam. Similarly, in response to persistent calls for an organization, which can answer questions about the planned buildup once we move from planning to construction, we formed the Civil-Military Coordination Council (CMCC). The CMCC's first meeting was held in October 2010, where the government of Guam and DoD agreed on CMCC membership. The council is now drafting their operating charter, and will be ready to perform their duties once we shift to detailed project planning and building. I hope these actions, along with our commitment to ensuring 24/7 access to Pagat Village and to a smaller land footprint once the buildup is over, provide concrete evidence that DoD is indeed listening to the concerns of the government and people of Guam, and working hard to address them. As my discussions with the Guam Legislature made clear, we have not yet addressed every concern, but we hope to do so during the coming months. In closing, I would like to personally thank Gov. Calvo, Lt. Gov. Tenorio, Speaker Won Pat and the members of the Guam Legislature for their forthright and pointed comments today. I will take back what I heard and work even harder to resolve any remaining issues. We believe the buildup on Guam will benefit the island and its people, and are anxious to work with the government of Guam to define the next steps forward."