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# Relations High

#### Senkaku dispute resolved alliance problems

Mulgan 10

(Aurelia George Mulgan, Professor of Politics at the University of New South Wales, Australian Defence Force Academy, East Asia Forum, 10/26/10, <http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2010/10/26/us-japan-alliance-the-big-winner-from-the-senkaku-islands-dispute/> /mr)

Japan’s new DPJ government initially set out to rebalance Japan’s relations between the United States and Asia by emphasising a more independent Asia-oriented diplomacy with an East Asian Community as the centrepiece.¶ Japanese rhetoric about the alliance has also changed: There was more talk of an ‘equal’ alliance and a security stance ‘equidistant’ between the United States and China. The shift in the government’s foreign policy stance was subtle but clear: Japan was reorienting itself toward Asia and away from the United States. Difficulties over the Futenma base issue compounded the view of a troubled and tense bilateral relationship and a possible weakening of alliance commitments on both sides. Some in the DPJ, such as former leader Ozawa Ichiro, made explicit their antipathy towards the presence of US military forces in Japan.¶ The Sino-Japanese dispute over the Senkaku Islands has changed all that. It has energised the Japan-US alliance across a number of fronts.¶ First, the United States has offered reassurance to Japan that the Senkaku Islands fall within the scope of the Japan-US Security Treaty, which obligates the United States to defend Japan. The Japanese press reported an explicit commitment from Secretary of State Hillary Clinton in talks with Foreign Minister Maehara Seiji in New York in September. Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Mike Mullen and Secretary of Defense Robert Gates have also expressed strong support for Japan, offering assurance that the US will fulfil its alliance responsibilities. These statements underline the deterrence function of the alliance, which is the chief rationale for US bases in Okinawa. The Senkaku ‘shock’ will, therefore, become a factor in the mix of considerations determining the resolution of the Futenma base issue.¶ Second, the US side is leveraging the deterioration in Japan’s security environment to apply pressure on the Japanese government to maintain, if not increase, the fiscal allocation for ‘Host Nation Support’ for US forces in Japan, which the Japanese call the ‘sympathy budget’, or omoiyari yosan. While these payments were under review to assist in budget cuts, there are indications that the funds will continue at least at the current level. This can be directly attributed to the newfound importance that the government is attaching to the alliance after the recent dispute with China.¶ Third, Foreign Minister Maehara Seiji, who is well known for his pro-US sympathies and who in the past has referred to a China ‘threat’, has proposed a review of the 1997 Japan-US Defence Cooperation Guidelines, which enable Japan to provide logistical and rear-area support for the United States in the event of regional conflict. Such a development could conceivably see an expansion in Japan’s operational role and thus the operational capability of the alliance. There may also be developments in other areas of Japanese security policy such as the ban on exporting weapons and related technology, and participating in collective defence. Both Defence Minister Kitazawa Toshimi and Foreign Minister Maehara are in favour of reviewing the weapons export ban in order to strengthen the alliance, a move that is strongly supported by US Defense Secretary Gates.¶ Fourth, in addition to a joint SDF-USFJ exercise to reclaim a remote southwestern island in December, a joint command post exercise (CPX) will be held next January, which incorporates the defence of southwestern islands for the first time. The CPX will entail Japanese and US forces establishing a south-western barrier to bottle up Chinese naval forces in the East China Sea, simulating the deployment of military forces to one of the Amami Islands and other outlying islands, and operations to recapture islands from foreign forces.¶ The Southwest (Nansei) or Ryukyu Islands have a special value in solidifying the alliance because they are an issue on which US and Japanese strategic interests are strongly aligned. These islands are not only central to Japan’s sovereign territorial interests but are also highly relevant to US naval strategy in the region.¶ James Holmes and Toshi Yoshihara of the Jamestown Foundation argue that if China gained possession of one or more of the islands in the Ryukyus, it would secure vital straits through which a Chinese PLAN flotilla could exit from the East China Sea into the Western Pacific as well as protecting PLAN shipping through the straits. Further, a Chinese island campaign would underpin what the US Department of Defense has called China’s anti-access/area denial (A2/AD) operations against the US navy. This strategy is designed to prevent US naval reinforcements from reaching maritime Asia as well as blocking in-theatre forces from entering the Taiwan Strait and the seas off the east coast of Taiwan. Holmes and Yoshihara give the Senkakus, which lie due north of the southwestern tip of the Ryukyus, potential significance in this strategy as political, psychological and resource assets.¶ Funabashi Yoichi concurs and reports the words of a US administration official who stated: ‘I think about what will happen to the Senkaku Islands if the marine corps leave Okinawa. A Chinese flag will probably be standing on the Senkaku Islands the next day.’ Funabashi interpreted this comment as an American attempt to play the ‘Senkaku Islands card’. As it turns out, the need for such a ploy has been obviated by China itself.¶ Indeed, in a conflict scenario where the Chinese capture one or more of the Ryukyu Islands, the marines based in Okinawa could possibly play a key role. Andrew Krepinevich, President of the US Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments was quoted in the Asahi Shimbun on 5th May as saying that ‘the marine corps stationed in Okinawa could play a role in territorial disputes in the South China Sea etc’ (i.e. presumably also in the East China Sea).¶ The overall outcome of the Senkaku Islands dispute has been a Japan-US gain and a Chinese loss. The alliance is more highly valued in the region, particularly by other countries embroiled in their own maritime territorial disputes with China. The dispute also offers the Obama administration a chance to rebuild the bilateral security relationship by recruiting Japan into a strategic coalition against China. Meanwhile, the Kan administration has been handed a powerful argument in favour of maintaining a strong marine presence in Okinawa. Across a spectrum of bilateral issues including island defence, the Senkaku ‘shock’ has turned out to be a ‘Senkaku tailwind’.

#### Relations high now – marines aren’t key

The Korea Herald 12 (July 8, 2012, “U.S. –Japan alliance grows for Asia-Pacific security balance” <http://view.koreaherald.com/kh/view.php?ud=20120708000302&cpv=0> /mr)

U.S.-Japan alliance deepens¶ As the U.S. has been shifting its military and diplomatic priorities toward the economically vibrant region, its alliance with Japan, along with its one with South Korea, will continue to be the core of its strategy to maintain primacy in the region.¶ “Washington hopes to work with China’s neighbors to put together a balancing coalition that will contain China and prevent it from dominating Asia the way the U.S. dominates the Western Hemisphere,” said Mearsheimer.¶ On the surface, the alliance between the U.S. and Japan appears to have worsened in recent years due to a long-standing controversy over the relocation of the Futenma airbase in Okinawa.¶ But this would not undermine the core of the alliance between the two countries that share security interests and values of democracy, and take initiatives against global terrorism and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, experts pointed out.¶ “People should not misconstrue a long-running local dispute over how to close one Marine air base with the durability and capability of that vital alliance,” said Patrick M. Cronin, senior director of the Asia Program at the Center for a New American Security.¶ After the Democratic Party of Japan took power in 2009, ending a half-century of almost unbroken conservative rule, the alliance appeared to have deteriorated with the Tokyo leadership pursuing a closer yet “equal” relationship. ¶ But it has apparently re-prioritized its relationship with Washington as it recognized growing security challenges from China and North Korea.¶ Amid its strategic pivot toward Asia, the U.S. is likely to escalate its calls for the Asian ally to contribute more to maintaining stability in the region. ¶ Japan also wanted to increase its military role in the region and beyond. But it has been fettered by the pacifist constitution. ¶ The law prohibits Japan from going to war and having any potential war materials, and engaging in collective defense action, which makes it difficult to help support its ally U.S. even if it is attacked. Right-wingers have sought to rewrite the law or tried to alter the interpretation of it to expand the role of the Self-Defense Forces.¶ The deepening of the military alliance is also crucial for Tokyo, which has been engaged in an increasingly strident territorial disputes with Beijing over a set of islands in the East China Sea, which are called Senkaku in Japanese and Diaoyu in Chinese.¶ Japan is now considering nationalizing the islands to manage them “stably and peacefully.” This move has sparked strong opposition from China and Taiwan.¶ As the U.S. is now fleshing out the AirSea Battle concept apparently to counter China’s “anti-access/area denial” capabilities, Japan is also expected to play a crucial role in making it more concrete and viable given its close missile defense cooperation with the U.S., observers said.¶ The concept Washington put forward earlier this year is to conduct integrated aerial and naval operations across all domains such as air, maritime, space and cyberspace to neutralize increasingly sophisticated military techniques of potential adversaries.¶ “Japan’s role is expected to be crucial (for the AirSea Battle concept) given its air and naval power in addition to U.S. troops in Japan consisting mainly of marines, naval and air units,” said Nam Chang-hee, political science professor at Inha University.¶ “Japan is actively supporting America’s move to strengthen the bilateral military cooperation as it expands its naval assets such as submarines. The two countries are becoming united in the alliance.”¶ Seeking to tackle its national debt, Washington has been striving to form a security network with its allies including South Korea and Japan, and other partners such as Vietnam, which wants a greater U.S. presence due to China’s aggressive foreign policy.¶ At the same time, Washington also hopes to engage Beijing in its diplomatic activities and a variety of multilateral cooperative mechanisms to encourage it to play a “positive” role in the regional security architecture.

#### The alliance is unshakeable

Ruch 12

(Grace Ruch, 5/8/12, “US, Japan Leaders Meet on 60th Anniversary of Alliance to Talk Security, Exchanges, and Blossoms,” <http://www.japanmattersforamerica.org/2012/05/us-japan-summit-security-exchanges-and-blossoms/> /mr)

Obama-Noda Summit: “A Shared Vision for the Future”¶ Prime Minister Noda’s long-awaited visit to the White House was President Obama’s first formal meeting with Japan’s top leader since the Democratic Party of Japan came into power in 2009. Shortly after arriving in Washington, D.C., Noda met with members of the Fairfax County Search and Rescue Team that assisted with the response to the March 11, 2011, disasters in Tohoku, as well as the family of JET program English teacher, Taylor Anderson, who died after getting her students to safety. Noda later remarked that while he had “always held the conviction that our bilateral alliance is the lynchpin of Japan’s diplomacy,” after that visit he “felt anew that the U.S.-Japan alliance…is unshakeable.”¶ At a press conference following their summit meeting on Monday, April 30, Obama saluted the Prime Minister’s efforts to revitalize the US-Japan alliance and the strength and resiliency of Japan in the wake of last year’s disaster, saying to the Japanese people: “More than ever, the American people are proud to call you a friend and honored to call you an ally.” There, he and Noda announced what was referred to as “a joint vision to guide our alliance and help shape the Asia Pacific for decades to come.”¶ This US-Japan Joint Statement, the first issued since Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi met with President George W. Bush in 2006, described five main areas of this shared vision: that the US-Japan alliance will remain the foundation for peace and prosperity between the two nations and within the broader Asia Pacific region; that increased bilateral trade and investment will support jobs and economic growth; that America and Japan seek an Asia Pacific region built on international norms, freedom of commerce and navigation, and peaceful resolution of conflicts, and as such are partners in addressing the provocations of North Korea and the democratic transition of Burma; that the US and Japan continue to act as global partners through shared values and commitment to international peace and human rights; and to deepen the ties between the people of the US and Japan.¶ Exchanges and Blossoms¶ Dogwood trees in bloom in Washington DC. After receiving the gift of 3000 cherry blossoms- sakura- in 1912, President Taft and his wife sent 50 dogwood trees to Tokyo, though few survive today; on the centennial of the sakura the US government announced it will give 3000 more dogwoods to the people of Japan. Photo by: Julia Ross, via Flickr¶ A suite of US-Japan cooperative initiatives were announced to undergird the leaders’ commitment to expanding America-Japan ties. These include the establishment of a Bilateral Commission on Civil Nuclear Cooperation to continue the close US-Japan efforts in this area following the March 2011 Fukushima Daiichi accident, and new joint research and development initiatives under the US-Japan Clean Energy Policy Dialogue in areas such as green communities in Tohoku, innovation in clean energy, and the use, production, and recycling of critical materials such as rare earth elements. Other programs and initiatives were announced on cooperation in travel facilitation, cyber and space collaboration, and supply chain security.¶ At a dinner hosted in honor of the Prime Minister, Secretary Clinton also announced that 3,000 flowering dogwood trees, native to America, will be given to Japan as a gift from the people of the United States. The donation celebrates the centennial anniversary of Japan’s gift of the sakura cherry blossom trees to the city of Washington, D.C. Toasting Noda, who had appropriately promised the day before to make Japan-US relations “bloom,” Clinton remarked: “We hope that these dogwood trees in Japan will, like the cherry trees here, serve as a symbol of the strong relationship and friendship between our countries.”

#### Relations strong –

#### A) Military exercises

**Williamson 10 (**Tara A. Williamson, Airman 1st Class, 18th Wing Public Affairs, Kadena Air Base, 12/1/2k10, “Keen Sword exercise sharpens US-Japan alliance,” http://www.kadena.af.mil/news/story.asp?id=123232979)

About 10,500 U.S. service members and their Japan Self Defense Force counterparts are participating in exercise Keen Sword 2011, Dec. 3-10, on military installations throughout mainland Japan, Okinawa and in the waters surrounding Japan. Keen Sword is a regularly scheduled exercise designed to strengthen U.S. and Japanese military interoperability and meet mutual defense objectives. “Keen Sword will cap the 50th anniversary of the Japan-U.S. alliance as an ‘alliance of equals,’” said Maj. William Vause, chief of operational plans, training and exercises. “It is the largest bilateral exercise between the United States and Japan military forces. [The exercise] will better enhance both of our countries’ readiness to respond to varied crisis situations.” Training events include integrated air and missile defense, base security and force protection, close air support, live-fire training, maritime defense and interdiction, and search and rescue. “Guardian Angel, rescue specialists delivering combat medical care under extreme duress, has very unique ground focused rescue techniques,” said Capt. Robert L. Wilson, team commander 31st Rescue Squadron. “Throughout Keen Sword the 31st and 33rd will be employing and sharing techniques with our JSDF partners. Focused mission sets will be maritime rescue, high-angle procedures, and extrication from vehicles.” Keen Sword is also designed to allow Japan and the United States to practice and evaluate their coordination procedures and interoperability requirements. “We hope to increase both U.S. and Japanese understanding of our mutual capabilities and rescue limitations,” said Captain Wilson. “An exercise like Keen Sword is invaluable for presenting opportunities to establish closer host nation friendships and practicing interoperability for the future.” Keen Sword is not designed to respond to or mirror any actual world events, nor is it directed at any nation. This training between Japan and the United States has been a routine, recurring event for many years. “The goal of Keen Sword is to increase and improve our bilateral relationship to further enhance the Japan and U.S. alliance,” Major Vause said, “and to provide a realistic training environment that allows JSDF and U.S. forces to respond to a wide range of situations.”

#### B) Cultural and education ties

Japan Times 10 (Takashi Kitazume, Staff writer, Japan Times, 9/24/2k10, “New vision of Japan-U.S. ties needed at key turning point,” <http://search.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/nb20100924d1.html>)

Calder added that Japan and the U.S. need to move beyond the military-security dimensions and broaden their scope of cooperation to other areas including energy, environment, mass transportation and the medical field. He stressed the importance of cultural and educational ties between the two countries**.** "The alliance is something much broader than simply political-military dimensions, even if they are at the core. And these can be things that help us to create a win-win environment, rather than just a narrow focus on Futenma, where there is always a sort of scoreboard on who is winning and who is losing. I think we need to broaden our relationship beyond that," he said.

#### C) Earthquake Assistance

**Stimson Center 11** (Henry L. Stimson Center, nonpartisan institution devoted to enhancing international peace and security, 5/9/2k11, “The US-Japan Alliance After 3/11,” http://www.stimson.org/essays/the-us-japan-alliance-after-311/)

The day opened with introductory remarks by Ambassador Lincoln P. Bloomfield, Jr., Stimson's Chairman of the Board.  Ambassador Bloomfield proposed that while the Great Eastern Japan Earthquake continues to present both the Japanese government and its people a formidable challenge, the tragedy was also an opportunity to demonstrate the strength of the US-Japan alliance.  Ambassador Bloomfield shared his confidence that the United States, as Japan's ally, will work closely with Japan as it tackles the formidable challenges of recovery and reconstruction in the years to come.

#### **Alliance high – perception of moving the marines solved problems**

Washington Post 4/30/12

(David Nakamura, “Obama, Japan’s Noda hail security alliance after bilateral meeting, Washington Post 4/30/12, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/44/post/obama-japans-noda-hail-security-alliance-after-bilateral-meeting/2012/04/30/gIQAZSYSsT_blog.html> /mr)

President Obama on Monday reaffirmed the United States’ defense commitment to Japan, calling the relationship the “linchpin” of security in the Far East.¶ Japanese Prime Minister Yoshihiko Noda/ (KAZUHIRO NOGI - AFP/GETTY IMAGES)¶ Appearing with Japanese Prime Minister Yoshihiko Noda after their bilateral meeting, Obama hailed the recent agreement to relocate 9,000 U.S. Marines off Okinawa to other bases in the Western Pacific, saying the move will help allay concerns of Japanese residents of the island.¶ Obama pledged that the move will not compromise the long-time alliance at a time when the United States is rebalancing its commitment to Asia to counter China’s influence and renewed nuclear threats from North Korea.¶ “We think we’ve found an effective mechanism to move this process forward in a way that is respectful of the situation in Okinawa, the views of residents there,” Obama said during a joint news conference in the East Room, “but also is able to optimize the defense cooperation between our two countries and the alliance that’s the linchpin not just of our own security but also security in the region as a whole.”¶ The Marine Corps Air Station in Okinawa is seen as critical to counterbalancing China’s aggression in the region, but the noisy base has caused tension with Japanese residents in the crowded urban area.¶ U.S. and Japan officials have been negotiating a relocation of some troops and the base for years. Some of the 9,000 Marines likely will be relocated to Guam, but the two sides still have not settled on a new location for the airbase inside Japan.¶ Noda, who was making his first visit to Washington since taking power seven months ago, said that he and Obama were “able to confirm that our two countries will cooperate in the context of a deepening bilateral alliance towards the realization of the optimum U.S. force posture in the region and the reduction of burden on Okinawa.”

# Ext. Military Exercises

Keen sword exercises means alliance is strong

Williamson 10

(Tara A. Williamson, Airman 1st Class, 18th Wing Public Affairs, “Keen Sword exercise sharpens US-Japan alliance,” Official Web Site of the U.S. Air Force, 12/2/2k10, <http://www.af.mil/news/story.asp?id=123233042> /mr)

12/2/2010 - KADENA AIR BASE, Japan (AFNS) -- About 10,500 U.S. servicemembers and their Japan Self Defense Force counterparts are participating in exercise Keen Sword 2011, Dec. 3 through 10, on military installations throughout mainland Japan, Okinawa and in the water surrounding Japan. Keen Sword is a regularly-scheduled exercise designed to strengthen U.S. and Japanese military interoperability and meet mutual defense objectives, according to exercise planners. "Keen Sword will cap the 50th anniversary of the Japan-U.S. alliance as an 'alliance of equals,'" said Maj. William Vause, the chief of operational plans, training and exercises. "It is the largest bilateral exercise between the United States and Japan military forces. (The exercise) will better enhance both of our countries' readiness to respond to varied crisis situations." Training events include integrated air and missile defense, base security and force protection, close-air support, live-fire training, maritime defense and interdiction, and search and rescue. "Guardian Angel rescue specialists delivering combat medical care under extreme duress, have very unique ground focused rescue techniques," said Capt. Robert L. Wilson, the 31st Rescue Squadron team commander. "Throughout Keen Sword, the 31st (RS) and 33rd (RS) will be employing and sharing techniques with our JSDF partners. Focused mission sets will be maritime rescue, high-angle procedures, and extrication from vehicles." Keen Sword is also designed to allow Japanese and U.S. servicemembers to practice and evaluate their coordination procedures and interoperability requirements. "We hope to increase both U.S. and Japanese understanding of our mutual capabilities and rescue limitations," Captain Wilson said. "An exercise like Keen Sword is invaluable for presenting opportunities to establish closer host nation friendships and practicing interoperability for the future." Keen Sword is not designed to respond to, or mirror, any actual world events, nor is it directed at any nation. This training between Japan and the U.S. has been a routine, recurring event for many years, Major Vause said. "The goal of Keen Sword is to increase and improve our bilateral relationship to further enhance the Japan and U.S. alliance, and to provide a realistic training environment that allows JSDF and U.S. forces to respond to a wide range of situations," he said.

# Can’t Solve Relations

#### Infrastructure doesn’t solve - addition to marines in Okinawa makes their relations impact inevitable and will negate the goodwill of the plan

Tritten 12 (Travis Tritten, writer for Stars and Stripes, June 12, 2012, <http://www.stripes.com/news/us-to-beef-up-marine-presence-on-okinawa-before-drawdown-1.180172> /mr)

CAMP FOSTER, Okinawa — The United States plans to add thousands of Marines to bases on Okinawa, swelling the ranks here to levels not seen since the end of the Cold War, even as Washington works with Japan on a new agreement to reduce the controversial American military presence on the island, the Department of Defense has confirmed.¶ Existing units will be filled to maximum potential and a unit deployment program will rotate in troops to boost the number of Marines on Okinawa from an average of 15,700 since the late 1990s to around 19,000 in advance of any eventual drawdown on the island, according to a senior DOD official who works closely on the issue and was authorized to speak on background.¶ Yet that number would be nearly double the size of the force of 10,000 Marines that U.S. and Japanese negotiators agreed to in April, after years of stalled efforts to reduce the American footprint on Okinawa. No timetable for reaching that reduced end-state number was specified in the agreement.¶ “Yes, in the near-term there will be an increase in the actual number of Marines on the island,” the DOD official said in an interview with Stars and Stripes. “The authorized strengths of those units [on Okinawa] are between 19,000 and 20,000 today. … As the Marines come back from Afghanistan, we expect the number of Marines on Okinawa at any one time will be close to that number.”¶ Filling out the forces on the island is a natural progression as combat operations end and troops begin returning to units that may have been depleted of personnel for the past decade, the official said.¶ Newly available Marines who are r eturning from Afghanistan as well as rotational deployments will be a key to adding the thousands of troops.¶ Additionally, about 800 Marines from Hawaii are expected to begin rotations to Okinawa this summer as the Marine Corps unit deployment program ramps up again after being dormant for the past decade, according to Capt. Gregory Wolf, a Marine Corps spokesman. The number of Marines who take part in the future still depends upon operations winding down in Afghanistan, Wolf wrote in an email to Stars and Stripes.¶ News of the planned increase in Marines on Okinawa has apparently not been shared with Okinawa officials.¶ ADVERTISEMENT¶ “If the U.S. military is planning to increase the number of Marines on Okinawa to the fullest of the authorized number, it owes Okinawa a clear and proper explanation,” said Susumu Matayoshi, director-general of the executive office of the Okinawa governor. “It is unacceptable if the increase is decided behind our back.”¶ Matayoshi added that Okinawa residents and officials have long held serious reservations about the size of Marine force stationed here because it shifts without any local input or explanation from the United States.¶ This year’s agreement to eventually reduce the number of Marines on the island was the latest attempt by the U.S. and Japanese governments to appease the Okinawans, who have protested for generations over the large number of U.S. bases here as well as aircraft noise and the occasional crimes committed by military personnel.¶ However, until the realignment is accomplished, the Marine presence on Okinawa will be pumped up as part of a massive American military pivot into the Pacific region.¶ Since late last year, the military has begun pursuing new deployments and bases in Australia, Singapore and Guam to shore up security in a key trading zone and provide a counterweight to the rise of China following a decade of wars. Now, Okinawa is also set to see a surge in troop levels as well.¶ Last year, there were 15,365 Marines deployed to the island – the highest number by far since 2004, according to the most recent annual U.S. force numbers reported to the Okinawa prefectural government.¶ The Defense Department now wants to fill out the force to meet the maximum authorized number of Marines, which is a force size decided by military planners, who weigh unit and security needs. The authorized size of the force has also been included in the U.S. security pact with Japan and in the negotiations on the Marine realignment.¶ The last time the island hosted the planned 19,000 to 20,000 Marines was in 1989, at the close of the Cold War, and forces have steadily shrunk over the past two decades. The number of Marines fell to about 15,000 by the end of the 1990s and then as low as 12,400 during the height of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the annual force numbers show.¶ Jeff Kingston, director of Asian Studies at Temple University Japan, said the DOD plans to increase force strength before the drawdown do not appear to be in line with the stated U.S. and Japanese efforts to move troops and bases off Okinawa.¶ “The question is, ‘Why do [the Marines] need to be redeployed to Okinawa given plans to more or less redistribute Marines to Guam?’ ” Kingston said.¶ Bruce Klingner, a senior Northeast Asia research fellow for the Heritage Foundation, said it is not surprising that units would be regaining strength on Okinawa following the wars.¶ The island remains a critical stage for U.S. forces in the Pacific and Marine forces are typically very fluid around the world compared to other military branches, Klingner said.¶ He said the public should not focus on the “wrong numbers” – the actual count of Marines in recent years -- but instead on the total potential of troops on the island when judging the realignment plans.¶ “There will be those in Okinawa who will be looking for a conspiracy,” he said. “The reality is you move Marines in units.”¶ No deadline has yet been set for the relocation of the Marines off the island, and key components are still unplanned or undecided.¶ Many of the Marines are expected to be moved to Guam, but the U.S. has not completed required environmental studies or decided what facilities might be needed, a process that is expected to take at least two years. It could potentially take even longer to build the facilities needed to host the Marines.¶ The DOD also has yet to decide what will be done with another 4,000 Marines who are supposed to be redeployed off of Okinawa, despite media reports that they may be moved to Hawaii or rotated through Australia, the official told Stars and Stripes.

#### Plan doesn’t solve relations- diminishes perceived commitment and deterrence capabilitties

Japan Times 2k2

(Japan Times, “marines on Okinawa are worth keeping”, May 23 2002, pg online @ http://www.japantimes.co.jp/text/eo20020523a2.html)

Thirty years after reversion to Japan, the U.S. Marine bases on Okinawa remain a contentious issue. Periodic calls for their reduction or elimination may be good politics, and offer academics and other commentators the satisfaction that they are taking a "progressive" stance on the issue.¶ ¶ But substantially reducing the Marine presence will do little or nothing to improve U.S.-Japan security relations, to revive Okinawa's economy, or to make up for Okinawa's years of second-class treatment by the national government. It will, however, degrade America's Asian security strategy and blur perceptions of its military commitment to the Pacific region.¶ Okinawa-based Marine forces are somehow seen as less necessary than Japan-based U.S. air and naval forces. Despite evidence to the contrary, air and naval power advocates have long promised single-handed, bloodless victory if given a big enough share of the defense budget. During the Persian Gulf War, a six-week bombing campaign and a naval blockade still required ground troops to eject Iraqi forces from Kuwait. The subsequent decade of naval and aerial blockade enforcing U.N. sanctions has not brought Saddam Hussein to heel. More recently, in Kosovo, only the threat of ground intervention -- after a month of air strikes that were less effective than advertised -- forced a Yugoslav withdrawal.¶ Modern war is a combined-arms activity. The most effective and least costly approach combines air, ground and sea capabilities. Each can do what the other cannot. The Third Marine Expeditionary Force (III MEF) on Okinawa and mainland Japan is the only immediately deployable ground force in a massive operational area stretching from Hawaii to Africa.¶ In war and other contingencies (especially humanitarian intervention, disaster relief, peacekeeping operations and noncombatant evacuations) you must have people on the ground to seize terrain, to engage enemy forces, or to aid and assist people. This cannot be accomplished by simply sending ships to cruise offshore or planes to fly overhead.¶ Some commentators argue that there are not enough Marines on Okinawa to make a difference in the event of a major war in Asia. Besides the fact that even a small number of troops can make a difference, this argument overlooks the fact that in the event of a more serous contingency, Japan-based Marines are intended to be employed as part of a larger effort involving forces from overseas. Arguments focusing on high-intensity warfare also miss the Marines' broader operational role, focusing instead on the most drastic (and least likely) possible contingency.¶ Proposals for "rearranging Okinawa" include relocation to Guam, the "koban" scheme, the "virtual presence" solution and prepositioning. None of these offer a real solution.¶ Guam has some attractive features, but its training areas are inadequate to serve as a replacement for Okinawa. Also, a Marine move to Guam could be seen as a sign of diminished U.S. commitment to Asia.

# Ext: Can’t Solve Relations

#### More marines means poor relations

UPI News 12 (UPI News, June 13, 2012, <http://www.upi.com/Top_News/World-News/2012/06/13/US-Marines-to-bump-up-numbers-on-Okinawa/UPI-19491339623347/> /mr)

CAMP FOSTER, Japan, June 13 (UPI) -- The number of U.S. Marines stationed at Okinawa, Japan, will jump to as many as 20,000, the most since 1989, before eventually dropping, an official said.¶ The news isn't sitting well with officials in Okinawa who have been trying to get the United States to reduce its presence on the island. U.S. and Japanese negotiators agreed in April to reduce to winnow the number of Marines on Okinawa to 10,000, though no timetable was set.¶ Stars and Stripes reported Okinawan officials apparently had not been told of the U.S. plans to put more Marines on the island.¶ "If the U.S. military is planning to increase the number of Marines on Okinawa to the fullest of the authorized number, it owes Okinawa a clear and proper explanation," said Susumu Matayoshi, director-general of the executive office of the Okinawa governor. "It is unacceptable if the increase is decided behind our back."¶ The number of Marines on the island has averaged 15,700 since the late 1990s and Okinawa last hosted 19,000-20,000 Marines in 1989 at the end of the Cold War, Stars and Stripes reported.¶ The number fell to about 15,000 by the end of the 1990s and was as low as 12,400 during the height of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.¶ Marines returning from Afghanistan and some of those on rotational deployments will add to the number of Marines on the island.¶ The number of Marines in Okinawa shifts without local input or explanation from the United States, Matayoshi said,¶ Okinawa residents have complained about the number of U.S. bases, noise from aircraft and occasional crimes committed by military personnel.¶ The planned increase in the number of Marines on Okinawa comes as the United States increases its military presence in the Asia-Pacific region.

# Moving Marines Doesn’t Solve Relations

They want Futenma closed – the plan doesn’t do that

Associated Press 12

(Fox News, 2/8/12, “US, Japan pave way to send Okinawa Marines to Guam,” <http://www.foxnews.com/world/2012/02/08/us-japan-pave-way-to-send-okinawa-marines-to-guam/#ixzz20MR6AFyk> /mr)

TOKYO-- Japan and the United States agreed Wednesday to proceed with plans to transfer thousands of U.S. troops out of the southern Japanese island of Okinawa, leaving behind the stalled discussion of the closure of a major U.S. Marine base there.¶ The transfer, a key to U.S. troop restructuring in the Pacific, has been in limbo for years because it was linked to the closure and replacement of the strategically important base, which has been fiercely opposed by Okinawa residents.¶ The announcement Wednesday follows high-level talks to rework a 2006 agreement for 8,000 Marines on Okinawa to move to the U.S. territory of Guam by 2014 if a replacement for the base -- Marine Corps Air Station Futenma -- could be built.¶ That agreement has been effectively scuttled by opposition on Okinawa, where many residents believe the base should simply be closed and moved overseas or elsewhere in Japan. More than half of the 50,000 U.S. troops in Japan, including 18,000 Marines, are stationed on Okinawa, taking up around 10 percent of the island with nearly 40 bases and facilities.¶ In a joint statement Wednesday, the two governments said the transfer of thousands of U.S. Marines to Guam would not require the prior closure of Futenma, as in the original pact. Details of the realignment will be discussed further, but about 10,000 troops will remain on Okinawa, as in the original agreement.

#### They move troops from one hated place to another- doesn’t solve alliance

**Tritten, 12** (Travis J Tritten, "Realignment would shift 9,000 marines across pacific" on Apil 26, 2012 from www.stripes.com/news/pacific/okinawa/realignment-would-shift-9-000-marines-across-pacific-1.17567)

The Futenma base, located in the middle of a densely populated urban area, has long been a major irritant for Okinawans. The U.S. and Japan reiterated their intention to close the Futenma air station, as well as about five other American military facilities on Okinawa. The closures were also part of the stalled 2006 realignment agreement. But the planned relocation of the Futenma base to Camp Schwab, a Marine base further north on the island, has generated fierce opposition from local residents, who fear the noise and damaging environmental impacts they believe would result. The prefecture’s governor has indicated he will not approve the necessary environmental permits that would allow the relocation to proceed.¶ U.S. officials, however, reiterated their insistence that the relocation of Futenma to Camp Schwab must go forward.

#### **Guam doesn’t solve relations and public anger**

#### **Time 12** (Krista Mahr, Time World, 2,7,2012, <http://world.time.com/2012/02/07/why-okinawa-wont-be-celebrating-if-4700-u-s-marines-move-to-guam/#ixzz20Dvc9cnw> /mr)

TOSHIFUMI KITAMURA / AFP / GETTY IMAGESS¶ A Marine helicopter takes off from the Futenma air base in Ginowan, Okinawa. Sources say the U.S. and Japan have reached an agreement to transfer 4,700 Marines to Guam¶ If you’re into planes, the hilltop park overlooking the U.S. Marine Corps Air Station Futenma is not a bad place to be. You can watch cargo planes make wide circles over the green hills of Okinawa all day, swooping down to the airfield below for a landing or practice drop, and lifting back up into the overcast winter sky. You can also get a pretty good idea of how the locals feel about those planes. A decidedly unsubtle placard at the overlook shows an aerial photo of the airstrip and the surrounding neighborhood rammed up against its fences. Every elementary school, kindergarten, hospital, elderly-care center, playground and religious institution within crashing distance is marked. Quite clearly. In English.¶ For years, residents in the Okinawan city of Ginowan have called for the Futenma air base to leave their neighborhood. And for years, residents near Camp Schwab, a more remote Marine base on the north of the island that the U.S. and Japan have agreed will absorb Futenma, have been protesting that too. The Okinawans’ standoff – fueled as much if not more by resentment of Tokyo than the U.S. – has been a major headache between Japan and the U.S. at a time when both sides are looking to strengthen security ties in the face of the looming specter of a stronger and more assertive China.¶ This week, something resembling a resolution — or at least a step forward in some direction — may be coming into focus. Japanese government sources told reporters that the U.S. and Japan had “reached a broad agreement” to transfer 4,700 Marines off Okinawa and move them to Guam. If it goes ahead, the move would be a revision to a 2006 bilateral agreement, known as the U.S.-Japan Realignment Road Map, which originally linked the transfer of 8,000 Marines from Okinawa to Guam with the relocation of the contentious Futenma air base out of the crowded city of Ginowan.¶ The discussions are happening during meetings this week between the U.S. and Japan in Washington, and reports of the Marine transfer have not been confirmed or denied by the U.S. government. Commander Leslie Hull-Ryde, a Department of Defense spokesperson, said in a statement that “the United States and Japan are continuously looking for more efficient and effective ways to achieve the goals of the Realignment Road Map. However, no decisions have been made; therefore, there are no announcements to be made.” But the statement did affirm that “the two countries remain fully committed to the implementation of the Futenma Replacement Facility and the relocation of the MCAS Futenma air base to Camp Schwab.”¶ Japanese media are reporting that a joint announcement is on its way within the week. Whatever it is, it’s not going to go down well on Okinawa, despite the fact that many on the island have been fighting for the Marines and all other U.S. military members to leave the island for years. Why? By detaching the Marine relocation from the 2006 deal – part of the U.S. “pivot to Asia” strategy of installing more smaller and nimble forces around the Pacific from Hawaii to Darwin to Guam – Okinawans may have lost whatever bargaining chip they had left with Tokyo. The incentive to find a good solution to the Futenma relocation now comes down to good faith, which isn’t to say that the U.S. and Tokyo are not committed to making Okinawans, who were occupied by the U.S. until 1972, more comfortable with the arrangement. It’s just that Okinawans might not see it that way.¶ (MORE: Read about U.S. foreign policy under President Obama)¶ While Guam, which has been waiting to receive the influx of Marines for years now, has for the most part been looking forward to the boom of a military buildup, Okinawans are fed up with hosting half the American forces in Japan. The U.S. military has exclusive access to 18% of island, and most of that is encircled in high fences and barbed wire, which, frankly, makes it feel like a lot more. Though islanders blame the worst atrocities they endured during World War II on the Imperial Army, their list of grievances with the U.S. military and its personnel is also long, running from daily nuisances like plane noise and drunk Marines ending up in their yards to fatal traffic accidents and sexual assault. The brutal kidnapping and rape of a 12-year-old girl by three U.S. service members led to massive protests in 1995 and, ultimately, laid the foundation of the agreement to move Futenma.¶ Mike Green, Japan chair at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, says although a “garrison mentality” that developed during the U.S. occupation “created a lot of resentment,” the military has been working hard to get its act together. “The crimes by American soldiers and Marines are way down,” Green says. “The safety records are way up. They have taken all these measures to reduce the impact.”¶ But for many, the deadlock in Okinawa is not as simple as finding the right place to move loud aircraft and rowdy 20-year-olds out of a crowded neighborhood. It’s about 70 years of feeling overlooked and abandoned by Tokyo. The island remains the poorest prefecture in Japan, with one of the highest unemployment rates, despite the oft touted economic benefits that the 26,000 American personnel and their families bring. “Okinawa was totally destroyed during the war,” says Susumu Matayoshi, director general of the Okinawa prefectural government. “Who started the war? Japan. During 30 years of [U.S.] occupation, while Japan was enjoying an industrial boom, Okinawa was left behind.”¶ It’s hard to see how Okinawans won’t interpret this week’s arrangement, whatever it turns out to be, as another deal made with the mainland’s interests at heart. Toshio Odo, a retired teacher out taking a morning walk along the fence near his house in Ginowan, points up at a plane coming in for a landing. “I can see the faces of the pilots from my house,” he says. When he was a boy, Odo says, he watched his friend killed in a hit-and-run accident. The driver, an American serviceman, got out of his car, threw a blanket over the dead boy, and drove off. “This was America then. We couldn’t do anything,” recalls Odo, now 63. “I’m not against Americans. I’m not against any nationality. But I am against people who treat us cheaply because they have power.”

#### Guam ignites opposition

Klinger 11 – Senior Research Fellow for Northeast Asia in the Asian Studies at The Heritage Foundation (Bruce, Heritage Foundation, 6/14/2k11, “Top 10 Reasons Why the U.S. Marines on Okinawa Are Essential to Peace and Security in the Pacific,” <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-marines-on-okinawa-are-essential-to-peace-and-security-in-the-pacific> /mr)

Guam Agreement Does Address Okinawan Concerns The Guam Agreement addresses the concerns raised by the Okinawans, including the need to reduce U.S. flight operations in a congested area, decrease the U.S. military presence on Okinawa, and return land to local authorities. [28] Yet, despite meeting each of these issues, the Guam Agreement faces continued opposition from Okinawa. For example, the Guam Agreement does exactly what the Okinawans have demanded: It reduces the U.S. military presence on the island. The FRF would be one-third the size of the Futenma air base. The planned redeployment of 8,000 Marines and 9,000 dependents from Okinawa to Guam would constitute a nearly 50 percent reduction of the Marine Corps forward presence in Japan. That redeployment would enable the return of 70 percent of the U.S. bases south of the Kadena Air Base. Tokyo hoped to allay Okinawan concerns by altering the construction method at the planned relocation site to address environmental concerns. Protesters have complained that the replacement facility would harm the habitat of the dugong (manatee) and that building on coral would destroy a pristine bay. These complaints are groundless. Local Okinawans say they have not seen a dugong—which is a migratory animal—in Henoko Bay for three generations. Nor is the bay as unique or irreplaceable as depicted; Okinawan civilian construction firms continue to build extensively on offshore coral locations throughout Okinawa.[29] Unsurprisingly, these proposed alterations have done little to allay Okinawan objections, however, as the purported environmental issues are simply another means of combating the U.S. redeployment plan. Japan has also sought to decrease Okinawan resistance to the Guam Agreement by reducing the “burden” of the U.S. military presence. Washington and Tokyo agreed that F-15 fighter training flights would move from Okinawa’s Kadena base to Guam. Up to 20 days of training by two F-15 squadrons stationed at Kadena would be relocated, with a maximum of 20 out of a total of 50 fighters participating each day.[30] Japan subsequently announced that U.S. flights out of Misawa Air Base in Aomori Prefecture and the MCAS Iwakuni in Yamaguchi Prefecture would also be moved to Guam. The Kan administration emphasized that the training agreement constituted a tangible reduction of the U.S. military burden on Okinawa and hoped it would facilitate implementation of the long-stalled FRF agreement. However, the agreement has had no impact on Okinawan demands. Indeed, Governor Nakaima continues to downplay the significance of the flight training movement, arguing, “That’s the only part of the military presence that has been reduced, and often those flights moved out are just replaced with new aircraft coming in. I won’t know the true outcome until the move has been completed.”[31] Neither reductions in flight operations nor mitigation of the environmental impact of relocation will satisfy those who are seeking the withdrawal of USMC flight operations, let alone the entire U.S. military presence. Short of turning over bases to Okinawan control, attempts at reducing the burden that the Marines place on the island is unlikely to appease opponents of the relocation plan. The Okinawan priority is not alliance requirements and geostrategic factors but localized concerns of reduced military footprint, land givebacks, and removal of noisy military units. For Okinawan politicians, the preferred option has always been to defer making a decision, both to avoid having to implement an unpopular option and to garner additional benefits from Tokyo and Washington.

Plan sparks political controversy in Japan

AP 2/8/12

[Associated Press, "US, Japan pave way to send Okinawa Marines to Guam", pg. online @ www.foxnews.com/world/2012/02/08/us-japan-pave-way-to-send-okinawa-marines-to-guam// bprp]

**TOKYO-- Japan and the United States agreed Wednesday to proceed with plans to transfer thousands of U.S. troops out of the southern Japanese island of Okinawa, leaving behind the stalled discussion of the closure of a major U.S. Marine base there. The transfer, a key to U.S. troop restructuring in the Pacific, has been in limbo for years because it was linked to the closure and replacement of the strategically important base, which has been fiercely opposed by Okinawa residents. The announcement Wednesday follows high-level talks to rework a 2006 agreement for 8,000 Marines on Okinawa to move to the U.S. territory of Guam by 2014 if a replacement for the base -- Marine Corps Air Station Futenma -- could be built. That agreement has been effectively scuttled by opposition on Okinawa, where many residents believe the base should simply be closed and moved overseas or elsewhere in Japan. More than half of the 50,000 U.S. troops in Japan, including 18,000 Marines, are stationed on Okinawa, taking up around 10 percent of the island with nearly 40 bases and facilities. In a joint statement Wednesday, the two governments said the transfer of thousands of U.S. Marines to Guam would not require the prior closure of Futenma, as in the original pact. Details of the realignment will be discussed further, but about 10,000 troops will remain on Okinawa, as in the original agreement. Foreign Minister Koichiro Gemba told a news conference that he hoped the progress on the realignment plan would help the two countries step up deterrence in the Asia-Pacific region. He also said Tokyo and Washington would continue efforts to eventually close Futenma. Wednesday's statement was vague on specifics of what lies ahead. Officials said details would be determined through further discussions over the next few months. But senior Japanese officials have said 4,700 Marines will be transferred to Guam. The remaining 3,300 would reportedly rotate among Australia, Hawaii and the Philippines. Progress on the issue is important to the United States, which is looking to revise its military and diplomatic posture in Asia -- in what is being called the "Pacific Pivot" -- to reflect the rising power of China and increasing tensions over territorial disputes throughout the region. Washington is also under pressure to make the most of its resources as budget cuts loom in Congress with the winding down of combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. Guam has pushed hard for the buildup because of the potential economic boom. "We are the closest U.S. community to Asia. We are very patriotic citizens. And unlike many foreign countries and even some U.S. communities, we welcome an increased military presence," Gov. Eddie Calvo said in a statement released last week. "We are the closest U.S. community to the fastest-growing region in the world." Tokyo, meanwhile, is hoping the reduction of troops on Okinawa will ease local opposition and demonstrate its desire to stand by promises to reduce the island's share of the troop-hosting burden. Officials say they remain committed to closing Futenma, which the U.S. and Japan agreed to do after the 1995 rape of a schoolgirl by three American servicemen led to mass protests. "We decided to choose to reduce Okinawa's burden as much as possible rather than being stuck in a stalemate by sticking to an earlier package," Gemba said, stressing Tokyo's effort to serve Okinawa's interest as much as possible. But Okinawa Gov. Hirokazu Nakaima gave a mixed response. He welcomed the agreement to move ahead with the Marines' relocation and a return of some of the bases as serving "Okinawans' desire to reduce the U.S. military presence," but repeated his rejection to move Futenma to another location on the island. "A relocation without local consent would be impossible. We want Futenma moved out of Okinawa," Nakaima said in a statement. The most likely replacement site, on a less crowded part of the island, is widely opposed on Okinawa and its viability remains a heated political debate. Guam, which is being built up to play a greater role in Washington's Asia-Pacific strategy, could also stand to get far fewer Marines than expected if the new plan goes through. The tiny U.S. territory had been counting on a huge boost from the restructuring plan, and may have to revise its forecasts. But officials said the revised number could be more manageable. A smaller contingent of Marines would alleviate concerns on Guam that the swelling military presence would overwhelm the island's infrastructure and environment.**

Public isn’t satisfied with the transfer

Bloomberg 12

(Sachiko Sakamaki and Takashi Hirokawa, Bloomberg Businessweek, 2/10/12, <http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-02-10/u-s-marines-relocation-to-guam-bypasses-japan-base-dispute.html> /mr)

As part of a 2006 agreement with Japan, 8,000 Marines and 9,000 dependents were to be transferred from Okinawa almost 1,500 miles (2,414 kilometers) south to Guam by 2014. Japan pays about 188 billion yen ($2.4 billion) a year to host 38,000 American military personnel and 43,000 dependents as part of a 52-year security treaty. More than 75 percent of the bases are on Okinawa, about 950 miles south of Tokyo.¶ Unsuccessful¶ Prime Minister Yoshihiko Noda, Japan’s sixth leader in five years, hasn’t been any more successful than his predecessors in persuading Okinawa residents to accept the base transfer. He was forced to replace his defense minister after a ministry official was fired for comparing the relocation to rape, recalling a 1995 incident in which three American soldiers sexually assaulted an Okinawan schoolgirl.¶ Last May, Democratic Senators Carl Levin of Michigan and Jim Webb of Virginia joined Republican Senator John McCain of Arizona in calling on the Defense Department to save money by reducing the Marine Corps expansion on Guam.¶ U.S. troops will be stationed in northern Australia under a plan that Obama and Prime Minister Julia Gillard announced in November. The U.S. and the Philippines last month agreed to “deepen and broaden” maritime security cooperation as Philippine officials seek closer ties to deter China from operating in disputed waters in the South China Sea.¶ “The U.S. is shifting its projection of power to the Pacific region amid China’s rise,” said Tomohiko Taniguchi, a former Foreign Ministry official and a visiting professor at Keio University in Tokyo.

# Relations CP

#### The United States federal government should enter into deep consultation with Japan about the future of the US-Japan alliance.

#### That solves

Tanaka 10

(Hitoshi Tanaka, senior fellow at the Japan Center for International Exchange, chairman of the Institute for International Strategy at the Japan Research institute, he served for three years as Japan’s Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs, advisor to Prime Minister Koizumi on relations with North Korea, China, and the United States, 2/16/10, East Asia Forum, <http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2010/02/16/the-us-japan-alliance-beyond-futenma/> /mr)

The US-Japan alliance is too important to be put at risk over politics, particularly over the fate of a single base. Instead, we need to handle issues such as the Futenma relocation in a way that does not damage the alliance. To do this, we should operate with a broader perspective and take a number of joint steps that are explicitly linked to one another.¶ Immediately Begin Joint Consultations on Futenma Relocation Plan¶ Fundamentally, both the US and Japanese governments understand that it is necessary to reduce the burden of bases on the local populations. Therefore, it is important for them to engage in an ongoing effort to reduce the size and footprint of the proposed new facility, which requires a thorough analysis of the operational requirements it fulfills. Even if it turns out that there is no other viable alternative to the current agreement, more thought needs to be given to reducing the facility’s scope and consolidating functions elsewhere. For example, it may be best to consider dropping the idea of a runway for fixed-wing aircraft in the planned new facilities, instead using existing runways elsewhere, while keeping a much smaller heliport in the plans.¶ Having said this, one thing we cannot forget is that any solution to the Futenma problem has to be the product of joint work between two allies, not the product of confrontational negotiations. The US approach seems to be to wait for Japan to come up with a plan, as Prime Minister Hatoyama has promised to do, and then to respond to it. However, this may not be the right way to go. Once any country’s political parties publicly commit to a plan that is so high profile in nature, it is extraordinarily difficult to convince them to back down from their position. The creation of a plan cannot just be a case of Japan deciding what it wishes to do, then going back and forth with the US government. Instead, it needs to be the product of joint work. If we are to have a successful outcome that accommodates the interests of both countries, it is crucial for the United States to enter into deep consultations with Japanese leaders as soon as possible, before Japanese political leaders’ positions become entrenched.¶ Give Greater Consideration to Strengthening Japan’s Contributions¶ With the changes unfolding in Japan and the world around it, Japan also needs to think seriously about how it can better contribute to international security. Japan needs to be taking on a greater share of the burden of ensuring international security, for example by supporting peacekeeping operations, but it has serious limitations under the current legal framework. The cabinet needs to consider if it is still right to stick to the existing interpretation of constitutional prohibitions on the use of force, and the issue of collective self-defense must be reviewed in full detail. The basis for this examination should be the broader legitimacy of potential actions in the regional and global context.¶ Going a step further, Japan needs to be more proactive in creating a better security environment in East Asia. Prime Minister Hatoyama rightly talks about the need for an equal US-Japan partnership and the importance of East Asia community. But when those in Asia talk about East Asia community, they cannot separate this from discussions of the role of the United States, which has been the region’s security guarantor. To go this route, Japan has to begin seriously discussing how to create a better security architecture in the region in partnership with the United States.¶ One can envision a regional security architecture that bridges the need for a robust US-Japan alliance and the importance of constructing an East Asia community. This can be best described using the analogy of a building with four floors. The first floor should be bilateral alliances such as the US-Japan, US-Korea, and US-Australia alliances. All other floors rest upon this one. Moving up, the second floor is trilateral arrangements and forums, including US-Japan-Korea cooperation, a China-Japan-Korea relationship that builds trust even while focusing mainly on economic issues, and, hopefully, some sort of official China- Japan-US trilateral forum. The third floor would consist of sub regional arrangements, most prominently ASEAN in Southeast Asia and an eventual successor to the Six Party Talks in Northeast Asia. And the fourth floor would involve regional arrangements, preferably an action-oriented institution with broad participation from the East Asia Summit countries and the United States that would be designed to respond to a host of nontraditional security issues such as disaster relief, terrorism, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (One option is this author’s proposal for an East Asia Security Forum. See ‘East Asia Community Building: Toward an East Asia Security Forum’). These types of multi-layered institutional arrangements can provide the proper direction for the evolution of the US-Japan alliance as the basis for the regional security architecture.¶ Launch a US-Japan Commission on the Future of the Alliance¶ President Obama’s scheduled visit to Japan in November 2010 provides excellent timing for a joint statement on the US-Japan security alliance, coming as it does during the 50th anniversary of the US-Japan Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security. Any statement should be substantive in nature and forward looking, not merely consisting of platitudes, and for this reason it is important that consultation on the broad outlines of it start right away. Meanwhile, Japan is undergoing an important revision of its National Defense Program Guidelines that should be completed by the end of 2010. It is important to link this to American and Japanese consultations on their vision for regional security and on how to better share their defense burdens.¶ For this purpose, the Japanese and American governments should consider launching a high-profile joint commission to examine the US-Japan alliance and chart a way forward for it. Japan has long been accustomed to dealing with security affairs in a closed room, but it has become clear that there is now a need for greater transparency and active public involvement in the national security debate. This can be aided greatly by a bilateral commission that involves not just government bureaucrats but also politicians, public intellectuals, and representatives of civil society. While the immediate rationale for this review is linked to the changes in governments in both countries and the desire to make the 50th anniversary of the alliance more forward looking—rather than a mere celebration of the past—fundamentally it is needed because the security situation in Asia is changing dramatically with the rise of powers such as China and India and the emergence of new non traditional challenges. Therefore, the commission should have a broad mandate, covering issues running the gamut from basing facilities and the nuclear umbrella to the regional role of the US-Japan alliance and the future of the regional security architecture. Ideally, its deliberations would start in the spring and could help set the general parameters for a November 2010 US-Japan statement on the alliance.¶ Naturally, such a commission could help soothe tensions that will inevitably arise in the aftermath of a final decision on the Futenma relocation plan. But its major contribution would be to encourage Japan to come up with a much clearer and more coherent national security policy. Japan has long avoided in-depth discussions of national security, in a sense closing its eyes and waiting for the United States to save the day. Japan and the world have changed, though, and this is no longer possible, so the time has come for a broader public discussion of Japan’s role in ensuring its own security and in contributing to international security. Defense issues should not be further politicized in Japan, but without defense policy being placed on the domestic political agenda, it will be difficult for Japan to escape the current pattern in which issues are taken up in an overly narrow manner—such as the Futenma relocation plan being examined merely from the perspective of the local burden—so this can instead be discussed in a healthier, broader context.¶ An objective assessment of the US-Japan alliance reveals that it continues to benefit both countries and play an essential role in maintaining peace and security in the region. However, saving it from narrow debates such as the one over the Futenma relocation plan requires flexibility and far-sighted thinking from both sides and, most importantly, it means that they should jointly consult with each other as allies rather than negotiate as adversaries.

# Resentment CP

#### The United States federal government should promote co-location of Japanese and United States bases within Okinawa. The United States federal government should allow local Japanese governments to conduct environmental inspections of American military bases. The United States federal government should take steps to revitalize Okinawa’s economy, including but not limited to improving energy efficiency and renewable energy. The United States federal government should engage Japan in anticipatory public engagement through the Japan-US Educational Commission.

That solves resentment

Cronin et al, 10 **-** Senior Advisor and the Senior Director of the Asia-Pacific Security Program at the Center for a New American Security. (Patrick, “Renewal: Revitalizing the U.S.-Japan Alliance”, October, http://cnas.org/files/documents/publications/CNAS\_Renewal\_CroninKlimanDenmark.pdf)

The United States should take additional measures to defuse local tensions stemming from the presence of American troops in Japan. It can encourage support for American bases (or at least reduce resentment) by granting local Japanese governments the right to conduct environmental inspections of American military facilities, an idea broached in a joint statement issued by the U.S.-Japan Security Consultative Committee in May 2010.72 “Reasonable access” on environmental matters is something local governments in Japan currently desire, and a right that governments of individual U.S. states exercise over federal property, including military bases.¶ Whenever feasible, U.S. military bases should be co-located with Japanese bases to ease local concerns. Co-location has already occurred in Yokota with the groundbreaking establishment of a bilateral joint operations and coordination center.73 As the JSDF makes use of facilities traditionally limited to the U.S. military, an increasing number of “American” bases will fly Japanese flags, easing sovereignty concerns. Co-locating bases not only carries political advantages; it also contributes to greater interoperability between the U.S. military and the JSDF.74¶ Engaging in public outreach, offering “reasonable access" to American military facilities and even co-locating bases will not remedy the challenges that exist on Okinawa. The U.S. footprint there will remain intrusive – American facilities cover almost 20 percent of the island.75 Plus, while U.S. bases on Okinawa create jobs, the island ranks as the poorest of Japan’s 47 prefectures, adding to the level of preexisting frustration.76¶ Although tensions on Okinawa will never fully dissipate so long as intrusive military bases remain there, the United States and Japan can mitigate popular frustration by renewing long-dormant efforts to revitalize Okinawa’s economy. The two governments should scale up an experimental “smart grid” in Okinawa into a “green Okinawa” initiative.77 This would entail investing further to improve the island’s energy efficiency and promote the use of renewable power sources such as solar and wind. A “green Okinawa” initiative could ultimately transform the island, boosting local economic growth and creating jobs.78

Solves resentment

Cronin et al, 10 - Senior Advisor and the Senior Director of the Asia-Pacific Security Program at the Center for a New American Security. (Patrick, “Renewal: Revitalizing the U.S.-Japan Alliance”, October, <http://cnas.org/files/documents/publications/CNAS_Renewal_CroninKlimanDenmark.pdf>)

The Japanese public’s support for the alliance is essential for its long-term viability. Polling in Japan shows general support for the alliance running at close to 80 percent, with rates of support virtually uniform across all age cohorts and both genders.69 Critically, however, frustration with the alliance is bubbling up in localities that host U.S. bases – most prominently, Okinawa. The U.S. and Japanese governments must address this frustration; otherwise, controversies such as that surrounding the relocation of Futenma will torpedo efforts to advance the alliance. As a starting point, leaders in Washington and Tokyo need to articulate unequivocally the enduring value of military bases in Japan. Although both governments retain the right to consider changes to the shape of U.S. forces in Japan, they should make abundantly clear that a long-term military presence is a core value of the alliance. Moreover, the same spirit of frank cooperation that helps to resolve basing issues should also infuse the process for managing other issues related to burden sharing, including the perennial debate over the level of host-nation support Japan provides to the U.S. military. To solidify national public support for the alliance, the United States and Japan should also engage in anticipatory public engagement. One way to do so is to educate members of the Japanese media about the value of the alliance. In Japan, journalists play a vital role in shaping popular views of the alliance. Yet for the most part, they lack real expertise on security issues, resulting in commentary on the alliance that often emphasizes points of discord rather than the alliance’s contributions to the defense of Japan, regional stability and the upkeep of a liberal international order. To create a cadre of security experts inside the Japanese media, Washington and Tokyo should send Japanese journalists to American think tanks or other policy-oriented organizations for intensive training in regional studies and strategic studies. This program could be established under an existing organization such as the Japan-U.S. Educational Commission (Fulbright Japan) or the congressionallysupported Asia Foundation.70

# \*\*\*Guam Economy Defense\*\*\*

# Economy High Now

#### Investments in solar energy stimulate the economy now

Losinio 12

(Louella Losinio, staff writer, 6/29/12, “Guam solar energy contract signed,” <http://www.mvariety.com/cnmi/cnmi-news/local/47609-guam-solar-energy-contract-signed.php> /mr)

HAGÅTÑA — With the Integrated Resource Plan for 2012 soon to be launched this summer, the Guam Power Authority took a historical first step Wednesday by signing a contract for a solar power facility that would put forward one of the goals of the resource plan: to start a renewable energy initiative that would produce at least 35 megawatts of power within the next 10 to 15 years.¶ The GPA signed a contract with Quantum Utility Generation to officially launch Guam’s first renewable energy project — a photovoltaic, AKA solar panel, facility that will produce 20 megawatts of power, enough to provide the energy requirements of 1,700 homes.¶ The facility will be constructed over 150 acres of land near the Layon Landfill in Inarajan. According to the GPA, the facility will use 85,120 photovoltaic panels in order to meet the energy goal.¶ Once the facility is up and running, the GPA figures indicate that more than 63,500 barrels of oil will be saved by shifting to renewable energy. This will also result in a decrease in harmful carbon dioxide, sulfur dioxide, and nitrogen oxide emissions.¶ “We are taking a quantum leap for the island. Our IRP this summer will help us address the cost of energy, and help us diversify our fuel source and add additional renewables, both in the supply side and with the customer side. There are a lot of efforts coming together,” Consolidated Utility Services General Manager John M. Benavente said during the signing of the contract.¶ With the new project, Benavente said the GPA will be converting oil to jobs, and circulate money within the economy by hiring people to construct, operate and maintain the solar energy facilities.¶ For his part, GPA General Manager Joaquin Flores said: “We are helping stimulate the economy — not to stimulate the Singapore economy, but the Guam economy.” He said it took the team more than a year to finalize the project.¶ “Next year, we will see the first kilowatt hour generated from this facility,” Flores proudly said before the contract signing.¶ Consolidated Commission on Utilities Chairman Simon Sanchez emphasized that the project is an attempt to diversify away from oil after realizing the non-renewable energy source creates a very “expensive proposition” for the island.¶ “While solar energy will not necessarily bring your bill down right away, they have the potential to become cheaper than oil in the long run. We want therefore to invest on renewable energy,” Sanchez said.¶ GPA and CCU have developed a policy with the Legislature, he added, that established the goal of achieving 25 percent of renewable power by 2025. In the next 10 years, he is hoping they will be able to achieve this goal.¶ Sanchez emphasized the advantages of entering into a private-public partnership with Quantum Power by stating the company “will take responsibility in whatever inherent risks a project of this type might entail.”¶ “There’s no risk for the people of Guam. If they don’t make the energy, we don’t pay them,” Sanchez explained. “They own it. They operate it. They take the risk. We just pay them for the power they generate,” he added.¶ Quantum will fully finance the project, according to Flores. He said the total contract, based on purchase energy, is about $200 million over 25 years.

#### Recent Regional Free Trade Agreement Solves

#### **Pacific News Center 12**

(Pacific News Center, 6/27/12, a speech by Judi Won Pat, <http://www.pacificnewscenter.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=24944:speakers-weekly-address&catid=45:guam-news&Itemid=156> /mr)

Guam - Speaker Judi Won Pat reports on last week's Association of Pacific Island Legisaltures [APIL] in her Weekly Address.¶ HEAR the Speaker's Weekly Address HERE>>>6-27 speaker address.mp3¶ READ the Speaker's Weekly Address below:¶ “The Guam Legislature secures regional support for growing Guam's economy.”¶ My Dear People of Guam,¶ Buenas yan Hafa Adai! This past week the Guam delegation to the Association of Pacific Island Legislatures (APIL) was successful in¶ securing the support of regional nation states and territories for several important initiatives that are meant to stimulate and sustain local and regional economic growth.¶ I led a delegation of Guam Senators at the APIL’s 31st General Assembly on Saipan this past week and together we were successful in securing support from ten nation states and territories for the Guam-CNMI Visa-Waiver program and a regional Free Trade Agreement.¶ APIL Resolution No. 31-GA-10 expresses the support of APIL member states for Guam and the CNMI visa waiver program to include China. ¶ The resolution was authored and introduced by myself and was co-sponsored by Senator Chris Duenas who is an APIL Director. Senator Tina Rose Muna Barnes was vocal in her testimony and both she and Senator Sam Mabini worked with me to encourage APIL delegates to vote for passage of the resolution. ¶ The regional nation-state leaders saw that the inclusion of China into the Guam-CNMI Visa Waiver program provides new access to a promising tourism market. ¶ In November of last year the APIL adopted a resolution that I introduced that further affirmed its united position in desiring to strengthen our Pacific peoples and governments through trade and economic accords that mutually benefit APIL member nations and territories. ¶ The resolution dubbed the “Blue Continent Free Trade Agreement” called for regional legislatures to facilitate, encourage and promote free trade among island countries and states in the Pacific Region.¶ APIL also adopted a resolution that respectfully called on the chief executives of the respective regional nation states to adopt and¶ promulgate free trade initiatives for our region in the exchange of local goods and services between our nation states.¶ In closing, the future of our island’s economic prosperity must be rooted in an actionable plan that incorporates new markets to Guam and in our region.¶ Saina Ma’ase.

#### Guam’s economy is way better off than US’s

#### Marianas Variety 12

(Mar-Vic Cagurangan, writer for M Variety, 6/26/12, <http://www.mvariety.com/cnmi/cnmi-news/local/47478-guam-banking-sector-still-stable-.php> /mr)

HAGÅTÑA — The local banking industry is generally a safe haven and unlikely to be affected by the crisis currently besetting U.S. banks, Bank of Guam chief economist Joseph Bradley said on Sunday.¶ “Because of our geographical location, Guam banks are conservative in their lending practices; they don’t engage in subprime lending and don’t expose themselves to risky loans,” Bradley told Variety.¶ Bradley also noted that local financial institutions don’t participate in high-risk trading that puts U.S. banks in peril.¶ Moody’s Investors Service on Thursday downgraded the credit ratings for five large U.S. banks — including Bank of America, JPMorgan Chase, Goldman Sachs, HSBC and Citigroup — along with those of 10 other global financial institutions.¶ In a statement posted on its website, Moody’s said the banks — whose credit ratings dropped by one to three notches — have shrinking prospects for long-term profitability and growth.¶ “All of the banks affected by today’s actions have significant exposure to the volatility and risk of outsized losses inherent to capital market activities,” Moody’s Global Banking Managing Director Greg Bauer said in a statement.¶ Citigroup Inc., which owns Citibank Guam, challenged Moody’s rating, saying its assessment was “arbitrary and completely unwarranted.”¶ “Moody’s approach is backward-looking and fails to recognize Citi’s transformation over the past several years, the strength and diversity of Citi’s franchise, and the substantial improvements in Citi’s risk management, capital levels and liquidity,” Citigroup said in a statement.¶ Citi said it had more than $420 billion of surplus liquidity held generally in cash and government securities at the end of the first quarter of 2012.¶ “We have surplus liquidity based on a variety of stress tests and liquidity models, and Citi exceeds the proposed Basel III liquidity coverage ratio requirement with a ratio of approximately 125 percent, even though this measurement does not go into effect until 2015,” the statement said.¶ If anything, Citi said, the U.S. financial system is stronger, not weaker, than it was before the 2008 meltdown as a result of new regulations that “have substantially enhanced the stability and resilience of the system.”¶ While saying the U.S. banks’ credit rating crisis “will not have any impact on Guam at all,” Bradley agreed that Moody’s could have been a little more gentle with its verdicts.¶ “A one step downgrade may be more reasonable, but two notches may be a little harsh,” Bradley said. “Moody’s might have missed the adjustments that U.S. banks have made.”¶ He said Moody’s is still “recovering from the errors” it had made prior to 2008, which saw a global recession that analysts attributed to understatement of risks.¶ Just the same, Bradley said, the mass credit downgrade of U.S. banks “is not an indicator of another meltdown.”¶ “There are other problems in the world that can contribute to a meltdown,” he added.¶ At any rate, Bradley said Guam’s banking industry has its own story, with data indicating its healthy state. In his economic update presentation at the Bank of Guam-sponsored forum in March, Bradley said deposits in Guam banks have grown to $2.30 billion, accounting for an 18 percent increase in two years.¶ Bradley said the surge in deposits can be attributed to the tax refund releases, coupled with people’s new cautious attitude. “People are more nervous about the economy so they are saving more money in case something goes wrong,” he said.¶ The Calvo administration released a total of $197 million in tax refunds in December 2011 and another $93 million this year.¶ “That money stays in the local economy. Some people put their tax refund money in the bank while others spent their cash into local businesses. In turn, these businesses have more money to put in the bank,” Bradley said.¶ The local mortgage industry is equally stable, he said. “Those banks that were making bad loans are no longer in business,” Bradley said. “Today, banks are making every effort to work out arrangements with their borrowers.”¶ The last time Guam experienced a mortgage crisis was between 2003 and 2005. “There were lots of foreclosures then, but part of that was [a result] of a bad economy. Many people left Guam after (Supertyphoon) Pongsona,” he said.¶ Meanwhile, Moody’s noted that the banks with downgraded credit ratings also engage in other, “often market leading business activities that are central to Moody’s assessment of their credit profiles.”¶ “These activities can provide important shock absorbers that mitigate the potential volatility of capital markets operations, but they also present unique risks and challenges,” Bauer said.

#### Guam economy recovering- tourism and national defense

Osman 2k4

(Wali M. Osman ph.D. is a regional economist, “An Update on the economies off Guam and commonwealth of the northern mariana islands”, May 2004, pg online @ http://www.doi.gov/archive/oia/Osman/Osmanreports/An%20Update%20on%20the%20Guam%20and%20CNMI%20Economies.pdf)

Following several years of stagnation and decline, Guam’s economy is headed for ¶ recovery and growth. The levels of activity in the two main engines of growth, tourism ¶ and national defense, are rising, although for different reasons and with different effects ¶ on Guam’s economy, the labor market and public finances. ¶ While benefiting hotels, restaurants, shopping malls and other facilities catering ¶ mainly to tourists, increases in tourist traffic without discernible increases in the average ¶ tourist spending tend to have subtle and gradual effects on the economy, government ¶ finances and the labor market. With Guam’s hotel occupancy rates averaging in the 50-60 ¶ percent range during most of the last 3-4 years, currently projected increases in tourist ¶ traffic are a long way from bringing financial strength to local hotels and making a ¶ visible impact on the rest of the economy. At such an early stage of recovery and ¶ expansion, gains in tourist traffic have to be registered for several months to be ¶ considered a turning point from the current stage of the business cycle. ¶ By contrast, increases in defense spending, especially in force and personnel, ¶ refurbishment of base facilities and new construction projects tend to have a more ¶ perceptible effect, as some of these create immediate work opportunities. Now that both ¶ tourism and defense outlays are rising simultaneously, the prospect for recovery in ¶ Guam’s economy is better than in several years. It is too early to suggest the depth and ¶ breadth of this recovery, but if both tourism and defense spending rise consistently for 4-¶ 6 months, it will be possible to make a more quantitative assessment of gains in business, ¶ the tax base, public finances, employment and, eventually, total output.

# Alt Causes

Regional and Global Economic Downturn hurts the Economy

Guam Economic Recovery and Development Team, Bureau of Statistics and Plans, and Guam Economic Development and Commerce Authority 3

(Government of Guam, “The Guam Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy,” April 2003, <http://www.bsp.guam.gov/Socio_Econ/2003CEDSFINALv3.pdf> /mr)

As part of the Guam’s economic fate is not only tied to the United States but more directly affected¶ by the regional economic downturn that eventually led to the disastrous Asian economic meltdown¶ in 1997-1998. The island’s unemployment rate, which hovered at 8% from 1994 through 1996, rose¶ to 10% in 1997, and then surpassed 15% in 1999 and 2000. While Guam is now stabilizing from¶ the effects of the Asian Economic Crisis, the struggle to recover will be hampered by recent¶ economic setbacks in the United States and Japan. As the economic outlook for the U.S. (Asia’s¶ biggest single market for the region’s exports) has become increasingly less optimistic, the United¶ Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UN-ESCAP), was prompted¶ to declare that its 2001 forecast for a 6.0 percent GDP expansion for Asia’s developing nations was¶ too optimistic. While no one is predicting another regional crisis, and the U.S. slowdown is¶ expected to be short-lived, the current economic performance of the U.S. and Japan will undoubtedly¶ delay the region’s full economic recovery.

#### Alt Causes

#### a. Social Services

Guam Economic Recovery and Development Team, Bureau of Statistics and Plans, and Guam Economic Development and Commerce Authority 3

(Government of Guam, “The Guam Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy,” April 2003, <http://www.bsp.guam.gov/Socio_Econ/2003CEDSFINALv3.pdf> /mr)

Lagging Social Services¶ Relative to the U.S. and developed countries is Asia, Guam’s education and health systems¶ are far below standard. Educational and skill levels of Guam’s workforces are not presently¶ sufficient for the needs of a growing and diversifying economy. Also, poor education and¶ health services adversely affect overseas investor or company decisions to use Guam as a¶ regional corporate base

b. Lack of land and labor

Guam Economic Recovery and Development Team, Bureau of Statistics and Plans, and Guam Economic Development and Commerce Authority 3

(Government of Guam, “The Guam Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy,” April 2003, <http://www.bsp.guam.gov/Socio_Econ/2003CEDSFINALv3.pdf> /mr)

Lack of Land and Low-Cost Labor¶ Guam cannot compete in industries that require an abundance of inexpensive land and lowcost labor. In combination with improved education and training, Guam should set its sights¶ on export industries that produce high quality, technologically advanced goods and services.

c. Tariff Regulations

Guam Economic Recovery and Development Team, Bureau of Statistics and Plans, and Guam Economic Development and Commerce Authority 3

(Government of Guam, “The Guam Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy,” April 2003, <http://www.bsp.guam.gov/Socio_Econ/2003CEDSFINALv3.pdf> /mr)

U.S. Tariff Regulation¶ Guam is subject to the U.S. minimum wage law and regulated shipping tariffs, which reduce¶ Guam’s wage and international shipping competitiveness, especially when compared with¶ neighboring Asian countries.

d. Restrictive local laws

Guam Economic Recovery and Development Team, Bureau of Statistics and Plans, and Guam Economic Development and Commerce Authority 3

(Government of Guam, “The Guam Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy,” April 2003, <http://www.bsp.guam.gov/Socio_Econ/2003CEDSFINALv3.pdf> /mr)

Restrictive local laws¶ Local regulation for some sectors, especially finance and insurance, are unduly restrictive¶ and inhibit overseas investment in those sectors.

# Ports CP

## Note- Here’s what the program is

### SEC. 2829. PORT OF GUAM IMPROVEMENT ENTERPRISE PROGRAM.

(a) In General- The Secretary of Transportation, acting through the Administrator of the Maritime Administration (in this section referred to as the `Administrator'), may establish a Port of Guam Improvement Enterprise Program (in this section referred to as the `Program') to provide for the planning, design, and construction of projects for the Port of Guam to improve facilities, relieve port congestion, and provide greater access to port facilities.

(b) Authorities of the Administrator- In carrying out the Program, the Administrator may--

(1) receive funds provided for the Program from non-Federal entities, including private entities;

(2) provide for coordination among appropriate governmental agencies to expedite the review process under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) for projects carried out under the Program;

(3) provide for coordination among appropriate governmental agencies in connection with other reviews and requirements applicable to projects carried out under the Program; and

(4) provide technical assistance to the Port Authority of Guam (and its agents) as needed for projects carried out under the Program.

(c) Port of Guam Improvement Enterprise Fund-

(1) ESTABLISHMENT- There is established in the Treasury of the United States a separate account to be known as the `Port of Guam Improvement Enterprise Fund' (in this section referred to as the `Fund').

(2) DEPOSITS- There shall be deposited into the Fund--

(A) amounts received by the Administrator from non-Federal sources under subsection (b)(1);

(B) amounts transferred to the Administrator under subsection (d); and

(C) amounts appropriated to carry out this section under subsection (f).

(3) USE OF AMOUNTS- Amounts in the Fund shall be available to the Administrator to carry out the Program.

(4) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES- Not to exceed 3 percent of the amounts appropriated to the Fund for a fiscal year may be used for administrative expenses of the Administrator.

(5) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS- Amounts in the Fund shall remain available until expended.

(d) Transfers of Amounts- Amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for any fiscal year for an intermodal or marine facility comprising a component of the Program shall be transferred to and administered by the Administrator.

(e) Limitation- Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize amounts made available under section 215 of title 23, United States Code, or any other amounts made available for the construction of highways or amounts otherwise not eligible for making port improvements to be deposited into the Fund.

(f) Authorization of Appropriations- There are authorized to be appropriated to the Fund such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

## CP

#### The United States federal government should complete the Port Improvement Project through the Port of Guam Improvement Enterprise Program.

#### CP solves long term economy- jobs, technological innovation, and private sector

Port Authority of Guam 09

(ECONOMIC IMPACT AND JOBS¶ ANALYSIS OF THE PORT¶ IMPROVEMENT PROJECT, August 2009, BTS Associates)

The Port Improvement Project will enable increased employment in Guam, particularly in the¶ private sector. The Project will have not only a positive effect on employment, but also on Gross¶ Domestic Product and personal incomes in Guam and the U.S. mainland. This is particularly¶ evident with the DOD buildup, which cannot occur without the Project’s improvements to the Port¶ of Guam.¶ After construction, the Project will generate ongoing Port/transportation-related jobs. The¶ Government of Guam’s Procurement Technical Assistance Center (PTAC) plays a key role in¶ ensuring that the growth in sales by Guam businesses to the government supports the creation¶ of high-wage jobs and promotes technology innovation. The PTAC program is a pragmatic¶ approach to help Guam businesses build capacity, transition to high-wage jobs, and help make¶ Guam a contributor to the defense industrial base of the future.

#### CP generates better jobs and stimulus for economic growth

Port Authority of Guam 09

(ECONOMIC IMPACT AND JOBS¶ ANALYSIS OF THE PORT¶ IMPROVEMENT PROJECT, August 2009, BTS Associates)

The Port Improvement Project will generate jobs and economic stimulus in a severely distressed¶ area. Guam’s per capita income was a mere $12,768 in 2005,2 approximately 37% of the U.S.¶ average in that year.¶ The most recent unemployment rate available for Guam is for September 2007, when Guam¶ experienced unemployment at a rate of 8.3%.3 At the time, Guam’s unemployment rate was¶ 2.1% higher than that of the U.S. (at 6.2%). In general, unemployment has always been higher¶ in Guam than in the mainland U.S. Guam is clearly an Economically Distressed Area.¶ The jobs created during construction will be high-quality jobs, as the average wage paid will be¶ significantly higher than the average wage in the private sector:¶ 􀁸 According to the Government of Guam Department of Labor, the average annual wage in¶ Guam is currently $21,970 across all private sector jobs.¶ 􀁸 Construction jobs in Guam (general contracting) average $27,900 per year, which is 26.8%¶ higher than the average private sector wage in Guam.¶ 􀁸 The jobs created at the Port of Guam have an average income of $32,930, which is 49.9%¶ higher than the average private sector wage in Guam..

#### CP solves a bigger internal link to economy

US Department of Transportation Maritime Administration No Date

(US Department of Transportation Maritime Administration, “Port of Guam Improvement Enterprise Program,” <http://www.marad.dot.gov/ports_landing_page/infra_dev_congestion_mitigation/port_term_infra_dev/pt_infra_dev_guam/guam.htm> /mr)

Vision¶ The vision of the Port of Guam Improvement Enterprise Program provide a partnership between the federal government, the Government of Guam, and the Port Authority of Guam to modernize and improve the Jose D. Leon Guerrero Commercial Port for the benefit of the citizens of Guam, its stakeholders, and the surrounding region.¶ Mission¶ The mission of the Port of Guam Improvement Enterprise Program is to modernize and improve stimulate economic development and provide more efficient movement of goods and services through the Port of Guam. By modernizing and expanding the existing facilities and equipment, the Port will be able to meet expected growth in established trade, encourage natural resource exports, and create employment opportunities by attracting new industry and new cargo movement.¶ Overview¶ The Maritime Administration established a partnership in 2008 with the Government of Guam and Port Authority of Guam to assist them in modernizing and expanding the Jose D. Leon Guerrero Commercial Port. In establishing this program, the agency’s role will be to provide federal oversight and coordination of projects under the program, to act as a central procurement organization, leveraging federal, non-federal, and private funding resources, and streamlining the environmental review and permitting process.¶ The Jose D. Leon Guerrero Commercial Port is a vital asset to the economy of Guam and to the national security of the United States. The Port was originally constructed by the U.S. Navy in the 1960s and was turned over to the Government of Guam in the 1970s. Since that time, the Port has remained largely unchanged and requires substantial improvements in order to continue providing the level of service required by the community and other stakeholders. Further, the timely completion of this major infrastructure improvement program is necessary in order to provide modern and efficient transportation access to the island of Guam and to the region to meet the Department of Defense requirements for the Guam build-up.¶

#### Port key to cargo efficiency and economic growth

Port Authority of Guam 09

(Port Authority of Guam, Report to the Legislature Pursuant to 5 GCA Chapter 9 § 9301, 2007 revised in 2009, Port Authority of Guam PDF)

The Port will be one of the first critical and immediate infrastructural components in Guam that will experience tremendous impacts from the impending surge in cargo demand. The modernization of the berths, wharves and upland areas upon completion of the engineering and environmental studies would provide the critical and immediate infrastructure improvements necessary to handle the increased cargo demands and improve cargo handling operations and efficiency. The proposed modernized port will generate revenue for the Port and the island economy as a whole. It is imperative that the Port immediately begin the facility modernization and improvements needed to meet these projected demands in an environmentally acceptable manner.

# Guam Economy CP

That solves

Guam Economic Recovery and Development Team, Bureau of Statistics and Plans, and Guam Economic Development and Commerce Authority 3

(Government of Guam, “The Guam Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy,” April 2003, <http://www.bsp.guam.gov/Socio_Econ/2003CEDSFINALv3.pdf> /mr)

Six-point Action Framework on Ten Strategic Initiatives¶ A Six Point Action Framework was also developed as a platform from which immediate action¶ would be taken as follows:¶ 1. Promote tourism aggressively and fix our Guam product. Target markets including¶ Japan, Korea, China/Asia and military “R&R” personnel will be agressively pursued in order¶ to generate immediate cash income and diversify our visitor markets. A Tumon¶ Improvement District will be created to restore destination viability and protect the driver¶ of $2 billion in island income.¶ 2. Increase military presence and uncorrelated regional employment opportunities. ¶ Military presence will be increased to provide immediate cash income for Guam, and¶ produce a more stable and permanent revenue base. Guam’s regional advantages will also¶ be promoted to cultivate the development of industries uncorrelated with tourism and the military in order to provide incremental income, diversify employment opportunities, and¶ broaden the tax base.¶ 3. Reorganize the government of Guam’s structure. This strategy is intended to consolidate¶ and streamline departments and agencies in order to reduce waste and costs to government,¶ and to improve services and interagency coordination.¶ 4. Improve revenue management and Retirement Fund reforms. This strategy is intended¶ to consolidate and refinance existing debt in order to improve cash flow, interest savings,¶ and debt management. An interdepartmental core team will be established to maximize¶ federal entitlements in order to provides cost savings and income opportunities, timely¶ payment to vendors, and improve federal grants management and accountability. Retirement¶ fund abuses will also be addressed in order to generate cash flow, reduce costs and enhance¶ financial security of retirees.¶ 5. Facilitate immediate capital improvement expenditures. GWA and Ordot Landfill¶ problems will be fixed and spending of $82 million in idle funds already available for capital¶ improvement and other operational projects will be expedited in order to resolve EPA and¶ other legal issues, improve the quality of life, stimulate construction activity, and improve¶ our investment image.¶ 6. Facilitate GWA privatization and outsourcing initiatives. Guam Waterworks Authority,¶ Department of Corrections and Department of Youth Affairs will be privatized and other¶ government functions, maintenance and services will be outsourced in order to improve¶ reliability of services, reduce cost of government, and convert tax consuming activities to¶ tax producing enterprises to expand the island’s tax base.

# \*\*\*Deterrence Defense\*\*\*

# Deterrence CP

**The USFG should relocate [the amount of marines the plan advocates] from Okinawa to Tinian.**

**Guam can’t sustain marines- Tinian provides alternate space**

EIS 10

(Final EIS, “Guam and CNMI Military Relocation”, July 2012, pg online @ http://www.guambuildupeis.us/documents/final/volume\_3/Vol\_03\_Ch01\_Purpose\_Of\_and\_Need\_For\_Actions.pdf)

Training operations proposed on Tinian would support individual up to company level sustainment ¶training for the relocated Marines. Sustainment training is training that enables Marine Corps forces to ¶maintain combat readiness. The individual and crew-served weapons qualification ranges are proposed ¶ for Guam (refer to Volume 2, Chapter 2, Section 2.3). The training that would take place on Tinian is ¶essential to the end-state of sustaining combat readiness of Guam-based Marines. The proposed Tinian ¶ ranges are for training Marines with use of weapons similar to the Guam ranges (5.65 mm and below) but ¶ in tactical scenarios. Individual-level training would occur on Guam as travel distances and logistics to ¶ Tinian would not be practical for individual-level training. Training in tactical scenarios requires larger ¶ areas than is available on Guam. Training units would include ground elements that would enable three of ¶ the four components of the Marine Air Ground Task Force (Command, Ground, Air, and Logistics) to ¶ accomplish weapons training tasks according to Mission Essential Task List, as designated by appropriate ¶ commanders

**Guam doesn’t have enough training space- plan can’t solve operational readiness**

**Kan 12**

(Shirley A. Kan is a specialist in Asian Security affairs, “Guam: US Defense Deployments”, March 29 2012, Congressional Research Service, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS22570.pdf)

Tinian. The study also found that Guam cannot accommodate all training for the relocated ¶marines, and the nearby island of Tinian (100 miles away) could help to provide land for their ¶ training. There would be a challenge for sustaining operational readiness in training while ¶limiting the time and expense to travel to train. The study found that “the training ranges ¶currently planned for Guam and Tinian only replicate existing individual-skills training ¶capabilities on Okinawa and do not provide for all requisite collective, combined arms, live and ¶maneuver training the Marine Corps forces must meet to sustain core competencies. As with ¶ Marine Corps forces currently in Okinawa who must now travel to mainland Japan, other partner ¶ nations, and the U.S. to accomplish this requisite core competency training, the Marine Corps ¶forces relocating from Okinawa to Guam would also have to use alternate locations to accomplish ¶requisite core competency training.” After a visit to Guam, Tinian, and Saipan in February 2010, ¶ Senator James Webb expressed concern about placing live-fire ranges on Guam for the Marine ¶ Corps and urged greater use of Tinian. Also, Guam’s Delegate Madeleine Bordallo expressed ¶ concern about a proposed firing range on Guam and urged the Pentagon to consider an alternative ¶ for a range on Tinian, at a hearing on March 15, 2011, of the House Armed Services ¶ Subcommittee on Readiness. The Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Energy, Installations, and ¶ Environment testified that certain training for the marines needs to be on the island of Guam. ¶In addition, the Navy would need a new deep-draft wharf at Apra Harbor to support a transient ¶ aircraft carrier. Third, the Army would relocate about 600 military personnel to establish and ¶ operate an Air and Missile Defense Task Force (AMDTF).

# Guam Bad for Deterrence

#### Not enough training space- plan can’t solve operational readiness

Kan 12

(Shirley A. Kan is a specialist in Asian Security affairs, “Guam: US Defense Deployments”, March 29 2012, Congressional Research Service, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS22570.pdf)

Tinian. The study also found that Guam cannot accommodate all training for the relocated ¶ marines, and the nearby island of Tinian (100 miles away) could help to provide land for their ¶ training. There would be a challenge for sustaining operational readiness in training while ¶ limiting the time and expense to travel to train. The study found that “the training ranges ¶ currently planned for Guam and Tinian only replicate existing individual-skills training ¶ capabilities on Okinawa and do not provide for all requisite collective, combined arms, live and ¶ maneuver training the Marine Corps forces must meet to sustain core competencies. As with ¶ Marine Corps forces currently in Okinawa who must now travel to mainland Japan, other partner ¶ nations, and the U.S. to accomplish this requisite core competency training, the Marine Corps ¶ forces relocating from Okinawa to Guam would also have to use alternate locations to accomplish ¶ requisite core competency training.” After a visit to Guam, Tinian, and Saipan in February 2010, ¶ Senator James Webb expressed concern about placing live-fire ranges on Guam for the Marine ¶ Corps and urged greater use of Tinian. Also, Guam’s Delegate Madeleine Bordallo expressed ¶ concern about a proposed firing range on Guam and urged the Pentagon to consider an alternative ¶ for a range on Tinian, at a hearing on March 15, 2011, of the House Armed Services ¶ Subcommittee on Readiness. The Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Energy, Installations, and ¶ Environment testified that certain training for the marines needs to be on the island of Guam. ¶ In addition, the Navy would need a new deep-draft wharf at Apra Harbor to support a transient ¶ aircraft carrier. Third, the Army would relocate about 600 military personnel to establish and ¶ operate an Air and Missile Defense Task Force (AMDTF).

Guam more susceptible to terrorist and China attacks

Kan 12

(Shirley A. Kan is a specialist in Asian Security affairs, “Guam: US Defense Deployments”, March 29 2012, Congressional Research Service, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS22570.pdf)

A concern is that Guam’s higher military profile could increase its potential as a ¶ strategic target for terrorists and adversaries during a conflict. For example, potential PRC and ¶ DPRK missile attacks could raise Guam’s need for missile defense. Still, when he worked in ¶ Guam in 1974, Senator James Webb wrote that “as long as the U.S. maintains and communicates ¶ a credible military presence and capability, Guam is under no greater threat, in reality, than any ¶ other part of the U.S.”¶ 21¶ China is believed to have deployed ballistic missiles that could target ¶ Guam, considered by China as part of the “Second Island Chain” from which it needs to break out ¶ of perceived U.S.-led “containment.” China’s missiles that could target forces based at Guam ¶ include the DF-3A (CSS-2) medium-range ballistic missile (MRBM). China also has developed ¶ an extended-range DH-10 ground-launched land-attack cruise missile (LACM) and the world’s ¶ first anti-ship ballistic missile (ASBM), the DF-21D ASBM, to target aircraft carriers and other ¶ ships. While the DF-21D’s initial range could be 1,500-2,000 km (930-1240 mi), a more ¶ advanced variant could extend the range to about 3,000 km and reach Guam.¶ 22¶ In addition, the ¶ DPRK has developed an intermediate range ballistic missile (IRBM) with a range over 2,000 ¶ miles. There has been a question about whether North Korea deployed this IRBM. In 2008, South ¶ Korea’s Defense White Paper stated that North Korea started to deploy its IRBM (Taepodong-X) ¶ with a range that could reach Guam. At a high-profile military parade in October 2010, North ¶ Korea showed a new IRBM (a missile some called Musudan), apparently deployed without flight ¶ testing in North Korea. It was unclear whether it was the same IRBM reported by South Korea, ¶ with a different designation. The U.S. National Intelligence Council (NIC) reported to Congress ¶ in early 2011 that North Korea in 2010 continued to develop a mobile IRBM and did not report ¶ that it was deployed. Still, the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), Lieutenant ¶ General Ronald Burgess, Jr., testified to the Senate Armed Services Committee on March 10, ¶ 2011, that North Korea has tried to upgrade already deployed missiles that included IRBMs.¶ 23

#### Guam is even worse for deterrence

Bruce Klingner, Senior Research Fellow for Northeast Asia in the Asian Studies Center at The Heritage Foundation, 2009 (“U.S. Should Stay Firm on Implementation of Okinawa Force Realignment,” Heritage Foundation Backgrounder #2352, December 15th, Available Online at<http://www.heritage.org/Research/AsiaandthePacific/bg2352.cfm>)

Okinawa's strategic location contributes to potent U.S. deterrent and power projection capabilities as well as enabling rapid and flexible contingency response, including to natural disasters in Asia. Marine ground units on Okinawa can utilize Futenma airlift to deploy quickly to amphibious assault and landing ships stationed at the nearby U.S. Naval Base at Sasebo, Nagasaki Prefecture.¶ Okinawa has four long runways: two at Kadena Air Base, one at Futenma, and one at Naha civilian airfield. The Futenma runway would likely be eliminated after return to Okinawa control to enable further civilian urban expansion. The planned FRF would compensate by building two new (albeit shorter) runways at Camp Schwab. However, if the Futenma unit redeployed to Guam instead, no new runway on Okinawa would be built. Japan would have thus lost a strategic national security asset, which includes the capability to augment U.S. or Japanese forces during a crisis in the region. Not having runways at Futenma or Schwab would be like sinking one's own aircraft carrier, putting further strain on the two runways at Kadena.¶ Redeploying U.S. forces from Japan and Okinawa to Guam would reduce alliance deterrent and combat capabilities. Guam is 1,400 miles, a three-hour flight, and multiple refueling operations farther from potential conflict zones. Furthermore, moving fixed-wing aircraft to Guam would drastically reduce the number of combat aircraft sorties that U.S. forces could conduct during crises with North Korea or China, while exponentially increasing refueling and logistic requirements.

#### Guam can’t sustain marines- Tinian provides alternate space

EIS 10

(Final EIS, “Guam and CNMI Military Relocation”, July 2012, pg online @ http://www.guambuildupeis.us/documents/final/volume\_3/Vol\_03\_Ch01\_Purpose\_Of\_and\_Need\_For\_Actions.pdf)

Training operations proposed on Tinian would support individual up to company level sustainment ¶ training for the relocated Marines. Sustainment training is training that enables Marine Corps forces to ¶ maintain combat readiness. The individual and crew-served weapons qualification ranges are proposed ¶ for Guam (refer to Volume 2, Chapter 2, Section 2.3). The training that would take place on Tinian is ¶ essential to the end-state of sustaining combat readiness of Guam-based Marines. The proposed Tinian ¶ ranges are for training Marines with use of weapons similar to the Guam ranges (5.65 mm and below) but ¶ in tactical scenarios. Individual-level training would occur on Guam as travel distances and logistics to ¶ Tinian would not be practical for individual-level training. Training in tactical scenarios requires larger ¶ areas than is available on Guam. Training units would include ground elements that would enable three of ¶ the four components of the Marine Air Ground Task Force (Command, Ground, Air, and Logistics) to ¶ accomplish weapons training tasks according to Mission Essential Task List, as designated by appropriate ¶ commanders

# **China War Defense**

**First strike checks China War**

Lieber and Press 6 – Keir A. Leiber, author of War and the Engineers: The Primacy of Politics over Technology, Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Notre Dame. Daryl G. Press, author of Calculating Credibility: How Leaders Assess Military Threats, Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Pennsylvania ("The Rise of U.S. Nuclear Primacy, Foreign Affairs, March/April 2006)

China's nuclear arsenal is even more vulnerable to a U.S. attack. A U.S. first strike could succeed whether it was launched as a surprise or in the midst of a crisis during a Chinese alert. China has a limited strategic nuclear arsenal. The People'sLiberation Army currently possesses no modern SSBNs or long-range bombers. Its naval arm used to have two ballistic missile submarines, but one sank, and the other, which had such poor capabilities that it never left Chinese waters, is no longer operational. China's medium-range bomber force is similarly unimpressive: the bombers are obsolete and vulnerable to attack. According to unclassified U.S. government assessments, China's entire intercontinental nuclear arsenal consists of 18stationary single-warhead ICBMs. These are not ready to launch on warning: their warheads are kept in storage and the missiles themselves are unfueled. (China's ICBMs use liquid fuel, which corrodes the missiles after 24 hours. Fueling them is estimated to take two hours.) The lack of an advanced early warning system adds to the vulnerability of the ICBMs. It appears that China would have no warning at all of a U.S. submarine-launched missile attack or a strike using hundreds of stealthy nuclear-armed cruise missiles. Many sources claim that China is attempting to reduce the vulnerability of its ICBMs by building decoy silos. But decoys cannot provide a firm basis for deterrence. It would take close to a thousand fake silos to make a U.S. first strike on China as difficult as an attack on Russia, and no available information on China's nuclear forces suggests the existence of massive fields of decoys. And even if China built them, its commanders would always wonder whether U.S. sensors could distinguish real silos from fake ones. Despite much talk about China's military modernization, the odds that Beijing will acquire a survivable nuclear deterrent in the next decade are slim. China's modernization efforts have focused on conventional forces, and the country's progress on nuclear modernization has accordingly been slow. Since the mid-1980s, China has been trying to develop a new missile for its future ballistic missile submarine as well as mobile ICBMs (the DF-31 and longer-range DF-31A) to replace its current ICBM force. The U.S. Defense Department predicts that China may deploy DF-31s in a few years, although the forecast should be treated skeptically: U.S. intelligence has been announcing the missile's imminent deployment for decades. Even when they are eventually fielded, the DF-31s are unlikely to significantly reduce China's vulnerability. The missiles' limited range, estimated to be only 8,000 kilometers (4,970 miles), greatly restricts the area in which they can be hidden, reducing the difficulty of searching for them. The DF-31s could hit the contiguous United States only if they were deployed in China's far northeastern corner, principally in Heilongjiang Province, near the Russian-North Korean border. But Heilongjiang is mountainous, and so the missiles might be deployable only along a few hundred kilometers of good road or in a small plain in the center of the province. Such restrictions increase the missiles' vulnerability and raise questions about whether they are even intended to target the U.S. homelandor whether they will be aimed at targets in Russia and Asia. Given the history of China's slow-motion nuclear modernization, it is doubtful that a Chinese second-strike force will materialize anytime soon. The United States has a first-strike capability against China today and should be able to maintain it for a decade or more.

**2. No risk – Break-up of states is unlikely, ideological tensions decreased, and multilateral structures prevent war.**

**Straits Times 08** “Why War is Unlikely in Asia” [http://www.asiaone.com/News/the%2BStraits%2BTimes/Story/A1Story20080625-72716.html](http://www.asiaone.com/News/the%2BStraits%2BTimes/Story/A1Story20080625-72716.html%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank)

Nevertheless, the region is more stable than one might believe. Separatism remains a challenge, but the break-up of states is unlikely. The North Korean nuclear issue, while not fully resolved, is moving towards a conclusion with the likely denuclearisation of the peninsula. Tensions between China and Taiwan seem unlikely to erupt into conflict, especially after the recent victories of the Kuomintang in Taiwan. The region also possesses significant multilateral structures such as the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum, the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation, the nascent Six-Party Talks forum and, in particular, Asean.

**2. US won’t be drawn in – No escalation.**

**Jeffrey Record 01**, professor of strategy and international security at the Air War College at Maxwell AFB, senior research fellow at the Center for Int’l Strategy, Technology, and Policy at the Georgia Institute of Technology, PhD from Johns Hopkins School of Advanced Int’l Studies, Winter 2001, Aerospace Power Journal, v15 i4, “Thinking about China and War,” p. InfoTrac OneFile

Chinese military action against Asian mainland states not allied with the United States probably would not occasion a direct,armed US response. Sino-Russian, -Indian, and -Vietnamese war scenarios of the kind that transpired in 1962, 1969, and 1979, respectively, would not directlyengage the vital interests of the United States--unless they spilled over into attacks on US forces and allies. Why would the United States intervene in such conflicts? To be sure, it has a general interest in peace and stability on the Asian mainland and a specific interest in deterring nuclear war between other states. But would it go to war to prevent a nuclear exchange between, say, Russia and China? It was certainly not prepared to do so to deter an Indo-Pakistani exchangeduring the South Asian nuclear-war scare of 1999.

**4. No impact – China is rising peacefully, and their military buildup is not threatening.**

**Straits Times 08** “Why War is Unlikely in Asia” [http://www.asiaone.com/News/the%2BStraits%2BTimes/Story/A1Story20080625-72716.html](http://www.asiaone.com/News/the%2BStraits%2BTimes/Story/A1Story20080625-72716.html%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank)

But the rise of China does not automatically mean that conflict is likely. First, a more assertive China does not mean a moreaggressive China. Beijing appears content to press its claims peacefully (if forcefully) through existing avenues and institutions. Second, when we examine the Chinese military buildup, we find that there may be less there than some might have us believe. The Chinese war machine is not quite as threatening - although still worrisome - as some fear.

# Africa War Defense

**1. No risk of great power conflict over Africa.**

Robert **Barrett 05**, PhD Military & Strategic Studies, U of Calgary, 6/1, [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/SSRN\_ID726162\_code327511.pdf?abstractid=726162&mirid=1](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/SSRN_ID726162_code327511.pdf?abstractid=726162&mirid=1" \t "_blank)

Westerners eager to promote democracy must be wary of African politicians who promise democratic reform without sincere commitment to the process. Offering money to corrupt leaders in exchange for their taking small steps away from autocracy may in fact be a way of pushing countries into anocracy. As such, world financial lenders and interventionists who wield leverage and influence must take responsibility in considering the ramifications of African nations who adopt democracy in order to maintain elite political privileges. The obvious reason for this, aside from the potential costs in human life should conflict arise from hastily constructed democratic reforms, is the fact that Western donors, in the face of intrastate war would then be faced with channeling funds and resources away from democratization efforts and toward conflict intervention based on issues of human security. This is a problem, as Western nations may be increasingly wary of intervening in Africa hotspots after experiencing firsthand the unpredictable and unforgiving nature of societal warfare in both Somalia and Rwanda. On a costbenefit basis, the West continues to be somewhat reluctant to get involved in Africa’s dirty wars, evidenced by its political hesitation when discussing ongoing sanguinary grassroots conflicts in Africa. Even as the world apologizes for bearing witness to the Rwandan genocide without having intervened, the U nited S tates, recently using the label ‘genocide’in the context of the Sudanese conflict (in September of 2004), has only proclaimed sanctions against Sudan, while dismissing any suggestions at actual intervention (Giry, 2005). Part of the problem is that traditional military and diplomatic approachs at separating combatants and enforcing ceasefires have yielded little in Africa. No powerful nations want to get embroiled in conflicts they cannot win – especially those conflicts in which the intervening nation has very little interest.

**2. Other African conflicts make their impact inevitable**

Dr. Jeffrey **Deutsch**, founder of the Rabid Tiger Project, December 15, **2002**, The Rabid Tiger Newsletter, Vol. II, No. 10, “Africa’s Horn O’Plenty (of Trouble),” [http://www.rabidtigers.com/rtn/newsletterv2n10.html](http://www.rabidtigers.com/rtn/newsletterv2n10.html%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank)

We must keep in mind that trouble can develop in other parts of the world on short notice. In particular, Africa is host to various conflicts, which may involve US interests. We will discuss one of the most contentious regions, the Horn of Africa (the easternmost part of Africa, south and west of the Arabian peninsula and on the Indian Ocean), in this issue. The Horn of Africa was a Cold War arena, as the US and the Soviet Union supported Ethiopia and Somalia (not necessarily respectively) in a long-running war between them. Since then, Eritrea, which comprised the whole Red Sea coastal area of Ethiopia, has seceded, leaving Ethiopia landlocked. Eritrea and Ethiopia have only been at peace for two years, and UN officials are still establishing their common boundary. Ethiopia’s borders with her neighbors the Sudan and Somalia (with whom Ethiopia is now at least officially at peace) have not yet been clarified. Somalia has been in anarchy for over a decade, and one of then-Presidents George H. W. Bush’s and Bill Clinton’s failures was a deployment of ground forces to Somalia in 1992-3 - Operation Restore Hope - in an attempt to protect humanitarian aid supplies. There is now a facade of a central government in Mogadishu, the capital, but its writ does not go very far as opposed to the will of various clans and tribes, the most powerful of which are the two effectively independent northern regions Somaliland and Puntland. Kenya, a country friendly to the US and bordering Somalia to the south, has suffered al-Qaeda attacks. Most recently, on November 28, 2002, an Israeli-owned hotel was attacked by suicide bombers, and a Tel Aviv-bound passenger plane taking off from Mombasa narrowly escaped destruction by a shoulder-fired surface-to-air missile. Meanwhile, Sudan is suffering a civil war of her own, between the Muslim rulers in the north and the non-Muslims (partly but not mainly Christian) in the south. In fact, some Muslim parties in the north have joined the rebels. Sudan’s civil war is very much a religious one: Sudan is a Muslim theocracy with many people who object to Muslim religious rule. Sudan is under the shari’a - the Islamic law, which applies to everyone (at least where the government effectively rules in the north). By contrast, Eritrea, which also has both many Muslims and some non-Muslims (especially Coptic Christian, Roman Catholic and Protestant), has a secular set of laws, with shari’a law that only applies to cases with Muslim parties. Eritrea, like Somalia (and to a smaller extent Sudan) occupies a strategic position near the Arabian peninsula. In fact, Eritrea has disputed with Yemen the ownership of certain tiny Red Sea islands. Eritrea has an air force as well as a navy, which enable her to influence events on the peninsula and possibly beyond. Eritrea also has the enmity of her neighbors Ethopia, Sudan and Yemen. Eritrea had fought for her freedom from Ethopia and won it only in 1993, and also been at war with Ethiopia from 1998 until a peace treaty was signed in December 2000. Eritrea has also been alleged to support some Sudanese insurgents. Last but not least, Eritrea’s relations with the US have cooled since the arrest of two (Eritrean) employees of the US Embassy. The employees have been jailed for over a year without trial - according to some sources because they are thought to have leaked information to the press adverse to the government of President Afworki Isaias.

**3. Outside powers won’t intervene in African conflicts**

Tim **Docking 07**, African Affairs Specialist with the United States Institute of Peace, 2007, Taking Sides Clashing Views on African Issues, p. 376

Since the tragedy in Somalia, the trend has been for Western nations to refuse to send troops into Africa's hot spots. Jordan recently underscored this point when it expressed frustration with the West's failure to commit soldiers to the UNAMSIL mission as a reason for the withdrawal of its troops from Sierra Leone.  America's aversion to peacekeeping in Africa alsoreflects broader U.S. foreign policy on the continent. Africa occupies a marginal role in American foreign policy in general (a point highlighted by conference participants).

# Asia War Defense

**1. Asian war is unlikely --- all potential conflicts are solved by regional stability initiatives throughout the region**

**Bitzinger & Desker, ‘08** – senior fellow and dean of S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies respectively (Richard A. Bitzinger, Barry Desker, “Why East Asian War is Unlikely,” Survival, December 2008, [http://pdfserve.informaworld.com-/678328\_731200556\_906256449.pdf](http://pdfserve.informaworld.com-/678328_731200556_906256449.pdf%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank))

The Asia-Pacific region can be regarded as a zone of both relative insecurity and strategic stability. It contains some of the world’s most significant flashpoints – the Korean peninsula, the Taiwan Strait, the Siachen Glacier – where tensions between nations could escalate to the point of major war. It is replete with unresolved border issues; is a breeding ground for transnationa terrorism and the site of many terrorist activities (the Bali bombings, the Manila superferry bombing); and contains overlapping claims for maritime territories (the Spratly Islands, the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands) with considerable actual or potential wealth in resources such as oil, gas and fisheries. Finally, the Asia-Pacific is an area of strategic significance with many key sea lines of communication and important chokepoints**. Yet despite all these potential crucibles of conflict, the Asia-Pacific, if not an area of serenity and calm, is certainly more stable than one might expect**. To be sure, there are separatist movements and internal struggles, particularly with insurgencies, as in Thailand, the Philippines and Tibet. Since the resolution of the East Timor crisis, however, the region has been relatively free of open armed warfare. Separatism remains a challenge, but the break-up of states is unlikely. Terrorism is a nuisance, but its impact is contained. The North Korean nuclear issue, while not fully resolved, is at least moving toward a conclusion with the likely denuclearisation of the peninsula. Tensions between China and Taiwan, while always just beneath the surface, seem unlikely to erupt in open conflict any time soon, especially given recent Kuomintang Partyvictories in Taiwan and efforts by Taiwan and China to re-open informal channels of consultation as well as institutional relationships between organisations responsible for cross-strait relations. And while in Asia there is no strong supranational political entity like the European Union, there are many multilateral organisations and international initiatives dedicated to enhancing peace and stability, including the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum, the Proliferation Security Initiative and the Shanghai Co-operation Organisation. In Southeast Asia, countries are united in a common eopolitical and economic organisation – the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) – which is dedicated to peaceful economic, social and cultural development, and to the promotion of regional peace and stability. ASEAN has played a key role in conceiving and establishing broader regional institutions such as the East Asian Summit,ASEAN+3 (China, Japan and South Korea) and the ASEAN Regional Forum. **All this suggests that war in Asia – while not inconceivable – is unlikely.**

**3. Rising Beijing Consensus unifies nations and shared vaue between Asian countries prevents conflict.**

**Straits Times 08** “Why War is Unlikely in Asia” [http://www.asiaone.com/News/the%2BStraits%2BTimes/Story/A1Story20080625-72716.html](http://www.asiaone.com/News/the%2BStraits%2BTimes/Story/A1Story20080625-72716.html%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank)

Instead of Washington's perspectives shaping Asia-Pacific affairs coercively, the rise of China is likely to see a new paradigm in international affairs. The nascent 'Beijing Consensus', for want of a better term, would consist of the following attributes: The leadership role of the authoritarian state, a technocratic approach to governance, an emphasis on social rights and obligations over individual rights, a reassertion of the principles of national sovereignty and non-interference, support for freer markets and stronger regional and international institutions. The argument that there is an emerging 'Beijing Consensus' is not premised on the rise of the 'East' and decline of the 'West', as sometimes seemed to be the sub-text of the earlier 1990s 'Asian values' debate. But like the previous debate, this new debate will reflect alternative philosophical traditions. At issue is the appropriate balance between the rights of the individual and those of the state. This debate will highlight the values China and other states in the region share. By contrast, one conventional American view is that Sino-American competition will result in 'intense security competition with considerable potential for war' in which most of China's neighbours 'will join with the United States to contain China's power'. Asia's shared values are likely to reduce the risk of such conflict and result in regional pressure for an accommodation of and engagement with China, rather than a confrontation with it.

# North Korea War Defense

**1. North Korea won’t attack- even if they did it wouldn’t escalate**

**Swami 10**- Diplomatic editor of [telegraph.co.uk](http://telegraph.co.uk/%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) (Praveen, “Why North Korean strike will not trigger world war three,”11/23/10, [http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/northkorea/8154274/Why-North-Korean-strike-will-not-trigger-world-war-three.html](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/northkorea/8154274/Why-North-Korean-strike-will-not-trigger-world-war-three.html%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank), CJC)

South Korea is one of the engines of Asian prosperity, on which the world's hopes of an early economic recovery rest on peace in the region. By attacking Yeonpyeong island, a target of no strategic value, North Korea's dysfunctional regime is telling the world how much pain it could inflict if it isn't bribed to behave itself. It hopes that its sabre-rattling will force talks where the West will agree to a substantial aid package in return for a guarantee that Pyonyang will not produce further nuclear weapons. Both sides want wealth, not world war three.  Like other weak but nuclear-armed states, North Korea believes it can use limited conventional-weapons aggression to secure its objectives, since its weapons guarantee it protection from large-scale retaliation that could threaten its existence. The first sign of North Korea's post-nuclear strategy emerged when it sank the South Korean naval corvette Cheonan in March.  Nuclear deterrence guru Glenn Snyder described the phenomenon, of which there are several examples, as the "stability-instability paradox". Beijing military hawks fought Russia over the Zhebao island on the Ussuri river in 1969 to strengthen their political position without actually risking a large-scale war that would have destroyed them. Pakistan fought a limited war with India over Kashmir in 1999, a year after both countries tested their nuclear weapons.

**2. No war- and resource shortages mean war wouldn’t escalate**

**Edwards 10**­– International development specialist and policy analyst (Michael, “Full-scale war on Korean peninsula ‘unlikely’,” 11/25/10, [http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2010/11/24/3075727.htm](http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2010/11/24/3075727.htm%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank), CJC)

"I actually think that they can absorb a lot of provocation because the risk of war," he said. "Given that Seoul, which represents roughly 80 per cent of their economy, is within striking distance of artillery and rockets from North Korea means that we would have to see a lot more violence at this point before the South will be willing to actually conduct military operations against the North." Professor Hayes does expect North Korea's main ally China to intervene. "I think what is much more likely at this point is that we will see thegreat powers lean very heavily on each other and particularly on China, which is the main backer at this point both politically and economically of North Korea," he said. "It will send a message to Pyongyang and this will probably be a military to military message between the Chinese PLA and the North Korean People's Army, that they simply can't go about business this way. "That they will pull the plug and by pulling the plug I mean turn off the oil, which goes from a pipeline from China to North Korea. Without oil, the North Korean military actually can't run for much more than a month before they actually run out of fuel."

# Middle East War Defense

**No mideast war**

**Ferguson 06** Laurence A. Tisch Professor of History @ Harvard [Niall “This might not be a world war, but it still needs a sense of urgency” July 23rd, [http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/3626545/This-might-not-be-a-world-war%2C-but-it-still-needs-a-sense-of-urgency.html](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/3626545/This-might-not-be-a-world-war%2C-but-it-still-needs-a-sense-of-urgency.html%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank)]

Such language can -- for now, at least -- safely be dismissed as hyperbole. This crisis is not going to trigger another world war. Indeed, I do not expect it to produce even another Middle East war worthy of comparison with those of June 1967 or October 1973. In 1967, Israel fought four of its Arab neighbors -- Egypt, Syria, Jordan and Iraq. In 1973, Egypt and Syria attacked Israel. Such combinations are very hard to imagine today.  Nor does it seem likely that Syria and Iran will escalate their involvement in the crisis beyond continuing their support for Hezbollah. Neither is in a position to risk a full-scale military confrontation with Israel, given the risk that this might precipitate an American military reaction. Crucially, Washington's consistent support for Israel is not matched by any great power support for Israel's neighbors. During the Cold War, by contrast, the risk was that a Middle East war could spill over into a superpower conflict. Henry Kissinger, secretary of State in the twilight of the Nixon presidency, first heard the news of an Arab-Israeli war at 6:15 a.m. on Oct. 6, 1973. Half an hour later, he was on the phone to the Soviet ambassador in Washington, Anatoly Dobrynin. Two weeks later, Kissinger flew to Moscow to meet the Soviet leader, Leonid Brezhnev.  The stakes were high indeed. At one point during the 1973 crisis, as Brezhnev vainly tried to resist Kissinger's efforts to squeeze him out of the diplomatic loop, the White House issued DEFCON 3, putting American strategic nuclear forces on high alert. It is hard to imagine anything like that today. In any case, this crisis may soon be over. Most wars Israel has fought have been short, lasting a matter of days or weeks (six days in 1967, three weeks in 1973). Some Israeli sources say this one could be finished in a matter of days. That, at any rate, is clearly the assumption being made in Washington.

# Terrorism Defense

**No nuclear terror – Terrorists cant acquire, build, or deliver a bomb**

**Chapman 08**Steve Chapman, reporter and editorial writer for Chicago Tribune, 2/8 2008 [RealClearPolitics, “The Implausibility of Nuclear Terrorism”]

But remember: After Sept. 11, 2001, we all thought more attacks were a certainty. Yet al-Qaida and its ideological kin have proved unable to mount a second strike. Given their inability to do something simple -- say, shoot up a shopping mall or set off a truck bomb -- it's reasonable to ask if they have a chance at something much more ambitious. Far from being plausible, argued Ohio State University professor John Mueller in a recent presentation at the University of Chicago, "the likelihood that a terrorist group will come up with an atomic bomb seems to be vanishingly small." The events required to make that happen comprise a multitude of Herculean tasks. First, a terrorist group has to get a bomb or fissile material, perhaps from Russia's inventory of decommissioned warheads. If that were easy, one would have already gone missing. Besides, those devices are probably no longer a danger, since weapons that are not scrupulously maintained (as those have not been)quickly become what one expert calls "radioactive scrap metal." If terrorists were able to steal a Pakistani bomb, they would still have to defeat the arming codes and othersafeguards designed to prevent unauthorized use. As for Iran, no nuclear state has ever given a bomb to an ally -- for reasons even the Iranians can grasp. Stealing some 100 pounds of bomb fuel would require help from rogue individuals inside some government who are prepared to jeopardize their own lives. The terrorists, notes Mueller, would then have to spirit it "hundreds of miles out of the country over unfamiliar terrain, and probably while being pursued by security forces." Then comes the task of building a bomb. It's not something you can gin up with spare parts and power tools in your garage. It requires millions of dollars, a safe haven and advanced equipment -- plus people with specialized skills, lots of time and a willingness to die for the cause. And if al-Qaida could make a prototype, another obstacle would emerge: There is no guarantee it would work, and there is no way to test it. Assuming the jihadists vault over those Himalayas, they would have to deliver the weapon onto American soil. Sure, drug smugglers bring in contraband all the time -- but seeking their help would confront the plotters with possible exposure or extortion. This, like every other step in the entire process, means expanding the circle of people who know what's going on, multiplying the chance someone will blab, back out or screw up. Mueller recalls that after the Irish Republican Army failed in an attempt to blow up British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, it said, "We only have to be lucky once. You will have to be lucky always." Al-Qaida, he says, faces a very different challenge: For it to carry out a nuclear attack,everything has to go right. For us to escape, only one thing has to go wrong

# Indo-Pak War Defense

**Indo-Pak war doesn’t escalate.**

Gwynne **Dyer 02**, Ph.D. in war studies from the University of London, serves on the Board of Governors of Canada’s Royal Military College, independent journalist, May 24, 2002, Hamilton Spectator, “Nuclear war a possibility over Kashmir,” p. Lexis

For those who do not live in the subcontinent, the most important fact is that the damage would be largely confined to the region. The Cold War is over, the strategic understandings that once tied India and Pakistan to the rival alliance systems have all been cancelled, and no outside powers would be drawn into the fighting. The detonation of a hundred or so relatively small nuclear weapons over India and Pakistan would not cause grave harm to the wider world from fallout.

# \*\*\*Solvency\*\*\*

# Need Other Infrastructure

#### Can’t sustain marines- water and other infrastructure needs upgrading

Skaczkowski 12

(Amelia Skaczkowski is the managing editor at The South Australian Globalist, May 7th 2012, On the Record, <http://www.ontherecord-unisa.com.au/?p=2438>)

Eight thousand US marines could be relocated to Guam when the US marine base in Japan closes down.¶ The United States territory of Guam could become home to 4700 marines, with some of the 3300 remaining moving to Australia.¶ The move comes after fears that infrastructure requirements and public needs in Guam could not be met.¶ Increased government funding is needed for water, sewage, landfill and transportation developments.¶ Guam Senator for Community, Culture and Recreation Tina Muna-Barnes said the sudden population growth could have both negative and positive consequences for the tiny island.¶ “Our roadways will have to be reinforced and in some cases restructured to sustain the increased traffic ,” Senator Barnes said.¶ “The island’s only hospital is in dire need of repair and upgrades to the existing facility, not to mention additional resource requirements to include medical staff and equipment.”¶ Moreover, Guam’s agriculture capabilities would struggle to sustain the sudden boom.¶ “It has been estimated that over 90 per cent of all consumables are imported to the island,” Senator Barnes said.¶ “As the cost for fuel continues to increase we need to increase our work to develop a sustainable farming industry that can meet present and future food supply demands.”¶ The Department of Defence will bear some of the costs but the rest could come from the income tax of non-resident US military and federal personnel.¶ Approximately $52 million is already received annually, with this amount set to soar if and when the 4700 marines are transferred from Japan.¶ “The time for the official transfer of marines to Guam is unclear as it remains unclear whether the Department of Defence will have the financial means or the political support to make the relocation a reality,” Senator Barnes said.¶ Dr Dave Chapman of the Adelaide University said political pressure has been building over the years to close down the American marine base in Japan where the 8000 marines are currently housed.¶ “Japanese locals have been campaigning to close down Futenma after the sexual assault of a local schoolgirl by three servicemen in 1996,” Dr Chapman said.¶ The move to Guam would reduce America’s marine presence in Japan while allowing the US to maintain its coverage of the Asia Pacific region at a time when Japan’s military power is on the rise.¶ “This would have a mixed effect for Japan – a US presence increases stability in the region especially with North Korea and China nearby, but having US marines around does not help socially,” Dr Chapman said.¶ “In terms of finance, Japan may end up worse off.¶ “The US is currently campaigning for Japan to financially help move US marines from Japan to Guam.¶ “This is the first situation I have ever heard of where one national is asking another to pay for the removal of the first nations troops” Dr Chapman said.¶ One reason for the 15 year delay in moving marines is space.¶ Guam must undergo massive restructuring to provide an additional 8.9 sq km of land, on top of the 145.7 sq km the Department of Defence already controls on the 541 sq km island.¶ A large proportion of this land will act as a live firing range, and the preferred site is the town of Pagat.¶ “It is home to an ancient Chamorro village which could include ancient pottery, tools and perhaps even ancient remains,” Senator Barnes said.¶ The Department of Defence has also called for 0.3 sq km of live coral reef to accommodate a nuclear carrier.¶ “Discussions are ongoing however, to finalise any land requirements identified by the Department of Defence,” Senator Barnes said.¶ Despite these possible environmental repercussions, Guam could financially benefit from the addition of almost 5000 people.¶ “From construction to retail, the Guam build-up could potentially mean jobs in every sector of every industry on our tiny island,” Senator Barnes said.¶ It is suggested the remaining 3300 troops could be stationed in Australia, Hawaii and the Philippines on a rotational basis.

# Environment Turn

Transportation infrastructure not enough- sewage spills have other environmental effects

Associated Press 10

(“EPA Opposes US military plan to move marines to guam, Associated Press, February 25, 2010, pg online @ <http://cnsnews.com/news/article/epa-opposes-us-military-s-plan-move-marines-guam>)

Honolulu (AP) - The Environmental Protection Agency is sharply criticizing the military's plan to move thousands of Marines to Guam, saying its failure to plan for infrastructure upgrades would lead to raw sewage spills and a shortage of drinking water.¶ ¶ Further, the agency said the military's plan to build a new aircraft carrier berth at the U.S. territory's Apra Harbor would result in "unacceptable impacts" to 71 acres of a high quality coral reef.¶ ¶ The EPA outlined the criticisms in a strongly worded six-page letter to the Navy regarding a draft environmental impact statement by the military.¶ ¶ "The impacts are of sufficient magnitude that EPA believes the action should not proceed as proposed and improved analyses are necessary to ensure the information in the EIS is adequate to fully inform decision makers," the EPA said.¶ ¶ The military's Joint Guam Program Office said it was evaluating all comments it received on its environmental study and was committed to working with the EPA and other federal agencies to find solutions.¶ ¶ "The issues raised by EPA regarding the potential impacts to Guam from the military buildup are consistent with what we have heard from Guam's leaders, local agencies and the public," the military office said in an email statement to The Associated Press on Wednesday.¶ ¶ The military plan includes moving 8,600 Marines, and 9,000 of their dependents, to Guam from Okinawa, Japan. Washington and Tokyo are jointly paying for the transfer, which is designed to reduce the U.S. military's large footprint on densely populated Okinawa.¶ ¶ The letter said that at its peak, the change is expected to boost the Pacific territory's population by 79,000 people, or 45 percent, over the island's current 180,000 residents. The figure includes large numbers of construction workers that will have to move to Guam to build the new facilities.¶ ¶ The EPA's letter, dated Feb. 17, was first reported by the Pacific Daily News on its Web site Thursday Guam time.¶ ¶ Specifically, the EPA said the military's plan would lead to the following problems:¶ ¶ -- A shortfall in Guam's water supply, resulting in low water pressure that would expose people to water borne diseases from sewage.¶ ¶ -- Increased sewage flows to wastewater plants already failing to comply with Clean Water Act regulations.¶ ¶ -- More raw sewage spills that would contaminate the water supply and the ocean.¶ ¶ Regarding coral reefs, the EPA said the military underestimated the effect the aircraft carrier berth would have on a resource that currently provides essential habitats for fish and endangered sea turtles and that supports commercial and recreational fishing.

#### Relocation causes water shortages and hurts the ecosystem

Reyes 10

(Leo Reyes is a writer for a Canadian new source the Digital Journal, he works in marketing, plant operation and general management, “Guam Military Base Raises Environmental Concerns”, May 23rd 2010, pg online @ http://digitaljournal.com/article/289451)

Residents of the pacific island of Guam are angry about the ongoing transfer of the US military base in Okinawa to Guam, saying the relocation plan will have severe impact on Guam's environment and natural resources.¶ The impending partial closure of the US military base in Okinawa and the planned move to transfer military and civilian personnel raise fears among Guam residents about its effect on the ecosystem of the island territory.¶ The US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) said the military build up could trigger island-wide water shortage and an overload of sewage treatment system.¶ The relocation requires dredging underwater to accommodate a giant marine port including the construction of military airstrip will definitely impact on Guam's ecosystem.¶ "We're trying to identify and understand the current conditions on Guam and the potential impact of the relocation," said Nancy Sutley, head of the White House Council on Environmental Quality, who on Tuesday will lead a delegation to the island. "There's no question that the environmental conditions on Guam are not ideal."¶ Environmental regulators maintain that the relocation project should not proceed, saying Guam's natural resources could not possibly accommodate the on-going relocation.¶ "The government of Guam and the Guam Waterworks cannot by themselves accommodate the military expansion," said Nancy Woo, associate director of the EPA's western regional water division. She said Guam would need about $550 million to upgrade its water and sewage systems. White House officials said the EPA findings are preliminary.¶ Washington Post reports:¶ At the peak of construction, the buildup would increase Guam's population by 79,000 people, or about 45 percent. The EPA said the military plans, so far, to pay for public services for about 23,000 of the new arrivals, mostly Marines and their dependents who are relocating from the Japanese island of Okinawa. Ceded to the United States by Spain in 1898, Guam is a U.S. territory. Its residents are American citizens, but they cannot vote in presidential elections and have no voting representative in Congress.¶ Guam residents are hopeful that President Barack Obama's upcoming visit to Guam will allow him to 'understand the anxieties and unlock federal resources' and to address the different concerns of the people regarding the relocation of the military base.¶ President Obama was scheduled to visit Guam last week but canceled his trip to attend to the passage of the health bill, which was narrowly passed by the US congress. The Asian trip which include Guam has been rescheduled for June this year.

#### Water shortages lead to instability and US security threats

Bloomberg 12

(Us Intelligence says water shortages threaten stability, Bloomberg, Mar 22 2012, pg online @ <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-03-21/u-s-intelligence-says-water-shortages-threaten-stability.html>)

Competition for increasingly scarce water in the next decade will fuel instability in regions such as South Asia and the Middle East that are important to U.S. national security, according to a U.S. intelligence report.¶ An all-out water war is unlikely in the next 10 years, as nations will be more likely to use water as a bargaining chip with each other, according to the report from the Director of National Intelligence released today. As shortages become more acute, water in shared basins will increasingly be used as leverage, and the adoption of water as a weapon by states or terrorists will become more likely after 10 years, it found.¶ “These threats are real, and they do raise serious security concerns,” Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said in a speech today at the State Department, which requested the report. The study was drawn from a classified national intelligence estimate.¶ The report, drafted principally by the Defense Intelligence Agency, reflects a growing emphasis in the U.S. intelligence community on how environmental issues such as water shortages, natural disasters and climate change may affect U.S. security interests. It assumes no major changes in water-management practices.¶ Population and economic growth are the biggest near-term drivers of water shortages, while climate change rises as a threat, Clinton said.¶ Terrorist Targets¶ Increased tensions over water will require the U.S. to take a leading role in water development, she said. As nations increase water-related projects to gain influence, vulnerable dams, irrigation projects and reservoirs could become more attractive targets for terrorists or military strikes, according to the report.¶ Depleted groundwater for agriculture, which uses 70 percent of water, could destabilize markets and contribute to price swings such as those last year that sent food costs to a record and created unrest in the Middle East and North Africa, the report’s authors said.¶ “Many countries important to the United States will experience water problems -- shortages, poor water quality, or floods -- that will risk instability,” the study found. “North Africa, the Middle East, and South Asia will face major challenges coping with water problems.”

EPA says Guam has inadequate water infrastructure- environmentally unsustainable

Washington Post 10

(On Guam planned marine base raises anger, infrastructure concerns, March 22 2010, pg online @ http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/03/21/AR2010032101025.html?sid=ST2010032102932)

HAGATNA, GUAM -- This remote Pacific island is home to U.S. citizens who are fervent supporters of the military, as measured by their record of fighting and dying in America's recent wars.¶ But they are angry about a major military buildup here, which the government of Guam and many residents say is being grossly underfunded. They fear that the construction of a new Marine Corps base will overwhelm the island's already inadequate water and sewage systems, as well as its port, power grid, hospital, highways and social services.¶ "Our nation knows how to find us when it comes to war and fighting for war," said Michael W. Cruz, lieutenant governor of Guam and an Army National Guard colonel who recently returned from a four-month tour as a surgeon in Afghanistan. "But when it comes to war preparations -- which is what the military buildup essentially is -- nobody seems to know where Guam is."¶ The federal government has given powerful reasons to worry to the 180,000 residents of Guam, a balmy tropical island whose military importance derives from its location as by far the closest U.S. territory to China and North Korea.¶ The Environmental Protection Agency said last month that the military buildup, as described in Pentagon documents, could trigger island-wide water shortages that would "fall disproportionately on a low income medically underserved population." It also said the buildup would overload sewage-treatment systems in a way that "may result in significant adverse public health impacts."¶ A report by the Government Accountability Office last year came to similar conclusions, saying the buildup would "substantially" tax Guam's infrastructure.¶ President Obama had planned to visit Guam on Monday as the brief first stop of an Asia trip, but he delayed his travel because of Sunday's health-care vote in the House. Obama is aware of the problems here and had planned to promise some federal help, White House officials said.¶ "We're trying to identify and understand the current conditions on Guam and the potential impact of the relocation," said Nancy Sutley, head of the White House Council on Environmental Quality, who on Tuesday will lead a delegation to the island. "There's no question that the environmental conditions on Guam are not ideal."¶ Besides a new Marine base and airfield, the buildup includes port dredging for a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier, a project that would cause what the EPA describes as an "unacceptable" impact on 71 acres of a vibrant coral reef. The military, which owns 27 percent of the island, also wants to build a Marine firing range on land that includes one of the last undeveloped beachfront forests on Guam.¶ 'Should not proceed'¶ In a highly unusual move, the EPA graded the buildup plan as "environmentally unsatisfactory" and said it "should not proceed as proposed."¶ "The government of Guam and the Guam Waterworks cannot by themselves accommodate the military expansion," said Nancy Woo, associate director of the EPA's western regional water division. She said Guam would need about $550 million to upgrade its water and sewage systems. White House officials said the EPA findings are preliminary.¶ Guam government officials put the total direct and indirect costs of coping with the buildup at about $3 billion, including $1.7 billion to improve roads and $100 million to expand the already overburdened public hospital. On this island -- where a third of the population receives food stamps and about 25 percent lives below the U.S. poverty level -- that price tag cannot be paid with local tax revenue.¶ "It is not possible and it is not fair that the island bear the cost," Woo said.¶ At the peak of construction, the buildup would increase Guam's population by 79,000 people, or about 45 percent. The EPA said the military plans, so far, to pay for public services for about 23,000 of the new arrivals, mostly Marines and their dependents who are relocating from the Japanese island of Okinawa. Ceded to the United States by Spain in 1898, Guam is a U.S. territory. Its residents are American citizens, but they cannot vote in presidential elections and have no voting representative in Congress.¶ The Marine Corps is sensing a populist backlash on Guam, which is three times the size of the District of Columbia and more than 6,000 miles west of Los Angeles.¶ "I see a rising level of concern about how we are going to manage this," Lt. Gen. Keith J. Stalder, the Hawaii-based commander of Marine forces in the Pacific, said in a telephone interview. "I think it is becoming clearer every day that they need outside assistance."¶ The White House said Obama included $750 million in his budget to address the civilian impact of the relocation and has asked Congress for $1 billion next year, but Guam officials say they have received no assurances from the federal government that the money is headed their way.

# Bad for Guam

#### Relocation angers Guam- hurts relations

Washington Post 10

(“Planned Marine bases raises ire on Guam”, April 22 2010, pg online @ http://issuu.com/guampedia/docs/washington\_post\_marine\_base\_guam)

'Not being listened to'¶ The governor of Guam, Felix Camacho, asked the military last month to slow down the deployment of Marines until sufficient federal money arrives. But as a territory, and without a vote in Congress, the island has negligible lobbying power and no legal means of halting the buildup.¶ Many residents have hoped that Obama -- a fellow Pacific islander, who was born in Hawaii and lived in Indonesia -- might understand their anxieties and unlock federal resources. The White House said Obama will visit Guam when his Asia trip is rescheduled, perhaps in June.¶ "I just want to remind President Obama that his story is our story," said Victoria-Lola Leon Guerrero, an English instructor at the University of Guam and a leader of a group opposing the buildup. She said her students read Obama's autobiography, "Dreams From My Father," focusing on a coming-of-age passage from his years in Hawaii, in which he describes his realization that he was "utterly alone."¶ "That's how we feel here," she said. "We feel like we are not being listened to, like we are not being respected."¶ The federal government's push to further militarize this island -- combined with its heel-dragging in paying for the impact on civilians -- has led many Guam residents to doubt the value of their relationship with the United States.¶ "This is old-school colonialism all over again," said LisaLinda Natividad, an assistant professor of social work at the University of Guam and an activist opposing the buildup. "It boils down to our political status -- we are occupied territory."

# \*\*\*Futenma/Marines Good\*\*\*

# General

#### Futenma’s key to deter Korean War, Senkaku Crisis, China conflict, and other regional threats that escalate

Klinger 11 – Senior Research Fellow for Northeast Asia in the Asian Studies at The Heritage Foundation (Bruce, Heritage Foundation, 6/14/11, “Top 10 Reasons Why the U.S. Marines on Okinawa Are Essential to Peace and Security in the Pacific,” <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-marines-on-okinawa-are-essential-to-peace-and-security-in-the-pacific> /mr)

Top 10 Reasons for Keeping U.S. Marines on Okinawa The United States Marines stationed on Okinawa operate as one element of an integrated, comprehensive U.S. security strategy that uses individual service capabilities based on a specific contingency or operation. Removing Marine Corps assets from Okinawa would leave the United States with a two-legged security stool in a region where steadiness and support are essential. It is therefore essential that all parties recognize the following 10 reasons for maintaining the U.S. Marine presence on Okinawa. Reason #1: The U.S. Marine presence is a tangible sign of America’s commitment to defend Asia. U.S. forward-deployed forces in Asia are indisputable signals of Washington’s commitment to the obligations of its 1960 security treaty with Japan to defend its allies and maintain peace and stability in Asia. The U.S. Marines on Okinawa are an indispensable component of any U.S. response to an Asian crisis. The Marine presence is also a clear rebuttal to perceptions of waning United States resolve in the face of a rising and assertive China. Withdrawing the U.S. Marines from Okinawa would only affirm that perception and lead Asian nations to accommodate themselves to Chinese pressure. As a senior U.S. military officer commented, “U.S. dominance is not a given. You have to be on the court to be in the game.” Finally, an important question remains: What impact would the removal of U.S. ground forces have on President Obama’s much-hyped claim that “the U.S. is now back in Asia”? Reason #2: The U.S. Marine presence deters aggression. U.S. Ambassador to Japan John Roos has explained that the fundamental role of U.S. military forces in Japan is to “make those who would consider the use of force in this region understand that option is off the table. The forward deployment of U.S. forces puts us in a position to react immediately to emerging threats.”[[7]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-marines-on-okinawa-are-essential-to-peace-and-security-in-the-pacific%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn7) The December 2010 Japanese National Defense Program Guidelines underscored Roos’s comments by noting that the presence of U.S. armed forces in Japan gives countries in the Asia–Pacific region a strong sense of security by “functioning as deterrence against and response to contingencies in this region.”[[8]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-marines-on-okinawa-are-essential-to-peace-and-security-in-the-pacific%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn8) Foreign Minister Okada affirmed that “the presence of U.S. Marines on Okinawa is necessary for Japan’s national security [since they] are a powerful deterrent against possible enemy attacks and should be stationed in Japan.”[[9]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-marines-on-okinawa-are-essential-to-peace-and-security-in-the-pacific%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn9) History has repeatedly shown that ground troops are necessary to influence an opponent. Removing combat elements of the only rapidly deployable U.S. ground force between Hawaii and India would degrade U.S. deterrence capacity and limit response options. Reason #3: The U.S. Marine presence enables the conduct of full-spectrum combat operations. The Third Marine Expeditionary Force (III MEF) on Okinawa is a flexible, scalable, tailored, self-contained, rapidly deployable, powerful military force that can fulfill any contingency that might arise throughout the region. A combined arms force that operates under the Marine Corps doctrine of Marine Air Ground Task Force (MAGTF), the III MEF is comprised of organic ground, air, and logistics components under a single commander. A MAGTF requires collocation of its ground, air, and logistics components to enable coordinated training of integrated units. Ambassador Roos explained that the Marine helicopters on Okinawa enable the U.S. to: Rapidly move our ground combat and support units on Okinawa across the island chain that links Northeast and Southeast Asia to wherever they would be required. For heavier and longer-range operations, the Marines would be supported by our naval fleet in Sasebo, just a few days sailing time away, which could project both Marine ground and air power anywhere in the region. The Marines on Okinawa would “arrive first on the scene to secure critical facilities, conduct civilian evacuations, and provide forward land and air strike power.”[[10]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-marines-on-okinawa-are-essential-to-peace-and-security-in-the-pacific%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn10) Lieutenant General Keith Stalder, former commander, U.S. Marine Forces Pacific, echoed Roos’s comments, noting that Okinawa Marines are trained to respond to dozens of different emergencies and contingencies: “When the 31st MEU [Marine Expeditionary Unit] is aboard ship in Okinawa, there is a 100 percent chance they are about a day’s transit time to either a U.S. defense treaty ally, a threat to regional stability, or a perennial disaster relief location.”[[11]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-marines-on-okinawa-are-essential-to-peace-and-security-in-the-pacific%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn11) Reason #4: The U.S. Marine presence helps America meet its commitment to defend Japan, including the Senkaku Islands. The United States has pledged the lives of its sons and daughters to defend Japan. As Lieutenant General Stalder succinctly explained, “all of my Marines on Okinawa are willing to die if it is necessary for the security of Japan.” [[12]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-marines-on-okinawa-are-essential-to-peace-and-security-in-the-pacific%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn12) Indeed, as Prime Minister Kan commented, “Including the Marines in Okinawa, all U.S. troops stationed in Japan play a major role in contributing to our nation’s safety and the region’s stability.”[[13]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-marines-on-okinawa-are-essential-to-peace-and-security-in-the-pacific%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn13) Kan stated: [W]e must never forget that in the context of the Japan–U.S. alliance, members of the Japanese Self-Defense Forces and the U.S. Marines, perhaps youth not even twenty years of age, have a mission to be prepared to shed their own blood [for the defense of Japan] should a contingency arise. In response to Chinese provocations, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton reassured Foreign Minister Maehara in November 2010 that the United States considered the Senkaku Islands to be Japanese territory under the bilateral security treaty. The U.S. statement was a stronger affirmation than previous vague diplomatic comments on the sovereignty of the islands. In addition to the Senkaku Islands, U.S. Marines are also critical to securing Japanese interests in Okinawa. For example, Defense Minister Toshimi Kitazawa opposed moving U.S. Marines from Okinawa to Guam because, as he noted, these troops “a very important role in deterring against Chinese adventurism near Okinawa—if all the Marines in Okinawa were transferred to Guam, we cannot defend those islands.” [[14]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-marines-on-okinawa-are-essential-to-peace-and-security-in-the-pacific%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn14) Further highlighting the Marine’s role in the Pacific, in February 2011, Admiral Robert Willard, commander of Pacific Command, announced that the Marine Corps had been integrated into the new U.S. AirSeaBattle Concept battle plan, commenting that “their capabilities will be an enhancement to our joint force.” A U.S. defense official added that the revised strategy could use the Marines to retake islands in the East China or South China seas after a Chinese attack. The official commented that “the Japanese and South China Sea states don’t have Marine Corps-type capabilities to stop a Chinese occupation of islands.”[[15]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-marines-on-okinawa-are-essential-to-peace-and-security-in-the-pacific%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn15) Reason #5: The U.S. Marine presence would help to defeat a North Korean invasion of South Korea. The U.S. Marines on Okinawa play a critical role in Operations Plan 5027, the joint U.S.–South Korean war plan for responding to a North Korean invasion. Marine forces are capable of conducting a full range of combat operations in Korea. Even the threat of an amphibious invasion would force North Korea to divert ground forces from the front line. General Burwell Bell, former commander of U.S. Forces Korea, affirmed that: [The Marines on Okinawa] have a critical role in any Korean contingency. They were my deep operational ground maneuver unit. Without them, it would be WWI all over again. When the North Koreans consider the potential for the United States Marines to interdict their logistics sites and fragile supply lines deep in their rear areas, the likelihood of the North seriously considering a sustained ground offensive drops drastically.[[16]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-marines-on-okinawa-are-essential-to-peace-and-security-in-the-pacific%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn16) Representative Park Jin, then chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the South Korean National Assembly, declared that: [T]he U.S. military bases located in Okinawa play a significant role in keeping the Korean peninsula peaceful and safe. The U.S. Marines in Okinawa are obliged to defend Korea…. Thus, the relocation of U.S. military bases in Japan would affect not only the U.S.–Japan relations but also security on the Korean peninsula. [[17]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-marines-on-okinawa-are-essential-to-peace-and-security-in-the-pacific%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn17) In seeking to justify removing U.S. Marine forces from Okinawa, some analysts have asserted that a Korean War would be over quickly and that South Korean forces would be sufficient to handle the North Korean forces. Both premises are dangerously wrong. U.S. war simulations reveal that, even a week after a North Korean invasion, the situation would remain precarious. Moreover, an invasion would result in horrific casualties in the hundreds of thousands as well as trillions of dollars worth of damage.[[18]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-marines-on-okinawa-are-essential-to-peace-and-security-in-the-pacific%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn18) A U.S. defense official commented: [E]ven if South Korea could do it without U.S. Marines, it would be with far greater casualties and destruction. Why would you do that? Why would you send the military into a dangerous situation with fewer capabilities than necessary? Besides, you need those [South Korean] troops for the post-war collapse of North Korea.[[19]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-marines-on-okinawa-are-essential-to-peace-and-security-in-the-pacific%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn19) Indeed, the North Korean attack on Yeonpyeong Island in November 2010 illustrated the critical role Marines would play in rebuffing an attack by Pyongyang. As a result, Seoul augmented its own 27,000-member Marine Corps by 2,000, thereby bolstering its ability to defend the five islands in the West Sea.[[20]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-marines-on-okinawa-are-essential-to-peace-and-security-in-the-pacific%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn20) Reason #6: The U.S. Marine presence helps the U.S. respond to Korea crisis contingencies other than war. The U.S. and South Korea have also developed Concept Plan 5029 to respond to crisis contingencies short of war. MAGTF forces can conduct several military operations in support of those plans, including limited amphibious raids and full-scale amphibious assaults, airfield and port seizure operations, maritime interdiction operations, amphibious advanced force operations, stability operations, and tactical air support.[[21]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-marines-on-okinawa-are-essential-to-peace-and-security-in-the-pacific%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn21) Major General Mark Brilakis, commanding general of the 3rd Marine Division on Okinawa, affirmed that in all U.S. contingency plans for Korea, the 3rd MEF plays a major role. In case of hostilities on the Korean Peninsula, Brilakis stated, “overnight, I go from being the smallest division in the Marine Corps to being the largest.”[[22]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-marines-on-okinawa-are-essential-to-peace-and-security-in-the-pacific%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn22) According to Japanese media reports, Lieutenant General Stalder commented during a private meeting with Japanese officials that during a Korean crisis, the Marines in Okinawa would be charged with seizing North Korean nuclear weapons.[[23]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-marines-on-okinawa-are-essential-to-peace-and-security-in-the-pacific%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn23) Such an operation would be consistent with the responsibilities of Military Expeditionary Unit—Special Operations Capable (MEU–SOC) units that conduct operations behind enemy lines, such as special reconnaissance and direct action against designated strategic targets. Reason #7: The U.S. Marine presence enables non-combatant evacuation operations (NEOs). Marines, through NEOS, provide physical protection and evacuate U.S. citizens from Taiwan or other Asian nations during a deteriorating security situation or natural disaster. NEOs usually involve “swift insertions of a force, temporary occupation of an objective, and a planned withdrawal upon completion of the mission.”[[24]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-marines-on-okinawa-are-essential-to-peace-and-security-in-the-pacific%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn24) NEOs have typically been a specialty of Marine Expeditionary Units, which have participated in several NEOs worldwide. Implementing an NEO may require forming a joint task force. However, the organic combat, combat support, and combat service support forces of a Marine Corps forward-deployed amphibious expeditionary strike group (special operations capable) are trained and certified to conduct NEOs.[[25]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-marines-on-okinawa-are-essential-to-peace-and-security-in-the-pacific%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn25) The 31st MEU on Okinawa routinely trains for NEOs. Moving U.S. Marines away from Okinawa would hinder protection and evacuation operations, directly increasing the threat to U.S. lives, as well as the lives of America’s allies. Reason #8: The U.S. Marine presence helps the U.S. to conduct humanitarian operations. The Okinawa Marines have routinely been the primary responders to major natural disasters in Asia, such as the 2004 Asian tsunami, mudslides in the Philippines, and the typhoon in Taiwan. The Marines have led or participated in 12 significant humanitarian assistance–disaster relief (HADR) missions during the past five years alone, helping to save hundreds of thousands of lives in the region.[[26]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-marines-on-okinawa-are-essential-to-peace-and-security-in-the-pacific%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn26) For example, in response to the March 2011 natural disasters in Japan, U.S. military forces in Asia responded quickly and worked seamlessly with the Japanese Self-Defense Forces. Operation Tomodachi (“friendship”) highlighted the versatility of U.S. forces deployed on Okinawa. During Operation Tomodachi, the proximity of Futenma MCAS to Marine ground and logistics units was critical to the rapid deployment of supplies and personnel. Marine assets on Okinawa began flying to Japan within four hours of being tasked. Helicopter and fixed-wing C-130 aircraft from Futenma were involved in humanitarian operations, as were members of the 31st MEU, 3rd Marine Logistics Group, and 1st Marine Air Wing, all based in Okinawa. U.S. disaster relief operations generated considerable goodwill in Japan, including on Okinawa. Okinawans now realize what the Marines were training for when conducting HADR operations elsewhere in Asia. Yet Okinawan media refused to publish articles or photos of U.S. Marines from Okinawa conducting humanitarian assistance operations in Japan. In fact, some Japanese media outlets went so far as to criticize the Marines’ relief work. For example, the Ryukyu Shinpo criticized the U.S. Marine humanitarian assistance as a “tool for political manipulation [and an attempt] to gain the support of the Japanese people to keep the FRF within Okinawa.” The Shinpo editorialized that the U.S. statements highlighting the benefits of having the Marines available to assist Japan was “very discomforting” and “tricks.” The Okinawan Times chimed in as well, posturing that the U.S. was using the disaster as a “political tool [to] manipulate our political decision-making…. [I]t is something we cannot allow.”[[27]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-marines-on-okinawa-are-essential-to-peace-and-security-in-the-pacific%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn27) Reason #9: The U.S. Marine presence is vital to the Theater Security Cooperation program. The Marines influence the regional security environment on a daily basis through the Theater Security Cooperation program, which, with 70 joint exercises per year, enables partners and reassures allies. Reason #10: Japan lacks the necessary defensive capacity. Japan lacks any Marine forces of its own, has ground forces that are less capable than their U.S. counterparts, and has poor combined arms operation capabilities. Nor is there any existing Asian architecture that guarantees the rights or interests of Asian nations. The continued presence of U.S. Marines ensures that Japan’s security limitations do not become liabilities. The Japanese Ministry of Defense responded to growing concerns over China’s increasingly assertive foreign policy by advocating the creation of Japanese ground forces “modeled after the U.S. Marine Corps to strengthen the defense of remote islands in southwestern Japan.” The ministry recommended doubling the 2,000 GSDF troops on Okinawa and developing ground forces capable of conducting amphibious operations to retake islands held by hostile forces. Yet Japanese forces’ amphibious operations capabilities remain in their infancy, and Tokyo does not intend to assume the regional responsibilities of the U.S. Marines on Okinawa.

#### Geography means Okinawa is key

Keith J. Stalder, Lieutenant General in the United States Marine Corps, Currently Commanding General of U.S. Marine Corps Forces Pacific,2010 (“Marine General Stalder Speaks at Tokyo American Center,” U.S. Embassy to Japan, February 17th, Available Online at<http://tokyo.usembassy.gov/e/p/tp-20100217-71.html> /mr)

Ladies and gentlemen, perhaps this is a good place for me to say a few things about Okinawa, because our bases there are absolutely vital to this Alliance and to Japan's national security.¶ Okinawa is very important because, as I said earlier, geography matters. If you want to know why the Marine Corps maintains forces on Okinawa, look at a map. Transit time by sea from Okinawa to mainland Japan is one-to-two days, to Korea, two days, to the South China Sea, three days, and to the Strait of Malacca, five days. From California, transit time to any of those locations is 21 days or more.¶ When the 31st Marine Expeditionary Unit is aboard ship near Okinawa, on any given day there is a 100% chance they are about a day's transit time to either a U.S. defense Treaty ally, a threat to regional stability, or a perennial disaster relief location.¶ That's why, in order to fulfill our Alliance responsibilities to defend Japan, the Marine Corps - the expeditionary, rapidly deployable branch of the U.S. military and the only forward deployed and available U.S. ground force between Hawaii and India - must be based on Okinawa and must have its helicopters near its ground and logistics forces.

Keith J. Stalder, Lieutenant General in the United States Marine Corps, Currently Commanding General of U.S. Marine Corps Forces Pacific,2010 (“Marine General Stalder Speaks at Tokyo American Center,” U.S. Embassy to Japan, February 17th, Available Online at<http://tokyo.usembassy.gov/e/p/tp-20100217-71.html>)

This leads me to the purpose of the Marine Corps, which is to be expeditionary, amphibious, and naval - the Navy-Marine team is the best in the world at what we do.¶ Credible combat power, whether for deterrence or warfighting, rests on three cornerstones: the right capabilities, at a high level of readiness, and postured for rapid employment. The Marine Corps' combination of capabilities, readiness, and posture make it ideally suited to be Asia's emergency response force.¶ The fundamental Marine Corps organizational structure is the Marine Air Ground Task Force, in which war fighting elements of aviation forces, ground combat forces, and logistics forces all operate under a single commander. This unique organizational structure serves the Alliance extremely well. A Marine Air Ground Task Force can be tailored to every mission requirement.¶ It is inherently maritime in nature, extremely flexible and adaptive, and works well with coalition and other forces.¶ It provides the greatest combat power for the minimum force footprint and it is battle tested around the world. It is the perfect organizational model for Marines in the Pacific. It is the perfect model to support Alliance objectives of deterring, defending, and defeating potential adversaries.

#### Withdrawal hurts deterrence

#### Global Security 12

(Global Security, “Okinawa, Japan,” April 2012, <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/facility/okinawa.htm> /mr)

The United States and Japan agreed in 2006 to move Marine Corps Air Station Futenma to another part of the island in five years. But the new Japanese administration wants that plan put on hold. In 2006, Japan and the United States agreed to close Futenma and move its facilities to another Marine base with a heliport built on reclaimed land offshore. That agreement also called for 8,000 marines to be moved off Okinawa, to the US territory of Guam. The plan came after 15 years of negotiations but Japan's new government now wants to reconsider it. Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama and his Democratic Party of Japan won a historic election in August, in part by calling for a review of that 2006 agreement. Four DPJ members from Okinawa won parliamentary seats with promises of reducing the US troop presence on the island.¶ The Department of Defense believes that Marine Corps forces along with other US forces on Okinawa satisfy the US national security strategy by visably demonstrating the US commitment to security in the region. These forces are thought to deter aggression, provide a crisis response capability should deterrence fail, and avoid the risk that US allies may interpret the withdrawal of forces as a lessening of US commitment to peace and stability in the region.¶ By 2003 the US was considering moving most of the 20,000 Marines on Okinawa to new bases that would be established in Australia; increasing the presence of US troops in Singapore and Malaysia; and seeking agreements to base Navy ships in Vietnamese waters and ground troops in the Philippines. For the Marines based on Okinawa, most for months without their families, the US is considering a major shift. Under plans on the table, all but about 5,000 of the Marines would move, possibly to Australia.¶ During 2004 Japan and the United States continued discussions on plans to scale back the US military presence in the country. Tokyo will ask Washington to move some Marines now on the southern island of Okinawa outside the country. There is no doubt some changes will be made to the Okinawa forces. The US Marines are a tremendous burden in Okinawa, particularly the infantry and the training needs of the infantry in Okinawa can't really be met on the island, given the sensitivities there. Okinawa accounts for less than one percent of Japan's land, but hosts about two-thirds of the 40,000 American forces in the country. In recent years, Okinawans have grown increasingly angry about the military presence, because of land disputes and highly publicized violent crimes committed by a few U.S. troops. In return for moving troops outside the country, Japan would provide pre-positioning facilities for weapons, fuel and other equipment for the US military.¶ Okinawa's proximity to potential regional trouble spots promotes the early arrival of US military forces due to shorter transit times and reduces potential problems that could arise due to late arrival. The cost of this presence is shared by the government of Japan, which provides bases and other infrastructure on Okinawa rent-free and pays part of the annual cost of Okinawa-based Marine Corps forces.¶

#### Marines key – resolve

#### Associated Press 10

(Associated Press, “U.S. Marines in Okinawa necessary for deterrence: U.S. commander,” Yahoo! News, 10/21/10, <http://news.yahoo.com/u-marines-okinawa-necessary-deterrence-u-commander.html>)

The outgoing commander of U.S. forces in Japan said Thursday that the presence of the U.S. Marine Corps in Okinawa Prefecture is necessary to maintain deterrence in the region.¶ "The Marines are uniquely suited to a set of activities that we don't have anywhere else in the United States military," Lt. Gen. Edward Rice told a press conference in Tokyo. "(They) have a very significant deterrent effect on the people that we might want to deter."¶ Rice explained that the Marines in the southwestern Japanese prefecture are effective in signaling to potential foes the force's proximity and capacity to deal with possible contingencies in the region as well as the strength of the U.S.-Japan alliance.¶ He was apparently suggesting that deterrence against the threats posed by countries such as China and North Korea would weaken if the Marines were moved out of Okinawa.

#### Marines are key

#### Yomiuri Shimbun 10

(Yomiuri Shimbun, “U.S. marines crucial deterrent,” 10/23/10, <http://www.yomiuri.co.jp/dy/editorial/T101023001899.htm>)

Last month's collisions between two Japan Coast Guard vessels and a Chinese trawler off the Senkaku Islands in Okinawa Prefecture reminded us anew of the crucial role played by U.S. Marine Corps forces stationed in the prefecture.¶ While the United States says the full strength of marines in the prefecture is 18,000, there actually were only 14,879 there as of the end of March. They account for nearly 30 percent of the 53,082 U.S. military personnel in this nation. The marine corps in Okinawa includes infantry, artillery, air transportation and rear logistics support units, as well as a command unit.¶ The marines' strength lies in their readiness to rapidly mobilize for deployment to conflict areas for combat operations. While their missions include special operations such as the rescue of civilians, they are not armed with missiles or bombing capabilities, unlike the U.S. Navy and Air Force.¶ Former Democratic Party of Japan leader Ichiro Ozawa once unwisely said the U.S. Navy's 7th Fleet would be enough to secure the U.S. military presence in the Far East. However, this argument is divorced from reality. The marines have cooperative and complementary relations with the U.S. Army, Navy and Air Forces.

Marines are critical to deter China and North Korea- solves conflict over Taiwan

Roos, 10 [Ambassador John V. Roos, Ambassador to Japan, was the CEO of Silicon Valley-based law firm Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati, Waseda University Organization for Japan-U.S. Studies (WOJUSS) event, “The Enduring Importance of our Security Alliance,” January 29, 2010, <http://tokyo.usembassy.gov/e/p/tp-20100129-71.html>]

As we look back, our two countries can take pride in the fact that the U.S.-Japan Alliance has provided a half-century of peace in East Asia, allowing Japan and the entire region to reach unprecedented levels of security and prosperity. When our two nations entered into this alliance, the coming half-century of peace and prosperity was far from assured. In 1960 we were at the height of the Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union. Tensions across the 38th parallel and Taiwan Strait were high, with regular exchanges of fire across boundaries that no party viewed as satisfactory or permanent.¶ Yet for the next 50 years, conflict did not erupt. Our security partnership, a primary component of which is the United States' forces in Japan, helped deter a renewal of full-scale hostilities on the Korean Peninsula and across the Taiwan Strait, while containing Soviet efforts to project power into the Pacific. With this shield, Japan invented the model for rapid economic growth that was soon copied by others in this region. With rising incomes came a flourishing of democracy in South Korea and Taiwan. The United States worked hand-in-hand with Japan and other democratic allies around the world to build a set of international rules and norms that ushered in the most vibrant period of commerce and innovation human history has ever seen. The success of this system ultimately enabled us to bring an end to the Cold War.¶ In my first few years - months, hasn't been a few years, sometimes it seems like a few years - but in my first few months as Ambassador, a number of people, including some in government, have questioned the need for the present level and/or mix of the U.S. bases in Japan, even though poll numbers show that the alliance enjoys more popular support than ever before (85% approval rating in the last poll). I just returned from the United States where I heard similar statements being made by many in my own country. Some have pointed to the recent troop adjustments in Europe as a reason to make major adjustments here in Japan. But the end of the Cold War has in no way diminished the importance of our forward deployed forces and our security posture to maintain peace and stability in this area of the world. Even in Europe, in the context of a mutual security architecture, NATO, that has significantly diminished the possibility of cross border conflict, our allies look to us to maintain 80,000 troops and tactical nuclear weapons, to help ensure stability. Of greater concern is the continued level of risk that remains in this region despite the end of the Cold War. With China's dramatic and well-funded military modernization and North Korea's missile and nuclear program, arguably, Japan's security situation is just as complicated as it was when the Berlin Wall fell 21 years ago.¶ North Korea obviously remains the most immediate concern. North Korea is the most militarized state in the world, with over a million soldiers under arms, it remains a conventional threat. Over the past several years, North Korea has focused on developing a wide range of capabilities including ballistic missiles. North Korea, as you know, has also proliferated, using its weapons technology to earn cash from dangerous regimes throughout the world. Even as we prepare to meet these military threats, the possibility of regime collapse, particularly in the context of leadership succession, is a growing concern. A North Korea that falls into internal disarray would pose monumental security challenges to this region. We have all worked hard to use diplomacy to steer North Korea into the community of nations, and we will continue to do so. Our diplomatic efforts, however, rest in part on the credibility of our ability to deter North Korea from using other means to achieve its objectives.¶ China is perhaps the best example of the complexities we face in the world today. There is no doubt that the economies of the United States, Japan, and China are increasingly interdependent. The United States relies on Japanese and Chinese capital. China could not succeed without U.S. and Japanese technology. And Japan and China depend on U.S. markets and we depend on China's markets. The interplay among our three countries has emerged as a driver in the global economy. China's leadership is also very important to solving global problems from climate change to North Korea's nuclear program. President Obama has emphasized that the U.S. seeks a positive cooperative and comprehensive relationship with China, and the world is counting on Beijing to work with the United States, Japan, and the international community to address some of the key issues of our day. Recently, for example, China has worked with us as a partner in stabilizing the international financial system, and in protecting vital sea lanes from piracy. Given Japan's and the United States' overlapping interests as allies, we believe that Japan's active bilateral engagement with China is a positive and complements our own. The relations among and between our three countries are not, as some would suggest, a zero sum game.¶ Yet, even as the United States and Japan work with China as a partner, we have questions about China's accelerating military modernization, especially in areas like cyber warfare, anti-satellite weapons, and the rapid modernization of its nuclear, submarine, and strategic forces. The build-up of military capabilities across from Taiwan over the past decade has the potential to erode the long-standing cross-strait military balance which is so essential to peace and prosperity. Many countries in the region share our concerns about China's recent efforts to limit freedom of navigation in international waters beyond territorial limits. As major maritime trading partners, freedom of navigation is essential to the futures of both the United States and Japan.¶ So while I want to be careful not to overstate these concerns, among these types of uncertainties in this region the deterrent effect of a robust U.S.-Japan Alliance is crucial to ensuring that the dramatic changes in the security environment do not negatively affect this region's future peace and prosperity. The purpose of maintaining a credible deterrent capability is to make the price of using force greater than any potential political or economic gains that could be obtained through the use of force. This is vitally important here in East Asia, which has four of the five largest armed forces in the world. The cost of a military conflict in this region is beyond imagination. In addition to the human toll, even a short conflict would set the global economy back years, if not longer. This is why there has been some concerns expressed these past several weeks about the perceived tensions in our alliance by leaders and editorialists from Singapore to Taiwan to Seoul. Our Alliance is the critical stabilizing force in this area of the world.¶ The fundamental role of U.S. forces in Japan is to make those who would consider the use of force in this region understand that that option is off the table. The forward deployment of U.S. forces puts us in a position to react immediately to emerging threats, and serves as a tangible symbol of our commitment. The 49,000 soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines in Japan are our front line forces.¶ Why does the United States undertake obligations to Japan and other nations that have to be paid in national treasure and possibly the blood of its citizens? As President Obama said in his remarks at his acceptance of the Nobel Peace Prize, "The service and sacrifice of our men and women in uniform has promoted peace and prosperity from Germany to Korea, and enabled democracy to take hold in places like the Balkans. We have borne this burden not because we seek to impose our will. We have done so out of enlightened self-interest - because we seek a better future for our children and grandchildren, and we believe that their lives will be better if others' children and grandchildren can live in freedom and prosperity."¶ The current mix of U.S. forces in Japan is based on our assessment of the military capabilities we need to achieve this goal of stability and deterrence in this crucial part of the world.¶ The U.S. Air Force, for example, deploys top line aircraft for air superiority, counterstrike, and intelligence collection. The presence of our naval forces in Yokosuka and Sasebo would enable us to react in a matter of days rather than weeks to any situation that may arise. Our naval forces also work on a daily basis with their Japanese counterparts to track the growing foreign submarine presence in the waters around Japan. Our Army would provide logistical support in the event of a conflict in this area, as well as integrating with the Navy, Air Force, and Japanese Self Defense Forces to provide ballistic missile defense for Japan.¶ The Marine Corps presence in Okinawa, which I am sure you have all been hearing about, is perhaps the least understood by the general public, but in reality is among the most critical of the forces we deploy in both peacetime and in the unlikely event of conflict. So let me be a little more detailed here and a little technical, because I think it is important for all of us to understand. The III Marine Expeditionary Force in Okinawa brings together the core capabilities of all of our other services into a rapidly deployable self-contained fighting force known as the Marine Air-Ground Task Force. The Marines combine air, ground, and logistical forces together, so that in any contingency or emergency there would be no need to wait for complicated logistical and airlift support from other services. The short range helicopters assigned to the Marines in Okinawa would be able to rapidly move our ground combat and support units on Okinawa across the island chain that links Northeast and Southeast Asia to wherever they would be required. For heavier or longer-range operations, the Marines would be supported by our naval fleet in Sasebo, just a few days sailing time away, which could project both Marine ground and air power anywhere in the region. This mobility and forward presence is why the Marines in Okinawa are routinely our primary responder to major natural disasters in Asia, such as the 2004 Asian Tsunami, mudslides in the Philippines, or the recent typhoon in Taiwan. A little known fact is that the Marines, along with other U.S. forces, have led or participated in 12 significant humanitarian assistance/disaster relief missions in the last five years alone, helping to save hundreds of thousands of lives in this region. The Marines in Okinawa would play a similar rapid response role in any armed conflict in the region, arriving first on the scene to secure critical facilities, conduct civilian evacuations, and provide forward land and air strike power.¶ If the Marines were moved entirely off of Japan, their mobility and effectiveness in the region would be impacted, and it could be perceived negatively with regard to the United States' commitment to this region. The next closest ground combat troops available are Army contingents based in Hawaii, and the distance that they would have to travel would delay U.S. responsiveness in regional contingencies.¶ In addition, the ability of the Marines and all our forces in Japan to conduct realistic training exercises ensures not only that they are ready to respond to any situation, but also serves as a visible deterrent. What we do here in Japan is carefully watched throughout the region. Whether it is F-15 air-to-air combat drills off of Kadena Air Force Base or visits by Ballistic Missile Defense-equipped Aegis destroyers to civilian ports on the Sea of Japan, publicly exercising our forces' capabilities to defend Japan makes it less likely that we will ever need to use them in a real conflict.¶ Of course, behind our forward-based forces in Japan is also the full weight of U.S. national military power, both conventional and nuclear. If, God forbid, a conflict were to erupt, our front line units would be stretched to maintain a sustained conflict without reinforcement. That is why we routinely bring military assets such as the F-22s to Japan to ensure that we could deploy the necessary resources as quickly as possible in the event the need ever arises.

#### US/China war causes extinction.

**Straits Times -2K** (Straits Times, June, 25, 2000, No one gains in war over Taiwan] (PDNSS2115)

THE DOOMSDAY SCENARIO -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 possibilityof 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. There would be no victors in such a war. While the prospect of a nuclear Annaggedon over Taiwan might seem inconceivable, it cannot be ruled out entirely, for China puts sovereignty above everything else.

# Asian Stability

#### Solves Asian stability – location

Rajesh Kapoor, Associate Fellow at the Centre for Land Warfare Studies at The Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses—a non-partisan, autonomous body dedicated to objective research and policy relevant studies on all aspects of defence and security that has been rated as one of the top think tanks in Asia, 2010 (“The Strategic Relevance of Okinawa,” Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, June 10th, <http://www.idsa.in/idsacomments/TheStrategicRelevanceofOkinawa_rkapoor_100610>)

In the post-Occupation period, US troops and military bases in Japan have been instrumental in ensuring peace and stability within Japan as well as in East Asia. The geo-strategic location of Okinawa makes it the preferred site for hosting US military bases both in terms of securing Japan as well as for US force projection in the Far East. Okinawa’s distance from the rest of Japan and from other countries of East Asia makes it an ideal location to host military bases and thus extend US military outreach considerably. In the case of an eventuality, it is easier for the US marines, who act as first responders to exigencies, to take appropriate action well before the rest of Japan is affected. In addition, Japan cannot ignore the potential threat it faces from its nuclear neighbours including China, North Korea and Russia. The Russian and Chinese threats, as of now, can be ruled out. However, the North Korean threat is very much real and Japan has been building up its Ballistic Missile Defence system in collaboration with the US to cater for it.¶ Okinawa Prefecture includes a chain of hundreds of small islands. The midpoint of this chain is almost equidistance from Taiwan and Japan’s Kyushu Island. During the Vietnam War, the USFJ military bases particularly in Okinawa were among the most important strategic and logistic bases. In addition, strategists in Japan note that despite the country’s three non-nuclear principles, some bases in Okinawa were used for stockpiling nuclear weapons during the Cold War. Even today, US nuclear-armed submarines and destroyers operate in the vicinity of Japan, facilitated by a secret deal between the governments of the US and Japan. Moreover, having military bases in Japan also helps the US to have easy access to the strategically important five seas –the Bering Sea, the Sea of Okhotsk, the Japan Sea, the East China Sea and the South China Sea.1

#### Futenma is key to deter regional threats – Japanese officials prove

Klinger 6/14 – Senior Research Fellow for Northeast Asia in the Asian Studies at The Heritage Foundation (Bruce, Heritage Foundation, 6/14/2k11, “Top 10 Reasons Why the U.S. Marines on Okinawa Are Essential to Peace and Security in the Pacific,” <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-marines-on-okinawa-are-essential-to-peace-and-security-in-the-pacific>)

After months of advocating the eviction of a Marine Corps air base from Okinawa, several senior DPJ politicians reversed course and publicly admitted that the Marines are an indispensable and irreplaceable element of any U.S. response to a crisis in Asia. For example: Although Prime Minister Hatoyama campaigned on a promise to remove the Marine air unit from Okinawa, he later admitted that, “As I learned more about the [security situation in Asia], I’ve come to realize that [the Marines] are all linked up as a package to maintain deterrence.”[[3]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-marines-on-okinawa-are-essential-to-peace-and-security-in-the-pacific%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn3) He added that the U.S. Marines on Okinawa “have a major role to play, and it’ll be inappropriate to relocate the Marines too far away from Okinawa.”[[4]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-marines-on-okinawa-are-essential-to-peace-and-security-in-the-pacific%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn4) Foreign Minister Okada reversed his earlier opposition to the Futenma Replacement Facility (FRF) by declaring that “the presence of U.S. Marines on Okinawa is necessary for Japan’s national security [since they] are a powerful deterrent against possible enemy attacks and should be stationed in Japan.[[5]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-marines-on-okinawa-are-essential-to-peace-and-security-in-the-pacific%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn5) U.S. diplomatic cables reveal that then-Land Minister and State Minister for Okinawa Seiji Maehara told U.S. diplomats in December 2009 that “if the U.S. does not agree to an alternative to the existing FRF plan, the DPJ would be prepared to go ahead with the current plan.” In January 2011, Deputy Chief Cabinet Secretary Yorihisa Matsuno told the U.S. embassy that the DPJ would “consider for ‘form’s sake’ Futenma options outside of Okinawa, but the only realistic options are to move Futenma to Camp Schwab or another existing facility.”[[6]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-marines-on-okinawa-are-essential-to-peace-and-security-in-the-pacific%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn6) It is important to acknowledge that the DPJ has made the right—albeit belated—decision with regard to U.S. Marines in Okinawa, but the real issue—one that is perhaps not well understood in either America or Japan—is why U.S. Marines must remain in Okinawa.

#### Marines are key to Asian stability

#### Melton and Elridge 10

(Col. Melton, a former marine attache at U.S. Embassy Tokyo, currently serves as the assistant chief of staff, G-5, U.S. Marine Corps Bases, Japan. Eldridge, Ph.D., a former tenured associate professor of U.S.-Japan relations and Okinawan history at Osaka University, serves in the same office as Melton, “U.S. marine presence in Okinawa Pref. essential,” 3/4/10, <http://www.yomiuri.co.jp/dy/columns/commentary/20100304dy01.htm> /mr)

The opinion piece entitled "Putting Okinawa Air Base in Perspective" by Michael O'Hanlon carried in The Daily Yomiuri on Feb. 3 is a thoughtful discussion of the U.S.-Japan alliance. We fully agree with the "need to lift our sights above bickering over bases and put strategy and [dealing with] the world's real problems back at the center of our alliance," but we believe Mr. O'Hanlon does not fully appreciate the importance of Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Futenma or understand the complex dynamics of the so-called "Okinawa problem." Moreover, he downplays the vital role that forward-deployed United States Marines fulfill in meeting the obligations of the 1960 United States-Japan Treaty of Mutual Security and Cooperation.¶ There is much to rebut in his op-ed, but we will concentrate on the following four faulty premises: 1) that the functions of MCAS Futenma are less important than Kadena Air Base (KAB) and thus can be forfeited as a political pawn; 2) that sacrificing MCAS Futenma would make KAB less of a political target and thus satisfy anti-base activists in Okinawa and elsewhere; 3) that the U.S. government has not regularly "factored in local sensitivities" into alliance management issues and has done nothing in the past to alleviate local concerns; and 4) that a contingency basing formula in which civilian airports are used is an operationally practical solution.¶ While both KAB and MCAS Futenma are co-located in central Okinawa, they have fundamentally different roles and missions. Yet, there is an important synergy between the two airfields in daily operations as well as in a contingency if deterrence failed. A loss of the capabilities of either airfield could significantly impact operations during a crisis. When discussing them, it is not an either/or choice but a clear requirement for both. While scholars can hope for the best, planners need to prepare for the worst. One airfield reduces contingency options and creates a military planner's worst nightmare: a single point of failure.¶ We disagree that this option is a "tolerable one," as he suggests, by any means, regardless of whether contingency access to other airfields is improved or not. There are numerous political and operational challenges to the concept of contingency use but the bottom line up front is: moving or spreading the functions of Futenma outside of the main island of Okinawa not only would critically affect the ability of the Marine Corps to perform its daily operations and training to sustain combat readiness as well as to ably and quickly respond to crises, but could also impair the deterrence functions and credibility of our alliance and thus security in the entire region.¶ The USMC takes seriously "local sensitivities" in all aspects of our training and operations, and it was the U.S. and Japanese governments' efforts to address these concerns that were behind the 1996 and 2006 agreements to return Futenma, which were conditioned on a replacement site being found within the prefecture. A replacement facility then and now remains important because the capabilities Futenma possesses are vital to the mission of the Marine Corps and other U.S. forces in Okinawa, as well as being a United Nations Command (Rear) Airfield and a diversion airfield for civilian aircraft. Not only do the Marines provide significant contributions to deterrence and defense of Japan and peace and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region, but are also actively involved in HA/DR missions and Theater Security Cooperation (TSC), which is designed to build transparency and trust in this region. Significantly, there have been hundreds of thousands of lives saved in the region by U.S. Marines, such as during the 12 significant HA/DR operations in the past five years alone, including the 2004 tsunami and the disastrous tropical cyclones in 2007 in Bangladesh and 2008 in Burma in which units from the III Marine Expeditionary Force stationed on Okinawa either directly led or significantly contributed to response efforts.¶ The implied argument in the op-ed--that the forfeiting of MCAS Futenma and removal of all Marines from Okinawa would "preserve local support for Kadena"--is misplaced. Regrettably, the fact is anti-base, anti-alliance activists will only pocket concessions and continue to press for the next one. Following the closure of MCAS Futenma without a replacement, as recommended by Mr. O'Hanlon, the activists will likely turn their attention next to closing Kadena Air Base, which would further degrade alliance capabilities.¶ Fortunately, there has been a realization that the United States and Japan need to do more at the political level to help ensure the smooth implementation of the bilateral security treaty as well as to educate our respective publics more on the importance of the alliance.¶ Equally important is that Japan's SDF be allowed to play a larger operational role in the alliance and in the region. The proposal by Mr. O'Hanlon for Japan to send "substantial numbers of peacekeeping troops to Sudan and the Congo" is also good, but has no bearing on the strategic situation in Northeast Asia or even the Asia-Pacific. Having only recently adopted a "joint" approach to operations, the SDF is trying to operate more closely with the military forces of its only ally to develop these capabilities. Working with the U.S. and increasingly with the militaries of other countries, the SDF is gaining experience and confidence. While it was given a mandate to participate in more international HA/DR operations abroad, the SDF is faced with a declining budget and decreasing personnel numbers. In the interim, the U.S. Marines, being the only truly rapidly deployable ground troops in Northeast Asia, will continue to be the first responders--the 911 force--to any crisis and continue to represent, along with the Navy, Air Force, and Army service components of U.S. Forces Japan and U.S. Pacific Command, the American commitment to the region. The Marines' capabilities, experience, and proven record of success are hard to replicate, something the SDF, particularly the Ground Self-Defense Forces, look to as they further develop their capabilities and jointness.¶ At the end of his opinion piece, the author refers to the late Ambassador Mike Mansfield's description of the U.S.-Japan alliance as being the most important, bar none. We entirely agree. But we would also remind him that out of all of Mr. Mansfield's accomplishments including educator, senator, majority leader, and ambassador, he was most proud of his service as a United States Marine and had written on his tombstone in Arlington National Cemetery after his death in October 2001 the following simple epitaph: "Michael Joseph Mansfield, Pvt. U.S. Marine Corps."¶

# Senkaku

Presence on Futenma is key to effective deterrent, especially over Senkaku Islands

Japan Times 10

(Masami Ito, Staff writer, “Senkaku challenge surmountable: departing U.S. Forces Commander,” Japan Times, 10/22/10, <http://search.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/nn20101022a6.html> /mr)

Masami Ito STAFF WRITER Lt. Gen. Edward Rice, before he steps down next week as the commander of U.S. Forces Japan, said Thursday it is natural for any country, including Japan and China, to face bilateral "challenges" and expressed optimism the two countries will be able to move forward in a positive direction. Japan-China relations have been severely strained over the arrest of a trawler captain last month near the uninhabited Senkaku Islands in the East China Sea. The islets are controlled by Japan but are claimed by China and Taiwan and are often the source of diplomatic tension. During a round-table news conference with media outlets in Minato Ward, Tokyo, the air force officer said there are "no major conflicts" in the region. "No relationship is without disagreements . . . (and it is) not an abnormal condition or a condition to fear," Rice said. "The key is do we have mechanisms that allow us to work through those challenges while at the same time keeping open the opportunities that we have to work together to bring prosperity to our nations." Since the Senkaku incident, China has taken a hardline stance that led to a halt of exports of rare earth minerals to Japan. And a recent report by The New York Times suggested that China, which produces more than 90 percent of the global supply of the minerals, has blocked some shipments to the U.S. and Europe as well. "I think all countries have a very strong economic relationship with China," Rice said. "China has the capacity to contribute in many productive ways to the development of the region and what happens around the world. So we are all seeking, and I think (China) is seeking this too, are ways to engage constructively together." Rice, who will be promoted to the rank of general and take over as commander of the Air Education and Training Command at Randolph Air Force Base in Texas next week, declined to say what kind of military support the U.S. would provide in case of a conflict between Tokyo and Beijing over the Senkaku Islands. Rice said the strategy depends on each contingency scenario. "It is just very difficult to speculate or hypothesize about what we might do in a given scenario," Rice said. "It is exactly why it is important for us to have flexible capabilities to include a basing structure that allows us to organize our forces to the requirements of a specific contingency." Rice, who arrived to Tokyo in February 2008, has seen the historic change in government from the Liberal Democratic Party to the Democratic Party of Japan. This past year, bilateral ties have been strained by the contentious relocation of U.S. Marine Corps Air Station Futenma in Okinawa. While most Okinawa residents have expressed strong doubt over the need for the marines to be stationed in Okinawa, Rice stressed that their presence is vital as a deterrent. He cited the uniqueness of the Marine Air-Ground Task Force, whose duties range from amphibious operations to air assaults. "I think that (the marines) have a very significant deterrent effect on the people we might want to deter because these people understand military operations," Rice said. "They understand time-distance relationships, they understand the capacity that's inherent in a Marine Air-Ground Task Force and it affects every day their thinking about the U.S. presence here, the value of our alliance, and the strength of our alliance." Host-nation support is also a sensitive issue as there is some criticism in Japan over the money paid to Washington to support the U.S. military presence. Rice said the financial support is Japan's contribution to the alliance, just as he and other U.S. service members are obliged to defend Japan. "I have obligated myself to defend Japan and if necessary, give my life in the defense of Japan. . . . That is part of our contribution to this alliance," he said. "What value you put on my commitment to defend Japan is subjective in some way, but I would suggest that it is certainly not an unequal commitment for Japan to agree to host the forces that are here for their defense and provide a modest level of support for those forces as we meet our obligations."

#### Senkakus erode Sino-Japanese relations

Malik, 10 – Japan Foundation Fellow and author of an important volume on Pakistan-Japan relations (Ahmad Rashid, “Sino-Japanese Balance Must Be Maintained,” October 9, PanOrient News, <http://www.panorientnews.com/en/news.php?k=484>)

Sino-Japanese relations revolve around acute sensitivities. A tempest in a teacup can easily turn into a political typhoon. Both Japan and China are powerful countries. Their relationship is an ancient relationship, but it is often held together by a very weak thread that can be broken at any time on any issue. This creates many challenges, not only for Japan and China, but also for the many nations which maintain important relations with both of them. A Sino-Japanese rivalry that gets out of hand would present a formidable destabilizing element that would confuse the policies of many nearby nations. In spite of the great need for a constructive Sino-Japanese relationship, these nations have a tendency to clash even on rather marginal issues. In regard to the highly emotional, territorial issue presented by the Senkaku / Diaoyu Islands dispute, international law in fact provides more questions than answers. More assertive military policies by either side could easily trigger a large-scale conflict that would benefit no nation. Clearly, the recent confrontation over a Chinese fishing boat captain has been a setback to efforts to deal with the islands issue peacefully and has led to an overall deterioration in Japan-China relations.

# China & North Korea Conflict

#### US forces are key to prevent China and North Korea conflict

Baron, 1/13 [Kevin Baron is a Washington bureau reporter covering the Pentagon, national security and foreign policy issues. In more than a decade in Washington, Baron has reported on assignment from Asia, Africa, Australia, Europe, the Middle East and the South Pacific. Stars and Stripes, “Gates: U.S. troops needed in Japan to keep China, North Korea in check,” January 13, 2011,<http://www.stripes.com/news/pacific/japan/gates-u-s-troops-needed-in-japan-to-keep-china-north-korea-in-check-1.131835>]

TOKYO — The U.S. needs troops in Japan for the long term to keep China’s rising power in check and contain North Korea’s aggressive nuclear and missile aspirations, Defense Secretary Robert Gates said Friday, even as the U.S. begins considering a future with a smaller, more affordable military.¶ “On account of the scope, complexity and lethality of these challenges, I would argue that our alliance is more necessary, more relevant and more important than ever,” Gates said in a keynote speech at Tokyo’s Keio University.¶ Without U.S. armed forces in Japan, Gates said North Korea’s military provocations could be “even more outrageous,” China might act more aggressively, disaster assistance would take longer, joint exercises would be harder to execute and the U.S. would have less intelligence on the region.¶ ADVERTISEMENT¶ In a sweeping assessment of the U.S.-Japan security stance, Gates said the two countries require “more effective” missile defense capabilities. He praised the existing system as “one of the most advanced of its kind in the world,” and hailed the advanced SM-3 interceptor’s ability to thwart a North Korean attack. Both countries will continue to share missile defense commands at Yokota Air Base.¶ Gates made clear that the U.S. intends to move forward with Futenma relocation under the plan adopted last year, although he took a softer tone in remarks Thursday and at the defense ministry. That marked a change from past visits in which Gates had pressed Japan to get on with the move.¶ The address marked the last day of a weeklong swing through Asia where, in Beijing, Gates won Chinese support for better U.S. military relations and cooperation on North Korea. Gates left Japan on Friday for Seoul, South Korea, and brief visits with President Lee Myung-bak and National Defense Minister Kim Kwan-jin.¶ Gates said the region’s security challenges dominated conversations during his trip, but he defended his decision to engage in more open military relations with China.¶ “I disagree with those who portray China as an inevitable strategic adversary of the United States,” he said. “We welcome a China that plays a constructive role on the world stage.”¶ Yet, he warned that Chinese advances in cyber and anti-satellite warfare pose “a potential challenge” to U.S. military’s Pacific operations and communications “in ways that could inflict enormous damage to advanced, networked militaries and societies. Fortunately, the U.S. and Japan maintain a qualitative edge in satellite and computer technology,” he said.¶ China dominated the questions from the Japanese audience questions. On the perceived gap between China’s civilian and military leadership, given Tuesday’s J-20 stealth fighter test that appeared to surprise China’s President Hu Jintao, Gates called the disconnect worrisome. But he said repeatedly that he believes Hu is clearly in command.¶ Hu visits Washington next week to meet with President Barack Obama.¶ Speaking a week after introducing Pentagon plans to reduce the size of the U.S. military and pull back on costly weapons buys, Gates said Japan will need to take on more of its security responsibilities.¶ “In the United States, we are engaged in a robust debate about the size, composition and cost of our military,” Gates said. “We will continue to maintain the military strength necessary to protect our interests, defend our allies and deter potential adversaries from acts of aggression and intimidation. To do this, we need a committed and capable security partner in Japan.”¶ Gates praised Japan’s recent agreement to stand “shoulder to shoulder” with South Korea, saying their increased military activities around the world are a key rationale for recommending Japan join the U.N. Security Council.¶ For now, regional security remains wholly dependent on the U.S. Yet as Gates openly advocated for negotiations with North Korea, he sounded pessimistic.¶ “Despite the hopes and best efforts of the South Korean government, the U.S. and our allies, and the international community,” he said, “the character and priorities of the North Korean regime have sadly not changed.

# American Forces Solve China Expansion

#### American forces are key to prevent Chinese hegemony

Robert Kagan, Senior Fellow in Foreign Policy Studies at the Brookings Institution, Adjunct Professor of History at Georgetown University, former senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, contributing editor to The Weekly Standard, holds a Master of Public Policy degree from the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University and a Ph.D. in U.S. History from American University, 2011 (“The Price of Power,” The Weekly Standard, Volume 16, Number 18, January 24th, Available Online at<http://www.weeklystandard.com/print/articles/price-power_533695.html>, Accessed 01-27-2011)

• American forces deployed in East Asia and the Western Pacific have for decades prevented the outbreak of major war, provided stability, and kept open international trading routes, making possible an unprecedented era of growth and prosperity for Asians and Americans alike. Now the United States faces a new challenge and potential threat from a rising China which seeks eventually to push the U.S. military’s area of operations back to Hawaii and exercise hegemony over the world’s most rapidly growing economies. Meanwhile, a nuclear-armed North Korea threatens war with South Korea and fires ballistic missiles over Japan that will someday be capable of reaching the west coast of the United States. Democratic nations in the region, worried that the United States may be losing influence, turn to Washington for reassurance that the U.S. security guarantee remains firm. If the United States cannot provide that assurance because it is cutting back its military capabilities, they will have to choose between accepting Chinese dominance and striking out on their own, possibly by building nuclear weapons.

# Disaster Relief/Deterrence

#### **Marines key to disaster relief and deterrence**

Keith J. Stalder, Lieutenant General in the United States Marine Corps, Currently Commanding General of U.S. Marine Corps Forces Pacific,2010 (“Marine General Stalder Speaks at Tokyo American Center,” U.S. Embassy to Japan, February 17th, Available Online at<http://tokyo.usembassy.gov/e/p/tp-20100217-71.html>, Accessed 10-24-2010)

One more thing about ground forces. Their mission is not just about conflicts. Look at Haiti today. Think of the response when Mount Pinatubo blew up in the Philippines, or the efforts after the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami. Recall responses to cyclones in Bangladesh and Burma. Central to all these humanitarian relief efforts was the Marine Corps.¶ May I interject here how proud the Marine Corps is to be operating with the Japan Self Defense Force in Haiti at this very moment. That your government was willing to send your forces half way around the world to help people in urgent need sends a powerful message about the values of the people of Japan.¶ Every time the Third Marine Expeditionary Force deploys on a humanitarian assistance mission, we are assisted by the citizens of Okinawa. Our bases in Okinawa make these life-saving missions possible, and have resulted in perhaps hundreds of thousands of lives being saved in the last fifty years. Geography matters. Okinawa is in the center of an earthquake and cyclone region. There is probably nowhere better in the world from which to dispatch Marines to natural disasters. Hours matter during such tragedies. Timed saved means lives spared in the aftermath of these terrible events. Humanitarian assistance is also a key means of supporting stability. Disaster relief missions often involve assisting poorer governments lacking the capacity or capability to manage a crisis. By helping those governments meet needs and rebuild lives, we contribute to political stability that sustains economic growth throughout the wider region.¶ Looking to the next 50 years of our Alliance, Humanitarian Assistance/Disaster Relief is an area where the U.S. and Japan have great potential to unite our capabilities and make a difference in the lives of millions of people, as we strengthen peace and stability. Humanitarian assistance is important because it enhances political stability, reinforces to the world our fundamental values, and provides an answer to our enemies who lie about our intentions. But it also reinforces deterrence. When the impressive power and capability of a United States Marine Air Ground Task Force can land at the site of a disaster within hours or days, our competitors notice.

# Deterrence Key

#### Deterrence is key – plan destroys it

#### Yomiuri Shimbun 3/22/12

(Yomiuri Shimbun, “Japan-U.S. deterrent power should be maintained, enhanced,” 3/22/12, <http://www.yomiuri.co.jp/dy/editorial/T120322004564.htm> /mr)

Find new location in Japan¶ We hope Tokyo and Washington continue the talks in a level-headed manner without ruling out the relocation of marines to bases within Japan other than Iwakuni, in addition to Hawaii and other candidate sites abroad.¶ Meanwhile, the United States has demanded that Japan allocate more government money for relocation costs. We think this unilateral demand by the United States is unreasonable, even though the U.S. Congress has been pressing for cuts in defense spending. Japan should patiently negotiate with Washington.¶ The U.S. Marine Corps has laid out a policy of spreading out its units and rotating them among several bases in the Pacific region along with enhancements in their mobility. The marines think their units could become a stronger force if they are spread to bases in Guam and other places rather than concentrated in Okinawa Prefecture, in light of China's strategy of trying to deny U.S. forces access to the Pacific region near Asia and the improved performance of its ballistic missiles.¶ However, the United States is planning to keep the command of the 3rd Marine Expeditionary Force and its main combat unit, the 31st Marine Expeditionary Unit, in Okinawa Prefecture even as other units relocate.¶ Since the U.S. government initially had a plan to relocate the command to Guam, there was concern that its ability to defend Okinawa Prefecture would weaken. We welcome their stay in the prefecture as a way to maintain deterrent power.¶ The security environment in East Asia is becoming more volatile than ever with the Chinese military's rapid arms buildup and expanded activities as well as threats from North Korea's nuclear weapons and missiles. The deterrent power of U.S. forces should not merely be maintained. It should be enhanced as well.

# \*\*\*Links\*\*\*

# Agenda DA links

The Plan is extremely unpopular with Congress and pits the President against Congress

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)

The outline of these new force posture elements has raised or reinforced a number of critical questions from U.S. congressional committee and member offices. While the revised agreement with Japan regarding Okinawa and Guam was seen as more easily implemented than the original Defense Policy Review Initiative plan that linked the Marine relocation and FRF issues, Congress remains skeptical of overall costs and schedules, given earlier inaccurate estimates of Guam‘s infrastructure and economic assistance needs. This problem has been compounded by the fact that geographically distributing forces adds new variables and potential delays to calculations about cost and executability. These variables include the involvement of more governments (and levels of government) in decision-making (e.g., Australia, Guam, Hawaii), additional supplemental environmental impact statements (SEISs), and new requirements for lift and logistics over a larger geographic area. Moreover, with the functional distribution of roles and missions to put more emphasis on shaping and reassurance activities and with DoD‘s shift to adaptive planning over the past decade, preparing for larger contingency operations has become a less predictable benchmark for determining budgets for military construction and force posture. Finally, there is a lack of consensus between the executive and legislative branches regarding strategy toward China. In part this is because the strategy is still evolving, in part because sensitivities in the region constrain DoD‘s ability to describe the strategy, and in part because the Congress is not itself focused on the strategic framework of budget-related decisions.

#### Guam Relocation Plan causes “logjam” in Congress

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)

The Senators' statement was silent on another part of the study, however: CSIS also challenges Capitol Hill and the administration to compromise on stalled plans to move Marines from Okinawa to Guam. "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.

#### Plan costs PC – Congressional opposition

**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)

Several factors have converged to give the issue new urgency. **Opposition remains strong on Okinawa to construction of a new facility in the Henoko Bay area**, to replace US Marine Air Station Futenma, which has been slated for closure since 1995. **There is no momentum in Japan to move forward with the project**, a situation made more stark by the Great Eastern Earthquake of March 11. Tokyo is intensely focused on reconstruction efforts; **neither the financial nor political capital is available to push the Henoko project through.** Meanwhile, **construction delays and cost overruns** [**continue**](http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/Digital-Library/ISN-Insights/Detail/?lng=en&id=129533&contextid734=129533&contextid735=129531&tabid=129531129533) **to bedevil a critical, related portion of the plan: the relocation of over 8,000 Marines and 9,000 family members from Okinawa to Guam. In Washington, an increasingly debt-weary Congress is asking whether it is worth the cost of building the new Henoko facility and the new Marine housing and related facilities on Guam, when cheaper force configurations more conducive to strategic needs in Asia might be found.** Diplomats are under stress to find some answers because of plans for a “2+2” meeting of defense and foreign ministers from the two countries, to be followed by a summit meeting between President Barack Obama and Prime Minister Kan Naoto. With leaders in Japan tied down with reconstruction efforts, no schedule has yet been set for either meeting, though staging both by the end of June has been discussed.

#### Guam relocation unpopular with congress and Japan

Foreign Policy 12

(Josh Rogin is a staff writer at Foreign Policy, “Us and Japan to announce new basing agreement”, April 24 2012, pg online @ http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/04/24/us\_and\_japan\_to\_announce\_new\_basing\_agreement)

The United States and Japan are nearing completion of a new basing agreement for U.S. troops in Okinawa, but three top senators want to make sure that Congress has a seat at the table before anything is set in stone.¶ "We have been advised informally that the United States and Japan are preparing to announce an agreement regarding basing issues on Okinawa and Guam as early as this Wednesday, April 25, in advance of Prime Minister Noda's coming visit to the United States," Sens. Carl Levin (D-MI), John McCain (R-AZ), and Jim Webb (D-VA) wrote to Defense Secretary Leon Panetta today. "While we have been strongly encouraging a resolution of this complex and troubling issue, we feel compelled to emphasize that no new basing proposal can be considered final until it has the support of Congress, which has important oversight and funding responsibilities."¶ The 2006 U.S.-Japan agreement to relocate 8,000 Marines from Okinawa to Guam and move the Futenma Air Station to a different part of Okinawa has been stalled for years due to the Tokyo government's failure to secure the buy-in of local Okinawan officials and communities for the new location of the airbase.¶ Last July, Levin, McCain, and Webb came out with strong objections to the plan due to the upward spiraling costs of the Guam part of the project. They added language to the 2012 National Defense Authorization Act to require a independent study to rethink the whole arrangement. That study is now being conducted by the Center for Strategic and International Studies, a non-partisan Washington think tank.¶ The bill requires the Department of Defense to study the feasibility of relocating some of the Air Force assets at Kadena Air Base on Okinawa to other bases in Japan or to Guam, and moving Marine Corps aviation assets currently at Marine Corps Air Station Futenma to Kadena Air Base rather than building an expensive replacement facility at Camp Schwab, another base located on Okinawa. This idea is extremely unpopular in Japan.¶ In February, the United States and Japan announced they would delink the troop location from the base relocation in the hopes of moving at least part of the agreement forward. The senators' letter today said that a new announcement is expected this week in advance of the Japanese prime minister's April 30 visit to Washington. According to Bloomberg, the new announcement will include a drastic scaling back of the number of troops headed to Guam, diverting about half of the 8,000 slated to leave Japan to Australia, Hawaii, or the Philippines.¶ The senators aren't necessarily opposed to such a plan, but say they haven't been briefed on the announcement and haven't been able to determine if the new plan addresses their concerns as laid out in the legislation last year. The independent assessment hasn't been completed, they pointed out. The bill also prevents any spending on the project until various conditions are met and those conditions have not been met, the senators wrote.¶ "Based on the information we have received about this emerging agreement, we have many questions that have not been fully addressed," the senators wrote. "We require additional information regarding how this proposal relates to the broader strategic concept of operations in the region, the Marine Corps' concept of operations, master plans, and alternatives to base realignments on Guam and Okinawa, as well as the positioning of U.S. Air Force units in the Asia-Pacific region. We also remain concerned about the absence of firm cost estimates informed by basing plans, an analysis of logistical requirements, and environmental studies related to this new agreement."¶ The senators said they were mindful of how sensitive basing issues are in the U.S.-Japanese relationship (some say the Obama administration's battles with former Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama contributed to Hatoyama's downfall). They also said they support a robust U.S. military presence in the region and a strong U.S.-Japanese security alliance. But they want the administration to delay the announcement nonetheless.¶ "We remain committed to working with the Administration to resolve this matter to the benefit of both the United States and Japan. But, for the reasons given above, it is our position that any announcement on this critical matter that goes beyond an agreement in principle at this time would be premature and could have the unintended consequences of creating more difficulties for our important alliance," they wrote.¶ Noda will visit the White House and meet with President Barack Obama on April 30 but he will not get a state dinner like his Chinese counterpart Hu Jintao.¶ "The President looks forward to holding discussions with the Prime Minister on a wide range of bilateral, regional and global issues, including the U.S.-Japan Security Alliance, economic and trade issues, and deepening bilateral cooperation. The two leaders will also discuss regional and global security concerns," the White House said in a statement.

#### Transportation infrastructure spending unpopular

Washington Post 11

(“Transportation funding tough to sell to public”, Washington Post, Lexis, December 7, 2011)

Alaska's "bridge to nowhere" is so seared in the minds of voters as the epitome of wasteful federal spending that hardly anyone is willing to pay more to revitalize the nation's aging highways, bridges and transit systems, experts say.¶ Faced with that grim assessment, an elite group of transportation experts who gathered in Washington last week did not pause to ponder the calamity they foresee if the public fails to grasp the need. Their bipartisan report had defined it a year earlier as more than $60 billion a year just to maintain current systems.¶ Sobered by the reality that, at best, Congress might vote to keep funding at current levels - roughly $54 billion a year - they received another dose of bad news last week.¶ Americans don't trust their leaders to spend transportation tax dollars wisely.¶ "The overwhelming sense that this thing has become a scam is very compelling," said Jim Mulhall, a political strategist who has done focus groups for the advocacy organization Building America's Future.¶ Led by five former secretaries of transportation - James Burnley, Samuel Skinner, Rodney Slater, Norman Y. Mineta and Mary Peters - the group gathered at the University of Virginia's Miller Center offices in Washington for two days of discussion on how to educate and energize average Americans about the cancer that is eating away the networks that carry people from place to place and goods to market.¶ They were told that they had some hope of persuading those on the political left and center, but that "conservatives are utterly convinced that there is waste and corruption, and that no [more] money is needed," said Rich Thau of Presentation Testing, who has tested public opinion on the issue.¶ They think "somebody wasted my money and it's going to something else," Thau said. "You can make a good case for infrastructure [improvements,] but people still don't want to pay."¶ The infrastructure issue has played large within the Beltway, where think tanks, transportation advocates and some members of Congress wave around data indicating that gridlock and economic stagnation will descend dramatically unless trillions of dollars are spent on roads, bridges, ports, transit and aviation systems.¶ But for many in the country, transportation funding is synonymous with pork barrel spending and boondoggles.¶ Advocates have quantified the issue every which way in at least a half-dozen major reports and lots of smaller studies that singled out one slice of the transportation pie chart. Almost 70,000 bridges are structurally deficient, more than 20 percent of flights at the busiest major airports experience delays, the U.S. risks losing competitive ground with other nations that invest more, traffic congestion threatens to strangle the economic viability of big cities, long-neglected metro transit systems are breaking down and the foundations are crumbling beneath that fresh coat of asphalt on millions of miles of highway.¶ None of that has persuasively connected with the public, the collected experts agreed.¶ "Ultimately, it comes down to a trust issue," said Emil H. Frankel, a former assistant secretary for transportation in the George W. Bush administration who now works at the Bipartisan Policy Center.¶ Thau said polling has shown for years that many Americans believe about half of every dollar spent on transportation is wasted.¶ Congress has itself to blame for the deep public cynicism. Although earmarks became commonplace in bills of all sorts during the 1980s and 1990s, nowhere were the pet projects of individual lawmakers more likely to appear than in transportation bills. The last long-term transportation bill in 2005 had 6,000 of them.

#### No link turns – proponents lack the requisite PC

**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)

Secretary Gates remains adamantly opposed, and there does not yet exist within the administration the necessary correlation of political forces willing to force Gates to accept a new approach. The Pentagon’s rigid stance is worsened by the lack of a replacement yet for Gen. Chip Gregson, who retired recently as assistant secretary of defense for Asian affairs. Senior Pentagon officials continue to say the administration is committed to the Henoko plan. But with the Pentagon leadership in transition, with CIA director Leon Panetta set to take over once Gates departs**, senior officials are reluctant to veer from established policy, even if they want to. Officials at this level are in a bind: aware of opposition in Japan, aware of the enormous** [**investment**](http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/Digital-Library/ISN-Insights/Detail/?lng=en&id=129533&contextid734=129533&contextid735=129531&tabid=129531129533) **the Marines and US diplomacy have in the existing policy, but not politically strong enough to push for, much less win, a policy change.**

#### Obama must push the plan

**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)

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.

#### McCain opposes the plan

**Aguon ’11** (Mindy, writer for Kuam News, a Guam news publication, “McCain calls for defense spending cuts for Guam,” 12-11-11 <http://www.kuam.com/story/16352328/2011/12/19/mccain-calls-for-defense-spending-cuts-for-guam>)

Guam - **Senator John McCain isn't giving up on his efforts to exclude funding for the military buildup**. In a letter to Senate Committee on Appropriations Chairman Senator Daniel Inouye and Vice Chair Senator Thad Cochran, **McCain urges them to cut what he calls "unneeded spending for public infrastructure on Guam" from the Department of Defense section of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, which is pending action in the Senate.** In the December 15 letter, **McCain urges his colleagues to cut $33 million from the President's budget request for socioeconomic infrastructure improvements on Guam**. With the buildup on Guam now "paused", **McCain doesn't believe Congress should take money normally used for base operations, supplies and ammunition and use them to address "long standing problems on Guam completely unrelated to the Marine Corps build-up**" such as building a cultural artifacts repository, purchasing 53 school buses and building the first phase of a [mental health facility](http://www.kuam.com/story/16352328/2011/12/19/mccain-calls-for-defense-spending-cuts-for-guam) to satisfy a federal injunction. McCain wrote, "I have strong concerns about the challenges and growing costs in a time of severe fiscal constraints of building large new U.S. military facilities and associated training areas on Guam for the permanent stationing of 8,700 Marines and their families.". **The Arizona senator adding that the build-up on Guam is contingent on tangible progress towards the construction of a Futenma Replacement Facility which hasn't happened**." As a result of these developments, we believe a pause in further obligations of either U.S. or Government of Japan funds is reasonable pending a[study](http://www.kuam.com/story/16352328/2011/12/19/mccain-calls-for-defense-spending-cuts-for-guam) of the strategy and U.S. force posture in the Pacific area of responsibility," he wrote. McCain's letter comes just days after the House and Senate passed the 2012 National Defense Authorization Act, cutting $155 million for military construction projects on Guam to support the relocation of the Marines.

#### Congress is definitely involved

#### Washington Post 12

(Greg Jaffe and Emily Heil, Washington Post, “U.S. comes to an agreement with Japan to move 9,000 Marines off Okinawa,” 4/26/12, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/us-comes-to-agreement-with-japan-to-move-9000-marines-off-okinawa/2012/04/26/gIQA1seKkT_story.html> /mr)

In a statement, Armed Services Chairman Carl Levin (D-Mich.), ranking Republican John McCain (Ariz.) and James Webb (D-Va.) said the revised plan had addressed “some” of the issues they raised.¶ “We still have many questions about the specific details of this statement and its implications for our force posture in the Asia-Pacific region, and we will continue to work with the Administration and the Government of Japan to achieve the objectives we all share,” the three senators said in a statement.¶ Earlier this week, they wrote a letter to Panetta raising doubts about the emerging proposal. They questioned “cost estimates, military sustainment and force management, and how it would support a broader strategic concept of operations in this increasingly vital region.”¶ The senators suggested that no plan should be considered final without the support of Congress, which controls spending on base construction.

# Spending DA Links

#### Plan costs a lot of money

**Brown 11**

(Adam Brown, staff writer, 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> /mr)

Japanese government funding for upgrades and expansion of utilities on Guam total $740 million, according to the Joint Guam Program Office. Investment 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.

Lots of money

Bloomberg 12

(Sachiko Sakamaki and Takashi Hirokawa, Bloomberg Businessweek, 2/10/12, <http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-02-10/u-s-marines-relocation-to-guam-bypasses-japan-base-dispute.html> /mr)

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 in the west Pacific Ocean, according to people familiar with the matter. The U.S. will rotate an additional 4,000 troops through Australia, the Philippines and Hawaii, according to the people, who asked not to be identified before the announcement.

#### More ev

#### Washington Post 12

(Greg Jaffe and Emily Heil, Washington Post, “U.S. comes to an agreement with Japan to move 9,000 Marines off Okinawa,” 4/26/12, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/us-comes-to-agreement-with-japan-to-move-9000-marines-off-okinawa/2012/04/26/gIQA1seKkT_story.html> /mr)

Under the current plan, the total cost of closing Futenma and transferring the 9,000 Marines off Okinawa will be about $8.6 billion. The Japanese government will pay about $3.1 billion to facilitate the moves.