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## Robots CP

Text: The United States Federal Government should establish a legal framework for rapid development of military robotics and establish legal protections against potential harm robotics systems represent to humans. The United States Federal Government should fully fund the development and implementation as quickly as possible of autonomous robotics with “safety-critical computing” for the U.S. military. The United States Federal Government should streamline all United States Federal Government robotics research and development programs into one program under the authority of the Department of Defense.

The Counterplan allows the military to field fully autonomous capabilities within a few years, saves money, and makes the technology safe

James Jay Carafano, Ph.D., is assistant director of the Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for International Studies and Senior Research Fellow for National Security and Homeland Security in the Douglas and Sarah Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies at the Heritage Foundation. 12-19-2007. “The Pentagon’s Robots: Arming the Future” The Heritage Foundation. http://www.heritage.org/Research/NationalSecurity/bg2093.cfm

Congress and the Administration should continue to promote the development of robotics. While the private sector is actively researching the application of robotics to a wide range of uses from building cars to sweeping floors, commercial research is not sufficiently focused on national security needs to develop the cutting-edge robotic applications that the military needs. Thus, in the decade ahead, commercial off-the-shelf products are unlikely to provide the Pentagon with dramatic new capabilities. Congress should therefore encourage and support national security robotic research. Specifically, a few key initiatives would bolster the development and utilization of robots. Currently, each military service prefers separately managed programs geared to its individual needs. However, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) concluded that the military could save money and resources by combining the services' 13 UAV programs. The GAO cited the Fire Scout UAV program as an example of the potential of interagency cooperation. The Army and Navy are pursuing common components under the Navy contract, saving an estimated $200 million in research and development costs. The Department of Defense should accelerate this type of cooperation, promoting common configurations, harmonizing performance requirements, and drawing on common testing, evaluation, and support. Cooperation should extend to the Department of Homeland Security, supporting the UAV requirements of the Coast Guard and Customs and Border Protection. Congress should continue to fund robotic research, development, and procurement across the board. Their success on the battlefield merits the resources necessary to meet the Pentagon's goal of replacing one-third of its armed vehicles and weaponry with robots by 2015. As autonomous robots come closer to becoming reality, safety will be a major issue. Robots, especially on the battlefield, should have "safety-critical computing" to maintain human control and to ensure they do not behave in unintended or dangerous ways. Public policy needs to recognize these dangers but to address them in a manner that does not unduly hold back research that could bring dramatic new capabilities to the marketplace and further national security. Congress can speed the development of autonomous robotics by creating a legal framework in which research can occur without unnecessary restraint. The framework should include input from the Defense Department, the Department of Homeland Security, and NASA.

Robots CP – 1NC 2/2

Autonomous combat robots would make the military virtually invincible in conventional and unconventional warfare

James Jay Carafano, Ph.D., is assistant director of the Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for International Studies and Senior Research Fellow for National Security and Homeland Security in the Douglas and Sarah Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies at the Heritage Foundation. 12-19**-**2007. “The Pentagon’s Robots: Arming the Future” The Heritage Foundation. http://www.heritage.org/Research/NationalSecurity/bg2093.cfm

Robots have stepped out of the science fiction pages and onto the battlefield. Thousands are deployed in Iraq and Afghanistan, supporting military operations on land, at sea, and in the air. Some robots cost as little as several thousand dollars each. Controlled remotely by soldiers, sailors, and airmen, they perform tasks such as disarming roadside bombs, scouting dangerous territory, and patrolling the sky. As technology advances, robots will become increasingly autonomous of human supervision, providing new cutting-edge national security applications that could give the U.S. military significant competitive advantages. Robots on the battlefield will not bring an age of "bloodless" push-button warfare nor provide "silver-bullet" solutions to every combat challenge, but they can offer U.S. forces tactical advantages for outfighting both conventional (regular armed forces) and unconventional (e.g., terrorists and insurgents) enemies. The U.S. government should continue prudent investments in robotic technologies, particularly for autonomous operations--an area of research not adequately supported by commercial research and development. Congress can help by establishing a framework that will facilitate national security research and development programs and by addressing concerns about the risk to humans with legislative guidelines for liability and safety issues in research, development, and procurement.

Solves Hegemony – General

Robotics represents an opportunity akin to the breakout military tech of the first half of the 20th century

James Jay Carafano, Ph.D., is assistant director of the Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for International Studies and Senior Research Fellow for National Security and Homeland Security in the Douglas and Sarah Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies at the Heritage Foundation. 12-19**-**2007. “The Pentagon’s Robots: Arming the Future” The Heritage Foundation. http://www.heritage.org/Research/NationalSecurity/bg2093.cfm

The challenge of imagining the future of war is often a question of timing. Promising technologies are often derided or dismissed simply because their proponents' imaginations outpace the capacity of science and technology to deliver. World War I offers a case in point. The nascent technologies described by 19th century science fiction writers and military futurists were not ready for prime time and incapable of breaking the gridlock of attrition warfare. While H. G. Wells and Jules Verne are often praised for their foresight in envisioning the proliferation of weapons like tanks, airplanes, and submarines, the machines that they described were little more than fanciful, completely out of the reach of foreseeable technologies. Military writers were more conservative in their appreciation of how machines would change warfare, but even they missed the mark. In World War I, the future arrived too fast, before new technologies had matured to the point that they could reshape the face of conflict. If World War I had been avoided and the great powers had not tested these new technologies until the 1940s when they were more mature, both science fiction writers and military futurists might have been much closer to making more accurate guesses. Timing may not be everything, but it can dramatically affect the process of turning imaginative vision into reality. This may turn out to be the case for robotics. The vision of robots in combat, popularized in science fiction since the cliffhanger movie serials of the 1930s, never came to fruition in the succeeding decades. The Pentagon had little to show after decades of research, leading the promise of robotics in battle to be largely derided and dismissed as a failure of overly exuberant imagination. Dismissing military robotics as a failed future vision may be premature. The armed services' increasing expertise in robotic technologies, the effectiveness of robots in recent military operations, and promising new research developments suggest that artificial warriors may yet prove to be the next big thing.

Robotics systems greatly improve effectiveness even in the face of CBW’s and Nuclear Weapons

John Matsumura, Randall Steeb, John Gordon IV, Thomas J. Herbert, Russell W. Glenn, and Paul Steinberg, 2003. “Lightning Over Water- Sharpening American’s Light Forces for Rapid Reaction Missions”. “Robotics: Augmenting the Soldier?” The Rand Corporation. http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph\_reports/MR1196/

It is apparent that robotic systems have great potential on the future battlefield, both for

saving lives and for carrying out missions that [personned] systems cannot accomplish.

They can strongly improve a force’s situational awareness. They can also achieve

stealth and endurance, and they can operate with impunity in the face of biological,

chemical, electronic, and nuclear effects. They can even deliver nonlethal weapons without

being affected. In all of the missions we examined, future robotic systems would

make strong contributions to the force. Improvements over the levels of speed, range,

and survivability are needed over the Demo II prototypes, but these should be achievable

in the next few years.

Solves the Economy

Cutting defense spending incites depression

James Cypher, Professor of Economics at CSU-Fresno, Dollars & Sense, July-August, 2002, p19(4)

Military spending is once again propping up an economy burdened by excess capacity and withering private-sector investment. (See James M. Cypher, "Return of the Iron Triangle: The New Military Buildup," D&S, January/February 2002.) But military spending also crowds out social programs supported by public-sector funds, such as healthcare, public transportation, education, and environmental protection. James M. Cypher Since World War II, military spending has been used by the U.S. government as an imperfect form of domestic planning. It has functioned as a vital economic prop for a system that is prone to stagnation and depression. It has created an artificial demand for the "metal eating" industries (autos, steel, aluminum, coal, iron ore, machine tools, shipbuilding, etc.) whenever these industries faced a declining domestic market. In short, military spending has helped the U.S. economy grow.

\*Military spending causes more investment, preventing recession from turning into depression

James Cypher, Professor of Economics at CSU-Fresno, Dollars & Sense, July-August, 2002, p19(4)

The CEP attempts to show that the U.S. economy's low level of growth in recent years is due to a high level of military spending which leads to a low level of investment. (Military spending "crowds out" investment.) In fact, the opposite is true. In the United States, when military spending declines, investment declines. Thus, in 1970, military spending declined 1.6% and investment went down 2.0% (see table). In 1974 military spending fell 3.5% while investment decreased 1.7%. In both cases in the following year, military spending was increased to counteract the fall in investment. In expansionary periods we find that both military spending and investment increase. Thus, given the need for the stimulus that military spending provides for the U.S. economy, we find that military spending directly and via its ripple effect leads U.S. corporations to expand their capital base. In periods of slump and recession, the stimulus provided by military spending stops investment from declining as much as it otherwise would without the military buildup. This helps to put a "floor" underneath the economy, helping to stabilize its otherwise erratic movement.

## Basing CP – Working

Text:

### Bases cost American Taxes 41.6 Billion dollars and the cost will only grow

Christine Ahn and Sukjong Hong, 4/6/11,

“Bring War Dollars Home by Closing Down Bases”,http://www.stwr.org/global-conflicts-militarization/bring-war-dollars-home-by-closing-down-bases.html,

Most **figures used to estimate the cost of U.S. wars omit the global network of U.S. bases** that provides vital resources and infrastructure to existing military conflicts. **The Pentagon’s 2010 Base Structure Report**, for example, **lists 662 overseas bases but fails to include the 411 bases in Afghanistan, the 88 remaining bases in Iraq, or sites in Qatar and other countries where U.S. military personnel are stationed**. **Maintaining and constructing all U.S. bases cost American taxpayers $41.6 billion in 2010, according to Undersecretary of Defense Dorothy Robyn**.Of these 662 overseas bases, more than 70 military installations and bases and 28,500 U.S. troops are stationed in South Korea. Ted Galen Carpenter and Doug Bandow of the Cato Institute estimate that the cost of U.S. bases in Korea “probably runs on the order of $15 to $20 billion annually.” Although the United States and South Korea have agreed to reduce and consolidate the number of U.S. military bases in Korea, other bases and training ranges — including Osan Air Base in Pyeongtaek — are expanding displacing thousands of villagers and destroying Korea’s productive and limited farmland.The agreements governing the responsibility for U.S. base relocation in Korea illustrate the unequal dynamic prevalent in countries that host U.S. bases. Under the Special Measures and Base Relocation Agreements, the United States and South Korea agreed to share the cost burden of moving U.S. bases, with South Korea obligated to pay more than half that cost. In 2008, South Korea paid $741.4 million, angering South Koreans unhappy over having to foot the majority of the moving bill and pay to clean up 60 years of environmental contamination. At some of the 23 bases ”returned” to South Korea, the levels of contamination are 100 times above the limit set by Korean law. Cleanup at these sites will require years of decontamination at enormous cost to South Korean citizens, not to mention the public health and ecological consequences for generations to come.

Increased spending on basing actually kills Heg

Florian Pantazi, historian and political analyst, 4/27/12, “A US military view of global geopolitical shifts”, http://www.europesworld.org/NewEnglish/Home\_old/CommunityPosts/tabid/809/PostID/3046/AUSmilitaryviewofglobalgeopoliticalshifts.aspx

A year ago, **a group of superior US officers** with Republican **credentials were involved in a geopolitical brainstorming session** at the National Defense University in Washington. The group **was asked to provide answers regarding the US’ place in the world** and to outline a ten-year national security plan. Edward Luce was invited to attend and he subsequently summarised the group’s findings in a book, Time to Start Thinking, America in the Age of Descent, published in 2012.The sixteen officers arrived at **the conclusion that the biggest threat to US national security was not represented by the country’s external enemies, but by America’s decaying economy, infrastructure, education and health systems, and by its ballooning public debt. In their assessment, it will be next to impossible to keep the US as a world hegemon after 2020 :** eventually, America could continue to provide the public goods associated with international law and order only if it were to share domination of the world with equally powerful nations, like China or super-states such as the EU.The brainstorming **group advocated reducing by 100,000 soldiers the numbers of the military, as well as cutting US military spending by 20 percent**. **It also proposed to close down military bases from Germany, South Korea and elsewhere,** and to allow China to rule over Taiwan in exchange for accepting the reunification of South and North Korea.**The amount of money** thus **saved from military spending should be used to improve America’s infrastructure and to greatly expand foreign aid programmes, which currently stand at only one percent of every $100 the US spends every year**.**Their assessment of the dire situation of the US economy** was reinforced by Admiral Mike Mullen, who **said that, as a country“we are borrowing money from China to build weapons to face down China, which is clearly a broken strategy”.**The conclusions of the brainstorming session are echoed in the article “A National Strategic Narrative”, by Captain Wayne Porter and Colonel Mark Mykleby writing under the pseudonym “Mr Y”, in Foreign Policy magazine. The two officers claim, quite rightly, that the US should – in order to practise “smart power” abroad – practise “smart growth” at home first.As anyone would agree, the ranks of the US military do not seem to conform to the cliché of a military caste bent on world domination. If anything, the two examples above go to show that the enlisted men and women of the United States army are perhaps more patriotic in their approach to their country’s problems than many Washington politicians up to the highest level. This happens, unfortunately, because the latter all too often fall prey to well-written but deeply flawed articles and studies such as Robert Kagan’s “The Myth of America’s Decline”, that represent the views and ambitions of the neo-conservative political fringe.

### Our unnecessary military bases are costing us billions of dollars that could be better spent

David Vine, 2/25/09, “ Too Many Overseas Bases”, <http://www.fpif.org/articles/too_many_overseas_bases>

**In the midst of an economic crisis that’s getting scarier by the day, it’s time to ask whether the nation can really afford** some **1,000 military bases overseas.** For those unfamiliar with the issue, you read that number correctly. One thousand. One thousand U.S. military bases outside the 50 states and Washington, DC, representing the largest collection of bases in world history.Unlike domestic bases, which set off local alarms when threatened by closure, **our collection of overseas bases is particularly galling because almost all our taxpayer money leaves the United States (much goes to enriching private base contractors like corruption-plagued** former Halliburton subsidiary **KBR**). **One part of the massive Ramstein airbase** near Landstuhl, Germany, **has an estimated value of $3.3 billion. Just think how local communities could use that kind of money to make investments in schools, hospitals, jobs, and infrastructure.Even the Bush administration saw the wastefulness of our overseas basing network.** In 2004, then-Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld announced plans to close more than one-third of the nation’s overseas installations, moving 70,000 troops and 100,000 family members and civilians back to the United States. National Security Adviser Jim Jones, then commander of U.S. forces in Europe, called for closing 20% of our bases in Europe. According to Rumsfeld’s estimates, we could save at least $12 billion by closing 200 to 300 bases alone. While the closures were derailed by claims that closing bases could cost us in the short term, even if this is true, **it’s no reason to continue our profligate ways in the longer term.**

### Bases ruin our reputation with other countries and cause anti-Americanism

David Vine, 2/25/09, “ Too Many Overseas Bases”, <http://www.fpif.org/articles/too_many_overseas_bases>

Unfortunately, **the financial costs of our overseas bases are only part of the problem**. **Other costs to people at home and abroad are just as devastating**. **Military families suffer painful dislocations as troops stationed overseas separate from loved ones or uproot their families through frequent moves around the world.** While some foreign governments like U.S. bases for their perceived economic benefits, **many locals living near the bases suffer environmental and health damage from military toxins and pollution, disrupted economic, social, and cultural systems, military accidents, and increased prostitution and crime.** In undemocratic nations like Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Saudi Arabia, our bases support governments responsible for repression and human rights abuses. **In too many recurring cases, soldiers have raped, assaulted, or killed locals,** most prominently of late in South Korea, Okinawa, and Italy. The forced expulsion of the entire Chagossian people to create our secretive base on British Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean is another extreme but not so aberrant example. Bases abroad have become a major and unacknowledged “face” of the United States, frequently **damaging the nation’s reputation, engendering grievances and anger, and generally creating antagonistic rather than cooperative relationships between the United States and others.** Most dangerously, as we have seen in Saudi Arabia and Yemen, and as we are seeing in Iraq and Afghanistan, **foreign bases create breeding grounds for radicalism, anti-Americanism, and attacks on the United States, reducing, rather than improving, our national security.**

## Basing CP Answers

**The US is currently losing key military bases in North Korea and Japan**

Choe Sang-**Hun,** August 18, 20**11**, “Island’s Naval Base Stirs Opposition in South Korea”, http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/19/world/asia/19base.html?pagewanted=all

**American ships cruising East Asian seas** will be permitted to **visit the port**, the Defense Ministry says, **and many villagers and anti-base activists from the Korean mainland suspect that the naval base will serve** less as a shield against South Korea’s prime enemy, North Korea, than **as an outpost for the United States Navy to project its power against China**. Fear of becoming “the shrimp whose back gets broken in a fight between whales” — a popular saying in this country, whose territory has been the battlefield of bigger powers — is palpable in this village, where palm trees sway in the wind and low-slung homes lie snug behind walls of volcanic rock**.“I don’t understand why we’re trying so hard to accommodate something people in Okinawa tried so hard to resist,” said Kim Jong-hwan**, 55, a tangerine farmer, **referring to the Japanese islanders’ struggle against the American military base there**.Song Kang-ho, **an activist against the base, disagreed. “With the U.S. economy in a mess, it’s just a matter of time before China dominates Northeast Asia**,” Mr. Song said. “We should keep neutral between the rising and declining superpowers.”

### US losing important military base in Kyrgyzstan

#### Vladimir **Voronin**, August 12, **2011,** “US to lose its base in Kyrgyzstan”, http://rt.com/politics/manas-kyrgyzstan-american-base/#

**Kyrgyzstan is not going to prolong its agreement with Washington, which entitles the US to use Manas Transit Center to supply its forces in Afghanistan**, after it expires in 2014, the republic's Prime Minister Almazbek Atambayev has said.“…In full compliance with our commitments, we will inform the American side on the termination of the contract six months prior to its expiry,” the Central Asian state's premier said in an interview with Rosbalt agency. Kyrgyzstan plans to turn the Center, formerly known as Manas Air Base, into a civil transportation hub. Both Russian and Western investors would be welcome to participate in the creation of the facility, Atambayev added.**The military installation has been used as a key transit center for US and allied troops deployed to Afghanistan since the beginning of the Afghan War in 2001.**However, in 2009 the Manas military base was transformed into a transit hub used for the delivery of non-military cargo for the international coalition operating out of the Islamic republic. That followed a string of conflicts over the sum of rent and other incidents involving the base’s personnel, after which Kyrgyzstan denounced an agreement on maintaining a military air base on their territory. A significant rent increase and US investments into several Kyrgyz projects helped the sides to iron out their differences and ultimately reach a compromise.After the 2010 ouster of former President Kurmanbek Bakiev following bloody anti-government protests, the new government was to make a decision on the fate of the base near the Kyrgyz capital.Prime Minister Atambayev noted the former leadership's “preconceived attitude to undertaken commitments” has spoiled Kyrgyzstan’s image abroad. In order to improve it, the republic has no choice but to fulfill previously reached agreements, he said.Back in December 2010, US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said that Washington would not consider shutting down its Manas transit center until troops were pulled out of Afghanistan in 2014.“And then we will look to see if there is any continuing mission that would be of benefit to Kyrgyzstan that would be continued there,” she said while speaking to Kyrgyz students and civil society representatives in a televised interview during her trip to the Central Asian state. Later, while talking to the military personnel in Manas, she noted “You are not going to be here indefinitely”.Apparently, Kyrgyzstan no longer finds it beneficial to host the so-called transit center. The US was already resolved to the fact that they’d have to leave the crucial hub in Central Asia sooner or later, though probably not this soon.On June 23, a new ramp was opened at Manas International Airport. It was constructed under an agreement between Washington and Bishkek

**Loss of U.S Air bases badly hurts Heg.**

Alexander **Cooley**, associate professor of political science at Barnard College, Columbia University, 2009, http://www.nytimes.com/2009/02/10/opinion/10iht-edcooley.1.20075778.html

The recent decision by President Kurmanbek Bakiyev of Kyrgyzstan to close the U.S. military base in the small Central Asian country should come as no surprise to Washington's new foreign **policy team.** Since its establishment in the fall of 2001, the U.S. air base at Manas has been founded upon the granting of narrow economic incentives to the host country - and not on the Kyrgyz Republic's commitment to the broader international campaign in Afghanistan. What began as a relationship based on economics is about to end for financial reasons. Though the loss of Manas will deal **a** short-term blow to U.S. efforts in Afghanistan, staying is not worth the new Kyrgyz asking price.

**Base loss causes huge wars that US has to get involved in**

David Martin, 2009, “What Would Happen if North Korea Attacked?”,http://www.cbsnews.com/2100-18563\_162-5987983.html

A nighttime satellite photo of the Korean Peninsula reveals the stunning gap between the modern South and the black hole that is North Korea. How can a country which can barely keep the lights on even think about starting a war?"If the North starts anything, the North loses and I believe that firmly," said John Tilelli.Tilelli believes that based on his three years as the commanding General of the U.S. and South Korean forces."If this were to happen, is this a short war or a long war?" asked CBS News correspondent David Marin."I think it is a short war," Tilelli said.It would be a contest of mass. The North Koreans have a million men under arms against the technology and training of 28,000 American and half a million South Korean troops.But the North Korean advantage in numbers would be quickly overwhelmed by U.S. reinforcements and airstrikes from as far away as Guam or as close in as submarines off the coast.**So what could the leaders of North Korea** possibly hope to achieve in a war they know they cannot win?"Their hope is that they can make the war so painful to the United States and South Korea that we will not pursue it to the end," said Joseph Bermudez.Bermudez tracks the North Korean military for Jane's Defense Weekly believes it would begin with a massive barrage by thousands of artillery pieces and rocket launchers, many of them capable of hitting the capital of Seoul, a sprawling megalopolis of 13 million people just 20 miles south of the DMZ."They intend to employ chemical weapons, ballistic missiles right from the very beginning," Bermudez said. "If they feel threatened enough, they might even go nuclear. We're not sure."The U.S. has long since pulled its nuclear weapons out of South Korea but the threat of retaliation against a nuclear or chemical attack still stands."The United States has made it clear for many years it reserves the right to respond with overwhelming force to the use of weapons of mass destruction against the United States, our people, our forces, and our friends and allies," Defense Secretary Robert Gates said last year.Even without nuclear weapons, a conventional war on the Korean Peninsula would be horrific."The consequences are extreme," Tilelli said."Extreme in causalities?" Martin asked. "What are we talking about here?""I would say it would be in the tens of thousands," Tilelli said.North Korea's artillery barrage would be met with an immediate counter-attack by South Korean and American artillery and aircraft with precision guided weapons.But North Korea's artillery is not an easy target. Much of it is dug into the sides of mountains."They are able to open the doors, the blast doors, move out, fire a set number of rounds and then return under cover," Bermudez said.North Korean tanks would come south through three corridors. One of them is a major north-south highway. All of them heavily fortified and mined with charges to collapse bridges and overpasses.Its infantry would come pouring through secret tunnels dug beneath the DMZ. Special operations forces would land in miniature submarines behind the front lines."This combination is hoped by the North Koreans to totally throw off the defending forces and give them the opportunity to penetrate quickly and deeply. That's their hope," Bermudez said.Wars never go according to plan, but in the end the South would win and the North would lose,. and it would be a disaster for all sides

### **Losing the Japanese base causes massive nuclear proliferation**

Joseph Trento, April 9th, 2012, “: Secret Japan nuclear bomb program covered up using nuclear power industry”http://enenews.com/report-secret-japan-nuclear-bomb-program-covered-up-by-nuclear-power-industry-enough-to-build-arsenal-larger-than-china-india-and-pakistan-combined

The United States deliberately allowed Japan access to the United States’ most secret nuclear weapons facilities while it transferred tens of billions of dollars worth of American tax paid research that has allowed Japan to amass 70 tons of weapons grade plutonium since the 1980s, a National Security News Service investigation reveals. [...] the United States has known about a secret nuclear weapons program in Japan since the 1960s, according to CIA reports. [...] The Reagan and George H.W. Bush administrations permitted sensitive technology and nuclear materials to be transferred to Japan despite laws and treaties preventing such transfers. [...]While Japan has refrained from deploying nuclear weapons and remains under an umbrella of U.S. nuclear protection, NSNS has learned that the country has used its electrical utility companies as a cover to allow the country to amass enough nuclear weapons materials to build a nuclear arsenal larger than China, India and Pakistan combined. [...]That secret effort was hidden in a nuclear power program that by March 11, 2011– the day the earthquake and tsunami overwhelmed the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Plant – had amassed 70 metric tons of plutonium. Like its use of civilian nuclear power to hide a secret bomb program, Japan used peaceful space exploration as a cover for developing sophisticated nuclear weapons delivery systems. Political leaders in Japan understood that the only way the Japanese people could be convinced to allow nuclear power into their lives was if a long line of governments and industry hid any military application. For that reason, a succession of Japanese governments colluded on a bomb program disguised as innocent energy and civil space programs. [...]

### Military bases are key to heg

Mark Thompson, 6/8/2010, “Why Japan and the U.S. Can't Live Without Okinawa”,

http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,1994798,00.html

The continued U.S. military presence in Japan has been a growing concern for the Japanese public, and last week it became a lever to pry Prime Minister Yukio Hatoyama from office. The first Democratic Party Prime Minister in half a century may have brought that fate upon himself by promising during last fall's election campaign to move a key U.S. air base off Okinawa, and perhaps out of Japan entirely. That promise broke with his predecessors' tradition of treating the U.S. presence in Japan as an American birthright, but what proved to be Hatoyama's undoing was his failure to deliver. Despite the Hatoyama government's intentions, Washington refused to back down from a 2006 pact between the two nations permitting its continued base rights on Okinawa, nearly 1,000 miles south of Tokyo. A legacy of World War II, 47,000 U.S. troops are based in Japan within two or three days' sail of potential hot spots on the Korean peninsula and the Taiwan Strait. Hatoyama's fall suggests that despite the Japanese people's desire for a reduced U.S. military presence, they aren't ready to give up the protection it offers. "Hatoyama got into difficulty with the Japanese people because it was perceived that he was weakening the security of Japan," says Tom Schieffer, U.S. ambassador to Japan from 2005 to 2009. "The security of Japan is tied to the U.S.-Japanese alliance, and it has been that way since the end of the war."

### Military bases keep powerful countries in line

#### Peter **Nicholas**, November 17, 20**11**, “Obama Visits Key Military Base in Northern Australia”, http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/world\_now/2011/11/obama-visits-key-military-base-in-australias-northern-territory.html

President Obama closed out a quick trip to Australia with a visit to the Northern Territory, scene of deadly fighting during World War II and now home to a fast-expanding military base aimed partly at keeping tabs on an assertive China. Obama didn't mention China in brief remarks Thursday at an air force base in this coastal city. But he made the case that the new defense pact between the U.S. and Australia is vital to protecting commercial traffic in the Pacific. Speaking to nearly 1,700 Australian troops and a few dozen Marines, Obama laid out a reason why "we're deepening our alliance here."“This region," he said, "has some of the busiest sea lanes in the world, which are critical to all our economies."That seemed a reference to a simmering dispute in East Asia involving a major commercial hub -- the South China Sea. China is asserting broad jurisdiction over the South China Sea, upsetting smaller East Asian nations that also claim sovereignty.By deploying more warplanes and 2,500 Marines to northern Australia in the coming years, the U.S. is signaling that it will contest any Chinese push for military dominance in the region. Bejing is wary of the move. Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman Liu Weiminon, speaking to reporters Wednesday, questioned whether strengthening military alliances is the best idea in a period of global economic unrest.Presenting himself as a solid ally and friend in the Pacific, Obama tried to endear himself to the Australians in his short stay. He took a stab at an Australian accent and greeted crowds with a breezy "G'day."Visiting a local high school in Canberra on Thursday, he fielded a question from one student about teen heartthrob Justin Bieber. Should Obama partner with Bieber as a way to reach more students? she asked. Obama called Bieber a "very nice young man" but maintained that "hanging around with Justin Bieber" is no substitute for "the ideas I put forward."In his appearance here, Obama led the soldiers in a chant of "Aussie, Aussie, Aussie!" and told them he had gotten "the most unique gift I've ever received as president -– crocodile insurance."Over and over he thanked Australia for its military sacrifices. Shortly before leaving the country he visited a memorial to the Peary, a U.S. destroyer that was sunk during a Japanese air raid in 1942. He and his Australian counterpart, Prime Minister Julia Gillard, pinned cards to a pair of wreaths overlooking Darwin Harbor, next to a 4-inch gun that was salvaged from the wreck. Afterward, Obama chatted with a few elderly survivors of the air raid, hugging one woman who broke down in tears.Obama had twice planned to visit Australia, only to cancel because of pressing business back home. Still, he got a largely warm reception over the last two days. People in the crowds gathered along the motorcade route in Darwin wore tricorn hats fashioned out of newspaper, with the bill reading: "Obama Territory."A few protesters held up signs objecting to an increased U.S. military presence. "Darwin Residents Against War!" read one sign.Next up for Obama is a series of summit meetings in Indonesia. He arrived in Bali on Thursday night and will spend the next two days talking to leaders of East Asian nations and the states belonging to ASEAN –- the Assn. of Southeast Asian Nations.Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao will attend, and U.S. officials anticipate a fierce debate over the South China Sea.

### Bases are key to prevent the expansion of Chinese militarization

Joseph Gerson, news analyst, Compensating for Decline: Revitalizing US Asia-Pacific Hegemony, 2011,<http://archive.truthout.org/compensating-decline-revitalizing-us-asia-pacific-hegemony66397>

In an article about Obama's week in Asia, the journalist-scholar Fareed Zakaria wrote, **"Obama** was **making America's opening move in a new great power game unfolding in Asia**." **He and his advisers were reinforcing Washington's military alliances** with Japan, South Korea, Australia and New Zealand, **building tacit alliances** with India and Indonesia, **and putting China on notice that it will not have a free hand in Asia, the South China Sea or the Pacific and Indian Oceans. The goal is to ensure that the US can "moderate Beijing's behavior."**[1]The Obama administration is attempting to leverage its allies' resources and power while taking advantage of the insecurities resulting from China's rising power and its aggressive assertions of its territorial ambitions. The US is weaving together a system of military and political alliances and relationships from Japan to India and across Central Asia, as well as to Europe and to NATO.**Even as China develops** its "string of pearls" - **basing and access agreements with Myanmar, Sri Lanka, Pakistan and possibly Bangladesh - the US is reinforcing its more powerful collar: alliances, military cooperation, bases and access agreements with South Korea, Singapore, the Philippines, Guam, Indonesia, Australia, New Zealand and Afghanistan. And, in pushing "the reset button" with Russia, it hopes to complete China's encirclement.**