

Asia Military Readiness Disadvantage

Table of Contents

Uniqueness: (Okinawa) Military Readiness Good	2
Uniqueness: (South Korea) Military Readiness Good.....	4
Link: Withdrawing Troops Reduces Military Readiness.....	5
Internal Link: Okinawa	6
Internal Link: Okinawa (2)	7
Internal Link: South Korea	8
Brink: South-North Korea Tensions Rising.....	9
Brink: North Korea Continues Nuclear Proliferation	10
Impact: Instability in Asia → Nuclear War	11
Impact: East Asian Instability → Nuclear War	12
Impact: North, South Korea & Japan go Nuclear	13
Impact 2: Nuclear War causes Extinction.....	14
Impact Calc: Extinction from Nuclear War is Worst.....	16
Answers to: Non-Unique	19
Answers to: Non-Unique (2).....	20

Uniqueness: (Okinawa) Military Readiness Good

US military readiness in Okinawa is good.

"Military readiness tested by tsunami," Cpl. Joseph A. **Cabrera**, military personnel, March 5, **2010**, posted on Okinawa.usmc.mil, <http://www.okinawa.usmc.mil/public%20affairs%20info/archive%20news%20pages/2010/100305-tsunami.html>

AMP FOSTER, Okinawa (March 5, 2010) -- U.S. military bases throughout Okinawa prepared to safeguard Status of Forces Agreement personnel and local nationals working on-base from the potential dangers of an incoming tsunami here Sunday.

The warning came after an earthquake in Chile caused a tsunami which traveled across the globe to the Western Pacific region. The tsunami glanced the mainland of the United States and Hawaii and hit mainland Japan causing minor property damage and no injuries.

The first reports of the incoming tsunami predicted it would pummel low-lying areas of Okinawa with 4-to 6-foot waves. However, the waves ended up smaller than originally anticipated.

U.S. military installations throughout Okinawa from Camp Kinser, in southern Okinawa, to the Okuma Recreation Facility in the north, evacuated the flood plains aboard installations and restricted movement by personnel into some of these areas until the tsunami warning was cancelled, said Jay Farmer, the Marine Corps Bases Japan deputy assistant chief of staff G-3.

All personnel in areas designated as red areas, areas below 30-feet mean sea level, were ordered to evacuate to higher ground. Personnel living between 30-feet and 60-feet above sea level were recommended to evacuate.

Notifications of the incoming tsunami were sent out by mass e-mails, family readiness officers, the public address systems aboard all Marine Corps camps and American Forces Network radio and television broadcasts, said Barbara A. Lubkin, the deputy camp commander of Camps Lester and Foster.

The auxiliary security forces were activated, and those Marines, along with Provost Marshal's Office Marines, went door-to-door in the Old Lester Housing Area to fully evacuate the area.

With plenty of advance notice and repeated warnings, personnel were able to evacuate with their families, pets and a few possessions.

"Could you hear the Lester PA system? They kept announcing the evacuation, and there were Marines going door-to-door," said Barbara A. Rich, a religious education coordinator with the U.S. Naval Hospital Okinawa Chaplain's Office who took refuge at the Camp Foster Post Exchange area, one of the highest areas on the base. "We took the basics: passports, birth certificates, checkbook, kids and identification. The things we would need right away if something happened."

SOFA personnel living in off-base housing received the same notifications from AFN TV and radio broadcast as those who live aboard the bases.

Service members and their families with nowhere else to go were advised of areas within military installations throughout Okinawa they could go for shelter.

"We were more than happy to go, just to be on the safe side," said Gina R. Monteiro, a secretary with the Camp Foster and Lester Camp Services Office.

Even at the Okuma Recreation Facility, visitors were advised of the incoming tsunami and evacuated. Any of the visitors who did not have transportation were taken to the top of a nearby hill for safety until the warning was cancelled, said Air Force Capt. Adam S. Vaccarezza, the detachment commander of the Okuma Recreation Facility.

"I basically wanted to make sure guests got out in time. I didn't want them in an area surrounded by water. I had to get them to a safer area on higher ground," he said.

Even though tsunamis are not a regular occurrence on Okinawa, the commands aboard the military installations were able to effectively come together to implement the plan when the threat arose.

"The whole Marine Corps community did well, I've been here 10 years, and we haven't done this yet. Each of the camp commands worked well together," Farmer said.

Uniqueness: (South Korea) Military Readiness Good

US military readiness in South Korea is good.

"Obama Tells Military: Prepare for North Korea Aggression," Jeff Mason, **Reuters**, May 24, **2010**,
<http://www.commondreams.org/headline/2010/05/24-6>

WASHINGTON - President Barack Obama has directed the U.S. military to coordinate with South Korea to "ensure readiness" and deter future aggression from North Korea, the White House said on Monday.

US and South Korean Marines move into position during a battle drill at the US army's Rodriguez range in Pocheon, northeast of Seoul. (AFP/File/Kim Jae-Hwan) The United States gave strong backing to plans by South Korean President Lee Myung-bak to punish North Korea for sinking one of its naval ships, White House spokesman Robert Gibbs said in a statement.

The White House urged North Korea to apologize and change its behavior, he said.

"We endorse President Lee's demand that North Korea immediately apologize and punish those responsible for the attack, and, most importantly, stop its belligerent and threatening behavior," Gibbs said.

"U.S. support for South Korea's defense is unequivocal, and the president has directed his military commanders to coordinate closely with their Republic of Korea counterparts to ensure readiness and to deter future aggression," he said.

Link: Withdrawing Troops Reduces Military Readiness

It's simple: reducing troops from a region reduces military readiness.

"American Military Intervention: A User's Guide," John **Hillen**, staff writer for The Heritage Foundation, May 2, **1996**,
<http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/1996/05/BG1079nbsp-American-Military-Intervention-A-Users-Guide>

The current national security strategy ostensibly is predicated on fighting and winning two nearly simultaneous major regional conflicts (MRCs). While President Clinton maintains that "the forces the Administration fields today are sufficient to defeat aggression in two nearly simultaneous major regional conflicts,"²¹ most experts disagree.²² More damaging is the assessment of the uniformed military, those who actually will have to carry out the Clinton strategy with inadequate resources. General Ronald Fogleman, the Air Force Chief of Staff, has testified before the House National Security Committee that the service chiefs "had made no secret of the fact that we have never had the force structure that was called for... to execute the two-MRC strategy."²³

This strategic bankruptcy, exacerbated by military interventions in areas of marginal strategic importance, violates what the great American foreign policy thinker Walter Lippman called "the controlling principle" of strategy: that a nation should keep its goals within its means and should never make commitments without providing the resources necessary to achieve them. For the United States, this means ensuring that the shrinking military forces of the U.S. are trained, ready, and postured to defend the national security interests of the U.S.

The primary mission of the U.S. armed forces should be to fight and win the nation's wars, although this obviously does not mean that war is their only task. In fact, of the over 250 military interventions carried out by the U.S. since 1789, only five have been declared wars.²⁴ In the post-Cold War world, the U.S. military must be prepared for all manner of military interventions, including limited conventional warfare (Panama 1989 and Desert Storm), punitive airstrikes (Libya 1986 and Iraq 1993), deterrence (Kuwait 1994), shows of force (Persian Gulf 1988 and Philippines 1989), and support for peace operations (when their goals are clearly defined and they serve the national interest). However, two critical points must instruct the wide range of possible interventions.

The first is common sense: Forces intervening somewhere are not available elsewhere. Nor are they training. Congressman Ike Skelton (D-MO) has noted that "peace-keeping commitments may so degrade the armed forces' warfighting capability that it will be impossible to carry out the national military strategy."²⁵ His findings are supported by the General Accounting Office, which has found that even small combat units returning from peace operations need up to six months of recovery time to train back up to warfighting standards; larger units (such as divisions) need more.²⁶ This means that because the Bosnian peace implementation force requires so many resources from the 1st Armored and 3rd Infantry Divisions, the U.S. Army in Europe is unable to meet the Army's standards of warfighting readiness for one to two years. It also means that the shrinking forces of the U.S. are finding it difficult to keep up with their many security commitments.

Internal Link: Okinawa

Having troops at Okinawa allows for U.S. military crisis response in the area; withdrawing those troops withdraws that ability.

"Issues Involved in Reducing the Impact of the U.S. Military Presence on Okinawa," **United States General Accounting Office** (GAO), March 1998, <http://www.gao.gov/archive/1998/ns98066.pdf>

The III Marine Expeditionary Force (along with other U.S. forces on Okinawa and in the region) supports the U.S. national security strategy to promote peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region and to deter aggression by forcing an aggressor to risk a military confrontation with U.S. forces, according to DOD. The national security strategy and the congressionally mandated Quadrennial Defense Review cite U.S. presence in the region as necessary to demonstrate U.S. political commitment to security in the region. In addition, the United States has long-standing mutual defense treaty obligations with five countries in the region, including Japan and South Korea, and the U.S. forward presence visibly demonstrates commitment to these treaties, according to the U.S. Pacific Command, the geographic combatant command.

In addition to showing the U.S. commitment to the region, the U.S. forces on Okinawa could be used if crises arise, according to the Pacific Command. Furthermore, forward-deployed U.S. forces could readily respond to a contingency because Okinawa is near several potential regional trouble spots, including the Korean peninsula, and the operational risk of a late arrival in an area of operations could be avoided. Moreover, Japan pays a significant share of the Okinawa-based Marine Corps force's annual cost, including the cost of base infrastructure that is provided rent-free to the United States.

Internal Link: Okinawa (2)

Military presence at Okinawa is key for responses to crises in all of East Asia and the Pacific.

“Okinawa, Japan,” **GlobalSecurity.org**, Date unavailable—page last modified November 16, 2009 by site admin John Pike,
<http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/facility/okinawa.htm>

The Department of Defense believes that Marine Corps forces along with other US forces on Okinawa satisfy the US national security strategy by visibly 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...

...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.

Internal Link: South Korea

The United States needs troops in South Korea in order to help prevent and treat crises that arise from on-going tensions with North Korea.

"US to Join South Korea Military Exercise Off North Korea Coast," Luis Martinez, staff writer, ABC News, June 2, 2010,
<http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/Media/us-join-south-korea-military-exercise-north-korea/story?id=10807101>

Following a months-long international investigation that included salvaging the ship from the ocean floor, South Korea accused North Korea last week of using a mini-submarine to launch a torpedo that sunk the warship. In a statement issued by the White House after South Korea announced its findings, the United States said South Korea could count on its full support. It also said "U.S. support for South Korea's defense is unequivocal." Pentagon spokesman Bryan Whitman said last week that as part of that commitment, the South Korean findings had prompted the U.S. and South Korea to hold two military exercises with South Korea in the "near future." He said the U.S. had committed to holding an anti-submarine exercise and was in discussions about conducting a maritime interdiction training exercise.

Brink: South-North Korea Tensions Rising

Currently tensions are rising between South and North Korea, making the ability for the US' military to respond to crises more pertinent than ever.

"U.S. Military Will Assist South Korea With Naval Defense," David **Sessions**, reporter, PoliticsDaily, May 31, **2010**,
<http://www.politicsdaily.com/2010/05/31/u-s-military-will-assist-south-korea-with-naval-defense/>

In the aftermath of a North Korean submarine sinking South Korean warship two months ago, American officials say the U.S. military is developing a long-term plan to bolster South Korea's naval defenses, the New York Times reports. They said the attack revealed that even after years of spending and training, the South is still vulnerable to surprise attacks. The March incident caught both American and South Korean officials off guard. As South Korea has risen to become one of the world's top economies, it has invested billions in national defense strategies and pursued a close relationship with the United States to help deter assaults from the North. Pledged to assist the South in the event of a conflict, the U.S. would be drawn into hostilities between the two countries should they break out. Adm. Mike Mullen, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said that a joint training exercise planned off the coast of South Korea in the next few weeks is part of a "near-term" strategy for holding back Kim Jong-Il's regime, but noted that a long-term plan would involve detecting underwater technology that the North increasingly employs. Mullen said the latter would be "a very difficult technical, tactical problem."

A bulk of the strategy will involve increasing South Korean monitoring of waters previously thought too shallow to harbor a threat, with both sonar and air patrols. The North Korean regime has been focusing on building a small arsenal of weapons, including "midget submarines," that can afflict economic and political instability on the South while remaining difficult to track or challenge. Mullen said the sinking of the South Korean warship would probably not be the end of such stealth attacks. "North Korea is predictable in one sense: that it is unpredictable in what it is going to do," he said. "North Korea goes through these cycles. I worry a great deal that this isn't the last thing we are going to see."

Brink: North Korea Continues Nuclear Proliferation

North Korea is still advancing their nuclear proliferation and doesn't seem to want to stop.

"North Korea's Nuclear Tantrum," Shim Jae **Hoon**, columnist, YaleGlobal, May 28, **2009**,
<http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/north-korea-nuclear-tantrum>

SEOUL: North Korean leader Kim Jong Il is no stranger to brinkmanship but his latest series of actions is qualitatively different. With North Korea's second underground nuclear test conducted on May 25, and simultaneous test-firing of a series of short-range missiles in the direction of Japan over the following two days, Kim seems to be betting all his chips to get direct dialogue with the US. His failing health and uncertain succession may have added urgency to his drive to get US recognition as a nuclear power and to leave a stable legacy. He may soon discover that he has seriously miscalculated; instead of frightening the US and its South Korean and Japanese allies into a new round of talks, his gamble has pushed them into an even stronger resolve against the North's proliferation drive.

Kim is fighting for a place in the nuclear club, and by doing so, will have the power to demand the withdrawal of American troops from the South. North Korea has not given up the ambition of reunifying the peninsula under its dominance, just as Vietnam was reunified under Hanoi's control. Through repeated nuclear tests, the North seeks to make its nuclear weapons program a fait accompli. Kim believes that getting admitted to the nuclear club **is the only guarantee** to keep his economically crumbling regime from being taken over by the vastly more powerful South Korea. A nuclear weapon, to him, is a ticket to survival.

Impact: Instability in Asia → Nuclear War

Instability in Asia causes nuclear war.

“The Asian Nuclear Chain Reaction,” Joseph Cirincione, Senior Fellow and Director for Nuclear Policy at the Center for American Progress, *Foreign Policy*, Spring 2000, p. 120

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

Impact: East Asian Instability → Nuclear War

Conflict in East Asia immediately escalates to nuclear war if there is no stability or deterrence.

Jonathan S. Landay, National Security and Intelligence Correspondent, KNIGHT RIDER NEWS SERVICE, March 10, 2000

Few if any experts think China and Taiwan, North Korea and South Korea, or India and Pakistan are spoiling to fight. But even a minor miscalculation by any of them could destabilize Asia, jolt the global economy and even start a nuclear war. India, Pakistan and China all have nuclear weapons, and North Korea may have a few, too. Asia lacks the kinds of organizations, negotiations and diplomatic relationships that helped keep an uneasy peace for five decades in Cold War Europe. “**Nowhere else on Earth are the stakes as high and relationships so fragile**,” said Bates Gill, director of northeast Asian policy studies at the Brookings Institution, a Washington think tank. “We see the convergence of great power interest overlaid with lingering confrontations with no institutionalized security mechanism in place. **There are elements for potential disaster.**”

Impact: North, South Korea & Japan go Nuclear

No stability or deterrence causes North Korea, South Korea and Japan into a nuclear soiree.

Toshimura **Ogura**, Economics Professor at Toyama University, MONTHLY REVIEW, April 1997,
http://findarticles.com/p/articles/m..._19693242/pg_8

North Korea, South Korea, and Japan have achieved quasi- or virtual nuclear armament. Although these countries do not produce or possess actual bombs, they possess sufficient technological know-how to possess one or several nuclear arsenals. Thus, virtual armament creates a new nightmare in this region - nuclear annihilation. Given the concentration of economic affluence and military power in this region and its growing importance to the world system, any hot conflict among these countries would threaten to escalate into a global conflagration.

Impact 2: Nuclear War causes Extinction

Nuclear war causes global extinction.

"Racing Toward Extinction," Larry Ross, Founder of NZ Nuclear-Free Peacemaking Association, December 10, 2003, <http://nuclearfree.lynx.co.nz/racing.htm>

We have greatly changed our environment with our new destructive tools - nuclear weapons. They have given us a quantum leap in our ability to destroy ourselves and world. Given present trends, we will not adapt, but will continue on the present path to nuclear extinction. However, our brains provide the vital difference between extinct species and us. They can tell us what we have created, and the probable results if we keep repeating our historically destructive behaviour - the thousands of wars in our history. Our unique insight allows us to change our behaviour so we don't repeat our traditional pattern of destruction with our new earth-destroying tools. We have even recognised the extreme risks to ourselves, by creating treaties committing us to vigorously pursue disarmament steps to abolish nuclear weapons before they abolish us. Unfortunately, we have not observed these treaties. The essential question is: Will we use our brains constructively to solve this problem in time to save ourselves? It seems unlikely. We are using our brains to deny the terrifying reality, pretend there is no risk, or that it is insignificant. Many believe that nuclear weapons have been proven over 50 years to give us security. We tend to venerate our leaders, believe and obey them. Like the Germans did with Adolph Hitler, or Italians with Mussolini. Leaders are respected as rational, sensible, honest, moral Christians who could never do anything crazy. However President Bush - the world's most powerful man, and his allies and staff, have lowered the barriers against using nuclear weapons. They have developed new doctrines that allow them to use nuclear weapons in many more war situations and against non-nuclear states - not just in retaliation for a massive attack. The U.S. Congress and mass media have skirted this issue, so you may not know about this 'seismic' change in U.S. policy and its implications. People have forgot, or never learned, how nuclear weapons can destroy our world. Here is a chart with 6,000 dots divided into 100 squares. The one dot in the centre represents all the explosive power of allied bombs dropped in WWII - equal to 3,000,000 tons of TNT or 3 megatons. Millions were killed. We have enough for about 6,000 WWII's. The dots in just one of the 100 squares represent the firepower to kill all life on earth. We have made enough weapons to kill everyone on earth many times over. That is our dire situation today. We are not adapting to change our behaviour, but reinforcing old behaviour that leads to war? The nuclear arms race, accelerated by the vested interests of the military-industrial-political complex, and the phantom threats we invent to sustain it, is the major occupation of many top brains and huge resources today. It has huge momentum and power. It is embedded in U.S. society and some others. It is an accepted part of the culture. This weapons culture and the new doctrines mean that nuclear weapons are no longer treated as a last resort. They can be used in addition to conventional weapons to achieve military goals. . The culture has programmed itself for self-destruction and now has the ideology to continue until they precipitate a nuclear holocaust which kills all life. The quantum leap in destructive power has now been matched by this new will, or self-permission, to use these weapons. Laws, fears and reservations have been swept aside. Humanity seems to have accepted the new doctrines. Few seem

concerned that any usage can kill millions, and quickly expand beyond any countries control, leading to a global nuclear war which ends humanity. We have radically altered our environment in so many other ways as well, that also threaten our existence in the longer term. Population growth and our economic growth ideology augment the trends of climate change - global warming - pollution - dwindling natural resources - deforestation etc. To emphasise again, the biggest change we have made in our environment is the quantum leap in our ability to destroy ourselves. Our psychological and social climate makes it more probable. Most people are not aware of this huge change in our environment. Others just accept it. We have learned to live with and treat nuclear weapons as a normal part of the environment. Many feel that to question or oppose this situation is silly, disloyal or threatens the security we think nuclear weapons give us. Nine countries are dedicated to constantly developing their nuclear arsenals. That makes accidental or intentional usage more likely. That the U.S. has said the nuclear barriers are down adds to the likelihood of nuclear weapons use by some other state. A probable escalation would follow.

Impact Calc: Extinction from Nuclear War is Worst

Because of its scientific probability and global destruction, extinction from nuclear war is the worst impact.

Jonathan Shell, *Fate of the Earth*, 1982, pp. 93-96

To say that human extinction is a certainty would, of course, be a misrepresentation – just as it would be a misrepresentation to say that extinction can be ruled out. To begin with, we know that a holocaust may not occur at all. If one does occur, the adversaries may not use all their weapons. If they do use all their weapons, the global effects in the ozone and elsewhere, may be moderate. And if the effects are not moderate but extreme, the ecosphere may prove resilient enough to withstand them without breaking down catastrophically. These are all substantial reasons for supposing that mankind will not be extinguished in a nuclear holocaust, or even that extinction in a holocaust is unlikely, and they tend to calm our fear and to reduce our sense of urgency. Yet at the same time we are compelled to admit that there may be a holocaust, that the adversaries may use all their weapons, that the global effects, including effects of which we as yet unaware, may be severe, that the ecosphere may suffer catastrophic breakdown, and that our species may be extinguished. We are left with uncertainty, and are forced to make our decisions in a state of uncertainty. If we wish to act to save our species, we have to muster our resolve in spite of our awareness that the life of the species may not now in fact be jeopardized. On the other hand, if we wish to ignore the peril, we have to admit that we do so in the knowledge that the species may be in danger of imminent self-destruction. When the existence of nuclear weapons was made known, thoughtful people everywhere in the world realized that if the great powers entered into a nuclear-arms race the human species would sooner or later face the possibility of extinction. They also realized that in the absence of international agreements preventing it an arms race would probably occur. They knew that the path of nuclear armament was a dead end for mankind. The discovery of the energy in mass – of "the basic power of the universe" – and of a means by which man could release that energy altered the relationship between man and the source of his life, the earth. In the shadow of this power, the earth became small and the life of the human species doubtful. In that sense, the question of human extinction has been on the political agenda of the world ever since the first nuclear weapon was detonated, and there was no need for the world to build up its present tremendous arsenals before starting to worry about it. At just what point the species crossed, or will have crossed, the boundary between merely having the technical knowledge to destroy itself and actually having the arsenals at hand, ready to be used at any second, is not precisely knowable. But it is clear that at present, with some twenty thousand megatons of nuclear explosive power in existence, and with more being added every day, we have entered into the zone of uncertainty, which is to say the zone of risk of extinction. But the mere risk of extinction has a significance that is categorically different from, and immeasurably greater than that of any other risk and as we make our decisions we have to take that significance into account. Up to now, every risk has been contained within the framework of life; extinction would shatter the frame. It represents not the defeat of some purpose but an abyss in which all human purpose would be drowned for all time. We have no right to place the possibility of this limitless, eternal defeat on the same footing as risk that we run in the ordinary conduct of our affairs in our particular transient moment of human history. To employ a mathematician's analogy, we can say that although the risk of extinction

may be fractional, the stake is, humanly speaking, infinite, and a fraction of infinity is still infinity. In other words, once we learn that a holocaust might lead to extinction we have no right to gamble, because if we lose, the game will be over, and neither we nor anyone else will ever get another chance.
Therefore, although, scientifically speaking, there is all the difference in the world between the mere possibility that a holocaust will bring about extinction and the certainty of it, morally they are the same, and we have no choice but to address the issue of nuclear weapons as though we knew for a certainty that their use would put an end to our species. In weighing the fate of the earth and, with it, our own fate, we stand before a mystery, and in tampering with the earth we tamper with a mystery. We are in deep ignorance. Our ignorance should dispose us to wonder, our wonder should make us humble, our humility should inspire us to reverence and caution, and our reverence and caution should lead us to act without delay to withdraw the threat we now post to the world and to ourselves.

Answers to: Non-Unique

Currently military readiness is highly important and has been successful recently for the United States.

"Haiti: The US and Military Aid in Times of Natural Disaster," Carlota Garcia **Encina**, research assistant at Elcano Royal Institute, Real Instituto Elcano, May 13, **2010**,

http://www.realinstitutoelcano.org/wps/portal/rielcano_eng/Content?WCM_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=/elcano/elcano_in/zonas_in/ari57-2010

For years now, natural disasters have been part of the range of threats the US has to address. And this is part of official US military strategy, although it must be noted that the aid process that follows a catastrophe is an inter-agency effort. Military aid in cases of natural disasters now appears for the first time in the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) of 2006, which stresses its growing importance for the American military. That review also stated that it was in the US's national security interest to back up governments that are at a clear disadvantage in confronting earthquakes, hurricanes or other phenomena of this kind, through cooperation and joint exercises.

Answers to: Non-Unique (2)

The United States military is continually being used for crisis response, and thus reducing troops makes no sense as they would be used for major regional conflicts.

“Force is the Issue,” Lawrence **Korb**, writer, GovermentExecutive.com, January 1, **2000**,
<http://www.govexec.com/features/0100/0100s6.htm>

The third - and most important - challenge for our national security decision-makers is deciding when to use our military forces. Starting with the last days of the Bush administration, when the military was deployed to the Persian Gulf on a permanent basis and troops were sent to Somalia, U.S. forces began to be deployed with increasing frequency and became the preferred instrument for implementing U.S. foreign policy. According to some estimates, the U.S. military has been used for unexpected contingency operations about once every nine weeks since the end of the Cold War. These missions have ranged from traditional military activities and war fighting (Korea, Kuwait, Taiwan) to humanitarian relief (Central America) and peacekeeping functions (Somalia, Haiti, Rwanda, Bosnia and Kosovo)