

North Korea Deterrence Disadvantage

Table of Contents

Uniqueness: US Trying to Stabilize Korean Peninsula	2
Uniqueness: US Making Deterrence Efforts Now	3
Uniqueness: Obama Committed to Nuclear Deterrence in Korea	4
Link: South Korea Withdrawal	5
Link: Okinawa Withdrawal	6
Link: Okinawa Withdrawal (2)	7
Brink: South-North Korea Tensions Rising	8
Brink: North Korea Continues Nuclear Proliferation	9
Impact: Instability in Asia → Nuclear War	10
Impact: East Asian Instability → Nuclear War	11
Impact: North, South Korea & Japan go Nuclear	12
Impact 2: Nuclear War causes Extinction	13
Impact Calc: Extinction from Nuclear War is Worst	15
Answer To: US Hegemony in South Korea Bad	17
Answer To: China Won't Support / China Relations Hurt	18
Answer To: Japan Won't Support / Japan Relations Hurt	19

Uniqueness: US Trying to Stabilize Korean Peninsula

The United States military is currently acting to stabilize the North-South Korea tensions.

“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.

Uniqueness: US Making Deterrence Efforts Now

The US is committed to deterring North Korea from going nuclear.

“US, South Korea to test military force as deterrence to North Korea ‘future aggression’,” Ron **Powers**, writer, Associated Press, May 24, **2010**, <http://blog.taragana.com/politics/2010/05/24/us-south-korea-to-test-military-force-as-deterrence-to-north-korea-future-aggression-38519/>

More than 28,000 U.S. troops are stationed in South Korea, an important regional ally. Previously, the Obama administration has been intentionally vague on how it might respond, reflecting U.S. reluctance to stoke tension unnecessarily.

U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton — in Beijing to win support from China, North Korea’s top ally, for diplomatic action — said Monday the Obama administration **is striving to avoid a conflict on the Korean peninsula.**

“We are working hard to avoid an escalation of belligerence and provocation,” Clinton said. “This is a highly precarious situation that the North Koreans have caused in the region.” The U.S. will work with other nations to make sure that North Korea feels the consequences of its actions and changes its behavior **to avoid “the kind of escalation that would be very regrettable.”** she said.

Uniqueness: Obama Committed to Nuclear Deterrence in Korea

Obama is increasing economic sanctions against North Korea because of their nuclear proliferation.

“Obama: Warning to North Korea and Iran over nuclear threats,” *Asia News*, January 28, 2010,
<http://www.speroforum.com/a/26376/Obama-Warning-to-North-Korea-and-Iran-over-nuclear-threats>

A year after his election, Obama devoted his maiden speech in particular to issues of domestic politics, the economic crisis, unemployment, health care reform and says that in 2010, the primary concern of the U.S. will be to create jobs.

Obama apologized for the apparent failure of this first year, attributed to the fact that he took office "in the middle of two wars, the economy suffering from acute recession, the financial system on the verge of collapse and a government deeply in debt".

Only toward the end of the speech did he deal with themes of international politics, pointing to the "greatest danger to the American people - the threat of nuclear weapons." The United States and Russia - he said - are reducing the arsenals (while ensuring deterrence) and are "finalizing the negotiations for a treaty on arms control, the magnitude of which is the largest of the last 20 years." He added that the Summit on Nuclear Safety in April, 44 nations will gather in Washington with a clear purpose "in four years to ensure vulnerable nuclear materials from falling into the hands of terrorists."

"It is for this reason - he said - that North Korea now faces more isolation and stronger sanctions - sanctions that **will be vigorously implemented**. And that is why the international community is more united and the Islamic Republic of Iran is more isolated. And if Iran's leaders continue to ignore their obligations, there will be no doubt: they will also face increasing consequences. **And that's a promise.**"

Link: South Korea Withdrawal

South Korea needs United States military presence to ward off an invasion from North Korea and nuclear proliferation.

“Rand: 400,000 troops needed to secure N. Korea and its ‘loose nukes’,” Donald **Kirk**, writer, World Tribune, January 25, **2010**, http://www.worldtribune.com/worldtribune/WTARC/2010/ea_nkorea0051_01_25.asp

At times North and South Korea seemed to be vying with one another to see which side could issue the most menacing statement. No sooner had North Korea got wind of South Korea's "contingency planning" for North Korea's collapse than the North's Korean Central News Agency warned of a "sacred nationwide retaliatory battle to blow up the stronghold of the South Korean authorities".

South Korea's Defense Minister Kim Tae-young went one better, saying that South Korea would indeed have to stage a pre-emptive strike "if we detected that it has a clear intention to attack with nuclear weapons".

If that remark appeared alarmist, it reflected yet another concern — that is, worries about South Korea's ability to command all forces in the South in the event of war. The plan for South Korea to assume war-time command instead of the U.S. takes effect in 2012, and South Korean military leaders are frankly worried about whether or not they're capable of coordinating a massive war effort in which U.S. air, naval and ground forces play a secondary role.

Link: Okinawa Withdrawal

Troops at Okinawa are vital to keeping stability in the Far East.

“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.

Link: Okinawa Withdrawal (2)

Military presence at Okinawa is key for deterrence and response 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.

Brink: South-North Korea Tensions Rising

Currently tensions are rising between South and North Korea, making the need for stability and deterrence more important 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.

Answer To: US Hegemony in South Korea Bad

United States military hegemony in South Korea is needed for deterrence in the region and is vital keeping peace there and elsewhere in the world.

“Toward a Neo-Reaganite Foreign Policy,” William **Kristol** and Robert **Kagan**, *Foreign Affairs*, July/August 1996

Consider the events of just the past six months, a period that few observers would consider remarkable for its drama on the world stage. In East Asia, the carrier task forces of the U.S. Seventh Fleet helped deter Chinese aggression against democratic Taiwan, and the 35,000 American troops stationed in South Korea helped deter a possible invasion by the rulers in Pyongyang. In Europe, the United States sent 20,000 ground troops to implement a peace agreement in the former Yugoslavia, maintained 100,000 in Western Europe as a symbolic commitment to European stability and security, and intervened diplomatically to prevent the escalation of a conflict between Greece and Turkey. In the Middle East, the United States maintained the deployment of thousands of soldiers and a strong naval presence in the Persian Gulf region to deter possible aggression by Saddam Hussein's Iraq or the Islamic fundamentalist regime in Iran, and it mediated in the conflict between Israel and Syria in Lebanon. In the Western Hemisphere, the United States completed the withdrawal of 15,000 soldiers after restoring a semblance of democratic government in Haiti and, almost without public notice, prevented a military coup in Paraguay. In Africa, a U.S. expeditionary force rescued Americans and others trapped in the Liberian civil conflict.

These were just the most visible American actions of the past six months, and just those of a military or diplomatic nature. During the same period, the United States made a thousand decisions in international economic forums, both as a government and as an amalgam of large corporations and individual entrepreneurs, that shaped the lives and fortunes of billions around the globe. America influenced both the external and internal behavior of other countries through the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Through the United Nations, it maintained sanctions on rogue states such as Libya, Iran, and Iraq. Through aid programs, the United States tried to shore up friendly democratic regimes in developing nations. The enormous web of the global economic system, with the United States at the center, combined with the pervasive influence of American ideas and culture, allowed Americans to wield influence in many other ways of which they were entirely unconscious. The simple truth of this era was stated last year by a Serb leader trying to explain Slobodan Milosevic's decision to finally seek rapprochement with Washington. "As a pragmatist," the Serbian politician said, "Milosevic knows that all satellites of the United States are in a better position than those that are not satellites."

And America's allies are in a better position than those who are not its allies. Most of the world's major powers welcome U.S. global involvement and prefer America's benevolent hegemony to the alternatives. Instead of having to compete for dominant global influence with many other powers, therefore, the United States finds both the Europeans and the Japanese -- after the United States, the two most powerful forces in the world -- supportive of its world leadership role. Those who anticipated the dissolution of these alliances once the common threat of the Soviet Union disappeared have been proved wrong. The principal concern of America's allies these days is not that it will be too dominant but that it will withdraw.

Answer To: China Won't Support / China Relations Hurt

China wants to see Korea unified as quickly as possible so that it can gain more geopolitical power in the region.

“Geostrategy and U.S. Hegemony: An Analysis of the Grand Chessboard and Beyond,” David A. Owen, University of the Thai Chamber of Commerce, publication date not available, accessed July 30, 2010 at http://www.utcc.ac.th/public_content/files/001/P185_1.pdf

The most important single issue for US primacy in the Far East region is that of a unified Korea. Brzezinski states that Korea's future is of geostrategic importance to its neighbors in the Far East (Brzezinski, 1997, p. 157). All three powers, China, Japan and the US have a vested interest in the future of Korea. China's policy for Korea is driven by its desire for regional primacy based on China's interest in security and ideological concerns (Xiaoxiong, 1995). The US and Japanese policies are driven by any factors, but limiting China's claim to regional primacy would be the foremost.

Answer To: Japan Won't Support / Japan Relations Hurt

Japan wants to see Korea unified.

“Geostrategy and U.S. Hegemony: An Analysis of the Grand Chessboard and Beyond,” David A. Owen, University of the Thai Chamber of Commerce, publication date not available, accessed July 30, 2010 at http://www.utcc.ac.th/public_content/files/001/P185_1.pdf

The most important single issue for US primacy in the Far East region is that of a unified Korea. Brzezinski states that Korea's future is of geostrategic importance to its neighbors in the Far East (Brzezinski, 1997, p. 157). All three powers, China, Japan and the US have a vested interest in the future of Korea. China's policy for Korea is driven by its desire for regional primacy based on China's interest in security and ideological concerns (Xiaoxiong, 1995). The US and Japanese policies are driven by any factors, but limiting China's claim to regional primacy would be the foremost.