**1AC Plan**

Plan: The United States federal government should substantially phase its military presence out of South Korea.

# 1AC North Korea

**Contention One: North Korea**

**More North Korean provocations are inevitable soon. Further provocations will prompt South Korean retaliation.**

**Bloomberg 2/17** (2/17/11, “North Korea May Attack again in ‘Months’, US says”, “http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-02-17/north-korea-may-attack-again-in-months-u-s-says.html”, vz)

North Korea may stage another attack “in months and not years,” said Navy Admiral Robert Willard, the top US commander in the Pacific. North Korean leader Kim Jong Il appears to be training his son “on a compressed timeline” in “coercive measures” like the attacks last year that killed 46 sailors on the South Korean Cheonan warship and four people on the island of Yeonpyeong, Willard told a forum sponsored by the Asia Society in Washington today. “We may very well be facing the next provocation in months and not years,” Willard said in remarks that also touched on China and Southeast Asia. The US is working with South Korea on efforts to “be prepared for a next provocation should it occur,” said Willard, who leads the US Pacific Command. “These provocations have raised the ire of the South Korean people in a way that we haven’t seen,” Willard said, echoing comments by Defense Secretary Robert Gates on a trip to the region last month. “The South Korean level of tolerance for a next provocation is very low.” Another attack may prompt more severe retaliation from South Korea than the military exercises and exchange of artillery fire that occurred last year, especially after North Korea walked out of the first talks with South Korea in four months on Feb. 9. North Korea has resisted appeals from the US and partners in the region to end missile tests and its nuclear program.

**US deterrence in Korea fails and only provokes the North. The root cause of all prior attacks as well as North Korean prolif is US hostile policy. Only troop withdrawal prevents war with North Korea and China.**

**Beal 12/13** – Senior Lecturer at Victoria University of Wellington and the editor of The Pyongyang Report, PhD in China’s terms of trade, MA with Honors in modern Chinese studies (Tim, 13 December 2010, “A Second Korean War would become a Sino-American War”, http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/HL1012/S00127/a-second-korean-war-would-become-a-sino-american-war.htm, RBatra)

The US-ROK joint military exercises not merely prepare for a possible invasion of North Korea but they also serve as weapons of attrition. They force North Korea to devote much more of its resources to the military than it would if there were no palpable threat. An important component of the exercise is their element of ambiguity. The Korean People’s Army (KPA) can never be sure when a feint might become the real thing, so every exercise has to be taken very seriously. The translation of this commentary from the Rodong Sinmun on the Key Resolve and Foal Eagle exercises in 2009 may be fractured but the underling fear of attack is clear: The said largest-scale saber rattling kicked off by the US imperialists against the DPRK at a time when their scenario for the second Korean war is at the final stage of completion is a very adventurous and dangerous military provocation that can be seen only on the eve of a war, and this is an undisguised military threat and a sort of declaration of war against the DPRK. No one can vouch that the US imperialist bellicose elements will not ignite a war against the DPRK by surprise while reinforcing armed forces and staging war maneuvers in south Korea and its vicinity as they did in Iraq.[18] It is important to note that the clash at Yeonpyeong Island coincided with a substantial military exercise, the Hoguk (‘Safeguarding the Nation’): North Korea fired the artillery during South Korea’s military drill called the Hoguk Exercise on Nov. 22-30 that involves 70,000 South Korean military troops, 50 warships, 90 helicopters and 500 planes. The 31st Marine Expeditionary Unit (MEU) of US Marine Corps and US Seventh Air Force will also participate in the exercise.[19] The scheduled participation of the 31st Marine Expeditionary Unit (MEU) is particularly significant.[20] The 31st MEU is based in Okinawa and it is America’s ‘forward deployed rapid-response’ unit in East Asia. It trains with the ROK marines practicing beach landings, but its major specialism appears to be urban warfare. [21] One of its possible functions is to mount a commando type raid on the DPRK. A Japanese scholar writing in the authoritative PACNET newsletter of Pacific Forum CSIS (the Honolulu branch of the Washington think tank Center for Strategic and International studies rather gave the game away about the ‘North Korean threat’ by putting it thus: As a collapse of North Korea -- rather than a North Korean invasion of South Korea -- has become a more likely scenario, the 31st MEU can search and seize the North Korean nuclear arsenal, and prevent proliferation of those weapons[22] It is not surprising therefore that the KPA was concerned about the Hoguk exercise and responded to the ROK live firing in line with the ‘zero tolerance’ strategy. However, concerns extend beyond specific military exercises, to the whole policy of building up of tension in preparation for a crisis that would lead to an invasion of the North. The KPA barrage can be seen as a message that an attack would be met by a devastating counteroffensive which would, at the very least, imperil Seoul; it was a reminder that ‘Seoul [is] not safe from artillery attacks’.[23] The DPRK’s ‘zero tolerance’ strategy The DPRK’s ‘zero tolerance’ policy long predates the Lee Myung-bak administration, let alone the present crisis. Basically this strategy is to reiterate than no infringement of DPRK territory will be tolerated, and any intrusion will be met by force. There has been flexibility and restraint in implementing this strategy, especially in respect of the NLL (see below), but the underlying strategic calculation is that any sign of weakness will lead to further US and ROK moves against the DPRK. The case of the US invasion of Iraq is often cited by the North Koreans of the dangers of an appeasement policy. This is often raised in respect of the nuclear deterrent. For instance, Alexander Frolov, writing recently in the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs journal International Affairs on lessons from the Iraq war made the point: The leadership in N. Korea also realized that nothing less than a nuclear status can guarantee the country against US aggression. [24] However, the relevance of Iraq to the non-appeasement policy goes beyond developing a nuclear deterrent. For instance, in May 2003 after a breakdown in US-DPRK negotiations, the official Korea Central News Agency (KCNA) in a lengthy statement included a reference to Iraq: On March 20 this year the US provoked a war of aggression against Iraq under the pretext of "finding out weapons of mass destruction" in a bid to topple the Saddam government. The Iraqi war taught the lesson that "nuclear suspicion," "suspected development of weapons of mass destruction" and suspected "sponsorship of terrorism" touted by the US were all aimed to find a pretext for war and one would fall victim to a war when one meekly responds to the IAEA's inspection for disarmament. Neither strong international public opinion nor big countries' opposition to war nor the UN Charter could prevent the US from launching the Iraqi war. It is a serious lesson the world has drawn from the Iraqi war that a war can be averted and the sovereignty of the country and the security of the nation can be protected only when a country has a physical deterrent force, a strong military deterrent force capable of decisively repelling any attack to be made by any types of sophisticated weapons. The reality indicates that building up a physical deterrent force is urgently required for preventing the outbreak of a nuclear war on the Korean Peninsula and ensuring peace and security of the world, now that the US does not show any political intention and will to renounce its hostile policy toward the DPRK. The DPRK will increase its self-defensive capacity strong enough to destroy aggressors at a single stroke. Any US aerial attack will be decisively countered with aerial attack and its land strategy will be coped with land strategy. [25] In reality, a North Korean counter offensive would not match like with like - ‘aerial attack will be decisively countered with aerial attack and its land strategy will be coped with land strategy.’ The DPRK cannot hope to match US military power (especially in the air) so its offensive would be asymmetrical, drawing on its strengths.[26] It would probably utilise its special forces, submarines, and in particular its artillery[27] As noted, the frequent war exercises, the integration of the ROK military into the US command structure, and the associated operational plans, are seen by the DPRK as very threatening: [The United States] made public "strategic guideline No. 1" in November 1978 and thus officially announced the formation of the "Combined Forces Command" in south Korea. It saw to it that the "Combined Forces Command" took over the "UN Forces Command's" Operation Control of the US forces in south Korea and puppet army. The organization of the "Combined Forces Command" deepened the military dependence of south Korea on the United States and increased the danger for an outbreak of a new war on the Korean Peninsula. The Team Spirit joint military exercises for invading the north had been escalated as a large-scale war exercises involving huge armed forces over100,000-200,000 strong from 1978. Such joint military exercises as the Reception, Staging, Onward Movement and Integration (RSOI), Ulji Focus Lens and Foal Eagle have been staged almost every day as planned and directed by the command. The aggressive and bellicose nature of the command has remained unchanged even after the June 15 era [the 2000 North-South summit], a new era of reconciliation and cooperation, was ushered in on the Korean Peninsula. Many war scenarios against the north including "OPLAN 5030", "New OPLAN 5026" and "OPLAN 8022-02" have been worked out and war exercises to carry them into practice conducted in a more frenzied way. This year the command changed the codenames of the RSOI and Ulji Focus Lens with Key Resolve and Ulji Freedom Guardian and is holding actual maneuvers to hurl US imperialist aggression forces in the mainland and abroad into Korean front. It goes without saying that such war exercises and arms buildup had have negative effect on the north-south relations and chilled the ardent desire for the Korean people for reunification. The south Korean people thus press for the dissolution of the "Combined Forces Command" disturbing peace in Korea and obstructing her reunification. The south Korea-US "Combined Forces Command", a tool for war of aggression and a source of permanent atmosphere of war and tension on the Korean Peninsula, should be disbanded without delay. [28] The most famous example of the efficacy of the strategy is the reported argument between President Kim Young-sam and President Bill Clinton in 1994. According to Kim, Clinton wanted to bomb the North Korea nuclear reactor at Yongbyon. A 2003 BBC report recounted the tale: "Clinton told me that he would launch an immediate bombardment on the Yongbyon area. Clinton was very determined about it, but I argued to him that such an attack should never take place," said Mr Kim. "So there was quite an argument between him and me. Sometimes the phone conversations lasted more than 40 minutes," he said. Mr Clinton first revealed the 1994 plan to attack North Korea last month, but said nothing of the alleged dispute with the South. Mr Kim said that a US attack would have led to a tremendous loss of life, and would have turned Seoul into a "sea of fire". "Finally I told him that if the United States attacks North Korea, I cannot send one single member of South Korea's 650,000 armed forces into battle." [29] Kim’s version of events was contradicted by Tong Kim (Kim Dong-hyun) a Korean-American who worked as an interpreter for the State Department for over 30 years. According to him, It simply is not the case [...]. There was no discussion about a possible US attack on North Korea between the two presidents via phone. Such discussions indeed took place between their defense ministers Kwon Young-hae and William Perry with the South Korean minister obviously opposed to the military action.[30] The consequences of a Northern counterattack, and specifically an artillery offense against Seoul, was not the only consideration, although it was the main one. A South Korean simulation exercise predicted that ‘bombing of North Korea’s nuclear facilities could in the worst case make the whole of Korea uninhabitable for a decade’.[31] The bombing of Yongbyon was but one variant of the ‘military option’ that the United States has been examining, albeit the favoured one.[32] The release of radioactivity aside, an US attack would mean war with immense devastation of the Korea peninsula, so it is to be expected that there has been, in the past, opposition across the political spectrum, from progressive President Roh Moo-hyun to conservative legislator Park Jin.[33] The exception to that have been those, such as Lee Myung-bak, who pin their hopes on a collapse that would prevent the North from making a counterattack. This is an ongoing issue but as long as the DPRK functions as a viable state, committed and able, to retaliate, then there will be no attack. Part of the reason for the vigorous response at Yeonpyeong was presumably to demonstrate that the KPA was still in business. The DPRK has been threatened, and blockaded, by the United States for decades, but unlike various other countries, it has not been invaded, or bombed. To that degree the zero-tolerance strategy can be said to work. But it has its disadvantages. It is a high-risk strategy. If there is a miscalculation or a misunderstanding, or ‘maverick’ action by soldiers on the front line, then the situation could rapidly whirl out of control. War would be disastrous for North Korea, despite the brave words. It would have grave consequences for the South, and Japan. If it spread to China the results are incalculable, but it might mean the end of the United States, that ‘fragile empire’ as Niall Ferguson recently termed it.[34] It is a variant of the mutually assured destruction of the Cold War period, a bluff that is effective because it is credible, but a bluff that if put into action would be catastrophic. In this case, the destruction would not be equivalent. The DPRK would suffer more than other countries, but the ROK and the US would suffer unacceptable damage and that could be considered sufficient to keep the peace. The strategy has other disadvantages. It allows the DPRK to be portrayed as belligerent, and certainly the coverage of the Yeonpyeong incident, within South Korea, and internationally has been virtually uniformly hostile. Not everyone has jumped on to the bandwagon and there are those, in particular Korean-Americans, who oppose the drift towards war and call for engagement.[35] But these are only a tiny minority. The strategy also runs counter to the main thrust of DPRK strategy which is to negotiate the United States into accepting peaceful coexistence. Recourse to confrontation, and military action, makes that more difficult to prosecute. Finally, it gives a hostage to fortune. The other side (here South Korea but in other circumstances it could be the US) can construct a provocation knowing that it will trigger a response that can be labelled as belligerent. The trick here is to do something which the DPRK regards as provocative but which can be disguised as normal and legitimate. The military exercises in general fall within this category. For the DPRK (and China) they are intimidating and provocative, but that is not how they are described in the Western media. No doubt if the tables were turned and it was a North Korean carrier stalking up the American coast, perceptions would be different. In the particular case of Yeonpyeong the ROK did something that was portrayed as legitimate and non-threatening but which the DPRK found intolerable. To understand why that was so we must turn to the curious case of the Northern Limit Line (NLL) Northern Limit Line The Northern Limit Line is a very strange beast, as a glance at the map shows (fig 1). Fig 1: Contested seas: The NLL and the MDL 1.Yeonpyeong Island (artillery clash) 2.Baengnyeong Island (Cheonan sinking) 3.Daecheong Island 4. Incheon Airport 5.Seoul 6.Incheon 7.Haeju 8.Kaesong 9.Ganghwa County 10.Bukdo Myeon 11.Deokjeok Myeon 12.Jawol Myeon 13.Yeongheung Myeon On this map #1 indicates Yeonpyeong Island where the artillery clash took place, and #2 Baengnyeong Island, off which the Cheonan sank. The upper(blue) line represents the Northern Limit Line (NLL) and the lower (red) one the West Sea Military Demarcation Line (MDL) claimed by the DPRK. The NLL was unilaterally established by the Americans (officially the United Nations Command) in August 1953.[36] The NLL, instead of striking out directly from the coast at the end of the land Military Demarcation Line (MDL), snakes up the west coast of North Korea, through rice crab fish grounds, and taking in various islands the main three of which are .Yeonpyeong (1) , Baengnyeong (2), and Daecheong (3). It has been argued that it was set up to prevent Southern incursions into Northern waters (Syngman Rhee had not signed the Armistice Agreement and wanted the war to continue), although it would be more plausible to see it also as affording bases for inserting intelligence and commando teams. Be that as it may, by the 1990s commando raids were a thing of the past, and yet the ROK refused to negotiate. This despite two major incidents in 1999 and 2002 which were a distinct threat to the ‘Sunshine Policy of then president Kim Dae-jung.[37] There was a further clash in November 2009 under the presidency of Lee Myung-bak.[38] This 2009 incident may have owed something to the more assertive North Korea policy of the Lee administration.[39] The NLL did not receive much international attention until the Cheonan incident of March 2010. There were a number of reasons for this. Most of the causalities in the past were Northern and so, in the eyes of most of the international media, perhaps warranted less attention. The Cheonan was the largest single disaster for the ROK navy. Many commentators were quick to point out what a dangerous situation the sinking of the Cheonan illustrated. Typical was Nicole Finnegan of the Washington-based Korea Economic Institute: Regardless of what we learn the true cause of the tragedy to be, the sinking of the Cheonan has revived fear and debates on how easily North and South Korea could lurch into war unexpectedly.[40] There is nothing new in these concerns. The NLL by its unilateral nature, its configuration close to the North Korean coast, and running through highly prized crab grounds, is a recipe for conflict. Fishing boats from both South and North sometimes ignore the NLL during the crab season and their respective navies tend to follow them. The NLL is also at variance with the now standard territorial sea limit of 12 nautical miles.[41] Writing in 2002, after the clash of June that year, John Barry Kotch and Michael Abbey, point out that: If the two Koreas are genuinely committed to reconciliation, these differences can be resolved through negotiation, thereby preventing future incidents. A line that was drawn more than a half-century ago for an entirely different purpose should no longer be allowed to fester as a source of conflict, thereby retarding the peace process.[42] The differences were not resolved, so the question is why? If this failure to negotiate a resolution had just occurred during the Lee Myung-bak administration it might not have been surprising. But this was during the time of Kim Dae-jung and Roh Moo-hyun. It is clear that a resolution would have meant the South abandoning the NLL and agreeing to something approximating the North’s line. It seems extremely unlikely that anyone in the DPRK would have opposed that. Although the NLL was established by the UNC, it appears that it is not longer involved, officially at least. It may well be that unofficially it is very much involved; the relationship between the US and ROK military seems to be unexplored territory. Whatever the role of Americans behind the scenes it seems clear that resolution of the NLL was opposed, successfully, by the ROK military. This opposition presumably was partly due to natural inertia – nobody likes giving up territory – but it must have gone deeper than that. The logical conclusion is that there were strong forces in the ROK political elite, revolving around the military, who wanted to keep the NLL precisely because it would “to fester as a source of conflict, thereby retarding the peace process” Fig 2: measuring policy change: KCNA mentions of the NLL over two administrations All of the previous conflicts around the NLL had been at sea, and the artillery duel at Yeonpyeong was the first one on land. To understand how that came about we must return to the map. It appears that the DPRK acknowledges ROK control over the islands, but claims these are its territorial waters, except for the access channels shown on the map.[43] Whilst the NLL has long been a bone of contention, the situation has greatly worsened since the Lee Myung-bak administration came into office. One rough way of measuring that is to calculate the number of times the official KCNA news agency mentions the North Limit Line. Roh Moo-hyun was in office from 25 February 2003 to 25 February 2008 when Lee Myung-bak took over. Fig 2 shows the monthly average of NLL stories over those two administrations. This is admittedly an imperfect metric but the difference between the two administrations is compelling: under Lee Myung-bak the number of North Korean complaints rose nearly three-fold. In March 2008, for instance, the KPA navy warned: Combined firepower drills for "striking and destroying" warships of the Navy of the Korean People's Army and drills for tactical naval maneuvers are staged on Paekryong, Taechong and Yonphyong Islets and in waters around them almost everyday. A situation in which an armed conflict may break out any moment is prevailing in the frontline waters in the West Sea due to the reckless military provocations of the south Korean military warmongers. Any attempt on the part of the south Korean military authorities to "protect" the "northern limit line" at any cost would only spark off a clash in the said waters.[44] The following year, as the Lee administration moved to join the US-led Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) the KPA navy issued another warning: 3. For the present, we will not guarantee the legal status of the five islands under the south side's control (Paekryong, Taechong, Sochong, Yonphyong [ and U islands) in our side's territorial waters northwest of the extension of the Military Demarcation Line in the West Sea of Korea and safe sailing of warships of the US imperialist aggression forces and the south Korean puppet navy and civilian ships operating in the waters around there.[45] The PSI is in many ways similar to the NLL. It is unilateral and illegal. The PSI claims that a set of nations – the US and its clients – are above international law and may stop and search ships on the high seas. Ostensibly this is to stop the shipping of weapons of mass destruction which given the United States pre-eminence in the international arms trade smacks of a certain degree of chutzpah.[46] Indeed, as Hazel Smith has documented, ‘There is little hard evidence that the government of North Korea is involved in the illicit shipping of WMD or components of WMD’.[47] The PSI seems to be really about harassing the DPRK and stoking tension, and that also holds for the NLL. The NLL seems to have been much more successful in attaining these objectives so far than the PSI. The NLL was perhaps only peripheral to the Cheonan incident. True the ship sank in disputed waters, and had the NLL not existed, but the two Koreas had been separated by a mutually agreed maritime border, the sinking would probably not have occurred. It appears that it ran aground in shallow waters and in an attempt to extricate itself was sunk by one of the South’s mines.[48] Nevertheless, the actual sinking of the Cheonan appears to have been an accident; it was the subsequent investigation that was deliberately fraudulent. The Yeonpyeong incident is different in that it occurred because of a deliberate provocation by the South. The artillery duel at Yeonpyeong As to be expected there is much that is uncertain and contested about this incident. But the essentials can be traced. The media tends to give the impression that the North Korean barrage against the marine base on Yeonpyeong island on 23 November came out of the blue, with nothing preceding it. The Chosun Ilbo specifically makes that claim: … the latest artillery bombardment on Yeonpyeong Island came completely out of the blue, and there is no way of telling when, where and how North Korea will strike next.[49] A rather more nuanced version is the Washington Post narrative, with the North launching a barrage and the South responding: North Korea launched a massive artillery barrage on a South Korean island Tuesday, killing two South Korean marines, wounding at least 19 other people and setting more than 60 buildings ablaze in the most serious confrontation since the North's sinking of a South Korean warship in March. South Korea immediately responded with its own artillery fire and put its fighter jets on high alert, bringing the two sides - which technically have remained in a state of war since the Korean armistice in 1953 - close to the brink of a major conflagration[50] No mention here of the South’s arms buildup on the island, the North’s warnings, the provocative nature of the Northern Limit Line, or the threatening military exercises. Back in 2008 the KPA complained about the ROK introducing new weaponry into the NLL islands: They also issued an order to batteries of 155 mm caliber howitzers and various type guided weapons deployed on the above-said five islets to be ready to go into action.[51] The KPA statement also claimed that: Combined firepower drills for "striking and destroying" warships of the Navy of the Korean People's Army and drills for tactical naval maneuvers are staged on Paekryong, Taechong and Yonphyong Islets and in waters around them [take place] almost everyday. A situation in which an armed conflict may break out any moment is prevailing in the frontline waters in the West Sea due to the reckless military provocations of the south Korean military warmongers. Any attempt on the part of the south Korean military authorities to "protect" the "northern limit line" at any cost would only spark off a clash in the said waters. [52] The live fire drills that the ROK conducted on 23 November were not just artillery practice; they were specifically focussed on possible combat against KPA ships in waters around the island. However, it was the specific contested status of those waters, in a tense situation exacerbated by the military exercises since the Cheonan incident, which sparked the North Korean response. It appears that the North warned the South against the drills, but the warnings were disregarded. The Seoul newspaper Chosun Ilbo reported on 24 November that: North Korea in a telegram on Tuesday morning [23 November] criticized an annual South Korean defense drill now underway. The same afternoon the North Korean military fired on Yeonpyeong Island. An official at the Joint Chiefs of Staff said, "At around 8:20 am. on Tuesday, North Korea sent a telegram that said they would not sit idly by and watch if South Korea fire at North Korean waters during the military training." North Korea already criticized the drill on Nov. 17 on the website of the Committee for the Peaceful Reunification of the Fatherland and again on Monday when the drill began. But the military dismissed North Korea's claims, saying an artillery firing drill by the Marine Corps that took place in Yeonpyeong Island on Tuesday had nothing to do with the annual drill but was a part of monthly training there. Moreover, the drill the North cited as an excuse for the attack is an annual routine drill which has been conducted by the South Korean military since 1996. A spokesman for the Joint Chiefs of Staff said, "The training was directed at South Korean waters to the southwest of Yeonpyeong Island, and the training site had been announced already through the international network of communication of merchant ships.[53] To say that the marine artillery drills had nothing to do with the Hoguk exercise seems to be a sophism. Moreover, the warnings stretched further back. The information available on the English-language KCNA website is only a portion of the published Korean-language material, and on top of that there are the direct communications between North and South (such as the telegram mentioned above). However, there is enough English-language for us to get a certain picture of preceding events, even though often the English translation is of poor quality.’ Fig3: Smoke from rocket fire over Yeonpyeong island This picture taken on November 23, 2010 by a South Korean tourist shows huge plumes of smoke rising from Yeonpyeong island in the disputed waters of the Yellow Sea on November 23, 2010. North Korea fired dozens of artillery shells onto a South Korean island on November 23, 2010, killing four people, setting homes ablaze and triggering an exchange of fire as the South's military went on top alert. (STR/AFP/Getty Images) On the 4th of June 2010 a Rodong Sinmun editorial headed ‘S. Korean Accused of Dangerous Provocations’ warned that: The puppet military is massively amassing offensive forces in the waters off five islets of the West Sea including Paekryong and Yonphyong [Yeonpyeong] islets while vociferating about "defence of the northern limit line" and ceaselessly infiltrating its warships into the territorial waters of the DPRK for the purpose of sparking off a new armed conflict. It is needless to say that the large-scale "demonstration of military muscle" and war maneuvers taking place under this situation are as dangerous acts as playing with fire by the side of a powder magazine. These moves are, in fact, a prelude to an all-out war. The DPRK loves peace and does not want a war. But it is the DPRK's spirit and mettle to react to fire with fire and punish the provocateurs with a merciless retaliation of justice. If the puppet group finally opts for starting a war of aggression against the DPRK in league with foreign forces, defying its warnings, the group will not be able to escape a thousand-fold indiscriminate retaliatory blow, warns the article. [54] This is a generalised warning about retaliation ‘for starting a war of aggression’ rather than specifically threatening a response to military exercises at Yeonpyeong. ‘Indiscriminate’ in this context presumably means ‘all-out war’. This warning was followed by another on 3 August which specifically threatened retaliation for ‘naval firing maneuvers’ from Yeonpyeong and other islands in the area: The Command of Forces of the Korean People's Army in the western sector of the front issued on Tuesday the following notice in this connection: The naval firing maneuvers to be staged by the above-said warmongers in the waters near Paekryong, Taechong and Yonphyong islets in August with all ground, naval and submarine attack means involved are not simple drills but undisguised military intrusion into the inviolable territorial waters of the DPRK and reckless politically motivated provocation to preserve the illegal "northern limit line" to the last. …. In view of the prevailing situation, the Command of Forces of the Korean People's Army in the western sector of the front made a decisive resolution to counter the reckless naval firing projected by the group of traitors with strong physical retaliation. …. As regards the expected DPRK's counteraction for self-defence, the command warns in advance all the civilian ships including fishing boats not to enter the theatre of naval firing fixed by the group of traitors in the waters close to the five islets in the West Sea of Korea. It is the unshakable will and steadfast resolution of the army and people of the DPRK to return fire for fire. [55] Whether the ROK marines carried out any firing exercises after that warning is unknown. The Chosun Ilbo report quoted above says the drills were held ‘monthly’ but the [London] Telegraph talks about ‘monthly air raid drills’, so the exercises on 23 November may have been the first since the August threat. The island, lined with tank traps and trenches, and equipped with 19 fully-stocked bomb shelters in which residents conduct monthly air raid drills, is permanently ready for war.[56] The South Koreans admitted carrying live firing exercises on 23 November but justified these by saying they were fired into the sea, away from the direction of the North Korean mainland. There seems no doubt they were firing into the sea (on the technical level it was presumably an anti-ship exercise), though the actual direction of fire is unclear. One report says southward.[57] Another says to the west. [58] Yet another has it to the southwest.[59] In fact, as far as the North was concerned, the direction was irrelevant because in any case the shells landed in their territorial waters. And therein lies the rub. The DPRK argues that if it tolerated the exercise it would be relinquishing its claim to the waters. The enemy fired shells from the islet which is so close to the territory of the DPRK that it is within each other's eyeshot despite the fact that there are so many mountains and rivers, sea waters and islets in south Korea. This powder-reeking saber-rattling cannot be construed otherwise than a politically motivated provocation. The enemy is claiming that they fired shells southward from the islet in a bid not to get on the nerves of the DPRK but Yonphyong Islet is located deep inside the territorial waters of the DPRK away from the maritime military demarcation line. If live shells are fired from the islet, they are bound to drop inside the territorial waters of the DPRK side no matter in which direction they are fired because of such geographical features. The ulterior aim sought by the enemy is to create the impression that the DPRK side recognized the waters off the islet as their "territorial waters", in case that there was no physical counter-action on the part of the former. Herein lies the crafty and vicious nature of the enemy's provocation. The army of the DPRK took such a self-defensive measure as making a prompt powerful strike at the artillery positions from which the enemy fired the shells as it does not make an empty talk. [emphasis added].[60] As can be seen from the map (fig 1), the DPRK seems to accept ROK control of the island (but not necessarily sovereignty) but it does not recognise any claim over the surrounding sea. It would appear that the DPRK claim to these waters has much to justify it; the Northern Limit Line is manifestly iniquitous; it is unilateral and provocative and should have been abolished years ago. But does that justify the DPRK artillery barrage? An important point here is the number of warnings that were given. We have already quoted the public statements, and mentioned a telegram, but the North also claims it made a telephone call to the South: The south Korean puppet warmongers' firing of shells into the territorial waters of the DPRK side in the West Sea of Korea on Nov. 23 was a premeditated and deliberate military provocation from A to Z and a war action in fact. On Nov. 22, the south Korean puppet forces made no scruple of announcing that they would fire shells into the territorial waters of the DPRK side with artillery pieces they deployed on Yonphyong Island while staging Hoguk exercises for a war of aggression against the DPRK, straining the situation on the Korean Peninsula. In this connection the DPRK side sent a telephone notice to the south Korean puppet military at 8 a.m. on Nov. 23, strongly urging it to immediately cancel the plan for firing shells into the territorial waters of the DPRK side. In the notice the DPRK side seriously warned that if it paid no heed to this demand, it would face a resolute physical counter-strike and would be held fully responsible for all the ensuing consequences.[61] This telephone call, and the previous public warnings, have received very little coverage in the Western media, but there is no doubt that it took place, since it was reported by the Seoul newspaper Korea Herald: In the morning [of the clash], the North sent a telephone message to the South, saying “The North would not just sit back if the South fired shots into the North Korean territorial waters,” according to JCS [South Korean Joint Chiefs of Staff] officials.[62] We do not know how explicit that warning was, but since it was a telephone call, the Southern officer could presumably have sought clarification. Moreover, we have other reports that the ROK military was aware that that DPRK had moved artillery into position. This was then followed by practice shooting: A senior military said several hours before the shelling began the North Korean military deployed one battery of six 122-mm MLRS shells and later two batteries of 12 112-mm MLRS shells. It also carried out preparatory shooting practice just before the attack. "As far as I know the South Korean military was aware of this," he said.[63] It seems fair to assume that the local ROK military commander knew what would happen if the firing exercise went ahead. Whether he relayed this to higher levels and asked for confirmation to go ahead we do not know, but it seems likely. There was no great time pressure and taking action which would result in the first artillery exchange since the Korean War would surely have been referred up to higher levels. The warning/foreknowledge issue become even more convoluted with revelations on 1 December that South Korean intelligence had known since August that the North would respond. The Director of the National Intelligence Service [NIS] gave testimony to a closed-door session of a committee of the National Assembly. Members of the National Assembly Intelligence Committee quoted NIS Director Won Sei-hoon as saying the agency knew from wiretapping that the North Korean regime ordered the military to prepare to attack the five islands in the West Sea. He said the NIS submitted the intelligence report to President Lee Myung-bak.[emphasis added] [64] The phrase ‘prepare to attack’ implies, and is meant to imply, a Northern provocation, an unprovoked assault. In fact, we have from another story a much more plausible phrase: The[Asahi Shimbun]quoted the source, who is familiar with North Korea-China relations, as saying, "Early last month, the North Korean military issued instructions in Kim Jong-un's name to senior military commanders to get ready to counter the enemy's provocations any time." The source quoted an unnamed North Korean Army officer as commenting on the artillery attack on Yeonpyeong. "It had been planned. We had been preparing for that for a long time." [emphasis added][65] This countering of what the North regarded as a Southern provocation is consistent with the published and telephone warnings. It gives a quite different take on who was provoking whom. This did not prevent the Chosun Ilbo, which ran the story, from heading it ‘Kim Jong-un 'Ordered Attack in Early November'. Not the first time a newspaper has mendaciously given a headline which is contradicted by the actual story under it. In fact, the Chosun Ilbo, which has a very virulent ideological position, often does it. On 3 December it ran a story about an interview Russian Prime Minister Putin gave in the United States in which it was reported that ‘Putin said that he finds the situation in the Korean Peninsula "very acute and disturbing"’. The headline was ‘N.Korean Attack 'Acute and Disturbing,' Says Putin’. The assertion that the NIS submitted the intelligence report to President Lee Myung-bak has to be taken cautiously. From the public account we do not know whether he was given it personally, and the warning drawn to his attention. It may have just been passed to his office, and he never got to read it. That is a generous interpretation. Whether Lee was aware personally it is clear that the North Korean warning that they would retaliate if the exercises took place was known at the highest levels of the South Korean command. Events of the day The actual sequence of events is more complex than most press reports and commentaries suggest. According to the Korea Herald report the Northern shelling started at 2.34pm, but was perhaps not the ‘massive onslaught’ that it was often called: “As the North fired coastal artillery shells at around 2:34 p.m. into waters off the Yeonpyeong Island as well as on the island, we immediately fired back in full accordance with combat rules,” said Lee Hong-kee, chief director for joint operations at the JCS, in a press briefing. [emphasis added][66] Either the accuracy of the Northern artillery was poor, or firing into the water was deliberate. According to the report, here is the sequence of events After 8.00am and before 2.34 pm South fires into sea 2.34 pm North starts firing into sea (and land?) 2.47 pm South starts firing at Northern coastal batteries – ‘strong, concentrated’ counterattack causing ‘considerable damage’ 2.55 pm North ceases firing 3.11 pm North recommences firing 3.42 pm North ceases firing 3.48 pm South telephones North urging it to stop its ‘provocative acts’ By 9.30 pm 2 marines killed; while six others were seriously injured. Ten other soldiers and three civilians suffered minor injuries This raises some intriguing questions. • Did the North fire simultaneously at the island and into the sea, or did the land fire come later? • Did the North fire onto the island only after the Southern counterattack on its positions? • Why did the South make a telephone call asking the North to stop if it had already done so? • Did the North recommence firing sometime after 3.42 pm? • As of 9.30 pm we have three civilians reported with minor injuries but subsequent reports give two dead. Were the dead amongst these three, or were they discovered later? The ‘fog of war’ no doubt produces confusion but these discrepancies suggest that we have not had the full story by any means. The quite erroneous claim that this was an ‘unprovoked attack’ by the North has been repeated so many times by ROK officials, and by the media, that even liberals such as the American investigative journalist Tim Shorrock have been taken in.[67] The other main canard in the official narrative concerns civilians. The theme is set at the top with statements from Lee Myung-bak. On 29 November he gave a short address to the nation: During a seven-minute speech Lee expressed outrage over the North's ruthless attack on civilians, calling it an "inhumane" crime [emphasis added].[68] Others were more circumspect. A JCS spokesman called the firing ‘indiscriminate’: “This provocation is a premeditated, intentional illegal attack in violation of the U.N. Convention, the Armistice Agreement and the inter-Korean non-aggression accord. It is also an inhumane atrocity, in which it indiscriminately fired shells into unarmed civilian residential areas.”[69] Song Min-soon, former Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade and currently a Democratic Party (i.e. opposition) member of the National Assembly attacked what he called an: outrageous indiscriminate artillery attack against civilians and military alike.[70] The American liberal John Feffer wrote of a ‘disproportionate response’ which killed ‘two civilians and two soldiers’. [71] Early reports (such as the Korea Herald one above) mention only minor civilian injuries, though they talk of a ’civilian area’: ..killing two South Korean marines, wounding 16 soldiers and three civilians, and damaging homes and facilities. This was the first time since the Korean War that the North has fired artillery shells on a civilian area in South Korea.[72] ‘Civilian area’ is a rather elastic term. Most military bases have civilians living in the vicinity, some more than others. The giant US headquarters in South Korea, Yongsan Garrison occupies 2.5 sq km in the centre of this city of 10 million people; the site was originally developed by the Japanese Imperial Army. By 24 November the casualties changed to four – two military and two civilians. In addition to the two marines killed, the bodies of two men, believed in their 60s, were pulled from a destroyed construction site, the coast guard said. At least 18 people - most of them troops - were injured.[73] It was not stated where this construction site was in relation to the marine camp. If it were on the other side of the island, then that would indicate fire that was either indiscriminate or very inaccurate. If it were close by, or even on the camp, then this would put a different complexion on things. It is clear that the main target was the marine camp, as this quotation from the JCS indicates Many landed on a military camp but others on a civilian village on the island. Flames and thick columns of smoke were seen rising above the village and a nearby mountain. "The North must have carefully premeditated the provocation against the camp," a JCS officer speculated. [74] Fig 4: Damage at the marine base A K-9 Marine artillery base on Yeonpyeong Island under attack by North Korea on Tuesday /Courtesy of the Ministry of Defense ["N.Korean Shelling 'Aimed for Maximum Damage to Lives, Property'." Chosun Ilbo, 26 November 2010. The Washington Post went one step further and reported that: Most of the shells landed on a military base on Yeonpyeong island [emphasis added][75] However, most reports either did not mention the marine base, or gave no details. For instance, another Washington Post article talked of ‘civilian-inhabited Yeonpyeong Island’ without any reference to the marine base.[76] In fact the military installations were very significant as a New York Times article makes evident. … [Yeonpyeong Island] houses a garrison of about 1,000 South Korean marines, and the navy has deployed its newest class of “patrol killer” guided-missile ships in the Western Sea, as the Yellow Sea is also known. [77] This NY Times article gave the civilian population as 1,600 but this was later revised down to 1,350. [78] Most appear to be connected, as one might expect, to fishing (this area is especially famous for crabs); how many work on the base is unclear. The most detailed, technical, assessment of the artillery duel is given by the US ‘geopolitical intelligence’ company STRATFOR. It released a report, accompanied by a pdf file showing satellite images taken after what it called the ‘North Korean attack on Yeonpyeong Island’. The STRATFOR reports are interesting partly for what they reveal but also what they hide or obscure and for what might be considered a surprising lack of geopolitical intelligence in an organisation in the business of selling the stuff. It admits that: A [South Korean] battery of six K9 155 mm self-propelled howitzers, which was conducting live-fire drills on a Yeonpyeong Island military base, fired some 80 rounds. And then, a bit further down: Significantly, the South claims its Yeonpyeong Island drill was not part of the larger Hoguk exercises under way simultaneously throughout South Korea. North Korea has occasionally protested these drills – including recently – and claims dozens of shells fell in North Korean waters near the island, provoking it to fire. However, as the North does not recognize the Northern Limit Line and considers the entire island and its surrounding water to be North Korean territory, it does not seem to be clear that this particular incident was any more provocative than any other drill.[79] This is a curious argument. Hoguk and the other military exercises over the decades have taken place in South Korean territory or international waters. This one was being held in what the North considered to be DPRK territory. It was not merely provocative from a military point of view, but as they made clear in their statement of 24 November, from a legal one as well. That is a very important distinction which differentiated the Yeonpyeong exercise from others. Although the STRAFOR report mentions the military base in passing, it is absent from the satellite images document. We have satellite photos of destroyed houses, but nothing about the base, which is not even identified. Since the base was the main target of attack, and early reports focused on military dead and wounded, this is a rather suspicious omission. The STRATFOR report, and images, do however throw considerable light, albeit inadvertently, on the issue of the civilian casualties. It would appear from this, and other sources, that the North Korean fire was not very accurate. The North Koreans either exclusively, or mainly (it is not clear which) used Multiple Launch Rocket System [MLRS] artillery These are, as the name suggests, basically a bundle of tubes which can fire rockets. Interestingly it is said that they can be traced back to the 15th century Korean hwacha (‘fire vehicle’) which could fire a hundred or more projectiles in one salvo.[80] The most famous example in modern times was the Soviet Katyusha, used in the Second World War and nicknamed the ‘Stalin organ’.[81] The Americans used them in 1991 in the Gulf War, and the ROK military is equipped with them.[82] MLRS can deliver formidable devastation but are not very accurate, especially the older versions with which the KPA is equipped: The initial barrage consisted of 150 rounds, followed by 20 more intermittently – meaning that while a full battalion appeared to be in position, a fully armed single battery could have conducted the entire attack. Of these 170 rounds, 80 struck Yeonpyeong Island, though 20 failed to detonate….. With a few modern exceptions, artillery rockets are unguided and achieve results through massed fires rather than exceptional accuracy. Here, North Korea had no opportunity to register targets or adjust fire based on input from forward observers; South Korea has subsequently conjectured based on the targets that the North’s maps of military positions on the island may have been dated. The failure of so many rounds to reach the island and a dud rate of roughly a quarter of those that did suggest issues of quality control in manufacture and/or poorly controlled storage, as well as the potential for there to have been issues in the fire direction or on the gunline.[83] So it would appear that the reason that shells fell on the town was not so much that that the firing was indiscriminate, but that it was inaccurate. The North Koreans do not have a monopoly on this, and there was anger in the National Assembly Intelligence Committee when they were presented with the satellite photo (Fig 5) which showed that Southern shells fired from their much more accurate howitzers had missed their target, the North Korean artillery positions Committee members reportedly reacted angrily since they show impact points scattered mainly in paddy and dry fields.[84] Fig 5: Evidence of inaccurate fire In this satellite photo released by the US private intelligence agency Stratfor, rice paddies and fields in North Korea bear traces of South Korean artillery shells ["Spies Intercepted Plans for Yeonpyeong Attack in August ". Chosun Ilbo, 2 December 2010. There was also much dispute about the damage suffered by the North. The DPRK has not released any statement about casualties. In the South, some pointed out that their military equipment was far superior and more deadly and hence there must have been many casualties, and others pointed to the various satellite photos showing hits off target.[85] Sometimes military action is intended primarily to terrorise and demoralise the civilian population – the London blitz, the firebombing of Tokyo, the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the ‘shock and awe’ bombing of Bagdad prior to invasion – are just a few examples. If the DPRK fired on Seoul to unleash ‘a sea of fire’ it would be the civilian population that would be hit, and the military impact would be secondary. However, much military action is aimed primarily at the enemy military, and if this happens in a populated area, civilians become, in the US euphemism, ‘collateral damage’. Clearly the distinction between the two is often blurred in practice, and it is difficult, perhaps impossible, to be sure, but it appears from the available evidence that the target for the North Korean fire was the marine base and that civilian casualties and damage were accidental. There are several reasons for assuming this. Firstly, the inaccuracy of the MLRS. Secondly, if the intention had been to cause civilian causalities as a warning about the consequences of Lee Myung-bak’s confrontational policy – ‘today Yeonpyeong, tomorrow Seoul’ – we would expect that point to be made. There is little point in giving a warning unless it is reasonably explicit. I can find no indication that the DPRK has made any suggestion that the Yeonpyeong incident carried such a lesson for the people of the ROK. On the contrary, the public statement expressed regret for civilian casualties and laid the blame on the Southern side: The DPRK side warned several times against the enemy's plan for shelling in the sensitive areas around Yonphyong Island and sent a telephone notice on the morning of the very day the incident occurred as part of its superhuman efforts to prevent the clash to the last moment, but the south side preempted the firing of shells into the territorial waters of the DPRK side. The enemy side, however, has kept silent about all these facts. Moreover, it is now working hard to dramatize "civilian casualties" as part of its propaganda campaign, creating the impression that the defenceless civilians were exposed to "indiscriminate shelling" all of a sudden from the DPRK side. If that is true, it is very regrettable but the enemy should be held responsible for the incident as it took such inhuman action as creating "a human shield" by deploying civilians around artillery positions and inside military facilities before the launch of the provocation. The fact that there were human casualties inside the military base clearly proves itself the ulterior intention of the enemy. The US regarded the death of innocent civilians as a common practice in the past in a bid to serve its military purposes in Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan and other parts of the world. This inhuman atrocity of the US. repeated itself on the Korean Peninsula this time. While the incident occurred, the shells indiscriminately fired by the enemy dropped in the area close to civilian houses far from the artillery positions of the Korean People's Army.[emphasis added][86] This statement brings up a third factor. The claim about a ‘human shield’ doesn’t carry much weight. Civilians live on the island for historical and economic reasons and there is no reason to suppose that they were used to shield the military. However, the claim that civilian casualties occurred within the camp is not implausible. Civilians must have worked at the camp. Indeed, one report from the United States said of the shelling that ‘this resulted in the killing of two South Korean soldiers and two civilian contractors working on a military base’ [emphasis added].[87] As with the Cheonan incident we need a proper, impartial, investigation if we are to draw any firm conclusions, but as with the Cheonan no such investigation is likely. It is interesting to note that the DPRK statement does not claim that it suffered any civilian causalities, merely that enemy shells ‘dropped in the area close to civilian houses’. North Korean propaganda is frequently portrayed as dishonest and deceitful. Here is surely a case where it would have been to their advantage to fabricate civilian casualties, but they did not do so. Finally, it should be remembered that the ROK military on Yeonpyeong Island are not just ordinary soldiers, they are marines, an elite force trained for amphibious assault. Indeed, back in 2009 Rodong Sinmun commented on the buildup up in the area The puppet military reinforced warships and armed forces along and near the "northern limit line in the West Sea" and formed a "task force to be ready to go into action in half an hour" and deployed it on Yonphyong Islet[emphasis added][88] The road behind, the road ahead The fire fight at Yeonpyeong Island seems to have been a manufactured crisis. It appears to be the first time that South Korea, alone or in tandem with the United States, has carried out a military exercise in territory claimed by the North.[89] There have been frequent naval clashes around the Northern Limit Line and it is fairly certain that it has been preserved for that purpose. If’ Seoul’ had really been anxious to avoid incidents and preserve peace then the NLL would have gone long ago. President Roh moo-hyun and Chairman Kim Jong Il, at their summit on 4 October 2007 agreed to ‘special peace and cooperation zone in the West Sea’, but this peace initiative was overturned, as so many others, by incoming president Lee Myung-bak.[90] Preserving the NLL as an area where incidents were likely is one thing, but utilising the NLL deliberately to create an incident is another Warnings and intelligence reports aside, it must have been known that a military exercise within the NLL area would be provocative. On top of which, the legal implications made it intolerably provocative. This suggests that the crisis was planned, not necessarily in great detail, but with sufficient surety of outcome. This reading is quite consistent with Lee Myung-bak’s policy, which is one of building up tension through tension in order to precipitate a crisis on the peninsula, a collapse of the DRPK, and its absorption by the ROK. The DPRK is well aware of this, hence the reaffirmation of the zero tolerance policy at Yeonpyeong. On 23 November, in the aftermath of the clash, the KPA issued a communiqué which reiterated the policy: It is a traditional mode of counter-action of the army of the DPRK to counter the firing of the provocateurs with merciless strikes. Should the south Korean puppet group dare intrude into the territorial waters of the DPRK even 0.001 mm, the revolutionary armed forces of the DPRK will unhesitatingly continue taking merciless military counter-actions against it.[91] This is a calculated policy of brinkmanship, designed to avert war, by threatening war. The danger is, of course, that the momentum of events will bring war about. That, unfortunately, is becoming ever more likely. Lee Myung-bak is a consummate politician. He has set things in motion to produce, and replicate crisis, while giving the appearance of being reluctant. His address to the nation on 29 November used the same rhetorical device as Antony’s speech about Julius Caesar, where he claims to be burying Caesar, not praising him, but of course is doing just that. Lee combined ‘humility’ with an aggressive stance in such a way as to suggest he was reluctant to exacerbate the situation but was being forced into it. President Lee Myung-bak’s address Monday is being summarized as consisting mainly of “humility toward the people of South Korea” and an “ultra-hardline response to North Korea.” Analysts say it shows the president’s perception of the current crisis facing him and its solution following the North Korean artillery attack on Yeonpyeong Island. Although even North Korea acknowledged the attack to be a “provocation,” President Lee has faced harsh criticism domestically. Surveys show that more than 70 percent of South Koreans, conservative and progressive alike, feel that the military and Lee Myung-bak administration did not respond appropriately at the time of the attack. The fact that the president began his address Monday with what amounted to an apology to the people of South Korea reflected a consideration of this situation. [emphasis added] The performance so impressed the reporter from the liberal Hankyoreh that we get manifestly false statement that ‘North Korea acknowledged the attack to be a ‘provocation’. Throughout the crises of 2001, especially over Cheonan and then Yeonpyeong, Lee Myung-bak has been very adroit in fanning the flames while give the impression that he was attempting to put them out. In respect of the Cheonan incident President Obama was reported as saying "I think President Lee has shown extraordinary restraint given these circumstances.’[92] It may be objected that this was a public statement and should not be taken too literally; politicians often say in public the opposite of what they think in private. However, there does seem to be a consensus among Western observers at least that Lee is a reluctant warrior being driven into taking steps by the provocative obduracy of the North.[93] Take, for instance, this STRATFOR interview where the interviewer comments: I talked to three former [US?] envoys to Seoul this week and all of them agreed that South Korea had handled this in a pretty cool and sensible fashion[94] The South Korea public is rather more sceptical. One of the WikiLeaks cables [09SEOUL59] illustrates the confusion in the minds of US officials: President Lee is determined not to give in to North Korean pressure. Our Blue House contacts have told us on several occasions that President Lee remained quite comfortable with his North Korea policy and that he is prepared leave the inter-Korean relations frozen until the end of his term in office, if necessary. It is also our assessment that Lee's more conservative advisors and supporters see the current standoff as a genuine opportunity to push and further weaken the North, even if this might involve considerable brinkmanship.[95] On the one hand we have Lee facing up to North Korean pressure, but we also get the admission that the ‘current standoff’ ( this was in 2009) is seen as ‘ a genuine opportunity to push and further weaken the North, even if this might involve considerable brinkmanship’. Lee’s brinkmanship is, in fact, far more profound and aggressive than the US diplomat realised. Both North and South are engaging in brinkmanship, but the nature of the two is very different. Pyongyang is far poorer and weaker than its adversaries, which include not merely South Korea but the United States, and Japan.[96] North Korea’s brinkmanship is therefore inherently defensive. It is designed to protect the country (or regime if you prefer that) from attack and conquest. That does not mean that it is wise, or will be successful, that is a matter of debate. But it is important to recognise its essential characteristic of defensiveness. South Korea’s brinkmanship, on the other hand, is offensive. It is designed to bring about the collapse of the DPRK and its takeover by the ROK. Lee Myung-bak does not have to do this. His immediate predecessors (Kim Dae-jung and Roh Moo-hyun) had very different policies. Indeed, his aggressive brinkmanship is arguably a new development because even in the days of the military dictatorships while there was hostility towards the North because the balance of forces if anything favoured the North, there was not such an ambitious policy. However, Lee Myung-bak is reputedly pragmatic and opportunistic. Soon after he won the presidency he was described in the New York Times thus: Mr. Lee has a reputation as a pragmatist who, in contrast to President Roh Moo-hyun, holds few strong ideological positions. As mayor, he created parks and reformed the public transportation system. As president, he said, his main agenda would be to revive the country’s economy.[97] If that is correct, his brinkmanship has been a response to events and opportunities, rather than a considered strategy. In addition, we may discern three factors which may be propelling him to accelerate the buildup of tension on the peninsula. • A desire to renew the anti-North momentum after the relative failure of the Cheonan incident. His setback in the May elections, the widespread public scepticism about the investigation, and the failure to get the UN Security Council to condemn North Korea must rankle. The Yeonpyeong incident is seen as away to rekindle anti-North Korea sentiment In his address on 29 November he specifically made the point: There was a split in public opinion over the torpedoing of the Cheonan. Unlike that time, our people have united as one this time.[98] Despite the frequent assertions of implosion and crisis, the DPRK is not facing collapse. Whilst sanctions must have caused huge damage it appears that the economy is recovering. Certainly Pyongyang, from personal observation on a visit in November 2010, is manifestly economically improved over my last visit three years ago, with more motor vehicles, bicycles, and shops. The electricity supply is much better and there is a very noticeable increase in street lighting. These observations are broadly corroborated by series of recent American visitors.[99] If the South is to take over the North then something must be done to reverse this recovery. Time is not on Lee Myung-bak’s side. His term of office comes to an end on 25 February 2013 and under the present constitution he is ineligible to run again. Moreover, there are suggestions that because of demographic changes the conservative ascendancy represented by the Lee administration may not be sustainable and that South Korea will move to more progressive administrations.[100] Since the North’s brinkmanship is defensive, it is reactive and this leaves the initiative in the hands of the South. Seoul has reinforced its forces on the NLL island and has announced that there will be artillery exercises from Daecheong Island, and again on Yeonpyeong. [101] It seems inevitable that Pyongyang will feel compelled to respond. The new ROK Defence Minister, Kim Kwan-jin, has threatened what he calls ‘self-defense air raids’ in the event of another clash; ‘self defense’ being used in the Japanese sense.[102] It will be recalled that clause 9 of the Japanese constitution prohibits the establishment of armed forces, so the Japanese army, navy and air forces all have ‘self-defense’ in their titles thus solving the constitutional problem. Kim Kwan-jin’s air strike policy is all part of what the New York Times rather approvingly, and with a professional use of euphemism, called a new ‘muscular military posture’.[103] The implications of this new policy are obvious. Not merely has the South great superiority in aircraft, but the new rules allow great flexibility for escalation. However, there are limits to the ROK military’s freedom of action. There is the legal issue of operational control – when would war be deemed a war and thus trigger US control of the ROK military ? But before that stage is reached, the ROK air force is dependent on US intelligence to operate. Thus any serious escalation of the situation on the Korean peninsula would require US endorsement. Would this be forthcoming? Unfortunately it looks as if it would. The Obama administration has termed its policy towards Korea as one of ‘strategic patience’. [104] It might be better described as ‘strategic paralysis’. Not merely has it ignored that calls of a many Korea experts to engage with the DPRK, but it has effectively relinquished control of events to Lee Myung-bak.[105] It might be said that ‘strategic paralysis’ is not confined to US Korea policy but is the defining characteristic of Obama foreign policy, and that would be true, but nowhere is it more perilous than in Korea. Because ultimately Korea is China. A second Korean war would, like the first, soon become a Sino-American war.

**Chinese pressure on North Korea is key to maintain regional stability. However, the geopolitical rivalry with the US on the peninsula dissuades them.**

**Putten 12/21** – research fellow with the Clingendael Institue in The Hague, PhD in History (Frans-Paul van der Putten, 21 December 2010, “Sino-US geopolitical rivalry does not help Korean stability”, http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2010/12/21/sino-us-geopolitical-rivalry-does-not-help-korean-stability/, RBatra)

The United States government believes China needs to do more to contribute to stability on the Korean peninsula. According to this view, North Korea is highly dependent on Chinese support and Beijing should use its influence to moderate Pyongyang’s behavior. As some American and other Western observers have put it, it is time for China to start behaving like a responsible great power. But it is not likely that China will fundamentally alter its policies.

The main reason for this is that geopolitical rivalry between China and the United States overshadows the situation on the Korean peninsula. Lately both Chinese and US actions have escalated this rivalry. As long as the two powers are more interested in keeping the other in check than in stabilising the peninsula no significant progress in terms of stabilising the region is possible.

North Korea recently shelled the South Korean island of Yeonpyeong after a period of escalating tensions, killing two soldiers and two civilians. North Korea claims that it opened fire after being provoked by a South Korean exercise. In response to the shelling incident the US and South Korea have conducted joint military exercises in the Yellow Sea. These involved a US aircraft carrier and are regarded as threatening not only by North Korea but also by China.

China’s economic and diplomatic support for North Korea undermines efforts by other countries to affect the behavior of the regime in Pyongyang. Even China is troubled by North Korean behavior. The North Korean nuclear program, and the risks Pyongyang is running in escalating tensions with South Korea and the US, are counter to China’s security interests. Theoretically, the Chinese government could therefore decide to put pressure on Pyongyang by limiting its economic support and by ending the diplomatic support it often gives in the United Nations Security Council. It is very unlikely that China’s policy towards North Korea will change much. The US diplomatic reports revealed by WikiLeaks are a confirmation of uneasy Sino-North Korean relations rather than an indication that this relationship is about to change.

China will probably continue to give more support than any other country because it is highly vulnerable to the consequences of political or economic collapse in North Korea. The longest and most accessible border of North Korea is the one it shares with China. Chaos in North Korea would harm stability in China’s northeast, the region formerly known as Manchuria.

Moreover, Beijing is less motivated to put pressure on the North Korean regime than other countries are. The US is primarily interested in preventing the proliferation of nuclear technologies from North Korea. South Korea and Japan are mainly worried about the military threat from the north. Compared with these countries, China is less concerned about such issues.

The most fundamental element in China’s policy towards North Korea is that Beijing regards the US as a greater security threat than the situation on the Korean peninsula. Since neither China nor the US is by itself the predominant great power in Korean affairs, Beijing can only assume responsibility for regional stability if it does so jointly with the US. However, this will not happen since China and the US each regard one another as their main potential military adversary. They also have contrary interests on the Korean peninsula.

While China regards the US military presence in South Korea as a potential threat that should eventually be removed, the US intends to maintain this presence as it helps to limit Chinese regional influence. The relationship between Beijing and Pyongyang cannot be seen apart from this context of geopolitical rivalry. It is desirable for China that the regime in North Korea continues to exist and that the Chinese government retains a certain degree of influence in Pyongyang.

**The recent meeting changed nothing – military presence prevents Chinese pressure and risks regional arms races and war**

**Klein-Ahlbrandt 1/21** – China Adviser and North East Asia Project Director at Crisis Group, supervises the work of a small team of analysts responsible for high quality research and analysis on North East Asia (Stephanie Klein-Ahlbrandt, 21 January 2011, Despite Reports, “China's North Korea Policy Stays the Same,” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/stephanie-t-kleineahlbrandt/post\_1614\_b\_812407.html, RBatra)

During Hu Jintao's visit, he penned a joint statement with President Obama in which -- for the first time -- he voiced concern about North Korea's new uranium enrichment. Many in the US and South Korea are hailing this as support for their position, but they should know better. Despite tactical moves to smooth Hu Jintao's visit, little about China's North Korea policy has changed over the last few weeks nor is it likely to anytime soon.

In the past, a less strident Beijing's willingness to calibrate its responses to North Korean provocations was key to the West's strategy to moderate Pyongyang's behavior. But internal debates on North Korea policy have given way to traditionalist and conservative forces increasingly dictating the line, backed by nationalist public opinion. Over the past year and a half, China has strengthened its political, economic and military relationship with the North, refusing to hold Pyongyang to account for deadly attacks on the South which recently brought the peninsula the closest to war since 1953.

China's top concern of instability on its border deepened in 2009 following reports of Kim Jong-Il's failing health, a disastrous currency reform, and uncertainties surrounding leadership transition. But Beijing's calculations are also increasingly shaped by rising concerns about a perceived US strategic "return to Asia" and by opposition to American military and political presence in the region. China is using its close ties with Pyongyang as a bulwark against US military dominance in the region, giving the rogue nation virtually unconditional diplomatic protection. The two presidents' joint statement this week glosses over all of these realities.

When North Korea shelled Yeonpyeong Island on November 23 and after the sinking of the South Korean naval ship Cheonan on March 26, China's initial reaction was to dismiss international calls to pressure North Korea. Instead, it criticized US and South Korea for military exercises held in response, which it viewed as more threatening to its security than North Korea's violent behavior. It felt the US was using tensions on the Peninsula as a justification to expand its regional military presence. China also worried about the deepening military cooperation between the US, South Korea and Japan, seeing US security assistance not only as an attempt to contain China but also as emboldening regional players against it. While weeks after the shelling, China toned down its criticism of the US and sent an envoy to Pyongyang, it has made no changes to its fundamental economic, military and political support to Pyongyang. Beijing's tactical moves should not be confused with a broader shift in its approach towards North Korea.

Beijing's solidarity with Pyongyang has significantly strained relations with South Korea and Japan, which are strengthening their security alliances with the US Their rejection of China's call for emergency consultations after the Yeonpyeong Island shelling was more than a display of frustration at Beijing's unwillingness to take concrete action. It showed a widening gap between the two camps' perceptions of the North Korean threat and the appropriate ways to manage it. There is a real danger that the North will continue its asymmetric attacks in the Yellow Sea or elsewhere in the South. In response, Japan and South Korea are significantly boosting their military capabilities, intensifying the risk of a regional arms race or of a miscalculation leading to war.

Beijing's stance on North Korea is only the latest example of its increasingly assertive foreign policy behavior. Over the past year, it has intensified sweeping claims to disputed territories in the South China Sea and Diaoyu Islands, escalated a minor incident at sea into a major confrontation with Japan, and showed off a new stealth fighter aircraft just as the US and China were trying to restart their military relations. Beijing is more unwilling now to yield to external demands and increasingly expects quid pro quos from the West in return for cooperation on third country issues such as North Korea and Iran. A common question in Chinese policy circles is why continue to cooperate with the US when it continues to sell arms to Taiwan.

China needs to step up to the plate and assume the responsibilities that come with its rising power status. It has censured North Korea in the past after the 2006 and 2009 nuclear tests. Its failure to do the same now -- for the Cheonan sinking, Yeonpyeong Island attack and Pyongyang's new uranium enrichment -- endangers not just the region but also its own security interests. Shielding Pyongyang and continuing unconditional engagement reduces all other countries' ability to deter North Korea. China's strategy leaves it vulnerable to accusation that it is responsible for enabling North Korea's next attack. Let's hope President Obama realizes the joint statement must be backed up with a stern message to President Hu that Beijing's increasingly cozy relationship with Pyongyang and insistence on backing the North's bad behavior only heightens the risk of regional conflict.

**Korea war goes global and nuclear**

**STRATFOR 10** (5/26/10, “North Korea, South Korea: The Military Balance on the Peninsula,” http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/20100526\_north\_korea\_south\_korea\_military\_balance\_peninsula, JMP)

So the real issue is the potential for escalation – or an accident that could precipitate escalation – that would be beyond the control of Pyongyang or Seoul. With both sides on high alert, both adhering to their own national (and contradictory) definitions of where disputed boundaries lie and with rules of engagement loosened, the potential for sudden and rapid escalation is quite real.

Indeed, North Korea’s navy, though sizable on paper, is largely a hollow shell of old, laid-up vessels. What remains are small fast attack craft and submarines – mostly Sang-O “Shark” class boats and midget submersibles. These vessels are best employed in the cluttered littoral environment to bring asymmetric tactics to bear – not unlike those Iran has prepared for use in the Strait of Hormuz. These kinds of vessels and tactics – including, especially, the deployment of naval mines – are poorly controlled when dispersed in a crisis and are often impossible to recall.

For nearly 40 years, tensions on the Korean Peninsula were managed within the context of the wider Cold War. During that time it was feared that a second Korean War could all too easily escalate into and a thermonuclear World War III, so both Pyongyang and Seoul were being heavily managed from their respective corners. In fact, USFK was long designed to ensure that South Korea could not independently provoke that war and drag the Americans into it, which for much of the Cold War period was of far greater concern to Washington than North Korea attacking southward.

Today, those constraints no longer exist. There are certainly still constraints – neither the United States nor China wants war on the peninsula. But current tensions are quickly escalating to a level unprecedented in the post-Cold War period, and the constraints that do exist have never been tested in the way they might be if the situation escalates much further.

# 1AC China

**Contention Two: China.**

**Disputes over North Korea mean there’s no chance of a cooperative relationship with China in the status quo – a new U.S. military posture is necessary**

**Sanger 12/6** – Chief Washington Correspondent for The New York Times, appointed adjunct professor of public policy at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard AND Michael Wines, the China bureau chief for The New York Times, M.S. degree (David E., 6 December 2010, “North Korea Is Sign of Chilled U.S.-China Relations”, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/12/07/world/asia/07china.html?ref=northkorea, RBatra)

But in Beijing, both Chinese and American officials and analysts have another explanation: the long silence epitomizes the speed with which relations between Washington and Beijing have plunged into a freeze. This year has witnessed the longest period of tension between the two capitals in a decade. And if anything, both sides appear to be hardening their positions.

“The issues that used to be on the positive side of the ledger are increasingly on the negative side of the ledger, starting with North Korea,” Bonnie Glaser, a China scholar at the Washington-based Center for Strategic and International Studies, said in an interview last week. “I don’t think this is easily repairable, and I think we’re going to have a fairly cold relationship over the next two years, and potentially longer.”

Mr. Obama came into office seeking just the opposite: a new rapprochement with a rising power whose deep economic ties with the United States all but demand closer diplomatic ones. But the days when the White House spoke of a “G-2” that would manage the world economy and more, a phrase that preceded the first meeting between Mr. Obama and Mr. Hu in the depths of the financial crisis in early 2009, are long over.

Instead, he faces a problem very similar to the one Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton described in March 2009 during a lunch with Kevin Rudd, a China expert who was then Australia’s prime minister, according to a cable recounting their conversation that was in a newly released trove of WikiLeaks documents.

Mrs. Clinton was said to have asked Mr. Rudd, “How do you deal toughly with your banker?”‘

The latest bad sign is that cooperation on managing North Korea’s nuclear ambitions, which began with considerable promise in 2009, appears to have disintegrated.

On Monday, Mrs. Clinton was scheduled to convene an emergency meeting in Washington with her Japanese and South Korean counterparts about both the North’s shelling of a South Korean island last month, and its recent disclosure of a new nuclear facility that potentially expands its nuclear arsenal. China, the only nation with real sway over the North Korean leadership, will not be there.

To the contrary, China’s strategy on North Korea is at odds with that of Washington and its allies. In Monday’s telephone call with Mr. Hu, the White House said, Mr. Obama said North Korea’s new enrichment facility flouted commitments it made during the six-party talks on curbing its nuclear program, and urged China’s help in sending “a clear message to North Korea that its provocations are unacceptable.”

One former Chinese official with close ties to the government dismissed the American approach last week as characteristically legalistic. The former official, who would not be named because he is not authorized to speak on the topic, said China’s strategy is to reassure the Koreans about their security, not lecture them about diplomatic obligations.

Indeed, China’s strongest public reaction to last month’s shelling of South Korea has not been to condemn the North, but to criticize Washington’s response – joint war games with South Korea that put the American carrier George Washington and its strike force in the Yellow Sea, off China’s borders.

**Cooperation on the Korean peninsula is key to overall Chinese relations**

**Bandow 9** (Spring, Doug, “A New Approach to Counter Nuclear Proliferation on the Korean Peninsula,” International Journal of Korean Studies, p55-83,http://www.icks.org/publication/pdf/2009-SPRING-SUMMER/4.pdf, DA 9/1, MaT)

But American engagement may not be enough. The PRC could play a particularly important role in dissuading the North from its nuclear course. Indeed, H.D.S. Greenway of the Boston Globe has advocated building on "the new climate of U.S.-Chinese cooperation of late." 94 Such a strategy would offer at least one additional benefit. Working together to defuse the North Korean nuclear crisis successfully would make it easier to resolve other disputes between Washington and Beijing, thereby laying the groundwork for a wide-ranging partnership in the years and decades ahead. Nevertheless, the most important and immediate goal remains halting nuclear proliferation in Northeast Asia.

**This is reverse-causal – failure to cooperate over Korea kills relations**

**Bush 1/13** – senior fellow in the Foreign Policy program at The Brookings Institution, director of Brookings’s Center for Northeast Asian Policy Studies, served for nineteen years in the U.S. Government, in the Congress, the intelligence community, and as chairman and managing director of the American Institute in Taiwan. Co-Authored by Jonathan D. Pollack, Professor of Asian and Pacific Studies and Director of the Strategic Research Department at the Naval War College (Richard C., The U.S.-China Summit and the Korean Peninsula: Is Cooperation Possible?, 13 January 2011, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/richard-c-bush-iii/the-uschina-summit-and-th\_b\_808284.html, RBatra)

The stakes on the Korean peninsula could not be higher. If Presidents Hu and Obama are able to return to the cooperation of 2009, their joint efforts will impart to Pyongyang the clear costs of its actions, as well as inhibit additional risk taking by North Korea. It will also demonstrate that U.S.-China cooperation on crucial regional security issues is possible. If the leaders fail in these efforts, the dangers of 2010 will continue and deepen, and the risks of a wider conflict will grow.

**Sphere of influence concessions are key to relations**

**Carpenter 10** – vice president for defense and foreign policy studies at the Cato, Ph.D. in U.S. diplomatic history from the University of Texas (Ted Galen, 19 October 2010, “Resets and Spheres of Influence”, http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-skeptics/resets-spheres-influence-4266, RBatra)

The Obama administration has explicitly sought to “reset” the relationship with Russia, which had become quite dysfunctional during the final years of the Bush administration. Although Washington has not used the reset terminology with respect to the troubled U.S. relationship with China, the substantive goal appears to be similar. Secretary of Defense Robert Gates’ effort to restore the dialogue between the militaries of the two countries is one indication of that intent.

Both goals, however, are encountering headwinds for a key reason. Policy makers seem unwilling to accept the reality that any great power in the international system expects, and will seek to enforce, a sphere of influence in its immediate region. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice famously (or infamously) insisted that the concept of a sphere of influence was both obsolete and pernicious. But that viewpoint is dangerously erroneous. The tensions between the United States and Russia and those between the United States and China confirm that point.

**China relations are key to solve multiple scenarios for planetary destruction**

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

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

**They’re key to solve warming**

**Lieberthal 9** – director of the John L. Thornton China Center and senior fellow in Foreign Policy and Global Economy and Development at the Brookings Institution, PhD in Political Science, Columbia – AND – David B. Sandalow, Assistant Secretary for Policy and International Affairs at the Energy Department, JD (Kenneth G., January 2009, Overcoming Obstacles to U.S.-China Cooperation on Climate Change, http://www.brookings.edu/reports/2009/01\_climate\_change\_lieberthal\_sandalow.aspx, RBatra)

Opportunities for collaboration in fighting climate change are plentiful, but moving forward at the scale needed will require high-level political support in two very different societies, each with considerable suspicion of the other. This report recommends ways to win such support and sustain it for the long term.

Chapter 1 of the report provides a primer on two topics: climate change and U.S.-China relations. It describes the climate change threat, concluding that every year of delay in responding to it puts both countries – and the planet – at greater risk. Because the United States and China are the world’s top two greenhouse gas emitters, together accounting for more than 40% of annual emissions, any solution requires both countries to transition to low-carbon economies. U.S.-China cooperation on climate change would have not only bilateral but global benefits.

**Warming is real & anthropogenic – causes extinction**

**Deibel 7** (Terry L, Professor of IR @ National War College, “Foreign Affairs Strategy: Logic for American Statecraft”, Conclusion: American Foreign Affairs Strategy Today, cut by [presumably] Lexington)

Finally, there is one major existential threat to American security (as well as prosperity) of a nonviolent nature, which, though far in the future, demands urgent action. It is the threat of global warming to the stability of the climate upon which all earthly life depends. Scientists worldwide have been observing the gathering of this threat for three decades now, and what was once a mere possibility has passed through probability to near certainty. Indeed not one of more than 900 articles on climate change published in refereed scientific journals from 1993 to 2003 doubted that anthropogenic warming is occurring. “In legitimate scientific circles,” writes Elizabeth Kolbert, “it is virtually impossible to find evidence of disagreement over the fundamentals of global warming.” Evidence from a vast international scientific monitoring effort accumulates almost weekly, as this sample of newspaper reports shows: an international panel predicts “brutal droughts, floods and violent storms across the planet over the next century”; climate change could “literally alter ocean currents, wipe away huge portions of Alpine Snowcaps and aid the spread of cholera and malaria”; “glaciers in the Antarctic and in Greenland are melting much faster than expected, and…worldwide, plants are blooming several days earlier than a decade ago”; “rising sea temperatures have been accompanied by a significant global increase in the most destructive hurricanes”; “NASA scientists have concluded from direct temperature measurements that 2005 was the hottest year on record, with 1998 a close second”; “Earth’s warming climate is estimated to contribute to more than 150,000 deaths and 5 million illnesses each year” as disease spreads; “widespread bleaching from Texas to Trinidad…killed broad swaths of corals” due to a 2-degree rise in sea temperatures. “The world is slowly disintegrating,” concluded Inuit hunter Noah Metuq, who lives 30 miles from the Arctic Circle. “They call it climate change…but we just call it breaking up.” From the founding of the first cities some 6,000 years ago until the beginning of the industrial revolution, carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere remained relatively constant at about 280 parts per million (ppm). At present they are accelerating toward 400 ppm, and by 2050 they will reach 500 ppm, about double pre-industrial levels. Unfortunately, atmospheric CO2 lasts about a century, so there is no way immediately to reduce levels, only to slow their increase, we are thus in for significant global warming; the only debate is how much and how serious the effects will be. As the newspaper stories quoted above show, we are already experiencing the effects of 1-2 degree warming in more violent storms, spread of disease, mass die offs of plants and animals, species extinction, and threatened inundation of low-lying countries like the Pacific nation of Kiribati and the Netherlands at a warming of 5 degrees or less the Greenland and West Antarctic ice sheets could disintegrate, leading to a sea level of rise of 20 feet that would cover North Carolina’s outer banks, swamp the southern third of Florida, and inundate Manhattan up to the middle of Greenwich Village. Another catastrophic effect would be the collapse of the Atlantic thermohaline circulation that keeps the winter weather in Europe far warmer than its latitude would otherwise allow. Economist William Cline once estimated the damage to the United States alone from moderate levels of warming at 1-6 percent of GDP annually; severe warming could cost 13-26 percent of GDP. But the most frightening scenario is runaway greenhouse warming, based on positive feedback from the buildup of water vapor in the atmosphere that is both caused by and causes hotter surface temperatures. Past ice age transitions, associated with only 5-10 degree changes in average global temperatures, took place in just decades, even though no one was then pouring ever-increasing amounts of carbon into the atmosphere. Faced with this specter, the best one can conclude is that “humankind’s continuing enhancement of the natural greenhouse effect is akin to playing Russian roulette with the earth’s climate and humanity’s life support system. At worst, says physics professor Marty Hoffert of New York University, “we’re just going to burn everything up; we’re going to heat the atmosphere to the temperature it was in the Cretaceous when there were crocodiles at the poles, and then everything will collapse.” During the Cold War, astronomer Carl Sagan popularized a theory of nuclear winter to describe how a thermonuclear war between the Untied States and the Soviet Union would not only destroy both countries but possibly end life on this planet. Global warming is the post-Cold War era’s equivalent of nuclear winter at least as serious and considerably better supported scientifically. Over the long run it puts dangers from terrorism and traditional military challenges to shame. It is a threat not only to the security and prosperity to the United States, but potentially to the continued existence of life on this planet.

**The plan solves Chinese containment**

**Lee 10** – the moving force behind the Asian affairs website China Matters which provides continuing critical updates on China and Asia-Pacific policies, publishes frequently in Asia Times, has spent thirty years observing, analyzing, and writing on Asian affairs, quoting Chosun Ilbo, an influential Korean newspaper (Peter, 9 July 2010, “It's Official: America Has a China-Containment Policy”, http://chinamatters.blogspot.com/2010/07/its-official-america-has-china.html, RBatra)

The US-South Korea alliance forms the cornerstone of the South's national security and diplomacy. But China is South Korea's largest trading partner, and it also has a huge influence on peace and reunification on the Korean Peninsula. The time has come for Seoul to factor into its diplomacy and security policies both China and its intensifying competition with the US

The code word for "containment" in the Asian press, by the way, is "Cold War atmosphere".

The message that the Time article was meant to send was that the US Navy are now devoted to defining, countering, and to some extent creating a Chinese threat in the Pacific in order to preserve the scale of its forces and protect its budget.

The Chinese government, given the concerted efforts by the Obama adminstration to rollback China's influence throughout the world diplomatically and economically as well as militarily, will undoubtedly draw more sweeping conclusions.

I would take issue with two statements in Williams' article.

First, especially but not exclusively on the issue of the Korean peninsula, the US is there as an unbalancer, not a "balancer" as Bonnie Glaser put it.

The tilt away from the Six Party Talks structure including China to a strengthened ROK-USA security condominium is a signal that a Western response to instability on the peninsula, be it from "provocations" or the demise of Kim Jung Il, will not include China as an equal partner.

The US media has largely ignored the vitriolic response in the Chinese press to America's military moves, but the Chinese clearly see that the pendulum has swung away from stability--with the US presence precluding a rush to rearmament by Japan---to containment.

Containment, to China, implies that the US will continue to fan fears of China's military ambitions to encourage the rise of India and the the creation of pro-American governments and policies throughout Asia and turn a blind eye or, even worse, extend an enabling hand to Asian states that develop adventurist ambitions in challenging China on the issue of the uninhabited but contested islands that dot the region.

I guess we'll find out if the Obama administration has a long-term plan sees an upside in a near-open breach of relations with China beyond giving the opportunity for the US to play to its military strength in Asia and cooperate with local political leaders like South Korea's Lee Myung-bak, who want to use Washington as a counterweight to Beijing.

**Containment causes a self-fulfilling prophecy that guarantees war throughout Asia**

**Klare 6** – professor of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College, 2006 [Michael, “Containing China: The US's real objective”, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/China/HD20Ad01.html]

Accompanying all these diplomatic initiatives has been a vigorous, if largely unheralded, effort by the Department of Defense (DoD) to bolster US military capabilities in the Asia-Pacific region. The broad sweep of US strategy was first spelled out in the Pentagon's most recent policy assessment, the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), released on February 5. In discussing long-term threats to US security, the QDR begins with a reaffirmation of the overarching precept first articulated in the DPG of 1992: that the United States will not allow the rise of a competing superpower. This country "will attempt to dissuade any military competitor from developing disruptive or other capabilities that could enable regional hegemony or hostile action against the United States", the document states. It then identifies China as the most likely and dangerous competitor of this sort. "Of the major and emerging powers, China has the greatest potential to compete militarily with the United States and field disruptive military technologies that could over time offset traditional US military advantages" - then adding the kicker - "absent US counter-strategies." According to the Pentagon, the task of countering future Chinese military capabilities largely entails the development, and then procurement, of major weapons systems that would ensure US success in any full-scale military confrontation. "The United States will develop capabilities that would present any adversary with complex and multidimensional challenges and complicate its offensive planning efforts," the QDR explains. These include the steady enhancement of such "enduring US advantages" as "long-range strike, stealth, operational maneuver and sustainment of air, sea and ground forces at strategic distances, air dominance, and undersea warfare". Preparing for war with China, in other words, is to be the future cash cow for the giant US weapons-making corporations in the military-industrial complex. It will, for instance, be the primary justification for the acquisition of costly new weapons systems such as the F-22A Raptor fighter, the multi-service Joint Strike Fighter, the DDX destroyer, the Virginia-class nuclear attack submarine, and a new intercontinental penetrating bomber - weapons that would just have utility in an all-out encounter with another great-power adversary of a sort that only China might someday become. In addition to these weapons programs, the QDR also calls for a stiffening of present US combat forces in Asia and the Pacific, with a particular emphasis on the US Navy (the arm of the military least used in the ongoing occupation of and war in Iraq). "The fleet will have a greater presence in the Pacific Ocean," the document notes. To achieve this, "The navy plans to adjust its force posture and basing to provide at least six operationally available and sustainable [aircraft] carriers and 60% of its submarines in the Pacific to support engagement, presence and deterrence." Since each of these carriers is, in fact, but the core of a large array of support ships and protective aircraft, this move is sure to entail a truly vast buildup of US naval capabilities in the Western Pacific and will certainly necessitate a substantial expansion of the US basing complex in the region - a requirement that is already receiving close attention from Admiral Fallon and his staff at PACOM. To assess the operational demands of this buildup, moreover, this summer the US Navy will conduct its most extensive military maneuvers in the Western Pacific since the end of the Vietnam War, with four aircraft-carrier battle groups and many support ships expected to participate. Add all of this together, and the resulting strategy cannot be viewed as anything but a systematic campaign of containment. No high administration official may say this in so many words, but it is impossible to interpret the recent moves of Rice and Rumsfeld in any other manner. From Beijing's perspective, the reality must be unmistakable: a steady buildup of US military power along China's eastern, southern and western boundaries. How will China respond to this threat? For now, it appears to be relying on charm and the conspicuous blandishment of economic benefits to loosen Australian, South Korean, and even Indian ties with the United States. To a certain extent, this strategy is meeting with success, as these countries seek to profit from the extraordinary economic boom now under way in China - fueled to a considerable extent by oil, gas, iron, timber, and other materials supplied by China's neighbors in Asia. A version of this strategy is also being employed by President Hu Jintao during his current visit to the United States. As China's money is sprinkled liberally among such influential firms as Boeing and Microsoft, Hu is reminding the corporate wing of the Republican Party that there are vast economic benefits still to be had by pursuing a non-threatening stance toward China. China, however, has always responded to perceived threats of encirclement in a vigorous and muscular fashion as well, and so we should assume that Beijing will balance all that charm with a military buildup of its own. Such a drive will not bring China to the brink of military equality with the United States - that is not a condition it can realistically aspire to over the next few decades. But it will provide further justification for those in the United States who seek to accelerate the containment of China, and so will produce a self-fulfilling loop of distrust, competition and crisis. This will make the amicable long-term settlement of the Taiwan problem and of North Korea's nuclear program that much more difficult, and increase the risk of unintended escalation to full-scale war in Asia. There can be no victors from such a conflagration.

**It goes nuclear**

**Dodge, 5** (Paul, Department of Defense and Strategic Studies – Missouri State University, “China’s Naval Strategy and Nuclear Weapons: The Risks of Intentional and Inadvertent Nuclear Escalation”, Comparative Strategy, 24(5), December, p. 415-416)

In the summer of 2005, Chinese Major-General Zhu Chenghu threatened the United States with nuclear attack, stating that, “If the Americans draw their missiles and position-guided ammunition on to the target zone on China’s territory, I think we will have to respond with nuclear weapons.”1 It should be noted that the People’s Republic of China (PRC) considers Taiwan to be PRC territory, as well as the territorial waters surrounding the island, its exclusive economic zone, those of the Senkaku (Diaoyutai Islands), and virtually the entire South China Sea and its islands. To be successful in any military effort to acquire Taiwan or any of its many other territorial ambitions, the PRC realizes that it must be able to deter US military intervention. The idea is to convince the United States and the world that China is both capable and, more importantly, willing to inflict grievous casualties on US forces, even at the cost of heavy economic, diplomatic, and military losses to the PRC. Efforts toward this end have been manifested over recent years in the form of greatly increased military spending, the acquisition of weapons designed specifically to attack US naval forces, the development of new strategic and tactical nuclear weapons, and the formation of a naval warfighting strategy that emphasizes asymmetric attacks on high-value US assets and personnel. The July statement from General Zhu is of course among the most visible of these efforts. One wonders why General Zhu was not fired or even sternly reprimanded by his military and Chinese Communist Party (CCP) superiors for such a statement at an official press conference. In truth, it is but the latest in a string of bellicose remarks by high-ranking Chinese military officials designed to convince the US policymaking, intelligence, and military communities that China is ready to escalate to the use of nuclear weapons should it become necessary. Classic deterrence, after all, dictates that an enemy can only be deterred through the combination of capability and credibility. However, when considered in the context of the People’s Liberation Army (PLA) and Navy (PLAN) strategy to take on the United States in a naval and aerial conflict, China’s strategy to deter can be seen as a recipe for inadvertent nuclear escalation. Put simply, this piece argues that China’s warfighting doctrine is misguided, unrealistic, and dangerous. It is misguided because it places a great deal of focus on attacking US aircraft carriers, which in reality are likely to be far more difficult to find, track, and attack than the Chinese realize. It is unrealistic because the vast majority of Chinese naval and air forces, which comprise the backbone of its conventional force options, are likely to be annihilated by American standoff weapons, advanced aircraft, and vastly superior attack submarines. Most important of all, the way in which China has mated its nuclear strategy to its conventional warfighting strategy is extremely dangerous because it makes nuclear war with the United States far more likely. There are several reasons why this is the case. First, China’s acquisition of advanced foreign weaponry, its expectation that the United States will back down at the first hint of casualties, and its belief that nuclear weapons can act as a force multiplier all threaten to lower the nuclear threshold and cause a deterrence failure vis-`a-vis US forces in the region. Lulled into a false sense of security, China may act on its irredentist policies when it should be deterred by superior US forces and slim chances for victory. Second, Chinese capabilities are actually very modest, meaning they are only suitable for combat against other regional states. When faced with a first-rate power, China’s forces will suffer heavy attrition. Finally, the loss of these forces, including high-value naval combatants, aircraft, and early warning assets, will cause China’s conventional strategy to collapse, leaving only nuclear options. At this point, the PRC will be left with only two real choices and find itself at a strategic “fork in the road.” On one hand, it can de-escalate, sue for peace, or otherwise accept defeat. On the other, it can fall back on the nuclear aspect of its doctrine. Enormous domestic, economic, and political pressures will make the choice of the former a very difficult one for the PRC leadership. The latter choice entails either early nuclear usage to avoid anticipated casualties, or later use in a desperate effort to cause massive US casualties, aid PLAN conventional forces, or tip the tactical balance in China’s favor. This analysis first examines the conventional aspects of China’s naval strategy and its preoccupation with anti-carrier tactics. Nuclear weapons are closely integrated with conventional forces in this strategy, and both play a crucial role in threatening high-value US assets. The discussion then turns to the real-world difficulties China would face while attempting to track and attack an aircraft carrier battlegroup. Similarly, the vital role of US attack submarines in defeating China’s anti-access strategies will be detailed. While these sections explore why China’s anti-carrier and sea denial strategies are unlikely to succeed, they also highlight just a few of the many reasons why China’s forces would stand little real chance against US forces in the foreseeable future. Finally, these factors will be analyzed in the context of theories of inadvertent escalation. Originally formulated in reference to late ColdWar conflict scenarios, these ideas are greatly germane to any future Sino-US conflict. It is only through the exploration of the impacts of US offensive and defensive actions, as well as the concomitant attrition of conventional forces, that the full escalatory dangers of Chinese warfighting strategy may be revealed.

**US influence is ineffective and dead – arms races are inevitable now – the advantages solve**

**Dyer 12/15** – retired US Naval intelligence officer who served around the world, afloat and ashore, from 1983 to 2004 (J. E., 15 December 2010, “Hot Times in the Far East”, http://www.commentarymagazine.com/blogs/index.php/j-e-dyer/384331, RBatra)

Japan’s announcements on defense this month figure collectively as the augury of a seminal shift. It’s not all that unusual for Tokyo to announce an increase in the size of the Japan Self-Defense Force (JSDF). But the reason invoked on this occasion amounts to a crack in the foundation of the US-guaranteed security regime in the Far East. Japan plans to reorient its defense policy toward the emerging threat from China – and plans, in general, to defend its interests against Chinese and North Korean threats more proactively than at any time since 1945.

The Japanese will officially abandon the Cold War–era “basic defense doctrine,” which provided for territorial defense but not for the projection of military power beyond Japan’s recognized borders. Besides adding more submarines to the fleet, they will look at a military build-up in the southern chain of Japanese islands, near the Senkaku archipelago disputed with China. And on Sunday, Prime Minister Naoto Kan startled South Koreans by telling an audience that Japan would consider changing JSDF policy to allow for the deploying of troops to South Korea to rescue Japanese citizens.

The point here is not that any such move by Japan is suspicious. The point is that Japan perceives the need for a new, more active security posture. The tacit US guarantee since World War II has been a balance in the Far East: the three great powers there – Russia, China, and Japan – held in check with a network of alliances and military presence. In the past two decades, however, the US has failed to effectively counter what are arguably the most important threats to stability in the region: Chinese maritime aggression and the North Korean nuclear-weapons program. Against that backdrop, the Obama administration’s determined reliance on China to deal with North Korea looks – from the Asian side of the Pacific – like ceding China too much power. If America will not broker a balanced stasis, Russia and China will arm themselves for emerging opportunities, and everyone else will follow suit.

Meanwhile, Russia is probing and making shows of force wherever possible. The intrusion of Russian patrol aircraft in the naval exercise held by the US and Japan last week was remarkable for the fact that it was an actual intrusion. Military aircraft monitor foreign exercises all the time, but usually from a distance. The Russian planes approached so closely last week that the exercise was suspended while fighters were scrambled to intercept them.

The Nixon administration concluded a 1972 agreement with Soviet Russia to avoid such provocations in air and naval activity. Indeed, it was Nixon who, during the same period, re-established relations with China, returned Okinawa to Japan, and signed landmark defense agreements with Thailand and the Philippines. He hoped that these measures, desirable in their own right, would contribute to an environment of stabilized tension in which the two Vietnams could coexist. Although the hopes for Vietnam were dashed, his larger arrangements have stood for nearly 40 years. But they will not last much longer. The older pattern that obtains in the absence of US power is reasserting itself.

**Removal of forces from South Korea is key to ensure Chinese cooperation – this solves North Korean aggression and currency devaluation – key to global economic recovery**

**Sica 11/27** – president, Sica Wealth Management, which currently manages nearly 1 billion in client assets, real estate and private equity holdings, consistently ranked among the top producing advisors in the country and as a specialist in managing assets (Jeffrey, 27 November 2010, “SPIRIT OF FREEDOM-What the Conflict on the Korean Peninsula Means to the World Economy”, http://blogs.forbes.com/jeffreysica/2010/11/27/spirit-of-freedom-what-the-conflict-on-the-korean-peninsula-means-to-the-world-economy/, RBatra)

The most important aspect of this confrontation is how North Korea’s closest ally, China, deals with their recent aggression and insatiable need to advance their nuclear capabilities. China has a long history of using North Korea as a buffer against the US. Since the end of the Korean War, they have been leery of our strong alliance and our military presence in South Korea. They have never welcomed having our warships anywhere near their coastline. Furthermore, they have yet to firmly condemn North Korea on the attack of a South Korean warship which killed 46 sailors last March, the revelations of their nuclear capabilities or the most recent events. Alternatively, China, in a statement from its foreign ministry regarding our military exercises, has chosen to warn the US against “any military acts in our exclusive economic zone without permission.” In other words, China is threatening the US not to come too close to their coastline or face consequences. This statement by China will only serve to encourage the radical Korean dictator and his offspring to further threaten South Korea and defy the US. It should concern the Obama Administration that the strongest stand taken by the Chinese has been against the US protection of our allies, and not against the aggression of a radical dictator.

The US market fell this week amid concerns that the Korean peninsula conflict will escalate. The bulls have chosen to focus on this conflict as yet another example of “saber rattling” from North Korea, but its consequence could be far greater than ever before, considering a few key factors. FIRST, China has the greatest influence over North Korea and how they handle them will substantially affect the world economy. SECOND, China is the largest foreign holder of US Government debt in the history of our nation, with holdings of nearly 900 billion dollars. This position gives them significant leverage over the US and substantially undermines our ability to negotiate with them when they side against us, as they seem to be doing now. THIRD, China has systematically devalued the juan in response to QE2 creating the dawn of inflation as we are beginning to see now and will soon see in the US. The recent interest rate increase in China has yet to show signs of curbing inflation. If the US and China are unable to come to terms with the conflict in the Korean Peninsula, it is unlikely they will come to terms with stabilizing their currencies – continuing on a path of systematically devaluing currencies and creating a future threat of inflation while undermining a worldwide economic recovery. Finally, an insane dictator with nuclear weapons that is not kept at bay, by its closest ally and neighbor, is always a threat to the economy and well being of nations throughout the world. China has a responsibility to help stabilize the region and until they do, uncertainty and fear will remain throughout the worldwide financial markets, keeping us in a very defensive position.

**China/U.S. currency fights risk a trade war that collapses the economy**

**Peterson 11/14** – finance news reporter (Janet, 14 November 2010, “World Trade Markets: U.S. Chides China Currency Devaluation, G20 Upset”, http://www.usmoneytalk.com/finance/world-trade-markets-u-s-chides-china-currency-devaluation-g20-upset-911/, RBatra)

As the United States pushes for the world to exert pressure on China to allow its currency to rise, they are meeting resistance from leaders at the G-20 summit. While the United States is accusing China of devaluing their currency, they themselves are being accused of the same practice.

Both Countries Using Devaluation Tactics

While both the United States and China agreed in a joint statement to avoid currency devaluation tactics, although it is a non-binding agreement. At issue is China’s massive intervention in the market to keep the yuan undervalued on the world market. As an apparent counter, the fed is printing hundreds of billions of dollars to pump into the economy that analysts predict will depress the value of the dollar.

Risk Of Trade War

Leaders at the G-20 summit are not backing the United States, but at the same time fear that the rhetoric will escalate into a trade war that will drive the global economy back into a recession. Leaders balked at the recent move to inject $600 billion dollars into the market with the express purpose of making American imports more competitive with China. The move may effectively only serve to cause China to devalue their currency even further.

**Extinction**

**Harris & Burrows 9** 2009 Mathew, PhD European History @ Cambridge, counselor of the U.S. National Intelligence Council (NIC) and Jennifer, member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis” http://www.ciaonet.org/journals/twq/v32i2/f\_0016178\_13952.pdf

Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample Revisiting the Future opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be drawn from that period include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which the potential for greater conflict could grow would seem to be even more apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change would be steadier. In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groups\_inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacks and newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn. The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states i n the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own nuclear ambitions. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an unintended escalation and broader conflict if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus on preemption rather than defense, potentially leading to escalating crises. 36 Types of conflict that the world continues to experience, such as over resources, could reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this could result in interstate conflicts if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources, for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in a more dog-eat-dog world.