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So judges, top priority of Japanese government is to protect Japanese nation, not the position or status. So that's our stance and the reason why strongly propose this motion. Two things in my speech-- first, definition and the model, and, secondly, explaining our first argument. So first, definition of model. After taking this plan, the government will cut the budgets for the self-defense forces, and also, we will spend more money to fees of the US military base. And also, we will fix the whole military defense budget. So those are our models and that's our definitions and models.

So moving on to our first argument-- but we have two arguments here. First argument is about ensuring sustainability of national security-- ensuring sustainability of national security. And second argument is about stronger alliance with US-- stronger alliance with US. So explaining our first argument. Five things here. First, what is the international fear? So as you've seen from the news-- it's very urgent situation and the danger will increasing again and again. So two examples here. First, North Korea. As you have seen from the TV news, North Korea is launching [very?] missiles again and again. And also, second example is China or Russia. They are making new alliance with the [target?] countries or something like that. And also, it is often said that there is new cold war. It is often said. And also, there is no knowing what the situation will be in the future. So secondly-- so how about the Japanese military? So it is so limited. Two reasons here. First, constitution. As you know, the constitution limit having nuclear power and also public opinion is supporting that. So that raise our case. And also, second reason is public opinion supporting for a low number of the military budget.[inaudible]?No, thank you. So as you've seen from the news, stop having nuclear power or something like that. And also, more so, the public is refusing to increase the money of our military defense. So thirdly, what about the contribution of US military? So the Japanese virtually depend on US military. Two reasons. First, America has the nuclear power, as you've seen. And also, it is often said that Japan is under the nuclear umbrella. And secondly, they have very, very high technology. We could, for example, [inaudible] an entire laser system because they can freely develop the military system. And fourthly, why we are helping our [inaudible] expand? The sustainability of Japanese security will improve. Two reasons here. First, we can ensure the existence of using military. And regardless of the present opinion or something like that. And also, second reason is that there is no worry about the present opinion. So for example, Trump is saying, "Hey, pay the fee." So that's the only reason for protecting the Japanese-US militaries because it has really [inaudible] [forced?] US and Japan.So finally, importance is that the Japanese government's top priority is to protect Japan's nation's security. It means daily life-- so ensured life. So that's the very, very top priority for government to prioritize the most. And also, we can ensure its sustainability, and also we can ensure the responsibility for US military to-- yeah, to leaving Japan. So that's why we strongly propose this motion. Thank you.

Japan is currently in a situation where they have many debts and lack money and are unable to provide enough for their citizens but are able manage just barely. However, if Japan has to pay the full cost of US military bases, Japan will further be heavily burdened with debt and eventually collapse as a country. And that's why we beg to oppose. So our stance for today is protect economy and safety of Japan. Before moving on to our first point which is protect Japanese citizens - and our second speaker will be talking about our second point, mistrust - I would like to start-- I would like to start our refutations. So they talked in their definition how they will cut the budget for self-defenses. However, we cannot condone this. We think that we cannot cut this budget because our self-defense is very important when, for example, natural disasters happen. Right? We need these self-defense fees to help these people who are suffering from these natural disasters. And also, we need them for peace-keeping organization fees, right, in order to contribute to global society. So we cannot cut this budget. And we think that when we take this-- when we take this motion that, instead, the tax will rise instead.

Now, moving on to our first point which is protect Japanese citizens. So I'm going to analyze the status quo and analyze the after-plan. So in the status quo, Japan is poor in money and has many debts and lacks country finance. Right? This is because of the decreasing population. There's few people to tax. As a result of this, the country cannot provide enough for their citizens and, for example, the pension fee that's in the news. Right? So they're lacking all this money to provide the citizens. And the citizens'-- the quality of life is low. However, they're barely able to manage this. So they're just able to manage this.However, what will happen in the after-plan? There're two harm. First of all, there is harm on the government. There's government harm. So this is because we think that when this motion is put into action Japan will have to accept the requests of-- Japan will have to accept the requests of America more. This is because once Japan accept this request and pays full cost, US thinks that they're justified to do whatever they want and escalate their requests and say more. A example of-- no thank you. Example of this is the case in Guam. Right. First of all, America asked only for Japan to pay for the moving expenses. However, when Japan accepted this they told them to pay for the jet fees too. Another example is in Okinawa, they upped the price after Japan, firstly, accepted it. And they continued to up the price. So we think that Japan will have to listen to the US's requests more and more and they will escalate these requests. Because of this power balance-- no, thank you-- it means that also in other fields such as trade negotiations and treaties, maybe America might force Japan to leave the NATO because they're going to escalate their requests and Japan will have to be in that power balance and continue to listen to America.Now, I will move on to the second harm, the harm on citizens. Japan will have to pay more expenses and America can request as much as they want, right, as I told you in our first harm. And we say that this has severe harm on citizens. This is because Japan will not be able to pay citizens' welfare even more, compared to the status quo. In the status quo, it's already bad, the pensions fees. But that's going to be worsened because of the escalated requests and the lack of money.[inaudible].And we think that poor people will receive no support and there will be no pension fees in the future. And we say that if we take this motion, our country will completely collapse and that's why we beg to oppose. Thank you.

What are we doing in my speech? First of all, refutation. Next, reconstruction. And lastly, introduction of our second argument about international status. First of all, refutation, right? So they, basically, gave us two harms that they have given us. First of all, it was things like the quality of lives are going to decrease, the US military's requests are going to increase. And their second argument was about citizens. First of all, note that there is absolutely no mechanism here. All they're saying is just too vague. They said that the quality of lives are really low. However, we believe that if they can't clarify what they're actually talking about, we can't really see what they're actually talking about. Right? And furthermore, we tell you that rather, this kind of problem is-- we believe that the Japanese nation is taking the security for granted. That is why we think that if we can't ensure the safety in the first place, that is second--[inaudible]?No, thank you. We believe, yeah, these kinds of arguments-- although they are important-- we believe that safety overweighs the importance of that in the first place. We think that, first of all, their argument doesn't stand. And first of all, they told us that the requests are going to increase. However, we believe that this is because Japan is not paying-- because Japan is not doing its obligation. Japan is not contributing to US, right? The US is paying a lot of money for Japan, the base. Right? And they also do a lot of things for Japan as well, for its self-defense. But Japan is not actually doing anything to the US. We think that this situation is causing--[inaudible].This is exactly what causes the US military to request Japan to do more things. We think that rather not doing so-- by Japan actually trying to achieve their own obligations, we think that these kind of requests are going to, rather, decrease. We think that doesn't have-- we don't see any mechanism coming from their side of the house. Therefore, we believe that their second argument about citizens also collapses in the first place.[inaudible]?

Secondly, reconstruction-- no, thank you. Note that there was absolutely no refutation to our first argument about sustainability. All they said was that our model was flawed. They say that because things like natural disasters or PKO. They told us so. However, we tell you that, first of all, the US military and the self-defense force are already cooperating when national disasters happen. And we think that, first of all, that is, first of all, secondary. And even we tell you that PKOs, furthermore-- we think that is the much more secondary. We think that ensuring security of Japan, it should be prioritized.

Moving on to our second argument, our second argument about stronger alliance. Under the status quo, since 1952 Japan and US Security Treaty, Japan and the United States has created a really strong alliance which is extremely rare around the globe. And two values-- this is really beneficial. First of all, hard power. Right? Because the US has a base in Japan, they can watch around the Southeast Asia. And for Japan, they can actually secure themselves--[inaudible].--from North Korea. Right?. And secondly, soft power. Economically and politically, people like, for example, [inaudible] Trump, [inaudible] Obama, and Nakasone, and Reagan-- these kind of examples clearly shows that Japan and US has created a truly strong alliance in terms of soft power as well, or taxation right now like TDR or something like that. This win-win relationship between these two nations was truly beneficial. However, we believe that under the status quo where the United States' political power and economical power has started to decline-- we think that it is time for Japan to start achieving their own obligations. We think that by doing so, we think that we can sustain this strong international bond. We believe that, by taking this motion, Japan can increase its defenses, having a sustainable relationship, both in terms of hard power and soft power, with the United States. We think that this can ultimately lead to Japan's supremacy over some other countries. For all the reasons, very powerfully propose.

We think that Japan is its own country. We are not a state underneath the United States. And we have our own priorities that we have to put first. In our case, pension and welfare. Our economy is collapsing because we cannot support a growing population of the old. And we have to put these people first. Now, starting off with my refutation. One refutation against base leaving Japan. Two responses. Firstly, there is no uniqueness to paying the full cost of this military base. We think that it's much better to support the United States through the idea of trade, the reason being is because US trade is something that the United States is struggling with the most. We think we can incentivize the United States to protect us more if we help them in the space that they need to be helped the most-- for example, importing more cars, meats, grains, etc. because this is where they're struggling the most. And there is no uniqueness to paying the full cost of these military bases.

Now, moving on to my second response. We think that even if this is the best case to have the military stay within Japan, the US will not leave Japan because we are the only ally within East Asia that they can trust. We have had a long contract between the United States and we are the only trustworthy country that they have. That is why they will never leave Japan-- because they need that ally. They need that buffer within themselves and North Korea.

Now, moving to my reconstruction. Talking about whether these citizens will be harmed or not, two responses. Firstly, we think that tax will most definitely go up within our country because self-defense is something that is needed. They said that the United States also helps with cleanups and natural disasters, but they have no incentive to do so, right, because it's not saving Japan from the bigger threat. It's just helping because of obligation or of moral. And seeing from after the Fukushima disaster, US had no incentive, so they just sent over food or a little bit of money and didn't exactly help out with the cleanup, helping the actual people which only the Japanese self-defense can do. So we say that tax will most definitely go up because we need that funding in self-defense.Second response. We think that if the tax goes up and we spend that all in self-defense, we cannot support the welfare system right now. Obviously, there are going to be more older people in the future. And if we cannot pay for their pension, that means that majority will go homeless. They won't have access to medical care. And as well as this, we think that poor people will be harmed because we won't be able to pay for food stamps, etc.

Now, moving on to my point, mistrust. We think that the US incentive behind military bases is to protect Japan from radicalizing again and to prevent Japan from attacking other countries. Right? We think this will be lost.To analyze the status quo, we think that the US is harming Japan in two cases. Firstly, raping. There's a lot of rape going on in Okinawa, and American military men are not being punished because they cannot be prosecuted in Japan. Second case, plane crashes. An example, young mother and child died because a plane crashed in Japan. And recently, a plane crashed into a kindergarten. We think that the citizens are being significantly harmed and no justice is being served.[inaudible]?No, thank you. We think that this will escalate if we take this motion because it will affect all citizens. Right? We're taxing all citizens to support a killing machine against Japan. We think that because of this, citizens will lose trust within the government and vote for more a more radical government that will lead an attack against the United States because they are the ones attacking us in the status quo.So for our opposition today, we think that in order to put the people's best interests first, in order to protect our most vulnerable citizens, it is important that we oppose this motion. For these reasons [inaudible] propose.

Japan has been forced to put the US military base and now, the government side is trying to burden Japan even economically. It is not justified when this doesn't benefit the people. Therefore, we beg to oppose this motion. So government burden of proof is is why Japan has to pay full money when the US is the one who decided this system. And also, we believe that because America has more money to protect Japan and has incentive, we beg to oppose this motion. Moving on to the [class?] point. Which can protect Japan citizens? Which can protect Japan citizens? Government staff has said that they can protect the country for a long-term because they can sustain the international relationship and alliance. However, there's no uniqueness of paying the full cost of US military bases in Japan. Right? For example, as the second speaker has said, Japan can negotiate in a different field like trading or something, other things because the US has the incentive to put their military force in Japan because Japan is an ally in East Asia.And moving on to our side, if we take this motion, our citizens will die by poverty. Even now, Japan has no money, not enough money to protect our citizens by welfare. Because of aging society, Japan has no money to protect the poor or the elderly. So we believe that it is not clever to put even more burden using citizens' tax which doesn't benefit the people. We believe Japan should be prioritizing Japanese citizens over the international relationship which is just on surface because they're saying that by paying the tax, they can sustain the relationship. Right? So we believe that because this motion harms Japanese people and its government, we strongly oppose this motion. Thank you.

So the most important thing in this debate is that Japan government are hugely dependent on the US military force's bases in Japan. So we believe that is why we beg to propose. So two thing in my speech. The first thing is back to the second argument. And then, secondly, I'd like to summarize this debate in perspective of uniqueness in this motion. So first of all, we're back to the second. So their second argument is about some Japanese female are actually raped by the-- things like that, and plane crash are happening. But however, first of all, that is out of this debate because-- the reason why they doing that kind bad thing is because of that kind people. Right? The people of the United States military people and stuff. That is not--[inaudible].So sorry. This is not the problem of US military force bases. Right? So we believe, first of all, this is out of debate in the first place. And even if their argument were to stand, we believe, after taking this motion, Japanese government will pay the full money for the US military bases. So that means the United States of people are actually responsible for protecting Japan nations. Right? So we think that situation will actually go more better after taking this motion. Right? So first of all, this is out of debate. And moreover, we can say this situation will increase after taking this motion.

So moving on to the summarize today's debate-, in one-[inaudible]?Yes, please.So as the Japanese government, you will support an organization that systematically rapes women in Okinawa?So I will answer it later. So let me summarize which is more unique to this debate. So let's see the opposition's case. So today's opposition case is protecting Japanese citizen. And under the status quo, there is problem of pension system or something like that. But however, we believe this is not unique to this motion. They never explaining why, uniquely, these kind of budget are needed because they said that is is okay to raise tax or something? Yeah, that is good for these kind of pension system. Right? So we believe they never explained the uniqueness of that. And then we believe-- on the other hand, our side, we believe that by taking this motion, we can uniquely clear the women situation for United States and Japan. Right? So, for example, they said that after taking this motion, even if the Japanese government cannot pay the budget-- but however, they still in Japan. However, that is not true. Korea, right? Korea has also the US military bases. Right? On that context, we believe that by creating a win-win relationship, it's uniquely, say, these kind alliance with US, and then also, benefit for the Japanese military national security. So that is why we beg to propose. Thank you very much.