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# \*\*\*1NC\*\*\*

**Uniqueness: US/Chinese relations are fine now the Shangri-La Dialogue proves**

**Bianji 14**

“New model of China-U.S. relations lie in mutual respect, equality” By Yao Chun Bianji Senior Chinese officer June 01, 2014 1:26pm http://english.peopledaily.com.cn/n/2014/0601/c90883-8735461.html

SINGAPORE, **May 31 -- The establishment of a new model of China-U.S. relations requires the two countries to respect each other and treat each other as equals, a senior Chinese officer said here Saturday.**

However, the speech made by U.S. Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel went against the construction of this model, Wang Guanzhong, deputy chief of the General Staff of the People's Liberation Army (PLA), told the media after Hagel gave a keynote speech in the ongoing Shangri-La Dialogue. **"When building this new type of China-U.S. relations, friction, or even conflicts may emerge. As the two major countries in the world, contradictions and differences are inevitable. The key is to face and address the problems," Wang said.**

**In his speech, Hagel made groundless accusations against China on the sovereignty over the South China Sea, saying"China has undertaken destabilizing, unilateral actions asserting its claims in the South China Sea".**

**He also pledged to keep selling weapons and providing military assistance to the U.S. "allies and partners" in a bid to "build a cooperative regional architecture".**

**Responding to Hagel's accusations, Wang said that China and the United States need to expand the common interests and narrow differences, and eliminate misunderstanding and miscalculation in order to build the new model of relationship.**

**China is always making efforts in line with these principles while the moves of the United States mentioned by Hagel go contrary to them, Wang said. "Even so, I still have full confidence in the future of the new model of China-U.S. relations."**

**During a meeting between Chinese President Xi Jinping and U.S. President Barack Obama last year, the two sides reached the consensus of building a new model of major-country relationship based on mutual respect and win-win cooperation.**

**In the speech, Hagel also underscored the importance of developing the new type of major-country relationship, saying that the U.S.-China military-to-military dialogue has made and will continue to make progress although it still "has a long way to go" .**

**Hagel said that the United States supports sustained exchanges with China on cyber issues.**

China and the United States have recently been at odds over cyber security issue. The U.S. side announced the indictment against five Chinese military officers on allegations of cyber theft this month.

**Link: New US ocean policies tank Chinese relations**

**Takeda 14**

“China’s Rise as a Maritime Power: Ocean Policy from Mao Zedong to Xi Jinping” Takeda Jun’ichi Foreign policy and national defense journalist. Visiting Research Fellow at the Ocean Policy Research Foundation. April 23, 2014: <http://islandstudies.oprf-info.org/research/a00011/> pp. 73–95; published by the OPRF Center for Island Studies.

**China has taken the posture of trying to restrict the intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance activities of the US military, undertaking activities as a state with an emphasis on its own defense rights. Typical examples of this are the April 2000 collision between a J-8 Chinese naval fighter jet and a US naval EP-3 electronic reconnaissance aircraft in the skies near Hainan Island and the March 2009 harassment of the US navy’s 3,450-ton *Impeccable* sonar surveillance ship, also off the coast of Hainan, by a number of official vessels and fishing ships. These incidents reveal China’s touchiness about keeping the US military out of its EEZ. The United States** (Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard) **has responded from the standpoint of stressing freedom of navigation, clearly asserting its position that surveying of sea lanes and military investigations are not “scientific research,” which under UNCLOS requires approval from the coastal state in the form of prior clearance through diplomatic channels.**

**Internal Link: US Chinese co-operation is the only way to denuclearize N. Korea and check aggression.**

**Sejong 10**

“International Cooperation for the Denuclearization of North Korea: Limitations and Alternatives” By PhD from Korea University in North Korean studies, researcher at the Sejong Institute http://www.koreafocus.or.kr/design2/essays/view.asp?volume\_id=101&content\_id=103198&category=G

**International efforts to disarm North Korea have failed because of China`s reluctance to participate in sanctions on the North**. Following North Korea`s second nuclear test in May 2009, there were heated debates between China`s “strategists” and “traditionalists.” The former argued that the Chinese government should strongly push for the North`s denuclearization by fully utilizing its political and economic leverage on Pyongyang, pointing to changes in the two countries` bilateral relations. The traditionalists emphasized the importance of the Beijing-Pyongyang alliance. They called for substantial economic aid to the North, which they said was necessary to stabilize the North Korean situation and prevent provocative activities against South Korea and the United States.The traditionalists won the debate. The Chinese government decided that the stabilization of the North Korean regime was more important than the denuclearization of the North. In order to prevent the fall of the North Korean regime, China started economic aid to the North. **When special relations between nations cause a crack in international sanctions against a targeted country, the measures are destined to lose their effect. China resisted sanctions on North Korea because of its unstable relations with the United States.** In the post-Cold War era, the ideological and systemic differences between the United States and China and their economic and psychological conflicts have produced a roller-coaster relationship that alternates between competition and cooperation.The United States has had a two-track approach to China. The relationship is marred with political and military friction. Washington has been wary about the rise of China as a military power in Asia and has tried to halt the expansion of Chinese influence on U.S. allies in the region. While Washington does not want to aggravate relations between China and Taiwan, it believes that their different positions on human rights in China and regional issues obstruct smooth cooperation between the two countries. Washington attempts to offset China`s negative influence in the region by enhancing its traditional alliance with Japan, South Korea, Australia, the Philippines, Thailand and other Asian nations. At the same time, the United States has pursued comprehensive, positive and constructive relations with China. Washington regards economic cooperation with China as an important element of its own prosperity and expects that the rise of China`s influence in the international community will greatly contribute to the promotion of peace, security and prosperity across the world. **As for China, the Asian continent is where it can exercise maximum influence and where its foreign policies have the greatest stakes. Chinese leaders regard the United States as having direct influence on its pursuit of national interests in the region. China needs U.S. assistance and cooperation to continue economic development. With these basic perceptions, China has warned against U.S. hegemony in the region but is also trying to prevent its conflict and competition with the United States from escalating into outright confrontation. The strategic interests of the United States and China, the two key players in the international cooperation for the North Korean nuclear issue, clash in Northeast Asia and on the Korean peninsula, particularly surrounding the North Korean regime`s fate and its denuclearization. With the primary goal of denuclearizing the North**, the United States calls for strong sanctions regardless of their social and political consequences. The 2010 National Security Strategy Report of the White House says that North Korea can be politically and economically integrated with the international community if it abandons its nuclear armament programs, but warns that measures will be taken to isolate the regime from the international community if it refuses to do so.China, while adapting to the existing U.S.-led order in Northeast Asia to a certain extent, seeks to replace the status quo with new political and economic systems in the region. On the Korean peninsula, China`s long-term objective is to have pro-Chinese governments in both North and South Korea**. A rapid improvement of relations between the United States and North Korea and increased U.S. influence on the North will be detrimental to China`s security interest on the peninsula. China wants to stabilize North Korea rather than using forceful means that will weaken its regime in the denuclearization process. China believes that preventing the collapse of North Korea is consistent with its national interests. Beijing fears that the fall of the regime could bring millions of refugees into Chinese territory; it also feels uneasy about the loss of a buffer zone separating China from U.S. allies. Besides, a unified Korea could have significant political, economic and military impact on China**.

**Impact: Korean miscalculation causes nuclear war and extinction**

**Fungamwango 99**

“Third world war: Watch the Koreas” Pat Fungamwango Journalist and Political analysis for AU and African Times Oct 25, 1999 http://www.zamlii.org/zm/judgment/supreme-court/2000/1

**If there is one place today where the much-dreaded Third World War could easily erupt and** probably **reduce earth to a huge smouldering cinder it is the Korean Peninsula** in Far East Asia. Ever since the end of the savage three-year Korean war in the early 1950s, **military tension between the hardline communist north and the American backed South Korea has remained dangerously high.** In fact the Koreas are technically still at war. A foreign visitor to either Pyongyong in the North or Seoul in South Korea will quickly notice that the divided country is always on maximum alert for any eventuality. North Korea or the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) has never forgiven the US for coming to the aid of South Korea during the Korean war. She still regards the US as an occupation force in South Korea and wholly to blame for the non-reunification of the country. North Korean media constantly churns out a tirade of attacks on "imperialist" America and its "running dog" South Korea. The DPRK is one of the most secretive countries in the world where a visitor is given the impression that the people's hatred for the US is absolute while the love for their government is total. Whether this is really so, it is extremely difficult to conclude. In the DPRK, a visitor is never given a chance to speak to ordinary Koreans about the politics of their country. No visitor moves around alone without government escort. The American government argues that its presence in South Korea was because of the constant danger of an invasion from the north. America has vast economic interests in South Korea. She points out that the north has dug numerous tunnels along the demilitarised zone as part of the invasion plans. She also accuses the north of violating South Korean territorial waters. Early this year, a small North Korean submarine was caught in South Korean waters after getting entangled in fishing nets. Both the Americans and South Koreans claim the submarine was on a military spying mission. However, the intension of the alleged intrusion will probably never be known because the craft's crew were all found with fatal gunshot wounds to their heads in what has been described as suicide pact to hide the truth of the mission. The US mistrust of the north's intentions is so deep that it is no secret that today Washington has the largest concentration of soldiers and weaponry of all descriptions in south Korea than anywhere else in the World, apart from America itself. Some of the armada that was deployed in the recent bombing of Iraq and in Operation Desert Storm against the same country following its invasion of Kuwait was from the fleet permanently stationed on the Korean Peninsula. It is true too that **at the moment the North/South Korean border is the most fortified in the world.** The border line is littered with anti-tank and anti-personnel landmines, surface-to-surface and surfaceto- air missiles and is constantly patrolled by warplanes from both sides. It is common knowledge that America also keeps an eye on any military movement or build-up in the north through spysatellites. **The DPRK is said to have an estimated one million soldiers and a huge arsenal of various weapons. Although the DPRK regards** **[itself]** **as a developing country**, she **[it] can however be classified as a super-power in terms of military might.** The DPRK is capable of producing medium and long-range missiles. Last year, for example, she test-fired a medium range missile over Japan, an action that greatly shook and alarmed the US, Japan and South Korea. **The DPRK** says the projectile was a satellite. There have also been fears that she was **[is] planning to test another ballistic missile capable of reaching North America**. Naturally, the world is anxious that military tension on **the Korean Peninsula must be defused to avoid an apocalypse on earth.**

# \*\*\*Neg Extensions\*\*\*

## Uniqueness

### Relations hi now, military

**Despite recent cyber security breaches the US and China will continue to improve military relations**

**Mitchell 14**

“Despite hacking, US to continue pursuing military relations with China” By Billy Mitchell, IR journalist. May 21, 2014 4:10 pm <http://fedscoop.com/despite-hacking-us-continue-pursuing-military-relations-china/>.

**A day after the Justice Department charged five Chinese military officers with cyber-espionage, the Defense Department said** Tuesday **it will continue pursuing military relations with China.** Attorney General Eric Holder released indictments Monday accusing five officers in Unit 61398 of the Third Department of the Chinese People’s Liberation Army with hacking into the networks of six U.S. companies and stealing trade secrets. It is the first time the U.S. has officially charged active members of the PLA with cybercrimes stemming from economic espionage activities. Between 2006 and 2014, the accused — Wang Dong, Sun Kailiang, Wen Xinyu, Huang Zhenyu and Gu Chunhui — allegedly broke into the networks of Westinghouse Electric Co.; U.S. subsidiaries of SolarWorld AG; United States Steel Corp.; Allegheny Technologies Inc.; the United Steel, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union; and Alcoa Inc. to steal proprietary and confidential information. **The alleged actions of those five men, though, did not deter the Pentagon from pursuing better military relations with the PLA. “We still desire, from a military perspective, to further grow and develop the military-to-military relationship and to find ways to have a more productive conversation about these very tough issues,”** **Pentagon Press Secretary Navy Rear Adm. John Kirby said.** “Cyber’s one of them.” **These alleged crimes will likely lead to trust issues between the two countries’ militaries, but Kirby said that gives DOD more incentive to improve communication with China.** In fact, though Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel hasn’t yet spoken to his Chinese counterpart about the issue, **the Pentagon is leaving it up to the PLA to determine the future state of relations between the two militaries.**

### Relations hi now, national goals

**China needs a US partnership to achieve its national goals-2014 will see the rise of a new great power relationship**

**Furuya 14**

“Conflict control’ is key to U.S.-China relations in a bipolar world” By Koichi Furuya, political scientist. May 14, 2014 <http://ajw.asahi.com/article/views/opinion/AJ201405140005>.

**Restoring China’s national pride is a primary concern for President Xi Jinping as he seeks to establish a "new type of great power relationship" with the United States, according to a scholar who influences Beijing’s policy with Washington. In a recent interview with The Asahi Shimbun, Yan Xuetong, dean of Tsinghua University’s Institute of Modern International Relations, also said the concept of “conflict control” should play a key role at a time when China’s rise is driving a sea change in the world order. Excerpts of the interview follow:** **Question:** China’s growth is creating a shift in its relations with the United States. What is your view? **Yan:** China’s influence is still largely confined to the realm of the economy, or purchasing power. The world is in a state of overproduction, where the buyer has the upper hand. Oil, automobiles and aircraft are being produced in large quantities, but they don’t sell easily. The world has begun courting China because of the purchasing power it has built up quickly. Why does Hollywood go after China? That’s because China buys its films. It all started with the economy, but China’s value system will exert a strong influence in world affairs in the end. **Q:** The renminbi has also become a currency to be reckoned with. Why is that? **A:**Japan’s trade surplus is a major reason the Japanese yen has failed to grow into an international currency that is used in foreign reserves as the U.S. dollar has done. The yen will not go out as long as Japan is selling more than it buys. The strength of the U.S. dollar derives from the country’s trade deficit. The renminbi will spread across the world for the same reason. The United States and China will be competing partly over which country will be importing more. **You have argued that a U.S.-China conflict is inevitable in cultural and economic areas. Could you elaborate?  That will be inevitable. Japan clashed with the United States in the 1980s over corporate culture and other problems. There will certainly be an increasing number of similar clashes between the United States and China. But armed conflict should be averted at all costs. That’s the idea of “conflict control,” which is a key term. Recent talk of a “new type of great power relationship” between the United States and China is based on implementing control to avoid military conflict**, although there will be no control over cultural and ideological conflict. **Q:** What is the difference between conventional bilateral ties and the “new type of great power relationship”? **A:** China has four categories of bilateral ties according to levels of friendship: a “relationship of friendship and cooperation” with Russia and other countries; “normal ties” with France, Germany and other countries; the “new type of great power relationship” with the United States; and finally, a “relationship of rivalry,” which describes current ties with Japan. The new type of great power relationship involves no confrontation but does involve competition, and it is even lower than normal ties in terms of the degree of friendship. It is only slightly better than the relationship of rivalry. The new type of great power relationship between Washington and Beijing has so far remained in a state of “superficial friendship,” but that does not mean it will remain so forever. The new type of great power relationship could involve true rivalry between false friends. Using cooperative ties to control the competition between the United States and China: That’s what the “new type” is all about. **Q:** Some refer to current U.S.-China relations as a “Cool War,” a play on the Cold War. What is your take on that? **A:** I don’t know what “Cool War” means. In terms of temperature, “Cool War” should be between “Hot War” and “Cold War.” “Cool War” should mean that China-U.S. relations are more confronting than those between the United States and the former Soviet Union. I think “Cool War” is a wrong description of the current China-U.S. relationship. I would say today’s China-U.S. relationship is much less tense than the past Soviet-U.S. relationship. We are so frozen up that we cannot engage in war. I would call that an “Ice War.” **Q: What characterizes the foreign policy that President Xi Jinping is pushing for?  It is a foreign policy aimed at achieving Chinese national rejuvenation. China’s economic status has risen, but the country has yet to garner commensurate respect from the international community. To take the example of passports, those of Japan are under much less restrictions than Chinese ones (resulting in a higher degree of freedom of journeys), although China has surpassed Japan in terms of gross domestic product. We have few friends. We are the world’s second largest economy, but we have fewer friends than the United States does. Washington may have about 40 allies, but we have (virtually) zero.  And that is why you argue China needs allies. Is that right?  If China were to remain nonaligned, some countries would begin to fear they could bear the brunt of its immense military power. China will be able to guarantee, by entering alliances with smaller countries in its neighborhood, that it will not present a security threat to them. Without alliances, it would be natural for neighboring nations to feel frightened.**

### Soft Power

**China is seeking maritime expansion now-The seas are key to China’s sustained development and soft power**

**Takeda 14**

“China’s Rise as a Maritime Power: Ocean Policy from Mao Zedong to Xi Jinping” Takeda Jun’ichi Foreign policy and national defense journalist. Visiting Research Fellow at the Ocean Policy Research Foundation. April 23, 2014: <http://islandstudies.oprf-info.org/research/a00011/> pp. 73–95; published by the OPRF Center for Island Studies.

**The international community has been viewing China’s recent moves relating to the seas as representing “maritime expansion,” and the Chinese themselves have come to talk about making their country a maritime power.** In the political report he delivered in the autumn of 2012 to the eighteenth National Congress of the Communist Party of China, which stands at the top of the country’s power structure, **General Secretary Hu Jintao declared, “We should enhance our capacity for exploiting marine resources, develop the marine economy, protect the marine ecological environment, resolutely safeguard China’s maritime rights and interests, and build China into a maritime power.”** [[1]](http://islandstudies.oprf-info.org/research/a00011/#note-1000-1) This was Hu’s final report as the top leader of the CPC; after delivering it he stepped down from his posts as general secretary and chairman of the Central Military Commission and was succeeded by Xi Jinping. And at the National People’s Congress, in March this year, **Xi was elected to succeed Hu in the largely ceremonial post of state president. But the leadership transition did not change the commitment to building China into a maritime power, which has been set as a medium- to long-term strategic objective.**

So what do the Chinese mean when they speak of becoming “a maritime power”? Liu Cigui, director of the SOA, or State Oceanic Administration, has offered this explanation: **“Building China into a maritime power is an essential path on the way to the sustained development of the Chinese nation and [achievement of the status of a] global power. A ‘maritime power’ is a country that has great comprehensive strength in terms of the development, use, protection, management, and control of the seas.”** [[2]](http://islandstudies.oprf-info.org/research/a00011/#note-1000-2)

Ocean policy is the embodiment of this sort of maritime strategy**. China’s latest white paper on ocean policy, *China’s Ocean Development Report (2012)*, explains** the relationship between strategy and policy and their respective scopes as follows: “Ocean policy is a code of behavior established for the state’s strategy, course, development plans, and external relations concerning the seas; it is a basic policy embodying the intentions and interests of the state. It encompasses policies concerning development and use of the seas, including utilization of sea areas, development and protection of sea islands, protection of the marine environment, marine science and technology, marine industry, publicity/education, and human resources development. **Marine industry includes such fields as transportation, travel/tourism, fisheries, oil and gas development, and manufacturing of engineering equipment.”**

### China Expanding now

**China has become more aggressive in expanding its oceanic interests through creative interpretations of treaties**

**Takeda 14**

“China’s Rise as a Maritime Power: Ocean Policy from Mao Zedong to Xi Jinping” Takeda Jun’ichi Foreign policy and national defense journalist. Visiting Research Fellow at the Ocean Policy Research Foundation. April 23, 2014: <http://islandstudies.oprf-info.org/research/a00011/> pp. 73–95; published by the OPRF Center for Island Studies.

**As China’s economic growth allowed it to emerge as a great power, the country became more energetic in pursuing its maritime rights and interests, including sovereignty over islands and jurisdiction over waters. China adopted a clear posture of maximizing its political, security, and economic interests by interpreting and citing the concepts and provisions of UNCLOS to its own advantage, while working to keep other countries from exercising their claims.**

### Expanding now, 5 year plan

**China will dramatically increase their oceanic development and control in the next five years**

**Takeda 14**

“China’s Rise as a Maritime Power: Ocean Policy from Mao Zedong to Xi Jinping” Takeda Jun’ichi Foreign policy and national defense journalist. Visiting Research Fellow at the Ocean Policy Research Foundation. April 23, 2014: <http://islandstudies.oprf-info.org/research/a00011/> pp. 73–95; published by the OPRF Center for Island Studies.

**The foundations of China’s government policies are determined on the basis of five-year plans that are drawn up in line with the strategic course set by the CPC and officially approved by the National People’s Congress. The eleventh five-year plan, for 2006–10, included just one section about the seas, but the twelfth plan, for 2011–15, has an entire chapter on the subject of promoting development of the marine economy.** This has been followed by the drafting of more detailed plans by various government organs, **including five-year plans for maritime operations, for marine economic development, and for the development of marine science and technology**, also subject to approval by the State Council. However, the contents of these detailed plans are not released in full.

**Chapter 14 of the twelfth five-year plan starts with a call to “develop and implement a marine development strategy based on unified sea and land planning, and improve marine development and control capabilities.”** [[31]](http://islandstudies.oprf-info.org/research/a00011/#note-1000-31)

Section 1, “Optimizing the marine industry structure,” includes the passage “develop marine oil and gas, marine transport, marine fishing and coastal travel industries greatly, and expand marine biopharmaceutical, integrated seawater utilization, marine engineering equipment manufacturing and other rising industries.”

**And in Section 2**, “Strengthening integrated marine management,” we find these passages: “**Strengthen sea area and island management, improve the market mechanism for sea area use rights, . . . Make unified planning of marine environmental protection and land-based pollution, and strengthen the protection and recovery of the marine ecosystem**. . . . Improve the marine disaster relief system, and strengthen the handling capability of marine emergencies. Strengthen integrated marine surveying and mapping, and carry out polar and oceanic scientific investigation actively . . . **ensure the safety of marine transport channels [sea lanes], and maintain our country’s marine rights and interests.”**

### Expanding now, polar regions

**China is exploring the poles now, and beginning preliminary steps for resource extraction**

**Takeda 14**

“China’s Rise as a Maritime Power: Ocean Policy from Mao Zedong to Xi Jinping” Takeda Jun’ichi Foreign policy and national defense journalist. Visiting Research Fellow at the Ocean Policy Research Foundation. April 23, 2014: <http://islandstudies.oprf-info.org/research/a00011/> pp. 73–95; published by the OPRF Center for Island Studies.

**As of January 2013 they had dispatched a total of 29 missions to the Antarctic.The Chinese government has declared: “Under treaty, the mineral and energy resources of the Antarctic cannot be developed until 2041, but as countries exhaust their resources, they are proceeding with basic surveys under the banner of science and laying the groundwork for future claims of territory and resources in pursuit of their national interests.**” [[33]](http://islandstudies.oprf-info.org/research/a00011/#note-1000-33) **Though the passage is written in a detached tone, it seems to be tacitly setting forth China’s own intention of not getting left behind. The Chinese are now at work producing a domestically built icebreaker.** During the period of the twelfth five-year plan they say they will add one or two more base stations and assign fixed-wing aircraft for connections between the stations and other purposes.

**In the Arctic, the *Xuelong* conducted five observation missions from 1999 through 2012, and in 2004 China established an observation base, Huanghe Station, on Norway’s Svalbard Island. The Chinese are probably taking advance moves with a view to the opening up of Arctic seaways as a result of the receding of the polar ice cap and to participation in resource exploitation.** The fifth mission made a round trip to Iceland in the summer of 2012, passing through the Sea of Japan and Soya Strait to the Okhotsk Sea, sailing by the island of Paramushir in the northern Kurils to the Bering Sea, and taking a coastal route through Russia’s EEZ. On its return trip, as the melting of the Arctic ice cap had progressed faster than expected, the *Xuelong* was able to take the shortest route through the central Arctic Sea on its return, passing close to the North Pole; the vessel concluded its trip by passing through the Tsugaru and Tsushima Straits. It has been suggested that Russia is concerned, in terms of both security and economic rights, at the fact that the mission passed through the Sea of Okhotsk on its outward leg and that it did not follow a coastal route through the Arctic on its return leg.

### Expanding now, economics

**China’s growth rate is falling, China’s future is in maritime power**

**Takeda 14**

“China’s Rise as a Maritime Power: Ocean Policy from Mao Zedong to Xi Jinping” Takeda Jun’ichi Foreign policy and national defense journalist. Visiting Research Fellow at the Ocean Policy Research Foundation. April 23, 2014: <http://islandstudies.oprf-info.org/research/a00011/> pp. 73–95; published by the OPRF Center for Island Studies

**Ocean-related economic activity accounts for almost 10% of China’s gross domestic product, and the share is said to be above 16% in coastal regions. This activity is the source of some 33.5 million jobs. Meanwhile, the growth rate of the Chinese economy was 7.8% in 2012, falling below 8% for the first time in 13 years. In the context of this slowdown, local authorities particularly in coastal regions are looking at the seas as a new engine of growth to replace the urban development activities that have leveled off, and they have been coming out one after another with plans for marine economic development. One now often hears comments from key officials declaring that China’s future is as a maritime power and that the marine economy is the engine for achieving this.**

## Links

### Zero Sum

**Sea exploration is viewed as zero-sum by countries seeking rare earth minerals. Especially China**

**Harvey 14**

“The Deep Sea Resources Rush” By Gemima Harvey, scientific and political journalist. 20 May 2014 <http://www.islandsbusiness.com/news/usa/5398/the-deep-sea-resources-rush/>

Exploitation of seafloor minerals appears imminent. But do we really understand the potential impact?

**WASHINGTON, USA** --- **Insatiable demand for minerals and rare earth elements, coupled with dwindling resources on land have stakeholders across the world looking to a new frontier: the deep sea.** **Advancing mining technologies are making the prospect of exploiting seafloor minerals—including gold, copper, zinc, cobalt and rare earth elements (REEs)—not only possible but also imminent, with commercial licenses to be granted by the International Seabed Authority from 2016. China has a stronghold on REEs, controlling a staggering 97% of global production. These finite elements and other precious minerals are used in the creation of a massive range of electronics devices, emerging green technologies and weapon systems, triggering a strategic scramble to exploit new sources. In what has been described as a global race, governments and companies are keenly eyeing this emerging mining arena, eager to get their slice of the next “gold rush” as it’s made increasingly economically viable.** In 2010, there were eight exploration licenses, currently there are 17 in the high seas of the Pacific, Atlantic and Indian oceans. **There is also significant interest in the ocean’s resources within territorial waters, particularly in the Pacific Ocean, where more than 1.5 million sq km of the seafloor is currently under exploration license. This is an area roughly comparable to the state of Queensland in Australia. The president of the International Marine Minerals Society, Dr. Georgy Cherkashov, was quoted last year linking the rush for licenses to the reality of “first come, first get**

### National Priority

**Even during mass turmoil China prioritizes sea protection and control**

**Takeda 14**

“China’s Rise as a Maritime Power: Ocean Policy from Mao Zedong to Xi Jinping” Takeda Jun’ichi Foreign policy and national defense journalist. Visiting Research Fellow at the Ocean Policy Research Foundation. April 23, 2014: <http://islandstudies.oprf-info.org/research/a00011/> pp. 73–95; published by the OPRF Center for Island Studies.

**With the start of the Cultural Revolution in 1966, China entered into a 10-year period of turmoil, with a far-left line taking hold throughout the country. In marine fishery, for example, the unbalanced slogan “More ships mean more production” led to the overbuilding of dragnet fishing boats**, which are said to have exhausted fishery resources. In areas of reclaimed land the focus was on food production, while other considerations, such as aquaculture, production of reeds for papermaking, and activities for environmental protection, such as the planting of trees as windbreaks, were neglected—and in the end even the effort to produce more staple foods failed.

**Marine surveying, however, received great protection even during this period of turmoil. The SOA was equipped with a number of additional vessels**, including the *Shijian*, a Chinese-built 3,167-ton survey ship, in 1969, and the 13,650-ton *Xiangyanghong 05*, a converted Polish freighter, in 1972. The*Xiangyanghong 05* **conducted four survey missions starting in 1976 to check hydrometeorological conditions in the area of the planned landing of the transportation rocket** **(effectively a long-range ballistic missile)** **that China test-launched for the first time into the South Pacific in 1980. This is an indication of the intimate connection between the SOA and the development of China’s military strategy.**

In addition, two marine geological survey squadrons of the geology department (now the Ministry of Land and Resources), one based in Tianjin (and later in Shanghai) and the other in Zhanjiang, conducted geophysical surveys for oil, the former (using vessels including the survey ship *Kantan 1*) in the Bohai, Yellow, and East China Seas, and the latter in the South China Sea, notably in the waters off the coast of the Pearl River Delta.

### I Law

**Regardless of international law China is unrelenting in ocean expansion and protection**

**Takeda 14**

“China’s Rise as a Maritime Power: Ocean Policy from Mao Zedong to Xi Jinping” Takeda Jun’ichi Foreign policy and national defense journalist. Visiting Research Fellow at the Ocean Policy Research Foundation. April 23, 2014: <http://islandstudies.oprf-info.org/research/a00011/> pp. 73–95; published by the OPRF Center for Island Studies.

**In the 1970s China started to press its claim to the Diaoyu Islands**, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs issued a statement declaring: “Diaoyu Island and other islands, such as Huangwei Islet [in Japanese, Kubashima], Chiwei Islet [Taishōtō], Nanxiao Island, and Beixiao Island, belong to Taiwan. Like Taiwan, they have been integral parts of China’s territory since long ago. The Chinese people will liberate Taiwan without fail. The Chinese people with recover Diaoyu and the other islands that belong to Taiwan without fail.” [[19]](http://islandstudies.oprf-info.org/research/a00011/#note-1000-19)

**There was no explanation from the Chinese for why they started pressing their claim at this juncture. But many in Japan have analyzed it as being related to the results of a scientific investigation that concluded there were huge deposits of oil and gas in the East China Sea and particularly in the continental shelf north of Taiwan**, as reported by the United Nations’ Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE) in 1969.

**In the South China Sea, meanwhile, there is partial or total overlapping of the claims to ownership of islands and jurisdiction over waters among seven parties: China, Taiwan, Vietnam, the Philippines, Malaysia, Brunei, and Indonesia. Following the Battle of the Paracel Islands between China and South Vietnam in 1974, China established its effective control over all of the Paracels. In 1988 the Chinese skirmished with the Vietnamese in the Spratly Islands (Johnson South Reef Skirmish) after winning a commission from** the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization **(UNESCO)** **to build an observation post in the Spratlys** and starting to build it at Fiery Cross Reef. Following this clash the Chinese secured six reefs in the Spratlys for the first time and stationed a permanent garrison. **And in 1995, the Chinese extended their effective control over Mischief Reef** (which the Chinese call Meiji Reef), **also claimed by the Philippines**, building what it described as shelters for fishermen and stationing personnel from the Bureau of Fisheries Administration for the South China Sea.

**In 2002 China and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) signed a “Declaration on the Conduct of Parties in the South China Sea,” seeking to reduce the tension between them in these waters. Since then, however, the two sides have failed to make substantive progress toward elevating the status of this document to a legally binding code of conduct.** Some of the details are clouded, but in recent years **the Chinese have taken to referring to their claims in the East China and South China Seas as “core interests.” Meanwhile, in 2012 Vietnam adopted a maritime law defining its own territory as including the Paracels**, Spratlys, and the Macclesfield Bank in their entirety. **China countered this by establishing a local government for the three groups of islands under the city of Sansha, sited on Yongxing Island (Woody Island) in the Paracels, and by setting up a military security district for this city.**

### Rare Earth Minerals

**China views sea exploration as key to its regional hegemony and international monopoly on rare earth minerals**

**Xinhua 14**

“China speeds up Indian Ocean exploration for minerals” By Xinhua news agency Feb 26, 2014, 04.37PM

http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2014-02-26/news/47705593\_1\_polymetallic-sulphide-ore-deposit-international-seabed-authority-state-oceanic-administration

BEIJING**: China has said its research vessel surveying polymetallic deposits in the Indian Ocean has discovered two hydrothermal and four hydrothermal anomaly areas as the resource-hungry country stepped up efforts to extract minerals from the seabed. China's State Oceanic Administration (SOA) hailed achievements by Chinese scientists. The SOA said that scientists onboard the "Dayang-1" research vessel discovered two seafloor hydrothermal areas and four hydrothermal anomaly areas, and deepened understanding about the overall area. They also gained insight on the origins of carbonate hydrothermal areas, and made successful attempts to explore for sulfide, state-run Xinhua news agency quoted the SOA as saying. hydrothermal sulfide is a kind of seabed deposit containing copper, zinc and precious metals such as gold and silver. Firming up its foothold in India's backyard, China has gained approval in 2012 to explore a 10,000 sq km polymetallic sulphide ore deposit in an international seabed region of the southwest Indian Ocean. The 15-year approval was secured by China from the International Seabed Authority (ISA). China's booming economy has forced it to look for minerals abroad. China also has obtained exclusive rights to prospect in a 75,000-square-km polymetallic nodule ore deposit in the east Pacific Ocean in 2001.**

### EEZ

**EEZ and UNCLOS articles don’t check Chinese aggression**

**Takeda 14**

“China’s Rise as a Maritime Power: Ocean Policy from Mao Zedong to Xi Jinping” Takeda Jun’ichi Foreign policy and national defense journalist. Visiting Research Fellow at the Ocean Policy Research Foundation. April 23, 2014: <http://islandstudies.oprf-info.org/research/a00011/> pp. 73–95; published by the OPRF Center for Island Studies.

**In 1998 China adopted a Law on the Exclusive Economic Zone and the Continental Shelf.** [[26]](http://islandstudies.oprf-info.org/research/a00011/#note-1000-26) **This law** also **raises a number of issues.**

First, **Article 2 of this law declares, “The People’s Republic of China shall determine the delimitation of the exclusive economic zone and the continental shelf in respect of the overlapping claims by agreement with the states with opposite or adjacent coasts in accordance with the equitable principle on the basis of international law.” But in talks between Japan and China concerning the boundary between their EEZs, the Chinese side pushed for an area extending beyond the geographical median line to the Okinawa Trough based on the natural extension of the continental shelf. And with respect to the geographical median line, the Chinese assert that the continental side is a continuous coastline but that the Japanese coastline is made up of non-continuous islands, and that it goes against the equitable principle to delineate the zones on the basis of these unequal geographical conditions.** In December 2012 the Chinese government submitted an application to the Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf for recognition of its continental shelf extending as far as the Okinawa Trough.

Second, Article 14 states, “The provisions in this law shall not affect the historical right[s] that the People’s Republic of China enjoys,” **explicitly declaring that the determination of the EEZ and continental shelf does not mean the abandonment of China’s historical rights in the surrounding sea areas. In other words, China takes the posture of invoking its historical rights in order to secure its rights and interests.** **This is the logic that probably underlies the claim that the Chinese have been making since the time of the Republic of China for its “nine-dash line”** (or “nine-dotted line”) around a broad area extending out like an ox tongue into the South China Sea.

Third, **UNCLOS stipulates** (in Article 58, paragraph 3) **that states exercising their rights of navigation and overflight through an EEZ “shall have due regard to the rights and duties of the coastal State.” UNCLOS does not define the meaning of “due regard”**

### Polar Regions

**China has explicitly described martime development, Arctic and Antarctic observation as national security**

**Takeda 14**

“China’s Rise as a Maritime Power: Ocean Policy from Mao Zedong to Xi Jinping” Takeda Jun’ichi Foreign policy and national defense journalist. Visiting Research Fellow at the Ocean Policy Research Foundation. April 23, 2014: <http://islandstudies.oprf-info.org/research/a00011/> pp. 73–95; published by the OPRF Center for Island Studies.

**The first time the importance of the seas was officially raised at the National Congress of the CPC, which stands at the summit of China’s political leadership, was at the fifteenth Congress, held in 1997, during the rule of Jiang Zemin. The general secretary’s report to the congress noted, “The seas are an important element of the national territory and resources that can be developed on an ongoing basis.” The 16th Congress, held in 2002, after Hu Jintao took the helm, acknowledged “the need for a strategic organ to implement maritime development.” In an extension of this recognition, the State Council, in the “Outline of the Plan for National Marine Economic Development” it adopted the following year, declared that China would build itself into a maritime power in stages. This was the first time that the Chinese government set forth the term “maritime power” in an official document. And it was noted at the opening of the eighteenth Congress of the CPC in 2012 that building China into a maritime power had become established as a strategic objective.**

**Facing increasingly serious shortages of food, energy, and water resources, China is leaning more and more to the seas. The new trend is an omnidirectional maritime strategy, including the development of new fields like renewable maritime energy sources and deep-seabed mineral resources, prevention and mitigation of marine disasters, and expansion of Arctic and Antarctic observation activities.**

### Hegemony

**Sea exploration is a matter of international realism for China**

**Takeda 14**

“China’s Rise as a Maritime Power: Ocean Policy from Mao Zedong to Xi Jinping” Takeda Jun’ichi Foreign policy and national defense journalist. Visiting Research Fellow at the Ocean Policy Research Foundation. April 23, 2014: <http://islandstudies.oprf-info.org/research/a00011/> pp. 73–95; published by the OPRF Center for Island Studies.

**What underlies this increased emphasis on the seas? Though the five-year plan does not set forth a clear explanation, it presumably relates to the red lights that China sees in connection with its supplies of food, energy, and water, three key resources for its 1.3 billion people. In very rough terms, China’s cultivated acreage per person is only 40% of the world average, it depends on imports for 55% of its oil, and its supply of fresh water per person is just a quarter of the global level. So securing sustained supplies of these resources from the seas is a crucial issue for the country.**

### Soft Power/Resources

**Chinese maritime soft power’s key to its resource access**

Hunter 09

 “Soft Power: China on the Global Stage” Alan Hunter Professor and Director of the Centre for Peace and Reconciliation Studies @ Coventry University Chinese Journal of International Politics, Vol. 2, 2009, 373–398 http://cjip.oxfordjournals.org/content/2/3/373.full.pdf

Competition for resources is now a key issue for all major powers. **As the largest in population among all developing countries, and with the fastest growing manufacturing base, China’s need for natural resources is truly enormous. One analyst recently showed that among 10 countries with populations of over 100 million, China is second from bottom as regards indigenous natural resources**: only Japan is worse off. As population growth puts even more pressure on resources, effective political handling of resource issues is thus essential, because shortages could threaten the future of the country. Maintaining stable resource supplies, therefore, is a factor crucial to determining whether or not China can continue its development trajectory in the 21st century.23 The West now fears competition from China for access to global resources, particularly oil and gas.24 Henry Kissinger has mooted competition over hydrocarbon resources in coming years as the most likely cause of international conflict.25 As Hu Jintao showed at an Asian summit in 2005, Beijing leaders are also well aware of the issue. **Hu stated that achieving balanced and orderly growth through proper handling of the energy issue is a Chinese priority: China would focus on energy conservation and effective use of resources, as well as fresh exploration and new imports. But to satisfy its demand for oil and other resources China must explore many different options [Such as Oceans]** and on every continent.26 The government announced in 2002 a new policy encouraging its three major national oil corporations to ‘go out’ (zouchuqu) and ensure secure overseas energy supplies: through direct purchases, exploring and drilling programmes, constructing refineries, and building pipelines.27 The Chinese oil demand between 1993 and 2002 grew by almost 90%, and now stands at around 6 million barrels a day, some 40% of which has to be imported. Conversely, about 40% of oildemand growth worldwide from 2000 to 2004 is attributable to China.28 In November 2004, Chinese President Hu signed 39 commercial agreements with Latin American countries; investments in Argentina alone amounted to US$ 20 billion. On a later visit in 2005, Vice-President Zeng signed a key agreement with Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez on oil and gas explorations; China also announced it would extend favourable trade credits to Cuba. By 2005, China had offered more than US $ 50 billion of investment to countries within the US ‘backyard’, and has pursued a similar strategy in sub-Saharan African countries. Chinese businesses are participant in many projects, including major infrastructure development; corporations also invest heavily in oil production, notably in the Sudan, Angola, and Nigeria.29 An online newspaper report in December 2005 evidenced the fierce competition between China and the USA for African ‘black gold’.30 in the Middle East.’31 Frequent high-level exchange visits between Beijing and West Asian leaders endorse economic ties. Altogether, reflecting **China’s potential competition with the USA in West Asia and North Africa could be an even more sensitive issue than that in Latin America and East Asia. ‘The potentially explosive combination of a China less willing to passively accept US leadership and the prospect of competition between China and other states for control over vital energy resources poses particularly critical challenges to U.S. interests** the title of a recent study, China is a future hegemon whose rise inevitably engenders new transnational dynamics. **We have therefore explored China’s** need to avoid military conflict, its **massive economic development, and its need to secure resources as important contexts for Chinese soft power in the 21st century**.32 The author believes that the climate change is another factor which will become even more urgent and prominent in the immediate future.

### Territorial Claims

**China will remain aggressive in exploring, controlling, and seizing marine territory**

**Takeda 14**

“China’s Rise as a Maritime Power: Ocean Policy from Mao Zedong to Xi Jinping” Takeda Jun’ichi Foreign policy and national defense journalist. Visiting Research Fellow at the Ocean Policy Research Foundation. April 23, 2014: <http://islandstudies.oprf-info.org/research/a00011/> pp. 73–95; published by the OPRF Center for Island Studies

**Director Liu** also **stressed the importance of action to “resolutely safeguard the maritime rights and interests of the state,”** the fourth of the 10 major tasks. Since this is a key point, **let me share a full translation of what he said** in this connection in his statement to the session:

**“We will maintain the law enforcement patrols that have become normalized to safeguard rights and interests in the waters of the Diaoyu Islands. We will show our jurisdictional claims externally through ongoing patrols of the waters of the South China Sea under Chinese jurisdiction. We will move ahead in areas including selection of the scope of protection for territorial sea base points, management of place names in the South China Sea, research to determine the extent of the continental shelf extending beyond the 200-nautical-mile limit, and the naming of seabed places. We will move further ahead with comprehensive administration, and we will strike a ‘combination blow,’ the main elements of which will be legal, administrative, and maritime activities and public opinion propaganda. We will undertake systematic deepening of research and external propaganda on hot issues of maritime rights and interests.”** It is extremely unusual for a responsible official to go so far as to talk of a “combination blow” in a public session like this.

After becoming general secretary **in the fall of 2012, Xi Jinping, came out with repeated appeals to nationalist sentiment with expressions like “great renewal of the Chinese nation,” “Chinese dream,” and “dream of a strong military.” In the spring of 2013 the new leadership team headed by President Xi Jinping and Premier Li Keqiang got fully underway. To judge from the context of what we have seen so far, it seems certain that this new leadership will continue to press China’s claims to maritime rights and interests with increasing strength as a key element of the country’s ocean policy.**

### Sovereignty/Security

**China views all ocean exploration as a matter of national sovereignty and security.**

**Jennings 14**

**“Sea turtles, cannons, and arrests: What's going on in the South China Sea?” By Ralph Jennings Journalist “Christian Science Monitor” https://news.yahoo.com/sea-turtles-cannons-arrests-whats-going-south-china-150816629.html**

Two incidents over disputed territory in the South China Sea this week threaten to disrupt the tense status quo between China and its southeast Asian neighbors. In Vietnam, China's dispatch of a state-owned oil rig into waters close to Vietnam sparked a face-off between Chinese and Vietnamese ships and anti-China protests. In the Philippines, China is protesting the detention of a Chinese fishing boat filled with illegal sea turtles and the arrest of its crew. While the region has been home to competing territorial claims for centuries, increasingly assertive action by both China and its neighbors has raised concerns that more serious conflict could erupt. Here's what you need to know about the latest incidents:1. WHAT IS THE DISPUTE BETWEEN CHINA AND VIETNAM, AND HOW SERIOUS IS IT? **On May 3, China sent a 40-story high, football-field sized oil rig into territory claimed by both Vietnam and China**, about 130 nautical miles off the coast of Vietnam. **The deep-sea rig was reportedly accompanied by 80 Chinese ships. Vietnam responded by sending its own vessels, which rammed Chinese ships at least 171 times**, Chinese officials said. **Vietnamese officials accused China of firing water cannons at Vietnamese ships.** Vietnam harbors decades of territorial and political grievances against China, easily fueling popular protests when bilateral spats arise. Anti-Chinese protesters in southern Vietnam last night set fire to several factories they believed were Chinese-owned. There are signs of some diplomatic action: China and Vietnam had “14 communications” last week about the oil rig, the spokeswoman for the Chinese Foreign Ministry, said at a briefing on Monday. 2. WHAT IS THE DISPUTE BETWEEN CHINA AND THE PHILIPPINES, AND HOW SERIOUS IS IT? On May 6, the Philippines maritime police seized a Chinese fishing boat and its 11-person crew. China has demanded the return of the boat and the crew and said they were operating in China's "undisputed" territory. Manila is instead putting nine of the crew members on trial for criminal offenses, after sending home two minors. The move is popular among Filipinos who feel bullied by China, but one that risks economic sanctions from Beijing. The Philippines is known as one of the most aggressive challengers to China's territorial claims. It has opened international arbitration cases with the United Nations challenging Beijing's claims. Beijing has ignored the cases and has not sent lawyers to the UN. 3. ARE THESE TENSIONS IN THE SOUTH CHINA SEA LIKELY TO ESCALATE INTO FIGHTING**? Observers forecast more scuffles such as the Vietnam-China incident**, especially if Vietnam and the Philippines keep challenging China, which has a much larger military. **“In this highly charged environment there is always the possibility of an accident, which could result in an escalation of tensions,”** **says** Murray Hiebert, senior fellow at the US think tank **Center for Strategic and International Studies.** However, the parties aren’t testing one another with aggressive naval movements or air force flyovers. South China Sea territorial flare-ups usually alternate with periods of conciliation, when rivals hold talks. IS CHINA ASSERTING ITS TERRITORIAL CLAIMS MORE FORCEFULLY NOW THAN IN THE PAST? Six governments claim all or part of the South China Sea, which is known for international shipping lanes, fishing grounds, and up to 7.5 billion barrels of undersea oil. China, Taiwan, the Philippines, and Vietnam say virtually the whole sea is their own, including hundreds of atolls and barely inhabited islets. Brunei and Malaysia claim parts of the South China Sea. Disputes in the area emerged after World War II, heating up in the 1970s with occasional maritime scuffles.  **China clashed with Vietnam in 1974 and 1988 over competing ocean rights. China, Vietnam, and the Philippines most often appear on the front lines.** The other claimants keep a low profile to maintain relations with China, though Taiwan periodically reminds its rivals of a military airstrip it operates on Taiping island in the Spratlys. **China has become more aggressive as its economic and political clout** in the region **has grown.** It wants access to the ocean’s fisheries to feed its 1.3 billion people, and oil or natural gas to power its factories and cities. Beijing can now afford to take a tougher line against smaller Southeast Asian countries that increasingly depend on it for trade or investment. China bases its oceanic claim on a U-shaped “nine-dash line" that extends south of Hong Kong. It says this is a traditional boundary that was referenced as far back as the Tang Dynasty about 1,500 years ago. **Political analysts call China’s basis for sovereignty inconsistent with today’s international laws of the sea.**

## Impacts/Scenarios

### NK Scenario Ext.

**Co-op on N. Korea key to preventing flash point conflicts and miscalculation**

**Richard C. Bush 11**

“Co-op on Korea” Richard C. Bush Journalist for Brookings Institutehttp://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2011/0113\_us\_china\_korea\_bush.aspx, January 13, 2011

**The stakes on the Korean peninsula could not be higher.** **If** Presidents Hu and **Obama** are **[is ] 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**

**And, co-op is key to Korean stability**

**Van Der Putten 10**

“Sino/US rivalry does not help Korean stability” Pual Van Der Putten Journalist for Clingendael Institute.[http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2010/12/21/sino-us-geopolitical-rivalry-does-not-help-korean-stability/, December 21, 2010](http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2010/12/21/sino-us-geopolitical-rivalry-does-not-help-korean-stability/%2C%20December%2021%2C%202010)

**A major precondition for China to change its policy towards North Korea is an improvement in Sino-US relations**. In the past months *these* have been deteriorating*.* This is the result of China’s growing power, and America’s increasing concern that Beijing is not using its influence for the right purposes*.* Washington has been strengthening its strategic ties with actors such as Taiwan, Vietnam, Indonesia and Indi*a. The US government has also shown greater involvement in territorial disputes between China and some of its neighbours.* It is likely that, from a Chinese perspective, the US deploying an aircraft carrier in the Yellow Sea is merely the latest attempt by Washington to exploit a regional security crisis in order to strengthen its own position and weaken that of China. T**he American dual strategy of trying to get China to put pressure on North Korea while at the same time attempting to limit the growth of Chinese influence in regional affairs is unlikely to result in a more stable Korean peninsula**

### Prolif-> Extinction

**Proliferation results in global nuclear war**

**Utgoff 02**

“Proliferation, Missile Defence and American Ambitions” Victor A Utgoff Deputy Director of Strategy, Forces, and Resources Division of Institute for Defense Analysis *Survival*, Summer, p. 87-90

Further, the large number of states that became capable of building nuclear weapons over the years, but chose not to, can be reasonably well explained by the fact that most were formally allied with either the United States or the Soviet Union. Both these superpowers had strong nuclear forces and put great pressure on their allies not to build nuclear weapons. Since the Cold War, the US has retained all its allies. In addition, NATO has extended its protection to some of the previous allies of the Soviet Union and plans on taking in more. **Nuclear proliferation by India and Pakistan, and proliferation programmes by North Korea, Iran and Iraq, all involve states in the opposite situation: all judged that they faced serious military opposition and had little prospect of establishing a reliable supporting alliance with a suitably strong, nuclear-armed state.** What would await the world if strong protectors, especially the United States, were [was] no longer seen as willing to protect states from nuclear-backed aggression? **At least a few additional states would begin to build their own nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them to distant targets**, and **these initiatives would spur increasing numbers of** the world’s capable **states to follow** suit. Restraint would seem ever less necessary and ever more dangerous. Meanwhile, more states are becoming capable of building nuclear weapons and long-range missiles. Many, perhaps most, of the world’s states are becoming sufficiently wealthy, and the technology for building nuclear forces continues to improve and spread. Finally, it seems highly likely that at some point, halting proliferation will come to be seen as a lost cause and the restraints on it will disappear. Once that happens, **the transition to a highly proliferated world would probably be very rapid.** While some regions might be able to hold the line for a time, **the threats posed by wildfire proliferation in most other areas could create pressures that would finally overcome all restraint.** Many readers are probably willing to accept that nuclear proliferation is such a grave threat to world peace that every effort should be made to avoid it. However, every effort has not been made in the past, and we are talking about much more substantial efforts now. For new and substantially more burdensome efforts to be made to slow or stop nuclear proliferation, it needs to be established that the highly proliferated nuclear world that would sooner or later evolve without such efforts is not going to be acceptable. And, for many reasons, it is not. First, **the dynamics of getting to a highly proliferated world could be very dangerous. Proliferating states will feel great pressures to obtain nuclear weapons and delivery systems before any potential opponent does. Those who succeed in outracing an opponent may consider preemptive nuclear war before the opponent becomes capable of nuclear retaliation. Those who lag behind might try to preempt their opponent’s nuclear programme or defeat the opponent using conventional forces. And those who feel threatened but are incapable of building nuclear weapons may still be able to join in this arms race by building other types of weapons of mass destruction, such as biological weapons. Second, as the world approaches complete proliferation, the hazards posed by nuclear weapons today will be magnified many times over.** Fifty or more nations capable of launching nuclear weapons means that the risk of nuclear accidents that could cause serious damage not only to their own populations and environments, but those of others, is hugely increased. The chances of such weapons failing into the hands of renegade military units or terrorists is far greater, as is the number of nations carrying out hazardous manufacturing and storage activities. **Worse still, in a highly proliferated world there would be more frequent opportunities for the use of nuclear weapons.** And more frequent opportunities means shorter expected times between conflicts in which nuclear weapons get used, unless the probability of use at any opportunity is actually zero. To be sure, some theorists on nuclear deterrence appear to think that in any confrontation between two states known to have reliable nuclear capabilities, the probability of nuclear weapons being used is zero.’ These theorists think that such states will be so fearful of escalation to nuclear war that they would always avoid or terminate confrontations between them, short of even conventional war. They believe this to be true even if the two states have different cultures or leaders with very eccentric personalities. History and human nature, however, suggest that they are almost surely wrong. History includes instances in which states ‘known to possess nuclear weapons did engage in direct conventional conflict. China and Russia fought battles along their common border even after both had nuclear weapons. Moreover, logic suggests that if states with nuclear weapons always avoided conflict with one another, surely states without nuclear weapons would avoid conflict with states that had them. Again, history provides counter-examples Egypt attacked Israel in 1973 even though it saw Israel as a nuclear power at the time. Argentina invaded the Falkland Islands and fought Britain’s efforts to take them back, even though Britain had nuclear weapons. Those who claim that two states with reliable nuclear capabilities to devastate each other will not engage in conventional conflict risking nuclear war also assume that any leader from any culture would not choose suicide for his nation. But **history provides unhappy examples of states whose leaders were ready to choose suicide for themselves and their fellow citizens.** Hitler tried to impose a ‘victory or destruction’’ policy on his people as Nazi Germany was going down to defeat. And Japan’s war minister, during debates on how to respond to the American atomic bombing, suggested ‘Would it not be wondrous for the whole nation to be destroyed like a beautiful flower?” If leaders are willing to engage in conflict with nuclear-armed nations, use of nuclear weapons in any particular instance may not be likely, but its probability would still be dangerously significant. In particular, human nature suggests that the threat of retaliation with nuclear weapons is not a reliable guarantee against a disastrous first use of these weapons. While national leaders and their advisors everywhere are usually talented and experienced people, even their most important decisions cannot be counted on to be the product of well-informed and thorough assessments of all options from all relevant points of view. This is especially so when the stakes are so large as to defy assessment and there are substantial pressures to act quickly, as could be expected in intense and fast-moving crises between nuclear-armed states. **Instead, like other human beings, national leaders can be seduced by wishful thinking. They can misinterpret the words or actions of opposing leaders.** Their advisors may produce answers that they think the leader wants to hear, or coalesce around what they know is an inferior decision because the group urgently needs the confidence or the sharing of responsibility that results from settling on something. Moreover, leaders may not recognize clearly where their personal or party interests diverge from those of their citizens. Under great stress, human beings can lose their ability to think carefully. They can refuse to believe that the worst could really happen, oversimplify the problem at hand, think in terms of simplistic analogies and play hunches. The intuitive rules for how individuals should respond to insults or signs of weakness in an opponent may too readily suggest a rash course of action. Anger, fear, greed, ambition and pride can all lead to bad decisions. **The desire for a decisive solution to the problem at hand may lead to an unnecessarily extreme course of action.** We can almost hear the kinds of words that could flow from discussions in nuclear crises or war. ‘These people are not willing to die for this interest’. ‘No sane person would actually use such weapons’. ‘Perhaps the opponent will back down if we show him we mean business by demonstrating a willingness to use nuclear weapons’. ‘**If I don’t hit them back really hard, I am going to be driven from office, if not killed’. Whether right or wrong, in the stressful atmosphere of a nuclear crisis or war, such words from others, or silently from within, might resonate too readily with a harried leader.** Thus, both history and human nature suggest that nuclear deterrence can be expected to fail from time to time, and we are fortunate it has not happened yet. But the threat of nuclear war is not just a matter of a few weapons being used. It could get much worse. Once a conflict reaches the point where nuclear weapons are employed, the stresses felt by the leaderships would rise enormously. These stresses can be expected to further degrade their decision-making. The pressures to force the enemy to stop fighting or to surrender could argue for more forceful and decisive military action, which might be the right thing to do in the circumstances, but maybe not. And the horrors of the carnage already suffered may be seen as justification for visiting the most devastating punishment possible on the enemy.’ Again, history demonstrates how intense conflict can lead the combatants to escalate violence to the maximum possible levels. In the Second World War, early promises not to bomb cities soon gave way to essentially indiscriminate bombing of civilians. The war between Iran and Iraq during the 1980s led to the use of chemical weapons on both sides and exchanges of missiles against each other’s cities. And more recently, violence in the Middle East escalated in a few months from rocks and small arms to heavy weapons on one side, and from police actions to air strikes and armoured attacks on the other. **Escalation of violence is also basic human nature. Once the violence starts, retaliatory exchanges of violent acts can escalate to levels unimagined by the participants before hand.** Intense and blinding anger is a common response to fear or humiliation or abuse. And such anger can lead us to impose on our opponents whatever levels of violence are readily accessible. **In sum, widespread proliferation is likely to lead to an occasional shoot-out with nuclear weapons, and that such shoot-outs will have a substantial probability of escalating to the maximum destruction possible with the weapons at hand.** Unless nuclear proliferation is stopped, **we are headed toward a world that will mirror the American Wild West of the late 1800s. With most, if not all, nations wearing nuclear ‘six-shooters’ on their hips, the world may even be a more polite place than it is today, but every once in a while we will all gather on a hill to bury the bodies of dead cities or even whole nations.** This kind of world is in no nation’s interest. The means for preventing it must be pursued vigorously. And, as argued above, a most powerful way to prevent it or slow its emergence is to encourage the more capable states to provide reliable protection to others against aggression, even when that aggression could be backed with nuclear weapons. In other words, the world needs at least one state, preferably several, willing and able to play the role of sheriff, or to be members of a sheriff’s posse, even in the face of nuclear threats.

### Nukes-> Extinction

**Just one nuclear launch causes extinction**

**Ross 03**

**“**Racing toward extinction” Larry Ross Founder of NZ Nuclear-Free Peacemaking Association December 10 http://nuclearfree.lynx.co.nz/racing.htm

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

### Relations k2 economics/laundry list

**Two of the world’s two largest economies is paramount in solving all other extinction scenarios**

**Gewirtz 11**

“What America and China Must Not Forget” By Paul Gewirtz; professor at Yale Law School and director of The China Law Center. [http://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/19/opinion/19iht-edgewirtz19.html Jan 18 11](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/19/opinion/19iht-edgewirtz19.html%20Jan%2018%2011).

However, the fact that **the U**nited **S**tates **and China have many common interests** does not mean that we will inevitably pursue them. **Nor does China’s rising economic and military power mean inevitable conflict**, as fatalistic doomsayers in both countries are arguing. The United States and China are now so entangled with each other economically that conflict — whether escalating trade protectionism or belligerent rivalry for spheres of influence or military provocation — inflicts major harm on both countries. And there are so many **global problems** **that require U.S.-China cooperation** if the world is to find solutions — including **climate change, energy scarcity, nuclear proliferation, genocide and pandemics** — that we have large incentives and responsibilities to cooperate.

**And, Christensen in 11 agrees**

“The Need to PursueMutual Interests in U.S.-PRC Relations” By Thomas J. Christensen; Professor of Politics and International Affairs and Director of the Princeton-Harvard China and the World Program at Princeton University. <http://www.usip.org/files/resources/SR269Christensen.pdf>

**There are many** **additional areas of potential U.S.-Chinese cooperation, including global financial stability, disease control**, and product safety. This is why U.S. Embassy Beijing is and should be one of the busiest buildings in the entire U.S. government system. The examples above are only illustrations of areas where **cooperation** has taken place and **must be enhanced if the two nations’ national security interests are to be served.** If we succeed in achieving real results together and along with other concerned countries, we will have done a great deal toward building confidence and trust between the two governments. If, instead, China and the United States start with issues on which they simply cannot fully agree now or for the foreseeable future, such as Taiwan and Tibet, then they are likely to hit a wall with negative repercussions for their bilateral relationship and for their mutual ability to contribute to solutions to these global problems.

### Relations k2 systmeic impacts/laundry list

**Hachigian in 11 concludes co-operation is key to alleviating the largest systematic impacts**

“Conduct Befitting a Great Power Responsibility and Sovereignty in U.S.-China Relations” By Nina Hachigian; Senior Fellow at American Progress<http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/01/pdf/china_policy.pdf>

**It is possible that American and Chinese conceptions of global responsibility** and sovereignty **will converge** over time to meet the needs of the 21st century as China adjusts to its global role, assuming that the consensus in the United States holds for America continuing to play the role of the responsible leader. **If so, we can expect progress on rebalancing the global economy as well as tackling global warming, poverty, pandemics, and nuclear proliferation**, among other global issues. But that convergence is hardly a sure thing, especially given the politically charged window of the next two years leading up to a power transition in China and a U.S. presidential election in 2012.

### Pandemics-> Extinction

**Steinbruner 98**

“Biological Weapons: A plague upon all houses” John D. Steinbruner Senior Fellow at Brookings Institute Dec 22 1998

**It is** a considerable comfort and **undoubtedly a key to our survival that**, so far, the main lines of defense against this threat have not depended on explicit policies or organized efforts. In **the long course of evolution, the human body has developed physical barriers and a biochemical immune system whose sophistication and effectiveness exceed anything we could design** or as yet even fully understand. **But evolution is a sword that cuts both ways**: **New diseases emerge, while old diseases mutate and adapt.** **Throughout history, there have been epidemics during which human immunity has broken down on an epic scale.** An infectious agent believed to have been the plague bacterium killed an estimated 20 million people over a four-year period in the fourteenth century, including nearly one-quarter of Western Europe's population at the time. Since its recognized appearance in 1981, some 20 variations of the HIVvirus have infected an estimated 29.4 million worldwide, with 1.5 million people currently dying of aids each year. Malaria, tuberculosis, and cholera-once thought to be under control-are now making a comeback. **As we enter the twenty-first century, changing conditions have enhanced the potential for widespread contagion.** The rapid growth rate of the total world population, the unprecedented freedom of movement across international borders, and scientific advances that expand the capability for the deliberate manipulation of pathogens are all cause for worry **that the problem might be greater in the future than it has ever been in the past. The threat of infectious pathogens is not just an issue of public health, but a fundamental security problem for the species as a whole.**

### Warming-> Extinction

**Warming causes nuclear war**

**Kiwanuka ’07**

 “Global Warming How it could spark World War III” Ba Kiwanuka Staff Writer May 2007 http://www.energyefficienthomearticles.com/Article/global-warmingGlobal-Warming-How-It-Could-Spark-World-War-III-/5757

The following figures illustrate the CO2 emissions from the various regions around the globe: USA: 30.3% Europe: 27.7% Russia: 13.7% South East Asia: 12.2% Japan: 3.7% South America/Central America: 3.8% Middle East: 2.6% Africa: 2.5% Australia: 1.1% These figures amply illustrate how Western Europe and the United States are by far largely responsible for the effects of global warming we are seeing today. Contrastingly the regions least responsible are the ones that will bear the brunt of those effects (initially at any rate, until such time that the process progresses to an ice age then the situation will reverse). However, **with the two mega economies of China and India expanding rapidly** (each boasting a population in excess of 1 billion) soon **their greenhouse gas emissions may surpass those of the U.S. A series of meetings held in Washington in early 2007 had American legislators demanding that developing nations be held to the same greenhouse-gas-emission accountability as the developed nations**! Not unexpectedly there were worldwide outcries and accusations of shameless hypocrisy leveled at the United States. **With the not unreasonable contention that they have the right to develop and advance in the same manner that both Europe and America have enjoyed over the past forty years these two looming economical giants are not about to be cowed by Washington.** Furthermore considering the suspicious manner with which the U.S. justified its invasion of Iraq, few these days are inclined to believe a word that Washington says. Compounding this climate of distrust and suspicion are the many questionable prerogatives the U.S. claims. These include: 1. Not subscribing to the Kyoto Protocol (Treaty on Global Warming) 2. Seeking the right to pre-emptive strikes (Bush II) 3. Demanding to be exempted from The Geneva Convention (Bush II) 4. Not a participant of the World Court 5. Biggest contributor to global warming but doing the least to rectify the situation. **In a world where America demands exclusive rights to pre-emptive strikes, perhaps then it is not too far fetched to understand if India and China harbor a degree of paranoia that the U.S. may one day set its targets on them. After all for a country that so conveniently and magically connected two totally unrelated events to one another as an excuse to pursue its ultimate goal (U.S. invasion of Iraq after 911), it is not unconceivable that the U.S. could one day claim that the greenhouse gas emissions from the Asian giants are threatening the very existence of its coastal cities and hence amount to an act of war**! **For their part the Asian giants already suspiciously view Washington's demands concerning greenhouse gases as a thinly veiled attempt to restrict their economical development.** That said, China and India are hardly Iraq! **These are two countries which both boast formidable nuclear arsenals that are quite capable of reaching the U.S. Besides if the U.S. were to take any drastic action it is unlikely that the slumbering Russian bear would continue dozing for much longer. World wars have erupted over much less and in the heated climate of today it only takes one more little spark to set everything off!**

**Global warming will cause extinction**

**Sydney’03**

“Global Warming threatens Earth with mass extinction” Sydney Climate analysts Morning Herald accessed on Lexus Nexus June 2003

 **Global warming over the next century could trigger a catastrophe to rival the worst mass extinction in the history of the planet**, scientists have warned. Researchers at Bristol University have discovered that **a mere 6 degrees of global warming was enough to wipe out up to 95 per cent of the species which were alive on earth at the end of the Permian period**, 250 million years ago. United Nations **scientists** from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change **predict up to 6 degrees of warming for the next 100 years if nothing is done about emissions of greenhouse gases**, principally carbon dioxide, the chief cause of global warming. The Permian mass extinction is now thought to have been caused by gigantic volcanic eruptions that triggered a runaway greenhouse effect and nearly put an end to life on Earth. **Conditions in what geologists have termed this "post apocalyptic greenhouse" were so severe that only one large land animal was left alive and it took 100 million years for species diversity to return to former levels.** This dramatic new finding is revealed in a book by Bristol University's head of earth sciences, Michael Benton, which chronicles the geological efforts leading up to the discovery and its potential implications. Professor Benton said: "**The Permian crisis nearly marked the end of life. It's estimated that fewer than one in 10 species survived. Geologists are only now coming to appreciate the severity of this global catastrophe and to understand how and why so many species died out so quickly." Other climate experts say they are appalled that a disaster of such magnitude could be repeated within this century because of human activities.**

# \*\*\*Aff Answers\*\*\*

### Relations Lo Now

**China/US relations are low. S. China sea disputes are threatening war now**

**Reuters 14**

“U.S. warns China its actions in sea disputes are straining relations” Reuters May 16, 2014 3:02 PM. <http://www.interaksyon.com/article/86967/u-s--warns-china-its-actions-in-sea-disputes-are-straining-relations>

WASHINGTON - **China's "provocative" actions in maritime disputes with its neighbors are straining ties with the United States, raising questions over how the world's two biggest economies can work together**, a senior U.S. official said **The strong comments from Washington** on Thursday (early Friday in the Philippines) **come after deadly anti-China riots broke out in Vietnam in response to China towing an oil rig into a part of the South China Sea claimed by both Hanoi and Beijing."This is raising some fundamental questions for us about China's long-term strategic intentions,"** the U.S. official told Reuters, speaking on condition of anonymity. He said Beijing's move appeared to fit a "pattern" of advancing territorial claims through coercion and intimidation**."China's activities are straining the U.S.-China relationship because it raises questions about our ability to partner together in Asia or even bilaterally."** The Vietnamese government says one person was killed in the anti-China violence on Tuesday and Wednesday, but a doctor at a hospital near one area of rioting said he had seen 21 dead bodies and that at least 100 people were wounded. An eyewitness to fighting between Chinese and Vietnamese workers in an industrial zone in the same area said she had seen at least 13 bodies. There were no immediate reports on Friday of further violence. **Washington is in close contact with the Vietnamese government on "how most effectively to manage" Hanoi's standoff with Beijing**, the U.S. official told Reuters, **The Philippines, one of Washington's closest allies in Asia, has said China is reclaiming land on a reef in the oil- and gas-rich South China Sea that both countries claim and is building what appears to be an airstrip on it. It has offered the United States the use of an underdeveloped naval base on a nearby island to ensure U.S. warships can enter the vicinity. Vice President Joe Biden and other top U.S. officials told visiting General Fang Fenghui, chief of general staff in China's army, that Beijing's behavior in the maritime disputes was "dangerous and provocative" and must stop** the official said. **The renewed tensions in the South China Sea underscore one of the biggest challenges in Asia facing President Barack Obama, who is under pressure by America's allies to accelerate a "pivot"** of military assets to the region to counter China's rising influence. In Washington on Thursday, **Fang defended the deployment of the oil rig in the disputed South China Sea and blamed Hanoi, saying China cannot afford to "lose an inch" of territory The general also pointed the finger at Obama's strategic shift toward Asia, saying it had encouraged countries such as Vietnam, Japan and the Philippines to make trouble with Beijing. Vietnam and China are now grappling with one of the worst breakdowns in relations since the neighbors fought a brief border war in 1979.** The crisis has erupted after a week-long visit to Asia by **President Barack Obama** in late April in which he **pledged that Washington would live up to its obligation to defend its allies in the region.**

### Disad Inevitable

**Impact Inevitable- Chinese ocean disputes make flash point conflicts inevitable.**

**Archibald 14**

 “China's 'Mobile National Territory” David Archibald Fellow at the Institute of World Politics in D.C May 19, 2014 http://www.americanthinker.com/2014/05/chinas\_mobile\_national\_territory.html

**China has built an offshore oil drilling rig, numbered HD-981, specifically for the purpose invalidating other nations’ claims to seabed they thought was theirs.** There is no doubt about the purpose of the rig given that a **Chinese state oil company** official **once called it “our mobile national territory.”**  Its primary purpose isn’t commercial.  **If China can drill an oil well on some other country’s seabed, they can then claim that it was China’s territory all along.**  The rig is having its first outing to that purpose off the coast of Vietnam, accompanied by 86 Chinese vessels including a submarine.  Vietnam responded by sending 30 coastguard vessels to interfere with the Chinese drilling rig.  Ramming of Vietnamese vessels by the Chinese ones has been reported. **Miscalculation might not lead to war because there is nothing miscalculated about what China is doing.  China intends to start a war.**  Most probably China wants Vietnam to attack its drilling operation so that it can play the injured party and launch a retaliatory strike.  Not so much against forces on the Vietnamese mainland but against the Vietnamese island bases further south in the Spratly Islands.  Vietnam has a number of bases centred on Union Bank, with the main base being Sin Cowe Island.  At least one of these looks like a medieval fortress with firing slots, suggesting that the Vietnamese expect it to take some shelling and an assault across the reef. The Vietnamese base that would annoy the Chinese most is the one on an islet on South Johnson Reef just seven kilometres north of where the Chinese are now purportedly building an airstrip.  The scale of the operation, including a large dredge, suggests that’s what its purpose is.  There are other airfields in the Spratlys -- Taiwan has one on Taiping Island and the Philippines one on Thitu Island.  **China was late to this part of the South China Sea and, with no natural islands left, has to dredge up all the coral needed to make its artificial island. China declared an Air Defence Identification Zone (ADIZ) over the Senkaku Islands late last year, which upset the Japanese who own the islands.  China has also indicated that at some stage it will also declare an ADIZ over the 90% of the South China Sea that it claims.**  That claim goes as far south as James Shoal, just 4° north of the Equator.  James Shoal is 1,500 km south of the nearest Chinese air base on Woody Island in the Paracel Islands.  **That leads to the question of how such an ADIZ would be enforced.  That question is answered by the air base under construction on South Johnson Reef.  China already has an elevated radome further north on Subi Reef, also in the Spratlys, so it is already capable of tracking the air traffic in the region. Chinese state media has already stated that “Chinese troops to seize Zhongye Island back from the Philippines in 2014”.**  From the [China Daily Mail](http://chinadailymail.com/2014/01/11/chinese-troops-to-seize-zhongye-island-back-from-the-philippines-in-2014/) of 11thJanuary, 2014:“Relying on US support, the Philippines is so arrogant as to announce in the New Year that it will increase its navy and air force deployment at Zhongye Island, a Chinese island that it has illegally occupied for years.“It will be an intolerable insult to China.“**According to experts, the Chinese navy has drawn a detailed combat plan to seize the Philipines and the battle will be restricted within the South China Sea**.“The battle is aimed at recovery of the island stolen by the Philippines from China.”Zhongye Island is the Chinese name for Thitu Island.  The Philippines has a mutual defense treaty with the United States; Vietnam does not.  That is the advantage for China in starting with Vietnam first.  If the United States, and perhaps Japan, does not assist Vietnam in its coming war with China, then China is likely to decide that it can scrape the Filipino bases off their islands with impunity.Vietnam understands what is at stake in the South China Sea**.  China claims 90% of the South China Sea as part of its city of Sansha.  Once enforcement is established, ships and aircraft wanting to cross the South China Sea would have to ask China’s permission first.** Vietnamese ships sailing from Haiphong would have to hug the Vietnamese coast almost all the way down to the equator before heading east to avoid the zone.  It would add 3,500 km to the shipping distance between Haiphong and Japan, for instance.  What was open ocean to their east will become a Chinese lake.  It will be a great insult and impediment to the Vietnamese people.  That is the precise intention. **After Vietnam will most likely come Japan.  Rig HD-981, China’s “mobile national territory,” will be moved to a site in Japan’s EEZ north of the Senkakus, equidistant between the Chinese Shuimen airbase and the Japanese and US airbases on Okinawa.  This will be an intolerable insult to the Japanese, but a certain US president might decide that, as no land area is involved, the United States-Japan mutual defense treaty does not apply.**  China will wear down the Japanese forces and then invade the Senakaku and Yaeyama Islands.  If successful in taking them, China will then extend its ADIZ to at least 300 km east of the Yaeyama Islands, isolating Japan from the rest of Asia. All the countries of East Asia know that once Vietnam is defeated, their turn will come.  They will effectively become vassal states under the Chinese jackboot. **What can be done?  The best solution is to break the sequential Chinese battle plan.**  Japan and Vietnam would be well advised to have their own mutual defense treaty so that China is taking on everybody at once instead of one at a time.  For Japan that means fighting China sometime later this year perhaps instead of in 2015 or 2016

### Trade checks

**No South China Sea War-Economic Ties between 11 countries check aggression**

**Okudera and Kobayashi 14**

“China to become No. 1 economic partner, Asia-Pacific region experts say” Atsushi Okudera and Tetsu Kobayashi; journalists. May 27, 2014 <http://ajw.asahi.com/article/behind_news/politics/AJ201405270084>

WASHINGTON--**China will be the “most important economic partner in 10 years” for many countries in the Asia-Pacific region, according to experts specializing in international or Asian regional affairs who were surveyed by a leading U.S. think tank. Of all the experts from the 11 countries and regions surveyed, 56 percent cited China, double the 28 percent for the United States, the Washington-based Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) said. The result shows that those experts think that China’s impact will grow further in the coming decade,** despite continuing concern over the field of security. The survey was conducted from March 24 to April 22, just prior to U.S. President Barack Obama’s four-nation swing through Asia. **The 11 countries or regions were Japan, the United States, China, South Korea, Taiwan, India, Australia, Indonesia, Singapore, Thailand and Myanmar. A total of 402 experts gave replies. According to the survey, 86 percent of experts in South Korea said China will become their country’s “most important economic partner in 10 years.”** Australia followed with 77 percent and Singapore with 75 percent. On the other hand, 71 percent of experts in Japan and 49 percent of those in India cited the United States. The sharp difference between the former and the latter groups apparently shows that those percentage figures were influenced by their countries’ political relations with China. Meanwhile, 83 percent of experts in China cited the United States, and none cited Japan. **The experts were also asked about “China’s impact on regional economic development.” A total of 79 percent replied that it is “positive.” The figure included both those who replied that it is “very positive” and those who answered that it is “slightly positive.” The higher percentage figure shows that the respondents view China’s rapid economic development in a positive light.** By countries or regions, the figures were around 90 percent in Australia, Singapore and Thailand. In Taiwan and South Korea, the corresponding figures stood at 79 percent and 78 percent, respectively. On the other hand, only 44 percent of experts in Japan said that it is “positive,” while 37 percent of them replied that it is “negative.” **In response to the question, “Which countries (or regions) do you think will exert the greatest power in East Asia in 10 years?” 53 percent of all the respondents cited China. It was followed by the United States with 43 percent**. A summary of the survey results will be released by the CSIS ([http://csis.org/](http://csis.org/%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank)) on May 27 (U.S. time). Full details are set for release on June 5.

### Interdependence checks

**Market interdependence checks US-PRC conflict**

**Wiseman 14**

“Despite hacking case, U.S. depends on China trade” Paul Wiseman, political journalist. May 26 2014 <http://www.houstonchronicle.com/business/economy/article/Despite-hacking-case-U-S-depends-on-China-trade-5505783.php>.

**China may be trying to steal trade secrets from U.S. businesses, as federal prosecutors allege. Yet for many U.S. companies, China's vast market remains an irresistible source of business. The Justice Department's indictment** last week **of five Chinese military officials accused them of trying to pilfer confidential information from American companies. But even some of the alleged U.S. corporate victims of the hackers have little incentive to cheer any trade rupture with China.** **Westinghouse is building four nuclear reactors in China. Steel maker Allegheny Technologies operates a joint venture in Shanghai. A third, Alcoa, is the biggest foreign investor in China's aluminum market.** Indeed, Alcoa downplayed the U.S. charges: "No material information was compromised during this incident, which occurred several years ago."Delicate position American companies are in a delicate position. They want to maintain good relations with China, a market where U.S. companies' earnings grew nearly 50 percent last year. But they're also fearful of Chinese hackers stealing their trade secrets. A U.S.-China Business Council survey has found that cybersecurity is a growing threat for U.S. companies in China. U.S. companies are also irritated by China's attempts to censor the Internet, according to a survey by the American Chamber of Commerce in China. The confrontation over hacking - China rejects the charges as based on "fabricated facts" - highlights the often-awkward relationship between China and the United States. They're frenemies in a globalized world - rivals and partners in both politics and economics. U.S. companies complain that China is becoming less hospitable to foreign companies. They cite policies that give Chinese firms an edge over foreign competitors, cumbersome licensing requirements and endless struggles to protect their intellectual property - from software to music to clothing design - from theft. For all the complaints and tensions, **U.S.-China business ties are tight and getting tighter.** Last week, **even as the hacking controversy raged, former U.S. ambassadors to Beijing rang the closing bell at the New York Stock Exchange to mark the 35th anniversary of U.S.-China diplomatic relations. After all, 77 Chinese company stocks trade on the NYSE. Trade in goods between the U.S. and China last year hit a record $562 billion. U.S. companies earned nearly $10 billion last year in China, another record. U.S. direct investment in China exceeds $50 billion. General Motors sells more cars in China than in the U.S. General Electric sells China clean power plants that run on methane. Wal-Mart has 390 stores in China. Starbucks runs hundreds of cafes. In a big turnabout, Chinese companies have begun to invest in America, too. Chinese investment in the United States reached $14 billion last year, up from virtually nothing a decade ago. About 70,000 Americans work for Chinese companies, according to the Rhodium Group consultancy. Chinese companies are being drawn to America by cheap energy and land and by U.S. wages that aren't as high compared with China's as they once were.**

### Alt cause- Ground based missiles

**Pollack 09**

 “Bulletin of Atomic Scientists” Joshua Pollack consultant to the U.S. government on arms control August 2009 ebsco

**One of these new “entangling” weapons is the U.S. Ground-Based Midcourse Defense system, the only strategic ballistic missile de-fense system deployed by the United States.** Although the U.S. Mis-sile Defense Agency states that the system is designed exclusively to counteract emerging threats from North Korea and Iran, **Chinese officials and experts take a skeptical view** of these claims. And in theory, **the system—in combination with theater defense systems—could provide U.S. leaders with the ability to blunt China’s threat of retaliation should they choose to threaten a U.S. nuclear first strike. With this added edge, or so Beijing might conclude, Washing-ton could return to the “bullying” that originally motivated China’s** acquisition of nuclear **weapons. This possibility has been cited as driving some aspects of China’s intercontinental ballistic missile modernization, including the development of decoys and counter-measures to overcome defenses. But as long as Beijing perceives the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense system as emboldening Washing-ton, Chinese military planners will be tempted to consider the sys-tem a legitimate target, especially because it is not a nuclear target.**

### Alt cause currency manipulation

**Glaser 10**

 “Comparative Connections: Quarterly E-Journal on East Asian Bilateral Relations” Bonnie and Brittany Glaser CSIS consultants October 2010

**Economic issues remained front and center in the US-China relationship this quarter as pressure mounted from US lawmakers and industry groups to punish China for an undervalued currency** that has boosted Chinese exports and deprived Americans of jobs and profits. Since the People’s Bank of China announced on June 19 that it would pursue a more flexible exchange rate after keeping the currency at about 6.83 per dollar for almost two years, the yuan has appreciated a mere 2.2 percent. **With the US unemployment rate at 9.7 percent and the US mid-term elections only months away, there are signs that the Obama administration is losing patience with China on this issue.**

### Alt cause WTO trade disputes

**Glaser 10**

 “Comparative Connections: Quarterly E-Journal on East Asian Bilateral Relations” Bonnie and Brittany Glaser CSIS consultants October 2010

**US frustration with Chinese trading practices was further evidenced by the submission of two new cases against China at the WTO** on Sept. 15 in response to claims of discrimination against US industries by the steel industry and credit card companies. US Trade Representative Ron **Kirk expressed concern that China is “breaking its trade commitments** to the United States and other WTO partners” **by excluding US credit and debit card companies and by unfairly restricting imports of US steel**. The move was applauded by key lawmakers on trade issues. “We can’t stand by while China abuses its unfair trade laws for protectionist purposes,” said Sen. Charles Grassley (R-IA), the lead Republican on the Senate Finance Committee.

### Alt cause Taiwan arms sales

**Barrister 2010**

“China US relations show signs of strain” Harun ur Rashid Barrister UN ambassador December 25 2010 <http://www.thedailystar.net/newDesign/news-details.php?nid=167242>

**Mr Obama approved a $6 billion arms sale to Taiwan. The divergence of opinion on the military sale to Taiwan stems from how the West and China sees Taiwan**. Most Westerners believe that Taiwan is a separate sovereign entity that should only rejoin China if it wishes to do so. Therefore, **Americans see these military sales as fulfilling the Taiwan Relation Act** by providing Taiwan with additional defensive deterrent. The weapons themselves are very advanced, but they are defensive in nature and are not going to change the military balance across the straits. The best hope for Taiwan is still to make peace with China and maintaining strong relationship with America. **Most Chinese people believe that Taiwan is an inalienable part of China that no other country should interfere with. Therefore, any sale to Taiwan is looked as containing Chinese power, violating its sovereignty and interfering with its internal affairs.To the Chinese, the US president appears to have reneged on promises in 2009 November's joint statement of the two countries during President Obama's visit to China to concentrate on mutual interest and ignore intractable differences.**

### Turn: coop escalates NK

**Empirically proven military presence under cuts co-op on Korea**

**Klein 2011**

“North Korea policy stays the same” Stephanie T. Kleine Project Director of the International Crisis Group January 21, 2011 [http://www.crisisgroup.org/en/regions/asia/north-east-asia/china/Ahlbrandt-North-Korea-Despite-Reports-Chinas-North-Korea-Policy-Stays-the-Same.aspx accessed 6-26](http://www.crisisgroup.org/en/regions/asia/north-east-asia/china/Ahlbrandt-North-Korea-Despite-Reports-Chinas-North-Korea-Policy-Stays-the-Same.aspx%20accessed%206-26)

**When North Korea shelled** **Yeonpyeong** **Island on November 23 [2011]** 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 U.S. 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 U.S. 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 U.S., South Korea and Japan, seeing U.S. 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 U.S. 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.**

### US China relations stable (Domestics concerns check)

**Lampton 2008**

“United States-China Relations and the Korea Peninsula: The Need for Multilaterally Articulated Deterrence and Prevention” David Lampton PhD Washington Journal of Modern China volume 9 2008

**The idea of stabilization is the central common interest that supports U.S.-China relations. This diversified base for U.S.-China relations is intrinsically a firmer, interest-based foundation for ties than was the initial pillar of relations** in the 1960s-1980s—explicit and quite broad-ranging anti-Soviet cooperation. With the demise of the Soviet empire and the Soviet Union itself in the 1989-1991 period, punctuated by the Tiananmen tragedy of June 1989, the **U.S.-China relationship came to rely upon an economic rationale vulnerable to human rights and security critics in the 1990s and into the new millennium. By early in the Obama administration, however, a broader tripod of shared interests in stabilization had come to be articulate**d―on her February 2009 trip to Asia, in Seoul ,Secretary of State Clinton noted that, “Successive administrations and Chinese governments have been poised back and f on these issues [human rights-related concerns], and whave to continue to press them. But our pressing on those issues can’t interfere with the global economic crisis, the global climate change crisis, and the security crisis.” **Beyond these overlapping strategic concerns is a more fundamental reality—both China and the United States are so preoccupied with their domestic problems, and so motivated to minimize the drain, or further drain, of foreign entanglements, that neither leadership believes that it can afford a major problem with the other**, though I have the lurking anxiety that Chinese have come to (mistakenly) believe that Washington “needs” Beijing more than vice versa. A January 2009 Pew public opinion poll reported that 71 percent of Americans wanted their incoming president, Barack Obama, to focus on domestic affairs—only 11 percent said the focus should be on foreign affairs.6 As for the Chinese, Beijing never tires of repeating the mantra that foreign policy provides an environment for the peaceful pursuit of domestic modernization .