

2001 Japan National Debate Tournament

Should Japan amend its Constitution so as to allow the threat or use of force for settling international disputes?

Sophia University A team vs. University of Tokyo A team

Verified by N.A.F.A. & Edited by Noriaki TAJIMA

Introduction

N.A.F.A.主催による2001年度の第19回Japan National Debate Tournamentは、5月12、13日に東日本予選(獨協大学)と西日本予選(大阪大学)が行われ、5月19日に全国予選とベスト12、20日に決勝トーナメント(ともに立命館大学)と、のべ6日間に渡って行われた¹。参加チームは、2001年度前期のJapan Debate Associationプロポジションである、“Resolved: That Japan should amend its Constitution so as to allow the threat or use of force for settling international disputes.”をめぐってディベートを行った。8試合の予選(6試合の地区予選および2試合の全国予選)のあと、ベスト12の変則トーナメントの中²、準々決勝そして準決勝を勝ち抜き決勝戦に駒を進めたのは、この試合で肯定側となった上智大学(A)チーム(森杏花、荒川知之)と、否定側となった東京大学(A)チーム(上島千尋、石井恒至)である。この試合のジャッジは、中山昇一(早稲田大学ESA OB)、中野翔氏(大阪外国語大学)、菅田琢磨(同志社大学)、安斎達裕(立命館大学)、神田晴彦(早稲田大学ESA)、その中の5人全員が否定側に投票し、東京大学(A)チームが優勝した。

ディベートのスピーチ内容³がこの後に続き、使用エビデンス一覧がその後に添えられている。使用されたエビデンスは、ディベーターの協力により試合で用いたものがそのまま引用されている。なお、使用された証拠資料に関して検証は行われていない。ここから証拠資料を採取する場合、ご自分で調査、確認の上使用していただきたい。

¹ トーナメントディレクターは、神田晴彦(早稲田大学ESA)および佐藤佳邦(大阪大学)である。

² この予選を勝ち残った12チームは、獨協大学(B)チーム、立命館大学(A)チーム、北九州市立大学(B)チーム、明海大学、東京大学(A)チーム、早稲田大学ESS(A)チーム、東北大学、大阪外国語大学、京都大学(B)チーム、上智大学(A)チーム、北九州市立大学(A)チーム、慶応大学ESS(A)チームであった。

³ この内容は、決勝戦に残った4人のディベーターの協力により録音テープからおこされたものである。意図しない明らかな誤りを除き、録音内容を出来るだけそのまま記載している。

First Affirmative Constructive Speech

Tomoyuki ARAKAWA, Sophia University

Before my 1st affirmative constructive speech, I would like to express thanks to Committee of N.A.F.A., who made every effort to prepare for this tournament, and great judges. Especially Sophia University (B) team and Dokkyo University (B) team, who surprisingly lost in quarterfinal. Last year, we Sophia University beautifully won the final round of J.N.D.T.. So, under the maxim that the history repeats itself, I will start to prove that the excellence in debate as the tradition at Sophia University with Observation. Japan cannot dispatch Self-Defense-Forces to overseas with the purpose of the use of force without amending its Constitution.

Prof. 戸波 98; The Constitution of Japan is interpreted not to allow the dispatch of SDF to overseas countries with the purpose of the use of force because it surpasses the limitation of SDF's duty as ability of "necessary degree for self-defense. Governmental interpretation is the same as this one. This is the conclusion that the Constitution of Japan abandons the right of collective self-defense . . . Like this, the Constitution of Japan dose not allow the participation in U.N Peace Keeping Operation or Peace Keeping Force.

[1AC 1]

Now, we suggest that the following plan be adopted. Japan shall amend its Constitution so as to allow the threat or use of force for settling international disputes.

A) Shall dispatch SDF to United Nations Peace-Keeping activities for settling international disputes for amending the Constitution.

B) Shall clarify that Japan undertakes its responsibility prescribed in security treaties it joins.

C) If necessary, the preparatory budget shall be used for military activity.

D) Shall distribute vaccines for HIV to all SDF members.

E) Necessary adjustment shall be taken.

AD1: Asia Panic A) explains the declining power of U.S.. 1. In the past, U.S. kept power balance in Asia. However, now, U.S. cannot keep it alone due to its declining power.

Prof. Syu this April; National power of U.S. is, . . . declining in these 50 years. At the same time, the way for U.S. to intervene in Asia or other regions itself has been also changing. Until the beginning of '80s, U.S. has been promoting its strategy to the world with its own military to keep the hegemony in Asia or in the world Probably from now on, U.S. will promote its own strategy by utilizing, . . . military of other countries much more. [1AC 2]

2. Therefore, U.S. demands Japan to strengthen the military role.

Prof. Syu this April; From the latter half of '90s, China has been expanding its military power. Therefore, to strengthen Japan-U.S. alliances has been clarified as one policy of U.S.. Considering the immediate policy of U.S. to Asia in this situation, U.S. will request Japan to strengthen the alliance further, and request Japan to play a military role further. [1AC 3]

3. However, present Constitution is the obstacle for the cooperation with U.S.. Cross Apply Observation. 4. It makes New Bush administration take negative attitude to the security of Asia.

Prof. Igarashi this April; Bush Administration has many professionals with much higher stability than Clinton Administration However, the only problem is that U.S. will take policies which are negative to multinational convention of security in Asia and which make much of the relationship with allies in order to develop foreign policies with very reliable basics. [1AC 4]

5. As a result, China is strengthening its military power by taking advantage of the decline of U.S..

Steven W. Mosher 2001; Chinese strategists argue that the United will be compelled in the years to come to withdraw from Asia and abandon its bases in the region. Without forward bases, America's fundamental weaknesses in logistics will be revealed, . . . China has convinced itself that it can get hegemony on the cheap. By enlarging its missile force and by modernizing its conventional forces sufficiently to overpower its smaller neighbors, China's leaders believe

that it effortlessly can enlarge its sphere of influence as America retreats. [1AC 5]

6. Moreover, other Asian countries have been expanding their military to counter China, which invites power imbalance in Asia.

Economist Hasegawa 96; Some of Asian countries think that they must take a positive attitude to China. Plainly speaking, all countries in East Asia have already started to strengthen its military. Therefore, the action of China is an important point that triggers arms race of such countries It causes very tensed situation in Asia. [1AC 6]

B) Power imbalance has invited poverty, which kills many.

Assistant Prof. Nakano 97; According to *World Children White Paper* in developing countries, 35 thousand children die every day because of malnutrition or disease which comes from poverty One of most crucial factors is the serious debt accumulation, and 2nd one is world military economy and arms trade, which are the biggest waste of human and material resources. [1AC 7]

C) Plan will keep the power balance in Asia. 1. After plan, Japan can exercise the threat or use of force for stabilizing Asia. Cross Apply Plan. 2. Japan will supplement the U.S. military because of its strongest military in Asia.

CIA report 2000; Japan has a small but modern military force, more able than any other does in Asia. Japan's future military strength will reflect the state of its economy and the health of its security relationship with the United States. Tokyo will increasingly pursue greater autonomy in security matters and develop security enhancements, to supplement the U.S. alliance. [1AC 8]

3. Therefore, Japan will revive power balance in Asia.

Professor Irie 96; If Japan decides to amend the Constitution, including Article 9, the alliance between Japan and the U.S. would at last be the real alliance. It would not only give good influence to the relationship between those two countries but also would contribute to the peacemaking of East North Asia and its surrounding. [1AC 9]

AD2: Peace of South East Asia. A) describes the necessity of PKF in South East Asia. 1. South East Asia needs PKF,

because of its explosive condition.

Writer Klein 2000; Like East Timor problem, . . . in Asia, there is no regionalism like Europe, and there are many sparks of narrow-minded nationalism here and there, and they are escalating in some countries, which has made them in an explosive situation. [1AC 10]

2. However, Japan cannot participate in PKF under the present Constitution. Cross Apply Observation. B) Present PKF triggers new conflicts in South East Asia. 1. People in South East Asia never rely on present PKF, because of their hatred to White People.

Political critic Inoue 99; The greatest problem of the East Timor international army is a multinational force, that the Australia army which is a white was the main force, and that the feeling of dislike and the distrust as opposed to a white are strong. Because there is a past when Indonesia was the colony of the Netherlands. [1AC 11]

2. Therefore, Present PKF, only by white people, triggers new conflicts with countries in South East Asia.

Political critic Inoue 99; It is in the nationalism problem of East Asia that PKF participation of Japan is important. The special feature of the nationalism of that place region is that the ethnic problem between a white and others is involved. There is also a deep-seated grudge of the old colony time by the West, and such nationalism tends to lead rioters to an anti-white and anti-European and American feeling. [1AC 12]

3. Moreover, South East Asia is the powder magazine in the world.

Prof. Shikata 96; 33% of arms in the world have gathered in Asia. At last, Asia began to become "the powder magazine in the world" . . . Although the ASEAN countries seem to cooperate on the surface, actually they are opposed to each other in the various interests. Especially, Malaysia has serious friction with Indonesia, Singapore, and Thailand . . . Thus, . . . they have never cooperated in respect of a security. [1AC 13]

C) attains smooth solution of South East Asian issue. 1. After plan, Japan will participate in PKF. Cross Apply Plan. 2. Japan's participation in PKF avoids creating such conflict with

people in South East Asia, because of their reliance on Japan.

Political Critic Inoue 99; The foreigner that Indonesia has reliance on is only Japan, who helped independence. Just by Japan's participating in the main part business of PKF, . . . smooth solution of the East Timor problem is attained." [1AC 14]

3. Actually, countries in South East Asia hope for it.

Ezratti & Sakurai 2000; There is also voice which welcomes reinforcement of power of Japan in Asia . . . Ex-deputy Prime Minister of Malaysia say the anger to Japan remained in father's generation but the present world is "different" from a long time ago. Prime Minister Mahathir of the same country desires reinforcement of the military strength [of Japan] strongly. [1AC 15]

Under view. 1. Now, there are vaccines to cure AIDS.

Reporter Wendy Pugh in 2000; Australian scientists are researching putting a measles gene into genetically modified food to provide an alternative to traditional vaccination against the virus . . . The Melbourne based team is starting to look at genetic modification for the HIV virus, which can lead to AIDS. [1AC 16]

Efficacy is empirically proven by many human testings.

Prof. Langridge 2000; Arntzen obtained reassuring results in human trial in 1997 volunteers who ate raw potatoes containing a benign segment of the e.coli toxin . . . since then, the group has seen immune reactivity in 19 of 20 people who ate a potato vaccine aimed at the Norwalk virus. Similarly, after Koprowski fed transgenic lettuce [TIME] carrying a hepatitis B antigen to three volunteers, two of the subjects, displayed a good systemic responses. [1AC 17]

That's all.

Cross-Examination

ISHII questioning ARAKAWA

Ishii(I): Okay, about your plan,

Arakawa(A): Year,

I: Sorry, observation, sorry. Maybe advantage 1 inherency is coming from the situation that Japan does not exercise

corrective self-defense, right?

A: Yeah,

I: And advantage 2 inherency is the PKF, under the command of UN, right?

A: Yeah, yeah,

I: Then, I want to confirm your plan, ah, about your C) "preparative budget shall be used for the military."

A: Yeah,

I: How much?

A: If the money is used for the military activity or weapon, preparatory budget, not which is used now, is used for the purpose.

I: About advantage 2, maybe you said that South East Asia is depended from other Asian country. Then as for C), what is the solvency about this point?

A: Solvency, solvency by,

I: So, why can you say that the use of force will solve this conflict?

A: Perception of South East Asian countries will change. Perception, to PKF will change.

I: Uh? Then, why Japanese use of force is necessary, existence of SDF is necessary?

A: Present PKF to South East Asia is composed only of white people. South East Asian country think that they will,

I: No, I'm talking about the solvency by Japan. How can Japan solve this problem?

A: So, by Japan's participating in PKF, they will believe that the PKF will work for them.

I: So what?

A: Therefore, they will stop to rush into the riot or the conflict.

I: Why?

A: Of course,

I: Okay, could you show me the reason why the present conflicts are occurring?

A: Present conflict? Now, first of all, there are many disputes in South East Asia, but we don't talk about that point. In disputes, present PKF, that is by only white people will go there,

I: Sorry, is there disputes in South East Asian countries?

A: Pardon?

I: Disputes are occurring in South East Asian countries, right? Then what is the cause of disputes? Maybe the PKF is to solve the disputes, right? In order to solve PKF,

A: Our advantage comes from avoiding, avoid the creation of conflict or riot by the people in East Asia.

I: No, no, no. Why the PKF exist now in South East Asian country?

A: Ah, now, for example, like East Timor problem, . . .

I: That means that the disputes are occurring, right?

A: Yeah,

I: What is the cause of these disputes?

A: Ah, A) 1st evidence prove that the, and B) 3rd evidence prove, that there are many struggling, struggle for interest or,

I: Religious, political, or territorial problem, right?

A: Yeah,

I: So, your plan does not solve this problem, right?

A: Ha?

I: Your plan does not solve the basic cause for the disputes, that is the political, economic, or territorial problem.

A: Yeah,

I: So you just talks about the PKF, disputes by the, disputes occurred by the white people and the South East Asian countries, right?

A: Yeah,

I: That is all your impact, right?

A: Yeah,

I: Okay, advantage 1, about C) 2nd evidence. 2nd evidence comes from the CIA report, right?

A: 1st evidence?

I: 2nd argument, Japan will be the supplement.

A: Yeah,

I: Okay. I want to confirm A). All of the inherency comes from the situation that China is expanding the military power, right? As for the impact, right?

A: Yeah, the 1st,

I: What is the motive of China to expand the power?

A: To get the hegemony in Asia.

I: Uh, is there any enemy of China? [TIME] Thank you.

First Negative Constructive Speech

Chihiro UESHIMA, University of Tokyo

On behalf of UTYO Falcons, we thank to N.A.F.A. committee, and honorable judges. My partner, Koji Ishii, came here Ritsumeikan University not to win J.N.D.T. tournament, but to meet Mai Kuraki. He is now waiting for her coming here to cheer him up. [Laughter] I start with the traditional disadvantage of UT, MOIA. Sorry, roadmap. Disadvantage, counter-plan, and then go to case attack, advantage 1 and advantage 2.

May I start? Disadvantage Ministry of Internal Affairs. A) Affirmative plan expands the authority of military power. B) It leads to MOIA revival.

Ohno 84; MOIA was different from other ministries such as

MOF or Ministry of Commerce and Industry in that it has a strong network of the police of the whole country and controlled the people with the power of the police. [INC 1]

C) Results in war.

Tawara 86; Ex-chief of MOIA severely blamed himself: police department of MOIA in prewar days had cooperate with the forces, frivolously, conformed to them and lead Japan to ridiculous war, they made Japan overrun. [INC 2]

Counterplan: Interpretation. Mandate: the Japanese government shall change the interpretation of constitution. Details are as follows.

1. Shall not change any sentence of article 9
2. The cabinet and the diet shall interpret as follows and shall officially announce it.
3. Shall interpret that Japan can exercise collective defense power.
4. Shall send SDF to PKF.

Observation 1: Non-topicality. Definition of amendment comes from

Longman Dictionary of the English Language 84; to alter esp. the wording of specific to alter legislation formally by modification, deletion, or addition, amend the constitution. [INC 3]

Definition of constitution comes from

Black's Law Dictionary 79; The written instrument embodying this fundamental law. [INC 4]

Thus, counterplan is non-topical because we do not change written document of constitution. Observation 2: competitiveness. 1. Mutually exclusive because it is impossible to amend and change interpretation at the same time. 2. Redundancy should be taken because if redundant plan exists, the need of the affirmative plan is denied. Observation 3. Solvency. The present constitution prohibits use of force only for invasion. Therefore, we can take the same action without amending constitution.

Kayama 98; there are steps in use of force in UN charter 1: war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as means of settling international disputes, 2: use of force as a means of defense when invaded by foreign countries, 3: use of force that UN takes military sanction

under the consensus of international society, . . . among them, 1 is the internationally force which violates internationally illegal use of force because it is included in renunciation of war. 2 is the use of defense right, which is allowed in international law and Japanese constitution. About this, when Japan concluded San Francisco Treaty, Japan clarified we have inherent right of individual or collective self-defense. About 3, though it is not considered at the time of enacting constitution, considering the duty of UN charter, it is clear what it is also constitutional. [INC 5]

Observation 4: superiority. A) Counterplan captures all their advantage. Cross Apply Observation 3. B) Changing interpretation is flexible. Amendment of constitution costs time and money.

大阪市経済局参事山内98; each procedure [of the referendum system] toward the determination of the will takes a large amount of time and money. So there is a fear that the effective and mobile execution of the administration, . . . will be prevented. [INC 6]

C) Counterplan takes less action, thus avoids unknown risk of changing the status quo. Then, go to advantage 1. As for advantage 1 A) 4th, they said Bush takes negative attitude toward Asian security, because Japan cannot cooperate or so. However, No. 1. Please check the evidence. They said the U.S. is taking negative attitude. However, they never said that the U.S. will never take action in Asia. Therefore, No. 2. the U.S. have the motive and change the diplomatic policy to suppress China.

The Daily Yomiuri 2001; The U.S. defense secretary Ramified has signaled to President Bush to press dramatic change in the U.S. military strategy with increased emphasis toward Asia The president agreed with the thrust of Ramified emphasis on China's growing military and economic importance and on all of Asia. [INC 7]

Moreover, No. 3. The U.S. is capable to keep the military balance in Asia.

CNN 2001; Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld had decided to abandon the so-called "two major war" strategy The "two war" strategy calls for the United States to maintain military strength sufficient to fight and win two major wars nearly simultaneously, such as a conflict in the Persian Gulf and on the Korean Peninsula. [INC 8]

This card means that the U.S. abandoned the “two complex strategy”. Thus she can concentrate on all military force in Asia, which was once divided to Europe and Asia. And the U.S. concentrate the military force to Asia. That means that her military force has been simply doubled in Asian pacific region. Therefore, no inherency.

As for their A) 6th, they said Asian countries expand armament. However, please check their card. Their card says that East Asian countries are already starting armament, and never says that they will continue expanding armament. Therefore, no inherency. Asian countries will not expand armament any more, because further armament is bad for the economy.

Sasaki 95; When we meet around the political leaders’ classes and the brains in East Asian countries, we know most people think that the U.S. should keep political and militaristic presence in East Asian pacific. While many people think ‘We should limit the front deploying basis of the U.S. forces to the existing size and we cannot accept new bases of the U.S. forces.’ They demand ‘The maintenance of the security umbrella by the U.S.’ Almost all think ‘Comparing with any scenario, the U.S. presence is more stable and secure and it is beneficial for their economic growth.’ [INC 9]

Therefore, it is beneficial in terms of economy to rely on the U.S. presence.

Then, go to advantage 2. As for advantage 2, as for their B) 1st, they said that conflict is occurring because of the hatred of the white people. However, No. 1, please check the reason. The reason is the memory of the colonial crime. Therefore, No. 2. Same thing is said to the Japan as well, because Japan has colonized South East Asia. Some part of South East Asia still cannot forget the conducts of Japan in World War II.

Nishinon Shinbun 97; Though the number of the answer, “there are some wrong aspect, but I don’t mind now” exceeds that of the answer, “I cannot forget the wrong aspects”, the criticism for “wrong aspects” increases in Singapore, Indonesia, and Thailand, . . . the survey showed that Japan cannot still achieve to bury the past. [INC 10]

Thus, no solvency. As for their B) 3rd, please check their card. No. 1. Their card just shows only the top leader’s opinion, and never shows the ordinary people’s opinion. Therefore, No. 2. please cross apply the card up above. The ordinary people will oppose to Japan Sending military forces cannot solve the

problem and rather give rise to another conflicts.

Kawamura 95; However, the lessons learned by these two PKO operations were a question: even if such unit were dispatched, does it really leads to true solution? Like in Somalia, there’s a reflection that after all the UN become party concerned, causing [TIME] a battle against a local armed force. [INC 11]

Cross-Examination

ARAKAWA questioning UESHIMA

Arakawa(A): May I ask?

Ueshima(U): Sure.

A: As for your disadvantage, what’s the initial linkage from the affirmative plan?

U: Linkage comes from the giving authority to some kind of organization.

A: What’s some kind of organization?

U: It is inevitable to give authority concentrate to certain organization, because if Japan allow the SDF as military, of course, as you know, the Secretary of Defense in America, right?

A: Why can you say is it impossible to concentrate on one place?

U: The authority will be given to,

A: Ah, thank you. What’s the 2nd linkage from giving authority to revival of MOIA?

U: Such organization will abuse the authority,

A: What’s the motive of MOIA?

U: Pardon?

A: What’s the motive of MOIA to go to war?

U: Too much concentration of the authority,

A: Thank you, as for your C) last evidence just explains the past in World War II, right?

U: Example of World War 2,

A: Uh, thank you, as for your AD 1. your 1st evidence, you said that the U.S. has motive and change the diplomacy.

U: Diplomatic policy.

A: Your evidence just say Bush change strategy. How can you deny our 1st evidence, how can you say they can stabilize Asia?

U: I denied it by the 2nd evidence. This evidence is about after the 50 years, after the World War 2, right? The U.S. power is declining in 50 years. And the U.S. has, . . .

A: Uh, thank you. Next evidence, the U.S. can keep power balance in Asia. I think your evidence also says strategy of the U.S. is changing. But you didn’t prove that Actually the U.S.

power is expanding. You didn't say so, right?

U: Actually the U.S. is what?

A: Actually you cannot say power of the U.S. is increasing.

U: But simply talking, military in Europe came to Asia. That means that the, . . .

A: How can you prove that the actually, actually, military power of the U.S. in Europe shift to Asia?

U: Because America, the U.S. emphasize the, . . .

A: I think the

U: Emphasize Asia, and concentrate the military force, . . .

A: How can you deny our A) 5th? Actually, the number of the U.S. base is decreasing. Ah, sorry your last evidence, Asian role, stops the arms race.

U: Yeah,

A: Your evidence talks about the situation of '95, right? 1995, right? I think the evidence say, Asian country demand security of the U.S. or something.

U: This evidence contents is, for Asian countries it is beneficial to rely on [TIME] the U.S. presence, . . .

Second Affirmative Constructive Speech

Kyoka MORI, Sophia University

1st, disadvantage, then, counterplan, and AD1, AD2. May I start? As for DA. My 1st argument is plan spike. Japan shall prohibit the establishment of MOIA, hence no link. Moreover, No.2. B) never says MOIA will revive. Hence, no initial link from the affirmative plan. Moreover, No.3. B) never says uniquely amendment of the constitution cause MOIA to such action. Moreover, No.4. Not unique. Already authority of ministry was expanded by the participation of PKO or New Guideline. Moreover, No.5. C) just assumes pre-war situation. Moreover No.6. No link. In present situation, fascism will never revive.

Professor Watanabe 97; There are two reasons. First reason is, . . .After the WW , due to the world trend, not only the countries like Japan, . . . the victorious nation became unable to have a colony and a sphere of influence any longer. The second reason is, the multinational companies which are promoting the present major power-ization of Japan do not want them Therefore, first, the present militarism supports the U.S. Forces, . . . based on the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty, and, next, mobilizes itself as a PKO unit. Therefore, even if called military powerization, there is no possibility of the revival of Great Japan Empire army like pre-war days. [2AC 1]

Then, my 7th argument is turnaround. I will add more advantage here. Power imbalance invites accidental war in Asia.

James Lee 99; Underlying much of the discussion on arms control, we find the widely accepted orthodoxy that arms races are by nature a kind of "action-reaction" phenomenon. Opposing states' responses to each other's buildups and attempts to reap advantage lead to destabilization and heightened tension. If war should come, it is argued, it will do so accidentally, in a climate of intensifying suspicion and as the result of critical misperceptions during a crisis. [2AC 2]

Then, go to counterplan. Observation 1. non-topicality. My 1st argument is,

Definition of "amend" from The Random House Dictionary of the English Language 87; amend; to alter, modify, rephrase, or add to or subtract from by formal procedure. [2AC 3]

Moreover, No. 2. We present

The definition of "constitution" from Random House Dictionary of the English Language 87; constitution; the system of fundamental principles according to a nation, state, corporation, or the like is governed [2AC 4]

Therefore C-P is topical because C-P alters or modifies the system of fundamental principles according to which Japan is governed by changing the interpretation of the Constitution. Please go to observation 2. Redundancy should be taken. However, my 1st argument is, redundancy should not be taken, because it does not negate the desirability of the affirmative plan. Of course, presumption of the topicality is on the affirmative, therefore, the burden of proof to exclude our definition is on the negative. Moreover, I present

The definition of should from Webster's New World Dictionary of American English 99; Should. Used to express obligation, duty, property, or desirability. [2AC 5]

Then, go to observation 3. they said, today's interpretation enable (to go to PKO). However, my 1st argument is, who said so? How is the participation of PKF or cooperation with the U.S. allow changing the interpretation. Moreover, No.2. Never

says, specifically, the participation of PKF or cooperation with the U.S. by armed force is possible. Generally says that interpretation can be changed, with no reason. Moreover, No.3. Check their card. Never assumed for article 9 including clause 2. Just assumes the interpretation of article 9 clause 1. Therefore, No.4. Considering the whole of article 9, specifically the constitution of Japan never allows the SDF to participate in PKF and cooperate with the U.S.. Cross Apply Observation. One more evidence supports.

Prof. Tonami 98 ; Considering the renunciation of all force and no recognition of even the right of belligerency in the Article 9 Clause 2 of the Constitution, the Constitution is interpreted to renounce all kinds of war, including self-defense war. [2AC 6]

This is the governmental interpretation. Therefore, No.5. there is no feasibility of counterplan. Counterplan cannot be taken without the amendment of the constitution. Moreover, I present the inferiority of the counterplan. 1. Changed interpretation have devastated the constitution and deprived the power of constitution.

Prof. Tonami 98; The contradiction between article 9 and SDF is basically due to the attitude of government who set up and maintained SDF by unreasonable interpretation. Thinking constitution theory, to leave the difference between the principle of constitution and the real constitution weakens the prescriptive power of constitution and foster violation of constitution by governments. And as a result, it would give bad influence to the nation's respectful spirit to constitution. [2AC 7]

Moreover, No.2. without prescriptive power of constitution, the society will be confused.

Nishibe 91; "Rule by rule" to have come to be carried out as the last wisdom of civilization, because human being is imperfect on the virtue and wisdom. Without "rule by rule", human beings will damage, betray, and abuse the rule and deceive each other. [2AC 8]

Then, go to observation 4. They said that time and money. However no impact was shown. Moreover, No.2. Fiat denies the superiority, because thanks to fiat, we argue the situation after the constitution is amended. Argument by the process of amendment is denied by fiat. Moreover No.3. Even if their analysis is true, counterplan is inferior because it misses the

chance to create new industry by national referendum.

As for advantage 1. Please extend A) 1st card indicating, now, because of declining power of the U.S., China expands military. On this point, they said the U.S. motive will change. However, my 1st argument is, they just show motive, never says the U.S. can stabilize Asia. Moreover, No.2. please extend A) 1st. actually, now, the U.S. power is declining and it causes expanding military of China. Moreover, No.3. please extend A) 5th card indicating that even 2001 China expands their military, and as they expand military, other Asian countries fear for China, expands their military. This is proven A) 6th. Moreover, please check their next card, the U.S. can stabilize. My 1st argument is, their card just says, conflict solves. Never says stabilize Asia. Therefore, No.2. extend A) 1st card indicating that now, actually, the U.S. power is declining and China will expand their military. This is the inherency and their argument cannot deny our inherency. Moreover, please check their next card on A) 6th. They said that Asia never expand their military. However, my 1st argument is, they just says economy is important. Never says, that they stop armament. Moreover, No.2. please extend A) 6th card indicating that now in 2001, Asian countries build up armament. No.3. Under the heavy armament, Asian countries concentrate on the use of money for military and money for other department like economy will stop.

Ebata, Critic of Military 94; Furthermore, Arms race creates the tension, makes the Asia-Pacific area unstable, and disturbs the Asian economic development. Countries in Asia-Pacific area change the present policy, which devotes their whole energies to the economic development, and perhaps, cannot but invest much capital for military. [2AC 9]

Therefore, the brink of military expenditure will be broken. Then, go to advantage 2. As for B) they said that memory of WW2. However, my 1st argument is they never assume after the WW2. Moreover, No.2. Please extend C) 1st card indicating, after WW2, only Japan helped the independence of such South East Asian countries, this is the reason they rely on Japan. Therefore, they cannot deny our solvency. Moreover, please check their next card, they said that Japan cannot achieve. However, my first argument is, they just said Japan cannot achieve varies of the past, they never say Japan doesn't have the reliance. Therefore, please extend the C) 1st card indicating that actually, South East Asian countries rely on Japan, because Japan helped [TIME] the independence of them.

Cross-Examination

UESHIMA questioning MORI

Ueshima(U): As for disadvantage, your turnaround says that the power imbalance invites war.

Mori(M): Yeah,

U: Could you tell me the linkage of this turnaround?

M: Linkage?

U: What does this card show?

M: If we amend the constitution, of course Japan cannot cooperate with the U.S. to stabilize in Asia, so it causes power imbalance in Asia, so it causes war, accidental war.

U: If we continue the status quo.

M: Yeah, without amendment of the constitution.

U: This card says that the arms race is action-reaction-phenomenon. Did you show that the Japanese militarization never cause arms race?

M: What do you mean by that? By taking our plan, Japanese militarization will be off.

U: Japan will have the rearmament after your plan.

M: Rearmament?

U: I mean, you allow the use and threat of force.

M: Yeah.

U: Did you prove that it will never trigger the, . . .

M: Such Japanese rearmament with corporation with the U.S. will change the perception of China and other Asian countries. China will give up building up armament, because China never compete with the U.S.-Japan's power.

U: Sorry, thank you. And as for advantage 2. my first card, I read the card that shows that the most people cannot forget the deed of Japan in WW2 time.

M: Yeah.

U: You said only Japan help independence or so.

M: Yeah.

U: Did you read any card that the Japan helped all of Asian countries' independence?

M: All of South East Asia? Actually, for example, C) 1st card indicating that Indonesia relies on Japan because it helped the independence of, . . .

U: Yeah, for example Indonesia. What about else?

M: Ah, I never showed the evidence of, . . .

U: And did you read the card that the conflict is arising in Indonesia?

M: A) 1st card indicating that there are many conflicts in South East Asia.

U: Never specified in Indonesia.

M: Indonesia, ah, oh, yeah.

U: As for advantage 1, you read the card that shows that the under the situation, the many will agree to answer, . . .

M: No, no, the country cannot pay attention to economy because they have fear to [TIME] be attacked from other countries. Thank you.

Second Negative Constructive Speech

Koji ISHII, University of Tokyo

Advantage 2, and advantage 1. Okay, go for the advantage 2. As for the C) 2nd, they argued that the Japanese participation avoid the conflict. However, I'll argue 1. Of course, no inherency, because evidence indicates, that the existence of Japanese people is enough. Because evidence indicates, that the Japanese people are trusted. That means if only we have the negotiation with these countries, of course it is enough to solve this problem. No evidence indicates that the use of force is necessary. My 2nd argument is that there is no proof that Asian countries would trust PKF itself. Evidence indicates that Japan is trusted, but there is no proof that the mixed PKF, that is the white and yellow will be trusted in South East Asian countries. They have to prove this point. My 3rd argument is turnaround. SDF will be killed in PKF.

Prof. Yamauchi 98; According to *Aratana Chousen ni Mukatte The Annual Report of the UN Activities 1995* mentioned above, between 1948 and 90, 398 people died in Peace Keeping Operations. However, only between '91 and '95, the number had increased to as many as 456. [2NC 1]

My 4th argument is minor repair. Japan shall participate in PKO as backup. This is enough. I'll argue feasibility.

Konishi 98; As accomplished fact has kept being heaped up without legal valid some as the case in Cambodia, . . . As for the Security Treaty and military problem, they freely do what the government thinks. Besides when the government becomes inconvenient they revise the law and make a new law. [2NC 2]

Evidence indicates, if Japan participate in the activity by the UN, PKF will be trusted, that means it is not necessary to use the force. That means Japan will participate as a backup and supplies the food or medicine, this is enough to guarantee their solvency. Of course, superiority comes from the 3rd argument in 2NC. Evidence indicates SDF will be killed if they go to the

dangerous area. That means that this is the superiority. Go to the advantage 1. As for the A) 1st argument, they argued that the U.S. power is declining. However, this evidence is too conclusional. Their evidence does not prove what happens and how the power is declining. They have to prove. That means this evidence is not reliable. Then as for the 5th argument, China is declining the power. However, I'll argue 1. This evidence indicates that China would believe the base will disappear. But never says actually disappear. Thus, 1AR speaker will deny this point. My 2nd argument is that they said the reason for expanding armament is they are abandoning the bases in Asian countries. That means that of course Japan cannot solve, because Japan doesn't have the bases in other Asian countries. That cannot be the solvency. My 3rd argument is that motive for China to expand military is to unify Taiwan.

Journalist Gertz 2001; the internal Chinese military document declared that "a most important task of the communist party of China is the reunification of Taiwan" and that all military units, 60th combat and noncombat, must "be well-prepared for the war based on the rapidly-changing relationship with Taiwan." To resolve Taiwan issue and achieve the reunification as soon as possible not only involves our sovereignty and national dignity. [2NC 3]

Then, I'll argue 4. In case of the unification of Taiwan, China will never compromise.

Editor Fareed 2001; . . . most people concerned to the Chinese government seemed to think they can't avoid conflict with the U.S. about Taiwan problem. They are well aware of the possibility of being defeated. It seems that the risk of taking no action is bigger than that of taking action. [2NC 4]

Then, as for the 6th argument. They argued that the other Asian countries are expanding. However, of course this evidence kills solvency, because evidence indicates the difference of the military power causes the tension. That means even after the plan, China will continue to have the present military power, that means the difference of power will continue to happen. That means the tension will not be solved as for other Asian countries. At least there is no specific linkage about this argument. As for their C) 2nd argument, they argued that the Japan will be the supplement. However I'll argue 1. there is no proof that China will fear the existence of Japanese SDF. That could be the solvency. My 2nd argument is that this evidence assumes till now Japan cannot have the enough power. There is

need to succeed from now on. My 3rd argument is the PMA. Japanese force will decline from now on. The same source of their C) 2nd concludes as follows.

CIA report 2000; In the view of many experts, Japan will have the difficulty maintaining its current position as the world's 3rd largest economy Tokyo has so far not shown a willingness to carry through the painful economic reforms necessary to show the erosion of its leadership role in Asia. In the absence of an external shock, Japan is similarly unlikely to accelerate changes in security policy. [2NC 5]

Okay, my 4th argument is that their C) 3rd evidence just indicates Japan should participate, but never says that Japan's participation can solve this problem. In this sense that cannot be the solvency. My 5th argument is that China would easily outweigh the military power of Japan because Chinese economy is going well.

CIA 2000; China has been riding the crest of significant wave of economic growth for two decades China can maintain a growth rate of 7 percent or more for many years. Such impressive rates provide a foundation for military potential, and some predict that China's rapid economic growth will lead to a significant increase in military capabilities. [2NC 6]

That means that even if Japan exists, China don't have to fear for Japanese existence. They will just wait for some years, and they can easily outweigh the power of Japan, this is enough. My 6th argument is, moreover, cross apply my argument in A), China will cause war for Taiwan. At that time, the U.S. will intervene.

Nikkei Newspaper this year; . . . "Does the U.S. have obligation to guard Taiwan if they are attacked?" he answered at once, "Yes, China should understand that." These comments confirm the basic of "strategic ambiguous policy" by which they don't obviously support Taiwan independence and at the same time, imply the use of force for China's military action. [2NC 7]

My 7th argument is that Japan would be involved after the plan, because Japan is the alliance of the U.S..

Asai 2000; Now China has one hundred and tens of nuclear missiles whose shooting range includes the whole land of

Japan. Japan will be the target of these nuclear missiles if Japan will be the ally of the U.S. in the war between the U.S. and China. [2NC 8]

My 8th argument is uniqueness of this turnaround. Japan is not regarded as force in the status quo. Because Japan does not exercise the collective self defense.

Critic Okazaki this year; The most strange point of Far East military balance is that the strong military power of Japan is counted as zero. [2NC 9]

Of course this impact is enough to outweigh the advantage 1. Because advantage 1 is just delay the expansion of armament to some extent, because China can anyway expand the armament by its own economy, they don't have motive to stop armament. Because China has strong motive for the reunification of Taiwan. That means, solvency for advantage is quite small. But incase of the turnaround, there is clear difference between the status quo and after the plan, because there is no risk that Japan is involved, but after plan Japan will be surely the target of nuclear missile, that means in terms of possibility this turnaround easily outweighs. Okay, my 9th argument is also PMA. Now, People's Liberation Army depends on a military unification.

Economist Hasegawa 96; Soviet Union collapsed and started to do business with the U.S.. At this situation, the PLA must establish the reason why they must exist. They have a stronger sense of mission that they still have important task of unification of Taiwan with their mother country, . . . [2NC 10]

My 10th argument is that it is independent from the government. That means that governmental motive is irrelevant to the act of the PLA.

Economist Hasegawa 96; The People's Liberation Army has been more powerful than leaders in Beijing. In summer 1995, the matter which China's military fired a missile to Taiwan Straight occurred. In this time it was said that the People Liberation Army informed the fact for Beijing after they fired. Like that the People Liberation Army took a initiative about this summer. [2NC 11]

That means that there is no evidence talking about PLA will give up the motive for the reunification. That means that that cannot be the solvency. Moreover, all of the advantage comes

from the situation China is expanding the armament, if only China continue to have the armament, of course there would be no solvency.

Disad, bureaucrats. A) Affirmative plan is against bureaucrats.

Miyamoto 96; Bureaucrats have to make the responsibility unclear even for special individual or section anyway. Keep the present situation is an iron rule. [2NC 12]

B) It leads to political instability.

Wolfen 94; If a cabinet ministry sticks to exercise the power, . . . it will be inevitable to meet bureaucrat's sabotage, which we cannot look down on. [2NC 13]

C) Results in War.

James 90; An unstable government is always exposed to the danger that it is overthrown by domestic or foreign violence.[2NC 14]

That's all.

Cross-Examination

MORI questioning ISHII

Mori(M): As for your Disadvantage, bureaucrats, what is the uniqueness?

Ishii(I): Your plan changes the status quo by fiat. So bureaucrats get angry.

M: Why?

I: Because bureaucrats don't want to change the present condition.

M: So it's proven in A) card.

I: Yeah.

M: Bureaucrats never change the present situation.

I: Even if the policy is changed in status quo, this is initiated by the bureaucrats. But your plan will change the policy by fiat. So this is dangerous. Natural change of the policies is not problem in case of this disadvantage.

M: Then, advantage 1. On your 2nd argument on A) 5th, you said basis or something, . . .

I: I have 4 argument on this point. Which one do you want to know?

M: You said without basis we cannot solve, . . .

I: Ah, yes, your evidence indicates that the bases in Asian

countries except Japan are disappearing. So China is target of other Asian countries, and is going to attack. Japan doesn't have the bases there.

M: C) 2nd, what did you say in 2nd argument?

I: 2nd argument is the no proof this will continue from now on.

M: So as for your 3rd card in C), you said China attack Taiwan, . . . ?

I: 3rd, . . . ah, the U.S. will intervene. This is the 3rd card.

M: On your 1st card in AD 1, China has motive to attack Taiwan.

I: Yes.

M: Why?

I: Because China think Taiwan is one part of China. But the U.S. doesn't agree this point. So China will forcibly try to unify Taiwan.

M: So the armament or the means of force is needed to unificate Taiwan.

I: Yes, that's right.

M: So even after the plan, China will never give up to expand hegemony.

I: Yes, that's right.

M: On your last argument, government is irrelevant or something. What do you mean by?

I: So PLA, People Liberation Army, that is the military force in China. Since it is independent from the government, military force just think of reunification of Taiwan.

M: PLA want to unificate Taiwan?

I: Yes.

M: So governmental will is irrelevant.

I: Even if you said that you can suppress or threaten China,

M: Only PLA want to unificate Taiwan?

I: No, no, no, both of the government and [TIME] PLA want to unificate, . . .

M: Thank you.

First Negative Rebuttal Speech

Chihiro UESHIMA, University of Tokyo

Advantage 1 and advantage 2.

May I start? As for advantage 1, please extend my 1st and 2nd card I read in INC. I read the cards that show that the U.S. have the motive to suppress China, moreover she's capable to keep present military power in Asia because she abandoned too complex strategies to concentrate the military force in Asia. On this point, they argued that the we cannot deny the declining power of the U.S.. However, as I said this card never assume after the changing the diplomatic policy of America. This card

just says that the in 50 years the U.S. power is declining.

Therefore, the U.S. concentrated the military in Asia. This card never assume after the change of diplomatic policy. Please simply extend my partner's card check, . . . yeah. They extend that the A) 5th card. They said that China is expanding the military. We never denied that the actual declining power of America. However, this card just shows the expectation of one person. Therefore, this card never shows actually the U.S. bases have disappeared from Asia. Therefore, please simply extend my 2nd card in INC. The U.S. has abandoned too complex strategy, concentrated the military in Asia. Moreover, they never prove that the even after the concentrating most part of military to Asia, it can be deterrence to China, because even if the U.S. power is declining, they never denied that China aim at expanding military even if they confront with the concentrating military power of the U.S.. Moreover, as for A) 6th, I said that the Asian countries cannot expand the armament any more because of the economical reason. On this point, they said that we never said that actually Asian countries will stop the arms race or so. On this point they read the part that under the severe condition, they cannot think of economy or so. However, assumption is the under the severe situation, like the suppress of China will cause arms race. Thus it is denied by the argument up above because the U.S. stabilize Asian-pacific region. Moreover, this card that 2AC speaker read just shows the expectation of 1 person. However please extend my 3rd card in INC. This card shows, . . . their card is just theory, never shows actually they give up the economy. However, our card is actual voice of Asian country's leader. Therefore, top leader said that the economy is top priority. Please keep in your mind. Then as for advantage 2. on B) 1st they said our card just assumes after WW2, only Japan helps the independence or so. However this can apply to Indonesia, but how about other countries? They never prove this point, please. Therefore any argument in 1AR should be new. Moreover, as for this 1st card in INC, we never denied Japanese reliance or so. However, please simply extend 1st card in INC. Statistically, ordinary people have the fear and armies are against Japan because they never forget the deed of Japan in WW2. Therefore, of course in terms of dispatching the force to foreign countries, it is ordinary people that confronts with these armies. Actual voice of top leader can't deny this argument. Moreover please extend my 3rd and 4th argument on INC. Conflict will rather aggravate because Asian people have the resistance to Japanese people because they have the memory of wartime. Therefore, conflict will rather aggravate. This turnaround can flip advantage 2. That's all.

First Affirmative Rebuttal Speech

Tomoyuki ARAKAWA, Sophia University

Disadvantage 1, MOIA. And disadvantage 2 bureaucrats, and advantage 2 and advantage 1. May I start?

As for disadvantage 1 MOIA. Please extend the 6th argument in 2AC. In present situation there is no link to war, because now the multinational companies support the Japanese militarization however they don't want to go to war. Therefore no linkage at all.

Go to disadvantage 2, bureaucrats. My 1st argument is examine their B), their evidence never say uniquely amendment of the constitution invites sabotage. Therefore, my 2nd argument is not unique. Bureaucrats are already losing incentive.

Asahi Newspaper 99; In recent years, because of scandal about bureaucrats, people's distrust toward them is spreading, so they are completely losing incentive. They don't even stop policies even if such policies are in the wrong direction . . . It is very unfortunate that bureaucrats have to turn their efforts into jobs against their will. [1AR 1]

Moreover, my next argument is no link. Cross Apply C) after taking affirmative plan, much better relations between Japan and the U.S. kill the link to impact. It will stabilize.

Go to advantage 2. Firstly, as for 2NC argument, first evidence, turnaround. They said SDF will be killed. My first argument is, of course their evidence never says, after taking affirmative plan, the danger will be escalated. Therefore, even under the status quo, Japan will go to PKO. Moreover, my 2nd argument is not unique. Even without Japan's participating, other countries go to PKO. Therefore, if we keep the status quo, people in other countries die instead of Japan. Therefore, not unique at all. In terms of the quality of death, Moreover, my 3rd argument is, of course, quality of life; human life is equal whether it is Japanese or not. Therefore, no impact. Moreover, INC 2nd evidence, they said turn, aggravate conflict. My 1st argument is of course completely irrelevant because they just prove the conflict will be aggravated. Therefore, not unique to the affirmative plan, because other countries already intervene in conflict. My 2nd argument is of course our advantage comes from avoiding conflict between white people and South East Asia. Of course we avoid such conflict before it happens. Therefore, completely irrelevant.

Go to AD 1. Firstly, I will refute 2NC argument. Firstly as for A) 1st, they said our evidence is too conclusive or something. My 1st argument is extend my A) 1st evidence indicating that

until 1980 the U.S. had stabilized Asia alone. Therefore, power reached peak. Therefore, they lose power. Therefore, extend A) 2nd. Therefore, the U.S. demand Japan to strengthen military. This is the inherency. Moreover, as for A) 5th, 2NC said already the number of bases will be decreasing therefore PMA, or something. My 1st argument is, of course, they completely granted that the number of bases itself will be decreasing. Therefore, my 2nd argument is extend C), of course they misunderstand our solvency. Of course after taking affirmative plan Japan will supplement the U.S. military, and relationship between Japan and the U.S. will be better. Therefore, Japan and the U.S., this cooperation will stabilize Asia, this is solvency. And 2nd evidence, they said now the motive of China is to unify Taiwan and they will expand military. Please group up two pieces of evidence. My 1st argument is of course they never showed the latest situation. Therefore my 2nd argument is no inherency. In this January, Taiwan accepted unification.

James Conachy This January; The governments of both Taiwan and China have made significant political overtures to one another in the past weeks that appear intended to dissipate tension in Taiwan Strait . . . Beijing accepted the proposal by the Taiwanese government to open up "mini-links". Since 1949, the authorities on Taiwan have prohibited any direct trade, postal services or travel between the island and mainland China. (Omit) Beijing has agitated for direct links in order to draw even greater investment from Taiwan and to bind the two states closely together economically, thereby advancing its goal of reunifying the island politically with the mainland. [1AR 2]

Ah, so A) 6th, 2NC said kill solvency, even after taking affirmative plan China has the presence. My 1st argument is of course it's wrong. Extend A) 5th, now because of the declining of the U.S., China will be expanding more and more. However, extend C), after taking affirmative plan Japan and the U.S. will stabilize therefore, other Asian countries' fear to China will be solved. Moreover as for C) please group up the 1st to 3rd evidence, they said Japan has no power to stabilize Asia. My 1st argument is of course over-claimed. Their evidence never says Japan has no power, just say Japan is under the economic reform. Moreover, evidence just assumes status quo, moreover extend C), of course they misunderstand. after taking affirmative plan, Japan's cooperation with the U.S. will solve. Moreover my 3rd argument is, as long as money is problem, we shall plan spike. We shall publish national bond for military activities. On next argument, they said China's economy is growing more and more. My 1st argument is of course we

didn't talk about China is unreasonably increasing their military. By China's military expenditure, please extend A) 6th, because of fear for China, therefore, other Asian countries are expanding more and more. This perception of other Asian countries is the key to linkage. Next argument they said Japan will be involved in war. However, of course not unique. They didn't prove that if we don't Japan is not involved, other countries will be involved. Group up last 2 pieces of evidence. Of course reason is unification of Taiwan, . . . therefore [TIME] no inherency Taiwan accepted the unification.

Second Negative Rebuttal Speech

Koji ISHII, University of Tokyo

I'll start with advantage 2, and advantage 1. Okay, affirmative gave up advantage 2, that means the possibility of defending advantage 1. but the advantage 1 is quite slight, that means impact of turnaround is enough to outweigh. Go for the advantage 2.

They dropped the PMA in 1NR. Extend 1NR. We said that the Japanese people already feared that the ordinary citizens fear. This argument is granted. That means that there is no solvency because even if Japan should participate, ordinary people will fear. This argument is granted. Any refutation shall be new. My next argument is, extend 2NC 1st argument indicating, that there is no inherency because C) evidence assumption is that Japanese participation or existence of Japan is enough. That means in the status quo, peaceful negotiation that is not necessary to use force. That means there is no inherency at all. Moreover, extend our minor repair, we carry out the back up of PKO. We'll participate PKO as backup and we'll not use the force. This argument is completely granted. Then, extend the 3rd argument in 2NC. SDF will be killed in the dangerous area. On this point affirmative argued that it is not unique. However, of course plan is going to increase the number of the people in South East Asian countries as PKF. That means of course link is unique to this point. Their 2nd argument is other countries are doing and going well. However, my 1st argument is that other countries will decrease the number of soldiers after the plan. That means of course as for other countries, there would be no difference, but as for the frontier-Japan, plan by all [unintelligible] will increase, that means linkage is unique. Of course it is enough to outweigh advantage 1 and advantage 2. because advantage 1 is quite slight risk of war. But you cannot know to what extent, the people will be killed. But in case of SDF, it will surely happen. That means in terms of the possibility, impact of turnaround

outweighs advantage 1 and advantage 2.

Go for the advantage 1. Okay, I'll argue no inherency. First, extend our argument in 2NC against A), we said there is no proof how the power is declining. They argued that the U.S. cannot do alone but this evidence does not show how the situation has changed in these years. That means this cannot be the inherency. My 2nd argument is, thus extend 1NR argument. We said in the 1NR that the U.S. is concentrating the bases in the Asian countries. These arguments are granted. In the past, the U.S. had the bases in European countries and Asian countries, that means that military power is declined to half, but from now on the power of the U.S. will be twice. That means that of course its percentage urges China to these twice power. Of course there is no proof that China will continue to have armament, even after the situation that the U.S. have two-times armament. Therefore there would be no solvency. Then my next argument is the preemption. They might extend A) Bush is taking the negative attitude. However, they granted the card attack in 2NC. Please extend the card attack in 2NC. Evidence indicates that China has Asian countries' belief that these bases will disappear but it never says it actually decreases. This is just the concept of Asian countries but it is not the policy of the U.S. government. That means, Cross Apply up above. The U.S. government is already taking the policy to suppress China. That means this is enough to kill their inherency completely, because A) evidence indicates, till now in the past it excluded enough military power. There was no militarization. That means we just go back to the past situation, because the U.S. has two times of power. That means this is enough to kill their inherency. Then, as for next argument, reunification of Taiwan will be done. However, my first argument is of course this evidence kill the inherency. Because please extend our 2NC argument. Motive of the militarization is Taiwan. Affirmative has no other motive for the militarization. That means that from now on Taiwan will be reunified, but China don't have any reason to expand their military any more because in this sense the motive of expansion of armament just depends on the reunification of Taiwan. But it will disappear from now on. That mean China will lose the motive for expanding the armament, that means, this will kill the inherency completely because no motive of expansion, this is enough. Go to the 6th argument. They argued other Asian countries do,. However, please extend 2NC argument. We said the difference of power will cause the tension. That means of course the difference of the power will continue to have even after the plan. That means there is no solvency as for other Asian countries. Go to C). Okay, I'll argue that Japan will be involved because from now on the

possibility will increase because from now on if China has motive of war and expansion of the armament will be succeeded, us will intervene. Extend our 6th argument in 2NC. At that time China and Japan will be involved. On this point they argued not unique. Japan will be involved in status quo. However, of course no proof about the non-uniqueness argument. My 2nd argument is thus extend the next argument in 2NC. Evidence said Japan will is not regarded to have force, because Japan does not participate in collective self defense, that mean there is no reason to be attack Japan, but after the plan, Japan will be the part of the U.S., that means if the U.S. intervenes the war, of course Japan will be the target of the missile. Evidence indicates, China is going to shoot the missiles to the [TIME] . . . thank you.

Second Affirmative Rebuttal Speech

Kyoka MORI, Sophia University

Advantage 2 and advantage 1. As for advantage 2 please check the turnaround presented by 2NC, they said SDF will be killed or something, however, please extend my partner's 2nd argument indicating not unique even now PKO goes therefore not unique. Moreover, please extend my partner's next card indicating other countries will go, therefore, unique impact is very vague. Moreover, priority of the life is the same even if he is a foreigner. Moreover, as for turnaround presented in 1NC, aggravate or something. However, please extend my partner's 2nd argument indicating that our inherency is that we can avoid conflict before created. Therefore, irrelevant. Then go to advantage 1.

Advantage 1, please extend A) 1st card indicating that now because of declining power of the U.S., China will expand their military. On this point they said the U.S. have motive or something. However, please extend the 1st card in 1NC. They never say that, ah, . . . no. 2nd argument indicating that the even now the U.S. power is declining. Please extend A) 5th card indicating that even 2001, the China's military is expanding because of the declining power of the U.S.. She wants to get the hegemony in Asia, this is the reason why China expands their military, on this point they said the U.S. can stabilize or something. On this point please extend A) 2nd card indicating that now the U.S. demands Japan to strengthen military power. Therefore, this card is enough to prove the declining power of the U.S.. The U.S. demand on, . . . the U.S. on Japan to supplement to declining power. Moreover, please extend A) 3rd card, constitution is obstacle. Therefore, please extend A) 5th card indicating that China expands military. Moreover, please

extend A) 6th card indicating that other countries expand their military because of fear of China. On this point, they said in 2NC that China never stops or something. However, please simply extend 1AR 1st card indicating Taiwan accepted the unification of China. So all of below turnaround is caused from China-Taiwan war. So by this card we cut the linkage of all turnaround in down below. Moreover, they said this card kills inherency or something. However, please simply extend A) 5th card indicating that China wants the hegemony of Asian countries. Therefore, this is the motive of expanding military of China. Then go to the B). B) impact is completely granted. Therefore, now because of arms race, 35 thousands of children everyday. Because of military economy and arms race. On this point, they said that the because of economical problem, never expand or something. However, please extend 2AC 1st card indicating that under arms race or such dangerous situation, country cannot worry about the economy, because of fear to other countries. Therefore, inherency remains. Then, go to C). C) presents solvency. Solvency is that the after plan, Japan can exercise the use of force, and co-operate with the U.S.. Therefore, Japan can cover the declining power of the U.S.. So the U.S. can stabilize Asia again. This is the reason why China is expand the armament is the declining power of the U.S.. However by participation of Japan with cooperating with the U.S., make China give up the hegemony in Asia. This is the solvency. Moreover, please extend the C) 1st card indicating that Japan has strong enough military power therefore enough to cover the U.S. declining power. Moreover, please extend C) 2nd card indicating that by participation of Japan U.S.-Japan can make peace of Asia. Therefore, in terms of quantity, our AD 1 outweighs the turnaround shown in advantage 2. Because now 35 thousand children die everyday because of arms race. This is a great impact. However, they never showed the clear number [TIME] of the unique impact of turnaround. Therefore, please vote for the affirmative.

Evidence Read in Final Round

1AC

- 1: 戸波江仁 / 早稲田大学法学部教授 『憲法』 1998年 p.101,102
- 2: しゅうけい、東洋学院大学教授、『世界』 2001年4月号、東京、岩波書店、219頁。
- 3: しゅうけい、東洋学院大学教授、『世界』 2001年4月号、東京、岩波書店、220頁。
- 4: いがらしたけし、東京大学教授、『世界』 2001年4月号、東京、岩波書店、219頁。
- 5: Mosher, Steven W. 2001 /Insight on the news line/
URL:<http://www.insightmag.com/archive/200104315.shtml>
- 6: はせがわけいたろう、エコノミスト 『ゆうじのあじあ』 1996年、124-125頁。
- 7: なかのよういち、きゅうしゅうこくさいだいがくじょきょうじゅ 『ぐんかくとひんこんのせかいけいざいるん』、93頁。
- 8: CIA report 2000
URL:<http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/globaltrends2015/index.html#link12/12, <March,2001>>
- 9: いでたかのり、教授、『日米安保条約と日本国憲法』、PHP研究所、157頁。
- 10: Kleinたかこ、ノンフィクション作家、『だからのはげいにほんこくけんぼう』 2000年、120頁。
- 11: 井上茂信、政治批評家、『思想新聞』、1999年10月15日号、視点論点 URL:
<http://www.ifvoc.gr.jp/1999/newpage230.htm>
- 12: 井上茂信、政治批評家、『思想新聞』、1999年10月15日号、視点論点 URL:
<http://www.ifvoc.gr.jp/1999/newpage230.htm>
- 13: 志方俊之、帝京大学教授 『極東有事』 (株)クレスト社、1996年、133-134頁。
- 14 井上茂信、政治批評家、『思想新聞』、1999年10月15日号、視点論点
URL: <http://www.ifvoc.gr.jp/1999/newpage230.htm>
- 15: Milton・エズラティ、ロードアベット社 シニア・エコノミスト兼ストラテジスト、桜井よしこ、ジャーナリスト 『もう日本は黙っていない』 2000年、233-234頁。
- 16: Pugh, Wendy, reporter. *Daily News*, 01.30.2000, URL:
<http://dailynews.yahoo.com/h/nm/20000128/sc/health-gmo-1.html>
- 17: Langridge, William, Professor at Loma Linda University of Medicine in Gene Therapy.
URL: www.sciam.com/0900issuelangridge.html

1NC

- 1: おおのたつぞう、批評家 『警察と市民の人権』 みずち書房、257頁。

- 2: 田原総一郎、批評家 『警察官僚の時代』 講談社、144頁。
- 3: *Longman Dictionary of the English Language*, 1984, p.45
- 4: *Black's Law Dictionary*, 5th ed., 1979, p.306.
- 5 香山健一、1998年、
URL:www.golcom.ac.jp/proj/kouyama/all/A_folder/A92_03_27/A_92_03_27p171.htm
- 6 大阪市経済局参事 山内健生、『自治研究』 73巻8号 (1998年8月号)、良著普及会、86頁。
- 7 *The Daily Yomiuri*, (in which Koresawa-san is the Champ) March 24th 2001, p.4.
- 8 CNN 2001 May 7th,
URL:www.cnn.com/2001/ALLPOLITICS/05/07/pentagon/index.html
- 9 ささきよしひさ 『しんちつじょへのみち』 中央公論社、339-340頁。
- 10 西日本新聞、1997年5月16日、URL:
www.nishinippon.co.jp/media/news/9705/0516s.html
- 11 川村享夫、国連ニューヨーク本部法務担当官 『日本人の知らない国連』、ダイヤモンド社、81頁。

2AC

- 1: わたなべおさむ、一橋大学教授、『にほんのたいこくかはなにをめぐすのか』 36頁。
- 2: James Lee '99/ Canadian Library of the Parliament, Political and Social Affairs Division/ 15 February 1999
URL: www.parl.gc.ca/information/library/PRBpubs/8713-e.htm <010410>
- 3: *The Random House Dictionary of the English Language* 1987, p.66
- 4: *The Random House Dictionary of the English Language* 1987, p.436
- 5: *Webster's New Dictionary of American English*, Merriam Webster's Inc., 1999, p.1242.
- 6: 戸波江仁、早稲田大学法学部教授 『憲法』 (株)ぎょうせい、1998年、96頁。
- 7: 戸波江仁、早稲田大学法学部教授 『憲法』 (株)ぎょうせい、1998年、110頁。
- 8: 西部邁、元東京大学教養学部教授、『私の憲法論』 (株)徳間書店、17頁。
- 9: えばたけんすけ、軍事評論家 『エコノミスト』 1994年9月6日号、41頁。

2NC

- 1: やまうち恒久、教授、『恒久世界平和のために』、ケイソウ書房、264頁。
- 2: 小西誠、軍事問題研究者 『自衛隊の周辺事態出動～新ガイドライン下の変貌～』 社会評論社、28頁。

- 3: Grets, Bill, journalist and the defense and national security reporter for the Washington Times. *The China Threat* Regner Publishing Inc.. p.XX
- 4: Fareed, Editor. *Newsweek* 日本語版, 2001年4月18日号、毎日新聞社、29頁。
- 5: CIA report, 2000
URL:www.cia.gov/publications/globaltrends2015/index.html#ink12/
- 6: CIA report, 2000
URL:www.cia.gov/publications/globaltrends2015/index.html#ink12/
- 7: 『日本経済新聞』2001年4月26日号、7頁。
- 8: 浅井基文、明治学院大学国際学部教授、『中国をどう見るか』高文研、132頁。
- 9: おおざきひさひこ、ひょうろんか 『アジアにも半世紀の平和を』36頁。
- 10: はせがわけいたろう、国際経済学者、Richard, C. Koo, Charge Researcher at Nomura General Institute, 『ゆうじのあじあ』62-63頁。
- 11: はせがわけいたろう、国際経済学者、Richard, C. Koo, charge researcher at Nomura General Institute, 『ゆうじのあじあ』62頁。

- 12: 宮本政於、元厚生省検疫課長、『官僚の官僚による官僚のための日本?』講談社文庫、1996年、44頁。
- 13: Wolfen, フリー・ジャーナリスト 『日本権力構造の謎』早川書房、1994年、103頁。
- 14: James, Expert of War Simulation. 『戦争回避のテクノロジー』川出書房、1990年、42-43頁。

1AR

- 1: 『朝日新聞』1999年1月6日号、7頁。
- 2: James Conachy World Socialist Web Site, *Taiwan and China act to open direct contacts and ease tensions*.
Uploaded in 2001.1.12
URL: http://www.wsws.org/articles/2001/jan201/taiw-j12_prn.shtm <downloaded in 01.05.14>

注：記載は、英語、日本語MLA様式に従い行いましたが、スクリプトに直したときに対戦時のブリーフから抜けているものは外れています。日本語証拠資料の出典がローマ字記載のものはひらがなに直してあります。

(N.A.F.A.出版会)