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**South Korea**

**Update**

Strategy

Many affirmatives this year advocate removing troops from South Korea. Because of recent developments on the Korean peninsula, it is a good idea to have up-to-date evidence on the issue. In this file we have included recent cards on why we should leave South Korea and evidence for the negative discussing why, in light of recent events, it is important to remain in South Korea.
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# The U.S. Military Should Leave South Korea

U.S. prolongs the conflict and puts our troops at risk.

**Paul, 11/30**

**“Don't Start Another Korean War”** – U.S. Rep. Ron Paul (R-TX) <http://www.lewrockwell.com/paul/paul707.html>

11/30/10- Before the US House of Representatives on the resolution condemning North Korea

Mr. Speaker, I rise in **opposition** to this **saber-rattling resolution that unnecessarily escalates tensions between North and South Korea and may in fact put U.S. troops stationed in the area at risk.** This resolution portrays the recent hostilities between the two Koreas as "an unprovoked military attack'' by North Korea, which is untrue. **We know that South Korea was conducting live fire military exercises in the vicinity of disputed territory and that this action, taken with U.S. military support and participation, likely led to the exchange of gunfire between the two sides.**

As the resolution states, the "USS George Washington Carrier Strike Group is conducting exercises with Republic of Korea naval forces in the waters west of the Korean Peninsula.'' **Let us for a moment imagine the Chinese military holding joint exercises with Venezuela off the Texas coast. Might that be viewed as provocative by the United States?** This is not to excuse or endorse the actions of the North Korean military, which are certainly regrettable, but it is important to accurately portray the events.

This resolution is long on inaccuracies and hyperbole but it avoids the real issue, which is **why, more than fifty years after the end of the Korean war, the American taxpayer is still forced to pay for the U.S. military to defend a modern and wealthy South Korea.** **The continued presence of the U.S. military as a "tripwire'' to deter North Korea is ineffective and dangerous.** It is designed to deter renewed hostilities by placing American lives between the two factions. As we have seen recently, South Korean leaders, emboldened by the U.S. protection, seek to provoke North Korean reaction rather than to work for a way to finally end the conflict. **The U.S. presence only serves to prolong the conflict, further drain our empty treasury, and place our military at risk.** I encourage my colleagues to reject this jingoistic resolution and instead use our Constitutionally-granted authority to finally **end the U.S. military presence in and defense of South Korea.**

# The U.S. Military Should Leave South Korea

South Korea can afford its own defense. The United States military should leave.

**Stanton, 2010**

**“It's Time for the U.S. Army to Leave Korea”:** Joshua Stanton – CBS News/The New Ledger <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2010/04/11/opinion/main6386737.shtml>

Proceeding against the advice of my cardiologist, I must concede that for once, Ron Paul is actually on to something. **The ground component of U.S. Forces Korea, which costs U.S. taxpayers billions of dollars a year to maintain, is an equally unaffordable political liability on the South Korean street. We should withdraw it.** Every Saturday night off-post brawl is a headline in the muck-raking Korean press, for which the American soldier is inevitably blamed, and for which angry mobs perpetually demand renegotiations of the Status of Force Agreement to give Korea’s not-even-remotely-fair judicial system more jurisdiction over American soldiers.

**The South Korean people do not appreciate the security our soldiers provide.** The way some of them treat our soldiers ought to be a national scandal. Many off-post businesses don’t even let Americans through their front doors. The degree of anti-Americanism in South Korea is sufficient to be a significant force protection issue in the event of hostilities. The American security blanket has fostered a state of national adolescence by the South Korean public. Too many of them (some polls suggest most) see America as a barrier to reunification with their ethnic kindred in the North. **Maybe nothing short of a North Korean attack on the South can encourage more sober thinking by South Koreans about their own security, but I suspect a greater sense of self-reliance and even vulnerability might.**

**During my service in Korea, as U.S. taxpayers subsidized South Korea’s defense, South Korea subsidized Kim Jong Il’s potential offense with billions of dollars in hard currency that sustained the very threat against which we were ostensibly helping to defend.** South Korea never made North Korea’s disarmament a condition of this aid. Instead, that aid effectively undermined U.S. and U.N. sanctions meant to force North Korea to disarm. What does South Korea have to show for this colossal outlay now. **Because South Korea, now one the world’s wealthiest nations, expects up to 600,000 American soldiers to arrive protect it from any security contingency, successive South Korean governments actually cut their nation’s defense rather than modernizing it and building an effective independent defense.** Consequently, South Korea still has a 1970-vintage force structure, designed around a 1970-vintage threat, equipped with 1970-vintage weapons. **Worst of all, South Korea diverted billions of dollars that should have been spent on modernizing its military into regime-sustaining aid to Kim Jong Il, to be used, as far as anyone knows, for nukes, missiles, artillery, and pretty much everything but infant formula.** **To this day, South Korea continues to resist accepting operational control over its own forces in the event of war.** Thus, while I don’t go so far as to accept the Princess Bride Doctrine (”never get involved in a land war in Asia”), **I do not believe it is wise for us to have our forces within easy artillery range of Kim Jong Il, such that he may freely choose the time, place, and manner of our involvement**

# The U.S. Military Should Leave South Korea

The sinking of Cheonan should be a wakeup call. We should take our troops out South Korea.

**Bandow, 2010**

**“The U.S.-South Korea Alliance Outdated, Unnecessary, and Dangerous”:** Doug Bandow, senior fellow Cato Institute- Foreign Policy Briefing no. 90 <http://www.cato.org/pubs/fpbriefs/fpb90.pdf>

7/14/2010: **The ROK remains dependent on the United States today, despite vastly changed circumstances.** Aggressive, hegemonic communism is gone. South Korea is the most obvious beneficiary of the security relationship. However, when the South places its defense in Washington’s hands it also places decisions over its defense in Washington’s hands.

**Washington’s top priority is avoiding another conflict,** one that likely would be costly, brutal, and bloody—and of no conceivable benefit to Americans. However, **the end of the Cold War has sharply diminished South Korea’s security importance—relevance, even—to the United States.** North Korea is an irrelevant strategic backwater

**Pyongyang obviously poses no conventional military danger to the United States, other than to the 28,500 American troops currently and unnecessarily stationed in the peninsula.** One U.S. carrier group has more firepower than the entire DPRK military. **The deployment provides Kim Jong-il with thousands of convenient American nuclear hostages.**

**Washington nevertheless is stuck in the center of Korean affairs today because of the U.S.-ROK alliance, which provides a security guarantee to South Korea with no corresponding benefit to the United States.**

Seoul’s **need for a U.S. security guarantee long ago disappeared**. South Korea has upwards of 40 times the GDP of the North. The ROK also has a vast technological edge, twice the population, and a clearly superior international position. The South is capable of spending as much as is necessary to overmatch Pyongyang. The **ROK** doesn’t do so because it doesn’t have to, since it can **rely upon American defense subsidies the responsibility for defending Seoul lies with the ROK, not the United States.**

**Americans are borrowing money to pay to defend the South so South Koreans can spend their money on other priorities.** Finally, **reinforcing America’s military posture** on the peninsula represents a **move in the wrong direction.**

However, South Korea already possesses larger, better equipped, and more modern vessels than

does the North. **The sinking of the *Cheonan* should serve as a wake-up call to Seoul tofocus its military build-up on its own defenserather than regional or global missions.**The U.S.-ROK military alliance has lost itspurpose. **South Korea is not critical toAmerica’s defense and America’s assistance isnot—or at least should not be—critical toSouth Korea’s defense.**

**Washington should make policy to promote America’s, not the ROK’s,** continued economic development. After 65 years of dependence on the United States, **the South Korean people should take over responsibility for their own defense.**

# The U.S. Military Should Leave South Korea

North Korea does not pose a threat to the United States. We can no longer afford to defend South Korea.

**Bandow, 11/1**

**“U.S. Should Get Out of Korean Peninsula”:** Doug Bandow, senior fellow Cato Institute- <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=12521>

11/1/2010: **the U.S. should leave the problem of dealing with Pyongyang to the North's neighbors**. The so-called Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the world's first Communist monarchy, **poses no threat to America**. The DPRK's economy is a wreck. The North's military equips under-trained, malnourished soldiers with ancient equipment. One American aircraft carrier has more firepower than the entire North Korean military. What of Pyongyang's putative nuclear arsenal? The North probably hasn't miniaturized any weapons that it might have constructed. **North Korea also doesn't have a missile capable of hitting America, let alone doing so accurately.** Moreover, "Dear Leader" **Kim Jong-il is** evil, **not stupid**. **He knows that the U.S. could wipe his nation off the map.** He wants his virgins in this life, not the next, and wouldn't waste his time trying to pass power to his son if he planned self-immolation. Deterrence worked against Joseph Stalin, Mao Zedong and Kim's father, Kim Il-sung. It will continue to work against Kim Jong-il. **The North poses a greater threat to South Korea**, but even here the purported danger is exaggerated. The Republic of Korea is far ahead on most measures of national power. The South's forces are better trained and its equipment is more capable; Seoul has a much larger army reserve and military industrial base. The ROK has twice the population and upwards of 40 times the gross domestic product the North. Moreover, **neither China nor Russia, the North's traditional allies, would support the DPRK in another war.** Indeed, the South felt so secure that it spent much of the last decade investing in and aiding Pyongyang. **The supposedly conservative government in Seoul refused to close the South Korean-run Kaesong industrial park in the North even after the DPRK sank a South Korean warship** earlier this year. The ROK also recently restarted aid to North Korea.

**If the Seoul government isn't worried about its national security, then Americans shouldn't give it much thought.** The only reason Washington is so deeply involved in the peninsula's politics is because of its longstanding security guarantee to the South. **America's 27,000 troops should come home.**Thus, the next government, irrespective of Kim Jong-un's status, will probably be weak and divided. No one is likely to push the armed services to give up nuclear weapons.It is a nasty situation. But **why are Americans expected to sort out the mess? Rather than treating North Korea as a U.S. problem, Washington should turn the issue back to Pyongyang's neighbors**. **Any map demonstrates that the DPRK is primarily an issue for South Korea, Japan and China, not America.** Only the South is vulnerable to a traditional conventional assault, and it is well able to protect itself. Japan is conceivably at risk from a North Korean missile attack, but the government of that wealthy, high-tech society could do far more in its own defense. The North isn't likely to attack the People's Republic of China, but any instability emanating from Pyongyang will affect the PRC. **American disengagement would force the Chinese government to confront the North Korean "problem."**

**America can no longer afford to garrison the world. The Korean peninsula is a good place for the U.S. to again start acting like a republic.**

# The U.S. Military Should Leave South Korea

Washington should get out of North Korea. The only Americans threatened by North Korea are the thousands stationed in South Korea.

**Bandow, 11/29**

**“Pull U.S. Troops out of Korea”:** Doug Bandow, senior fellow Cato Institute- <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=12605>

11/29/2010: Eight months after sinking a South Korean warship, North Korea launched an artillery barrage last week against South Korean territory. Even worse, the North is a nuclear power. The U.S. should get used to it. **Washington's drive to prevent the Democratic People's Republic of Korea from acquiring nuclear weapons is dead.** Yet the Obama administration is pushing to restart nuclear negotiations with Pyongyang. Assistant Secretary of State Kurt Campbell recently opined: "We need to see a very clear signal that this new leadership — or some structure in North Korea — accepts the very clear commitments that North Korea made in 2005 to denuclearization." Thus, **the best outcome in the next several years likely is the status quo.** Negotiations may not hurt, but they are unlikely to provide any discernible benefit. **Unfortunately, none of the DPRK's neighbors are inclined to be particularly helpful.**

**South Korea's policy has ranged from isolation of, to subsidies for, the North, while relying on the U.S. for its defense.** Japan has subordinated policy towards the DPRK to resolving the status of Japanese citizens kidnapped by Pyongyang's agents in past years. The ever more assertive Beijing obviously believes that stability matters more than anything else. Indeed, the Chinese have been expanding investment in the North. The result has been to discourage reform. Nothing is likely to change in the near future. **Washington should step back and leave the issue to the North's neighbors.** **The only Americans within easy reach of Pyongyang's weapons are the thousands of U.S. troops stationed in South Korea. Given the South's manifold advantages over North Korea, an American military garrison is unnecessary. The troops should come home.**

**Then Washington should adopt a policy of benign neglect towards the North. Let Seoul, Tokyo, and Beijing bear the risk of implosion, war, or proliferation.** In particular, the U.S. should point out to China that North Korea remains a potential national powder keg, with a rushed power transfer in the midst of a continuing economic crisis. Moreover, a regime willing to risk war with South Korea may make a deadlier miscalculating in the future. Moreover, Washington should indicate that it does not intend to allow nonproliferation policy to leave only the bad guys with nuclear weapons. Should the North continue with its nuclear program, the U.S. would reconsider its opposition to the acquisition of nuclear weapons by South Korea and Japan. Nuclear proliferation in Northeast Asia might be a nightmare, but if so, it will be one shared by Beijing.

Then **the U.S. should turn its attention elsewhere.**

**Washington's policy towards the DPRK has failed.** North Korea is a nuclear power and is unlikely to voluntarily surrender that status.

**Rather than continue a fruitless campaign to denuclearize the North, the U.S. should hand off the problem to those nations with the most at stake in a peaceful and stable North Korea. Those nations with the most at stake should take the lead in resolving Northeast Asia's problems.**

# The U.S. Military Should Leave South Korea

South Korea could drag the U.S. into an unwanted war.

**Carpenter, 11/19**

**“Does Washington Need to Fear South Korea More than North Korea?”:** Ted Galen Carpenter, The National Interest <http://nationalinterest.org/node/4488>

11/29/2010: U.S. officials understandably focus on the dangers that could arise from North Korea’s actions. But there is a less obvious risk that merits more attention than it has received: that **South Korea has had enough of its neighbor’s aggression and may decide to respond in a manner that triggers a crisis**. Events over the past week suggest that South Korea’s military and political leadership might be going down that path. One has come to expect the North Korean propaganda apparatus to spout apocalyptic warnings on a regular basis. Korea watchers have probably lost count of the number of times Pyongyang has threatened to turn Seoul into “a sea of fire” over the years. And predictably, following the latest incident, North Korean media warned that the region teetered on the brink of war, and that both South Korean and U.S. forces would experience dire punishment if such a conflict erupted. There was nothing new in any of this.

**What is new—and more than a little ominous—is the tone coming out of South Korea.** **President Lee Myung-bak thundered that there would be “enormous retaliation”** should the North launch another attack like the shelling incident. Presumably, he has something more substantial in mind than the limited economic sanctions that his government imposed following the sinking of the Cheonan. Speaking at the funeral of two South Korean marines killed in the shelling, **the commander of those forces vowed “a thousand-fold revenge” for their deaths.** Other prominent figures have adopted a similar strident rhetoric. Of course, this all may be little more than patriotic bluster for domestic consumption. But having staked-out a strong position against Pyongyang’s latest outrage, political and military leaders risk looking weak—indeed, buffoonish—if the actual response is just more ineffectual symbolism. Equally important, **the South Korean public seems to be more supportive of serious retaliatory measures than in the past.** During previous crises, many South Koreans worried that Washington’s response to a Pyongyang provocation might plunge the Peninsula into war against the wishes of the South Korean people and government. They had reasons for such fears. In the months leading up to the 1994 Agreed Framework freezing Pyongyang’s plutonium program, the Clinton administration seriously considered air strikes against North Korean targets. South Koreans also remember how Senator John McCain advocated a similar strategy in 2003, and was openly dismissive of possible South Korean objections. Seoul would not have had a veto over U.S. actions in either case, despite the obvious negative consequences. But now **the opposite risk has emerged—that South Korea could drag the United States into an unwanted war.** Washington is counseling restraint, and the Obama administration has publicly praised the South Korean government for its patience and prudence to this point. It is more likely than not that U.S. pressure will prevail and cause tempers in Seoul to cool. Yet even if that happens in this case, **U.S. policymakers and the American people should soberly assess the grave risks that our country is incurring by maintaining the defense alliance with South Korea and, even more so, by keeping a tripwire military force on the Peninsula.**

**If Pyongyang continues to prod and provoke its neighbor, at some point South Korean leaders will likely conclude that they must respond militarily.** Like the mild- mannered student who is continuously harassed by the playground bully, there often comes a breaking point and that victim takes a stand. In some cases, the bully then backs down and the overall situation improves significantly. But in other cases, a major fight erupts with **highly unpredictable results.**

**If that happens on the Korean Peninsula, Americans will rue the day that their leaders foolishly maintained a military presence in such a dangerous neighborhood.**

# The U.S. Military Should Leave South Korea

North and South Korea can manage their own conflict. The U.S. should leave the peninsula.

**Trifkovic, 11/23**

**“Time to Leave North Korea”:** Foreign Affairs Expert, Dr. Srdja Trifkovic- Chronicles Magazine <http://www.chroniclesmagazine.org/2010/11/23/time-to-leave-korea/>

11/23/2010: After several weeks of tensions, highlighted by military exercises in which South Korea fired live artillery near North Korea in a show of force and defiance, South Korean President Lee Myung-bak, in what most news accounts described as a surprise, has called for the resumption of six-party talks over North Korea's efforts to acquire usable nuclear weapons. While the precise nature of the gesture may have been a surprise, the fact that, after ramping them up for awhile, President Lee made a gesture to defuse tensions should not have been a surprise. Despite some evidence to the contrary, **the leaders of the North are not crazy, and the leaders of the South certainly are not. They both know that an actual war on the peninsula would be devastating to both sides.**

Despite the sheer size of North Korea's military establishment, **the South's military is far superior and would undoubtedly overwhelm the North in a real wa**r. In the meantime, however, much of the South's capital city of Seoul is in range of thousands of Northern artillery pieces. It is likely that, before the North succumbed, it would be able to kill millions of South Koreans with utterly conventional artillery fire – no nukes needed.

**Both sides, therefore,** however much they may ramp up hostile dialogue, **have a strong interest in avoiding an actual war.** At various times in the recent past it has seemed as if some kind of viable accommodation between the two regimes would be reached, but the goal remains elusive. The most recent hostilities served the interests of both governments. Lee Myung-bak needed to demonstrate to his constituents that he is not soft following the sinking of a South Korean warship in March and the shelling of a South Korean island in November. And, while the North's government is frustratingly opaque, it seems likely that the planned ascension of Kim Jong Il's young and inexperienced son, Kim Jong Un, to absolute power might be experiencing resistance, so ginning up a confrontation to show his toughness might have seemed appropriate.

**These recent events suggest that the two Korean governments know how to manage their potentially unstable situation reasonably.** Even so, there's no guarantee that a future round of hostilities won't get out of control. If things settle down for awhile, **it would be a good time to announce the withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Korea. Given the overwhelming economic and military power of South Korea, U.S. troops' only purpose now is to serve as a tripwire to involve the U.S. in yet another war that is really none of its business.**

# The U.S. Military Should Leave South Korea

The global landscape has changed significantly from the beginning of the Cold War. There is no reason to remain in South Korea.

**Buchanan, 11/26**

**“Why Are We Still in Korea?”:** Pat Buchanan, Real Clear Politics

11/26/2011: **Fifty-seven years after that armistice, a U.S. carrier task force is steaming toward the Yellow Sea in a show of force after the North fired 80 shells into a South Korean village.** We will stand by our Korean allies, says President Obama. And with our security treaty and 28,000 U.S. troops in South Korea, many on the DMZ, we can do no other. But **why, 60 years after the first Korean War, should Americans be the first to die in a second Korean War? Unlike 1950, South Korea is not an impoverished ex-colony of Japan. She is the largest of all the "Asian tigers," a nation with twice the population and 40 times the economy of the North.**

**Seoul just hosted the G-20. And there is no Maoist China or Stalinist Soviet Union equipping Pyongyang's armies. The planes, guns, tanks and ships of the South are far superior in quality.**

**Why, then, are we still in South Korea?** Why is this quarrel our quarrel? **Why is this war, should it come, America's war?** High among the reasons we fought in Korea was Japan, then a nation rising from the ashes after half its cities had been reduced to rubble. But, for 50 years now, Japan has had the second largest economy and is among the most advanced nations on earth.Why cannot Japan defend herself? Why does this remain our responsibility, 65 years after MacArthur took the surrender in Tokyo Bay? **The Soviet Empire, against which we defended Japan, no longer exists, nor does the Soviet Union.** Russia holds the southern Kurils, taken as spoils from World War II, but represents no threat. Indeed, Tokyo is helping develop Russia's resources in Siberia. **Why, when the Cold War has been over for 20 years, do all these Cold War alliances still exist?** Obama has just returned from a Lisbon summit of NATO, an alliance formed in 1949 to defend Western Europe from Soviet tank armies on the other side of the Iron Curtain that threatened to roll to the Channel. Today, that Red Army no longer exists, the captive nations are free, and Russia's president was in Lisbon as an honored guest of NATO. **Yet we still have tens of thousands of U.S. troops in the same bases they were in when Gen. Eisenhower became supreme allied commander more than 60 years ago.** Across Europe, our NATO allies are slashing defense to maintain social safety nets. But Uncle Sam, he soldiers on. We borrow from Europe to defend Europe. We borrow from Japan and China to defend Japan from China. We borrow from the Gulf Arabs to defend the Gulf Arabs. To broker peace in Palestine, Obama began his presidency with a demand that Israel halt all new construction of settlements in East Jerusalem and the West Bank.Today, as his price for a one-time-only 90-day freeze on new construction on the West Bank, but not East Jerusalem, "Bibi" Netanyahu is demanding 20 F-35 strike fighters, a U.S. commitment to a Security Council veto of any Palestinian declaration of independence, and assurances the U.S. will support a permanent Israeli presence on the Jordan river. And the Israelis want it all From 1941 to 1989, she played a great heroic role as defender of freedom, sacrificing and serving mankind, a role of which we can be forever proud. But having won that epochal struggle against the evil empire, we found ourselves in a world for which we were unprepared. Now, like an aging athlete, we keep trying to relive the glory days when all the world looked with awe upon us.

**We can't let go, because we don't know what else to do. We live in yesterday -- and our rivals look to tomorrow.**

# The U.S. Military Should Leave South Korea

North Korea is a regional problem. We have nothing to gain and risk much by remaining on the peninsula.

**Kelly, 12/5**

**“North Korea? Not Our Problem”**: Jack Kelly, Pittsburg Post-Gazette, <http://post-gazette.com/pg/10339/1108056-373.stm>

12/5/2010: It is, as Yogi Berra might say, deja vu all over again on the Korean peninsula. On Nov. 23, North Korea fired artillery rockets at the South Korean island of Yeonpyeong, killing two South Korean marines and two civilians, and wounding 18 others. South Korean President Lee Myung-bak said Monday South Korea will "sternly retaliate" if there are any further provocations from the North. The North Korean artillery attack was a "provocative" show of force that "needs to be dealt with," said President Barack Obama.

**This song has been sung before. On March 26, North Korea sank a South Korean frigate, killing 46.** President **Lee promised "resolute" measures** then. **Secretary of State Hillary Clinton** condemned the attack on the frigate, and **declared it would not go "unanswered**." **But it did go unanswered**. The North Koreans noted that, despite their stern words, all South Korea and the United States did following the attack on the frigate was to schedule the four days of naval exercises in the Yellow Sea which began Sunday. These are being held close enough to North Korea to give the appearance of a show of force, but not close enough actually to threaten the North Koreans. Well might the North Koreans think "sticks and stones may break my bones, but words will never hurt me." The policy of bluster and retreat followed by South Korea and the United States for lo these many years may encourage the North Koreans to commit more daring provocations."It is worrisome, if not frightening, how far Pyongyang is now willing to go to achieve its foreign policy objectives," said Bruce Klingner of the Heritage Foundation.**Why does North Korea behave as it does? Because it works.** **North Korea is an economic basket case, incapable of feeding itself on a subsistence level. Without massive foreign aid, the regime would fall.**

Most of that aid comes from China. But since the Clinton administration, much of it has come from South Korea, Japan and the United States. **We've attempted repeatedly to bribe the North Koreans into good behavior, and each time failed. The North Koreans never will agree to abandon their nuclear program, or modify their aggressive behavior, because if they did so, they would lose the leverage that makes it possible for them to extort foreign aid.**

**Some pundits describe the leaders of North Korea as "crazy." But what's crazy is doing the same thing over and over again, expecting a different result.**  **North Korea is a big problem. But it shouldn't be ours.** **When we intervened in Korea in 1950, we did so for two very good reasons. North Korea was then a part of an international Communist conspiracy aimed at world conquest. South Korea was incapable of defending herself.**

**Things have changed in 60 years. North Korea is the last truly Communist nation left standing. Its ambitions are limited mainly to self preservation.** **South Korea,** which has more than twice the population of North Korea and more than 40 times the gross domestic product, **is more than capable of defending herself.** But, notes Doug Bandow of the CATO Institute, **"so long as America offers a security guarantee, maintains a tripwire troop presence on the peninsula and promises to do whatever is necessary to protect [them], the South Koreans have little incentive to take over their own defense."**

**North Korea is now just a regional problem. We gain nothing and risk much by continuing to make it ours, when the reasons for doing so have disappeared into history.**

# The U.S. Military Should Leave South Korea

The United States should not continue to protect South Korea since it can protect itself. We have nothing to gain by remaining in the country.

**Bandow, 11/29**

**“Sixty Years Is Enough”:** Doug Bandow, senior fellow Cato Institute- The American Spectator, <http://spectator.org/archives/2010/11/29/sixty-years-is-enough/1>

11/29/2010: In recent years South Korea has begun to develop regional ambitions. Seoul is creating a blue-water navy and deploying international peacekeeping troops. **The Republic of Korea increasingly sees itself sitting alongside the world's most powerful nations. Unfortunately, the ROK government appears to have neglected its most important duty: defending its people.** **What is truly shocking is the ROK's continuing dependence on America. The Korean War ended in 1953.** Since then the South has won the intra-Korea contest. The ROK raced past the North economically and **now has upwards of 40 times the latter's GDP.** South Korea has succeeded in hi-tech production, benefits from twice the population, and possesses global diplomatic clout. In fact, **Seoul even has stolen away North Korea's allies, trading far more with China and Russia. In contrast to 1950, the latter two countries would not likely back Pyongyang in a fight.** Yet the DPRK possesses a bigger military. Although the North's soldiers are ill-trained and its equipment is antiquated, the Kim government obviously still is capable of striking with deadly effect. **Why hasn't the South put its resources to better military effect? Because it doesn't have to. So long as America offers a security guarantee, maintains a tripwire troop presence on the peninsula, and promises to do whatever is necessary to protect the ROK, the South Koreans have little incentive to take over their own defense.** Granted, it's a bit humiliating to constantly beg Washington for aid: it would be a bit like the U.S. going hat-in-hand around the world asking for help to defend against Mexico. Still, better for Seoul to get the gullible Americans to pay its defense bill than to have to cover the cost itself.Making the ROK's behavior even more outrageous has been **Seoul's attempt to buy off Pyongyang while relying on American military support**. For nearly a decade the so-called "Sunshine Policy" emphasized aid to and investment in the North. Seoul even effectively bought a summit between the late President Kim Dae-jung and the North's Kim Jong-il. Although the Lee government has cut back on subsidies for the North, **Seoul has not closed the Kaesong industrial park, an important source of hard currency for Pyongyang.** Nothing changes even as North Korea kills the South's citizens. Should war break out, some of the weapons fired at U.S. soldiers would have been effectively paid for by America's allies in the South. North Korea's presumed nuclear capabilities add a more dangerous dimension to tensions on the peninsula, but **America's troop presence only worsens the problem by conveniently giving the Kim regime 27,500 nuclear hostages within easy reach.**

**With Uncle Sam effectively bankrupt, Americans increasingly will have to debate how much they should spend on "defense." The answer should be: as much as is necessary for defense -- of America**. **But no more for the defense of** prosperous and populous allies, such as **South Korea.**

**Today the U.S. protects countries that are well able to protect themselves.** The result is not just to further impoverish debt-burdened Americans. It also is to reduce American security. **After all, the U.S. would be far more secure if its allies were militarily strong and self-assured.** Yet **Washington's security guarantees have turned friendly Asians and Europeans into a gaggle of helpless weaklings and wimps.** U.S. allies espouse grandiose geopolitical ambitions but under-invest in defense -- and when conflict threatens, scamper to Washington wailing for relief. This behavior wouldn't matter much if evil had passed away. But as we see in the Korean peninsula, the lion has yet to lie down with the lamb. The era of perpetual peace is not yet here.  **Unfortunately, Washington's military commitments may help deter conflict, but they insure American involvement if war breaks out.** **In Korea, for instance, only U.S. intervention could have prevented a North Korean victory in 1950. That is not the case in 2010.** **Americans no longer have anything at stake that warrants risking involvement in another conflict on the Korean peninsula.** The time is long past when Washington could play Globocop. **We should start by bringing home the troops from Korea.**

# The U.S. Military Should Remain in South Korea

The recent North Korean aggression is not isolated. The United States must respond with strength.

**Klinger, 2010**

**“U.S. Must Respond Firmly to North Korean Naval Attack”:** Bruce KlingnerHeritageSenior Research Fellow, Northeast Asia, <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2010/05/us-must-respond-firmly-to-north-korean-naval-attack>

5/20/2010: “The evidence is clear: **North Korea is responsible for the torpedo attack that sank the South Korean naval frigate Cheonan.** Now that North Korea’s culpability for this heinous act of aggression has been proven, South Korea and **the United States must respond resolutely** by imposing a comprehensive package of unilateral and multilateral actions. These sanctions should include severing inter-Korean economic relations**, augmenting U.S.–South Korean naval forces** and detection capabilities in the West Sea, and insisting that the U.N. Security Council approve a resolution condemning and punishing North Korea.

Specifically, South Korea should:

Review South Korea’s defense posture. North Korea’s ability to inflict grievous injury on South Korea’s military should counter misperceptions that North Korean intentions have become less hostile or that engagement has moderated Pyongyang’s behavior. Therefore, Seoul should:

* **Initiate combined U.S.–South Korea anti-submarine and mine-clearing naval exercises near the NLL area.**
* Review the OPCON transfer agreement. The U.S. and South Korea should jointly assess whether the Cheonan attack **calls into question the scheduled 2012 transfer of wartime operational command of South Korean forces from the U.N. commander to Seoul.** More important, the U.S. Congress and Korean National Assembly should hold hearings to determine whether dissolving Combined Forces Command and establishing parallel commands undermines alliance deterrence and defense capabilities.

**It is likely that the *Cheonan* sinking is not a singular event but rather the beginning of a North Korean campaign to raise tensions on the Korean Peninsula.”**

# The U.S. Military Should Remain in South Korea

The United States must show strength in the face of North Korean provocation.

**Austin, 11/29**

**“North Korea Will Listen, but Only to F-22s”:** Michael Austin, Washington Examiner, AEI Scholar, <http://www.aei.org/article/102829>

11/29/2010: “**North Korea's wanton shelling of a South Korean island last week--one that has 1,000 civilian residents--is a reminder of how dangerous Pyongyang remains**. Pundits worldwide have been busy trying to fathom North Korea's "reasons" for firing 200 artillery shells over a 90 minute period, sending up thick plumes of black smoke across the island and killing four South Koreans. The truth is, we don't know and it doesn't matter. **What matters is our response, and that of the South Koreans.** Right now, that response may well embolden North Korea to further outrageous acts. **Washington has** made the usual noises of condemning the attack, but it also decided to reverse its first instinct of avoiding antagonizing the North, **instead sending a U.S. aircraft carrier group to Korean waters for naval exercises.**

**If South Korea and the United States won't stand up to the North, then this type of aggression will continue to happen into the future.** **The leaders of North Korea**, however, have to know that such an attack would lead, in short order, to the destruction of their state. That is why they have carefully planned each outrage they commit, so far **correctly assuming that South Korea and America will restrain themselves from responding.**So, how to take control of the situation and try to change North Korea's behavior? **By refusing to be paralyzed.** **The most powerful military in the world needs to start showing some strength, and see if that might force some behavioral adjustment in Pyongyang.** For 60 years, the Pentagon has kept an enormous amount of military power in East Asia, and those planes, ships, subs, and American military personnel have undoubtedly helped keep the general peace in the region. **Now is the time to start flexing our muscles** and the White House has taken the first positive step. On Wednesday, the USS George Washington, our nuclear-powered aircraft carrier homeported in Japan, left for waters off Korea, accompanied by two guided missile cruisers and two guided missile destroyers.This can be a significant show of force, but it all depends on where **the flotilla** goes. It **should be sent directly to the waters off the island, not just in the general vicinity of Korea.** **Naval power is important, but it's not enough, since the North's threat comes primarily from the air (its missiles) and the ground (its million-man army).** Thus, **it's time to start deploying our F-22 fighters to South Korea.** **This is why we built the F-22**: to show friends and enemies alike that we will enter any contested and defended airspace that we want, and that they won't be able to stop us.

**A squadron of F-22s should be sent to Osan Air Base in South Korea and start conducting air patrols along the DMZ and over South Korean territory that is targeted by the North.** Anything that fires on the F-22s should be destroyed, just as the North should have destroyed the artillery guns that attacked its island this week. **Let the F-22s show they have a real role to play in protecting our allies and in operating with impunity in conflict areas, just as they were designed to do.** And let the message get through to Pyongyang that if we want to, we can buzz Kim Jong-il's breakfast room.

**Sending the USS George Washington is a good first move, but it needs to be followed up by a strong and continuing military presence in the area. Otherwise, we will send the wrong message to a regime that acts with increasing aggression and confidence.**

# The U.S. Military Should Remain in South Korea

The United States has reasonable military options for dealing with North Korea. It is time to use them.

**Mazza, 12/7**

**“Should the U.S. Take Military Action Against N. Korea?”:** Michael Mazza, AOL News, AEI Scholar, <http://www.aei.org/article/102870>

In the wake of North Korea's shelling of Yeonpyeong Island on Nov. 23, there was plenty of talk about what can be done to prevent future provocations from the North. Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton said Monday that **the U.S. is "committed to the preservation of peace and stability"** in the region. But left largely unmentioned in all the talk so far has been any discussion of a U.S. military response. That needs to change. **The fact is that the U.S. has reasonable military options for dealing with North Korea, and it may be time to use them.**

**Negotiations over the past two decades have failed to rein in Pyongyang's provocative behavior.**

**But it may be time for the United States to demonstrate to Pyongyang with a show of force that Washington is committed to the defense of its ally and that there are severe consequences for Kim's actions.**In particular, the president should consider launching a campaign to **steadily reduce North Korea's ability to conduct military operations outside of its borders.** Such a campaign might include:Neutralizing missiles on launchpads, Locating and eliminating artillery positions along the North Korean coastline and the demilitarized zone (DMZ), Striking submarine berths, Depending on the risk of spreading radiation, attacking the North's known nuclear facilities**The goal would be to wipe out the North's power-projection capability**. Such a campaign would have the dual benefits of reducing the threat to South Korean security and, at long last, of setting Kim Jong Il back on his heels, forcing him to think twice about launching attacks against his southern neighbors.The risks, of course, are significant. No president can lightly consider attacking a country armed with nuclear weapons, however small its arsenal. And North Korea has thousands of artillery pieces on its side of the DMZ and within firing range of Seoul--Seoul's hostage status has provided Pyongyang with significant leverage over the years.**Yet appearances to the contrary, Kim Jong Il is a rational actor.He is concerned, first and foremost, with his own survival and the survival of his regime.** Any large-scale attack on Seoul, whether conventional or nuclear, would spark a war in whose aftermath the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would likely cease to exist. The Kim regime would be no more, and Kim's legacy would include not only the starvation of his people but the loss of his country.Kim knows all of this. For this reason**, his response to U.S. military operations would be bombastic in rhetoric, but might very well be more restrained in action** than is commonly feared. Indeed, his options would be as limited as the allies generally consider theirs to be.A U.S. attack on North Korean soil (in conjunction with financial sanctions) is not an ideal solution, but it just might be the least bad option.President Obama should at least discuss it with his national security advisers and with his counterparts in Seoul and Tokyo. **If Pyongyang is not punished for its actions--and soon--it will continue to launch periodic attacks on South Korea. Without punishment, those attacks are likely to grow increasingly deadly and provocative, leading eventually to a war on the Korean peninsula that all parties wish to avoid. American military action should not be off the table as a means to forestall such a fate.**

# The U.S. Military Should Remain in South Korea

The United States should implement a comprehensive missile defense in Asia.

Klinger, 2011

“The Case for Comprehensive Missile Defense in Asia”: Bruce Klingner Heritage Senior Research Fellow, Northeast Asia, <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2011/01/The-Case-for-Comprehensive-Missile-Defense-in-Asia>

**The United States and its allies are at risk of missile attack from a growing number of states and non­state terrorist organizations. This growing threat is partic­ularly clear in East Asia, where diplomacy has failed to stop North Korea** To counter these growing threats, **the U.S. should work with its allies, including South Korea and Japan, to develop and deploy missile defenses,** While Washington continues to seek diplomatic resolutions to the bal­listic missile threat, **it is critical that the U.S. simul­taneously pursue missile defense programs to protect itself and its allies**. **Missile defense contributes to regional peace and stability** and supports international nonprolifera­tion efforts by reducing other nations’ perceived need to acquire nuclear weapons. Conversely**, the absence of sufficient missile defenses leaves the U.S. and its allies “limited in their actions and pursuit of their interests if they are vulnerable to North Korean or Iranian missiles.”[**3]

**North Korea . Pyongyang has tested two nuclear devices, a 1-kiloton device in 2006 and a 4-kiloton device in 2009.** **North Korea has an extensive ballistic missile force that can strike South Korea, Japan, and U.S. military bases in Asia. It is continu­ing to develop an ICBM that would threaten the continental United States.**  **In July 2009, Pyongyang launched seven Scud missiles, which flew 300 miles prior to landing in the East Sea. The latter barrage of missiles was an unambiguous vio­lation of U.N. Security Council Resolution 1874,** which was passed in June 2009 in response to North Korea’s nuclear test of the preceding month. The resolution demanded that North Korea “not conduct any further nuclear test or any launch using ballistic missile technology” and ordered North Korea to “suspend all activities related to its ballistic missile program.” **[The sinking of the Cheonan portends] a dan­gerous new period when North Korea will once again attempt to advance its internal and external political goals through direct attacks on our allies in the Republic of Korea.** Coupled with this is a renewed realization that **North Korea’s military forces still pose a threat that cannot be taken lightly**.[11] The attack on the Cheonan shows that **Pyongyang retains a significant ability and inclination to attack South Korea with conventional weapons.** Missile defenses have the potential both to deter the aggressive impulses of freedom’s enemies and to strengthen the resolve of its friends**. Having a missile defense system in place could prevent an enemy attack from ever reaching Washington, New York, Seoul, or Tokyo and complicate any design aspiring world powers may have to limit America’s role as guar­antor of peace and security in the Asia–Pacific region.**

# The U.S. Military Should Remain in South Korea

Given recent developments, U.S. presence is more important than ever.

**O’Hanlon, 2011**

**“Understanding and Confronting North Korea”:** Michael E. O'Hanlon, Director of Research and Senior Fellow, Foreign Policy, 21st Century Defense Initiative, The Brookings Institution

1/12/2011 - <http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2010/1123_north_korea_ohanlon.aspx>

**Why does North Korea continue to provoke, often with lethal force, and always with severe consequences for stability and peace of mind in Northeast Asia?** At one level, no one knows. The Hermit Kingdom is famously opaque, and with a leadership transition from Kim Jong-Il to his son Kim Jong-Un likely in the works as well, the current mystery is even deeper than usual. At another level, the answer is rather obvious. **North Korea carries out such shenanigans because it gets away with them.** And it does so because it has few other ways to demand the world’s attention. Brinkmanship brings it global prominence. **In just the last two years, North Korea has tested a nuclear weapon, sunk a South Korean ship and killed 46 sailors, and now killed 2 more South Korean servicemen in another act of unprovoked murder. Worst of all, it now also appears to be reviving ambitions to expand its nuclear weapons arsenal.**

**Yet the North’s international standing has barely declined,** with China protecting North Korea’s main equities and states like South Korea and **the United States making it clear that they are still basically willing to return to six-party talks at any point.** For Pyongyang, the message would seem obvious—**misbehavior has no real consequences, and perhaps it will finally attract the world’s attention if it goes far enough**. The fact that the United States, South Korea, China, Russia, and Japan—the other participants in those six-party talks—have no common overall strategy for dealing with North Korea provides Pyongyang the opening it needs to divide and conquer the international community, assuming that someone will always come to its rescue if and when the going gets tough.

**Rather than let North Korea call the shots, we need to seize the initiative with a strategy that the other five parties can agree to.** Rather than vague talk about the possibility of an improved relationship, a roadmap for a better relationship is needed, with some degree of specificity. This should include the prospects of economic cooperation and a peace treaty if North Korea will do its part, denuclearizing and ceasing the provocations and beginning economic reforms along the Vietnam model. Someday not far off, human rights reforms would be needed as well.

**Right now Pyongyang is in the driver’s seat,** and **American policy contributes to that situation with an excessively passive and punitive approach.** **We need to be firm with North Korea,** but we also need to show where the relationship might go if its behavior improves. Incredibly, we have never done so.

# The U.S. Military Should Remain in South Korea

North Korea is an unpredictable threat. The United States has major stake in the region.

**Stares, November, 2010**

**“Military Escalation in Korea”:** Paul B. Stares, Council on Foreign Relations, CONTINGENCY PLANN ING MEMORANDUM NO. 1 0 <http://www.cfr.org/publication/23344/military_escalation_in_korea.html>

**Further provocations by North Korea** as well as other dangerous military interactions on or around the Korean peninsula **remain a serious threat** and carry the risk of miscalculation and unintended escalation.

**The United States has a major stake in preserving peace and stability in Korea** and must be prepared to manage new challenges and contingencies that **could arise with little or no warning**.

Until a prolonged period of calm returns, the risk of another deadly clash between North Korea and South Korea remains real. **Further naval incidents along the disputed Northern Limit Line (NLL) in the Yellow Sea are certainly conceivable and arguably more likely** now that South Korea has modified its rules of engagement to permit more rapid response to North Korean incursions. North Korea may engage in a renewed campaign of provocative behavior for domestic

reasons.

**The North may see carefully calibrated provocations** against South Korea, Japan, and by extension the United States**, as its only recourse to lessen the diplomatic and economic pressure** that has been brought to bear on it.**The succession process may not proceed as planned.** Kim Jong-Il could pass from the scene before the designated leadership arrangements have been consolidated.

South Korea fears losing its hard-won prosperity and a much weaker North knows that another war would almost certainly result in its demise—**the potential for miscalculation, misunderstanding, and unintended escalation cannot be dismissed**

**Divining North Korea’s intentions is widely considered to be one of the hardest intelligence challenges in the world.** Nothing illustrates this more than the ***Cheonan* incident** and its aftermath. There were evidently **no prior indications to suggest an elevated risk of an attack**, while North Korea’s subsequent public declarations of intent have gone more or less unfulfilled.

Also **at risk are over 50,000 U.S. civilians working and living in South Korea, of which 30,000 are believed to reside in Seoul** and thus **immediately vulnerable to North Korean military action.** **South Korea is also a major trading partner of the United States and a global economic player.** A serious emergency on the peninsula could do great damage to investor confidencein South Korea and **possibly trigger a major financial crisis** that could resonate regionally if not **globally.**

The United States and the ROK can continue with their efforts to deter further provocations through…**enhanced surveillance** of disputed or sensitive areas, upgrades to ROK antisubmarine warfare capabilities, **increased patrolling**, and **rapid military response capabilities**.

**The United States and South Korea should continue to maintain their heightened vigilance** through enhancements to their surveillance and intelligence-gathering capabilities.

# The U.S. Military Should Remain in South Korea

North Korea is not trustworthy. The U.S.-R.O.K. alliance is on the line. We must confront and contain North Korea.

**Bell, 12/14**

**“What Must Be Done About North Korea**”: Gen. B. B. Bell, Center for Strategic and International Studies, <http://csis.org/files/publication/101214_What_must_be_done_about_North_Korea_Platform.pdf>

General B. B. Bell retired from the United States Army in 2008 after 39 years of military

service. From 2006 to 2008, **General Bell served as the Commander of United States**

**Forces in Korea** as well as **Commander of all Allied Forces in Korea**.

Indeed, we all know that **North Korea cannot be trusted**, and with whom **good faith negotiations**

**are simply not possible.** I will repeat myself. In the current environment and with the

continuing leadership of Kim Jung Il, good faith negotiations are simply not possible with

North Korea. The North's strategy is clear, and it has been repeatedly and predictably demonstrated over the past decades -- they conduct provocations, short of general war, until there is a crisis environment, thus, in their view, compelling South Korea and the United States tocome to the negotiating table to defuse the situation and grant the North concessions. **This strategy of brinksmanship can no longer be tolerated and can no longer be rewarded.** **The North has gone too far -- way too far**. Too many South Korean lives have been lost. Not only is the sovereignty of the Republic of Korea being tested and violated by the North, but t**he very viability and credibility of the Alliance is on the line.** It is time for all nations in the region, including China, to wake up to the realities of North Korea. **It is time to confront and contain North Korea with military might, total economic sanctions, and resolute diplomacy.** Now is the time for **the Alliance** to show strength, and it **must not negotiate or compromise** with an individual who since March of this year has ruthlessly and without warning **killed dozens of South Korean citizens -- 46 sailors, 2 marines, and 2 innocent civilians, while grievously wounding dozens more.** Negotiations are simply not possible with a leader who never abides by the agreements he makes, while recklessly wielding military power. For its part, **the United States should immediately return an Army attack helicopter battalion to South Korea.** This would be the quickest and **most effective way to strengthen the U.S. military contribution in defense of the South Korea, while sending a powerful Alliance message to Pyongyang** and any other regional troublemakers. Land exercises between the South Korea and U.S. should increasingly include U.S. combat units deployed from the United States, and U.S. forward bases in the region. **Naval exercises, including U.S. carriers, should be ramped up and conducted more frequently.** An additional **U.S. Air Force combat fighter squadron could be forward deployed** to Korea, while additional elements of U.S. bomber capability should be forward deployed in the region.**The Alliance must quickly show strength and resolution to the North, we must do it now,** **and it has to be more than just words and a single naval exercise in the West (Yellow)** **Sea.** Frankly, the North likely sees little credibility in past statements that there will be military retaliation to further provocations, when indeed there have been none.

**The Unites States, the Republic of Korea, and Japan must take the lead to contain and**

**punish North Korea.** We must continue to ask for and seek China's assistance, but as

long as China refuses to be helpful, the three partners -- **South Korea, Japan and the**

**United States, must deal with the situation as it presents itself.**

# The U.S. Military Should Remain in South Korea

South Korea wants more U.S. presence.

**Jong-Heon, 2010**

**“Seoul seeks extended U.S. protection”:** Lee Jong-Heon, United Press International Correspondent <http://www.upiasia.com/Security/2010/02/04/seoul_seeks_extended_us_protection/2951/>

2/4/2010: **South Korea has asked the United States to postpone the planned transfer of wartime control of South Korean troops to Seoul beyond 2012, citing a mounting military threat from North Korea.** South Korea conveyed to Campbell its hope of holding talks with the United States to review a 2007 agreement on Seoul's regaining of wartime operational control of its troops from Washington, according to diplomatic sources here on Thursday. South Korea voluntarily put operational control of its military under the U.S.-led United Nations Command shortly after the Korean War broke out in 1950. It took back peacetime operational control in 1994. Under the 2007 accord, the United States has agreed to hand wartime operational command of South Korean troops back to Seoul by April 2012. The deal was pushed by the former maverick President Roh Moo-hyun, who wanted to reduce the country's military dependence on the United States. But his conservative successor President Lee Myung-bak ,who took office in early 2008, has campaigned to restore the security alliance with Washington, standing firmer against North Korea, which conducted a second nuclear test and a set of missile launches last year. **Security jitters here further mounted at the beginning of this year as the North's military fired hundreds of artillery shells near the inter-Korean maritime border over three days last week.** The Stalinist country is expected to conduct further artillery fire or short-range missile tests, as it has designated "naval firing zones" along the sea border until next Monday. **In the face of the increased security threat from their communist neighbor, more South Koreans want U.S. military protection extended.** Meeting with Campbell, Deputy Foreign Minister Lee Yong-joon **called for closer military ties to cope with the North's threats.** "We discussed security cooperation issues (with Campbell), **including American troops stationed in South Korea and the planned transfer of wartime operational control**," Lee told reporters at the end of the meeting. In response, Campbell said his government was seriously considering **The United States had maintained nearly 40,000 troops in South Korea, alongside the South's 670,000 troops, facing off against the North's 1.2 million-strong armed forces.** But it **recently reduced the number to 28,500 and is planning to redeploy the frontline U.S. ground forces to south of Seoul, in one of the biggest realignments of U.S. forces in this country since the Korean War.**

But the U.S. military said on Thursday that it has no immediate plan to redeploy troops from South Korea. In a statement, the command of the U.S. Forces Korea said a redeployment of its troops, even if necessary, would only be possible in the late 2010s after close consultations with South Korea.

**"The defense of the ROK (South Korea) remains the core mission of U.S. forces in Korea now and in the future, and there will be no reduction of U.S. forces in Korea tied to wartime operational control transition on April 17, 2012**," it said.

In return for longer U.S. military protection, South Korea has vowed to use an inter-Korean summit it is pushing to hold this year to persuade the North to give up its nuclear weapons. "Denuclearization of the peninsula must be the most important agenda item if an inter-Korean summit takes place," a Foreign Ministry official said. "A summit should be arranged as a way to address international concerns about the North's nuclear weapons," he said. In an apparent bid to coordinate summit agenda items with White House officials, Kim Tae-hyo, secretary to President Lee for national security strategy, is visiting Washington this week.

# The U.S. Military Should Remain in South Korea

North Korea will pose a direct threat to the United States within five years.

**MSNBC, 2011**

**“Gates: N. Korea will pose direct threat to U.S. in 5 years”:** MSNBC <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/41016040/ns/world_news-asiapacific/>

1/11/2011: **North Korea will pose a direct threat to the United States within five years if the communist dictatorship isn't reined in, U.S. Defense Secretary Robert Gates said Tuesday.**

Gates cited the **North's development of intercontinental ballistic missiles and its efforts to expand its nuclear weapons capability** during a press conference in Beijing with Chinese President Hu Jintao.Gates told reporters that he did not believe North Korea would amass large numbers of the missiles, saying it would be a limited capability. **"I think that North Korea will have developed an intercontinental ballistic missile within that time** — not that they will have huge numbers or anything like that," Gates told reporters.

**North Korea has more than 800 ballistic missiles and more than 1,000 missiles of various ranges. It has sold missiles and technology overseas,** with Iran a top buyer. **Pyongyang's arsenal includes intermediate-range missiles that can hit targets at up to 1,860 miles away,** the Yonhap news agency quoted a South Korean official as saying last year. **Those missiles could hit all of Japan and put U.S. military bases in Guam at risk.**

The Pentagon chief also noted that South **Korea's tolerance for the North's behavior has "worn thin."**

He said it's time for Pyongyang to demonstrate specific ways it is ready to re-engage with its neighbors, such as moratoriums on missile testing and nuclear testing. Gates said China has played a helpful role in lessening tensions, and said North Korea will be a significant topic when President Barack Obama meets with Hu in Washington next week.

Obama is expected to press Hu to exert more pressure on North Korea, which has alarmed the region by shelling a South Korean island and revealing advances in its nuclear program. China is North Korea's only major diplomatic and economic backer. Gates travels to South Korea and Japan after China, two other countries which are involved in stalled talks aimed at getting Pyongyang to give up its nuclear weapons ambitions.

# The U.S. Military Should Remain in South Korea

Prominent Korea expert says a troop increase is necessary.

**Yonhap News Agency, 12/2010**

**“U.S. expert calls for increasing American troop presence in S. Korea to stop NK provocations”** - Chang Jae-soon- Yonhap News Agency <http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2010/12/14/29/0401000000AEN20101214003300315F.HTML>

12/14/2010 -- **The United States should seriously think about stationing more troops in South Korea to deter further North Korean provocations**, a U.S. expert and former White House security official said Tuesday amid high tensions over the North's artillery shelling of a South Korean island. **"The single most important indicator, symbolic and significant indicator of U.S. commitment, security commitment to South Korea, has been its troop presence on the peninsula,"** **Georgetown University professor Victor Cha** said during a speech at the Korea Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

**"Even a symbolic increase in that troop presence will send a very clear message to North Korea and to China that there are real costs to continued North Korean provocations,"** he told a forum of South Korean business leaders. Cha, **one of the best-known security experts on Korea,** had served as the **Asian affairs director at the White House's National Security Council in the previous U.S. administration and as a U.S. negotiator in six-party talks on North Korea's nuclear programs.** About 28,500 American troops are stationed in South Korea to deter threats from the communist North, a legacy of the 1950-53 Korean War that ended in a truce, not a peace treaty, leaving the two sides still technically at war. Tensions on the divided peninsula have spiked after the North's Nov. 23 shelling of the South's Yeonpyeong Island, which killed four people, including two civilians. The artillery attack came eight months after the North torpedoed a South Korean warship, killing 46 sailors. Pyongyang has also ratcheted up nuclear tensions last month with revelations that it has a facility to enrich uranium that can be used to fuel atomic bombs if highly enriched. The uranium program gives North Korea a second way of making nuclear weapons after its plutonium-based program. **Cha praised the measures the current U.S. government has taken to deter North Korea following the island shelling, such as holding joint military exercises with South Korea more frequently**, bolstering trilateral relations with South Korea and Japan, and calling on China to exercise its influence over North Korea. But he also suggested other options to **discourage North Korea from provocations, including increasing American troop levels in South Korea** and getting the U.N. Security Council to adopt a resolution authorizing the use of force against the North. Cha said the recently concluded free trade agreement between Seoul and Washington would also help enhance relations between the two countries, saying the accord is not simply a trade deal, but it will have wider impacts on relations between the two allies.

On the power transition in North Korea, **Cha expressed strong skepticism that Kim Jong-un, the foreign-educated youngest son of leader Kim Jong-il, will carry out any reforms**. North Korea has made the junior Kim a four-star general and given him senior Workers' Party titles in steps to put him in place to take over after his father.