# 2AC Addon Economy

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

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

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

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

**Extinction**

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

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

# 2AC Addon Gender/Security

**The plan’s awesome – it’s key to end a cycle of binaries and violence**

**Kirk 8** – Associate Professor of Women and Gender Studies. Edited by John Feffer, co-director of Foreign Policy In Focus at the Institute for Policy Studies (Gwyn, 14 March 2008, Gender and U.S. Bases in Asia-Pacific, http://www.fpif.org/articles/gender\_and\_us\_bases\_in\_asia-pacific, RBatra)

The power dynamics of militarism in the Asia-Pacific region rely on dominance and subordination. These hierarchical relationships, shaped by gender, can be seen in U.S. military exploitation of host communities, its abuse and contamination of land and water, and the exploitation of women and children through the sex industry, sexual violence, and rape. Women’s bodies, the land, and indigenous communities are all feminized, treated as dispensable and temporary. What is constructed as “civilized, white, male, western, and rational” is held superior to what is defined as “primitive, non-white, female, non-western, and irrational.” Nations and U.S. territories within the Asia-Pacific region are treated as inferiors with limited sovereignty or agency in relation to U.S. foreign policy interests that go hand-in-hand with this racist/sexist ideology.

The imbalance of power in gender relations in and around bases is mirrored at the alliance level as well. The United States controls Hawai’i through statehood; Guam is a colonial territory; and the United States is the dominant partner in alliances with Japan, South Korea, and the Philippines. The expansion and restructuring of U.S. bases and military operations in the region depend on these imbalances of power, which are rooted in histories of annexation, colonization, exploitation, and war.

The Asia-Pacific region is a major part of the worldwide network of U.S. bases and facilities that support the global war on terror and enables the United States to extend its reach far beyond its own shores. The war on terror is only the latest justification for U.S. military presence in communities that have little say over the activities of armed outsiders. This network in turn depends on a set of interrelated phenomena – violence against women and girls, violation of local people’s self-determination, and abuse and contamination of the environment – that reinforce gender stereotypes.

Military Violence against Women

Violence against women is pervasive at U.S. bases in the region and in prevailing military culture and training. The case of Okinawa is especially shocking. In the past 62 years, there have been 400 reported cases of women who have been attacked, kidnapped, abused, gang-raped, or murdered by U.S. troops. Victims have included a nine-month old baby and girls between six and 15 years old. Most recently, in February 2008, Staff Sgt. Tyrone Luther Hadnott, aged 38, of Camp Courtney in Okinawa, was arrested and charged with raping a 14-year-old girl.

In November 2005, several Marines stood trial for raping a Philippine woman, “Nicole” (a pseudonym) near Olongapo (Philippines). One man, Daniel Smith, a U.S. marine, was convicted of this crime and sentenced to 40 years imprisonment in the Philippines. However, he was transferred to U.S. custody immediately after conviction. Philippine and U.S. organizations contend that this case illuminates the negative impacts of the U.S.-Philippines Visiting Forces Agreement (VFA), which undermines Philippines national sovereignty.

Violence against women recurs around U.S. bases in Asia. A particularly brutal rape and murder of a Korean woman in 1992 led to street demonstrations in Seoul and the formation of a new organization, the National Campaign for the Eradication of Crime by U.S. Troops in Korea, to document crimes and help victims claim redress. Activists in Guam are justifiably concerned that such violence will rise in their communities with the proposed increase in U.S. Marines stationed there.

Military personnel are trained to dehumanize “others” as part of their preparation for war. Their aggressiveness, frustration, and fear spill over into local communities, for example in acts of violence against girls and women. Although most U.S. troops do not commit such violations, these incidents happen far too often to be accepted as aberrations. Racist and sexist stereotypes about Asian women – as exotic, accommodating, and sexually compliant – are an integral part of such violence. These crimes inflame local hostility and resistance to U.S. military bases and operations, and have long-lasting effects on victims/survivors. Cases are seriously underreported due to women’s shame and fear or their belief that perpetrators will not be apprehended.

This pattern of sexual violence reveals structural inequalities between Asian communities and the U.S. military, encoded in Status of Forces Agreements and Visiting Forces Agreements. The military sees each crime as an isolated act committed by individual soldiers. Local communities that protest these crimes see gendered violence as a structural issue that is perpetuated by legal, political, economic, and social structures.

Military prostitution continues despite the military’s declared “zero tolerance” policy, affirmed in Department of Defense memoranda and Executive Order 13387 that President George W. Bush signed in October 2005. These days, most women working in clubs near U.S. bases in South Korea and Japan/Okinawa are from the Philippines due to low wages, high unemployment, and the absence of sustainable economic development at home. These governments admit Philippine women on short-term entertainer visas.

Servicemen are still protected from prosecution for many infringements of local laws and customs. The sexual activity of foreign-based troops, including (but not exclusively) through prostitution, has had serious effects on women’s health, boosting rates of HIV/AIDS, sexually transmitted diseases, unwanted pregnancies, unsafe abortions, drug and alcohol dependency, and mental illness. U.S. Navy ships visit the Philippines for R & R and make stops at Pattaya (Thailand) where the sex-tourism industry flourished during the Vietnam War.

Violation of Local People’s Self-Determination

The expansion of U.S. military bases and operations has had a huge adverse impact on local communities at social, economic, political, and environmental levels. Host governments and local business elites are complicit in this. They equate progress and economic development with U.S. corporate and military interests instead of addressing the effects of U.S. militarism on local communities. The United States uses political and economic control to exert military force in the Pacific region. Allied nations trade sovereignty for militarized “security.” Japan and South Korea both pay for upkeep of U.S. troops and the restructuring or expansion of U.S. bases in their countries.

# 2AC Addon Metals

**We've read all of the impact scenarios below, but not all in the same debate.**

**Containment causes rare-earth mineral cut-off**

**Steig 10** (Linda, Nov. 4, http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE6A31I520101104?pageNumber=2, ellipses in original, twm)

Push-back from the United States and China's Asian neighbors seems only to have made Beijing feel more threatened, while Chinese nationalist sentiment, seen in a series of anti-Japanese street protests, makes it harder for China to compromise. Fears China is using its monopoly over rare earth minerals needed for high-tech wares as a lever in diplomatic disputes have rattled Japan, despite Beijing's denials and the certainty that China itself would suffer from reciprocal economic retaliation.

"In some sense, what is more worrisome is not volatility rising militarily over those islands, but that they are willing to use economic power to get what they want," said Chikako Kawakatsu Ueki, a professor at Tokyo's Waseda University.

**Rare earth imports from China are key to renewable energy and jobs – we can’t wean ourselves off Chinese dependence**

**Bradsher 12/15** – chief Hong Kong correspondent on issues from China/ Asia for the New York Times, won the Society of Publishers in Asia award (Keith, 15 December 2010, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/12/15/business/global/15rare.html?\_r=2&src=busln&pagewanted=print, U.S. Called Vulnerable to Rare Earth Shortages, RBatra)

“We can build a new industry and put our clean energy future on a sound footing, creating many new jobs in the process,” Mr. Sandalow said.

Still, the report presents a fairly gloomy assessment of the United States’ ability to wean itself from Chinese imports. For as long as the next 15 years, the supplies of at least five minerals that come almost exclusively from China will remain as vulnerable to disruption as they are absolutely vital to the manufacture of small yet powerful electric motors, energy-efficient compact fluorescent bulbs and other clean energy technologies, the report said.

The five minerals are medium and heavy rare earth elements of which China mines an estimated 96 percent to 99.8 percent of the world’s supply: dysprosium, terbium, neodymium, europium and yttrium.

China also increasingly dominates the manufacture of clean energy technologies that require such minerals, including the production of million-dollar wind turbines. Chinese export restrictions have added up to $40 a pound to world prices, which makes a big difference particularly for some of the less expensive rare earths, like lanthanum, that sell for several dollars a pound in China.

That is among the reasons, along with cheap labor and extensive Chinese government subsidies, that many clean energy manufacturers have found it cheaper to shift production to China.

Mr. Sandalow said that wind turbine manufacturers were capable of building very large turbines without rare earths. But using rare earths could reduce the per megawatt cost of wind energy and improve its competitiveness through savings on other materials, like steel and copper.

He cautioned that the United States had been putting far fewer resources than China into exploring ways to use the powerful magnetic and other properties of rare earths.

“There are thousands of rare earth researchers in China and dozens in the United States, and that underscores both the challenge and the opportunity,” he said. “Their expertise in this area is significant.”

China’s finance ministry, in announcing plans to raise export taxes on some rare earths, did not indicate which minerals might be affected.

Since 2006, China has imposed an export tax of 15 percent on light rare earths like lanthanum and cerium, which are needed for oil refining and glass manufacturing, and 25 percent on heavy rare earths like dysprosium and terbium.

China mines about 92 percent of the world’s light rare earths.

Dysprosium, which helps rare earth magnets preserve their magnetism at high temperatures, is mined almost exclusively in southern China and sells for $95 a pound in China and $135 a pound outside, including the export tax.

Dysprosium has emerged as the mineral most vital to clean energy industries yet most vulnerable to supply disruptions, the report said.

Dudley Kingsnorth, a prominent rare earth mining consultant in Perth, Australia, said he agreed that a dysprosium shortage was likely. He added that he expected that a rare earth shortage would slow the overall adoption of new rare earth technologies by clean energy industries for at least the next five years.

**And, this destroys the industry**

**Bradsher 12/15** – chief Hong Kong correspondent on issues from China/ Asia for the New York Times, won the Society of Publishers in Asia award (Keith, 15 December 2010, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/12/15/business/global/15rare.html?\_r=2&src=busln&pagewanted=print, U.S. Called Vulnerable to Rare Earth Shortages, RBatra)

The United States is too reliant on China for minerals crucial to new clean energy technologies, making the American economy vulnerable to shortages of materials needed for a range of green products – from compact fluorescent light bulbs to electric cars to giant wind turbines.

So warns a detailed report to be released on Wednesday morning by the United States Energy Department. The report, which predicts that it could take 15 years to break American dependence on Chinese supplies, calls for the nation to increase research and expand diplomatic contacts to find alternative sources, and to develop ways to recycle the minerals or replace them with other materials.

At least 96 percent of the most crucial types of the so-called rare earth minerals are now produced in China, and Beijing has wielded various export controls to limit the minerals’ supply to other countries while favoring its own manufacturers that use them.

“The availability of a number of these materials is at risk due to their location, vulnerability to supply disruptions and lack of suitable substitutes,” the report says, which also mentions some concerns about a few other minerals imported from elsewhere, such as cobalt from the Congo.

**Key to economic leadership – solves extinction**

**Pernick 7** (Ron Pernick & Clint Wilder, - Ron Pernick and Clint Wilder are coauthors of The Clean Tech Revolution and co-founder/principal and contributing editor, respectively, of Clean Edge, Inc., Clean Edge, Renewable Energy World, Extinction or Innovation? U.S. Government Must Enact Clean Energy Policy,” July 23, 2007, http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/news/reinsider/story?id=49399, AM)

The United States, often the world's leader in technological innovation, could be about to cede the next wave of business breakthroughs and wealth creation -- those that come from clean energy and other clean technologies -- to other nations if it doesn't act soon. The nation desperately needs an aggressive, comprehensive clean-energy package, including a national renewable portfolio standard (RPS), if it is to remain relevant on an increasingly competitive global playing field. While the Senate, House and President get caught in a web of accusations, filibusters, back-room manipulation, and threatened vetoes, the future of our commitment to innovation and economic competitiveness suffers. It's time that Americans get an energy policy that moves the nation into the future, not one based on the technologies and energy sources of the past. In recent energy legislation passed by the Senate, opponents succeeded in preventing inclusion of a national RPS calling for 15% of electricity to come from clean energy sources by 2020 and dropping $32 billion in clean-energy tax incentives that would have supported the development of solar, wind, and other new energy resources. Now it's up to the House to see if it can move any of these initiatives forward. Since the start of the new millennium, as a clean-tech leadership vacuum persisted at the U.S. federal level, it's been U.S. states and cities that have picked up the ball. Two dozen states – both blue and red, comprising well over half the country's population – now have RPS' that require their utilities to generate a specific percentage of their power from clean and renewable sources by a specified date. Hundreds of U.S. cities have signed on to meet or beat the targets outlined in the Kyoto Protocol. But such local- and state-level actions, by themselves, are no longer adequate. Policies to grow the use of clean energy are not simply an environmental aim, they are an economic imperative. Industries such as solar energy, wind power and biofuels are growing at 30% annually or more, and they are creating quality jobs and becoming cornerstones of economic development from the plains of Iowa to the R&D centers of Shanghai. Germany, Japan, Denmark, Spain, Brazil and many other nations are vying for clean-tech leadership; even China has a national RPS and fuel efficiency standards that are currently more aggressive than those in the U.S. If the U.S. is to compete effectively in this new global environment, now is the time for the federal government to get serious about a consolidated, all hands-on deck, committed clean-energy policy – including a national RPS. At a recent conference of global clean-energy financiers in New York, California Energy Commissioner John Geesman called our lack of an RPS "a national embarrassment." As Tokyo, Beijing and Frankfurt continue to plot their clean-tech futures, the U.S. must take a leadership role in the creation and deployment of clean energy, transportation, and efficiency technologies. Just look at the numbers. According to research firm New Energy Finance, approximately $70 billion is now being invested globally in clean energy technologies by corporations, governments, venture capitalists, and the public stock market. Our firm, Clean Edge, estimates that the current market for solar power, wind power, biofuels, and fuel cells now exceed $50 billion globally. And Clean Edge and Nth Power, which each year track clean-energy venture activity in the U.S., report that energy-tech venture activity alone has increased from less than one percent of the total venture pie in 1999 to nearly ten percent in 2006. And one look no further than such corporate leaders as Google, IBM, GE, Applied Materials, and even Wal-Mart – all U.S. companies seriously working to deploy clean technologies and push the innovation envelope. So what can the Federal government do? In order to guarantee a leadership role and smart policy, we believe the national government must:• Stay focused. Don't confuse the issue by saying that nuclear power and so-called clean coal are clean technologies. They are not, and the Senate wisely defeated an amendment by Sen. Pete Domenici (R-New Mexico) that would have put them under the RPS umbrella. Focus on the industries that use proven technologies to produce power cleanly and more efficiently. • Shift subsidies from fossil fuels to clean energy technologies such as solar, wind, biofuels, smart grid, and energy efficiency. Make sure these commitments are long-term, reliable, and consistent. • Get serious about carbon. Our global counterparts have already begun to put a price on carbon and are building robust markets. In 2006 alone, the World Bank reports that the carbon trading market in Europe was worth approximately $20 billion. The U.S. must join this global imperative, and leading U.S. companies such as DuPont, Duke Energy, and PG&E are already calling for federal action. • Provide guidance to the states. To paraphrase the famous line from Tip O'Neill – "All Energy is Local." But the federal government can and must do its part with nationwide standards and financial commitments, along with national clean energy and renewable fuel targets. Clean-tech leadership is in our national interest; it can't all be left up to the states in isolation. Detractors and naysayers, of course, will say that clean energy is subsidy-dependent and therefore can't compete in the marketplace. But this is disingenuous double-speak. Close observers of the energy industry know that there is no such thing as a subsidy – and policy – independent energy source. The oil, coal, and nuclear power industries have all relied heavily not only on government policy, but also on rich and lucrative subsidy programs. Others will argue that clean technologies can't scale up. But this is misguided thinking. Spain and Denmark, for example, already generate about 20 percent of their nation's electricity from wind power and leading states like California are targeting around 30 percent of their grid electricity from new renewables before the end of the next decade. The U.S., known for its innovation in earlier tech revolutions such as computer chips, telecom, and the Internet can lead once again. But it will take a concerted effort by an army of corporate innovators and startup entrepreneurs – and, like any revolution – it will require supportive government policies. Sure, we're big supporters of the American free-market economy but it's unrealistic to act as if government policy and leadership doesn't matter. In today's increasingly competitive global marketplace, you either innovate or die – and government has a critical role in this process. Now is the time to push the envelope on the development of 21st century clean technologies. We need to embed silicon, like we have in our communication networks, into the electric grid. We need cars that don't just get 30 or 40 miles per gallon, but a new breed of plug-in hybrids that get up to 100 miles per gallon or more. Google.org recently awarded $1 million in grants and announced plans to provide $10 million toward the development, adoption, and commercialization of plug-in hybrids and fully electric cars. We believe that we are in the midst of one of the greatest shifts in human history. Within 50 years, we'll look back at the beginning of the 21st century and see it as the tipping point for clean technology. The choice for investors, companies, governments, and individuals is simple. Be part of one of the greatest business and economic shifts in recorded human history, or become extinct like the dinosaurs whose fossils fueled the last great industrial revolution. The opportunity for wealth creation and economic leadership stands on one side of the equation – and the very real threat of the collapse of civilization as we know it on the other. Shouldn't the federal government of one of the most forward-thinking, innovative, and technologically savvy nations on earth be leading that effort?

**Renewables solve air pollution and 70,000 deaths per year**

**Sovacool & Cooper 7** – \*Senior Research Fellow for the Network for New Energy Choices in New York and Adjunct Assistant Professor at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University in Blacksburg, VA and Executive Director of the Network for New Energy Choices (Benjamin K. Sovacool, also a Research Fellow at the Centre for Asia and Globalization at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy and Christopher Cooper, Renewing America: The Case for Federal Leadership on a National Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), Network for New Energy Choices • Report No. 01-07, June, 2007, http://www.newenergychoices.org/dev/uploads/RPS%20Report\_Cooper\_Sovacool\_FINAL\_HILL.pdf) JMP

C. Air Quality

Conventional electricity generation is by far the largest source of air pollutants that harm human health and contribute to global warming. In 2003, for example, fossil fuel use (for all energy sectors, not just electricity) was responsible for 99 percent of the country’s carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions, 93 percent of its sulfur dioxide (SOx) emissions, and 96 percent of its nitrous oxides emissions (NOx).269

Researchers at the Harvard School of Public Health estimated that the air pollution from conventional energy sources kills between 50,000 and 70,000 Americans every year. These researchers found that the emissions from just 9 power plants in Illinois directly contributed to an annual risk of 300 premature deaths, 14,000 asthma attacks, and more than 400,000 daily incidents of upper respiratory symptoms among the 33 million people living within 250 miles of the plants.271

Compiling data from the American Cancer Society, Harvard School of Public Health, and Environmental Protection Agency, the Clean the Air Grassroots Network estimated that residents in every single U.S. state were at risk to premature death from air pollution. 272

Children are particularly vulnerable to the pollution from fossil fuels. Because children spend more time outside and have smaller airways that necessitate more rapid breathing, they are much more vulnerable to develop illnesses associated with air pollution.273

By promoting technologies that displace conventional forms of electricity generation, a national RPS would substantially decrease air pollution in the U.S. A single 1 MW wind turbine running at only 30 percent of capacity for one year displaces more than 1,500 tons of carbon dioxide, 2.5 tons of sulfur dioxide 3.2 tons of nitrous oxides, and 60 pounds of toxic mercury (Hg) emissions.274

One study assessing the environmental potential of a 580 MW wind farm located on the Altamont Pass near San Francisco, California, concluded that the turbines displaced hundreds of thousands of tons of air pollutants each year that would have otherwise resulted from fossil fuel combustion. 275

The study estimated that the wind farm would displace more than 24 billion pounds of nitrous oxides, sulfur dioxides, particulate matter and carbon dioxide over the course of its 20-year lifetime – enough to cover the entire city of Oakland in a pile of toxic pollution 40 stories high.276 pg. 102-105

**Extinction**

**Driesen 3** - Prof Law – Syracuse, (David, Buffalo Environmental Law Journal, Fall, 2002/Spring ’03, “Sustainable Development and Air Quality: The Need to Replace Basic Technologies with Cleaner Alternatives” lexis)

Air pollution can make life unsustainable by harming the ecosystem upon which all life depends and harming the health of both future and present generations. The Rio Declaration articulates six key principles that are relevant to air pollution. These principles can also be understood as goals, because they describe a state of affairs [\*27] that is worth achieving. Agenda 21, in turn, states a program of action for realizing those goals. Between them, they aid understanding of sustainable development's meaning for air quality.

The first principle is that "human beings. . . are entitled to a healthy and productive life in harmony with nature", because they are "at the center of concerns for sustainable development." n3 While the Rio Declaration refers to human health, its reference to life "in harmony with nature" also reflects a concern about the natural environment. n4 Since air pollution damages both human health and the environment, air quality implicates both of these concerns.

**Collapses the U.S. military**

**Richardson 10** (Michael, 10/18, visiting senior research fellow at the Institute of South East Asian Studies in Singapore, Yale Global Online, “China’s Chokehold On Rare-Earth Minerals Raises Concerns ,” http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/chinas-rare-earth-minerals, da 11/16, mat)

Yet China could keep its dominant grip on the rare-earths industry for some years. It holds 35 percent of global reserves, but supplies over 95 percent of demand for rare-earth oxides, of which 60 percent is domestic, according to Industrial Minerals Company of Australia, a consultancy. Just as important, Chinese companies, many of them state-controlled, have advanced in their quest to make China the world leader in processing rare-earth metals into finished materials. Success in this quest could give China a decisive advantage not just in civilian industry, including clean energy, but also in military production if Chinese manufacturers were given preferential treatment over foreign competitors. Cerium is the most abundant of the 17 rare earths, all of which have similar chemical properties. A cerium-based coating is non-corrosive and has significant military applications. The Pentagon is due to finish a report soon on the risks of US military dependence on rare earths from China. Their use is widespread in the defense systems of the US, its allies, and other countries that buy its weapons and equipment. China has a key advantage: the world’s biggest reserves of rare-earth minerals that are essential to producing some of the newest technologies. In a report to the US Congress in April, the Government Accountability Office said that it had been told by officials and defense industry executives that where rare-earth alloys and other materials were used in military systems, they were “responsible for the functionality of the component and would be difficult to replace without losing performance.” For example, fin actuators in precision-guided bombs are specifically designed around the capabilities of neodymium iron boron rare-earth magnets. The main US battle tank, the M1A2 Abrams, has a reference and navigation system that relies on samarium cobalt magnets from China. An official report last year on the US national defense stockpile said that shortages of four rare earths – lanthanum, cerium, europium and gadolinium – had already caused delays in producing some weapons. It recommended further study to determine the severity of the delays.

**<Heg impact>\*\***

# 2AC Addon Regionalism

**Withdrawal will reduce Korea’s veto of multilateral security mechanisms – yielding a peace system on the peninsula that prevents great power war**

**Lee, 09** – Seoul National University (December 2009, Geun, “The Nexus between Korea’s Regional Security Options and Domestic Politics,” www.cfr.org, JMP)

Korea’s Option of Multilateral Security Cooperation in Northeast Asia The idea of multilateral security cooperation in Northeast Asia is not a recent one. Since 1988, Korea has advocated regional security cooperation, and in 1994, Korea officially proposed the Northeast Asia Security Dialogue (NEASED) at the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF). Serious discussion of multilateral security cooperation in Northeast Asia started in 2005 during the Six Party Talks to resolve the nuclear crisis on the Korean Peninsula. In fact, the Six Party Talks have been an important generator of innovative ideas, and participants in the Six Party Talks have gradually realized the importance of a multilateral security mechanism in Northeast Asia, even if they do not share identical interests in such a mechanism.6 From Korea’s perspective, a semi-regional arrangement like the Six Party Talks produces five main benefits.7 First, a multilateral security arrangement in Northeast Asia composed of the United States, China, Japan, Russia, North Korea, and South Korea will provide insurance to the concerned parties that the agreements struck at the Six Party Talks will not be violated by the participants. Cheating and lack of trust are among the fundamental problems in solving the Korean nuclear crisis, and a multilateral binding of agreements can help solve the problems by increasing transparency and the transaction costs of violating the agreements. Second, a multilateral security arrangement in Northeast Asia is fundamentally a global security arrangement, as it includes all the global powers except the European Union. The United States and China unofficially form the Group of Two (G2), Japan is an economic superpower, and Russia used to be the leader of the Eastern bloc. The high concentration of superpowers in Northeast Asia poses a threat to Korea because an outbreak of great-power conflict in the region will definitely devastate Korea, if not the world. Therefore, Korea has reason to promote a multilateral security mechanism that increases transparency among global powers and functions as a confidence-building measure. Third, voluntary or involuntary betrayal by the United States has preoccupied many Koreans and security experts. Some Koreans felt betrayed when the United States agreed to the division of the Korean peninsula. The Park Chung-hee government felt abandoned when the United States withdrew a significant portion of U.S. soldiers from Korea, and was taken aback by rapprochement between the United States and China. Many Koreans got upset when the United States supported the authoritarian Korean government and kept silent during the Kwangju massacre in 1980. They again felt betrayed when it was rumored that the Clinton administration planned air strikes against North Korea without informing South Korea. And they were upset with the unilateral foreign policy stance of the George W. Bush administration, including its decision to pull the second infantry division out of Korea. A multilateral security arrangement in Northeast Asia will mitigate the security concern of Korea when the United States either voluntarily or involuntarily defects from its commitment to Korea. Fourth, multilateral security cooperation in Northeast Asia is necessary to establish a peace system on the Korean peninsula and ultimately unify Korea. Many Korean people doubt that the major powers, including the United States, want the unification of the Korean peninsula. Korea wants to deal with these powers transparently through a multilateral security cooperation mechanism. Fifth, seeing the latest global financial crisis and the rise of China, many Koreans recognize the need to adjust Korea’s external strategy to the changing geoeconomic world. Making exclusive ties with the United States may be a high-risk investment in a past hegemon, while exclusive ties with China would be a high-risk investment in an uncertain future. In this transitional period for geoeconomics, multilateral security cooperation is an attractive partial exit option for Korea. A multilateral security mechanism in Northeast Asia appeals to Korea, so if voice and loyalty in the U.S.-Korea relationship do not reveal positive correlations, then Korea will pay more attention to multilateral regional options. Moreover, if the U.S. capability and credibility in delivering its security promises to alliance partners are questioned, there will be fewer veto powers in Korean politics against a multilateral security mechanism in Northeast Asia, particularly when such an option still maintains a loose form of the U.S.-Korea alliance.

# 2AC Addon SoKo Soft Power

**We've read several different impacts to this, but not all in the same debate.**

**South Korea is perceived as dependent – makes foreign policy leadership impossible**

**Bandow 98** (Doug, Senior Fellow – Cato Institute and Robert A. Taft Fellow – American Conservative Defense Alliance, “America’s Obsolete Korean Commitment”, Orbis, 42(4), Fall, Ebsco)

Are there risks from American disengagement from Korea and ultimately East Asia? Of course -anything is possible, however unlikely. As historian William Stueck observes, the original Korean war was “laden with miscalculation on all sides.“31 But that record is all the more reason to disengage. Mistakes were made between 1945 and 1950 that gave Americans little choice but to fight another war less than five years after the end of World War II. With the end of the Cold War, however, Washington need no longer bear the burden of other nations’ mistakes. In turn, South Korea and its neighbors would no longer have to help pay for America’s mistakes. The ROK and Japan, in particular, should ponder carefully the costs of their continuing security dependence on Big Brother. The first is the negative social impact, exemplified by the 1995 subway brawl in South Korea and rape in Okinawa involving American servicemen. Washington is used to having other nations treat its troops as occupying heroes, but tens of thousands of young American soldiers are not always going to act like gentlemen sensitive to a foreign culture. The second is the question of respect accorded other nations, particularly the ROK. “Most people in South Korea are beginning to feel more prestigious and self-confident,” says newspaper columnist Kil Jeong Woo. “These kinds of things should be respected by our American friends, not ignored.“32 But they will be ignored so long as the South relies on what amounts to U.S. military charity. This issue may have consequences beyond simply wounding the national ego of its allies. While Washington is generally benevolent, there is no reason to expect it to put anyone else’s interest before its own. Nor is this ever likely to change: the United States has yet to establish a security partnership among equals. As Ted Galen Carpenter puts it, “It is not in the best interest of the South Korean people for the ROK to have its national survival in the hands of decision makers in Washington.“33 Conclusion Americans will stay as long as South Koreans want us, according to the manna chanted by successive American presidents and defense secretaries. But such a policy makes no sense, even for Seoul. Indeed, the ROK’s Ministry of National Defense has acknowledged the importance of developing “a future oriented defense policy in preparation for the twenty-first century and the post-unification era.” As South Korea emerges as a significant international player in economic and political terms, it needs to begin playing an equally influential and independent military role as well.

**Perception of independence is key to effective South Korean diplomacy – solves disease, terrorism, environmental collapse, and human rights**

**Robertson 8** (Jeffrey, Trade Research Specialist with the Foreign Affairs, Defence, and Trade Group – Australian Parliamentary Information and Research Service, “Middle Power: A New Strategy for Korea?”, Korea Herald, 3-28, Lexis)

However, increasingly common definitions of what constitutes a middle-power focus not solely upon measurements of capacity, but also on foreign policy behavior. Once states attain a middle-power status in capacity terms, their foreign policy behavior is thought to evolve toward a distinct form of "middle-power diplomacy" or "middlepowermanship." Middle-power diplomacy is marked by the tendency to seek compromise in international disputes, to seek multilateral solutions to global issues and to demonstrate "good international citizenship." Reflecting its status as a middle-power in terms of capacity measurements, it could be expected that South Korea would begin to demonstrate middle-power foreign policy behavior. Accordingly, a new national strategy for Korea could well be the pursuit of middlepowermanship. What is a middle-power foreign policy? The tendency to seek compromise in international disputes, to seek multilateral solutions to global issues and to demonstrate good international citizenship revolve around the status quo. The central aim of any middle-power is to ensure the maintenance of the status quo, and in doing so, maintain its comfortable position in the upper echelons of the international hierarchy of states. Essentially, they seek to maintain the existing international order so that they may continue to derive benefit from entrenched inequalities in power and wealth. South Korea has already demonstrated a tendency toward this. During the late 1990s, with the collapse of the North Korean economy and uncertainty regarding its leadership transition, South Korea had the greatest potential to topple North Korea in the history of the peninsula's division. Despite this, South Korea sought to maintain the status quo. The Sunshine Policy with its key principles of coexistence and rejection of attempts to absorb or forcefully unify the peninsula was welcomed by a South Korean population accustomed to an advanced level of economic development and aware of the risk that change represented. The Sunshine Policy demonstrated a vested interest in both compromise and in the maintenance of the status quo. Middlepowermanship, however, goes further than just a preference for the status quo. Middle-powers must ensure that there are tools to maintain the status quo. They have a strong stake in a rules-based international order. Multilateralism is the middle-power's best friend. In multilateral forums middle-powers can engage with lesser powers to constrain the actions of major powers, and equally, they can engage with major powers to ensure lesser powers do not upset the existing hierarchy. Whether it is in trade at the World Trade Organization, arms control at the United Nations or economics at the OECD, the ability of middle-powers to achieve a favorable diplomatic outcome is greatly enhanced by multilateralism. Middle-powers can achieve more in a multilateral setting than could possibly be achieved in a bilateral setting. South Korea is yet to fully explore the potential that multilateralism holds for a middle-power. Reflecting its history, the young South Korea did not have a chance to mold multilateralism as more established middle-powers did, but rather was molded by multilateralism. During the Cold War, its position at the frontline and its contested legitimacy as the representative of the Korean peninsula, severely constrained South Korean participation in multilateralism. While the Cold War is long past, to this day, there remains a certain level of cynicism regarding multilateralism in South Korea. Other more established middle-powers are marked by their active use of multilateralism to further diplomatic aims. The classic example is Australia at the WTO. After years of seeking adjustments to European Union and United States agricultural support in a bilateral context, Australia launched a campaign at the multilateral level, in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the forerunner of the WTO. Through active coalition building, Australia was instrumental in the creation of the Cairns Group - a coalition of 17 agricultural exporting states. As leader of the Cairns Group, Australia pushed its diplomatic agenda at a level that would have been impossible in a bilateral context. The Cairns Group allowed Australia access to high level meetings and greatly enhanced its negotiating position vis-a-vis its old negotiating foes in agricultural liberalization, the European Union and the United States. Today, South Korea has the potential to play a much larger role in multilateral forums than ever before. As a middle-power with a substantial diplomatic capacity (and a former foreign minister at the helm of the United Nations) South Korea could play a much larger role. Indeed, as a middle-power, it should. To strengthen multilateralism, middle-powers must also make commitments that sometimes seem less self-interested. Middle-powers must adhere to what former Australian Foreign Minister and current President of the International Crisis Group, Gareth Evans, coined good international citizenship. This includes strengthening rules-based regimes, such as nonproliferation controls, environmental protection and human rights, and also increasing cooperation to tackle pandemics, transnational crime and terrorism. Essentially, good international citizenship is a recognition of the interdependence between states and the need to address global problems in collaboration. Middle-powers also serve their own self-interest in promoting good international citizenship. By making commitments to peace-keeping, humanitarian operations, leading forums on tackling AIDS or combating environmental degradation, middle-powers gain credibility. Middle-powers need to be viewed as credible and independent actors in international affairs in order to strengthen their capacity to build coalitions and wage successful diplomatic campaigns. Middle-power challenges in Korea There are notable challenges to the pursuit of a middle-power foreign policy in South Korea. Firstly, reflecting its historical background, South Korea often falls victim to an internal policy debate between "independence" and "reliance" that can constrain its foreign policy choices. Since its emergence as a modern state, Korean foreign policy debate has centered on the question of independence versus reliance. A long time before the terms "sadaejuui" (reliance on a greater power) and "juche" (self-reliance) were corrupted by communist propaganda, these and other analogous terms framed the nationalist debate on how Korea should develop and modernize, and what role it should play in the region. Indeed, the debate between independence and reliance continues in contemporary South Korean politics, as can be seen in the clash of foreign policy aims between former President Roh Moo-hyun and current President Lee-Myung-bak. However, the question of independence versus reliance constrains South Korean foreign policy. In South Korea, as a result of the security situation on the peninsula, independence versus reliance is often framed as a debate between extremes and is further muddied by ideological overtones. This constrains South Korea's capacity to use reliance and independence as a means to achieve diplomatic aims.

**Eco collapse causes extinction**

**Jayawardena 9** (Asitha, London South Bank University, “We Are a Threat to All Life on Earth”, Indicator, 7-17, http://www.indicator.org.uk/?p=55)

Sloep and Van Dam-Mieras (1995) explain in detail why the natural environment is so important for life on Earth. It is from the environment that the living organisms of all species import the energy and raw material required for growth, development and reproduction. In almost all ecosystems plants, the most important primary producers, carry out photosynethesis, capturing sunlight and storing it as chemical energy. They absorb nutrients from their environment. When herbivores (i.e. plant-eating animals or organisms) eat these plants possessing chemical energy, matter and energy are transferred ‘one-level up.’ The same happens when predators (i.e. animals of a higher level) eat these herbivores or when predators of even higher levels eat these predators. Therefore, in ecosystems, food webs transfer energy and matter and various organisms play different roles in sustaining these transfers. Such transfers are possible due to the remarkable similarity in all organisms’ composition and major metabolic pathways. In fact all organisms except plants can potentially use each other as energy and nutrient sources; plants, however, depend on sunlight for energy. Sloep and Van Dam-Mieras (1995) further reveal two key principles governing the biosphere with respect to the transfer of energy and matter in ecosystems. Firstly, the energy flow in ecosystems from photosynthetic plants (generally speaking, autotrophs) to non-photosynthetic organisms (generally speaking, heterotrophs) is essentially linear. In each step part of energy is lost to the ecosystem as non-usable heat, limiting the number of transformation steps and thereby the number of levels in a food web. Secondly, unlike the energy flow, the matter flow in ecosystems is cyclic. For photosynthesis plants need carbon dioxide as well as minerals and sunlight. For the regeneration of carbon dioxide plants, the primary producers, depend on heterotrophs, who exhale carbon dioxide when breathing. Like carbon, many other elements such as nitrogen and sulphur flow in cyclic manner in ecosystems. However, it is photosynthesis, and in the final analysis, solar energy that powers the mineral cycles. Ecosystems are under threat and so are we Although it seems that a continued energy supply from the sun together with the cyclical flow of matter can maintain the biosphere machinery running forever, we should not take things for granted, warn Sloep and Van Dam-Mieras (1995). And they explain why. Since the beginning of life on Earth some 3.5 billion years ago, organisms have evolved and continue to do so today in response to environmental changes. However, the overall picture of materials (re)cycling and linear energy transfer has always remained unchanged. We could therefore safely assume that this slowly evolving system will continue to exist for aeons to come if large scale infringements are not forced upon it, conclude Sloep and Van Dam-Mieras (1995). However, according to them, the present day infringements are large enough to upset the world’s ecosystems and, worse still, human activity is mainly responsible for these infringements. The rapidity of the human-induced changes is particularly undesirable. For example, the development of modern technology has taken place in a very short period of time when compared with evolutionary time scales – within decades or centuries rather than thousands or millions of years. Their observations and concerns are shared by a number of other scholars. Roling (2009) warns that human activity is capable of making the collapse of web of life on which both humans and non-human life forms depend for their existence. For Laszlo (1989: 34), in Maiteny and Parker (2002), modern human is ‘a serious threat to the future of humankind’. As Raven (2002) observes, many life-support systems are deteriorating rapidly and visibly. Elaborating on human-induced large scale infringements, Sloep and Van Dam-Mieras (1995) warn that they can significantly alter the current patterns of energy transfer and materials recycling, posing grave problems to the entire biosphere. And climate change is just one of them! Turning to a key source of this crisis, Sloep and Van Dam-Mieras (1995: 37) emphasise that, although we humans can mentally afford to step outside the biosphere, we are ‘animals among animals, organisms among organisms.’ Their perception on the place of humans in nature is resonated by several other scholars. For example, Maiteny (1999) stresses that we humans are part and parcel of the ecosphere. Hartmann (2001) observes that the modern stories (myths, beliefs and paradigms) that humans are not an integral part of nature but are separate from it are speeding our own demise. Funtowicz and Ravetz (2002), in Weaver and Jansen (2004: 7), criticise modern science’s model of human-nature relationship based on conquest and control of nature, and highlight a more desirable alternative of ‘respecting ecological limits, …. expecting surprises and adapting to these.’

**Human rights violations cause extinction**

**HR Web 94** (Human Rights Web, “An Introduction to the Human Rights Movement”, 7-20, http://www.hrweb.org/intro.html)

The United Nations Charter, Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and UN Human Rights convenants were written and implemented in the aftermath of the Holocaust, revelations coming from the Nuremberg war crimes trials, the Bataan Death March, the atomic bomb, and other horrors smaller in magnitude but not in impact on the individuals they affected. A whole lot of people in a number of countries had a crisis of conscience and found they could no longer look the other way while tyrants jailed, tortured, and killed their neighbors. Many also realized that advances in technology and changes in social structures had rendered war a threat to the continued existence of the human race. Large numbers of people in many countries lived under the control of tyrants, having no recourse but war to relieve often intolerable living conditions. Unless some way was found to relieve the lot of these people, they could revolt and become the catalyst for another wide-scale and possibly nuclear war. For perhaps the first time, representatives from the majority of governments in the world came to the conclusion that basic human rights must be protected, not only for the sake of the individuals and countries involved, but to preserve the human race.

**Diseases cause extinction**

**Sandberg 8** (Dr. Anders, Postdoctoral Research Fellow at the Uehiro Centre for Practical Ethics – Oxford University, et al., “How Can We Reduce The Risk Of Human Extinction?”, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, 9-9, http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/features/how-can-we-reduce-the-risk-of-human-extinction)

The risks from anthropogenic hazards appear at present larger than those from natural ones. Although great progress has been made in reducing the number of nuclear weapons in the world, humanity is still threatened by the possibility of a global thermonuclear war and a resulting nuclear winter. We may face even greater risks from emerging technologies. Advances in synthetic biology might make it possible to engineer pathogens capable of extinction-level pandemics. The knowledge, equipment, and materials needed to engineer pathogens are more accessible than those needed to build nuclear weapons. And unlike other weapons, pathogens are self-replicating, allowing a small arsenal to become exponentially destructive. Pathogens have been implicated in the extinctions of many wild species. Although most pandemics "fade out" by reducing the density of susceptible populations, pathogens with wide host ranges in multiple species can reach even isolated individuals. The intentional or unintentional release of engineered pathogens with high transmissibility, latency, and lethality might be capable of causing human extinction. While such an event seems unlikely today, the likelihood may increase as biotechnologies continue to improve at a rate rivaling Moore's Law.

**Terrorism causes extinction**

**Wright 7** – prize winning author of best winning books. Visiting scholar at The University of Pennsylvania and Schwartz Senior Fellow at the New America Foundation. Attended TCU, finished his interdisciplinary degree in public and international affairs at Princeton (Robert, 4/28, Planet Of The Apes, http://select.nytimes.com/2007/04/28/opinion/28wright.html, AG)

(3) Terrorism. Alas, the negative-feedback loop -- bad outcomes lead to smart policies -- may not apply here. We reacted to 9/11 by freaking out and invading one too many countries, creating more terrorists. With the ranks of terrorists growing -- amid evolving biotechnology and loose nukes -- we could within a decade see terrorism on a scale that would make us forget any restraint we had learned from the Iraq war's outcome. If 3,000 deaths led to two wars, how many wars would 300,000 deaths yield? And how many new terrorists? Terrorism alone won't wipe out humanity. But with our unwitting help, it could strengthen other lethal forces. It could give weight to the initially fanciful ''clash of civilizations'' thesis. Muslim states could fall under the control of radicals and opt out of what might otherwise have become a global civilization. Armed with nukes (Pakistan already is), they would revive the nuclear Armageddon scenario. A fissure between civilizations would also sabotage the solution of environmental problems, and the ensuing eco-calamity could make people on both sides of the fissure receptive to radical messages. The worse things got, the worse they'd get. So while no one of the Big Three doomsday dynamics is likely to bring the apocalypse, they could well combine to form a positive-feedback loop, a k a the planetary death spiral. And the catalyst would be terrorism, along with our mishandling of it.