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#### Economic engagement must be quid-pro-quo

Shinn 96 [James Shinn, C.V. Starr Senior Fellow for Asia at the CFR in New York City and director of the council’s multi-year Asia Project, worked on economic affairs in the East Asia Bureau of the US Dept of State, “Weaving the Net: Conditional Engagement with China,” pp. 9 and 11, google books]

In sum, conditional engagement consists of a set of objectives, a strategy for attaining those objectives, and tactics (specific policies) for implementing that strategy. The objectives of conditional engagement are the ten principles, which were selected to preserve American vital interests in Asia while accommodating China’s emergence as a major power. The overall strategy of conditional engagement follows two parallel lines: economic engagement, to promote the integration of China into the global trading and financial systems; and security engagement, to encourage compliance with the ten principles by diplomatic and military means when economic incentives do not suffice, in order to hedge against the risk of the emergence of a belligerent China. The tactics of economic engagement should promote China’s economic integration through negotiations on trade liberalization, institution building, and educational exchanges. While a carrots-and-sticks approach may be appropriate within the economic arena, the use of trade sanction to achieve short-term political goals is discouraged. The tactics of security engagement should reduce the risks posed by China’s rapid military expansion, its lack of transparency, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and transnational problems such as crime and illegal migration, by engaging in arms control negotiations, multilateral efforts, and a loosely-structured defensive military arrangement in Asia.8 [To footnotes] 8. Conditional engagement’s recommended tactics of tit-for-tat responses are equivalent to using carrots and sticks in response to foreign policy actions by China. Economic engagement calls for what is described as symmetric tit-for-tat and security engagement for asymmetric tit-for-tat. A symmetric response is one that counters a move by China in the same place, time, and manner; an asymmetric response might occur in another place at another time, and perhaps in another manner. A symmetric tit-for-tat would be for Washington to counter a Chinese tariff of 10 percent on imports for the United States with a tariff of 10 percent on imports from China. An asymmetric tit-for-tat would be for the United States to counter a Chines shipment of missiles to Iran with an American shipment of F-16s to Vietnam (John Lewis Gaddis, Strategies of Containment: A critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy. New York: Oxford University Press, (1982). This is also cited in Fareed Zakaria, “The Reagan Strategy of Containment,” Political Science Quarterly 105, no. 3 (1990), pp. 383-88).

#### Violation – the aff unilaterally engages with Mexico – it’s not quid pro quo

#### Vote negative – LIMITS – there are a near infinite range of “one exception” affs – conditionality forces to find significant deals that Mexico will accept

#### GROUND – unconditional engagement denies us “say no” and backlash arguments which are a crucial part of the engagement debate.

### 2

#### Movements against neoliberalism are growing and strong in Latin America and spill over globally---but the plans insistence on US led economic cooperation and integration reifies neoliberalism’s hegemonic grasp---instead of economic engagement, there must be a de-linking to preserve the environment and indigenous culture’s survival.

Harris 8 (Richard L Harris: Professor of Global Studies at California State University, Monterey Bay; Managing Editor of the Journal of Developing Societies (SAGE India); and Coordi­ nating Editor of Latin American Perspectives (SAGE USA). “Latin America’s Response to Neoliberalism and Globalization,” http://www.nuso.org/upload/articulos/3506\_2.pdf)

The economic, political and social development of the Latin American and Caribbean countries is obstructed by the power relations and international structures that regulate the world capitalist system. The structures of this system provide a hierarchical political and economic exoskeleton that constrains all national efforts to pursue any significant degree of self-directed, inward-oriented, balanced and environmentally sustainable development. Indeed, the geopolitical power structures that preserve and support the world capitalist system have made it almost impossible for the governments of the core as well as the peripheral countries in this system to pursue a path of inward-oriented, equitable, democratically controlled and environmentally sustainable development (Amin 2001b:20). Since the 1980s, inter-American relations and the economic, political and social development of the Latin American and Caribbean states have been shaped by these geo­ political structures and the neoliberal strategic agenda put forward by the government of the United States of America (USA), the major transnational corporations and the three major international financial institutions (IFIs) that operate in the Latin American and Caribbean region (Harris and Nef, 2008). This later group of IFIs includes the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB). The policies of these IFIs based in Washington generally follow the dictates of the government of the USA due to the controlling influence that it exercises over these institutions. Their agenda for the Latin American and Caribbean region gives priority to promoting and protecting the interests of the major investors and transnational corporations that are largely based in the USA and operate in the region. It also serves to maintain and strengthen the geopolitical hegemony of the USA over the Western Hemisphere (Harris and Nef). But conditions are changing. Washington’s neoliberal agenda for controlling the capi­ talist development of the Western Hemisphere and maintaining US hegemony over the region is increasingly threatened by a progressive alternative agenda for the regio­ nal integration of the Latin American and Caribbean countries that has begun to gain widespread support in the region. This alternative agenda for the region calls for the autonomous economic development of the region free of the hegemonic control and influence of the USA and the IFIs based in Washington. Not only does this type of development pose a fundamental threat to the hegemony of the USA in the region, it threatens the dominance of transnational capital throughout the Americas. Moreover, it also poses a significant threat to the global expansion and integration of the world capitalist system in general and to the global hegemonic coalition led by the government and transnational corporations of the USA. Today, political and economic strategies are being developed for moving from the prevailing export-oriented neoliberal model of economic development to new in­ ward-oriented models of sustainable development, tailored to the diverse conditions, economic capacities, political structures, natural endowments and cultural values of the societies involved. Moreover, a growing number of international and regional civil society organizations have emerged in recent years to create such alternatives. What the forums, networks, programs, and activities of these various types of organizations reveal is that there is a growing international network of organizations and social movements committed to promoting new, more equitable forms of international cooperation and regulation that support inward-oriented and sustainable development as well as genuine democracy at the regional and national levels. At the same time, these organizations argue that the present global trading regime that has been erected under the WTO should and can be replaced by a new global trading system that replaces the present system of so-called free but in fact unfair trade, with a sys­ tem that ensures «fair trade» and promotes South-South economic exchange and coo­ peration. Most of the progressive alternatives advocated by these organizations and the new left-leaning governments that have been elected to office in the region give priority to aligning the external relations of the countries in the region to the internal needs of the majority of the population. That is to say, decisions about what to export and what to import should be aligned with the needs of the population rather than the interests of transnational capitalists and transnational corporations or the hegemonic interests of the USA. Some of these alternative strategies involve what Walden Bello (2002) has referred to as «deglobalization.» That is to say, they involve unlinking the economies of these peripheral capitalist societies from the advanced capitalist centers of the world economy, particularly in the USA. They also involve throwing off the constraints that have been imposed upon the economic policies and structures of the­ se countries by the IFIs (IMF, World Bank, and IDB), the WTO and the other agents and regulatory regimes that regulate the world capitalist system. In fact, there appears to be growing interest throughout Latin America in revivifying the Pan-American ideal of unification, currently perhaps best expressed in Hugo Chávez’ Bolivarian dream of turning South America into a regional economic hegemon (DeLong, 2005). The governments of Bolivia, Cuba, Ecuador, Nicaragua and Uruguay have indicated they want to join the government of Venezuela in creating a regional union. It has been proposed that this coalescing continental confederation should shift the region’s extra-continental trade towards Europe, Asia and South Africa and away from North America. The prospect of this happening appears to have alarmed Washington more than the increasing number of electoral triumphs of leftist politicians in the region (Delong). There has also been considerable talk in the region about creating a single currency for the South American countries that would be modeled on and perhaps tied to the Euro rather than the US Dollar. This discussion is symptomatic of what appears to be an emerging desire to create an integrated economic and political community that is strikingly different from the type of hemispheric economic integration scheme being pursued by the Washington and its allies in the region (DeLong). Moreover, there is an increasing tendency in the region to find alternatives to trading with the USA. In particular, several Latin American nations (Brazil, Cuba, Venezuela and Chile) have been strengthening their economic relations with Asia, particularly with China. But the widespread popular opposition to neoliberalism and so-called globalization, and the shift to the Left in the region’s politics, represent much more than a serious challenge to US hegemony, they also represent a serious threat to the existing pattern of capitalist development in the region. Central to Washington’s strategy for the hemisphere has been the imposition of a neoliberal model of capitalist development on the region which involves the increasing integration of the region’s economies into a hemispheric ‘free trade’ area or rather a trade bloc that is dominated by the USA. This project is itself an essential part of the strategy of the USA for the domination of the global economy by its transnational corporations. The restructuring of the economies of the region under the mantra of neoliberalism and the banner of globalization has been aimed at giving the USA-based transnational corporations and investors free reign within the region and a strong hemispheric base from which to dominate the world economy In opposition to the neoliberal, polyarchical and globalizing model of development that has been imposed by the government of the USA and its allies in the region, the growing movement for an alternative form of development that is both genuinely democratic, equitable and environmentally sustainable appears to be gaining ground in various parts of Latin America and the Caribbean. This alternative model of development requires the reorganization and realignment of the existing economies in the region. It also requires the replacement of the existing political regimes, which serve the interests of the transnational bloc of social forces that are behind the integration of the region into the new global circuits of accumulation and production that the major trans­ national corporations and the IFIs have been constructing since the 1970s. In addition to fundamental economic changes, most of the existing pseudo-democratic political regimes in the region need to be thoroughly democratized so that they are responsive to and capable of serving the needs and interests of the majority of the people rather than the ruling polyarchies and the transnational corporations operating in the region. An essential requirement for realigning the region’s economies so that they produce people-centered and environmentally sustainable development is the integration of these economies into a regional economic and political union that has the resources, structures and the power to operate independently of the government of the USA and the transnational corporations based in the USA as well as in the European Union and Japan. If this type of regional integration takes place, it will enable the Latin American and Caribbean states to break free of the hegemonic influence of the USA, and reverse the denationalization (‘globalization’) of the Latin American and Caribbean economies. Instead of the corporate-driven hemispheric integration of the region under the hegemony of the USA, a new system of regional economic cooperation and both equitable as well as environmentally sustainable development is desperately needed to improve the lives of the vast majority of the people living in Latin America and the Caribbean. This type of regional, equitable and sustainable development can only be success­ fully carried out by truly democratically elected political leaders with broad-based popular support who are sincerely committed to achieving this alternative rather than the elitist neoliberal model. It probably will also require democratic socialist political institutions and structures of production and distribution. Regionalism has been the dream of the democratic left for some time. The European Union has its origins in the French socialist dream of ending Franco-German enmity through unifying Europe, and African regionalism was the vision of African socialists such as Julius Nyerere of Tanzania who saw regional integration as the only means to progress beyond tribalism and colonialism and create a united and democratic Africa (Faux, 2001:4). Viewed from the perspective of those who want to create a people-cen­ tered, democratic, equitable and environmentally sustainable social order in the Ame­ ricas, the corporate-dominated process of capitalist pseudo-globalization taking place in the region and around the world urgently needs to be replaced by what Samir Amin has referred to as a new system of «pluricentric regulated globalization» (Amin, 2001a). This alternative form of globalization requires the development of regional economic and political unions in Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Caribbean, the Middle East and elsewhere, which collaboratively promote people-centered, democratic and envi­ ronmentally sustainable forms of development on a regional basis. According to Amin, these regional unions of states are needed to collaborate as partners in collecti­ vely regulating the global restructuring of the world economy for the benefit of the vast majority of humanity rather than the transnational corporations and the northern centers of the world capitalist system in the USA, Europe and Japan. This type of regional-based regulative order is needed to regulate and redirect inter­ national economic, social, and political relations so that these relations serve the inte­ rests and needs of the vast majority of the world’s population. The present power structures and regulatory regime of the world capitalist system support the transna­ tional corporate-driven restructuring and denationalization of the economies of both the societies at the core and in the periphery of this system. The Latin American and Caribbean countries need to ‘de-link’ step-by-step from this exploitative and inequitable system. They need to redirect and restructure their eco­ nomies so that they serve the needs of the majority of their people while also protec­ ting their natural resources and ecosystems. The alternative policies of economic, poli­ tical and social development proposed and in some cases adopted by the new leftist leaders, the progressive civil society organizations and their supporters, combined with the project of regional integration associated with the new Unión de Naciones Suramericanas (UNASUR), are significant indications of unprecedented and pro­ found transformation unfolding in the Americas. A growing number of civil society organizations and social movements throughout the Americas are pressuring the governments of the region to follow what the pro­ gressive civil society networks such as the Alianza Social Continental/ Hemispheric Social Alliance (ASC/HSA) describes as a regional model of integration that supports the environmentally sustainable and democratic development of all the societies in the region (see ASC-HSA, 2006). The ASC/HSA also contends that the UNASUR pro­ ject and the Bolivarian dream of unification is threatened by the so-called free trade agreements that Washington has negotiated with Chile, Colombia, Peru, the Central American countries and the Dominican Republic. As the ASC/HSA makes clear in its documents and public information campaigns, these agreements compromise the national sovereignty, obstruct the local production of medicines, threaten public health, facilitate the profit-driven privatization of water and vital services such as health and sanitation, and threaten the survival of indigenous cultures, biodiversity, food sovereignty, and local control over natural resources. The «Alternatives for the Americas» proposal developed by this inter-American network of progressive civil society organizations and social movements calls on all governments in the region to subordinate trade and investments to sustainability and environmental protection as well as social justice and local democratic control over economic and social development (ASC/HSA 2002:5). The growing number and political influence of these kinds of networks, organizations and movements provide unquestionable evidence of the emergence of the social for­ ces and political conditions that Panitch (1996:89) and others (Harris, 1995:301-302; Jo­ nas and McCaughan, 1994) predicted in the 1990s would arise in opposition to neoli­ beralism, corporate-dominated pseudo globalization and the extension and consolida­ tion of the hegemony of the USA. It now seems increasingly possible that these forces and the political mobilization that they have helped to create will transform the politi­ cal regimes in the region as well as the nature of inter-American relations, bring about the regional integration of the Latin American countries and free these countries from US hegemony and the form of ‘turbo-capitalism’ to which they have been subjected. At this point, we can only speak in general terms about the new model(s) of develop­ ment that will replace the neoliberal model of uneven and inequitable development that has pillaged most of the region.

#### The plan FORCES energy privatization and dislocation – no positive benefit because the energy just feeds industrial domination

Hawley 9 - former Pulitzer-winning journalist, foreign correspondent

(Chris, “Clean-energy windmills a 'dirty business' for farmers in Mexico,” http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/money/industries/energy/environment/2009-06-16-mexico-wind-power\_N.htm)//BB

The windmills stand in rows like an army of Goliaths, steel towers taller than the Statue of Liberty and topped with blades as long as a jetliner's wing. The blades whoosh through the humid air, carving energy from a wind that rushes across Mexico's Isthmus of Tehuantepec on its journey from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean. Nearly every day, another tower rises out of the countryside.¶ The isthmus — Mexico's narrowest point — is becoming the Saudi Arabia of alternative energy as U.S. and European companies, emboldened by new technology and high oil prices, rush to stake their claims in one of the world's windiest places. The Mexican government wants the isthmus to produce 2,500 megawatts within three years, a goal that will require thousands of windmills and would catapult Mexico into the top 12 producers of wind energy.¶ "This is one of the finest wind areas in the world, and they are being very ambitious about developing it," said Martin Pasqualetti, an expert on renewable energy at Arizona State University who has studied the region. "They're trying to do in five years what California took 35 years to do."¶ But the energy gold rush has also brought discord, as building crews slice through irrigation canals, divide pastures and cover crops with dust. Some farmers complain they were tricked into renting their land for as little as $46 an acre annually.¶ Opponents of Mexican President Felipe Calderón fear the generators are the first step toward privatizing Mexico's energy sector. And some residents are angry that the electricity being generated is not going to homes here in Oaxaca, one of the poorest states in Mexico, but to power Walmart stores, Cemex cement plants and a few other industrial customers in Mexico.¶ "It has divided neighbors against each other," said Alejo Giron, a communal farmer in La Venta. "If this place has so much possibility, where are the benefits for us?"

#### Neoliberal policy makes racialized violence and war inevitable – it provides the foundations for genocide—turns case

Natalie Billick, 12-04-2004, writer, Nations and Nationalities, “Genocide,” filebox.vt.edu/n/natalieb/teachered/portfolio%20html/Genocide.doc

Genocide is the annihilation of a people based on nationality, ethnicity, race, or religion. For developed countries in the West to understand what ultimately lead to genocides in Nazi Germany and Rwanda during the last century, they must first look toward colonization. Modern genocide was nurtured in the colonies and can be accredited to European expansion and modernization. The illegitimacy of indirect rule through colonization sparked the genocide in Rwanda and the misapplication of industrialism and the extremism caused by modernism played a pivotal role in the Holocaust. Both genocides can be attributed to the political phenomenon known as the weak state. Colonialism provided the foundation for genocide because it resulted in a problem of legitimacy, resulting in weak states. Germany and Rwanda could be considered weak states because of governmental corruption, economic disparity, inequality, and the placement of ethnicity over citizenship. As weak states, Germany and Rwanda were unable to provide a sense of national security. This created an anxiety and fear that culminated with genocide. Slavery, “the first modern collective crime against humanity”, initiated the transition from colonialism to modernism (Weisband). Europeans began occupying other countries during the 1500’s in an attempt to exploit those countries’ natural resources. In the case of Africa, these resources included humans, who were commodified as slave labor. Slavery prompted an increase in cultures oriented around commodification and a transformation of kinship groups to groups organized around ethnicity. As humans became commodified, they were dehumanized by the destruction of their history, belonging, freedom, and future. Slavery exemplified the first step in a transition from colonialism to modernism because slaves and free men represented the beginning of modern divisions of labor. Slavery produced political, cultural, social, and economic results, including failed states, weak nations, minority groups, and racial inequalities. Slavery provides the linkage from colonialism to modernism, but it is colonialism that universalizes it. Colonialism is the creation of non-historical nations and artificial states to benefit the colonizers. European colonizers divide and combine territories with no regard for the political and cultural traditions already in place. In addition, colonizers magnify minute differences in appearance in order to categorize and separate people into ethnicities. It was through colonization that the idea of race developed. “Race was an attempt to biologize and naturalize class difference” (Mamdani 388). The ‘racialization’ of race that began in the colonies provided justification for the extermination of entire groups of people. Kinship groups are changed to ethnic groups through reification, causing anxiety and provoking hatred. This hatred is furthered by neo-colonialism; the exportation and integration of Western values into the colonies. Neo-colonialism causes cultural mimesis, or the replacement of kinship with Western values. It leads to mimetic dysfunctionalism when the colonized are forced to give up part of themselves or their values in order to adopt those of the colonizers. Although there is a desire to be a part of the imposed culture, a feeling of inferiority arises from the devalorization of their native culture. The result is a sense of self-rejection and guilt which ultimately leads to hate. Problems arise when colonizers are only partially effective in creating replicas of modern nation-states. One reaction to colonialism and neo-colonialism is nativism; a rejection of modernity and an attempt to reassert kinship identities. Nativism occurs in weak states because central authority lacks legitimacy, allowing for the continued support of kinship ideals and the opposition of national homogenization.

### 3

#### Solar PV production causes massive environmental damage—increases warming

**Mulvaney et al** 1/14/09 (Dustin Mulvaney, Ph.D.—Switzer Fellow, Vicki Bolam—Technical Writer, Monica Cendejas—Project Manager, SVTC, Sheila Davis—Executive Director, SVTC, Lauren Ornelas—Campaign Director, SVTC, Simon Kim—SVTC Intern, Stanford University, Serena Mau—SVTC Intern, University of California, Berkeley, William Rowan—SVTC Intern, Stanford University, Esperanza Sanz, SVTC Intern, De Anza College, Peter Satre—SVTC Intern, Stanford University, Ananth Sridhar—SVTC Intern, Stanford University, Dean Young—SVTC Intern, Stanford University. All work for Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition. “Towrds a Just and Sustainable Solar Energy Industry”. http://www.etoxics.org/site/DocServer/Silicon\_Valley\_Toxics\_Coalition\_-\_Toward\_a\_Just\_and\_Sust.pdf?docID=821)

Silicon-based solar PV production involves many of the same materials as the microelectronics industry and therefore presents many of the same hazards. At the same time, emerging thin-film and nanotech-based cells pose unknown health and environmental dangers. This section provides an overview of the hazards posed by current and emerging solar PV production technologies. A. Crystalline Silicon (c-Si) As with the production of silicon chips, production of c-Si wafers begins with the mining of silica (SiO2), found in the environment as sand or quartz.† Silica is refined at high temperatures to remove the O2 and produce metallurgical grade silicon, which is approximately 99.6 percent pure. However, silicon for semiconductor use must be much purer. Higher purities are achieved through a chemical process that exposes metallurgical grade silicon to hydrochloric acid and copper to produce a gas called trichlorosilane (HSiCl3). The trichlorosilane is then distilled to remove remaining impurities, which typically include chlorinated metals of aluminum, iron, and carbon. It is finally heated or “reduced” with hydrogen to produce silane (SiH4) gas. The silane gas is either heated again to make molten silicon, used to grow monocrystalline silicon crystals, or used as an input for amorphous silicon (see next section). The next step is to produce crystals of either monocrystalline or multicrystalline silicon. Monocrystalline silicon rods are pulled from molten silicon, cooled, and suspended in a reactor at high temperature and high pressure. Silane gas is then introduced into the reactor to deposit additional silicon onto the rods until they “grow” to a specified diameter. To produce multicrystalline silicon, molten silicon is poured into crucibles and cooled into blocks or ingots. Both processes produce silicon crystals that are extremely pure (from 99.99999 to 99.9999999 percent), which is ideal for microchips, but far more than required by the PV industry. The high temperatures required for c-Si production make it an extremely energy intensive and expensive process, and also produces large amounts of waste. As much as 80 percent of the initial metallurgical grade silicon is lost in the process.21 Sawing c-Si wafers creates a significant amount of waste silicon dust called kerf, and up to 50 percent of the material is lost in air and water used to rinse wafers.22 This process may generate silicon particulate matter that will pose inhalation problems for production workers and those who clean and maintain equipment. The U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) has set exposure limits to keep ambient dust levels low and recommends the use of respiratory masks, but it has been suggested that, despite the use of respiratory masks, workers remain overexposed to silicon dust.23The use of silane gas is the most significant hazard in the production of c-Si because it is extremely explosive and presents a potential danger to workers and communities.24 Accidental releases of silane have been known to spontaneously explode, and the semiconductor industry reports several silane incidents every year.25 Further back in the silicon supply chain, the production of silane and trichlorosilane results in waste silicon tetrachloride (SiCl4), an extremely toxic substance that reacts violently with water, causes skin burns, and is a respiratory, skin, and eye irritant.26 Although it is easily recovered and reused as an input for silane production, in places with little or no environmental regulation, silicon tetrachloride can constitute an extreme environmental hazard. As the Washington Post reported in March 2008 (see above), polysilicon manufacturing is expanding rapidly in China, but facilities to recycle silicon tetrachloride and other toxic outputs are not keeping pace.27 The extremely potent greenhouse gas sulfur hexafluoride (SF6) is used to clean the reactors used in silicon production. The Intergovernmental Panel of Climate Change (IPCC) considers sulfur hexafluoride to be the most potent greenhouse gas per molecule; one ton of sulfur hexafluoride has a greenhouse effect equivalent to that of 25,000 tons of CO2.28 It can react with silicon to make silicon tetrafluoride (SiF4) and sulfur difluoride (SF2), or be reduced to tetrafluorosilane (SiF4) and sulfur dioxide (SO2). SO2 releases can cause acid rain, so scrubbers are required to limit air emissions in facilities that use it. It is imperative that a replacement for sulfur hexafluoride be found, because accidental or fugitive emissions† will greatly undermine the reductions in greenhouse gas emissions gained by using solar power. Other chemicals used in the production of crystalline silicon that require special handling and disposal procedures include the following: Large quantities of sodium hydroxide (NaOH) are used to remove the sawing damage on the silicon wafer surfaces. In some cases, potassium hydroxide (KOH) is used instead. These caustic chemicals are dangerous to the eyes, lungs, and skin. Corrosive chemicals like hydrochloric acid, sulfuric acid, nitric acid, and hydrogen fluoride are used to remove impurities from and clean semiconductor materials. Toxic phosphine (PH3) or arsine (AsH3) gas is used in the doping of the semiconductor material. Though these are used in small quantities, inadequate containment or accidental release poses occupational risks.29 Other chemicals used or produced in the doping process include phosphorous oxychloride, phosphorous trichloride, boron bromide, and boron trichloride. Isopropyl alcohol is used to clean c-Si wafers. The surface of the wafer is oxidized to silicon dioxide to protect the solar cell. Lead is often used in solar PV electronic circuits for wiring, solder-coated copper strips, and some lead-based printing pastes. Small quantities of silver and aluminum are used to make the electrical contacts on the cell. Chemicals released in fugitive air emissions by known manufacturing facilities include trichloroethane, acetone, ammonia, and isopropyl alcohol.30

#### Disproportionately impacts minorities

**Moser and Dilling** 20**07** (Susanne Moser is a research scientist at the National Center for Atmospheric Research’s (NCAR) Institute for the Study of Society and Environment, Boulder, Colorado. She is an Aldo Leopold Leadership Program fellow and an associate of the International Human Dimensions Program (IHDP) Core Project on Global Environmental Change and Human Security (GECHS). Lisa Dilling is a visiting fellow at the Center for Science and Technology Policy Research of the Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences (CIRES), University of Colorado at Boulder. She has been awarded a visiting fellowship by CIRES, a John A. Knauss National Sea Grant fellowship, and a National Science Foundation graduate fellowship. “Creating a Climate for Change: Communicating Climate Change and Facilitating Social Change,” Cambridge University Press, Pg 7-8 Mkoo)

The problem of global warming is maybe the ultimate ‘‘commons’’ problem (Hardin, 1968; NRC, 2002; Dietz, Ostrom, and Stern, 2003). The nations of the world all share one atmosphere. When GHGs are emitted from anywhere, they affect the climate of the Earth as a whole. Rules about using the atmosphere for the discharge of GHGs are only slowly being defined, while monitoring, accountability, and consequences for ‘‘overusing’’ the global atmospheric commons are extremely difficult to ensure and implement. The ethical implications of sharing one atmospheric commons go further. Some regions are disproportionately affected by climate change, and societal vulnerability to these negative impacts is also highly uneven due to differential levels of exposure and sensitivity to the risks, and differential ability to cope and adapt (Agyeman, Bullard, and Evans, 2003; Kasperson, Kasperson, and Dow, 2001; Kasperson and Dow, 1991). Whether the decision is taken to maintain the status quo or undertake aggressive action to mitigate global warming, the burden and benefits of outcomes are unequally shared across nations and generations. Unfortunately, those who currently benefit from the status quo and who perceive themselves to be less severely impacted have little incentive to push for action (Agyeman, Bullard, and Evans, 2003; Kasperson, Kasperson, and Dow, 2001; Kasperson and Dow, 1991; Kasperson and Kasperson, 1991). Those, on the other hand, who are likely to be impacted more severely the poor within developing and developed countries have much incentive but little power and even fewer means to influence policy-making. In summary, the inherent natural characteristics and deep societal roots of climate change stack the deck against the issue being recognized as an urgent and actionable problem. Communicators who have succeeded in motivating action to address this problem have been able to negotiate these challenges and still find a way to excite and engage different audiences constructively. Throughout this volume we find examples and strategies that have worked in preventing audiences from getting bogged down in these characteristics of the problem in different settings.

### 4

#### [CP TEXT: The Banco del Sur authority should provide decentralized integrated photovoltaic electrification assistance to Mexico. The Banco del Sur authority should pass and comply with reforms that divide the bank into a regional development and central bank and pass a credit policy to strengthen publicly owned companies.]

#### CP solves the case while challenging US imperial consensus – the Banco del Sur can finance solar technology projects.

Patrick Bond, 9-23-2013, writer for International View Point, member of the UKZN Centre for Civil Society in Durban, “Are BRICS any use for rebuilding the collapsing global financial architecture?” http://internationalviewpoint.org/spip.php?article3133

Thus it was reasonable to ask, with skepticism, whether the BRICS leaders were really serious about challenging Bretton Woods. After all, there was an alternative already in place that they could have supported: the Bank of the South. Founded by the late Venezuelan president Hugo Chavez in 2007 and supported by Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Ecuador, Paraguay and Uruguay, Banco del Sur already has $7 billion in capital. It offers a more profound development finance challenge to the Washington Consensus, especially after Ecuadoran radical economists improved the design. Instead, a much more durable reflection of the commitment to stabilizing world finance – rather than radically changing the most unfair and intrinsically destabilizing components – is China’s ongoing financing of Washington’s massive trade deficit, by continuing to hold more than $1.3 trillion of Treasury Bills. The Chinese refuse to sell sufficient T-Bills in order to genuinely weaken Washington’s power, and to set up a new currency that the world could more democratically manage, instead of the Fed with its bias to the interests of the world’s largest banks. Notwithstanding rhetoric about increasing use of BRICS currencies, not much more is being done to end the destructive system in which the US dollar has world ‘seignorage’: i.e., it is the world’s reserve currency, no matter how badly Washington officials abuse that power. If China really wants the renmimbi to one day take its place, the pace at which this is happening is agonizingly slow. Worse still, in close alignment with Washington, South Africa explicitly supports financial liberalization. SA Reserve Bank deputy governor Daniel Mminele acknowledged last November that Pretoria opposed global regulation such as the ‘Robin Hood tax’ on financial transactions that was supported by more enlightened countries, including those from Europe being roiled by global financiers. BRICS development banking? Meanwhile South Africa’s own precursor to the BRICS bank – the Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA) – has been run in a ‘shoddy’ way, according to the new chief executive Patrick Dlamini last December [[8](http://internationalviewpoint.org/spip.php?article3133#nb8)]; he implied that corruption had been tolerated. He then announced both a 40 percent cut of his 750-strong staff, starting with environmentalists and social specialists, and a massive increase in privatisation financing [[9](http://internationalviewpoint.org/spip.php?article3133#nb9)]. But Dlamini [[10](http://internationalviewpoint.org/spip.php?article3133#nb10)]admitted this week that the Bank suffered a net loss of $83 million in 2012-13 due to ‘impairment losses on development loans of $160 million and revaluation losses on financial instruments of $40 million.’ Its lending volume last year was only $1.8 billion, after reaching $3.4 billion two years earlier. The BRICS’ largest development finance institution, the Brazilian National Economic and Social Development Bank (BNDES) has also been exceptionally destructive in its massive lending portfolio, now in the range of $80 billion annually, more than twice the World Bank’s. Warns Carlos Tautz [[11](http://internationalviewpoint.org/spip.php?article3133#nb11)]from Instituto Mais Democracia, ‘If the Brics Bank is mirrored on BNDES, this reveals a probable lack of transparency and omissions in governance.’ The China Development Bank and the Export-Import Bank of China have had some positive impacts especially in expanding solar technology and avoiding the imposition of Washington Consensus policies. But as Boston University scholar Kevin Gallagher shows, they can be severely destructive in sites as diverse as Burma, Honduras and Gabon.

### 5

#### [CP TEXT: The United States federal government should provide decentralized integrated solar thermal assistance to Mexico. The United States federal government should halt its photovoltaic assistance to Mexico.]

#### Solar thermal technology solves the aff better – it’s more efficient than photovoltaic.

Richard Klein1 and Mariela Vasquez2, Spring-xx-2010, founder, Quixotic Systems Inc, inventor and entrepreneur1, engineering team, Quixotic Systems, B.A. in Mechanical Engineering @ University of Virginia2, “Solar Thermal: A New Sustainable Solution for Urban Multi-Family Buildings,” <http://www.quixotic-systems.com/imgs/nesea-article.pdf>

Advantages of solar thermal over solar electric (PV) Over the past few years, solar electric (PV) systems have gained greater momentum over solar thermal systems due to government incentives and more attention from the media. However, due to the diversity of buildings and their demands, PV systems are not always the most efficient or financially beneficial renewable energy source. Solar thermal systems are capable of providing better efficiency and return in larger residential buildings where the domestic hot water load is greater than the electricity con sumption (see table 1).

### Centralized Injustice

#### Photovoltaic energy require rare earth metals

Barber 12 (03-07, DA, http://www.energytrend.com/PV\_20120307)

Rare earth metals are critical for clean energy technologies, such as PVs, as well as hybrid and electric vehicles, high-efficiency wind turbines, smart grid technologies, and even compact fluorescent lights that are targeted to replace energy-wasting incandescent bulbs in the United States.Other high-tech uses include: fiber optics, lasers and hard disk drives; defense guidance and control systems; global positioning systems; and advanced industrial, military and outdoor recreation water treatment technology.

#### Rare earth metal mining causes massive socio-ecological structural violence

Smith 11 [S.E., Environmental Justice Activist and essayist with credits in publications at The Guardian, AlterNet, Salon, Longshot Magazine, Global Comment, Think Progress, and Truthout, and cofounder of FWD/Forward: Feminists with disabilities for a way forward, “RARE EARTH METALS AND THE TECH BOOM”, <http://meloukhia.net/2011/09/rare_earth_metals_and_the_tech_boom.html>]

Environmental costs associated with rare earth metals are quite significant. First, you have to extract them. Then, you have to purify them. After they’re distributed into technology, they often end up in landfills because it is less costly to simply toss equipment than it is to recycle it. A push in the direction of electronics recycling has come with its own set of environmental and social problems. And addressing these issues is not a simple process, especially when consumers do not play an active role. Consumers have immense power, when they choose to use it, over the companies they patronise and the kinds of goods they buy, but they need to exercise that power. Mining is a dirty industry. Some of that dirt is unavoidable, because the industry has to tear into the earth to access useful metals and minerals. In other cases, it is avoidable, but only at great cost. Mining companies resist environmental reform because they want to make more money off their products. Some claim it is impossible to provide metals and minerals at the costs demanded by manufacturers, under pressure from consumers, and thus that they are forced to be dirty, because there is no other choice if they want to remain competitive in the industry. Attempts to commit to using clean metals require too much money, and consumers aren’t willing to pay a premium. Rare metal extraction involves substantial pollution in the mining, onsite processing, and refining phase. Mines create environmental degradation through topsoil loss, poorly controlled tailings ponds that leach into groundwater as well as lakes and rivers, roads slicing through habitat, and the use of large amounts of energy to extract and process the materials they uncover. Some rare earth metals require substantial processing, and that provides a number of opportunities for pollution at every step of the way. The hard physical labor and exposure to pollution also make it hard to find workers. Mine locations are predicated by deposits in the Earth’s crust, but workforces can be imported, if necessary, if a facility is located in a region where no locals are willing to work in a mine. Mining is hot, dirty work and it comes with few labour protections in some regions. Vast mines in regions like South Africa work people to excess, for very minimal pay, and often do not provide their workers with basic health and safety protections. Here in the United States, mining work continues to be unsafe despite supposedly tough labour laws, and it is among the most dangerous occupations.

#### Decentralization still leads to corporate capture and they don’t spill-up to alter politics

JEBR 10 JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS RESEARCH

Year XVI, No. 1/ 2010, Editor in chief: Ph.D Associate Professor Luiela Magdalena Csorba, "Aurel

Vlaicu" University of Arad, Romania

Associate Editor in chief: Ph.D Associate Professor Cristina Nicolaescu, "Aurel

Vlaicu" University of Arad, Romania

Recent paradigm shifts in energy planning from large-scale, centralized and relatively homogenous to a decentralized and diversified energy regime (see Helm, 2005; Sebitosi and Okuo, 2010) are underpinned by the physical characteristics of renewable energy and by technological achievements. Advancements in technologies related to harnessing two thermodynamic cycles (e.g., combined cycle turbines) or two energy vectors (e.g., combined heat and power) have diluted the notion that ‘bigger’ energy facilities are inherently more economical (Sebitosi and Okuo, 2010; Li, 2005). As such, smaller and distributed forms of energy generation are more prevalent. Furthermore, the physics and the economics of renewable energy necessitate greater spatial correlation between energy availability, energy conversion, and energy consumption (see Elliot, 2000). This makes it possible – and in some cases necessary – to establish short energy procurement, production, distribution and consumption chains (Pepermans et al. 2005). This suggests the increasing relevance of the ‘local’ scale, and thus of local actors (see also Fraser et al, 2004; Bagliani, 2010). It is important to qualify the term ‘increasing’. Surely, given the decentralized nature of renewable energy, energy production will be visible to a greater proportion of the population. It stands to reason that a greater number of protests or public consultation will characterize future energy decisions. But this does not mean that local actors are acquiring more power relative to outside interests [4]. In fact, market evidence supports the opposite claim. Renewable energy ‘subsidy farming’, which might be conceptualized as a neo-colonial enterprise, is a common phenomenon. This is a situation in which multi-national corporations, increasingly of the foreign brand and not always traditional energy companies, are installing a significant proportion of renewable energy systems in jurisdictions that subsidize renewable energy. Opposition to deals struck between Samsung and the Government of Ontario for wind energy development exemplifies this phenomena. Indeed, local ownership is not a fundamental element to the nature of a decentralized energy regime (Pepermans et al, 2005). Further, there are considerable signs that RETs will simply be massproduced in cheap labour countries, and we should be careful to assume that this economic rhythm will be disturbed simply as a function of renewable energy research, subsidization and deployment in developed countries.

#### Status quo solves poverty – benefit programs in Mexico and Brazil significantly reduced poverty and are modeled globally – peer reviewed studies prove

Rosenberg 11– (Tina, columnist for the New York Times “To Beat Back Poverty, Pay the Poor” 1/3/11 <http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/01/03/to-beat-back-poverty-pay-the-poor/?_r=0>) DF

The program, called BolsaFamilia (Family Grant) in Brazil, goes by different names in different places. In Mexico, where it first began on a national scale and has been equally successful at reducing poverty, it is Oportunidades. The generic term for the program is conditional cash transfers. The idea is to give regular payments to poor families, in the form of cash or electronic transfers into their bank accounts, if they meet certain requirements. The requirements vary, but many countries employ those used by Mexico: families must keep their children in school and go for regular medical checkups, and mom must attend workshops on subjects like nutrition or disease prevention. The payments almost always go to women, as they are the most likely to spend the money on their families. The elegant idea behind conditional cash transfers is to combat poverty today while breaking the cycle of poverty for tomorrow.¶ Most of our Fixes columns so far have been about successful-but-small ideas. They face a common challenge: how to make them work on a bigger scale. This one is different. Brazil is employing a version of an idea now in use in some 40 countries around the globe, one already successful on a staggeringly enormous scale. This is likely the most important government anti-poverty program the world has ever seen. It is worth looking at how it works, and why it has been able to help so many people.¶ In Mexico, Oportunidades today covers 5.8 million families, about 30 percent of the population. An Oportunidades family with a child in primary school and a child in middle school that meets all its responsibilities can get a total of about $123 a month in grants. Students can also get money for school supplies, and children who finish high school in a timely fashion get a one-time payment of $330.¶A family living in extreme poverty in Brazil doubles its income when it gets the basic benefit.¶BolsaFamilia, which has similar requirements, is even bigger. Brazil’s conditional cash transfer programs were begun before the government of President LuizInacio Lula da Silva, but he consolidated various programs and expanded it. It now covers about 50 million Brazilians, about a quarter of the country. It pays a monthly stipend of about $13 to poor families for each child 15 or younger who is attending school, up to three children. Families can get additional payments of $19 a month for each child of 16 or 17 still in school, up to two children. Families that live in extreme poverty get a basic benefit of about $40, with no conditions.¶ Do these sums seem heartbreakingly small? They are. But a family living in extreme poverty in Brazil doubles its income when it gets the basic benefit. It has long been clear that BolsaFamilia has reduced poverty in Brazil. But research has only recently revealed its role in enabling Brazil to reduce economic inequality**.**¶ The World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank are working with individual governments to spread these programs around the globe, providing technical help and loans. Conditional cash transfer programs are now found in 14 countries in Latin America and some 26 other countries, according to the World Bank. (One of the programs was in New York City — a small, privately-financed pilot program called Opportunity NYC. A preliminary evaluation showed mixed success, but it is too soon to draw conclusions.) Each program is tailored to local conditions. Some in Latin America, for example, emphasize nutrition. One in Tanzania is experimenting with conditioning payments on an entire community’s behavior.¶The program fights poverty in two ways. One is straightforward: it gives money to the poor. This works. And no, the money tends not to be stolen or diverted to the better-off.Brazil and Mexico have been very successful at including only the poor. In both countries it has reduced poverty, especially extreme poverty, and has begun to close the inequality gap.¶The idea’s other purpose — to give children more education and better health — is longer term and harder to measure. But measured it is — Oportunidades is probably the most-studied social program on the planet. The program has an evaluation unit and publishes all data. There have also been hundreds of studies by independent academics. The research indicates that conditional cash transfer programs in Mexico and Brazil do keep people healthier, and keep kids in school.¶ In Mexico today, malnutrition, anemia and stunting have dropped, as have incidences of childhood and adult illnesses. Maternal and infant deaths have been reduced. Contraceptive use in rural areas has risen and teen pregnancy has declined. But the most dramatic effects are visible in education. Children in Oportunidades repeat fewer grades and stay in school longer. Child labor has dropped. In rural areas, the percentage of children entering middle school has risen 42 percent. High school inscription in rural areas has risen by a whopping 85 percent. The strongest effects on education are found in families where the mothers have the lowest schooling levels. Indigenous Mexicans have particularly benefited, staying in school longer.

### Scalar ptx

#### The guise of economic engagement is another card in the deck of empire building – expanding contact with Cuba is just another tactic to expand the empire

James Petras, Bartle Professor (Emeritus) of Sociology at Binghamton University, New York, 12-30-11, “Imperialism and the “Anti-Imperialism of the Fools,”  
 <http://petras.lahaine.org/?p=1886>

There is a long history of imperialist “anti-imperialism”, officially sponsored condemnation, exposés and moral indignation directed exclusively against rival imperialists, emerging powers or simply competitors, who in some cases are simply following in the footsteps of the established imperial powers. English imperialists in their heyday justified their world-wide plunder of three continents by perpetuating the “Black Legend”, of Spanish empire’s “exceptional cruelty” toward indigenous people of Latin America, while engaging in the biggest and most lucrative African slave trade. While the Spanish colonists enslaved the indigenous people, the Anglo-american settlers exterminated [indigenous people]….. In the run-up to World War II, European and US imperial powers, while exploiting their Asian colonies condemned Japanese imperial powers’ invasion and colonization of China. Japan, in turn claimed it was leading Asia’s forces fighting against Western imperialism and projected a post-colonial “co-prosperity” sphere of equal Asian partners. The imperialist use of “anti-imperialist” moral rhetoric was designed to weaken rivals and was directed to several audiences. In fact, at no point did the anti-imperialist rhetoric serve to “liberate” any of the colonized people. In almost all cases the victorious imperial power only substituted one form colonial or neo-colonial rule for another. The “anti-imperialism” of the imperialists is directed at the nationalist movements of the colonized countries and at their domestic public. British imperialists fomented uprisings among the agro-mining elites in Latin America promising “free trade” against Spanish mercantilist rule ;they backed the “self-determination” of the slaveholding cotton plantation owners in the US South against the Union;they supported the territorial claims of the Iroquois tribal leaders against the US anti-colonial revolutionaries … exploiting legitimate grievances for imperial ends. During World War II, the Japanese imperialists supported a sector of the nationalist anti-colonial movement in India against the British Empire. The US condemned Spanish colonial rule in Cuba and the Philippines and went to war to “liberate” the oppressed peoples from tyranny….and remained to impose a reign of terror, exploitation and colonial rule… The imperial powers sought to divide the anti-colonial movements and create future “client rulers” when and if they succeeded. The use of anti-imperialist rhetoric was designed to attract two sets of groups. A conservative group with common political and economic interests with the imperial power, which shared their hostility to revolutionary nationalists and which sought to accrue greater advantage by tying their fortunes to a rising imperial power. A radical sector of the movement tactically allied itself with the rising imperial power, with the idea of using the imperial power to secure resources (arms, propaganda, vehicles and financial aid) and, once securing power, to discard them. More often than not, in this game of mutual manipulation between empire and nationalists, the former won out … as is the case then and now. The imperialist “anti-imperialist” rhetoric was equally directed at the domestic public, especially in countries like the US which prized its 18th anti-colonial heritage. The purpose was to broaden the base of empire building beyond the hard line empire loyalists, militarists and corporate beneficiaries. Their appeal sought to include liberals, humanitarians, progressive intellectuals, religious and secular moralists and other “opinion-makers” who had a certain cachet with thelarger public, the ones who would have to pay with their lives and tax money for the inter-imperial and colonial wars. The official spokespeople of empire publicize real and fabricated atrocities of their imperial rivals, and highlight the plight of the colonized victims. The corporate elite and the hardline militarists demand military action to protect property, or to seize strategic resources; the humanitarians and progressives denounce the “crimes against humanity” and echo the calls “to do something concrete” to save the victims from genocide. Sectors of the Left join the chorus, finding a sector of victims who fit in with their abstract ideology, and plead for the imperial powers to “arm the people to liberate themselves” (sic). By lending moral support and a veneer of respectability to the imperial war, by swallowing the propaganda of “war to save victims” the progressives become the prototype of the “anti-imperialism of the fools”. Having secured broad public support on the bases of “anti-imperialism”, the imperialist powers feel free to sacrifice citizens’ lives and the public treasury ,to pursue war, fueled by the moral fervor of a righteous cause. As the butchery drags on and the casualties mount, and the public wearies of war and its cost, progressive and leftist enthusiasm turns to silence or worse, moral hypocrisy with claims that “the nature of the war changed” or “that this isn’t the kind of war that we had in mind …”. As if the war makers ever intended to consult the progressives and left on how and why they should engage in imperial wars.! In the contemporary period the imperial “anti-imperialist wars” and aggression have been greatly aided and abetted by well-funded “grass roots” so-called “non-governmental organizations” which act to mobilize popular movements which can “invite” imperial aggression. Over the past four decades US imperialism has fomented at least two dozen “grass roots” movements which have destroyed democratic governments, or decimated collectivist welfare states or provoked major damage to the economy of targeted countries. In Chile throughout 1972-73 under the democratically elected government of Salvador Allende, the CIA financed and provided major support – via the AFL-CIO–to private truck owners to paralyze the flow of goods and services .They also funded a strike by a sector of the copper workers union (at the El Tenient mine) to undermine copper production and exports, in the lead up to the coup. After the military took power several “grass roots” Christian Democratic union officials participated in the purge of elected leftist union activists. Needless to say in short order the truck owners and copper workers ended the strike, dropped their demands and subsequently lost all bargaining rights! In the 1980’s the CIA via Vatican channels transferred millions of dollars to sustain the “Solidarity Union” in Poland, making a hero of the Gdansk shipyards worker-leader Lech Walesa, who spearheaded the general strike to topple the Communist regime. With the overthrow of Communism so also went guaranteed employment, social security and trade union militancy: the neo-liberal regimes reduced the workforce at Gdansk by fifty percent and eventually closed it, giving the boot to the entire workforce.. Walesa retired with a magnificent Presidential pension, while his former workmates walked the streets and the new “independent” Polish rulers provided NATO with military bases and mercenaries for imperial wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. In 2002 the White House, the CIA , the AFL-CIO and NGOs, backed a Venezuelan military-business – trade union bureaucrat led “grass roots” coup that overthrew democratically elected President Chavez. In 48 hours a million strong authentic grass roots mobilization of the urban poor backed by constitutionalist military forces defeated the US backed dictators and restored Chavez to power .Subsequently oil executives directed a lockout backed by several US financed NGOs. They were defeated by the workers’ takeover of the oil industry. The unsuccessful coup and lockout cost the Venezuelan economy billions of dollars in lost income and caused a double digit decline in GNP. The US backed “grass roots” armed jihadists to liberated “Bosnia” and armed the“grass roots” terrorist Kosova Liberation Army to break-up Yugoslavia.Almost the entire Western Left cheered as, the US bombed Belgrade, degraded the economy and claimed it was “responding to genocide”. Kosova “free and independent” became a huge market for white slavers, housed the biggest US military base in Europe, with the highest per-capita out migration of any country in Europe. The imperial “grass roots” strategy combines humanitarian, democratic and anti-imperialist rhetoric and paid and trained local NGO’s, with mass media blitzes to mobilize Western public opinion and especially “prestigious leftist moral critics” behind their power grabs. The Consequence of Imperial Promoted “Anti-Imperialist” Movements: Who Wins and Who Loses? The historic record of imperialist promoted “anti-imperialist” and “pro-democracy” “grass roots movements” is uniformly negative. Let us briefly summarize the results. In Chile ‘grass roots’ truck owners strike led to the brutal military dictatorship of Augusto Pinochet and nearly two decades of torture, murder, jailing and forced exile of hundreds of thousands, the imposition of brutal “free market policies” and subordination to US imperial policies. In summary the US multi-national copper corporations and the Chilean oligarchy were the big winners and the mass of the working class and urban and rural poor the biggest losers. The US backed “grass roots uprisings” in Eastern Europe against Soviet domination, exchanged Russian for US domination; subordination to NATO instead of the Warsaw Pact; the massive transfer of national public enterprises, banks and media to Western multi-nationals. Privatization of national enterprises led to unprecedented levels of double-digit unemployment, skyrocketing rents and the growth of pensioner poverty.The crises induced the flight of millions of the most educated and skilled workers and the elimination of free public health, higher education and worker vacation resorts. Throughout the now capitalist Eastern Europe and USSR highly organized criminal gangs developed large scale prostitution and drug rings; foreign and local gangster ‘entrepeneurs’ seized lucrative public enterprises and formed a new class of super-rich oligarchs Electoral party politicians, local business people and professionals linked to Western ‘partners’ were the socio-economic winners. Pensioners, workers, collective farmers, the unemployed youth were the big losers along with the formerly subsidized cultural artists. Military bases in Eastern Europe became the empire’s first line of military attack of Russia and the target of any counter-attack. If we measure the consequences of the shift in imperial power, it is clear that the Eastern Europe countries have become even more subservient under the US and the EU than under Russia. Western induced financial crises have devastated their economies; Eastern European troops have served in more imperial wars under NATO than under Soviet rule; the cultural media are under Western commercial control. Most of all, the degree of imperial control over all economic sectors far exceeds anything that existed under the Soviets. The Eastern European ‘grass roots’ movement succeeded in deepening and extending the US Empire; the advocates of peace, social justice, national independence, a cultural renaissance and social welfare with democracy were the big losers. Western liberals, progressives and leftists who fell in love with imperialist promoted “anti-imperialism” are also big losers. Their support for the NATO attack on Yugoslavia led to the break-up of a multi-national state and the creation of huge NATO military bases and a white slavers paradise in Kosova. Their blind support for the imperial promoted “liberation” of Eastern Europe devastated the welfare state, eliminating the pressure on Western regimes’ need to compete in providing welfare provisions. The main beneficiaries of Western imperial advances via ‘grass roots’ uprisings were the multi-national corporations, the Pentagon and the rightwing free market neo-liberals. As the entire political spectrum moved to the right a sector of the left and progressives eventually jumped on the bandwagon. The Left moralists lost credibility and support, their peace movements dwindled, their “moral critiques” lost resonance. The left and progressives who tail-ended the imperial backed “grass roots movements”, whether in the name of “anti-stalinism”, “pro-democracy” or “anti-imperialism” have never engaged in any critical reflection; no effort to analyze the long-term negative consequences of their positions in terms of the losses in social welfare, national independence or personal dignity. The long history of imperialist manipulation of “anti-imperialist” narratives has found virulent expression in the present day. The New Cold War launched by Obama against China and Russia, the hot war brewing in the Gulf over Iran’s alleged military threat, the interventionist threat against Venezuela’s “drug-networks”,and Syria’s “bloodbath” are part and parcel of the use and abuse of “anti-imperialism” to prop up a declining empire. Hopefully, the progressive and leftist writers and scribes will learn from the ideological pitfalls of the past and resist the temptation to access the mass media by providing a ‘progressive cover’ to imperial dubbed “rebels”. It is time to distinguish between genuine anti-imperi

alism and pro-democracy movements and those promoted by Washington, NATO and the mass media.

#### Specifically, environmental justice movements fail and have historically been used to fuel neo-liberal redevelopment efforts.

Holifeld 04 [Ryan, assistant professor in the Department of Geography at the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, “Neoliberalism and environmental justice in the United States environmental protection agency: Translating policy into managerial practice in hazardous waste remediation”, Geoforum Volume 35, Issue 3, May 2004, Pages 285–297]

Brenner and Theodore (2002) identify a dynamic of “creative destruction” at work within processes of neoliberalization. On the one hand, there are “moments of destruction,” in which the strategic focus of neoliberalization is gutting regulations and dismantling institutions of the Keynesian welfare state. On the other, there are “moments of creation,” in which new institutions are constructed in order to consolidate and sustain neoliberal hegemony. In the context of the US and the UK, Peck and Tickell (2002) link these moments to two historical phases: “roll-back” or “shallow” neoliberalization in the 1980s and “roll-out” or “deep” neoliberalization in the 1990s. They argue that during the latter phase, neoliberal economic policy became increasingly “normalized”––placed under the control of technocratic routines, and thereby removed from the possibility of political contestation. At the same time, in order to ameliorate the destructive effects of the Reagan–Thatcher era, the federal state took on a new “socially interventionist” role. This was not a return to Keynesianism, but an effort to “deepen” the neoliberal project by embedding it within the institutions of civil society (Jessop, 2002). One prominent strategy associated with “deep” neoliberalization has been the selective appeal to “community” and non-market values as “flanking mechanisms” for neoliberal projects (Brenner and Theodore, 2002; Jessop, 2002; Peck and Tickell, 2002). Jessop (2002) specifies neocommunitarianism as one of several strategies for promoting global neoliberalism and “rolling out” new institutional arrangements to replace the Keynesian welfare state. Neocommunitarianism emphasizes … the link between economic and community development, notably in empowering citizens and community groups; the contribution that greater self-sufficiency can make to reinserting marginalized local economies into the wider economy; and the role of decentralized partnerships that embrace not only the state and business interests but also diverse community organizations and other local stakeholders. The neocommunitarian strategy focuses on less competitive economic spaces (such as inner cities, deindustrializing cities, or cities at the bottom of urban hierarchies) with the greatest risk of losing from the zero-sum competition for external resources… It aims to redress the imbalance between private affluence and public poverty, to create local demand, to re-skill the long-term unemployed and reintegrate them into an expanded labor market, to address some of the problems of urban regeneration (e.g. in social housing, insulation, and energy saving), to provide a different kind of spatiotemporal fix for small and medium-sized enterprises, to regenerate trust within the community, and to promote empowerment (Jessop, 2002, p. 463). Jessop emphasizes that there is no “pure” neocommunitarian strategy; it is always combined with other approaches to developing the neoliberal project. 2.2. “Roll-out” neoliberalism and environmental justice The deployment of neocommunitarian strategies made the idea of environmental justice, usually invoked as a challenge to market-driven environmental policy, compatible with processes of neoliberalization. In order to incorporate environmental justice within the project of “deep neoliberalization,” the Clinton administration drew selectively from the broad progressive agenda of the environmental justice movement (Harvey, 1996; Foreman, 1998). Unsurprisingly, the administration did not embrace the sweeping vision of the grassroots document Principles of Environmental Justice, which demands “the cessation of the production of all toxins, hazardous wastes, and radioactive materials,” calls for direct democracy in decision-making, and addresses issues ranging from urban housing to indigenous sovereignty (Principles of Environmental Justice, 1991, n.p.). Instead, it focused its approach to environmental justice on data analysis, public participation, and economic opportunity (Foreman, 1998). If data analysis offered the potential to help consolidate a technocratic basis for federal environmental justice policy decisions, the emphasis on public participation and economic opportunity permitted the administration to link the “roll-out” of neoliberal institutions and programs with themes that have animated environmental justice activism, such as community empowerment, citizen involvement, and economic self-sufficiency. Through data analysis, the administration attempted to normalize the “environmental justice community” and to make environmental injustice subject to calculation, measurement, and mapping. Executive Order No. 12898 focused the agenda of environmental justice on the problem of “disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects…on minority and low-income populations” (Clinton, 1994, sec. 1–101). In order to calculate these disproportionate effects, federal agencies were directed to “collect, maintain, and analyze information” on demographics and levels of risk. This information was to serve as the potential basis for verifying claims of environmental injustice and defining the boundaries of the standardized “EJ community.” The Clinton administration also sought to build trust in these communities and empower them politically and economically. It promoted carefully managed community involvement in decision-making processes and established programs designed to reduce welfare dependency and to support economic self-sufficiency. Unsurprisingly, it did not embrace the grassroots environmental justice movement's sweeping demands for full democratic participation in decision-making. The executive order defines public participation primarily in terms of improved public relations: making the agencies' information and decisions “accessible” and allowing the public to submit recommendations. Nonetheless, it stresses community involvement as an important component of environmental justice policy. The Clinton administration also treated environmental injustices as opportunities to create new private-sector jobs and to stimulate new investment in neglected communities. The EPA under Clinton established several modest grant programs geared toward EJ communities. In addition, it expanded or created programs––such as the Minority Worker Training Program and the Superfund Jobs Training Initiative––to train workers in these communities for jobs helping clean up hazardous waste sites. Another major initiative of the Clinton EPA was the redevelopment of brownfields: hazardous waste sites that failed to qualify for remediation under Superfund. At these sites, usually located near economically disadvantaged inner-city neighborhoods, the administration sought to stimulate reinvestment by offering relaxed liability standards to prospective developers.

#### Leads to the retrenchment of eurocentricism – the US maintains genocidal policies as a result

Edgardo Lander, 2000 (Prof. of Sociology and Latin American studies at the Venezuelan Central University in Caracas, Nepantla: Views from South Volume 1, Issue 3, 2000, “Eurocentrism and Colonialism in Latin American Social Thought”, http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/nepantla/summary/v001/1.3lander.html :)

Political and social thought regarding Latin America has been historically characterized by a tension between the search for its specific attributes and an external view that has seen these lands from the narrow perspective of European experience. There has also been an opposition between the challenge of the rich potentialities of this New World and distress over its difference, which stands in contrast with the ideal represented by European culture and racial composition. Nonetheless, external colonial views and regrets because of the difference have been widely hegemonic. A brief revision of the texts of the first republican constitutions is enough to illustrate how liberals, in their attempt to transplant and install a replica of their understanding of the European or North American experience, almost completely ignore the specific cultural and historical conditions of the societies about which they legislate. When these conditions are considered, it is with the express purpose of doing away with them. The affliction because of the difference—the awkwardness of living in a continent that is not white, urban, cosmopolitan, and civilized—finds its best expression in positivism. Sharing the main assumptions and prejudices of nineteenth-century European thought (scientific racism, patriarchy, the idea of progress), positivism reaffirms the colonial discourse. The continent is imagined from a single voice, with a single subject: white, masculine, urban, cosmopolitan. The rest, the majority, is the “other,” barbarian, primitive, black, Indian, who has nothing to contribute to the future of these societies. It would be imperative to whiten, westernize, or exterminate that majority.

#### The aff’s approach to energy poverty from the state level ignores individual responsibilities for solving poverty—changing wasteful and inefficient human usage of energy is a prerequisite

Levai, Rippey, and Rhyne 11--\*Program manager for the Center for Financial Inclusion at ACCION AND \*\* AND A microfinance specialist and climate change activist with 20 years of experience in Africa and Asia \*\*\*Director of the Office of Microenterprise Development at the U.S. Agency for International Development, Managing Director at the Center for Financial Inclusion (David, Paul, Elisabeth, “Microfinance and Energy Poverty: Findings from the Energy Links Project,” Center for Financial Inclusion at ACCION International, September, http://centerforfinancialinclusionblog.files.wordpress.com/2011/10/110929\_cfi\_rpt\_energy-links-full\_final.pdf)//BJ

*Financing the Value Chain.* End-user finance alone has not been successful in increasing outreach substantially because it turned out not to be the most restrictive financial bottleneck at this time. At present, the most urgent finance need occurs one step back in the of the pyramid markets are generally young or start-up companies, which are only now value chain. The SMEs that are producing and distributing modern energy devices to serve bottom growing to the point in size and management sophistication to qualify for substantial outside equity and some long-term debt, such as from impact investors. This still leaves a gap. In order to expand locally, the energy value chain needs to provide a ready and reliable supply of products to those who will distribute and market them to end users. Local investment and working capital are essential for facilitating this movement within the supply chain. *The Industry-Building Vision.* An industry-building perspective is needed, in which donors work towards a vision of scale and sustainability and put the elements in place that will turn a few scattered projects and energy SMEs into a massive industry. This will require pre-commercial, grant-based efforts and involved support to both individual projects and companies, and to the architecture of the industry. A platform for peer learning and documenting the many different decentralized approaches, programs successes, pitfalls, and lessons learned will increase the knowledge base on renewable energy microfinance and energy microenterprises. Knowledge sharing will also make it easier for MFIs and energy providers to find each other and form successful partnerships.

#### Complexity theory fails—prevents our ability to strategize against threats and has no empirical foundation

Geltzer et al. 2012 (Michael J. Gallagher, Captain in the US Marine Corps, Fellow in the Junior Officer Strategic Intelligence Program, and Ph.D. student in international relations at Georgetown University; Dr. Joshua A. Geltzer, law clerk to Chief Judge Alex Kozinski of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, graduated in 2011 from Yale Law School, where he served as editor in chief of the Yale Law Journal, received his Ph.D. in War Studies from King’s College, London, where he studied on a Marshall Scholarship; Dr. Sebastian L. v. Gorka, Director of the Homeland Defense Fellows Program at the College of International Security Affairs, National Defense University, and also teaches Irregular Warfare and US National Security at NDU and Georgetown, Spring 2012, “The Complexity Trap,” http://www.carlisle.army.mil/USAWC/parameters/Articles/2012spring/Gallagher\_Geltzer\_Gorka.pdf)

We live in a world of unprecedented complexity, or so we are told. President Obama’s words above echo an increasingly common narrative in the American foreign policy and national security establishments: the forces of globalization, rising nonstate actors, irregular conflict, and proliferating destructive technologies have made crafting sound national security strategy more elusive than ever before. 2 If “strategy is the art of creating power” by specifying the relationship among ends, ways, and means, 3 then the existence of unprecedented complexity would seem to make this art not only uniquely difficult today but also downright dangerous, inasmuch as choosing any particular course of action would preclude infinitely adaptive responses in the future. As Secretary of Defense Robert Gates memorably described, the pre-9/11 challenges to American national security were “amateur night compared to the world today.” 4 And as former State Department Director of Policy Planning Anne-Marie Slaughter recently stated, there is a “universal awareness that we are living through a time of rapid and universal change,” one in which the assumptions of the twentieth century make little sense. 5 The “Mr. Y” article that occasioned her comments argued that, in contrast to the “closed system” of the twentieth century that could be controlled by mankind, we now live in an “open system” defined by its supremely complex and protean nature. 6 Unparalleled complexity, it seems, is the hallmark of our strategic age.¶ These invocations of complexity permeate today’s American national security documents and inform Washington’s post-Cold War and -9/11 strategic culture. The latest Quadrennial Defense Review begins its analysis with a description of the “complex and uncertain security landscape in which the pace of change continues to accelerate. Not since the fall of the Soviet Union or the end of World War II has the international terrain been affected by such farreaching and consequential shifts.” 7 In a similar vein, the National Intelligence Council’s Global Trends 2025 argues that the international system is trending towards greater degrees of complexity as power is diffused and actors multiply. 8 The Director of National Intelligence’s Vision 2015 terms our time the “Era of Uncertainty,” one “in which the pace, scope, and complexity of change are increasing.” 9 Disturbingly, the younger generation of foreign policy and national security professionals seems to accept and embrace these statements declaiming a fundamental change in our world and our capacity to cope with it. The orientation for the multi-thousand-member group of Young Professionals in Foreign Policy calls “conquering complexity” the fundamental challenge for the millennial generation. Complexity, it appears, is all the rage. ¶ We challenge these declarations and assumptions—not simply because they are empirically unfounded but, far more importantly, because they negate the very art of strategy and make the realization of the American national interest impossible. We begin by showing the rather unsavory consequences of the current trend toward worshipping at complexity’s altar and thus becoming a member of the “Cult of Complexity.” Next, we question whether the world was ever quite as simple as today’s avowers of complexity suggest, thus revealing the notion of today’s unprecedented complexity to be descriptively false. We then underscore that this idea is dangerous, given the consequences of an addiction to complexity. Finally, we offer an escape from the complexity trap, with an emphasis on the need for prioritization in today’s admittedly distinctive international security environment. Throughout, we hope to underscore that today’s obsession with complexity results in a dangerous denial of the need to strategize.

# 2NC

## Topicality

### AT: Not Predictable

#### Cuba QPQs are predictable in the literature

Haass 00 – Richard Haass & Meghan O’Sullivan, Brookings Institution Foreign Policy Studies Program, “Terms of Engagement: Alternatives to Punitive Policies”, Survival, 42(2), Summer, p. 15-16

Rather than maintaining the status quo, the US should simultaneously pursue two forms of engagement with Cuba. First, it should actively seek out Castro’s willingness to engage in a conditional relationship and to chart a course towards more satisfactory relations. It should attempt to strike a dialogue with Castro in which reasonable benefits are offered to him in return for reasonable changes. Rather than accentuating the desire for a regime change or immediate democratic elections, US policy-makers should make lesser goals the focus of their policy, as the more ambitious the demands, the less likely Castro is to enter into a process of engagement. For instance, the release of political prisoners and the legitimisation of political parties might be offered in exchange for the selected lifting of elements of the embargo. Regardless of Castro’s reaction to such an approach, benefits would accrue to the United States. If Castro accepted this dialogue, US policy would be seen as pushing forward real political liberalisation on the island; if Castro rejected these attempts, America would still ease tensions with its European allies by demonstrating it was willing to take a more flexible line towards Cuba.

#### Venezuela QPQs are predictable

Christy 3/15, [Patrick Christy is a senior policy analyst at the Foreign Policy Initiative, http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/world-report/2013/03/15/after-chavez-us-must-encourage-democratic-venezuela](file:///C:\Users\Nirav%20Ilango\Dropbox\camp%202013!\Patrick%20Christy%20is%20a%20senior%20policy%20analyst%20at%20the%20Foreign%20Policy%20Initiative,%20http:\www.usnews.com\opinion\blogs\world-report\2013\03\15\after-chavez-us-must-encourage-democratic-venezuela)

What's perverse is how the Obama administration's move to "reset" relations with Maduro is doing more to legitimize him as the rightful heir to Venezuela's presidency than to resuscitate relations between the two governments. The move showed itself to be even more naive after Maduro accused the United States of plotting to poison Chavez shortly after the strongman's death.Washington must realize that a strategy of engagement alone will not ensure a renewed and improved partnership with Caracas. Failure to realize this will not only undermine whatever influence America has in the months ahead, but also send a troubling signal to Venezuela's increasingly united political opposition. The Obama administration should instead pursue a more principled policy towards a post-Chavez Venezuela. In particular, it should:Pressure Caracas to implement key election reforms.Venezuela's opposition faces formidable obstacles. Interim President Maduro will use the government's near-monopoly control of public airwaves, its established networks of political patronage and last-minute public spending programs to bolster his populist agenda.Washington should stress publicly and privately that any attempts to suppress or intimidate the opposition runs contrary to Venezuela's constitution and the principles defined in the Inter-American Democratic Charter, which was adopted by Venezuela in 2001. To this point, José Cárdenas, a former USAID acting assistant administrator for Latin America, [writes](http://shadow.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2013/03/06/the_struggle_for_venezuela_s_future),The Venezuelan opposition continues to insist that the constitution (which is of Chavez's own writing) be followed and have drawn up a list of simple electoral reforms that would level the playing field and better allow the Venezuelan people to chart their own future free of *chavista* and foreign interference.Demand free, fair and verifiable elections. Although Venezuela announced that a special election to replace Chavez will be held next month, it is important to remember that elections alone do not make a democracy. Indeed, Chavez long embraced the rhetoric of democracy as he, in reality, consolidated executive power, undermined Venezuela's previously democratic political system and altered the outcomes of election through corruption, fraud and intimidation.The Obama administration should make clear that free and fair elections,[properly monitored](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/09/the-chavez-plan-to-steal-venezuelas-presidential-election-what-obama-should-do) by respected international election observers, are essential to Venezuela's future standing in the hemisphere and the world. Likewise, Secretary of State John Kerry should work with regional partners—including (but not limited to) Brazil, Canada, Colombia and Mexico—to firmly encourage Maduro's interim government. A unified regional voice would send a powerful signal to Chavez's cronies in Caracas and longtime enablers in China, Iran and Russia.Condition future diplomatic and economic relations**.** Corruption and criminality were widespread under the Chavez regime, as high-level government and military officials benefited from close ties to corrupt businesses and international drug traffickers. Yet to date, the Obama administration has done little to hold Venezuela's leaders accountable. Washington should make clear that full diplomatic relations with the United States will be contingent upon Venezuela ending ties to international terrorist groups and rogue regimes like Iran. If Venezuela takes meaningful steps to end these ties and ensure future elections, the United States should work with Caracas and the private sector to reform Venezuela's energy industry and identify key development projects and reforms to improve the country's economic future.The United States can play an important role in shaping Venezuela's post-Chavez future. But to do so, the Obama administration will need to stand with the people of Venezuela by publicly defending democratic principles and the impartial rule of law in Latin America.

## Solar Thermal PIC

### 2NC S – Must Read – CP Solves

#### Integrated, distributed solar thermal implementation in Mexico solves the whole aff – not doing solar thermal causes urban exclusion and mass poverty, which makes “scalar politics” impossible – this card’s pretty damn good.

Chromagen, 3-xx-2011, company based in Israel focusing mainly on solar water solutions, “Solar energy for the less privileged,” <http://chromagen.com/files/News/social_housing_032011.pdf>

Solar thermal systems are able to reduce energy costs. To realise such savings, government programmes in Turkey, Brazil and Mexico are promoting the integration of solar installations in social housing. I f you have ever driven through a megacity like Is­ tanbul, Hong Kong or Mexico City, you will prob­ ably never forget the seemingly endless sea of houses. The millions of inhabitants all need appro­priate living space. Where no land remains for further settlements on the periphery, the buildings grow higher and higher. But irrespective of whether the ex­ pansion is vertical or horizontal, the population fig­ures continue to increase. To be able to offer those with low incomes an affordable home, and at the same time to combat illegally erected dwellings, the governments invest considerable sums in the con­ struction of social housing. At the same time, govern­ments are becoming increasingly obliged to protect their citizens from exploding energy prices and to help preserve the environment. Solar water heating is one way to combine these aims. SUN & WIND ENERGY would here like to present three examples of programmes for solar thermal systems in social housing in Turkey, Mexico and Brazil. State commission in Turkey Turkey is a perfect example for how demographic de­ velopments drive social housing construction. Popu­ lation figures have been rocketing since the middle of the 20th century. Despite the fact that population growth is now slowing once more, Turkey is today still one of the most rapidly urbanising countries in the world, with currently around 78 million inhabitants. The major cities Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir continue to draw waves of rural­to­urban migration, and the settlements in coastal regions and a number of other medium and large­sized cities in Anatolia are also ex­periencing rapid urban growth. It was not long before housing construction was unable to keep pace with this development. At the same time, more and more households found them­selves without the means to rent or purchase accom­ modation on the open market. Israeli solar manufac­ turer Chromagen supplies solar thermal systems for social housing projects in Mexico through its distri­butor Heliocol de Mexico. The consequence was a proliferation of illegally erected settlements. “Many end up settling in unauthorised squats, bringing along many problems like urban exclusion, urban poverty, degradation of the urban environment and the loss of natural resources,” as the Housing Devel­ opment Administration of Turkey (TOKI) writes on its website.

### 2NC S – AT: PV k2 Decentralization

#### LOL WHAT ARE YOU DOING – solar thermal can be decentralized, too – in fact, it does it BETTER than photovoltaic.

Dr. Alan Harries et al, 11-21-2011, Renewable Energy Group, BDSP Partnership Limited, with Dr. Zahir Dehouche, professor at the School of Engineering and Design @ Brunel University, and Sinisa Stankovic, Director of BDSP Partnership Limited, “Advanced solar thermal integration for decentralized power supply for buildings,” <http://www.findaphd.com/search/ProjectDetails.aspx?PJID=34835>

Research Project: Advanced solar thermal integration for decentralized power supply for buildings Solar power technologies such as Concentrated Solar Power (CSP) have demonstrated the ability to transform over 50% of incident solar radiation into usable energy (compared to <20% for current high-end Photovoltaics). As such, these technologies offer significant opportunities as we move into the new era of decentralised supply networks delivering clean and renewable high-grade energy to local buildings. The proposed research aims to investigate and develop solar power systems using the latest available technologies. An emphasis is placed on meeting local thermal energy needs and thermal energy storage on short and long (seasonal) timescales will be an integral part of the research, e.g. ground storage, as well as the integration with other building systems and energy technologies such as ground source heat pumps. The processes required to interface with designers, clients and other specialists at the various design stages will be developed. This will include working on real design projects, improving the market confidence in solar technologies, investigating the effect of local climates/conditions on system performance, analysing the effect of the scale of the installation for different systems and creating novel solutions (e.g. combining solar thermal systems with energy storage and recovery technologies).

## Centralized Injustice Advantage

### 2NC Rare Earth Metals Turn—AT: No Link

#### Rare earth metals are key to producing solar PV—releases radioactive byproducts that makes farming impossible

Tverberg 1/22—consultant for Towers Watson, contributor to Business Insider (Gail, “10 Big Problems With Wind And Solar Energy,” Business Insider, 1/22/14, http://www.businessinsider.com/ten-reasons-intermittent-renewables-wind-and-solar-pv-are-a-problem-2014-1)//BJ

Both wind turbines and solar PV use rare earth minerals, mostly from China, in their manufacture. Mining and processing these rare earths generates a tremendous amount of “hazardous and radioactive byproducts.” In the part of China where rare earth minerals are mined, soil and water are saturated with toxic substances, making farming impossible.

### 2NC Rare Earth Metals Turn—Solvency Takeout

#### The rare earth link takes out solvency—shortages—vote negative on presumption.

Balashov 11 Sergei Balashov, correspondent for Proactiveinvestor, PwC warns on rare earth metals shortage as China tightens supplies, http://www.proactiveinvestors.co.uk/companies/news/36671/pwc-warns-on-rare-earth-metals-shortage-as-china-tightens-supplies-36671.html, Dec 7

PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) sounded an alarm on the impending supply shortage of rare earth metals, which could seriously hit the automotive, chemicals and renewable energy industries. According to a survey of executives from 69 manufacturing companies released by PwC, 14 of the 17 rare earth metals that include cerium, dysprosium, fluorspar and beryllium are set to become even scarcer within the next five years. Demand for rare earth metals is currently expected to outstrip supply by 30-50,000 tonnes in 2012. This shortage is likely to result in a decline in production rate of devices and products such as mobile phones, TVs, military equipment and wind turbines that require rare earth metal made components. The majority of the companies that participated in the survey are major global players with annual revenues of over US$10 billion, said PwC. The survey has found that 71 per cent of executives from European consumers of rare earth metal see the shortage as a risk to their businesses. PwC went as far as calling the situation a "ticking time bomb". “Put simply, many businesses now recognise that we are living beyond the planet's means,” said global sustainability leader at PwC Malcolm Preston. It was reported earlier this week that China, the world’s largest producer of rare earth metals that accounts for 94 percent of global output, exported 65 percent less metals in the first nine months of the year compared to the same period of 2010. Total exports for the period reached 11,000 tonnes, just 40 percent of the export quota for 2011, while demand for the metals outside of China is estimated at around 40,000 tonnes. China keeps reducing its export quotas to redirect supplies to the domestic markets, prompting users of rare earth metals to move their manufacturing operations to China. The country’s largest rare earths producer Baotou Steel Rare-Earth Hi-Tech has recently decided to suspend production in order to push the prices higher after China decided to impose new environmental restrictions on the industry.

# 1NR

## Banco del Sur CP

### Net Benefit XT

#### It is impossible to separate “good engagement” from “bad engagement.” Seemingly good-intentioned US policies are just a tool of the Empire to cement economic control over Mexico

Harvey 07—Distinguished Professor of Anthropology at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York (David, “A Brief History of Neoliberalism,” Oxford University Press, March 1, pg. 118-19)//BJ

But one persistent fact within this complex history of uneven neoliberalization has been the universal tendency to increase social inequality and to expose the least fortunate elements in any society--be it in Indonesia, Mexico, or Britain--to the chill winds of austerity and the dull fate of increasing marginalization . . . . The incredible concentrations of wealth and power that now exist in the upper echelons of capitalism have not been seen since the 1920s. The flows of tribute into the world's major financial centres have been astonishing. What, however is even more astonishing is the habit of treating all of this as a mere and in some instances even unfortunate byproduct of neoliberalization. The very idea that this might be--just might be--the fundamental core of what neoliberalization has been about all along appears unthinkable. It has been apart of the genius of neoliberal theory to provide a benevolent mask full of wonderful-sounding words like freedom, liberty, choice, and rights, to hide the grim realities of the restoration or reconstitution of naked class power, locally as well as transnationally, but most particularly in the main financial centres of global capitalism. (BHoN, pp. 118-89)

### 2NC S – AT: BdS Neoliberal

#### The Bank of the South solves—sends a global signal about the sustainability of neoliberalism by *redefining* the role of emerging markets

Paez 11, Pedro Paez, Plenipotentiary Ambassador for the Ecuadorian Government on the New International Financial Architecture and Chair of the Ecuadorian Presidential Technical Commission for the design of Banco del Sur , “Financial governance¶ beyond the crisis¶ creating an innovative¶ financial architecture in latin America”, October 2011, <http://www.tni.org/sites/www.tni.org/files/PedroPaezInterview-en-final.pdf>)

The second vector is related to the transformation¶ of the relationship between the financial and the productive spheres in order to recover the coherence between production and consumption, which has currently broken down due to the exacerbated fragmentation caused by the evolutionary process of globalization and the parasitic hypertrophy of financial capital. The development of the capitalist system in recent decades has demonstrated that the financial sector has hijacked the process of accumulation, separating it from the productive process through financial instruments and innovation, which rather¶ than facilitating and empowering the development of productive forces, create mechanisms to undermine the value generated in the real economy under the umbrella of profit and the exploitation of society as a whole.¶ Under this horizon, a fundamental aspect is to open space in an economy based on a rationale that is different from the capitalist one and which is currently being assimilated into this logic by the forces and conditions of the market. The structural crisis of capitalism as a way of production and life, can only¶ be overcome from a logic that puts the life of the people first, which is to say human labour, and which recognizes another type of productive logic, another type of distribution mechanisms and a structure of incentives that give rise to processes which, while they are not dominant under the current logic of the market and capitalist profitability, can gradually stabilize and moreover can be replicated and are sustainable in time.¶ Finally, the third fundamental vector of the New International Financial Architecture, which is based on the previous two, is related to the renegotiation of the role of emerging economies as a periphery¶ in the international division of labour. This is built on a foundation of a new articulation between the private capitalist economy, the role of the State and the grassroots economy in all of its diversity. On the other hand, a new relationship between production and finances could redefine the role of emerging economies as a periphery in the international division of labour that is now outdated. In fact, one of the clearest expressions of the structural crisis we are currently facing is related to global macroeconomic imbalances. The logic of growth based on the growing debt of central countries, accompanied by the creation of a semi-periphery that produces manufactured goods and a periphery that is increasingly relegated to providing raw materials. This is absolutely unsustainable, not only in environmental and social terms but also from the local of capital itself.

## Neoliberalism DA

### 2NC L—XT

#### Independently, the 1AC’s knowledge production is ideologically fueled to leave the core system of neoliberalism intact while preventing counterhegemoic forces from overcoming it. This is done by creating a mask of benign engagement to stave off resistance while simultaneously entrenching neoliberal policy.

Neubauer 12 (Robert J, is a Phd Student at the School of Communications at Simon Fraser University, Vancouver “Dialogue, Monologue, or Something in Between? Neoliberal Think Tanks in the Americas,” http://ijoc.org/ojs/index.php/ijoc/article/viewfile/1481/789)

A key function of organic intellectuals is to respond to crises. To remain hegemonic, organic intellectuals must develop policy responses that are seen to mitigate problems, while leaving the core system intact. Otherwise, the bloc is left open to competition from counterhegemonic forces. This is precisely how neoliberalism overthrew Keynesianism in the 1970s, and how Keynesianism itself overthrew the laissez-faire order of the early 20th century. It is therefore instructive to analyze the Dialogue’s output in times of crisis. One example is the Dialogue-sponsored report Washington Contentious released in 2000 during the midst of the Argentinean financial crisis. The group’s Latin directors (to say nothing of the report writers themselves) would have been keenly aware of the crisis of legitimacy this event entailed—a crisis which could disrupt the accumulation circuits in which they were integrated. It is therefore unsurprising that the social dislocations caused by the crisis—soaring unemployment, public debt, severe poverty, and the annihilation of local savings—compelled the authors to propose limited Keynesian interventions, including an enhanced social safety net, food stamps, unemployment insurance, expanded public schooling, and progressive taxation (Birdsall & de la Torre, 2001). Yet interestingly, and in keeping with Truitt’s (2000) account, these limited reforms continue to be couched in a broader, over-arching continued support for neoliberal economics. According to the report (Birdsall & de la Torre, 2000), the limited Keynesian reforms proposed cannot be deficit financed, even in times of crisis, as “fiscal indiscipline . . . has high costs for the poor” (p. 22) The Dialogue thereby recommends that capital flight be mitigated through “market-supplied insurance” (p. 35) and the maintenance of government “stabilization funds” (p. 36). Banks and governments would have to build countercyclical provisions in times of high credit growth, thereby providing countercyclical liquidity Countries should also be given automatic “access to international lines of credit” in times of crisis (ibid.). Stability can be improved through a further “internationalizing [of] the banking system,” as the “entry of first-rate foreign banks can rapidly enhance the domestic banking system’s stability and resiliency” (p. 37). Finally, stability can be further enhanced through “continuing efforts to diversify trade and increase foreign direct investment, including negotiating multilateral, regional, and bilateral agreements” (ibid.). As policy responses, these recommendations are extraordinary. The immediate cause of the crisis was capital flight facilitated by financial deregulation and the elimination of capital controls. In the similar East Asian crisis of 1998, Malaysia ignored IMF advice and imposed capital controls to great success, while those nations that followed IMF dictates suffered greatly (Harvey, 2005). Yet capital controls would undermine regimes of flexible accumulation dependent on unrestricted capital flows. The Dialogue thereby rejects controls, simply advising that governments and banks hold enough money to ensure that the impact of capital flight is lessened in times of crisis. This is to be achieved through new insurance mechanisms and access to lines of credit—both of which will presumably be supplied by the same global financial firms that helped instigate the crisis in the first place, or possibly from the IFIs that originally imposed neoliberal reforms. Finally, the Dialogue’s cure for instability is not less, but more neoliberal financial and trade deregulation and integration. Another example is the 2009 report A Second Chance: U.S. Policy in the Americas, prepared for U.S. policy makers in the wake of the 2008 global financial-economic crisis (IAD). Aware that the crisis represents a further blow to regional neoliberal legitimacy, the report openly concedes that “popular frustration may lead to diminished support for democracy and markets” throughout both North and Latin America. Also, the report endorses a familiar suite of policy measures designed to placate Latin American publics, once again demonstrating which concessions are necessary to generate a transnational elite rolling consensus. The report (2009) advises the United States to restore its credibility on democracy and human rights; normalize relations with Cuba; help its regional partners in “confronting crime, violence, and drugs”; and reform immigration policy. However, the underlying thrust of proposed economic policies continues to be broadly neoliberal. Admitting that support for “new trade initiatives will not be a priority for either the United States or most Latin American nations in the coming period,” the report (IAD, 2009) recommends that the United States quickly “gain congressional ratification of the already negotiated and signed free trade agreements with Colombia and Panama,” while preserving “hemisphere-wide free trade” as a “critical long-term goal” (p. 10). On a similar note, the United States is urged to “avoid protectionist measures that would reduce Latin American access to U.S. markets and investments” (p. 9). Furthermore, the United States must “help ensure Latin America’s continuing access to necessary credit and capital” by “mobiliz[ing] support for an expansion of the resources and programs of . . . the Inter-American Development Bank, World Bank, IMF, and Andean Development Corporation” (p. 7). Three of the 4 IFIs mentioned are direct funders of the Dialogue, and all have worked to implement neoliberal reforms that laid the groundwork for the financial bubbles that caused the current crisis. No mention is made of the enhancement and/or support for the proposed “Bank of the South.” Only the traditional financial institutions of neoliberalism hold the key to global financial stability. “There is no alternative” (p. 7).