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Financial incentives are grants or loans—government purchases are distinct.

Czinkota et al 9—Associate Professor at the McDonough School of Business at Georgetown University, Michael, Fundamentals of International Business, p. 69 – google books

Incentives offered by policymakers to facilitate foreign investments are mainly of three types: fiscal, financial, and nonfinancial. Fiscal incentives are specific tax measures designed to attract foreign investors. They typically consist of special depreciation allowances, tax credits or rebates, special deductions for capital expenditures, tax holidays, and the reduction of tax burdens. Financial incentives offer special funding for the investor by providing, for example, land or buildings, loans, and loan guarantees. Nonfinancial incentives include guaranteed government purchases; special protection from competition through tariffs, import quotas, and local content requirements, and investments in infrastructure facilities.

Vote neg

Limits—government procurement allows tons of new affs dealing with the military, government research facilities and almost any government service, this explodes the topic making deep debate and predictable ground impossible.

Ground—most topic arguments assume a private-sector based increase in energy production like investment tradeoffs, environmental DAs or condition the company CPs, government procurement dodges all these.
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“Increase” means to make greater and requires pre-existence

Buckley 6 (Jeremiah, Attorney, Amicus Curiae Brief, Safeco Ins. Co. of America et al v. Charles Burr et al, <http://supreme.lp.findlaw.com/supreme_court/briefs/06-84/06-84.mer.ami.mica.pdf>)

First, the court said that the ordinary meaning of the word “increase” is “to make something greater,” which it believed should not “be limited to cases in which a company raises the rate that an individual has previously been charged.” 435 F.3d at 1091. Yet the definition offered by the Ninth Circuit compels the opposite conclusion. Because “increase” means “to make something greater,” there must necessarily have been an existing premium, to which Edo’s actual premium may be compared, to determine whether an “increase” occurred. Congress could have provided that “ad-verse action” in the insurance context means charging an amount greater than the optimal premium, but instead chose to define adverse action in terms of an “increase.” That def-initional choice must be respected, not ignored. See Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. 379, 392-93 n.10 (1979) (“[a] defin-ition which declares what a term ‘means’ . . . excludes any meaning that is not stated”). Next, the Ninth Circuit reasoned that because the Insurance Prong includes the words “existing or applied for,” Congress intended that an “increase in any charge” for insurance must “apply to all insurance transactions – from an initial policy of insurance to a renewal of a long-held policy.” 435 F.3d at 1091. This interpretation reads the words “exist-ing or applied for” in isolation. Other types of adverse action described in the Insurance Prong apply only to situations where a consumer had an existing policy of insurance, such as a “cancellation,” “reduction,” or “change” in insurance. Each of these forms of adverse action presupposes an already-existing policy, and under usual canons of statutory construction the term “increase” also should be construed to apply to increases of an already-existing policy. See Hibbs v. Winn, 542 U.S. 88, 101 (2004) (“a phrase gathers meaning from the words around it”) (citation omitted).

Violation – The plan mandates procurement from companies that comply with the solar industry environment and social responsibility standards – this changes on a year by year basis, shifting ground

Vote neg,

Predictable ground – the companies that comply to these standards every year changes – we can get specific, stable ground – makes getting link ground impossible

Bidirectionality – if no companies comply with these standards, it means they can advocate solar bad – makes negative prep impossible

Topical version of your aff specifies corporations rather than standards – literally no offense
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#### The United States federal government should transfer ownership of civilian activities of the Army Corps of Engineers to the state and local level. The Fifty States and all relevant territories should procure mobile solar power systems from companies who comply with the Solar Industry Environment and Social Responsibility Commitment for its training exercises and activities in response to emergencies in the United States.

#### Federal involvement decreases the plan’s economic benefits-empirics prove consistent mismanagement among federal agencies. The counter-plan avoids this.

Edwards ‘12. Chris Edwards, Director of Tax Policy, Cato Institute “Cutting the Army Corps of Engineers.” March 2012.[http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/usace]

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is a federal agency that constructs and maintains a wide range of infrastructure for military and civilian purposes.1 This essay concerns the civilian part of the agency, which employs about 23,000 people and will spend about $9.2 billion in fiscal 2012.2 The civilian part of the Corps—called "civil works"—builds and operates locks, channels, and other navigation infrastructure on river systems. It also builds flood control structures, dredges seaports, manages thousands of recreation sites, and owns and operates hydroelectric power plants across the country. While the Army Corps has built some impressive infrastructure, many of its projects have been economically or environmentally dubious. The agency's activities have often subsidized private interests at the expense of federal taxpayers. Furthermore, the Corps has a history of distorting its cost-benefit analyses in order to justify its projects. The civilian side of the Corps grew out of the engineering expertise gained by the agency's military activities early in the nation's history. In mid-19th century, Congress began adding civilian missions to the Corps in response to political demands and various natural disasters. Today we are left with an agency involved in far flung activities such as beach replenishment, upgrades to city water systems, agriculture irrigation, clean-up of hazardous waste sites, and efforts to revive the Florida Everglades. The Corps has been greatly mismanaged over the decades, with problems ranging from frequent cost overruns on projects to the major engineering failures that contributed to the disaster of Hurricane Katrina. In addition, the dominance of special-interest politics on the agency's activities has resulted in it supporting many wasteful projects. Fortunately, most of the Corps' activities do not need to be carried out by the federal government. Some of its activities—such as flood control and the management of recreational areas—should be turned over to state and local governments. Other activities—such as seaport dredging and hydropower generation—should be turned over to the private sector. This essay focuses on cutting the Corps' spending activities, and does not address the calls for reforming the agency's regulatory functions.3 The following sections look at the history of the Army Corps, the pork-barrel nature of its spending, its legacy of mismanagement, and its role in Hurricane Katrina. The essay concludes that the bulk of the agency's civilian activities and assets should be privatized or transferred to state and local governments. The remaining activities of the Corps that are truly federal in nature should be transferred to the Department of the Interior. The civilian side of the Army Corps should be closed down.
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Fiscal Cliff averted for two months – Obama needs polcap to avert total meltdown

Mahn 1-3 (Kevin, Forbes, http://www.forbes.com/sites/advisor/2013/01/03/fiscal-cliff-deal-4-tax-provisions-handled-1-hiked-still-work-to-be-done/)

A last minute fiscal cliff deal/compromise was reached in Washington to avert the initial stages of a potential economic meltdown that was received warmly by the markets given the extent of the relief rally that we have experienced thus far on the first trading day of the New Year.¶ However, I don’t believe that we are anywhere close to signaling “all clear” on the Fiscal Cliff front and that the deal in question—while it averted some of the feared, short-term draconian tax increases associated with going over the cliff—did nothing to address the longer term, more encompassing budget issues as the compromise delayed any decisions on spending cuts for another two months.¶ The compromise also did not deal with the impending Debt Ceiling debate, which promises to have both political parties digging in on their ideological heels.¶ Removing some uncertainty from the markets, what has been addressed in the deal/compromise were changes to the revenue side of the fiscal budget equation primarily dealing with tax rates and income levels associated with these tax rates.¶ As I understand it at this point in time, based primarily upon a recent The Wall Street Journalarticle entitled, “Summary of Bill’s Tax Provisions,” here are some of the major provisions of the deal that were agreed to by the White House, Senate and House of Representatives—and one noteworthy tax that was not addressed in the deal.¶ 1. The personal income tax rate for families with incomes above $450,000 (individuals with incomes above $400,000 and heads-of-households with incomes above $425,000) will increase. Any excess income above these levels will now be taxed at 39.6%. This represents the largest income tax rate increase in nearly two decades. The tax rates for families, individuals and heads-of households with income below these thresholds will not change and will remain at their existing Bush-era tax bracket levels.¶ 2. The tax rate on capital gains and dividendswill rise to 20% from 15% for incomes above the levels described in (1) above. These tax rates will remain at 15% for all other applicable taxpayers below these thresholds. Avoiding the tax treatment of dividend income at ordinary income rates, as opposed to the agreed upon tax rates of 15% or 20%, is viewed as a major positive for investors–especially those with dividend oriented investment strategies in their portfolios.¶ 3. The estate tax will be increased from a top tax rate of 35% to 40% with a $5 million exemption level. This threshold will be indexed to inflation going forward.¶ 4. The Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT) was patched to avoid raising taxes, through the AMT, on more middle-class Americans by raising the income exemption from $33,750 (individuals) and $45,000 (married couples filing jointly), as it would have reverted to for the tax year 2012, to $50,600 (individuals) and $78,750 (married couples filing jointly) respectively. The exemption amounts will be indexed going forward as well.¶ 5. The deal did not address payroll taxes. As a result, the rate of payroll taxes for workers used to fund Social Security will increase from 4.2% (which was in place for the previous two tax years) to 6.2% as of January 1, 2013. According to The Tax Policy Center, approximately 77% of American households will face higher federal taxes in 2013—not just income tax increases on wealthier American households but payroll tax increases on middle and low income American households as well.¶ While the details of the “first Fiscal Cliff deal,” addressing revenue (i.e. taxes), show that the compromises reached helped to lessen the initial taxable impact that would have been experienced by many taxpayers and investors if no deal had been reached at all, I remain concerned with the lack of any type of deal on spending cuts at this time.¶ A “second Fiscal Cliff deal,” addressing spending cuts, would need to be reached within the next two months according to the outtakes of the first Fiscal Cliff deal. If an agreement between the two political parties on spending cuts cannot be reached in that timeframe, the Debt Ceiling debate would then return to the front burner as more debt would thus be needed (potentially involving another increase to the Debt Ceiling) to fund the existing Federal balance sheet imbalance.¶ Judging from past experience, I would anticipate that any agreement on a second Fiscal Cliff deal will probably come down to the wire, if not get postponed again, and that market volatility will likely continue to increase as we get closer to the new deadline.

Current deal isn’t enough – lack of a full deal will cause a full collapse

Delamaide 1-3 (Darrell, Marketwatch, “Tactical deal on “cliff” risks permanent damage,” http://www.marketwatch.com/story/tactical-deal-on-cliff-risks-permanent-damage-2013-01-03?link=MW\_latest\_news)

The bill passed with so much drama converted the temporary George W. Bush-era tax cuts into the permanent Obama tax cuts. As hard as it may be to not extend tax cuts that are due to expire, it’s much harder politically to actually raise tax rates.¶ The tax rates, originally adopted in response to a surging government surplus and then extended to avoid fiscal contraction during a recession, have now been set at a permanently low level, which could hinder the country from achieving its future economic and social goals.¶ This was the thrust of the argument made by one of the 16 Democratic congressmen who voted against the bill.¶ “We have concretized revenue at an extraordinarily low rate,” Rep. Jim Moran said Wednesday on MSNBC.¶ Moran, who represents some of the Washington suburbs in northern Virginia, said the tax rates enshrined in the legislation now signed into law by President Barack Obama meant “we will never bring in more than 15% of GDP.” But, he added, the U.S. has never enjoyed a robust economy without government spending of at least 20% of gross domestic product.¶ Moran, beginning his 12th term in Congress this week, noted the deal’s immediate consequences of leaving several ugly fiscal battles to fight in the coming weeks — raising the debt ceiling, disarming the “sequester” of automatic spending cuts, and passing a budget that enables the government to continue operating.¶ But the real issue is the long-term problem of starving the beast, with Obama at his moment of maximum leverage getting only $620 billion in added tax revenue over 10 years — instead of the $1.6 trillion he sought in earlier proposals.¶ “I wanted [Obama] to have a legacy he could be proud of,” Moran said, including investments in education and training to keep the country competitive economically. “I doubt that can be done with the limited resources we voted [Tuesday] night.”

Collapse destabilizes the entire international system –

Burrows and Harris 9- Mathew J. Burrows is a counselor in the National Intelligence Council (NIC), the principal drafter of Global Trends 2025: A Transformed World, Jennifer Harris is a member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit, “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis”, The Washington Quarterly, April, http://www.ciaonet.org/journals/twq/v32i2/f\_0016178\_13952.pdf

Increased Potential for Global Conflict Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to bedrawn from that period include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies andmultiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and onthe sustainability ofmultilateral institutions (think League of Nationsin thesame period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which the potential for greater conflict could grow would seem to be even more apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change would be steadier. In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion oftechnologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s mostdangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groups inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attack and newly emergentcollections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized,particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrowerin an economic downturn. The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own nuclear ambitions. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationshipthat existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emergenaturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an unintended escalation and broader conflict if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. Thelack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missileflight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus onpreemption rather than defense, potentially leading to escalating crises. Types of conflict that the world continuesto experience, such as over resources, could reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this could result in interstate conflicts if governmentleaders deem assured access to energy resources,for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival oftheir regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopoliticalimplications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for navalbuildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup ofregional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, andcounterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer inAsia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in amoredog-eat-dog world.What Kind of World will 2025 Be? Perhaps more than lessons, history loves patterns. Despite widespread changes in the world today, there is little to suggest that the future will not resemble the past in several respects. The report asserts that, under most scenarios, the trendtoward greater diffusion of authority and power that has been ongoing for acouple of decades is likely to accelerate because of the emergence of new globalplayers, the worsening institutional deficit, potential growth in regional blocs,and enhanced strength of non-state actors and networks. The multiplicity of actors on the international scene could either strengthen the international system, by filling gaps left by aging post-World War II institutions, or could further fragment it and incapacitate international cooperation. The diversity in both type and kind of actor raises the likelihood of fragmentation occurring over the next two decades, particularly given the wide array of transnational challenges facing the international community. Because of their growing geopolitical and economic clout, the rising powers will enjoy a high degree of freedom to customize their political and economic policies rather than fully adopting Western norms. They are also likely to cherish their policy freedom to maneuver, allowing others to carry the primary burden for dealing with terrorism, climate change, proliferation, energy security, and other system maintenance issues. Existing multilateral institutions, designed for a different geopolitical order, appear too rigid and cumbersome to undertake new missions, accommodate changing memberships, and augment their resources. Nongovernmental organizations and philanthropic foundations, concentrating on specific issues, increasingly will populate the landscape but are unlikely to affect change in the absence of concerted efforts by multilateral institutions or governments. Efforts at greater inclusiveness, to reflect the emergence of the newer powers, may make it harder for international organizations to tackle transnational challenges. Respect for the dissenting views of member nations will continue to shape the agenda of organizations and limit the kinds of solutions that can be attempted. An ongoing financial crisis and prolonged recession would tilt the scales even further in the direction of a fragmented and dysfunctional international system with a heightened risk of conflict. The report concluded that the rising BRIC powers (Brazil, Russia, India, and China) seem averse to challenging the international system, as Germany and Japan did in the nineteenth and twentiethcenturies, but this of course could change if their widespread hopes for greater prosperity become frustrated and the current benefits they derive from a globalizing world turn negative.
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The aff's focus on race shatters class based coalitions against capitalism - even if oppression is found within intersectionality, capitalism is a much greater force to fostering that inequality, which means we turn the case.

Dander & Torres 99

A. Darder and R. Torres, 1999.Darder is a University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Professor of Educational Policy Studies and Latino/a Studies, Torres is Professor of Planning, Policy, and Design, Chicano/Latino Studies, and Political Science. “Shattering the Race Lens: Towards a Critical Theory of Racism.” Critical Ethnicity. P. 174-6

[**W]e work with raced identities on already reified ground.** In the context of domination, **raced identities are imposed and internalized,** then renegotiated and reproduced**. From artificial to natural, we court a hard-to-perceive social logic that reproduces the very conditions we strain to overcome**. Jon Cruz (1996)8. Over the last three decades, **there has been an overwhelming tendency among** a variety of **critical scholars to focus on t**he concept of “**race” as a central category of analysis** **for interpreting** the social conditions of **inequality and marginalization**.9 As a consequence, much of the literature on subordinate cultural populations, with its emphasis on such issues as “racial inequality,” “racial segregation,” “racial identity,” has utilized the construct of “race” as a central category of analysis for interpreting the social conditions of inequality and marginalization. In turn, **this literature has reinforced a racialized politics of identity** and representation, **with its problematic emphasis on “racial” identiy as the overwhelming impulse for political action**. **This theoretical practice has led to serious analytical weaknesses and absence of depth** in much of the historical and contemporary writings on racialized populations in this country. The **politics of busing** in the early 1970s **provides an excellent example** that illustrates this phenomenon. **Social scientists studying “race relations” concluded** that **contact among “Black” and “White” students would improve “race relations**” and the educational conditions of “Black” students if they were bused to “White” (better) schools outside their neighborhoods.10 Thirty years later, many parents and **educators adamantly denounce the busing solution** (a solution based on the discourse of “race”) **as not only fundamentally problematic** to the fabric of African American and Chicano communities, **but an erroneous social policy experiment** that failed to substantially improve the overall academic performance of students in these communities. Given this legacy, it is not surprising to find that the theories, practices, and policies that have informed social science analysis of racialized populations today are overwhelmingly rooted in a **politics of identity**, an approach that **is founded on parochial notions of “race”** and representation **which ignore the imperatives of capitalist accumulation and the existence of class divisions within racialized subordinate populations**. The folly of this position is critiqued by Ellen Meiksins Wood11 in her article entitled “Identity Crisis,” where she exposes the limitations of a politics of identity which **fails to contend with the fact that capitalism is the most totalizing system of social relations the world has ever known**. Yet, in much of the work on African American, Latino, Native American, and Asian populations, an analysis of class and a critique of capitalism is conspicuously absent. And even when it is mentioned, the **emphasis is primarily on an undifferentiated plurality of identity politics or an “intersection of oppressions,” which**, unfortunately, **ignores the overwhelming tendency of capitalism to homogenize rather than to diversify human experience**. Moreover, this practice is particularly disturbing since no matter where one travels around the world, there is no question that **racism is integral to the process of capital accumulation**. For example, the current **socioeconomic conditions of Latinos and other racialized populations can be traced to** the relentless emergence of the global economy and recent economic policies of expansion, such as the North American Free Trade Agreement (**NAFTA**). A recent United Nations report by the International Labor Organization confirms the negative impact of globalization on racialized populations. By the end of 1998, it was projected that one billion workers would be unemployed. The people of Africa, China, and Latin America have been most affected by the current restructuring of capitalist development.12 This **phenomenon of racialized capitalism is directly linked to the abusive corporations** as Coca Cola, Walmart, Disney, Ford Motor Company, and General Motors. In a recent speech on “global economic apartheid,” John Cavanagh,13 co-executive director of the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington, D.C., comments on the practices of the Ford Motor Company. “The Ford Motor Company has its state-of-the-art assembly plant in Mexico… where because it can **deny basic worker rights**, it can pay one-tenth the wages and yet get the same quality and the same productivity in producing goods…. The same technologies by the way which are easing globalization are also primarily cutting more jobs than they’re creating.” The **failure of scholars to confront this dimension** in their analysis of contemporary society as a racialized phenomenon **and** their **tendency to continue treating class as merely one of a mulitiplicity of** (equally valid) **perspectives**, which may or may not “intersect” with the process of racialization, **are serious shortcomings**. In addressing this issue, we must recognize that **identity politics**, which generally gloss over class differences and/or ignore class contradictions, **have often been used** by radical scholars and activists within African American, Latino, and other subordinate cultural communities in an effort **to build a political bas**e. Here, **fabricated constructions of “race**” **are objectified** and mediated as truth to ignite political support, **divorced from the realities of class struggle**. By so doing, **they have unwittingly perpetuated the vacuous and dangerous notion that the political and economic are separate spheres** of society which can function independently- **a view that firmly anchors and sustains prevailing class relations of power in society.**

Capitalism leaves hundreds of millions starving and suffering and is pushing the world to the brink of nuclear extinction. Its collapse is inevitable - either by its own hands or by socialist revolution.

Callinicos 4 [Alex, Director of the Centre for European Studies at King’s College, The Revolutionary Ideas of Karl Marx, 2004 pg. 196-197]

Capitalism has not changed its spots. It is still based on the exploitation of the working class, and liable to constant crises. The conclusion that Marx drew from this analysis, that the working class must overthrow the system and replace it with a classless society, is even more urgent now than in his day. For **the military rivalries which are the form increasingly assumed by competition between capitals now threaten the** very **survival of the planet**. As Marx’s centenary approached, the **fires of war flicker**ed **across the globe**—in **Lebanon, Iran** and **Iraq**, Kampuchea, southern Africa, the Horn of **Africa, Afghanistan** and the South Atlantic. The accumulation of **vast armouries of nuclear destruction by the superpowers**, missilerattling in the Kremlin, **talk of ‘limited’ and ‘protracted’ nuclear war** in Washington—these cast a shadow over the whole of humanity. **Socialist revolution is an imperative** if we are **to change a world** in the grip of economic depression and war fever, a world w**here 30 million rot on Western dole queues and 800 million go hungry in the Third World**. To that extent, Marx’s ideas are more relevant today than they were 100 years ago. **Capitalism** has tightened its grip of iron on every portion of the planet since 1883, and **is rotten-ripe for destruction, whether at its own handsthrough nuclear war, or at the hands of the working class**. The choice is between workers’ power or the ‘common ruination of the contending classes’—between socialism or barbarism. Many people who genuinely wish to do something to remedy the present state of the world believe that this stress on the working class is much too narrow. The existence of nuclear weapons threatens everyone, whether workers or capitalists or whatever. Should not all classes be involved in remedying a problem which affects them all? What this ignores is that what Edward Thompson has called ‘exterminism’— **the vast and competing military apparatuses which control the arms race—is an essential part of the working of capitalism today. No sane capitalist desires a nuclear war** (although some insane ones who believe that such a war would be the prelude to the Second Coming now hold positions of influence in Washington). **But** sane or insane, **every capitalist is part of an economic system which is bound up with military competition between nation-states**. Only a class with the interest and power to do away with capitalism can halt the march to Armageddon. Marx always conceived of the working class as the class whose own self-emancipation would also be the liberation of the rest of humanity. The socialist revolution to whose cause he devoted his life can only be, at one and the same time, the emancipation of the working class and the liberation of all the oppressed and exploited sections of society. Those who accept the truth of Marx’s views cannot rest content with a mere intellectual commitment. There are all too many of this sort around, Marxists content to live off the intellectual credit of Capital, as Trotsky described them. We cannot simply observe the world but must throw ourselves, as Marx did, into the practical task of building a revolutionary party amid the life and struggles of the working class. ‘The philosophers have interpreted the world,’ wrote Marx, ‘the point, however, is to change it.’ If Marxism is correct, then we must act on it.

**Communal organization provides freedom from the productive apparatus that fashions capitalist subjectivity and biopolitics. Only by the actual creation of an alternative can we collapse the capitalist nation-state and free human creativity – anything less ensures we all face the equality of nuclear extinction.**

**Marcuse**, German Philosopher and Professor at Columbia and Harvard, 19**69** (Herbert, member of the Frankfurt School, An Essay on Liberation, p. 85-91)

What kind of life? We are still confronted with the demand to state the "concrete alternative." The demand is meaningless if it asks for **a blueprint** of the specific institutions and relationships which would be those of the new society: they **cannot be determined a priori; they will develop, in trial and error, as the new society develops**. If we could form a concrete concept of the alternative today, it would not be that of an alternative; the **possibilities of the new society are sufficiently "abstract,"** i.e., removed from and incongruous with the established universe **to defy any attempt to identify them in terms of this universe. However,** the question cannot be brushed aside by saying that what matters today is the destruction of the old, of the powers that be, making way for the emergence of the new. Such an answer neglects the essential fact that **the old is not simply bad**, that it delivers the goods, and that **people have a real stake in it.** There can be societies which are much worse – there are such societies today. The system of corporate capitalism has the right to insist that those who work for its replacement justify their action. But the demand to state the concrete alternatives is justified for yet another reason. Negative **thinking draws** whatever **force** it may have **from its empirical basis:** the actual human condition in the given society, **and the "given" possibilities to transcend this condition**, to enlarge the realm of freedom. In this sense, **negative thinking is by virtue of its own internal concepts "positive":** oriented toward, and comprehending a future which is "contained" in the present. And in this containment (which is an important aspect of the general containment policy pursued by the established societies), the future appears as possible liberation. It is not the only alternative: the advent of a long period of "civilized" barbarism, with or without the nuclear destruction, is equally contained in the present. Negative thinking, and the praxis guided by it, is the positive and positing effort to prevent this utter negativity. The concept of the primary, initial institutions of **liberation is** familiar enough and **concrete enough: collective ownership,** collective **control and planning of the means of production** and distribution. This is the foundation, a necessary but not sufficient condition for the alternative: **it would make possible** the **usage of all available resources for** the **abolition of poverty**, which is the prerequisite for the turn from quantity into quality: the creation of a reality in accordance with the new sensitivity and the new consciousness. **This goal implies rejection of** those **policies of reconstruction, no matter how revolutionary, which are bound to perpetuate** (or to introduce) the pattern of the **unfree societies** and their needs. Such false policy is perhaps best summed up in the formula "to catch up with, and to overtake the productivity level of the advanced capitalist countries." **What is wrong with this formula is** not the emphasis on the rapid improvement of the material conditions but on **the model guiding their improvement. The model denies the alternative**, the qualitative difference. The latter is not, and cannot be, the result of the fastest possible attainment of capitalist productivity, but rather the development of new modes and ends of production "**new" not only** (and perhaps not at all) **with respect to technical innovations** and production relations, **but with respect to** the **different human needs** and the different human relationships in working for the satisfaction of these needs. These new relationships would be the result of a "biological" **solidarity in work and purpose, expressive of** a true **harmony** between social and individual needs and goals, **between recognized necessity and free development** -the exact opposite of the administered and enforced harmony organized in the advanced capitalist (and socialist?) countries. It is the image of this solidarity as elemental, instinctual, creative force which the young radicals see in Cuba, in the guerrillas, in the Chinese cultural revolution. Solidarity and cooperation: not all their forms are liberating. Fascism and militarism have developed a deadly efficient solidarity. Socialist solidarity is autonomy: selfdetermination begins at home -and that is with every I, and the We whom the I chooses. And this end must indeed appear in the means to attain it, that is to say, in the strategy of those who, within the existing society, work for the new one. **If the socialist relationships** of production **are to be a new way of life,** a new Form of life, then **their existential quality must show forth,** anticipated and demonstrated, in the fight for their realization. **Exploitation in all its forms must** have **disappeare**d from this fight: from the work relationships among the fighters as well as from their individual relationships. **Understanding, tenderness toward each other**, the **instinctual consciousness of** that which is evil, false, **the heritage of oppression, would then testify to the authenticity of the rebellion**. In short, the economic, political, and cultural features of a classless society must have become the basic needs of those who fight for it. This ingression of the future into the present, this depth dimension of the rebellion accounts, in the last analysis, for the incompatibility with the traditional forms of the political struggle. The **new radicalism militates against** the **centralized bureaucratic communist as well as** against the semi-democratic **liberal organization**. There is a strong element of **spontaneity, even anarchism, in this rebellion**, expression of the new sensibility, sensitivity against domination: the feeling, the awareness, that the joy of freedom and the need to be free must precede liberation. Therefore the aversion against preestablished Leaders, apparatchiks of all sorts, politicians no matter how leftist. The initiative shifts to **small groups, widely diffused, with a high degree of autonomy, mobility, flexibility. Not regression to a previous stage of civilization**, **but** return to an imaginary temps perdu in the real life of mankind: **progress to a stage of civilization where [hu]man has learned to ask for the sake of** whom or of **what he[or she] organizes** his **society**; the stage where he checks and perhaps even halts his incessant struggle for existence on an enlarged scale, surveys what has been achieved through centuries of misery and hecatombs of victims, and decides that it is enough, and that it is time to enjoy what he has and what can be reproduced and refined with a minimum of alienated labor: **not the** arrest or **reduction of technical progress, but the elimination of** those of its **features which perpetuate** man's **subjection** to the apparatus and the intensification of the struggle for existence -to work harder in order to get more of the merchandise that has to be sold. In other words, electrification indeed, and **all technical devices which alleviate and protect life, all the mechanization which frees human energy and time**, all the standardization which does away with spurious and parasitarian "personalized" services rather than multiplying them and the gadgets and tokens of exploitative affiuence. In terms of the latter (and only in terms of the latter), this would certainly be a regression -but freedom from the rule of merchandise over man is a precondition of freedom. The **construction of a free society would create new incentives for work.** In the exploitative societies, the so-called work instinct is mainly the (more or less effectively) introjected necessity to perform productively in order to earn a living. But **the life instincts themselves strive for the unification and enhancement of life; in nonrepressive sublimation they would provide the libidinal energy for work** on the development of a reality **which no longer demands** the **exploitative repression** of the Pleasure Principle. The "**incentives" would** then **be built into the instinctual structure of men**. Their **sensibility would register**, as biological reactions, the **difference between** the ugly and the beautiful, between calm and noise, **tenderness and brutality, intelligence and stupidity**, joy and fun, and it would correlate this distinction with that between freedom and servitude. Freud's last theoretical conception recognizes the erotic instincts as work instincts -work for the creation of a sensuous environment. The **social expression of the liberated work instinct is cooperation**, which, **grounded in solidarity, directs the organization of** the realm of **necessity and the development of** the realm of **freedom.** And there is an answer to the question which troubles the minds of so many men of good will: what are the people in a free society going to do? The answer which, I believe, strikes at the heart of the matter was given by a young black girl. She said: for the first time in our life, we shall be free to think about what we are going to do.

### Advantage

PV fails – expensive

National Geographic News 10 (“Shining Light on the Cost of Solar Energy”, 11/5/10, http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/energy/2010/11/101105-cost-of-solar-energy/, vh)

So why is solar so expensive? Converting light into electricity with no moving parts is a profoundly different enterprise than turning a turbine to make power—the technology that is at work in coal, natural gas, nuclear, hydropower plants and, most visibly to the public, at wind farms. “Wind power is the same technology as it’s been for 1,000 years,” said Tom Meyer, a professor of chemistry at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. “There’s nothing to invent. It just needs to be improved.” The makers of wind turbines have made huge cost reductions in recent decades with relatively small tweaks to an otherwise familiar system. That’s not yet true for solar, experts say. Most solar cells are made from silicon—the same semiconductor material that is at the heart of computers. The cells are expensive to produce because it takes a great deal of energy to purify the silicon. And, while the computer industry has made enormous strides in making cheaper silicon devices, those advancements don’t translate to the solar industry. “It’s kind of comparing apples and oranges,” says Hugh Hillhouse, a professor of chemical engineering at the University of Washington. “The semiconductor industry makes minutely patterned silicon. You’d have to look at it under an electron microscope to see the intricate structure. Their advancements have been about how to design and fabricate that intricate structure cheaply. And the solar cell: That’s completely not intricate. It’s simply a few layers of semiconductor. It changes the economics dramatically since the manufacturing cost is more closely tied to the cost of the material, not the patterning.” What may really help to lower the cost of solar are new materials—especially semiconductors made from the compound cadmium telluride. It’s cheaper to make “thin-film solar cells” with cadmium telluride than with silicon. But that still leaves what experts call “soft costs,” everything from permitting fees to the hardware that mounts solar panels onto a roof. Even though there’s disagreement over how much of the price of solar is tied up in these soft costs, they are clearly an important factor. In fact, Ryne Raffaelle, director of the National Center for Photovoltaics at the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, says the solar array itself accounts for only half the cost of a solar system today. Innovations that could cut both hard and soft costs are being made all the time, but they don’t necessarily reach customers quickly. For one thing, not every great idea that works in a lab can be replicated on a mass production scale. And it can take a long time to iron out technological kinks on an apparatus that the manufacturer wants to be sure will last a long time. “Different industries have different speeds from discovery to marketing. Consumer electronics is relatively quick. But it can be seven or eight years for the auto industry,” said Paul Friley, an energy economist at U.S. DOE’s Brookhaven National Laboratory in Upton, New York. “With solar, you have 20-year warrantees. You want it to work and be durable. And that means you have to spend a long time testing it.”

No solvency – long timeframe

National Geographic News 10 (“Shining Light on the Cost of Solar Energy”, 11/5/10, http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/energy/2010/11/101105-cost-of-solar-energy/, vh)

How Long Must Consumers Wait? But the question for most consumers is when it will make sense to put a solar panel on the roof. Partly because of the issues in estimating levelized cost, there’s not a clear answer right now. In fact, the right answer could change over time. For instance, cadmium telluride thin film panels could help solar reach grid parity sooner than silicon panels could, but tellurium—a key ingredient—is fairly rare. If production of cadmium telluride solar panels increases substantially, it could trigger a scarcity of tellurium, raising the price for that type of panel. If the solar industry has become dependent on the short-term low-cost cadmium telluride option, long-term scarcity could end up moving solar electricity back out of grid parity for many people. Thanks to the rising cost of coal and natural gas—as well as the short-term cost benefits of cadmium telluride, and falling costs of silicon and other solar options—the National Renewable Energy Laboratory estimates that solar energy could reach nationwide grid parity by 2017. That’s without any subsidies and with only small, incremental improvements on current technology. But Seth Darling at Argonne says the United States won’t be likely to see hundreds of gigawatts of solar running at grid parity until 2025, at the earliest.

There are multiple *economic* barriers to community solar development—the plan overcomes NONE of these or they link to our topicality violation.

Farrell ‘10. John Farrell directs the Energy Self-Reliant States and Communities program at the Institute for Local Self-Reliance and he focuses on energy policy developments that best expand the benefits of local ownership and dispersed generation of renewable energy “Community Solar Power: Obstacles and Opportunities.” A publication of New Rules. September 2010. A publication of New Rules. [MG]

In this paper, we explore whether community solar can:

• Overcome existing financial and institutional barriers to collectively-owned solar. Financial barriers include barriers to accessing federal tax incentives (the 30% tax credit and accelerated depreciation), rules that make it hard to raise capital (e.g. securities laws), and rules that prohibit easy sharing of electricity generation among geographically dispersed owners.

• Increase the number of people who can invest in and own decentralized solar power. Increasing participation means opening solar investment to people who traditionally cannot (i.e. renters or those with shady property). Increasing ownership means that participants are legal owners of their share of the community solar project, rather than holding a license or lease.

• Offer an affordable opportunity to “go solar.” Good community solar policy will make community solar projects cost the same or less than individual ownership and preferably offer participants a good return on investment.

Disperse the economic benefits of solar power development. Dispersing the benefits means broadening participation and more importantly ownership of solar power, so that the economic benefits accrue to many, varied investors.

• Tap unused space on existing structures rather than open ground for solar modules. Solar PV is uniquely suited among renewable energy technologies to claim unused roof-space and tap into the grid inexpensively in areas of high demand. Using open space for solar cedes one of its major technical advantages.2

• Replicate. Community solar can only accomplish the first five goals if it’s easy to duplicate a project model.

**PV bad – toxic chemicals leak into groundwater, disproportionately affecting minority communities – flips the aff**

LA Times 9 (“Solar energy's darker side stirs concern”, 1/14/09, http://articles.latimes.com/2009/jan/14/business/fi-notsogreen14, vh)

Everybody loves solar, the shiny superstar of renewable energy. But scratch the surface of the manufacturing process and the green sheen disappears. Vast amounts of fossil fuels are used to produce and transport panels. Solar cells contain toxic materials. Some components can't be easily recycled. pixel That has some environmentalists worried about a new tidal wave of hazardous waste headed for the nation's landfills when panels eventually wear out. A report to be released today by the Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition warns that the industry and lawmakers need to set policies now to ensure that a clean technology doesn't leave a dirty legacy. "You can't just call your product green and close your eyes to what's happening in the supply chain," said Sheila Davis, executive director of the San Jose nonprofit group that pushes for green practices in the technology sector. "The solar energy industry is running into some of the same problems . . . we've seen in the electronics industry," whose waste is polluting U.S. landfills and contaminating groundwater with harmful substances such as mercury and chromium, Davis said. Solar energy supplies less than 1% of the nation's electricity at present. But the technology is poised for explosive growth. Much of the world's production is centered in Asia, where Davis said some disturbing trends were emerging. China is major producer of polycrystalline silicon, a key component of solar cells. The Washington Post last year documented how at least one Chinese producer was dumping a toxic byproduct from that manufacturing process on nearby farmland. Experts suspect that firms in other developing countries are taking similar shortcuts. Silicon isn't the only conductor that can be used to convert sunlight to electricity. Companies are developing cells using other materials. Still, virtually all of them utilize hazardous chemicals that pose potential risks to workers and the environment, according to the coalition's report. Davis said developing benign substitutes for some of the most dangerous materials was essential for the solar industry to be truly sustainable. Making the panels is just the beginning. Planning needs to begin now on what to do with millions of these heavy modules as they wear out in 20 to 25 years or are replaced with better technology, environmentalists say. The high-tech industry generated more than 2.6 million tons of e-waste in the U.S. in 2005, about 87% of which ends up in landfills or incinerators, according to the report. Most of the rest was exported to developing countries to be dismantled by low-wage workers, many of whom are exposed to dangerous substances lurking in the guts of personal computers and other electronics. pixel pixel

1. REEs necessary for solar tech are produced in China

Nyaradi 12 [John, publisher of Wall Street Sector Selector, China’s Challenge: Solar Panels and Rare Earths April 12, 2012, http://wallstcheatsheet.com/stocks/chinas-challenge-solar-panels-and-rare-earths.html/]

In the transition to cleaner energy sources (NYSEARCA:GEX), it is important to consider the reality that many economies may be trading a fossil fuel addiction for a dependence on rare earth metals. Even as the US applies tariffs to Chinese solar panels (NYSEARCA:TAN) and seeks to strengthen domestic industry, more advanced solar technologies, such as thin-film solar panels, require indium—another rare earth metal, 100 percent of which is produced in China. Though the US mining company Molycorp has bought and plans to reopen the Mojave Desert rare earth mine, the promises of robust production by mid-2012 seem unlikely.

2. REE extraction results in global warming and radioactivity leaching

Neal Grasso and David Mayfield 10/1/11 (reporters for ceramic industry.net) “"Rare" Growth Opportunities” http://www.ceramicindustry.com/articles/91826--rare--growth-opportunities

For example, a recent LCA study evaluated the environmental impacts of REE production at the Bayan Obo mine in China.2 This study found that the production of REEs resulted in increased greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, resource depletion and waste production, including low level radioactive waste. Typical rare earth deposits contain small amounts of thorium and uranium, resulting in low level radioactivity in the wastewater slurry and mine tailings. While this example used an LCA approach to understand the environmental impacts associated with REE production, other studies have documented environmental impacts at former mining operations and facilities that formally processed REEs. For example, the previously discussed Bayan Obo mine has had documented releases of thorium, uranium, and heavy metals that have been linked to a possible increased incidence of illnesses in Baotou, China (population 1.7 million).

3. Extraction risks high environmental and health risks but regulation takes a back seat in the face of profit. Even if protests increase regulation, corporations just move to third world nations

Charles Hector 9/18/12 (Malaysian Human Rights advocate and activist.) “Trans-National Corporations in Extractive Industry and the Struggle Against them: The Case of Malaysia” http://amrc.org.hk/node/1275

An Extraction Industry – High Environmental Cost and Health Risk The extraction of rare earth was dubbed as being ‘one of mining's dirtiest industries – whereby the United States, who was once the world's largest supplier, slowly moved away from it . This industry has been blamed to have poisoned rivers with acid, and generates radioactive waste - an environmental cost that many would not be interested in taking. Studies done in both New Jersey and China shows that thorium radiation emitted during the refining process and by plant waste can cause cancer, leukaemia, birth defects and chronic lung diseases.(Reuters, 19/3/2012, Pollution the big barrier to freer trade in rare earths). Today, China is the source of more than 90% of the global demand, but things are changing and the demand is increasing and prices have been going up, and so ‘environmental cost’ and health risks now takes a back seat to profit. Better still, would be a solution to transfer the ‘environmental cost’ and health risk to some third world nation, by moving the extraction process and the storage of the waste there. Lynas’s Rare Earth Extraction Plant in Malaysia and Public Opposition This seems to have been what happened with Lynas Corporation Limited, the Australian TNC, who decided to ship rare earths ore from its mine in Mount Weld to Malaysia, where it was to be processed into highly sought after rare earths metals at its facility in Gebeng Industrial Zone, in Pahang, Malaysia. Lynas, however, states that the reason for doing so is different – better infrastructure and facilities. Somehow, this plan and the construction of the factory in Malaysia, did not receive public attention when it was being formulated, and partly to blame would also be the mainstream media, that is controlled and owned by persons or parties close to political powers. The Malaysian government also saw it fit not to highlight this plan, possibly knowing that it would result in public outcry and protest especially so since Malaysians still remember Bukit Merah.

There’s no one root cause of war—so many alternate explanations besides racism

Sharp 8 – senior associate deputy general counsel for intelligence at the US Department of Defense, Dr. Walter, “Democracy and Deterrence”, Air Force University Press, May, http://aupress.maxwell.af.mil/Books/sharp/Sharp.pdf

While classical liberals focused on political structures, socialists analyzed the socioeconomic system of states as the primary factor in determining the propensity of states to engage in war. Socialists such as Karl Marx attributed war to the class structure of society; Marx believed that war resulted from a clash of social forces created by a capitalist mode of production that develops two antagonistic classes, rather than being an instrument of state policy. Thus capitalist states would engage in war because of their growing needs for raw materials, markets, and cheap labor. Socialists believed replacing capitalism with socialism could prevent war, but world events have proven socialists wrong as well.32 **These** two **schools of thought**—war is caused by innate biological drives or social institutions—**do not demonstrate** any **meaningful correlation with** the occurrence or nonoccurrence of **war**. **There are many variables not considered** by these two schools: for example, the influence of **national special interest groups such as the military or defense contractors** that **may seek glory** through victory, **greater resources, greater** domestic political **power, or justification** for their existence. Legal scholar Quincy **Wright** has conducted one of the “most thorough studies of the nature of war”33 and **concludes** that **there “is no single cause of war**.”34 In *A Study of War*, he concludes that peace is an equilibrium of four complex factors: military and industrial technology, international law governing the resort to war, social and political organization at the domestic and international level, and the distribution of attitudes and opinions concerning basic values. War is likely when controls on any one level are disturbed or changed.35 Similarly, the 1997 US National Military Strategy identifies the root causes of conflict as political, economic, social, and legal conditions.36 **Moore** has **compiled** **the** following **list of** conventional **explanations** for war: **specific disputes;** absence of dispute settlement mechanisms; ideological disputes; ethnic and **religious differences; communication failures;** proliferation of weapons and **arms races**; social and economic **injustice; imbalance of power; competition for resources**; incidents, **accidents, and miscalculation; violence in the nature of man;** aggressive national leaders; and economic determination. He has concluded, however, that these causes or motives for war explain specific conflicts but fail to serve as a central paradigm for explaining the cause of war.37