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### Summary

#### This argument claims that the fundamental goal of economic engagement is to re-integrate Latin America into an economic system that is designed to benefit the United States more than anyone else. This paradigm of economic engagement is called “development” – it is a process of taking countries that don’t embody our ideals of economic mobility or stability and getting them to fall in line with the system of international trade that the US controls.

#### Because this system of economic development is designed to make trade benefit the United States, it often overlooks how bad our model of economic growth and our modes of production could be for the people & the environment in any of the 3 topic countries. On top of hurting the environment & increasing poverty rates, this mode of development objectifies people because it thinks of them as nothing more than profit opportunities or helpless victims that couldn’t survive without our leadership.

#### The alternative to this model of engaging other countries is to let them take charge of their own future. This is not a rejection of economic growth or development, but a claim that the people in the topic countries should be the ones to determine how they trade, what they produce, etc. – not US corporations or US policymakers. We won’t have a just system of economic engagement until the people who produce the goods that are going to be traded have a bigger voice in the process.

### Glossary

**Development –** the deliberate efforts of leaders to promote the growth of economic activity and output in a particular area.

**Economic rationality/logic –** a framework for understanding social and economic behavior, which is typically associated with the pursuit of profits.

**Export Processing Zones (EPZs) –** an area, within which goods may be landed, handled, manufactured or reconfigured, and exported without the intervention of the customs authorities.

**Foreign Direct Investment (FI) –** investingin United States businesses by foreign citizens (often involves stock ownership of the business).

**Globalization –** the process of international integration of culture, products, knowledge, etc. Globalization involves the disintegration of boundaries between nations, and in the context of this kritik, refers mostly to the process of making capitalism a universal feature of all nations.

**Imperialist –** the policy of extending the rule or authority of an empire or nation over foreign countries, or of acquiring and holding colonies and dependencies.

**Multinational Corporations (MNCs) –** A corporation that has its facilities and other assets in at least one country other than its home country.

**Neoliberalism –** the name given to an economic ideology that promotes the reduction of the public sector and the expansion of private sector. This system seeks to reduce regulation and government manipulation of businesses and trade.

**Transnational capital –** provides capital formation, financial structuring, and merger and acquisitions advisory services to emerging growth companies.

**Washington Consensus –** a term used to describe a set of core policy prescriptions that US leaders would frequently implement when dealing with developing countries.

**Worker-Engineer-Public-Control (WEPC) model –** an alternative model of economic development that envisions growth led by the people who work, as opposed to foreign investors and policymakers.

### Development K 1NC (1/3)

#### **Economic engagement is a tool utilized to facilitate economic integration in Latin America – it is a policy based on a paternalistic conception of development that culminates in the mass privatization of public goods and social inequality.**

Jacobs, assistant professor of political science at West Virginia U, 2004

(Jamie, "Neoliberalism and Neopanamericanism: The View from Latin America," *Latin American Politics & Society* 46:4, Project MUSE)

While Oliva and Prevost and the other authors featured in this volume point to the changes that have altered global relations since the end of the Cold War—among them an altered balance of power, shifting U.S. strategy, and evolving interamerican relations—they all view the U.S. foreign policy of neoliberalism and economic integration essentially as old wine in new bottles. As such, old enemies (communism) are replaced by new (drugs and terrorism), but the fear of Northern domination of and intervention in Latin America remains. Specifically, Oliva and Prevost identify the process through which "economics had taken center stage in interamerican affairs." They [End Page 149] suggest that the Washington Consensus—diminishing the state's role in the economy, privatizing to reduce public deficits, and shifting more fully to external markets—was instead a recipe for weakened governments susceptible to hemispheric domination by the United States (xi). The book is divided into two main sections that emphasize hemispheric and regional issues, respectively. The first section links more effectively to the overall theme of the volume in its chapters on interamerican relations, culture, governance, trade, and security. In the first of these chapters, Oliva traces the evolution of U.S. influence in Latin America and concludes that, like the Monroe Doctrine and Manifest Destiny in the past, the prospect of hemispheric economic integration will be marked by a dominant view privileging U.S. security, conceptualized in transnational, hemispheric terms, that is both asymmetrical and not truly integrated among all members. In this context, Oliva identifies the free trade area of the Americas (FTAA) as "an economic project suited to a hemispheric context that is politically favorable to the United States" (20). The chapters in this section are strongest when they focus on the political aspects of neoliberalism and the possible unintended negative consequences that could arise from the neoliberal program. Carlos Alzugaray Treto draws on the history of political philosophy, traced to Polanyi, identifying ways that social inequality has the potential to undermine the stable governance that is so crucial a part of the neoliberal plan. He goes on to point out how this potential for instability could also generate a new period of U.S. interventionism in Latin America.

### Development K 1NC (2/3)

#### This imposed model of economic interaction causes poverty, military interventions, and environmental degradation – culminates in extinction.

Szentesa, Professor Emeritus at the Corvinus University of Budapest, 2008

(Tamás, “Globalisation and prospects of the world society”, 4/22 [http://www.eadi.org/fileadmin/Documents/-Events/exco/Glob.\_\_\_prospects\_-\_jav..pdf](http://www.eadi.org/fileadmin/Documents/Events/exco/Glob.___prospects_-_jav..pdf))

It’ s a common place that human society can survive and develop only in a lasting real peace. Without peace countries cannot develop. Although since 1945 there has been no world war, but --numerous local wars took place, --terrorism has spread all over the world, undermining security even in the most developed and powerful countries, --arms race and militarization have not ended with the collapse of the Soviet bloc, but escalated and continued, extending also to weapons of mass destruction and misusing enormous resources badly needed for development, --many “invisible wars” are suffered by the poor and oppressed people, manifested in mass misery, poverty, unemployment, homelessness, starvation and malnutrition, epidemics and poor health conditions, exploitation and oppression, racial and other discrimination, physical terror, organised injustice, disguised forms of violence, the denial or regular infringement of the democratic rights of citizens, women, youth, ethnic or religious minorities, etc., and last but not least, in the degradation of human environment, which means that --the “war against Nature”, i.e. the disturbance of ecological balance, wasteful management of natural resources, and large-scale pollution of our environment, is still going on, causing also losses and fatal dangers for human life. Behind global terrorism and “invisible wars” we find striking international and intrasocietal inequities and distorted development patterns , which tend to generate social as well as international tensions, thus paving the way for unrest and “visible” wars. It is a commonplace now that peace is not merely the absence of war. The prerequisites of a lasting peace between and within societies involve not only - though, of course, necessarily - demilitarisation, but also a systematic and gradual elimination of the roots of violence, of the causes of “invisible wars”, of the structural and institutional bases of large-scale international and intra-society inequalities, exploitation and oppression. Peace requires a process of social and national emancipation, a progressive, democratic transformation of societies and the world bringing about equal rights and opportunities for all people, sovereign participation and mutually advantageous co-operation among nations. It further requires a pluralistic democracy on global level with an appropriate system of proportional representation of the world society, articulation of diverse interests and their peaceful reconciliation, by non-violent conflict management, and thus also a global governance with a really global institutional system. Under the contemporary conditions of accelerating globalization and deepening global interdependencies in our world, peace is indivisible in both time and space. It cannot exist if reduced to a period only after or before war, and cannot be safeguarded in one part of the world when some others suffer visible or invisible wars. Thus, peace requires, indeed, a new, demilitarised and democratic world order, which can provide equal opportunities for sustainable development. “Sustainability of development” (both on national and world level) is often interpreted as an issue of environmental protection only and reduced to the need for preserving the ecological balance and delivering the next generations not a destroyed Nature with overexhausted resources and polluted environment. However, no ecological balance can be ensured, unless the deep international development gap and intra-society inequalities are substantially reduced.

### Development K 1NC (3/3)

#### The alternative is to reject the affirmative’s imperialist model of development.

#### Global social movements are underway – these worker-organized struggles are essential to reclaim economic development in the people’s interest.

Wise, Director of Doctoral Program in Migration Studies & Prof of Development Studies; Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, Mexico, 2009

(Raúl Delgado, Forced Migration and US Imperialism: The Dialectic of Migration and Development, Crit Sociol, 35: 767, ProQuest)

The promotion of development as social transformation could curtail forced migration. Globalization depicts migration as inevitable; we must endorse, both in theory and practice, the viability of alternative processes of development and do so on different levels. We must first redefine the asymmetrical terms that developed countries, aided by principles that have by now turned into fetishes (e.g. democracy, liberty, and free trade), used for imperialist domination. This involves an exposé of imperialist practices, which have created oceans of inequality and condemned vast regions of the world to marginalization, poverty, social exclusion, and unfettered migration. Foreign investment (FI) has been a fundamental driving force in this regard. A genuine process of social transformation involving the migrant and non-migrant sectors of society would not only seek to contain the overwhelming flow of forced migration but also revert the ongoing processes of social degradation that characterize underdevelopment and even pose a threat to human existence (Bello, 2006; Harvey, 2007). As an alternative to the current phase of imperialist domination, Petras argues in favor of what he defines as a Worker-Engineer Public Control model (WEPC) based on six main principles: tax revenues versus tax evasions; profit remittances and privileged salaries versus social investment; high reinvestment ratios versus capital flight; long term invest- ment in research and development versus speculative investment; social welfare versus capitalist privileges; and fixed capital/mobile labor versus mobile capital/fixed labor (Petras, 2007: 234–5). This model provides an alternative approach that maximizes national and working- class interests: ‘it has potential drawbacks and internal contradictions, which require con- stant reflection, deliberation, debate and reforms’ (2007: 237). Nonetheless, ‘the model provides the surest and most direct road to development with democracy, social justice and national independence.

### Link – Cuba Embargo

#### Lifting the embargo paves the way for capitalism to bulldoze over Cuba’s people and environment – it is the only obstacle to ecological destruction and cultural independence.

Conell, Research Associate at the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, 2009

(Christina, “The U.S. and Cuba: Destined to be Environmental Partners,” June 12, Online: <http://www.coha.org/the-us-and-cuba-an-environmental-duo/>)

Many Cuba well-wishers fear if President Obama lifts the trade embargo, the invasion of raw capitalism could destroy Cuba’s relatively pristine environment. Although the Cuban government points to its environmental laws and the government agency which was established to develop a sustainable environmental policy, these measures have done little up to now to affect substantial change. In several distinct sectors, Cuba seems to remain unprepared for the lifting of the embargo and the island inevitably could face a flood of investors from the United States and elsewhere, eager to exploit the beautiful landscapes of the island, at great cost and risk.¶ After years of relying on government subsidies and protectionism, this rapid growth could generate irreparable shock waves through the economy. Oliver Houck, a professor at Tulane University who aided the Cuban government in writing its environmental protection provisions, said “an invasion of U.S. consumerism, a U.S.-dominated future, could roll over it (Cuba) like a bulldozer,” when the embargo ends. The wider Caribbean region has experienced water contamination, mangrove destruction and sewage problems due to large quantities of tourists and inadequate plumbing. Therefore, U.S. tourism regulations need to be in place in order to protect the precious ecosystem of the island and prohibit over development. Collaboration between the U.S. and Cuba would be mutually beneficial, as the U.S. could use Cuba as a laboratory of sustainable development and U.S. tourism would stimulate Cuba’s stagnant economy, if its negative impact could be controlled. Both countries must agree upon a mutual plan for development.¶ The Environmental Defense Fund (EDF) has conducted research in Cuba since 2000, working with Cuban partners on scientific investigations and strategies for protecting coastal and marine resources. Operating under a special license from the United States government, EDF experts are collaborating with Cuban scientists on research projects aimed at ensuring that if Cuba taps offshore oil and gas reserves, it will be done in an environmentally concious way. The US should establish more partnerships like these as President Obama has the legal authority to institute far-reaching cooperation with Cuba on joint marine environmental projects. These partnerships should be implemented as the first step in creating an elaborate alliance for environmental protection between the two countries.¶ If the embargo is lifted, symbols of meretricious American capitalism are likely to invade the once relatively isolated island. Opinion columnist Cynthia Tucker has commented on such matters: “Mickey Mouse is sure to arrive, bringing with him the aptly predicted full frontal assault of American culture and consumer goods,” suggesting that if Obama lifts the embargo, a functioning system of environmental protection supported by both the U.S. and the Cuban public must be present for the island to be protected.

### Link – Mexico (Generic)

#### Mexico-US economic engagement is the lynchpin and proving ground of neoliberalism – the affirmative aides the global success of neoliberal exploitation.

Mexico Solidarity Network, 2012

(“Mexico - A neoliberal experiment,” Online: http://www.mexicosolidarity.org/programs/alternativeeconomy/neoliberalism)

0

The United States and Mexico have been central to the development of the neoliberal model. We share a 2,000 mile border, the only place in the world where the Global North meets the South. The US-Mexico border is unique, and the relationship between the two nations is equally unique.¶ In many ways, this geographic marriage represents the most important relationship in the world - a laboratory that is defining the neoliberal model. Three historical markers stand out as central to the development of neoliberalism: the establishment of free trade zones and maquiladoras in 1965, Structural Adjustment Programs initiated by the International Monetary Fund in 1982, and the signing of the North America Free Trade Agreement in 1994.¶ The US-Mexico relationship has been the proving ground for the practical realities of the Washington consensus: production-for-export replacing production for internal consumption, the use of debt as a lever to force structural adjustment programs, loose investment rules that allow hot money to cross borders in seconds, and a trade agreement (read NAFTA) that is the model for a new legal framework that expands the rights of corporations at the expense of civil society.¶ Experiments that "work," from the perspective of transnational capital (and all of the above-mentioned experiments "worked") are exported to other countries. This implies a complete restructuring of the economies, politics and cultures around the world, to make them consistent with the neoliberal vision. Nearly everything is on the table for reform: economic policy, public subsidies, social programs, industrial policy, government procurement, intellectual property rights, patents, banking and financial services, agricultural policy, foreign direct investment, energy policy, labor regulations, environmental protection, public education and health care - and the list goes on. Twenty-first century neoliberalism is a project for world domination, and the US and Mexico are at the center of the vortex**.**

### Link – Mexico (Trade/Exports)

#### Export-based engagement with Mexico is a cover for poverty and the neoliberal exploitation of women.

Kelly, writer at Citizen’s Press, 2008

(Lara, “Neoliberalism in Latin America,” Oct 29, http://citizenspress.org/editorials/neoliberalism-in-latin-america)

Another aspect of neoliberal restructuring policies is the encouragement and creation of export processing zones (EPZs). Export processing zones are parcels of territory where special laws exist regarding production. These zones are meant to attract foreign investments. The incentives offered to corporations include the ability to import without tax, minimal corporate income tax, freedom from labour unions, lessened regulations on the environment and labour, and state subsidized infrastructure (Teeple, 89). Transnational corporations have the ability to invest in whichever country they please, and EPZs offer an extreme advantage in that the production costs to corporations are minimal in these zones. Wages are low, infrastructure costs are born by the state, and employee protections are nil (Teeple 90-91). Hojman argues that in Mexico EPZs helped to create a new middle class of transnational executives, public servants, politicians, professionals, tradespeople and media personnel (202). He does not specify if these people are those who have improved their standard of living due to employment opportunities within EPZs. I assume he is referring to people attracted to the export-processing zones in order to profit from the increased production activities. It is unclear why he makes this argument, because chances are, these upper-class people have always been upper-class, and the fact that they have moved to an EPZ does not mean anything for the regular worker in these zones. Contrary to Hojman, Sadasivam has shown that EPZs profit from women’s cheap labour, and offer jobs which are repetitive in nature and dead-end. These women are targeted for these jobs because of their ‘vulnerability, docility and dispensability’ and the jobs do not include any security or safety requirements from the employer. She uses the example of EPZs in the Dominican Republic where the women must endure “strict discipline, sexual harassment, low pay, occupational health hazards, excessive and forced overtime, and arbitrary suspension and dismissal for protesting or organizing” (642-643).

### Link – Mexico (Rural Assistance)

#### **Rural assistance divides Mexico’s urban and rural poor, pitting them against each other for resources – it’s a strategy to fracture anti-development groups.**

Holzner, assistant director of Latin American Studies at the University of Utah, 2007

(Claudio, “The Poverty of Democracy: Neoliberal Reforms and Political Participation of the Poor in Mexico Latin American” *Politics & Society*, 49:2, Summer, Project MUSE)

On the other hand, successive adminis- trations have dismantled Mexico’s elaborate welfare system, leading many low-income Mexicans to the conclusion that politicians have turned their backs on Mexico’s poor (Gutmann 2002). This has had harmful consequences for lower-class political efficacy and engagement.¶ Macroeconomic reforms shape political behavior by restructuring the relationship between citizens and the state in ways that create pow- erful incentives or disincentives for becoming involved in politics. In Mexico, repeated austerity programs since the 1980s, which gutted fed- eral spending programs and eliminated subsidies for basic foodstuffs; a decline in the spending and scope of rural development programs; and a general shrinking of state budgets made the state less relevant for the poor.10 Other free market reforms, such as the privatization of state- owned enterprises, the deregulation of the market for coffee and other cash crops without agricultural extension services, and attempts to pri- vatize ejidos (a form of collective property in rural areas), have rein- forced the perception among popular groups that the state cannot or will not provide for them.¶ Central to this change in incentives was the government’s shift away from comprehensive welfare, poverty alleviation, and rural develop- ment programs to more limited programs that carefully target people on the basis of individual need. Grindle (1986) has argued that rural devel- opment projects were core elements of the state’s strategy to extend its presence as deeply as possible into the Mexican countryside. In reality, it was precisely because of state-building efforts during the 1950s and 1960s and because of comprehensive development programs like PIDER-COMPLAMAR, SAM, and CONASUPO in the 1970s and 1980s that peasants had more and more incentives to target the state when seeking solutions to their material needs (see also Fox 1993). Similarly, Craig and Cornelius argue that Recent reforms have dismantled this welfare system, eliminating many of the incentives the poor had for engaging in political activity. The poverty alleviation initiatives of Ernesto Zedillo’s administration (1994–2000) particularly signaled a retreat of the state from the lives of the poor. A central characteristic of the new era of government-spon- sored poverty alleviation programs, such as PROGRESA; its successor, Oportunidades; and agricultural subsidy programs like PROCAMPO is that they target individuals on a strict need basis, using formulas for cal- culating the level of support that individuals and households receive. This rationalization of public spending may be good economic policy because it insulates policymakers from political pressures; but by elim- inating much of the discretionary power that parties, corporatist organ- izations, and politicians had in allocating benefits to their most loyal clients, it makes political participation irrelevant, if not irrational. Perhaps even more damaging, the selective allocation of social assistance often divides communities between those receiving assistance and those left out of programs. This fragmentation of interests atomizes the rural and urban poor, places them in competition with each other, and weak- ens their capacity for collective action. The net effect of these changes has been to increase the cost of tar- geting the state while making it less likely that political action will be successful.

### Link – Venezuela (Oil)

#### A shift away from export to the US is providing resources to fight neoliberal hegemony now – reverting to an alliance with the US will allow colonialist domination over Venezuela.

Barra, International Development Consultant and Public Policy Analyst; Former Public Policy Advisor at UNICEF, 2010

(Ximena de la, Sacrificing Neoliberalism to Save Capitalism: Latin America Resists and Offers Answers to Crises, 2010 36: 635, Crit Sociol)

Decline in demand now exacerbates this self-inflicted crisis. In contrast with this mismanagement in Latin America, and as a way of recovering national sovereignty especially in Bolivia, Ecuador and Venezuela, action is gradually being undertaken to recover public control over natural resources. Tired of seeing their resources such as oil, gas and metals depleted to make transnational corporations richer, Bolivia, Ecuador and Venezuela have renegotiated their contracts, increased royalties and established joint companies with their individual states as main shareholders and as the only owners of the resources. Unlike the American companies, most European companies accepted the new conditions seeing that profits would still be plentiful. At the same time, these countries have increased their growth indicators – until the crisis – which has allowed for unprecedented increases in their public budgets. Larger shares of resources, so badly needed to fend off the ravages of the crises, are therefore now being kept in the region. ¶ In the case of Venezuelan oil this has allowed it to firmly position itself on the international scene, including a leadership role within OPEC. Ecuador, for its part, has legislated dominion over extraordinary crude oil revenue (unexpected except in times of bonanza), increasing control from 50 percent to 99 percent of that extra revenue. Nationalizing Latin American natural resources to benefit legitimate owners and to help support other countries in need has enormous emancipatory effects. One of the greatest of these emancipatory effects is that of providing resources to fund badly needed social transformations. In addition to making sense financially, this is also a fundamental matter of national and regional sovereignty and dignity. ¶ Conclusion Multiple crises have resulted from conscious political decisions made by global leaders holding economic and military power. These crises have been imposed on the rest of humankind. The countries better positioned to withstand these crises are those with regulated economies and fewer links to the US economy. Should the USA lose its hegemony as a consequence of the crises, others would soon emerge to take its place. There are countries ready to undertake a sub-imperial role in Latin America (Brazil) and in Asia (China) that have the capabilities to inflict considerable damage on weaker economies should they so wish. There is growing awareness that poverty and exclusion levels in Latin America prove that the prolonged hegemonic alliance with the USA has not been favorable; and that recovering sovereignty and the role of the state has become vital. And for that purpose, a development model that is totally different from neoliberal capitalism is needed. Latin America has been in the forefront of resistance to neoliberalism but the crises now pose new challenges such as the need to confront capitalism and imperialism.

### Link – Economic Engagement

#### Economic engagement serves as a smokescreen to put Latin America under multinational corporate control.

Palley, Schwartz Economic Growth Fellow, 2009

(Dr. Thomas, “America's exhausted paradigm: Macroeconomic causes of the financial crisis and great recession,” Online: [www.newamerica.net/](http://www.newamerica.net/)files/Thomas\_Palley\_America's\_Exhausted\_Paradigm.pdf, p. 26-27)

The flawed model of global economic engagement broke with the old model of international trade in two ways. First, instead of having roughly balanced trade, the United States has run persistent large trade deficits. Second, instead of aiming to create a global marketplace in which U.S. companies could sell their products, its purpose was to create a global production zone in which U.S. companies could either produce or obtain inputs from. In other words, the main purpose of international economic engagement was not to increase U.S. exports, but rather to substitute cheaper imported inputs for US domestic production and to facilitate American owned production platforms in developing countries that could export to the United States. As a result, at the bidding of corporate interests, the United States joined itself at the hip to the global economy, opening its borders to an inflow of goods and exposing its manufacturing base. This was done without safeguards to address the problems of exchange rate misalignment and systemic trade deficits, or the mercantilist policies of trading partners. NAFTA The creation of the new system took off in 1989 with the implementation of the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement that established an integrated production zone between the two countries. 18 The 1994 implementation of NAFTA was the decisive next step. First, it fused Canada, the United States, and Mexico into a unified North American production zone. Second, and more importantly, it joined developed and developing economies, thereby establishing the template U.S. corporations wanted.

### Link – Free Trade

#### Free trade forcibly integrates populations into the global system of exchange without regard for the social and political implications – the impact is the perpetuation of massive wealth inequalities between the North and South.

De Angelis, lecturer in Political Economy at University of East London, 2000

(Massimo, “Trade, the global factory and the struggles for new commons,” Paper presented at the CSE conference "Global Capital and Global Struggles: Strategies, Alliances, and Alternatives,” July, Online: <http://libcom.org/files/NewComm.pdf>)

Let us be clear from the outset. There is no such as thing as "faire" trade liberalization. To the billion of people in the global economy, trade liberalization is part of the project to impose upon them the discipline of the global factory. This discipline is the competing game itself. Whether is Pakistan’s textiles that replaces Italian’ textile workers or a British telecommunication firm that make Thailand's telecom workers redundant, it is the game itself that sucks. Whatever gains some group of workers obtain due to their competitive advantage, some other group of workers loses out, until they themselves are forced to take notice of a new competitive force which came to displace them. And if we patently follow the economists’ advice to wait for the long-term positive effect of trade, we are left to wonder: isn’t it now the long term of 200 hundreds yeas ago, of 100 years ago, of 50, 40 years ago, of twenty years ago? The people who died as result of the new enclosures accompanying trade liberalisation in all these years, the people who suffered war as result of the disintegration of the social fabric brought about by structural adjustment and associated export promotion, the people of any country of the North has to run in the competing rat race no less, but even more than in the past, just to acquire what is on average necessary to live with dignity, the average people struggling to overcome an imposed condition of scarcity when in fact we live in plenty, can we say these people have benefited of the long term advantage of trade? Nonsense, nobody can make these sorts of judgements. Without a proper assessment of human, social and environmental costs of modern trade, one cannot even to start talking about long term or short term advantages of trade. Without taking into consideration the voice of those without voice the rhetoric of trade benefits is a bias rhetoric. If there is no way anybody can argue whether trade has brought advantages or disadvantages, the only thing we can say with certainty is that because of current patterns of trade the context in which our lives and struggles of today are located is different than the context of our lives and struggles of yesterday and, if trade liberalisation continues, of tomorrow. However, the recomposing factors of various movement in Seattle last November, can be summarised by the slogan “no new round, WTO turnaround.” With this slogan the movement sets against the boundlessness of capital’s accumulation, but there is more. “No new round”, all movements agree. "WTO turnaround”, here is the problem, because people start to ask and debate “where to?” The problem for us is to identify, in the context of the large movement emerged in Seattle and that has set a temporary limit to trade liberalisation, whether it is possible to start to promote a debate towards an independent position of planetary civil society, one that does not bow to the easy traps of the free trade ideology. To do so, we must open a debate on the contradictory nature of trade in this phase of capitalist accumulation, its meaning and implications for a diverse organisation of human and natural resources of the planet.

### Link – Foreign Investment

#### Foreign investment in Latin America leads to massive neoliberal exploitation of workers.

Wise, Director of Doctoral Program in Migration Studies & Prof of Development Studies; Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, Mexico, 2009

(Raúl Delgado, Forced Migration and US Imperialism: The Dialectic of Migration and Development, Crit Sociol, 35: 767, ProQuest)

Although Petras does not use the notion of the indirect exportation of labor he has been aware of the implications of this aspect of the process of industrial restructuring. When discussing the implications of foreign direct investment (FI), he notes that ‘since the 1990s, FI has increasingly looked toward outsourcing skilled jobs to low-wage/salary regions’. This, he notes, ‘requires state promotion of an educated low-paid work force and financing of local business elites to act as recruiters and point men for the FI’. Overseas relocation (both the reality and the threat of it) is a common policy for lower- ing wages, pensions, health benefits and job security in the imperial countries. Foreign investors, he notes, benefit from both ends: ‘exploiting skilled and unskilled labor in assembly plants and manufacturing industries in Latin America while reducing labor costs within the US’. Thus, the MNCs play one against the other and secure labor-related incentives in both. ‘ The net effect is to increase profitability by squeezing out greater pro- ductivity per worker at lower costs, expanding market shares and creating lucrative export platforms to sell back into the home market’ (Petras, 2007: 216).

### Link – Foreign Aid

#### US aid programs are continually hijacked by a neoliberal agenda – the plan will only help elites and corporations.

Dixon, Department of Development Sociology, 2011

(Marion, BRIEFING An Arab spring Cornell University, New York, USA Review of African Political Economy Vol. 38, No. 128, June 2011, 309–316, Online: http://cornell.academia.edu/MarionDixon/Papers/824718/An\_Arab\_Spring)

The role of US aid in promoting a professional class of international development ‘experts’ and a vast military complex over- seas, and in sidelining human rights and advocacy groups (in the case of Egypt), illustrates that the United States’ relation- ship with democracy promotion in the region is weak and contradictory, at best. What such critiques fail to show is how the system of Western-led expertise, with contractors and ‘meet and greets’/work- shops, reinforces the bifurcated ‘West knows best’ and the ‘underdeveloped Rest’. And of course there is nothing democratic about that modelled relationship. Further, a close examination of US aid programming in the region reveals the pervasive character of the neoliberal agenda. Among USAID’s programmes – from economic growth to health to education to governance – there is a thinly veiled thread of growth-based ‘development’ and Western corporate-sector proﬁteering. The health programmes deploy expert-led capacity-building workshops, rather than essential life-saving supplies. The education programmes focus on primary education and vocational training to create a pool of semi-skilled workers in the region for the ‘global market’. Economic growth equates with an export-oriented economy, with countries like Egypt exporting water- intensive and non-essential commodities (like strawberries and green beans), while importing staples (like wheat). These are the so-called prescriptions for countries in the region to become competitive globally. There is nothing democratic about these mechanisms prescribed for and adopted in the Global South supposedly to become a global player. Populations in authoritarian and democratic countries alike have not voted and do not vote for neoliberal ‘reforms’, which have been imposed (albeit welcomed and wil- fully implemented by the elite, beneﬁting classes) on governments by international banks as the only way to restructure debts and build creditworthiness. One may argue that the claim of US-led war and occupation unleashing the Arab Spring is the ﬂipside of the argument that promotion of the undemocratic economic order is essential to the region’s democratic transition. One side involves visible coercion, the other subtle – or perhaps more ﬁtting in Gramsci’s terms – the twin mutually reinforcing hegemony of coercion and of consent.

### Link – Government Assistance

#### Trying to promote “equality” by assistance governance reinforces the state as the arbiter of all social relations and promotes a mechanical method of improving democratic processes that authorizes violent action to naturalize political forces it cannot integrate.

Zanotti, Fellow European University Institute, 2005

(Laura, “Governmentalizing the Post-Cold War International Regime: The UN Debate on Democratization and Good Governance,” Alternatives, 30, JSTOR)

States became the subject of international scrutiny and reformation efforts aimed at making them to function as "governments" instead of as uncontrolled "sovereigns" (in the Foucaultian understanding) and at making them the visible and predictable actors of a normalized international arena. Governmentality emerges as a multifaceted and universally valid technique of rule, a knowledge/power formation that opens multiple spaces of visibility at the national and international level. In times of proliferating threats, where total control of variables becomes impossible, international security is sought through techniques aimed at reducing risk and increasing predictability through the normalization of potentially dangerous actors. Governance doctrines promote the construction of modern states and endeavor to protect citizens from states' incapacity by extending international regulatory and monitoring functions. In this sense, governmentalization may contribute to fostering the health, wealth, and security of populations. Furthermore, governance translates the abstract and controversial notion of democracy into a plurality of technical problems and issue-specific programs of institutional reform. This is an operational virtue that makes this framework appealing for international organizations, concerned about the political neutrality and soundness of their programs. Governance is presented as an apolitical, technically sound, and universally valid endeavor, and democracy can be delinked from the political debate and associated with good management procedures. Good governance is a capacious concept that creates consensus around matters that would otherwise remain politically controversial.'^'\* It provided the United Nations with a framework and a neutral technical language for addressing a wide range of issues and operationalizing diverse interventions. However, notwithstanding its apparent anodyne technical neutrality, governance discourse extensively uses value-loaded metaphors and dichotomies and reinforces oppositional identities. It aims at creating visibility out of obscurity, transparency out of opacity, accountability out of corruption, efficiency out of redundancy, effectiveness out of aimlessness, rights out of abuses, rule of law out of unpredictability. The international arena is thus divided between the orderly space of the civilized and the unpredictable and obscure borderlands of the uncivilized. Indeed, some of the current themes of democratization and good governance show many similarities with elaborations of the "civilizing mission" that, according to Michael Adas, was embedded in the European colonial enterprise.'^s This enterprise was expected to bring peace and order, overthrow despotism and corruption, bring about fair taxation, improve populations' income, and foster productivity.

### Link – Humanitarianism

#### The affirmative’s call to provide its small acts of aid for Latin America papers over the causes of poverty and American colonialism.

Lawston and Murillo, Assistant Professor of Women’s Studies at California State University San Marcos; Prof @ University of San Diego, 2009

(Jodie Michelle Lawston and Ruben R. Murillo, The discursive figuration of U.S. supremacy in narratives sympathetic to undocumented immigrants, Social Justice, 36.2 (Summer 2009): p38(16))

Such stories engender sympathetic feelings for immigrants, especially for children, in the reader. Faced with the shocking violence these children endure, the reader wants to "rescue them" or allow them to remain in the country. The focus on the travails and tribulations of undocumented children compels the reader to believe that conditions in the country of origin must be so bad that immigrants are willing to risk their lives and endure tortuous journeys to establish a "better life." In this way, the narrative naturalizes the United States as inherently superior to the immigrants' home countries without historicizing the direct involvement of the United States in creating oppressive social and economic conditions in Central America. ¶ Mexico serves as a melodramatic villain in Enrique's Journey, just as it does in 30 Days and Under the Same Moon. Readers learn how hostile and discriminatory some Mexicans are toward immigrants from Central America. This tends to placate the guilt and anxiety that many liberals feel over U.S. immigration policy and enforcement. The imperative to engage in charitable acts for the "less fortunate" is also an important part of the story. One of the book's most compelling chapters describes how residents in a small town in Vera Cruz throw bundles of food, clothing, and supplies to migrants riding the freight trains. Nazario's description of those generous people contrasts sharply with the hostile discrimination seen in Chiapas. She writes: Enrique expects the worst. Riding trains through the state of Chiapas has taught him that any upraised hand might hurl a stone. But here in the states of Oaxaca and Vera Cruz, he discovers that people are friendly. They wave hello and shout to signal if hostile police are lying in wait for them in an upcoming town (2006: 103). The altruism in Oaxaca and Vera Cruz breathes hope into a formerly bleak situation. Residents here tell Nazario (2006: 105), "If I have one tortilla, I give half away," "I know God will bring me more," "I don't like to feel that I have eaten and they haven't," and "It feels good to give something that they need so badly." These passages resonate poignantly with the sense of charity in the U.S. national imagination and they perhaps account for why Nazario's narrative won the Pulitzer Prize and became a bestseller. Charitable acts by these poor Mexicans move the typical American reader to offer a "helping hand" to undocumented immigrants and to "rescue" some of these children. But acts of charity do not make up for a legacy of conquest, neocolonialism, and U.S. interventionism; instead, like a shell game they distract groups and individuals from the causes of poverty.

### Impact – Laundry List

#### Neoliberal development practices make social inequality and extinction inevitable.

Wise et al., Director of Doctoral Program in Migration Studies & Prof of Development Studies; Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, Mexico, 2010

(Raúl Delgado Wise, Humberto Márquez Covarrubias, Rubén Puentes, Reframing the debate on migration, development and human rights: fundamental elements, October, 2010, www.migracionydesarrollo.org)

At the end of the first decade of the 21st century, a general crisis centered in the United States affected the global capitalist system on several levels (Márquez, 2009 and 2010). The consequences have been varied: ¶ Financial. The overflowing of financial capital leads to speculative bubbles that affect the socioeconomic framework and result in global economic depressions. Speculative bubbles involve the bidding up of market prices of such commodities as real estate or electronic innovations far beyond their real value, leading inevitable to a subsequent slump (Foster and Magdof, 2009; Bello, 2006). Overproduction. Overproduction crises emerge when the surplus capital in the global economy is not channeled into production processes due to a fall in profit margins and a slump in effective demand, the latter mainly a consequence of wage containment across all sectors of the population (Bello, 2006). Environmental. Environmental degradation, climate change and a predatory approach to natural resources contribute to the destruction of the latter, along with a fundamental undermining of the material bases for production and human reproduction (Fola- dori and Pierri, 2005; Hinkelammert and Mora, 2008). Social. Growing social inequalities, the dismantling of the welfare state and dwindling means of subsistence accentuate problems such as poverty, unemployment, violence, insecurity and labor precariousness, increasing the pressure to emigrate (Harvey, 2007; Schierup, Hansen and Castles, 2006). ¶ The crisis raises questions about the prevailing model of globalization and, in a deeper sense, the systemic global order, which currently undermines our main sources of wealth—labor and nature—and overexploits them to the extent that civilization itself is at risk. The responses to the crisis by the governments of developed countries and international agencies promoting globalization have been short-sighted and exclusivist. Instead of addressing the root causes of the crisis, they have implemented limited strategies that seek to rescue financial and manufacturing corporations facing bankruptcy. In addition, government policies of labor flexibilization and fiscal adjustment have affected the living and working conditions of most of the population. These measures are desperate attempts to prolong the privileges of ruling elites at the risk of imminent and increasingly severe crises. In these conditions, migrants have been made into scapegoats, leading to repressive anti- immigrant legislation and policies (Massey and Sánchez, 2006). A significant number of jobs have been lost while the conditions of remaining jobs deteriorate and deportations increase. Migrants’ living standards have drastically deteriorated but, contrary to expectations, there have been neither massive return flows nor a collapse in remittances, though there is evidence that migrant worker flows have indeed diminished.¶

### Impact – Interventionism/War

#### The affirmative’s ideological commitment to economic integration becomes a drum beat that demands co-operation – when the inevitable backlash to neoliberal reforms boils over again, military intervention will become a necessity.

Roberts, Secor and Sparke, professors of Geography at the University of Kentucky, 2003

(Susan, Anna and Matthew, “Neoliberal Geopolitics,” Online)

Other, still more narrowly national circuits of American capitalism benefited from the war—including, for example, Kellogg Brown and Root, a subsidiary of Vice President Dick Cheney’s Halliburton that, having helped the Pentagon orchestrate the destruction of Iraqi infrastructure, is now receiving generous contracts to rebuild Iraqi infrastructure using proceeds from Iraq’s “liberated” oil sales. But these classically imperial aspects of the hostilities are not our main focus here. Instead, our central concern is with how a neoliberal world vision has served to obscure these more traditional geopolitics beneath Panglossian talk of global integration and (what are thereby constructed as) its delinquent others. In the neoliberal approach, the geopolitics of interimperial rivalry, the Monroe doctrine, and the ideas about hemispheric control that defined Butler’s era are eclipsed by a new global vision of almost infinite openness and interdependency. In contrast also to the Cold War era, danger is no longer imagined as something that should be contained at a disconnected distance. Now, by way of a complete counterpoint, danger is itself being defined as disconnection from the global system. In turn, the neoliberal geopolitical response, it seems, is to insist on enforcing reconnection—or, as Friedman (2003:ANSWERS TO7) put it in an upbeat postwar column, “aggressive engagement.” It would be wrong, of course, to suggest that even this vision is brand new. Much like the broken neoliberal record of “globalization is inexorable,” the vision can be interpreted as yet another cover for the century-old package of liberal development nostrums that critics (eg Smith 2003) and apologists (eg Bacevich 2002) alike argue lie at the defining heart of “American Empire.” But what distinguishes this moment of neoliberal geopolitics is that the notion of enforced reconnection is today mediated through a whole repertoire of neoliberal ideas and practices, ranging from commitments to market-based solutions and public-private partnerships to concerns with networking and flexibility to mental maps of the planet predicated on a one-world vision of interdependency. Thomas Barnett merely represents one particularly audacious and influential embodiment of this trend.

### Impact – Environment/Economy

#### This neoliberal spread makes environmental and economic collapse inevitable.

Wise et al., Director of Doctoral Program in Migration Studies & Prof of Development Studies; Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, Mexico, 2010

(Raúl Delgado Wise, Humberto Márquez Covarrubias, Rubén Puentes, Reframing the debate on migration, development and human rights: fundamental elements, October, 2010, www.migracionydesarrollo.org)

The internationalization of capital. The expansion strategy of the global economy in- volves a profound economic restructuring based on the establishment of subcontracting chains dominated by large multinational corporations, which have a global reach. This form of expansion seeks to economically reinsert peripheral countries that are rich in natural resources and ensure an abundant and cheap workforce. The new export platforms, in fact, operate as enclaves, that is production, commercial and services zones dominated by multinational corporations and often exempted from national taxation and regulation of working and environmental conditions. These types of plants cur- rently employ between 55 million (Robinson, 2008) and 66 million Southern workers (Singa Boyenge, 2006) and the strategy is widely implemented by large manufacturing, financial, agricultural, commercial, and service-sector multinationals (Robinson, 2008). ¶ Financialization. Financial capital generates speculative strategies that foster the chan- neling of investment funds, sovereign funds, pension funds and social savings toward new financial instruments that offer short-term high profit margins but can entail re- current crises and massive fraud. These speculative strategies obstruct and affect the functioning of the so-called real economy (Foster and Magdof, 2009; Bello, 2006). ¶ Environmental degradation. Biodiversity, natural resources, and communal and national wealth are privatized for the benefit of large corporations that favor profits while ignoring social and environmental costs. This leads to increased environmental degradation, pollution, famine, and disease, as well as climate changes (global warming and increasingly frequent extreme climatic events) that threaten the symbiotic relationship between humans and the environment (Foladori and Pierri, 2005). ¶ The restructuring of innovation systems. Advances in IT, telecommunications, biotech- nology, new materials and nanotechnology cater to the needs of large corporations looking for increased profits. Scientific and technological research have been restructured under mechanisms such as outsourcing and offshore-outsourcing, which allow corporations to employ southern scientists, transfer risk and responsibility, and capi- talize on resultant benefits by amassing patents. This has lead to unprecedented mer- cantilism in scientific research, short-term perspectives and a lack of social concern (Freeman, 2005b, Lester and Piore, 2004).

### Impact – Terrorism/Instability

#### This model of development closes off avenues of self-determination, forcing suppressed antagonisms to use radical tactics to negate the universalization of American norms – this is the root cause of terrorism and threats to global stability

Baudrillard, 2004

(Jean, “This is the Fourth World War,” An Interview with Der Spiegel, IJBS 1:1, Online: <http://www.ubishops.ca/baudrillardstudies/spiegel.htm>)

In general all the positive historical utopias are extremely murderous, as fascism and communism have shown. Spiegel: Surely you cannot compare globalization with the bloodiest systems of the 20th century. Baudrillard: It is based, as colonialism was earlier, on immense violence. It creates more victims than beneficiaries, even when the majority of the Western world profits from it. Naturally the United States, in principle, could liberate every country just as it has liberated Afghanistan. But what kind of peculiar liberation would that be? Those so fortunate would know how to defend themselves even with terror if necessary. Spiegel: Do you hold globalization to be a form of colonialism, disguised as the widening of Western civilization? Baudrillard: It is pitched as the endpoint of the Enlightenment, the solution to all contradictions. In reality, it transforms everything into a negotiable, quantifiable exchange value. This process is extremely violent, for it cashes out in the idea of unity as the ideal state, in which everything that is unique, every singularity, including other cultures and finally every non-monetary value would be incorporated. See, on this point, I am the humanist and moralist. Spiegel: But don’t universal values such as freedom, democracy, and human rights also establish themselves through globalization? Baudrillard: One must differentiate radically between the global and the universal. The universal values, as the Enlightenment defined them, constitute a transcendental ideal. They confront the subject with its own freedom, which is a permanent task and responsibility, not simply a right. This is completely absent in the global, which is an operational system of total trade and exchange. Spiegel: Rather than liberating humanity, globalization only in turns reifies it? Baudrillard: It pretends to liberate people, only to deregulate them. The elimination of all rules, more precisely, the reduction of all rules to laws of the market is the opposite of freedom-namely, its illusion. Such out-dated and aristocratic values such as dignity, honesty, challenge and sacrifice no longer count for anything. Spiegel: Doesn’t the unrestricted recognition of human rights build a decisive bulwark against this alienating process? Baudrillard: I think that human rights have already been integrated into the process of globalization and therefore function as an alibi. They belong to a juridical and moral superstructure; in short, they are advertising. Spiegel: Therefore mystification? Baudrillard: Is it not a paradox that the West uses as a weapon against dissenters the following motto: Either you share our values or…? A democracy asserted with threats and blackmail only sabotages itself. It no longer represents the autonomous decision for freedom, but rather becomes a global imperative. This is, in effect, a perversion of Kant’s categorical imperative, which implies freely chosen consent to its command. Spiegel: So the end of history, the absolute sway of democracy, would be a new form of world dictatorship? Baudrillard: Yes, and it is completely inconceivable that there would be no violent counter-reaction against it. Terrorism emerges when no other form of resistance seems possible. The system takes as objectively terrorist whatever is set against it. The values of the West are ambivalent, at a definite point in time they could have a positive effect and accelerate progress, at another, however, they drive themselves to such extremes that they falsify themselves and ultimately turn against their own purpose.

### Impact – No Value to Life

#### The imposed value system of development paradigms reduces all life to commodity for exchange – the facilitates mass violence and exclusion.

Shiva, 2003

(Vandana, physicist, ecologist, activist, editor, and author of many books, ZNet Daily Commentaries, Globalisation and Its Fallout, April 2, Online: <http://www.zmag.org/sustainers/content/2003-04/02shiva.cfm>)

The first is the market fundamentalism of globalization itself. This fundamentalism redefines life as commodity, society as economy, and the market as the means and end of the human enterprise. The market is being made the organizing principle for the provisioning of food, water, health, education and other basic needs, it is being made the organizing principle for governance, it is being made the measure of our humanity. Our being human is no longer predicated on the fundamental human rights enshrined in all constitutions and in the U.N. declaration of human rights. It is now conditional on our ability to "buy" our needs on the global marketplace in which the conditions of life -- food, water, health, knowledge have become the ultimate commodities controlled by a handful of corporations. In the market fundamentalism of globalization, everything is a commodity, everything is for sale. Nothing is sacred, there are no fundamental rights of citizens and no fundamental duties of governments. The market fundamentalism of globalization and the economic exclusion inherent to it is giving rise to, and being reinforced and supported by politics of exclusion emerging in the form of political parties based on "religious fundamentalism"/xenophobia/ethnic cleansing and reinforcement of patriarchies and castism. The culture of commodification has increased violence against women, whether it is in the form of rising domestic violence, increasing cases of rape, an epidemic of female foeticide, and increased trafficking in women.

### Impact - Authoritarianism

#### Neoliberalism will destroy human rights and democracy in Latin America and cannot be morally allowed.

Kelly, writer at Citizen’s Press, 2008

(Lara, Neoliberalism in Latin America, Oct 29, http://citizenspress.org/editorials/neoliberalism-in-latin-america)

Liberal democracy is being hijacked by neoliberalism in Latin America. This new neoliberal order is a form of authoritarianism to which it is increasingly difficult to mount opposition. The interference of international lending institutions in a sovereign nation’s budgetary policy-making nullifies an essential process inherent in healthy liberal democracies. Innocent workers, peasants, women, men, and children all pay for the actions of international lending institutions who often loaned money to undemocratic regimes. The re-configuration of Latin American society in order to repay already rich nations is a global injustice. Human rights to sustenance, culture, political process, labour standards, and self-determination must come before the property rights of greedy corporations.

### Alternative Solvency Extension

#### Latin America is developing alternatives to neoliberalism now – failure of that struggles risks extinction.

Barra, International Development Consultant and Public Policy Analyst; Former Public Policy Advisor at UNICEF, 2010

(Ximena de la, Sacrificing Neoliberalism to Save Capitalism: Latin America Resists and Offers Answers to Crises, 2010 36: 635, Crit Sociol)

In this sense, crises are an opportunity to increase popular awareness that a better world is possible and that it is worth fighting for. A genuine hemispheric alliance will allow the development of a post-neoliberal and post-capitalist future in which an expanded universal citizenship will flourish. The opposite is also valid. A genuine hemispheric alliance and the survival of the human species depend upon the development of that post-capitalist future. ¶ Walden Bello warns that the world seems to be debating whether to refloat capitalism by way of a globalized social democracy or to opt for fundamentalist, nationalist, protectionist populism. The fact that discredited neoliberalism gets rapidly abandoned in order to embrace formerly vilified Keynesianism (though now in a globalized, deformed and meaner version) means that the real crisis feared by the powerful is the crisis of capitalism, not of neoliberalism, and that they will find new ways to rescue the system (Bello 2009). The struggle for emancipation therefore demands actions against capitalism in any of its forms as well as against imperialism. The struggle requires a socialist perspective going way beyond the mere regulation of the current system. As Wallerstein reminds us, what is important is that we be prepared for when we start emerging from the crises. The key issue, he says, is to understand that reconstruction can lead us into a better world, but it can also take us into a worse one (Wallerstein 2009). ¶ Only a socialist perspective will enable the organization of an economy at the service of common needs. It should be a democratic and participative socialism developed from the base, totally different from the failed experiences of bureaucratic state-socialism during the 20th century. It should be a type of socialism that will place collective selfmanagement at the center of efforts to build an egalitarian society for people in their emancipation process. Marx warned that capitalism will not fall by itself. Socialism will also not fall from the sky (Lebowitz 2006). Social struggle and the search for viable alternatives are what are vitally needed, precisely what Latin America is offering now. Current weaknesses at global centers of power, and structural contradictions embedded in capitalism especially regarding the environment and peoples’ development, are increasingly fostering alliances among social movements, peoples and nations to fight for an alternative post-capitalist, multicultural system in harmony with nature. In Latin America the struggle for a better future has already started and the alternative is gathering steam. We call it ‘socialism for the 21st century’ and we are inventing it and will perfect it as we progress in order to ‘live well’. We also offer our experience to global movements seeking ‘another world’ so that we can converge together and fight our political battles better equipped. We find ourselves, as Marta Harnecker expresses it, in the process of changing the correlation of forces in order to make possible in the future what now seems impossible (Harnecker 1999).

### ANSWERS TO: Perm

#### [ ]

#### [ ] Perm’s inclusion guarantee’s that inequalities are whitewashed and Western interests always win out.

Martell, University of Sussex, Brighton, UK, 2009

(Luke, Global Inequality, Human Rights and Power: A Critique of Ulrich Beck’s Cosmopolitanism, Critical Sociology 35(2) 253–272, SAGE)

Where Beck does try to put into action his cosmopolitan postcolonialism it runs into trouble (e.g. Beck and Sznaider, 2006). He advocates a ‘both/and’ perspective taking over from an ‘either/or’ perspective. This is good for bringing in previously excluded inputs to views that have stressed Westernization without understanding a mixture of influences including from non-Western sources (e.g. Abu-Lughod, 1989). However a ‘both/and’ view runs the risk of replacing Westernization perspectives with one in which power and inequality is glossed over by an attempt to resurrect understandings of the inputs of non- Western societies. When different global societies meet there are often some that have greater economic, political and ideological power. To highlight this fact is not to endorse it. And it is not to say there are not real sources of opposition and alternatives to Westernization both academically and politically (in the latter case from Iran to Venezuela for example). But positing a ‘both/and’ mix appears to give an equality to a mix of perspectives when there are great inequalities and power differences in that mix. In trying to give more of a role to inputs from beyond the West it runs the risk of playing down the Western power that such inputs are subjected to. Beck’s own use of a ‘both/and’ hybridizing postcolonialism (2000b: 89) underesti- mates these power relations and inequalities. In a discussion of deregulation and flexibi- lization which promote an informal economy, diluted trade union representation and weak states Beck suggests these are non-Western standards being adopted by Western societies. But the direction of power is the other way around. These are structures and effects of neoliberalism being exported by Western-dominated governments and institu- tions to other Western and non-Western societies with the deleterious effects that Beck rightly suggests. Western power is underestimated here when neoliberalism is seen as an effect of the importation of poor regulation from the non-West to West rather than an expression of the corporate and state power of Western interests. So the novelty and uniqueness of Beck’s cosmopolitanism for establishing a postcolo- nial perspective is justified by an understatement of the extent to which postcolonialism is already in existence and an overstatement of the role of cosmopolitanism in having a new role in establishing this itself. At the same time, his more hybrid postcolonial view, rather than restoring a greater emphasis on poorer countries’ contribution to globaliza- tion, may underestimate the power they are subjected to. Beck’s postcolonialism fits into a more general pattern in his work, of underestimating previous cosmopolitanism in social science, overestimating the novelty of his cosmopolitan vision, and leading down a road which rather than overcoming power and inequality seems as much to play down how significant it is.

### ANSWERS TO: Perm

#### [ ]

#### [ ] The perm brings the South perspective in as a partner in implementing their policy, not a genuine partner in development which guts the alt.

Castles and Wise, Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas; International Migration Institute @ Oxford, 2007

(Raúl Delgado, Stephen, Principles and measures to obtain more coherent and collaborative policy making on migration and development, International Network of Migration and Development, http://meme.phpwebhosting.com/~migr-acion/rimd/e-lista\_documentos\_miembros.php)

Attempts to achieve coherent approaches and coordination on migration and development will not succeed if ¶ the terms of debate are imposed in advance and without discussion by all concerned. So far the debate on migration and development has been one-sided: it has been overwhelmingly driven by northern governments and by international agencies. Southern states and civil society organizations have been brought in, but usually as partners for implementation, rather than as equals in setting principles and priorities. Northern governments, supranational bodies and international agencies have varying interests and perspectives on migration and development, and they hold frequent meetings on migration control and management. Southern states also have varying approaches, but have had little communication between themselves. They have had marginal roles in global fora, while migrant associations have usually had none at all. Without wanting to reproduce the debate on the migration and development nexus dealt with in Session 6, this paper will aim to suggest principles and measures to obtain more coherent and collaborative policy making by starting out from a comprehensive approach on the migration and development nexus, whereby the perspectives of the South are fully integrated. It is essential to achieve a comprehensive approach, based on participation of migrants and their associations, as well as governments, social partners and communities of sending, transit and receiving countries. A comprehensive approach means recognising differences in needs, values and interests, and finding ways of cooperating to achieve workable compromises. It is crucial to reorient the terms of the debate. A deeper and broader understanding of the migration-development nexus is required in which perspectives from the South are fully incorporated. This implies, among other things: • Understanding the ideological character of the discourse of globalization and the contradictions of global economic integration, especially the growing asymmetries among countries, increasing social inequalities, and precarious employment conditions of workers in labour markets now re-constituted at the transnational level. • Focusing on emergent actors and agents from civil society, which operates at different levels: local, national, and transnational. • Constructing new information systems which transcend the dominant focus on migrant-receiving country concerns (especially security and social cohesion); and which reflect the complexity and multidimensional character of the migration-development nexus.

### ANSWERS TO: Economic Engagement is Good

#### [ ]

#### [ ] The alternative doesn’t preclude development or engagement – it just reclaims that process in the interests of Latin Americans.

Wise et al., Director of Doctoral Program in Migration Studies & Prof of Development Studies; Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, Mexico, 2010

(Raúl Delgado Wise, Humberto Márquez Covarrubias, Rubén Puentes, Reframing the debate on migration, development and human rights: fundamental elements, October, 2010, www.migracionydesarrollo.org)

Rejecting super-exploitation of labor and the increasing human rights infringements that affect the majority of the global population, we must construct an essentially humane type of development that favors the common good and social sustainability over a minority’s lust for profit. This requires a fundamental emphasis on the upholding of human rights as a key element in the process of social transformation. Equitable development. Development and underdevelopment are not separate processes, but rather two sides of a single phenomenon that has gained considerable momentum under neoliberal globalization: unequal development. Given the increase in intranational, international and regional asymmetries and the expansion and deepening of social inequalities, processes of social transformation capable of counteracting these trends are much needed. One of the great challenges of our times is to achieve equality or, as stated by the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, it is “Time for Equality: closing gaps, opening trails” (ECLAC, 2010). This requires, among other things, creative ways of countering the unequal exchange and surplus transfer- ence mechanisms that characterize contemporary capitalism. Limits and effective regulations must be imposed on both the overt and covert monopolization of production, consumption and service provision. The gaps fostered by the structural heterogeneity that characterizes peripheral economies must be closed and the building of endogenous development foundations across national economies, encapsulating innovation, production and consumption, must be encouraged. Finally, we must reject current patterns of unequal wealth distribution and promote modes of social redistribution that revitalize the weakened—and, in some cases, vanquished—welfare state. Sustainable development. Far from degrading the environment, development must be based on a balanced symbiotic interaction between society and nature, one that guarantees the fulfillment of social needs and the progressive improvement in the quality of life of current and future generations. To achieve this, development must be sustainable across all spheres (economic, environmental, social, cultural and scientific).

### ANSWERS TO: Neoliberalism Is Inevitable

#### [ ]

#### [ ] Neoliberalism is not inevitable.

Wise, Director of Doctoral Program in Migration Studies & Prof of Development Studies; Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, Mexico, 2009

(Raúl Delgado, Forced Migration and US Imperialism: The Dialectic of Migration and Development, Crit Sociol, 35: 767, ProQuest)

A Critical Approach to Neoliberal Globalization Contrary to the discourse regarding its inevitability (on this see Petras and Veltmeyer, 2000), we posit that the current phase of imperialist domination is historical and can and should be transformed. In this regard, it is fundamental to notice that ‘[t]he principal factor generating international migration is not globalization but imperialism, which pillages nations and creates conditions for the exploitation of labor in the imperial center’ (Petras, 2007: 51–2). A Critical Reconstitution of the Field of Development Studies The favoring of a singular mode of analysis based on the belief that free markets work as powerful regulatory mechanisms, efficiently assigning resources and providing patterns of economic convergence among countries and their populations, has clearly resulted in failure. New theoretical and practical alternatives are needed, and we propose a reevalua- tion of development as a process of social transformation through a multi-dimensional, multi-spatial, and properly contextualized approach, ‘using the concept of imperialism as an alternative explanatory framework of international capitalist expansion and the growing inequalities’ (Petras and Veltmeyer, 2000). This integral approach requires the con- sideration of the strategic and structural aspects of the dynamic of uneven contemporary capitalism development, which should be examined at the global, regional, national, and local levels. For this purpose it is crucial to understand, inter alia, a) the central role played by foreign investment in the process of neoliberal restructuring of peripheral economies, and b) the new modalities of surplus transfer characterizing contemporary capitalism. ¶ The Construction of an Agent of Change The globalization project led by the USA has ceased to be consensual: it has only bene- fited capitalist elites and excluded and damaged an overwhelming number of people throughout the world. Economic, political, social, cultural and environmental changes are all needed but a transformation of this magnitude is not viable unless diverse move- ments, classes, and agents can establish common goals. The construction of an agent of change requires not only an alternative theory of development but also collective action and horizontal collaboration: the sharing of experiences, the conciliation of interests and visions, and the construction of alliances inside the framework of South-South and South-North relations.

### ANSWERS TO: Neoliberalism is Inevitable (Economic Logic)

#### [ ]

#### [ ] Reject the affirmative’s conceptualization of free trade – by placing limits on what can be commodified, intellectuals can found a new form of trade based on need and equity rather than competitiveness and exploitation.

De Angelis, lecturer in Political Economy at University of East London, 2000

(Massimo, “Trade, the global factory and the struggles for new commons,” Paper presented at the CSE conference "Global Capital and Global Struggles: Strategies, Alliances, and Alternatives,” July, Online: <http://libcom.org/files/NewComm.pdf>)

But the¶ conceptual horizons we gain in envisaging alternatives when we abandon the given¶ accepted wisdom of the market are immense. Thinking in terms of new commons makes¶ the slogan that everybody shared in Seattle ("No new round, WTO turnaround!") to¶ acquire new meaning.¶ In the first place, by setting a limit to what can be turned into a commodity, and indeed to¶ push back the sphere of what can be a commodity, new commons set limits to the market¶ and capitalist accumulation. But the latter is inherently boundless, it must relies on¶ continuous expansion, and on the colonisation of a wider range of aspects of life. The¶ only limits it recognises are what the agents and institutions of capital are made to¶ recognise by our struggles. To be able to set a limit to capital is like to announce its death.¶

### ANSWERS TO: Neoliberalism Is Making The World Better

#### Poverty is massively increasing – neoliberal growth is unsustainable.

Li, Prof of political economy at the Department of Political Science of York University, 2004

(Minqi,After Neoliberalism: Empire, Social Democracy, or Socialism?, http://monthlyreview.org/2004/01/01/after-neoliberalism-empire-social-democracy-or-socialism)

According to United Nations’ Human Development Report, the world’s richest 1 percent receive as much income as the poorest 57 percent. The income gap between the richest 20 percent and the poorest 20 percent in the world rose from 30:1 in 1960, to 60:1 in 1990, and to 74:1 in 1999, and is projected to reach 100:1 in 2015. In 1999–2000, 2.8 billion people lived on less than $2 a day, 840 million were undernourished, 2.4 billion did not have access to any form of improved sanitation services, and one in every six children in the world of primary school age were not in school. About 50 percent of the global nonagricultural labor force is estimated to be either unemployed or underemployed.[1](http://monthlyreview.org/2004/01/01/after-neoliberalism-empire-social-democracy-or-socialism#en1) ¶ In many countries, working people have suffered an absolute decline in living standards. In the United States, the real weekly earnings of production and nonsupervisory workers (in 1992 dollars) fell from $315 in 1973 to $264 in 1989. After a decade of economic expansion, it reached $271 in 1999, which remained lower than the average real wage in 1962. In Latin America, a continent that has suffered from neoliberal restructuring since the 1970s, about 200 million people, or 46 percent of the population, live in poverty. Between 1980 and the early 1990s (1991–1994), real wages fell by 14 percent in Argentina, 21 percent in Uruguay, 53 percent in Venezuela, 68 percent in Ecuador, and 73 percent in Bolivia.[2](http://monthlyreview.org/2004/01/01/after-neoliberalism-empire-social-democracy-or-socialism#en2) The advocates of neoliberalism promised that the neoliberal “reforms” or “structural adjustments” would usher in an era of unprecedented economic growth, technological progress, rising living standards, and material prosperity. In fact, the world economy has slowed towards stagnation in the neoliberal era. The average annual growth rate of world GDP declined from 4.9 percent between 1950 and 1973, to 3.0 percent between 1973 and 1992, and to 2.7 percent between 1990 and 2001. Between 1980 and 1998, half of all the “developing countries” (including the so-called “transition economies”) suffered from falling real per capita GDP.[3](http://monthlyreview.org/2004/01/01/after-neoliberalism-empire-social-democracy-or-socialism#en3) The global economy has been kept afloat by the debt-financed U.S. economy. Between 1995 and 2002, the U.S. economy accounted for 96 percent of the cumulative growth in world GDP.[4](http://monthlyreview.org/2004/01/01/after-neoliberalism-empire-social-democracy-or-socialism#en4) The U.S. expansion has been financed by reducing domestic savings, raising the private sector debts to historically unprecedented levels, and running large and ever-rising current account deficits. The process is unsustainable. The enormous imbalances have to be corrected one way or the other. If the United States cannot continue to generate ever-rising current account deficits and none of the other large economies are capable of functioning effectively as the autonomous driving force, the neoliberal global economy will be under powerful downward pressures and exposed to the threat of increasingly frequent and violent financial crises.¶

### ANSWERS TO: Neoliberalism Solves Poverty

#### [ ]

#### [ ] Neoliberalism causes massive poverty and inequality in Latin America.

Kelly, writer at Citizen’s Press, 2008

(Lara, Neoliberalism in Latin America, Oct 29, http://citizenspress.org/editorials/neoliberalism-in-latin-america)

The consequences of neoliberalist policies are far reaching for any nation, but particularly hurtful for the majority of Latin American residents. Income inequality has increased in most nations that have implemented the reforms (Bray, 68). Job losses and subsequent higher unemployment rates resulted due to the sale of state run enterprises and the scaling back of the public service (Kurtz, 269). Because of the removal of subsidies on necessary items such as fuel, food, and social services their prices have increased (Crisp & Kelly, 542). When Fujimori, the former president of Peru came to power in 1990, he immediately undertook neoliberal reforms. Immediately following there was an increase in the price of gasoline by 3000%, telephone and water prices increased by 1300%, and electricity prices increased by 5300% (Hays-Mitchell, 72).

### ANSWERS TO: Framework

#### [ ]

#### [ ] The alt has to come first – the Northern agenda for policy debate guarantees failure.

Wise, Director of Doctoral Program in Migration Studies Professor of Development Studies

Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, Mexico, 2007

(Raúl Delgado, GLOBAL FORUM ON MIGRATION AND DEVELOPMENT CIVIL SOCIETY DAY, Migration and Development Setting the Scene, http://meme.phpwebhosting.com/~migracion/rimd/e-lista\_documentos\_miembros.php)

Moreover, South-South dialogue is as important as the North-North dialogue that has been taking place for years – it is a precondition for a genuine global dialogue. The debate on migration and development has been dominated by the vision of the North, which tends to reduce the key issues to security, control of migratory flows, integration into the receiving society, and remittances (understood as the main driver of development). The vision of the South has been largely absent in this debate. This has led to a distortion of the very idea of development. It has also led to fragmented views and interpretations, which hinder understanding of the real significance and challenges of contemporary human mobility as a force for change. Northern-dominated research and policy debates on migration provide an inadequate basis for understanding the real scope and potential of the major changes taking place, and for designing and implementing new policy approaches.

### ANSWERS TO: Framework

#### [ ]

#### [ ] Rejecting the Aff’s research model makes alternative to neoliberal development possible.

Wise et al., Director of Doctoral Program in Migration Studies & Prof of Development Studies; Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, Mexico, 2010

(Raúl Delgado Wise, Humberto Márquez Covarrubias, Rubén Puentes, Reframing the debate on migration, development and human rights: fundamental elements, October, 2010, www.migracionydesarrollo.org)

The promotion of alternative development as social transformation can prevent forced migration. Ideologically speaking, neoliberal globalization posits itself as inevitable. It is therefore crucial that we theoretically and practically endorse the feasibility of alter- native development strategies. Rejecting the assymetrical power relationships between sending and receiving countries is of paramount importance. This will allow us to identify and counter practices that have plunged vast regions of the world into quagmires of inequality, marginalization, poverty, social exclusion and forced migration. A project of genuine social transformation must focus on the root causes of forced migration and fight them by creating decent, secure, and well-paid employment opportunities. This will make migration an option rather than a necessity.

### ANSWERS TO: Cede the Political

#### [ ]

#### [ ] The political sphere is dominated by corporate imperialist interests – the only effective strategy is to break away from policy reformism and retake the public sphere through intellectual rejection of imperialism.

Boggs, professor of social sciences at National University, 2009

(Carl, “A Way Forward?,” August 21, Online: http://www.zcommunications.org/a-way-forward-by-carl-boggs)

Having made this point, I still believe any serious movement for social transformation in this society ought to address most if not all of the following: 1. An anti-imperialist politics. This means coming to grips with the barbarism of U.S. foreign and military policy, the permanent war economy, and the national security state - all factors in destroying the world and subverting democracy here. For me this perspective ought to be central. 2. An ecological model of development - and politics. This means a comprehensive rethinking of corporate-based growth with its predatory view of nature, its sickening use of resources, its fetishism of growth, its fast-food economy including MacDonaldization of the workforce, its horrific reliance on animal-based agriculture (responsible for more than 35 percent of global warming and the most egregious use of natural resources, including water). A strong dose of animal-rights consciousness would not hurt either. 3. A mode of change organically tied to diverse social movements: feminist, ecological, anti-war, gay/lesbian, animal rights, etc. There should be an ecumenical openness to the large variety of grassroots struggles. 4. Embrace of a process of democratization that enters into all spheres of public life, beyond government, beyond the economy. 5. Social priorities involving a large-scale shift of resources from the military, intelligence, and prison/law enforcement complexes, toward the obvious range of public needs, goods, services, and programs. This used to be called a "conversion" process. 6. An agenda revolving around the dismantling of corporate power, a violent, destructive, predatory, corrupt form of domination that currently seems to colonize just about every realm of government, the economy, and society. Further: other dimensions of change will depend upon how far we can go in an anti-corporate direction. The failure of even the most modest efforts to "reform" health care indicate, once again, just how difficult this task will be. 7. Fundamental change requires a center of gravity outside the party duopoly: both Republican and Democratic parties are so basically corrupt and worthless as tools of change that we should be finished with discussions about how best to push the Democrats "leftward", once and for all. These "debates", in my opinion, are a total waste of time.8. From the above it might be concluded that my view of the best political "strategy" would be something along the lines of what emerged with the European Greens in the 1980s, only more radicalized.

### ANSWERS TO: There is No Alternative

#### [ ]

#### [ ] Latin America is at the center of the dismantling neo-liberal system- alternative is key.

Escobar, Professor of Anthropology at UNC, 2010

(Arturo, Alternative modernizations, post-liberalism, or post-development?, Cultural Studies

Vol. 24, Issue. 1)

Latin America is the only region in the world where some counter-hegemonic processes of importance might be taking place at the level of the State at present. Some argue that these processes might lead to a re-invention of socialism; for others, what is at stake is the dismantling of the neo-liberal policies of the past three decades – the end the ‘the long neo-liberal night,’ as the period is known in progressive circles in the region – or the formation of a South American (and anti-American) bloc. Others point at the potential for un nuevo comienzo (a new beginning) which might bring about a reinvention of democracy and development or, more radically still, the end of the predominance of liberal society of the past 200 years founded on private property and representative democracy. Socialismo del siglo XXI, pluri-nationality, interculturality, direct and substantive democracy, revolucion ciudadana, endogenous development centered on the buen vivir of the people, territorial and cultural autonomy, and decolonial projects towards post-liberal societies are some of the concepts that seek to name the ongoing transformations. The Peruvian sociologist Aníbal Quijano perhaps put it best: ‘It is a time of luchas (struggles) and of options. Latin America was the original space of the emergence of modern/colonial capitalism; it marked its founding moment. Today it is, at last, the very center of world resistance against this pattern of power and of the production of alternatives to it’ ([2008](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09502380903424208#CIT0116), p. 3).

### ANSWERS TO: Cuban Government will Check Capitalism

#### [ ]

#### [ ] The Cuban government can only protect its people if it continues to be economically isolated.

Reyes, staff writer, 2000

(Hector, Cuba: The Crisis of State Capitalism, International Socialist Review Issue 11, Spring 2000, http://www.isreview.org/issues/11/cuba\_crisis.shtml)

But defending Cuba against American domination is not the same as identifying with Castro’s regime. Cuba’s crisis is not separate from the severe economic recession that currently affects nearly 40 percent of the world. In country after country, the political parties traditionally associated with reforms—social democrats and liberals—have proven unwilling and incapable of effecting significant reforms. On the contrary, they have presided over extensive attacks on their working classes. Cuba’s population is facing a situation similar, but much sharper, to that of workers in Britain, Germany and the U.S., who are suffering from drastic cuts in the welfare state. The strategy of the guerrillas-turned-bureaucrats has always been playing the international market—a dead end for the Cuban working class. For in order for the Cuban economy to compete favorably in that market, continuous increases in productivity are demanded from its workers—in the form of longer working hours, speedups and lower wages. Even in their own terms, the bureaucracy’s goals of national development and of overcoming the dependence on sugar have failed wretchedly. There is a different road. It involves not playing the market, but fighting to end the international capitalist system that relies on that market. Cuba’s working class needs to fight its struggle on two fronts simultaneously. One is to defend its living standards against the impositions of its ruling class organized in the CCP. The other is against U.S. imperialism. Cuba’s fate has showed that there cannot be an island of “socialism” in a capitalist world. Even at its best, the conception of international revolution espoused by some revolutionaries in Cuba—such as Che Guevara—amounted to no more than a collection of nationalist revolutions that could come together to resist the policies of the advanced countries.59 That was in the 1960s. Such rhetoric has been abandoned by the Cuban leadership for many years. The liberation of the Cuban working class will come by means of a different strategy—through its own self-activity, defending its own interests and joining the workers of the world in a common fight to end the international system of capitalism, which causes misery in Cuba and imperialist siege and wars and destruction everywhere.

### ANSWERS TO: Venezuela is Already Capitalist

#### Chavez’s death has put Venezuela at a crossroads – it can either fully break with capitalism, or fall back in line as the affirmative desires.

Socialism Today, the official magazine of England and Wales’ Socialist party, April 2013

(“Venezuela after the death of Hugo Chavez, Online: <http://www.socialismtoday.org/167/chavez.html>)

Following the elections in 2012, divisions were beginning to open up within the Bolivarian movement as increasing layers of workers were coming into conflict with the regime. National security laws made strikes in the public sector almost illegal. The day before Chávez died, protests over housing conditions were met by police repression. His death has checked these developments, temporarily, as the masses have unified again to defeat the right-wing in presidential elections due on 14 April. The elections are likely to result in a victory for Nicolás Maduro, Chávez’s named successor. At this stage, the various groupings in the PSUV/Bolivarian movement have rallied together to ensure they win. Maduro, a former bus driver coming from the trade union bureaucracy, is clearly sensitive to the pressure and demands from the working class. Maduro and the Bolivarian leaders are fighting the election with an almost religious fervour, bestowing near sainthood on Chávez whose line they will continue. Maduro has even described himself as an "apsotle of Chávez", recognising the demands of the workers but appealing to them and all groups to be calm for "the sake of the fatherland". On the other side, the class prejudice of the capitalists is demonstrated in their hysterical outbursts of horror at the idea of a former bus driver becoming president. Yet Maduro is also trying to appease the ruling class. His declarations have been aimed at trying to moderate the working class, speaking about the "patriotic revolution continuing". Even before Chávez died, meetings had been arranged with representatives of US imperialism. The attempts at arriving at a consensus with capitalism are certain to come into conflict with the aspirations of the working class and masses after the elections. The worsening economic scenario globally and in Venezuela is certain to result in new conflicts and struggles. Moreover, Maduro does not have the same authority or loyalty in the eyes of the masses as Chávez did. It is not excluded that, under mass pressure, Maduro could also be compelled to adopt more radical policies which encroach on capitalist interests, but this is not certain. Divisions within the Bolivarian movement will re-emerge with even greater intensity reflecting different class interests. A new chapter in Venezuela will open following the election. Now more than ever it is urgent to build independent workers’ organizations to take the revolution forward with a democratic socialist programme to transform society.