# Cars Bad Case Neg

--States counterplan is a good strategy.
--Cap K is a good strategy - write a specific 1ac and blocks to this affirmative. People criticize the aff as a piecemeal solution.
--Gentrification: major, major, and more major argument. Have this as a case turn.
--Contact hypothesis false/breeds more racism.
--Make sure you have different versions of the case frontlines for each variation of the aff.
Chris

# States CP

**The fifty states should (**insert plan here**)**

#### Federal government can’t solve mass transit

Schweitzer 12 [Lisa Schweitzer, Associate Professor at the USC Sol Price School of Public Policy, 2/16/12, “Doig on the TEA party and a “war on transit” in Salon.com”, Urban Ethics and Theory, http://lisaschweitzer.com/2012/02/16/doig-on-the-tea-party-and-a-war-on-transit-in-salon-com/] aw

 Who lives where in the US is not unrelated to wealth and power, certainly, but I doubt that the issues about how to provide public transit fall into that discussion. Mostly, culture war arguments are lazy. Both sides use culture war arguments to whine and accuse rather than getting off their butts and constructing principled arguments. For example, I have yet to hear one compelling reason why the Federal government is a better funder of sidewalks and bike lanes than states or cities, other than the typical arguments that “those things are good for us!” Of course they are. Why can’t you fund them at the city, or in the case of transit, the state level?

#### States will collaborate with one another – especially for self-preservation in the face of war.

Mendelsohn 09, Barak Mendelsohn, Assistant Professor at Haverford College for International Politics, War on Terrorism, Conflict and the Middle East, Instructor at the Hebrew University, Jerusalem for Strategy in the Middle East, “Combating Jihadism: American Hegemony and International Cooperation in the War on Terrorism.” https://litigation-essentials.lexisnexis.com/webcd/app?action=DocumentDisplay&crawlid=1&srctype=smi&srcid=3B15&doctype=cite&docid=91+Geo.+L.J.+1003&key=4529115affeed57e6aa0c1c184016015

Note that the appearance of this self-preservation inclination and in¬terstate cooperation does not require a high level of shared norms and beliefs among states. Bull points at three complexes of rules that help to sustain international order, each presenting different depths of shared goals:6 First, "constitutional normative principles" identify states as the primary political organization of mankind, bound together by the rules and institutions of a collective society. Second, "rules of coexistence" restrict the use of violence to states, limit the causes for which states can legitimately start a war, and restrict the manner in which wars are con¬ducted. Such rules also emphasize the principle of equality among states and their obligation to respect the sovereignty of other states and not intervene in their domestic affairs. Finally, rules that regulate coopera¬tion among states go beyond what is necessary for mere coexistence and may even extend beyond political and strategic realms to cooperation in economic and social matters. Interstate collaboration for the sake of self-preservation falls within a logic of coexistence." Therefore, a plu¬ralist international society bent on the preservation of political and cul¬tural differences between states and based on the principles of state sov¬ereignty and nonintervention is sufficient to produce self-preservation tendencies. Importantly, a pluralist international society is not merely a sufficient condition for interstate cooperation; the case of the war on the iihadi movement provides additional support for a pluralist view of the current international society. At a time when many English School scholars high¬light solidarism—the promotion of cosmopolitan values that concern the rights of the individual and lead to a more interventionist understanding of international order—this book demonstrates the critical role of adher¬ence to pluralist principles in producing interstate collaboration, and testifies to the pluralist nature of the international society.

#### Individual states coordinate with one another to correct national abuse

Gardener 03, James A. Gardener, Distinguished Professor from the State University of New York, 2003, “State Constitutional Rights as Resistance to National Power: Toward a Functional Theory of State Constitutions,” Georgetown Law Journal 91 Geo. L.J. (2002-2003) http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/glj91&div=36&g\_sent=1&collection=journals

Another way in which states may check federal abuses is by using their ordinary affirmative powers when they are not preempted from doing so. Power can be tyrannical not only when it is used affirmatively for tyrannical ends, hut also when it is withheld in circumstances that either perpetuate an unjust status quo or passively permit some individuals to behave unjustly toward others. When national power is invoked affirmatively in abusive ways, it nonetheless preempts contrary exercises of state power. In contrast, when national power is abusively withheld rather than invoked, states are often free to take corrective action.98 For example, slate legislatures may use their affirmative powers to create state-level programs to address wrongs that the national government refuses to redress.99 State legislatures and courts may also create liability rules that allow individuals who are victimized by unjust private behavior to obtain injunctions against such behavior or to recover compensation for the harms it causes. Individual states may even coordinate informally" with one another to create regional coalitions dedicated to correcting national omissions that rise to the level of abuses of national power.

# Cap K

## 1NC

**Public Transportation is a tool of neoliberalism to obtain global capital and profit**

**Farmer 11**

Farmer Sociology Dep’t Roosevelt University 2011 Stephanie Uneven public transportation development in neoliberalizing Chicago, USA Environment and Planning http://envplan.com/epa/fulltext/a43/a43409.pdf,KB

Public transportation policy is one dimension of spatial restructuring deployed by entrepreneurial governments to create place-based competitive advantages for global capital. Transportation represents a fixed, place-based geographic element where the local and the global interact; where global processes shape local geographies and where local politics shape global networks. As Keil and Young (2008) suggest, transportation should now be considered in relation to globalized trade and economic networks and consumption-oriented patterns of everyday life. Growth demands in cities experiencing gentrification, the development of luxury consumption spaces, and a surge of tourism have placed pressure on local agencies to expand airports, roads, 1156 S Farmerand rail and public transit capacities. Large-scale urban redevelopment plans have made a comeback as city planners conceive of megaprojects that concentrate new public transit investment in the revalorized core (Fainstein, 2008; Keil and Young, 2008; Swyngedouw et al, 2002). Air transportation has become the leading form of global connectivity, influencing the decisions of global, national, and regional elites to create air-transportation infra-structure (Cidell, 2006; Erie, 2004; Keil and Young, 2008; Phang, 2007). For instance, there is a growing network of world-class cities (Shanghai, London, and Tokyo) that enables air travelers to connect seamlessly from one global city core to the next, with direct express train service from the downtown business core to the city's international airports (Graham and Marvin, 2001). These specialized public transit systems more closely integrate a city into global markets, thereby making the city more attractive for business activities (Brenner and Theodore, 2002; Graham, 2000). The resulting ``premium network spaces'' are ``geared to the logistical and exchange demands of foreign direct investors, tourist spaces or socioeconomically affluent groups'' (Graham and Marvin, 2001, page 100). Interactions with the surrounding residential districts are carefully managed by filtering `proper' users through nonstop services or prohibitively expensive fares. In addition, premium transport services tend to be bundled with upscale shopping centers, entertainment spectacles, hotels, or office spaces to form a giant, integrated bubble of luxury. Subsequently, sociospatial relations are reconfigured as premium infrastructure bypasses devalorized places and exclude economically disadvantaged users from accessing the transit service. The neoliberal trend towards premium public transportation deployed for the purposes of constructing competitive advantages in the global capitalist system privileges profit making for capital, or exchange-value purposes, and not necessarily for everyday use, or use-value purposes (Keil and Young, 2008; Logan and Molotch, 1987). In order to finance new urban transit projects, cash-strapped entrepreneurial governments are increasingly entering into long-term partnerships with the private sector, or public ^ private partnerships (PPPs), in which the public sector pays for services and infrastructure delivered by the private sector (Phang, 2007; Siemiatycki, 2006; Solino and Vassallo, 2009). In studies of PPPs used both for large-scale urban redevelopment projects and urban rail projects, scholars have noticed that planning agencies are increasingly favoring infrastructure projects favoring affluent segments of the population that have greater potential for profitability rather than delivering the largest public benefit (Fainstein, 2008; Siemiatycki, 2006; Swyngedouw et al, 2002). By privileging market-based metrics of efficiency, entrepreneurial administrations have profoundly changed the function of public transportation. In the Fordist era, public transportation involved a modicum of centralized planning aimed at industrial development, mitigating labor costs and alleviating the effects of uneven development produced by the highly subsidized highway system (Grengs, 2004; Weiner, 1999). Neo-liberal statecraft abandons the Fordist strategy of territorial redistribution mobilizing public transportation to enhance economically disadvantaged groups' access to the city. In its place, socially regressive neoliberal practices favor market-oriented growth and elite consumption patterns (Boschken, 2002; Grengs, 2004; Young and Keil, 2010). Thus, public transportation service has become a battleground in the global city growth machine's revanchist claims to the city (Smith, 1996).

#### Neoliberalism creates multiple structural trends towards extinction

Szentes (a Professor Emeritus at the Corvinus University of Budapest) 8

(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 militarisation 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 intrasociety 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 globalisation 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. Owing to global interdependencies there may exist hardly any “zero-sum-games”, in which one can gain at the expense of others, but, instead, the “negative-sum-games” tend to predominate, in which everybody must suffer, later or sooner, directly or indirectly, losses. Therefore, the actual question is not about “sustainability of development” but rather about the “sustainability of human life”, i.e. survival of mankind – because of ecological imbalance and globalised terrorism. When Professor Louk de la Rive Box was the president of EADI, one day we had an exchange of views on the state and future of development studies. We agreed that development studies are not any more restricted to the case of underdeveloped countries, as the developed ones (as well as the former “socialist” countries) are also facing development problems, such as those of structural and institutional (and even system-) transformation, requirements of changes in development patterns, and concerns about natural environment. While all these are true, today I would dare say that besides (or even instead of) “development studies” we must speak about and make “survival studies”. While the monetary, financial, and debt crises are cyclical, we live in an almost permanent crisis of the world society, which is multidimensional in nature, involving not only economic but also socio-psychological, behavioural, cultural and political aspects. The narrow-minded, election-oriented, selfish behaviour motivated by thirst for power and wealth, which still characterise the political leadership almost all over the world, paves the way for the final, last catastrophe. One cannot doubt, of course, that great many positive historical changes have also taken place in the world in the last century. Such as decolonisation, transformation of socio-economic systems, democratisation of political life in some former fascist or authoritarian states, institutionalisation of welfare policies in several countries, rise of international organisations and new forums for negotiations, conflict management and cooperation, institutionalisation of international assistance programmes by multilateral agencies, codification of human rights, and rights of sovereignty and democracy also on international level, collapse of the militarised Soviet bloc and system-change3 in the countries concerned, the end of cold war, etc., to mention only a few. Nevertheless, the crisis of the world society has extended and deepened, approaching to a point of bifurcation that necessarily puts an end to the present tendencies, either by the final catastrophe or a common solution. Under the circumstances provided by rapidly progressing science and technological revolutions, human society cannot survive unless such profound intra-society and international inequalities prevailing today are soon eliminated. Like a single spacecraft, the Earth can no longer afford to have a 'crew' divided into two parts: the rich, privileged, wellfed, well-educated, on the one hand, and the poor, deprived, starving, sick and uneducated, on the other. Dangerous 'zero-sum-games' (which mostly prove to be “negative-sum-games”) can hardly be played any more by visible or invisible wars in the world society. Because of global interdependencies, the apparent winner becomes also a loser. The real choice for the world society is between negative- and positive-sum-games: i.e. between, on the one hand, continuation of visible and “invisible wars”, as long as this is possible at all, and, on the other, transformation of the world order by demilitarisation and democratization. No ideological or terminological camouflage can conceal this real dilemma any more, which is to be faced not in the distant future, by the next generations, but in the coming years, because of global terrorism soon having nuclear and other mass destructive weapons, and also due to irreversible changes in natural environment.

#### **Our alternative is to reject the Aff’s capitalist model of development**

#### Movements against capitalism are possible now, our job as intellectuals is to attack the imperialist system at every turn

Wise (Director of Doctoral Program in Migration Studies & Prof of Development Studies; Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, Mexico) 9

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

The theoretical framework outlined in this article for understanding the dialectic relationship between development and migration has four critical components. 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 reevaluation 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 consideration 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 benefited 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 movements, 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. A Reassessment of Migration and Development Studies The current explosion of forced migration is part of the intricate machinery of contemporary capitalism as an expression of the dominant imperialist project. In order to understand this process we need to redefine the boundaries of studies that address migration and development: expand our field of research and invert the terms of the unidirectional orthodox vision of the migration-development nexus in order to situate the complex issues of uneven development and imperialist domination at the center of an alternative dialectical framework. This entails a new way of understanding the migration phenomenon.

## Links

Public transportation infrastructure is inherently neoliberal. They exclude the working class and minorities

Farmer 11

Farmer Sociology Dep’t Roosevelt University 2011 Stephanie Uneven public transportation development in neoliberalizing Chicago, USA Environment and Planning <http://envplan.com/epa/fulltext/a43/a43409.pdf>, KB

Taken together, Chicago's public transportation system and the unfolding transformations in Chicago's housing market reveal how neoliberal accumulation is restructuring uneven geographic development and the right to the city for working people and minorities. Chicago's neoliberal public transit and housing projects may improve the exchange value of its Central Area real estate, create place-based advantages to lure highly mobile capital and elevate its global-city status by tying it more closely into global air-transport networks. However, these policies have limited use-value for working-class and minority residents living outside the privileged Central Area who endure a transit system which is unreliable and sluggish for want of access or basic maintenance. I am not suggesting that the Central Area transit projects are without merit: Chicago needs more transit investment, not less. However, the proposed allocation of transit investment in the Central Area reflects the interests of growth-machine elites over and against the interests of the majority of Chicagoans. These trends also demonstrate the changing social role of public transportation in the neoliberal era. Urban public transit in the USA historically served as an instrument aimed at industrial development, mitigating labor costs, and ameliorating inequalities (Grengs, 2004; Weiner, 1999). This share of the social surplus has been redirected to construct premium network transit for capital and the affluent, thus securing their revanchist rights to the city. In effect, the CTA and the Daley administration's transportation and housing policies are contributing to the widening inequality gap between affluent groups and working-class residents, and between Whites and Blacks and Latinos. Unequal access to transportation resources parallels the broader widening of socioeconomic inequality in the era of neoliberalism. Therefore, a complete under-standing of growing inequality and uneven geographic development of the neoliberal accumulation regime should include a public infrastructure

#### **The notion that transportation can be used for profit is a mask for keeping those in poor areas impoverished and oppressed for the good of capital and strategic investment**

Freemark 11

(Yonah, urbanist and journalist who has worked in architecture, planning, and transportation, June 14th, 2011, “Local Neoliberalism’s Role in Defining Transit’s Purpose”, http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2011/06/14/local-neoliberalisms-role-in-defining-transits-purpose/)

Writing recently in Environment and Planning A, Sociologist Stephanie Farmer argues that the rise of neoliberal ideology in local and national politics has encouraged a “retreat from social redistribution and integrated social welfare policies in favor of bolstering business activity.”\* This, she writes in reference to Chicago, has specifically affected public transportation, which “is increasingly deployed as a means to attract global capital as well as enhance affluent residents’ and tourists’ rights to the city.” This trend, she states, stands in opposition to the mid-century “Fordist strategy of territorial redistribution mobilizing public transportation to enhance economically disadvantaged groups’ access to the city.”\*\* Farmer’s approach provides something of an explanation for Detroit’s experience: Rather than concentrate on the needs of its most impoverished denizens through the assurance of basic bus service, the city’s business and political elite has instead put its resources into the construction of a light rail line whose primary purpose is to stimulate economic development by creating “place-based advantages for capital.” Similarly, Farmer is very critical of Chicago’s approach, arguing that that city’s investments have repeatedly favored “business elites over everyday users by excluding public transit investment in areas outside of Chicago’s global city downtown showcase zone.” Her evidence for this trend is primary in former Mayor Richard Daley’s obsession in constructing a premium-fare, limited-stop express rail link to the airport (including his willingness to construct a station for said service without providing the funds to actually operate the trains) and the transit authority’s Circle Line plan, which she argued would “effectively redraw [and expand] the downtown boundary,” with little benefit for the city’s most transit dependent. The repeated delays in extending the Red Line south of 95th Street into some of Chicago’s least prosperous neighborhoods suggest that there is no political will to invest outside of the wealthiest areas. Farmer’s argument is revealing of the one of the peculiarities of transit promotion: Those who engage in it simultaneously argue for the social welfare benefits of providing affordable mobility for as many people as possible while also suggesting that good public transportation can play an essential role in city-building — essentially for the elite. After all, one of the primary arguments made for investing in new transit capital projects is that their long-term benefits include raising the property values of the land parcels near stations. This creates an uneasy pro-transit coalition in many places where development and real estate interests align their lobbying with that of representatives of the poor to argue for the construction of new transit lines (usually rail), under the assumption that projects will benefit each group. This produces an identity crisis for transit. For whom is it developed? Can its social mobility goals be reconciled with the interests of capitalists in the urban space? Identifying the value of a transportation project is an essential element of the planning process, so asking these questions is essential, since there are limited resources. When it comes to transit, this seems particularly relevant, since most funds invested in bus or rail projects are provided by the public sector. Ultimately, this means that the promotion of almost every transit project is defined by political ideology. Do we invest our funds in a project to connect downtown with the airport, under the assumption that economic benefits will flow down from the top, as conservatives might suggest? Is spending government money on ensuring the efficient transportation of the elite effective because it grows the economy as a whole and eventually aids the poor? Or should public dollars be reserved for redistributive causes, focusing on the needs of those who are least able to provide for themselves? Of course there are many examples in which these questions appear to have been resolved. Even in Chicago, it would be difficult to argue that the subway and elevated lines that run into to the Loop are unhelpful for the poor, since many of the city’s greatest resources even for the impoverished are located in Farmer’s “downtown showcase zone.” Nonetheless, ponder this question next time a transit project is proposed: For whom is it being built, and why?

#### Status Quo transportation systems are neoliberal because of the focus on profit maximization and the market. This causes racism and social exclusion

Farmer 11

Farmer Sociology Dep’t Roosevelt University 2011 Stephanie Uneven public transportation development in neoliberalizing Chicago, USA Environment and Planning <http://envplan.com/epa/fulltext/a43/a43409.pdf>, KB

Contemporary urbanization processes are strongly shaped by the logic and policies of neoliberalism. Neoliberal ideology advocates the extension of market-based principles in the arena of the state in order to `liberate' both public services from so-called `state inefficiencies' and capital `squandered' by taxation that could be more profitability deployed by private actors. Accordingly, neoliberal regulatory frameworks promote market discipline over the state, usually achieved by such policy mechanisms as lowering taxes on businesses and the wealthy, shrinking or dismantling public services, and subjecting public services to the logic of markets through public - private partnerships or outright privatization. The creative-destructive processes of neoliberal state strategy reconfigure the territorial organization of accumulation, and consequently produce new forms of uneven geographic development.

The literature on neoliberal urbanization establishes the broader processes of political, economic, and social restructuring and rescaling in response to declining profitability of the Fordist accumulation regime (Brenner and Theodore, 2002; Peck and Tickell, 2002). The roll-back of Fordist regulatory configurations and the roll-out of neoliberalization transformed the sociospatial hierarchy of regulatory frameworks with the nation-state as the center of state regulation to a more multiscalar regulatory framework articulated by the interactions of global, national, and local scales (Brenner and Theodore, 2002). Cities emerged as crucial sites of neoliberalization and institutional restructuring. In the United States, neoliberal policies restructured Fordist forms of territorial organization by devolving the relatively centralized, managerial -redistributive system of urban planning and financing at the federal level to subregional states and municipalities (Eisinger, 1998; Harvey, 1989). Thus localities were forced to finance local infrastructure, transit, housing, and other forms of collective consumption on their own or abandon them altogether. By starving cities of revenues, neoliberal state restructuring rendered states and municipalities more dependent upon locally generated tax revenues as well as intensifying intercity competition (Harvey, 1989).

Cities starved by neoliberal state restructuring responded to their fiscal troubles by adopting entrepreneurial norms, practices, and institutional frameworks. Entre-preneurial municipal governments prioritize policies that create a good business climate and competitive advantages for businesses (Harvey, 1989; Smith, 2002) by “reconstituting social welfare provisions as anticompetitive costs'', and by implementing ``an extremely narrow urban policy repertoire based on capital subsidies, place promotion, supply side intervention, central-city makeovers and local boosterism'' (Peck and Tickell, 2002, pages 47 ^ 48). In effect, neoliberal urbanization encourages local governments to retreat from social redistribution and integrated social welfare policies in favor of bolstering business activity (Brenner and Theodore, 2002; Peck and Tickell, 2002; Swyngedouw et al, 2002). As a consequence, entrepreneurial mayors emerged in the 1980s to forge alliances between government and business leaders (what I refer to as the `global city growth machine') under the banner of urban revitalization (Judd and Simpson, 2003). City space is mobilized ``as an arena both for market-oriented economic growth and for elite consumption practices'' (Brenner and Theodore, 2002, page 21). The abandonment of Fordist planning, privileging a more integrated urban form in favor of selective investment in privileged places, has resulted in what scholars have variously deemed as a fragmented, polarized, splintered, or quartered urbanity (Graham and Marvin, 2001; Marcuse and van Kempen, 2000; Sassen 1991; Swyngedouw et al, 2002). The business-friendly policies and practices pursued by entrepreneurial urban governments must also be understood in relation to the global reorganization of production. Global cities emerged as the command and control nodes of the global economy, where multinational headquarters, producer services, and FIRE (finance, insurance, and real estate) firms cluster (Sassen, 1991). To lure multinational corporate headquarters, producer services, professional ^ managerial workers, and tourists to their city, municipal governments recreate urban space by prioritizing megaprojects and infrastructure that help businesses gain competitive advantages and keep them connected within global networks as well as providing financing and amenities for gentrification, tourism, and cultural consumption (Brenner and Theodore, 2002; Fainstein, 2008; Graham and Marvin, 2001; Peck and Tickell, 2002; Swyngedouw et al, 2002). These urban development strategies are ideologically and discursively legitimized by the global city growth machine as necessary for `global city' or `world-class city' formation (McGuirk, 2004; Wilson, 2004).

Public transportation policy is one dimension of spatial restructuring deployed by entrepreneurial governments to create place-based competitive advantages for global capital. Transportation represents a fixed, place-based geographic element where the local and the global interact; where global processes shape local geographies and where local politics shape global networks. As Keil and Young (2008) suggest, transportation should now be considered in relation to globalized trade and economic networks and consumption-oriented patterns of everyday life. Growth demands in cities experiencing gentrification, the development of luxury consumption spaces, and a surge of tourism have placed pressure on local agencies to expand airports, roads, and rail and public transit capacities. Large-scale urban redevelopment plans have made a comeback as city planners conceive of megaprojects that concentrate new public transit investment in the revalorized core (Fainstein, 2008; Keil and Young, 2008; Swyngedouw et al, 2002).

Air transportation has become the leading form of global connectivity, influencing the decisions of global, national, and regional elites to create air-transportation infrastructure (Cidell, 2006; Erie, 2004; Keil and Young, 2008; Phang, 2007). For instance, there is a growing network of world-class cities (Shanghai, London, and Tokyo) that enables air travelers to connect seamlessly from one global city core to the next, with direct express train service from the downtown business core to the city's international airports (Graham and Marvin, 2001). These specialized public transit systems more closely integrate a city into global markets, thereby making the city more attractive for business activities (Brenner and Theodore, 2002; Graham, 2000). The resulting “premium network spaces'' are ``geared to the logistical and exchange demands of foreign direct investors, tourist spaces or socioeconomically affluent groups'' (Graham and Marvin, 2001, page 100). Interactions with the surrounding residential districts are carefully managed by filtering `proper' users through nonstop services or prohibitively expensive fares. In addition, premium transport services tend to be bundled with upscale shopping centers, entertainment spectacles, hotels, or office spaces to form a giant, integrated bubble of luxury. Subsequently, sociospatial relations are reconfigured as premium infrastructure bypasses devalorized places and exclude economically disadvantaged users from accessing the transit service. The neoliberal trend towards premium public transportation deployed for the purposes of constructing competitive advantages in the global capitalist system privileges profit making for capital, or exchange-value purposes, and not necessarily for everyday use, or use-value purposes (Keil and Young, 2008; Logan and Molotch, 1987).

## A2: We solve (Piecemeal)

### Root Cause – Urban Sprawl

#### Capitalism is the root cause of sprawl

B.B. 95 (author for the Socialist Labor Party publication “The People”, “Away with the garbage of capitalism!”, <http://www.deleonism.org/text/95061002.htm>)

When Karl Marx and Frederick Engels called for the end to the conflict between town and country, between the antagonisms of rural and city life, they were referring to a historical process set on foot with the advent of private property and the growth of class-ruled societies. Although these arose as the necessary development of the productive forces of society, they have become a monumental hindrance to human development, just as has capitalism. Marx and Engels perceived enormous squandering of society's resources, a fact that caused Engels to observe: "When one observes how here in London alone a greater quantity of manure than is produced by the whole kingdom of Saxony is poured away every day into the sea with an expenditure of enormous sums, and what colossal structures are necessary in order to prevent this manure from poisoning the whole of London, then the utopia of abolishing the distinction between town and country is given a remarkably practical basis." (THE HOUSING QUESTION.) Marx's and Engels' perspective was consonant with the thinking of the most advanced scientists of their day such as Justus von Liebig (1803-1873), who in his writings on the chemistry of agriculture, in which his first demand was that humanity shall give back to the land what it receives from it, and in which he proves that only the existence of the towns, and in particular the big towns, prevents this. Indeed, if one were to seek that form of class-ruled society that most effectively squanders and devours resources, one need go no further than capitalism's urban agglomerations. Contrariwise, if one were to discover that system of human habitation most conserving of natural resources, socialism would be that form. Consider satellite photographs of the planet Earth at night. The entire globe is laced with glowing agglomerations -- of illuminated cities, from pole to pole. The purpose? Illuminating uninhabited buildings and vacant streets, except for stray cats and vermin. This is but one aspect of urban sprawl and real estate anarchy. The energy consumed to keep lights fruitlessly glowing is immeasurable and totally irrational. It comprises light pollution. Urban sprawl is an organic component of capitalism driven by the mechanization of agriculture and the exodus of large populations from the countryside. In the process, productive farmland is despoiled as housing and commercial development surges into the countryside surrounding historical towns. The market stimulus such development induces is a part of the massive waste-stimulating growth in appliances, building components, steel, wood, concrete and a myriad of other commodities, not the least of which is automobile production.

#### Capitalism causes sprawl and environmental destruction

Gonzalez 6 (George, assc prof of political science @ uni of Miami, “An Eco-Marxist Analysis of Oil Depletion via Urban Sprawl Eco-Marxist Analysis of Oil Depletion via Urban Sprawl”, <http://i06.cgpublisher.com/proposals/421/index_html>)

The U.S. urban zones are the most sprawled in the world. Because of spiking oil prices and the contribution of urban sprawl to the global warming or climate change phenomenon, urban sprawl in the U.S. has been garnering increased attention. Urban sprawl can only be fully comprehended within the political economy framework developed by Karl Marx. Marx's concepts of value and rent are indispensable to understanding the profligate use of fossil fuels vis-à-vis urban sprawl that has significantly contributed to oil depletion and to the recent global warming trend. This argument is consistent with the Eco-Marxist contention that within the writings of Marx and Frederick Engels inhere a thorough ecological critique of capitalism. Urban sprawl was deployed in the U.S. during the 1930s as the means to revive U.S. capitalism from the Great Depression. The sprawling of urban zones greatly increased the need for automobiles and other consumer durables. This use of urban sprawl to increase economic demand is consistent with Marx's argument that demand within capitalism is malleable and is geared toward increasing the consumption of goods and services produced through social labor. The exploitation of social labor is the basis of capitalist wealth. The development of pro-urban sprawl policies in the U.S. is also consistent with the business dominance view of public policy formulation. Those that hold this view of the policymaking process contend that economic elites and producer groups are at the center of public policy formation.

### Root Cause – Spatial Inequality

#### Capitalism is a precondition for spatial inequality

Clark 80 (Gordon L., assistant prof of urban and regional planning at Harvard, “capitalism and regional inequality,” jstor)

CONVENTIONAL analysis, as epitomized by Borts and Stein, suggests that regional inequalities in capitalism are the result of tem- porary market failures.' According to this no- tion, inefficient capital and labor markets are a major barrier to maximum growth and the efficient spatial allocation of resources. In the long run, however, the issue is beyond doubt: as the aggregate economy matures regional disparities should inevitably decline. Radicals have often challenged this claim and have ar- gued that regional economic disparities are in- evitable in capitalism.2 Some marxists have suggested that inequality, spatial or otherwise, is a necessary condition for the perpetuation or reproduction of the capitalist system as a whole.3 According to this view, regional un- employment disparities, for example, have a positive role to play in maintaining the class divisions and the property rights of capitalists, continued capital accumulation, and the gen- eration and expropriation of surplus value. The "necessity of inequality" argument is probably the strongest claim made by radicals concerning the relationship of regional in- equalities to capitalism. Harvey argued that the accumulation and reproduction process depends upon three conditions:4 1) the existence of a surplus of labor-an industrial reserve army which can feed the expansion of production; 2) the existence in the market place of req- uisite quantities of, or opportunities to obtain, means of production; and 3) the existence of a market to absorb the increasing quantities of commodities produced. In essence, depressed regions are presumed to be dependent colonies providing reserves of labor, capital, and markets for exploitation by the core economy. The industrial reserve army and the process of reproduction has thus a specific spatial character which inevitably involves uneven regional development. Ex- ploitation of peripheral regions according to this marxian model of inequality requires a coordinating mechanism. In marxist terms, the agent best placed to undertake this coor- dinating role, in the interests of capital, is the state.5

### Root Cause – Automobility

#### Capitalism is the root cause of America’s car culture – the elites control choices regarding transportation and mobility

Furness 11 (Zack Furness, Assistant Professor of Cultural Studies in the Department of Humanities, History and Social Sciences at Columbia College Chicago, One Less Car: Bicycling and the Politics of Automobility, 2011, pgs. 7-8)

The historical transformation of the United States into a full-blown car culture is commonly, though somewhat erroneously, attributed to choice or desire, as if the aggregation of individual consumer choices and yearnings necessarily built the roads, lobbied the government, zoned the real estate, silenced the critics, subsidized auto makers, underfunded public transit, and passed the necessary laws to oversee all facets of these projects since the 1890s. One of the primary stories used to bolster this broad-based claim is that of America’s love affair with the automobile—a common trope in U.S. popular culture that colors our understanding of transportation history and also buttresses some of the most partisan arguments posed by the car’s vigorous defenders.27 It is unquestionable that many Americans do, in fact, love their cars and cling to the myth of “The Road” with the zeal of Madison Avenue and Jack Kerouac combined. However, the fidelity of the narrative is almost irrelevant when considering how it is put to use and for whom it is made to work. That is to say, while the love affair serves a variety of social and cultural functions in the United States, it is particularly compelling to a relatively small group of freemarket ideologues and multinational corporations (particularly oil conglomerates) who largely govern and/or profit from the production, marketing, sales, and regulation of the automobile. Indeed, the love story satisfies two of the most cherished myths of free-market capitalism concurrently: it corroborates the idea that consumer choices equal authentic power (i.e., people vote with their wallets), and it normalizes the false notion that consumer desires ultimately determine the so-called evolution of technologies—a position that ignores the profound roles that material and cultural infrastructures play in the success of any technology, much less the development of technological norms. Such explanations not only are misleading; they also effectively downplay some of the most undemocratic and thoroughly racist decision-making processes at the heart of postwar urban development and transportation policy implementation in the United States, as well as the political influence historically wielded by what could easily be termed an automobile-industrial complex.28 This is not to suggest that power is always exerted from the top down, nor to imply that the average person plays no role in the production or contestation of technological and cultural norms. Rather, it is simply a way of acknowledging that **technological desires and choices, particularly those concerning transportation and mobility, are necessarily constrained by the profit imperatives of very specific and very powerful institutions and organizations**. These interconnections partly constitute what John Urry calls the “system of automobility”: the assemblages of socioeconomic, material, technological, and ideological power that not only facilitate and accelerate automobile travel but also help to reproduce and ultimately normalize the cultural conditions in which the automobile is seen, and made to be seen, as a technological savior, a powerful status symbol, and a producer of both “modern” subjectivities and “civilized” peoples.29

#### Neoliberal interests mask the underlying market ideology that justifies automobility with the myth of the “open road”

Talsma 10 (Matthew Wietse Talsma, Department of Geography and Planning University of Toronto, Technologies of the City and Technologies of the Self: Lessons from the Road, http://cct335-w11.wikispaces.com/file/view/Driver's+Ed+and+technologies+of+the+self.pdf)

Furthermore, the problematic introduced when we acknowledge the necessary and significant action undertaken by the state in ordering and maintaining social-economic conditions, ceases to matter under a neoliberal regime. Although neoliberalism continues to employ the rhetoric of government non-interventionism championed by early liberalism, neoliberalism does not hide its interests and actions in supporting the market. With neoliberalism, not only is the maintenance of a ‘properly’ functioning market a primary concern of the state, but the economic rationale of the market is extended into all spheres, including that of the state. The state is controlled and shaped by the market (Brown, 2005). State action is determined through an economic calculus, and intervention can only be justified when it serves market ends (Lemke, 2001;Brown, 2005). It is possible to link this same rationality to the justification of state involvement in the production, maintenance and securitization of automobility, especially since automobility fits so snugly into an economic calculus. Furthermore, although neoliberal discourse creates the perception of a shift in the governance role of the state onto its citizens, in practice we observe not only a retention (and even expansion) of the traditional state apparatus, but the state also adopts new, indirect mechanisms of guidance and control (Lemke, 2001). Neoliberalism controls indirectly through the discursive construction of a responsible citizen-subject whose moral compass corresponds with the characteristics of the rational economic actor. To achieve success, the individual is encouraged to adopt a pattern of economically rational decision-making that extends into all other spheres of personal and social life. The demands of the entrepreneurial lifestyle operate to discipline the subject through a set of internal, self-regulating mechanisms that govern his or her behaviour and actions. In this way the individual is governed through their freedom (Rose, 1996). In many ways automobility operates on a similar level. The discursive construct of automobility promises us absolute freedom and autonomy. We can refute this with the simple observation that most time spent in a car is time spent in traffic. But more importantly, the discourse of the ‘freedom of the road’ obscures the extensive and intrusive presence of the state in regulating and controlling people and their movement.

### Root Cause – Poverty/Inequality

#### Capitalism intends to create inequality – it is an economy of death

Marsh 95 (James L., Professor of Philosophy at Fordham University, Critique, Action, and Liberation p. 271-272)

At the stage of relative surplus value, capitalism, because the investment in human beings decreases proportionally to that in technology and science, tends to produce a surplus population. Marx states the general law of capitalist accumulation as follows: "the greater the social wealth, functioning capital, the extent and energy of its growth, and therefore also the greater mass of the proletariat and productivity of its labor, the greater is the industrial reserve army." Capitalism structurally produces unemployment, poverty, homelessness. hunger, and so on. These are the effects of the original relationship of domination in the workplace, in which the worker is hired not for her own self-satisfaction and profit, but for the capitalist's. From this relationship all bad things follow. Capital is a Moloch on whose altar the poor and oppressed are sacrificed. Capitalism, then, structurally produces poverty. In a certain structural sense, capitalism intends to produce poverty. When the laborer is confronting the capitalist face-to-face with only her own labor power to sell, she is already denuded of wealth, divorced from land and means of production, not having the wherewithal to buy means of subsistence. During the process of further capitalist accumulation and circulation, she is further impoverished by being deprived of the surplus value she has produced and by being de-skilled as the mental control and direction of the work passes to the capitalist manager and machine. Finally, as we have seen, because of the relatively greater investment in means of production compared to labor, the industrial reserve army forms. Poverty of the worker is prior to. contemporaneous with, and consequent to the labor-capital encounter. Such marginalization. in which people are dropped by the wayside of the system as useless or superfluous, is perhaps a fourth, distinct kind of injustice, in addition to exploitation, tyranny and colonization. Contrary to what Habermas says, therefore, the face-to-face confrontation of the laborer with the capitalist is an ethical one in the life-world, grounding or founding the systemic aspects of capitalism and the colonization of life-world by system. Prior to colonization and founding it are exploitation and domination. When Marx refers to the rate of surplus value, the proportion of unpaid to paid labor time, as the rate of exploitation, he is referring to this ethical relationship. When he speaks of the movement from formal to real subsumption culminating in the process of extracting relative surplus value, he is speaking of the same relation. Formal subsumption. in which the laborer is gathered in the capitalist workplace to produce surplus value in a situation allowing the worker some control and direction of the work, is replaced by real subsumption. in which the worker is subordinated to a scientifically and technologically regimented workplace. The worker becomes an appendage of the machine. As capitalism develops more and comes more into its own. labor is devalued more and more, deprived, de-skilled. and impoverished. The increasing life and wealth of capital is the increasing death and poverty of the worker. Capitalism is an economy of death, of which militarism, nuclearism. and the warfare-welfare state are only the most recent examples.

#### Even if they win capitalism benefits some, it keeps five-sixths of humanity in povery

DeSoto 2k (Hernando, president of the institute for liberty and democracy, “The Mystery of Capital: why capitalism triumphs in the West and fails everywhere else” Pg. 5-8 JF)

In this book I intend to demonstrate that the major stumbling block that keeps the rest of the world from benefitting from capitalism is its inability to produce capital. Capital is the force that raises the productivity of labor and creates the wealth of nations. It is the lifeblood of the capitalist system, the foundation of progress, and the one thing that the poor countries of the world cannot seem to produce for themselves, no matter how eagerly their people engage in all the other activities that characterize a capitalist economy. I will also show, with the help of facts and figures that my research team and I have collected, block by block and farm by farm in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America, that most of the poor already possess the assets they need to make a success of capitalism. Even in the poorest countries, the poor save. The value of savings among the poor is, in fact, immense—forty times all the foreign aid received throughout the world since 1945. In Egypt, for instance, the wealth that the poor have accumulated is worth fifty-five times as much as the sum of all direct foreign investment ever recorded there, including the Suez Canal and the Aswan Dam. In Haiti, the poorest nation in Latin America, the total assets of the poor are more than one hundred fifty times greater than all foreign investment received since Haiti’s independence from France in 1804. If the United States were to hike its foreign-aid budget to the level recommended by the United Nations—0.7 percent of national income—it would take the richest country on earth more than 150 years to transfer the world’s poor resources equal to those they already possess. But they hold these resources in defective forms: houses built on whose ownership rights are not adequately recorded, unincorporated business with undefined liability, industries located where financiers and investors cannot see them. Because the rights to these possessions are not adequately documented, these assets cannot readily be turned into capital, cannot be traded outside of narrow local circles where people know and trust each other, cannot be used as collateral for a loan, and cannot be used as a share against an investment. In the West, by contrast, every parcel of land, every building, every piece of equipment, or store of inventories is represented in a property document that is the visible sign of a vast hidden process that connects all these assets to the rest of the economy. Thanks to this representational process, assets can lead an invisible, parallel life alongside their material existence. They can be used as collateral for credit. The single most important source of funds for new businesses in the United States is a mortgage on the entrepreneur’s house. These assets can also provide a link to the owner’s credit history, an accountable address for the collection of debt and taxes, the basis for the creation of reliable and universal public utilities, and a foundation for the creation of securities (like mortgage-backed bonds) that can then be rediscounted and sod in secondary markets. By this process the West injects life into assets and makes them generate capital. Third world and former communist nations do not have this representational process. As a result, most of them are undercapitalized, in the same way that a firm is undercapitalized when it issues fewer securities than its income and assets would justify. The enterprises of the poor are very much like corporations that cannot issue shares or bonds to obtain new investment and finance. Without representations, their assets are dead capital. The poor inhabitants of these nations—five-sixths of humanity—do have things, but they lack the process to represent their property and create capital. They have houses but not titles; crops but not deeds; business but not statutes of incorporation. It is the unavailability of these essential representations that explains why people who have adapted every other Western invention, from the paper clip to the nuclear reactor, have not been able to produce sufficient capital to make their domestic capitalism work. This is the mystery of capital. Solving it requires an understanding of why Westerners, by representing assets with titles, are able to see and draw out capital from them. One of the greatest challenges to the human mind is to comprehend and to gain access to those things we know exist but cannot see. Not everything that is real and useful is tangible and visible. Time, for example, is real, but it can only be efficiently managed when it is represented by a clock or a calendar. Throughout history, human beings have invented representational systems—writing, musical notation, double-entry bookkeeping—to grasp with the mind what human hands could never touch. In the same way, the great practitioners of capitalism, from the creators of integrated title systems and corporate stock to Michael Milken, were able to reveal and extract capital where others saw only junk by devising new ways to represent the invisible potential that is locked up in the assets we accumulate. The absence of this process in the poorer regions of the world—where two-thirds of humanity lives—is not the consequence of some Western monopolistic conspiracy. It is rather that Westerners take the mechanism so completely for granted that they have lost all awareness of its existence. Although it is huge, nobody sees it, including the Americans, Europeans, and Japanese who owe all their wealth to their ability to use it. It is an implicit legal infrastructure hidden deep within their property systems—of which ownership is but the tip of the iceberg. The rest of the iceberg is an intricate man-made process that can transform assets and labor into capital. This process was not created from a blue-print and is not described in a glossy brochure. Its origins are obscure and its significance buried in the economic subconscious of Western capitalist nations.

#### Capitalism causes countless deaths of the poor

Herod 7 (James, Columbia U graduate and political activist, “Getting Free” Pg. 8-9 JF)

Beyond these two basic awarenesses, there is the recognition of the linkages between our many miseries and the wage slave system. This knowledge is more difficult to acquire, mainly because capitalists, and their public relations people, take such pains to blame the sufferings of the world on anything and everything other than their own practices. If there is starvation in Bangladesh, it’s because there are too many people and not because agricultural self-sufficiency has been destroyed by capitalist world markets. If the oceans are dying from oil tanker flushes, this is a shame, but it’s really no one’s fault; it’s just the price we must pay for progress and civilization. If millions are living in abject poverty in the shantytowns of third world cities, there is nothing unusual about this; it’s just part of the worldwide process of urbanization they never mention that governments and corporations have seized the peasants’ lands, forcing them to leave their homes. If cities are filling up with the homeless, it’s because these people are lazy and won’t look for work, and not because there aren't enough jobs for everyone and rents are sky-high. The list of such subterfuges is endless. The truth is that most of the suffering in the world now is directly attributable to capitalists. If it were not for capitalists, most of the illness in the world could be eliminated, as well as most of the hunger, ignorance, homelessness, environmental destruction, congestion, warfare, crime, insecurity, waste, boredom, loneliness, and so forth. Even much of the suffering caused by hurricanes, floods, droughts, and earthquakes can be laid at the feet of capitalists because capitalists prevent us from preparing for and responding to these disasters as a community, in an intelligent way. And recently, capitalists are to blame for the increased severity of some of these events due to global warming, which capitalists have caused. Unless you’re already convinced, I know you’re not going to believe these bald claims. But others have documented the linkages between these various evils and the profit system, if you wish to study their works.

### Root Cause – Racism

#### Capitalism forms the foundation of racism

Taylor 11 (Keeanga-Yamahtta, doctoral candidate in the department of African American Studies at Northwestern U, Jan 4, wwww.socialistworker.org/2011/01/04/race-class-and-marxism)

Marxists argue that capitalism is a system that is based on the exploitation of the many by the few. Because it is a system based on gross inequality, it requires various tools to divide the majority--racism and all oppressions under capitalism serve this purpose. Moreover, oppression is used to justify and "explain" unequal relationships in society that enrich the minority that live off the majority's labor. Thus, racism developed initially to explain and justify the enslavement of Africans--because they were less than human and undeserving of liberty and freedom. Everyone accepts the idea that the oppression of slaves was rooted in the class relations of exploitation under that system. Fewer recognize that under capitalism, wage slavery is the pivot around which all other inequalities and oppressions turn. Capitalism used racism to justify plunder, conquest and slavery, but as Karl Marx pointed out, it also used racism to divide and rule--to pit one section of the working class against another and thereby blunt class consciousness. To claim, as Marxists do, that racism is a product of capitalism is not to deny or diminish its importance or impact in American society. It is simply to explain its origins and the reasons for its perpetuation. Many on the left today talk about class as if it is one of many oppressions, often describing it as "classism." What people are really referring to as "classism" is elitism or snobbery, and not the fundamental organization of society under capitalism. Moreover, it is popular today to talk about various oppressions, including class, as intersecting. While it is true that oppressions can reinforce and compound each other, they are born out of the material relations shaped by capitalism and the economic exploitation that is at the heart of capitalist society. In other words, it is the material and economic structure of society that gave rise to a range of ideas and ideologies to justify, explain and help perpetuate that order. In the United States, racism is the most important of those ideologies.

#### It’s reverse causal – must eradicate capitalism before we can fight racism

Young 6 (Robert, Red Critique, Winter/Spring, “Putting Materialism back into Race Theory”, http://www.redcritique.org/WinterSpring2006/puttingmaterialismbackintoracetheory.htm)

This essay advances a materialist theory of race. In my view, race oppression dialectically intersects with the exploitative logic of advanced capitalism, a regime which deploys race in the interest of surplus accumulation. Thus, race operates at the (economic) base and therefore produces cultural and ideological effects at the superstructure; in turn, these effects—in very historically specific way—interact with and ideologically justify the operations at the economic base [1]. In a sense then, race encodes the totality of contemporary capitalist social relations, which is why race cuts across a range of seemingly disparate social sites in contemporary US society. For instance, one can mark race difference and its discriminatory effects in such diverse sites as health care, housing/real estate, education, law, job market, and many other social sites. However, unlike many commentators who engage race matters, I do not isolate these social sites and view race as a local problem, which would lead to reformist measures along the lines of either legal reform or a cultural-ideological battle to win the hearts and minds of people and thus keep the existing socio-economic arrangements intact; instead, I foreground the relationality of these sites within the exchange mechanism of multinational capitalism. Consequently, I believe, the eradication of race oppression also requires a totalizing political project: the transformation of existing capitalism—a system which produces difference (the racial/gender division of labor) and accompanying ideological narratives that justify the resulting social inequality. Hence, my project articulates a transformative theory of race—a theory that reclaims revolutionary class politics in the interests of contributing toward a post-racist society. In other words, the transformation from actually existing capitalism into socialism constitutes the condition of possibility for a post-racist society—a society free from racial and all other forms of oppression. By freedom, I do not simply mean a legal or cultural articulation of individual rights as proposed by bourgeois race theorists. Instead, I theorize freedom as a material effect of emancipated economic forms. I foreground my (materialist) understanding of race as a way to contest contemporary accounts of race, which erase any determinate connection to economics. For instance, humanism and poststructuralism represent two dominant views on race in the contemporary academy. Even though they articulate very different theoretical positions, they produce similar ideological effects: the suppression of economics. They collude in redirecting attention away from the logic of capitalist exploitation and point us to the cultural questions of sameness (humanism) or difference (poststructuralism). In developing my project, I critique the ideological assumptions of some exemplary instances of humanist and poststructuralist accounts of race, especially those accounts that also attempt to displace Marxism, and, in doing so, I foreground the historically determinate link between race and exploitation. It is this link that forms the core of what I am calling a transformative theory of race. The transformation of race from a sign of exploitation to one of democratic multiculturalism, ultimately, requires the transformation of capitalism.

# Elections

# Topicality

### 1NC T-Infrastructure≠Vehicles

#### A. Interpretation – Infrastructure is fixed, permanent equipment

GAO 98

(U.S. General Accounting Office (“Best Practices: Elements Critical to Successfully Reducing Unneeded RDT&E Infrastructure: Report to Congressional Requesters,” GAO Website, Jan. 1998, http://www.gao.gov/assets/160/156058.pdf)

DoD generally defines infrastructure as “all fixed and permanent, installations, fabrications, or facilities for the support and control of military forces." It consists of mission supporting property, plant, equipment, and personnel, including contractor manpower, DoD excludes the equipment and personnel necessary to perform directly critical technical and acquisition functions, DoE defines infrastructure as "all real property and installed equipment and personal property that is not solely supporting a single program mission." NASA defines infrastructure as “the supporting a single program mission." NASA defines infrastructure as “the underlying foundation for NASA operations, including its people, facilities, equipment, business systems, institutional information systems, and technical infrastructure." Facilities are the land, buildings, structures, permanently located trailers, and other real property improvements, including utility systems and collateral equipment that essentially is integrated into the facility. Business systems are business processes and business tools. Institutional information systems include NASA computers, networks, and general purpose application software. Technical infrastructure includes mission/project/technology/science implementation tools and processes, such as equipment and instrumentation, processes and procedures, and software tools.

#### B. Violation – the affirmative increases investment in vehicles – they’re distinct

CFST 06

(Campaign for Sensible Transportation, collection of organizations for better transportation in the Santa Cruz area (“Aboard Transportation”, 2006, http://www.cfst.org/transportation.html)/

Transportation or transport is the carrying of people and goods from one destination to another. The term comes from the Latin trans meaning “across” and *portare* meaning “to carry”. Transportation can be divided into three distinct fields:

1. Infrastructure - When we refer to infrastructure it includes our transport networks such as roads, railways, airways, canals, and pipeline. This also includes the terminals or nodes such as airports, railway stations, bus stations, and seaports.

2. Vehicle – These comprises of the vehicles that we regularly ride in the networks for instance automobiles (buses, cars, taxis, and etc.), trains and airplanes.

3. Operations – They are the control of the whole transport system including traffic lights/signals on roads, ramp meters, railroad switches, air traffic control, and etc.

#### C. Voting Issue

**1. Predictable Limits – they explode the topic – there are thousands of individual vehicle models and designs that we can’t prepare for**

**2. Topic education – unfair neg research burden ensures that every 2nr is a generic spending or politics round –**

**3. Grammatical Precision – forgetting about the word “infrastructure” when writing your aff means we prepare for drastically different interpretations of the topic – the impact is clash**

### 2nc Infrastructure = Stationary Facilities

#### Infrastructure must be physical facilities

Crockatt and Ogston 12

 (Crockatt and Ogston, Vice-President of Business Development and Marketing @ Ottawa International Airport, \*\*Faculty of Science student advisors @ University of Manitoba (Michael A. and Jill, “Airport Infrastructure as an Instrument for Regional Economic Development,” University of Winnipeg Prairie Perspectives, 3-16-12, http://pcag.uwinnipeg.ca/Prairie-Perspectives/PP-Vol03/Crockatt-Ogston.pdf)

The Infrastructure Technology Institute of Northwestern University defines infrastructure as the sum of the physical facilities that move people, goods, commodities, water, waste, energy and information. The main and most basic purpose of infrastructure is to “provide the basis for people and business to access goods, services and activities.” (Department of Transport, Western Australia 1999 p.3) Infrastructure includes: bridges, canals, railways, wires, cables. pipelines, roads, treatment plants, traffic signals, street lights and most importantly for this paper, airports. According to this definition, airports themselves are considered infrastructure. However, there are a number of smaller components that make up the total that is considered “airport infrastructure.” The following is a comprehensive list of airport infrastructure: runways, taxiways, aprons, terminal buildings, cargo buildings, maintenance buildings, administrative buildings, roadways, curb frontages, rental car areas, transit areas, taxi areas, limousine areas, fuelling systems, power systems, rescue units, air traffic control facilities, lighting, navigational aids, boarding devices, communications systems, security systems, parking lots, graphics, signage, landscaping, drainage, water supply, and sewer disposal. For the purposes of this paper, of prime concern are the actual airfield facilities and the access facilities. The airfield facilities include runways, aprons, taxiways and main buildings, such as the passenger terminal and cargo buildings. The access facilities are primarily the roadways (and rail lines, where applicable) that lead into the airport terminal and cargo areas. These two components of airport infrastructure are most important in terms of regional economic development. To a lesser extent, this paper also considers municipal infrastructure, such as water and sewer service.

### 2nc Infrastructure≠Vehicles

#### Transportation infrastructure is facilities – that’s distinct from vehicles

Rietveld 94

(Rietveld, professor in transport economics at the Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, and a fellow at the Tinbergen Institute (Piet, Spatial Economic Impacts of Transport Infrastructure Supply, 7/94, Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice Volume 28, Issue 4, Pages 329–341)

As a definition for transport infrastructure we use those immovable capital goods for transport which are characterized by a considerable degree of economies of scale so that it is usually supplied as a collective input into production. As a consequence, the government has a high degree of control on the level of supply, price, and/or quality. Transport infrastructure includes facilities such as railway lines, railway stations, highways, canals, seaports, and airports. As indicated in Table l, transport infrastructure investments have both temporary and nontemporary effects on the economy. A major temporary effect concerns the stimulation of employment and income during the construction phase via the demand side.

#### Infrastructure is distinct from the vehicles that use it

Utt, 11

(Ronald D. Utt, Ph.D., is Herbert and Joyce Morgan Senior Research Fellow in the Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation (“Using Market Processes to Reform Government Transportation Programs: Report No. 1,” 6/6, [http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/using-market-processes-to-reform-government-transportation-programs-report-no-1)](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/06/using-market-processes-to-reform-government-transportation-programs-report-no-1%29//DH)

Public v. Private Ownership Today the nation’s transportation system is a mix of public and private responsibilities. In general, the private sector builds, owns, and operates the rolling stock (cars, trucks, and trains) and airplanes, while the public sector builds, owns, and operates the infrastructure—notably, nearly all of the roads as well as nearly all airports and the air traffic control system. The only exceptions to this are the privately owned freight railroads, which own and operate both their rolling stock and infrastructure (and consistently runs at a profit and pays taxes), and the federally controlled Amtrak, which owns its rolling stock and some of its infrastructure (and consistently runs at a loss and absorbs taxes).

### 2nc AT: W/M – Transportation

#### Transportation is limited to stationary facilities too

TLC 2004

(Transportation Learning Center, non-profit organization that aims to improve public transportation in communities (“Transportation Industry Environmental Scan,” a report to the US Department of Labor, April 15, 2004, <http://transportcenter.org/images/uploads/TransportationEnvironmentalScan.pdf>, page 1, available via Google)

The 2002 North American Industry Classification (NAICS) Manual identifies the transportation and warehousing industry as including establishments that provide transportation of passengers and cargo, warehousing and storage for goods, scenic and sightseeing transportation, and support activities related to modes of transportation.

### 2nc: AT 1NC Doesn’t define “TI”

#### Transportation infrastructure excludes vehicles

EEA 10

(European Environment Agency, “Transport infrastructure investments”, 2010,

<http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/indicators/infrastructure-investments>)

The term “transport infrastructure” refers only to infrastructures that are open to the general public. It covers buildings and other constructions as well as machinery and equipment, but it excludes vehicles and rolling stock. Investment expenditure on infrastructure covers expenditure on new construction and extension of existing infrastructure, including reconstruction, renewal and major repairs of infrastructure.

# Poverty

Gentrification turns case – leads to more segregated societies

Farmer (Assistant Professor of Sociology at Roosevelt University) 11

(Stephanie, “Uneven public transportation development in neoliberalizing Chicago, USA.” 01/11/2011. http://envplan.com/epa/fulltext/a43/a43409.pdf.)

Understanding the race-based and class-based disparities of public transportation infrastructure is especially important in light of how global city residential patterns and the neoliberal transformation of public housing interlock with public transportation access to further entrench unequal opportunity the built environment. First, gentrification has become the dominant residential development form of the global city, controlled by global real estate developers and investors and supported by municipal governments (Hackworth, 2007; Smith, 2002). As a successful urban residential development strategy, gentrification hinges on the real and perceived security of affluent residents. One way in which the Central Area is being sanitized of threatening social groups (ie low-income minorities), is through the neoliberal policy of dismantling public housing in the central area. The City of Chicago working with the Chicago Housing Authority (CHA), implemented the Plan for Transformation in 2000 (Chicago Housing Authority, 2000) to transform public housing into mixed-income developments of low-rise apartments, condos, and townhouses. In order to construct low-rise mixed-income developments, the CHA demolished public housing high-rise towers concentrated inside and in the areas adjacent to the Central Area. However, as the public housing towers were demolished, the CHA failed to construct sufficient replacement housing and instead encouraged public housing residents to move into Section 8 housing (the private market) to find replacement housing (Pattillo, 2007). The city's Section 8 waiting list had been closed for nearly a decade, causing many Section 8 voucher holders to seek housing in the south suburbs where Section 8 housing is more readily available (Bennett, 2006). Exacerbating the situation, the newly constructed mixed-income housing allows only a small fraction of public housing residential occupancy in order to achieve the mixed-income balance, necessarily excluding the majority of public housing residents from returning to their former neighborhood. Those not using Section 8 housing tended to move to the margins of the city's private housing market neighborhoods on the West and far South Side thus shifting concentrated poverty outside of the gentrifying Central Area (Pattillo, 2007; Popkin, 2006). Since much of Chicago's public housing is located in the Central Area, the demolition of public housing not only raised property values and freed up more space for development in the adjacent areas but it also successfully sanitized the Central Area of people excluded from the global city vision and labor markets. Together, the revalorization of downtown real estate markets and policies dismantling public housing are creating new residential patterns in Chicago: affordable housing is shifting to the city's periphery and further away from job centers. By shifting low-income African-Americans from the Central Area further west and south, the lines of segregation in Chicago are becoming more spatially diffused, while poverty is being redistributed toward the city's periphery and inner-suburban ring. The `at-risk' inner suburban ring is characterized as having high needs but low and often declining tax bases, and is usually an extension of the ghetto (Dreier et al, 2004). Suburbs that are disproportionately Black are also experiencing devalorization and job loss (Street, 2007). Former public housing residents tend to be more transit dependent than the general population and yet they are precisely the ones who are forced out of the Central Area, the most transit-rich part of the city, to the areas of the city that Mike Evans of the DCP characterized as ``a transit desert''. By being pushed to the geographic margins, poor Blacks are moving to areas of the city that have a declining job base and sparser public transit services to access job centers in the city or more prosperous suburbs, thus exacerbating the jobs ^ housing spatial mismatch. The revalor- ization of the core and the consequent reconfiguration of racial segregation intensifies impoverished African-American, Latino, immigrant, and working-class isolation and marginalization in the global city. Taken together, Chicago's public transportation system and the unfolding trans- formations in Chicago's housing market reveal how neoliberal accumulation is restructuring uneven geographic development and the right to the city for working people and minorities. Chicago's neoliberal public transit and housing projects may improve the exchange value of its Central Area real estate, create place-based advantages to lure highly mobile capital and elevate its global-city status by tying it more closely into global air-transport networks. However, these policies have limited use-value for working-class and minority residents living outside the privileged Central Area who endure a transit system which is unreliable and sluggish for want of access or basic maintenance. I am not suggesting that the Central Area transit projects are without merit: Chicago needs more transit investment, not less. However, the proposed allocation of transit investment in the Central Area reflects the interests of growth-machine elites over and against the interests of the majority of Chicagoans. These trends also demonstrate the changing social role of public transportation in the neoliberal era. Urban public transit in the USA historically served as an instrument aimed at industrial development, mitigating labor costs, and ameliorating inequalities (Grengs, 2004; Weiner, 1999).

#### Plan doesn’t solve – employers discriminate against minorities

Princeton News 05

(Princeton News, 4/1/05, Many New York employers discriminate against minorities, ex-offenders, http://www.princeton.edu/main/news/archive/S11/23/70K64/index.xml?section=newsreleases)

The study, which investigated discrimination against young male minorities and ex-offenders by employers, also showed:¶ • Young white high school graduates were about twice as likely to receive positive responses from New York employers as equally qualified black job seekers;¶ • Ex-offenders face serious barriers to employment; a criminal record reduced positive responses from employers by about 35 percent for white applicants and 57 percent for black applicants.¶ Even without criminal records, however, black applicants had low rates of positive responses, about the same as the response rate for white applicants with criminal records. Hispanics also faced discrimination by employers, but were preferred relative to blacks.¶ "The results of this landmark study are deeply disturbing and highlight the need for strong enforcement of the New York City Human Rights Law," said Patricia Gatling, commissioner of the New York City Commission on Human Rights, which assisted in the study. In New York City it is illegal for employers to discriminate on the basis of race or a criminal record.¶ The researchers presented the results of their study at the Population Association of America's annual meeting in Philadelphia on March 31 and are preparing a paper for submission to an academic journal.¶ "A lot of people are skeptical that African Americans still face discrimination in the job market. But even in a diverse city like New York , the evidence of discrimination is unmistakable," Pager said.¶ Since 1972, the U.S. prison population has increased seven-fold, and that upsurge has affected young black men more than any other group. Research shows that young black men have a 28 percent chance of winding up in prison. About 60 percent of black high school dropouts will go to prison by age 35.¶ "The statistics from our study suggest that employer discrimination against minorities and ex-offenders has significantly undermined job opportunities for young black men with little schooling," Western said.

#### Can’t solve for poverty – their cards don’t assume the current economic crisis with over 8% unemployment. Even if they have access, there aren’t any jobs for them to get.

# Racism

#### Contact hypothesis only applies to long term contact – mass transit doesn’t provide the contact necessary to grow friendships

Pettigrew 98

(Thomas F. Pettigrew, Professor of Psychology at UC Santa Cruz, 2/1998, Intergroup Contact Theory: Annual Review of Psychology, http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/full/10.1146/annurev.psych.49.1.65)

Optimal intergroup contact requires time for cross-group friendships to develop. Past work has focused chiefly on short-term intergroup contact—the very condition that Sherif's (1966) Robbers' Cave field experiment found minimally effective. Once we adopt a long-term perspective that allows cross-group friendship to develop and the full decategorization, salient categorization, and recategorization sequence to unfold, we can expect striking results. Such a revised perspective explains why extended intergroup contact often has more positive results than either the contact hypothesis or cognitive analyses predict.¶ The power of cross-group friendship to reduce prejudice and generalize to other outgroups demands a fifth condition for the contact hypothesis: The contact situation must provide the participants with the opportunity to become friends. Such opportunity implies close interaction that would make self-disclosure and other friendship-developing mechanisms possible. It also implies the potential for extensive and repeated contact in a variety of social contexts. Allport (1954) alluded to this point when he favored intimate to trivial contact; Cook (1962) called it “acquaintance potential.” These European results suggest that “friendship potential” is an essential, not merely facilitating, condition for positive intergroup contact effects that generalize. Further, they suggest that Allport's conditions are important in part because they provide the setting that encourages intergroup friendship.

#### Can’t solve all racism – a large mass transit project wouldn’t get everyone out of their cars, people in rural areas and affluent people would still use their cars as they are faster